Social movements

Topic guide

August 2016

About this Topic Guide

This Topic Guide introduces key issues and debates in relation to social movements and collective action.

GSDRC Topic Guides aim to provide a clear, concise and objective report on findings from rigorous research on critical areas of development policy. Rather than provide policy guidance or recommendations, their purpose is to inform policymakers and practitioners of the key debates and evidence on the topic of focus, to support informed decision-making.

Author and contributors

This publication was written by Aditi Bhonagiri (Institute of Development Studies) in the summer of 2016. Its production was supported by the UK Government.

GSDRC appreciates the contributions of Mariz Tadros (IDS), Roopa Hinton, Helen Barnes, Aislin Baker, Alexandra Maclean (DFID) and Anita Gurumurthy (IT for Change).

Related GSDRC Topic Guides

- Voice, empowerment and accountability

- Open data, transparency and accountability

- State-citizen relations and citizenship in situations of conflict and fragility (topic guide supplement)

See: **gsdrc.org/topic-guides**

Supported by:

Contents

1. Introduction

Social movements are familiar features of the socio-political landscape, yet they can be hard to define. Broadly speaking, social movements are composed of multiple collective actions. Collective action involves people doing something together repeatedly or over a sustained period of time to achieve a shared purpose.

People's engagement with authority and/or powerful actors often takes place through spontaneous collective action outside established institutional channels. Collective action is increasingly being recognised as a pathway for: enhanced agency and voice for those who may not wish to use formal representation and who face social exclusion; broader participation in decision-making; and more transparent, responsive and accountable national governments and international governance institutions.

Social movements emerge when enough people feel alienated or excluded from the world around them or develop a deep distrust of how political institutions manage society. They express social, cultural, political or economic concerns locally, nationally or transnationally, and they are found in both democratic and repressive states. Information and communication technologies (ICTs) such as the internet, mobile phones and social media platforms have opened new spaces of engagement for collective action.

Some social movements may seek to reform the current system, some may espouse radical and revolutionary ideas, and some may seek to enhance – or circumscribe – rights. Some use violence; others do not. Citizens, non-citizens (e.g. migrants) and a variety of actors use social movements to champion a cause and direct, promote or resist change. However, the impact and effectiveness of social movements are highly contextual and can be difficult to assess. This topic guide provides a brief introduction to key debates surrounding social movements and collective action more broadly.

2. Defining and understanding social movements

2.1 What is a social movement?

> **Key points**
>
> - Social movements are dynamic, and may assume a different form, agenda or constituency over time. Analysis of a social movement needs to be precise about the period being examined.
>
> - Social movements are sensitive to 'political opportunity structures' but exist even in highly closed political systems.
>
> - Social movements actively frame or reframe the 'problem' they are tackling to mobilise people and sustain collective action. This helps legitimise their struggles and shared notions of the world and of themselves.

Social movements are dynamic, highly contextual phenomena. They differ in how they function and self-identify, and in the environments in which they emerge. Social historian Charles Tilly (cited in Foweraker, 1995:80) writes that a 'proper analogy to a social movement is neither a party nor a union but a political campaign'.

In the context of enhancing voice, empowerment and accountability, this topic guide proposes a definition of social movements based on three components identified by Tilly:

> Social movements mobilise actors and organisations seeking to alter power deficits or challenge authority. They combine three major elements (Tilly, 2006:183-4):
>
> '(1) **sustained campaigns** of claim-making;
>
> (2) an **array of public performances** including marches, rallies, processions, demonstrations, occupations, picket lines, blockades, public meetings, delegations, statements to and in public media, petition drives, letter-writing, pamphleteering, lobbying, and creation of specialised associations, coalitions, or fronts – in short, the social movement repertoire; and
>
> (3) repeated public displays of **worthiness, unity, numbers and commitment (WUNC)** by such means as wearing colors, marching in disciplined ranks, sporting badges that advertise the cause, displaying signs, chanting slogans, singing militant songs, and picketing public buildings'.

Various social science disciplines, including sociology, political science, history, anthropology, behavioural psychology and communication, have added to our understanding of social movements, collective action and social and political activism. Much of the scholarship on social movements comes from North America and Europe, in response to particular issues, historical events and changing social, political and economic dynamics in these regions. As a result, there is little scholarly consensus on the conceptual definition of social movements. The following sections outline shifts in theoretical perspectives on social movements.

'Old' and 'new' social movements

The extensive scholarship on social movements divides them into two main types:

- *old* **social movements** – struggles over material resources and political power

- *new* **social movements** – struggles over more emergent issues, including identity and cultural and symbolic issues

Old social movements, such as those of 19th century Europe and North America, demanded 'inclusion and rights within the framework of state and society relations' (Chester & Welsh, 2011:2). They included working-class and labour movements that questioned how state and society were organised. Noteworthy theorists included Karl Marx (theory of 'class conflicts') and Antonio Gramsci (theory of 'cultural hegemony').

The *new* social movements emerged in the 1960s and 70s 'out of the crisis of modernity and focus on struggles over symbolic, informational, and cultural resources and rights to specificity and difference' (Touraine, cited in Edelman, 2001:289). They focused on issues including human rights (feminist/women's and LGBT movements, and those against racial and ethnic discrimination), the environment and peace. They involved actors not previously mobilised, or issues not previously contested or politicised – often related to 'collective identity and belonging' (Horn, 2013:21).

These movements were 'new', argued Klandermans (cited in Chesters & Welsh, 2011), because they involved:

- new identities, class constituencies (e.g. the educated middle class)

- post-material concerns with questions of culture, power and identity

- new forms of action, such as small-scale participatory action outside established civil society groups

They dealt with issues and conflicts considered part of private and cultural life instead of focusing solely on political organisations.

Networked movements

Following the transformations in physical mobility and electronic communication and the emergence of virtual communities, theorists began to focus on the networked character of social movements. The network approach to social movements draws on ideas from Social Network Analysis (SNA), a research method that investigates social ties and shared stories and identities among individual actors in and around movements. According to SNA, social networks consist of 'nodes' linked by a direct relationship (explicit interaction and interdependence) or an indirect one (shared traits or orientation). When using this approach to study social movements, the nodes symbolise individuals or organisations mobilising or sympathising with a certain cause or subscribing to alternative lifestyles or cultural practices (Chesters & Welsh, 2011).

Analysing networked movements reveals how being embedded in a mesh of extensive connections affects people's decisions to participate in collective action and to maintain their associations. It also gives insight into the commitment of movement actors to a certain cause. Here, network relationships can be seen as a consequence, rather than a precondition, of collective action where movement actors work towards modifying social structures through collective agency (Diani, 2013). Thus, networked social movements are understood as processes through which 'networks of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups, and/or organizations, engaged in political or cultural conflicts, on the basis of shared collective identities' are reproduced (Diani, 1992:1).

Influential social movement theories

Theories of collective behaviour

The *collective behaviour* school of thought viewed social movements as an irrational or semi-rational spontaneous response to abnormal conditions in society, which challenged a legitimate social order and social norms of behaviour (Horn, 2013:20). It emerged against the background of the 1929 Great Depression in the US, the rise of fascism in Europe, and the Second World War.

Theories of resource mobilisation

McCarthy and Zald (1977:1217) formulated social movements as 'a set of opinions and beliefs which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution of a society'. This approach focuses on organisational resources and motivations for participation in movements, such as potential rewards, incentives and costs (Chester & Welsh, 2011:7; Horn, 2013:20).

Theories of political processes

This approach sought to examine movements' political and institutional context to shed light on 'political opportunity structures' and the success or failure of mobilisation processes. It emphasised social movements' political character as a form of 'contentious politics', which viewed one or more governments as a claimant or a target of claims (McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2001).

Theories of framing

This approach explains how movements emerge around the construction of ideas and meanings, and cognitive and moral constructions of prevailing problems, social struggles or injustices (Leach & Scoones, 2007; Horn, 2013). It analyses how debates, concepts and movement narratives about the 'root of the problem' are framed or reframed to fit the movement's agenda, so that people can connect with the cause and develop appropriate strategies.

2.2 Characteristics of social movements

Key points

- Social movements go through cycles of activity; they do not remain consistently or visibly active.

- A single protest is not in itself evidence of the existence of a social movement; neither is the absence of protests evidence of the absence of a social movement, since movements may diversify their strategies.

- Not all social movements have emancipatory ideologies or visions. Social movements, like other civil society actors, can advance 'progressive' agendas as well as those that are 'uncivil', and may seek to circumscribe the space, rights and voice of others.

A social movement is an organised collective. This is distinct from spontaneous collective action where individuals share similar ideas but not a common goal, logic, organisation or leadership (Bayat, 2000) – for example, women in public spaces violating dress codes set by their government.

Social movements that are able to sustain themselves share some common characteristics (Batliwala 2012; Snow, 2013:1201):

- They are change-oriented – whether they seek change or oppose it – although the level and extent of the change sought may vary.

- They challenge or defend existing institutional systems of authority (political, religious, corporate, educational or cultural).

- They are collective enterprises.

- They are built on existing formal or informal organisational structures or networks, but the degree to which they use non-institutional tactics may vary.

- They operate with some degree of organisation.

- They display some degree of continuity over time.

While social movements demonstrate some continuity, they involve 'cycles of contention' or protest (Tarrow, 1998). They grow or shrink depending on 'factors that enable or constrain them' (Sogge & Dütting, 2010: 31), such as contestation from within or shifts in their external environments. A movement's historical context is crucial in understanding its politics, strategies, emergence, meaning and impact.

The characteristics above outline what movements have in common. Fominaya (2014: 9-11) sets out four characteristics to help differentiate social movements:

Phases of visible or latent activity

Movements have visible and latent phases (Melucci, cited in Fominaya, 2014:9). Latent phases rarely entail protest activities. In such phases their activities are largely inward-looking, and include: experimenting with alternative forms of decision-making; brainstorming alternative solutions to social problems; generating new lifestyle and cultural practices or alternative forms of social organisation (e.g. cooperation, mutual aid) etc. Movements gain visibility when they engage in mobilisation and protest. A protest is not in itself a social movement, but only one form of (visible) social movement activity.

Prefigurative politics

Some social movements seek to use tactics and practices that embody or 'prefigure' the kind of society they want to create. This can be a type of social experiment in creating an aspirational and alternative vision of society, when movement goals are multiple and/or not predetermined (Maecklebergh 2011:1): 'certain political ideals are experimentally actualised in the "here and now"' (van de Sande, 2013: 230). The 'prefiguration' approach to politics originates from New Left civil rights movements of the 1960s and is seen in contemporary anarchist discourse and studies. It provides an alternative understanding of 'leaderless' movements: examples include the autonomous spaces created by the occupation of a town square during the 2011 revolution in Egypt, the 'Indignados' or 'Occupy' movements, and the global justice or anti-globalisation movements (ibid.). A prefigurative political orientation is 'based on a premise that the ends a social movement achieves are fundamentally shaped by the means it employs', emphasising the 'process' of change rather than just a movement's 'outcomes' (Leach, 2013:1004). Such social movements provide society with a site for learning that is guided by values rather than institutional efficiency. They create space for new ideas, ideals, practices and identities; they experiment with alternative political structures that transform the way power operates; and they incorporate intercultural decision-making processes (Eyerman & Jamison, 1991; Maecklebergh, 2011).

The 1871 Paris Commune is one example of prefigurative politics. It was a short-lived revolution against the French State, started by ordinary citizens who were represented by urban workers, tradespeople, and radical bourgeois to build a fairer and more equitable society. The commune was a result of years of political turmoil which led to citizens rising up against authorities, declaring independence and forming a municipal government organised on communistic principles which was later brutally repressed by government forces.

Social movements versus social movement organisations

A social movement organisation (SMO) may identify with and promote a social movement's goals, yet is usually more formally organised (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Greenpeace and Amnesty International are examples of SMOs – they are part of the broader environmental and human rights movements. SMOs' professionalisation can make their lobbying more effective, but may reduce the representation of grassroots constituencies in the organisations' elite positions. SMOs may also tone down their criticism to secure funding or continued access to policy-makers. Hence, Fominaya (2014) argues that, while SMOs are a part of social movements, they may lack two core elements of social movements: contentious and non-institutionalised collective action. However, the lines between social movements and SMOs remain blurred.

Progressive, uncivil, regressive movements and countermovements

Not all social movements work toward progressive social change. *Uncivil* movements resort to violence to pursue their goals. *Regressive* movements aim to return society to the way it was before a certain change took place, and include movements against immigration or immigrants. *Countermovements* work against progressive movements' demands or the policy changes they have brought about. Examples of countermovements include anti-abortion movements, and movements against gay rights or gay civil unions/marriage in countries where these rights have been granted.

2.3 Elements of social movements

Key points

- The different elements of a social movement help us understand its nature and politics.

- Social movement participants differ in their interests and contributions but are united by a common purpose.

- Understanding the social relations among various actors involved in, or targeted by, a social movement helps in understanding its dynamics.

- Collective action that mobilises people around contentious agendas in socially and politically conservative spaces may lead to unintended consequences – such as violent backlash and repressive measures against constituents or potential beneficiaries.

- Non-violent civil resistance and armed struggles may use similar strategies.

- A non-violent movement may turn to guerilla struggle or armed resistance following regime brutality or a violent crackdown.

People and participation

Collective action is often referred to as *people power,* and implies a degree of homogeneity of actors and participants. However, Hardt and Negri (2004) introduce the concept of *multitudes* to challenge the assumption that the people are a unified entity. A multitudes perspective views the *people* as 'a set of singularities ... a social subject which cannot be reduced to sameness, a difference that remains different' (ibid: 99). Thus, the people remain differentiated but are able to act based on what they have in common.

McCarthy and Zald (2014:164–5) propose a useful typology of the different kinds of 'people' or actors associated with social movements:

- *Adherents* – individuals and organisations that believe in the movement's goals.
- *Constituents* – provide resources for it (time, labour, money).
- *Potential beneficiaries* – individuals or groups that would directly benefit from the achievement of movement goals.
- *Conscience constituents* – individuals who support the movement but do not directly benefit from it.
- The *bystander public* – non-adherents who do not oppose the movement and merely witness its activity.
- *Opponents* – individuals, groups or organisations that disagree with a movement's goals.

Movement participants galvanised by a common purpose can include individuals, organisations or groups. They contribute in different ways to the movement's creation or maintenance. With respect to participation, successful movements overcome 'six strategic hurdles' of collective action. They '(1) attract new recruits; (2) sustain the morale and commitment of current adherents; (3) generate media coverage; (4) mobilize the support of 'bystander publics'; (5) constrain the social control options of its opponents, and (6) ultimately shape public policy and state action' (McAdam, 1996:339–40). However, Olson (1965) notes that social movements often suffer from a 'free-rider problem': people who would benefit from the movement either do not take part in its activities or make only limited contributions at their own convenience.

Goals and agendas

Social movement goals vary from movement to movement and respond to unique political opportunities and/or tipping points. Some pursue material benefits or rights for groups they represent or whose democratic rights they wish to expand (labour rights movements); others fight for protections and advantages for other groups or potential beneficiaries (animal rights movements). Some pursue local issues (movements against forced displacement or fracking); others look to global issues (movements against genetically modified organisms or for climate change action or coal divestment). Some attempt to bring about 'pivotal governance of constitutional shifts'; others aim to work towards social policy reforms.

Additionally, movements often have multiple goals – those that are 'expressive' and focused on internal movement audiences and those that are 'instrumental' and aimed at external audiences (Jasper, 2013). Moreover, goals are not static but constantly shifting, and there may be tensions between the goals of a group and of the individuals within it. These potential conflicts among the different goals add to the dynamics of the movement.

Most social movements have a clear political agenda with respect to the change they wish to bring about: a movement's constituency has a shared understanding or perception of the social and structural conditions

of disempowerment, inequality or injustice they seek to change (Batliwala, 2012). Aberele (1966, cited in Snow, 2013:1202) identified four types of movements based on their social change agendas:

Type of movement	Realm of change	Social change agenda
Alternative	Individual	Pursue partial change in individuals. Not concerned with changing the system. *Examples*: campaigns for planned parenthood or self-help women's groups.
Redemptive	Individual	Aim for complete transformation of an individual. *Examples*: faith-based movements or religious sects that recruit members to be 'reborn'.
Reformative	System	Seek to change limited but focused aspects or norms with respect to rights, access or participation in the social system. Constituents usually try to pursue goals by adhering to the system or using tools provided by the system, such as the legal system to challenge unfair laws or public demonstrations to influence policy reforms. *Examples*: the US civil rights movement, the international domestic workers' movement, migrants' rights movements.
Revolutionary or transformative	System	Not interested in working within the system, but seek fundamental changes in a social and political system's institutional structures and pervasive practices or values. May seek to redefine rights and privileges of citizenship and personhood. *Example*: separatist movements.

Source: Aberele (1966, cited in Snow, 2013).

Reformist movements tend to improve conditions within an existing framework without immediately challenging underlying assumptions and overall structures. Revolutionary and/or transformative movements challenge a system's basic assumptions and values and seek to alter social structures, institutional and cultural behaviours and processes. Empowering constituencies is at the core of both types of agendas.

However, the ability of movements to bring about radical change is limited: movements that voice the concerns of the economically, politically and socially marginalised also compete with the interests and ideologies of powerful corporate and administrative groups that control decision-making mechanisms (Fernando, 2012). In addition, movements are exposed to a real threat of violent backlash or repressive measures, limiting their ability to effectively mobilise and work towards their goals.

With reference to poverty, exclusion, empowerment and social development, Mitlin and Bebbington (2006:2) propose a typology of issue-based social movement agendas that mobilise citizens on the basis of (or against):

- access to and control of natural resources and distribution of productive assets – e.g. land rights movements, pastoralist movements, peasant movements, indigenous rights movements
- economic exploitation and unequal access to markets, especially labour markets – e.g. movements against the extractive industries or trade liberalisation
- systemic and structural forms of discrimination, prejudice and social exclusion based on race, ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation.

In relation to fragile, conflict-affected or politically closed contexts, especially in societies involved in liberation struggles (e.g. against military occupation), Carter (2012: 22) compares the strategic aims of what she terms:

- **people power**: long-term movements of unarmed civil resistance, which use non-violent strategies (e.g. civil disobedience movements, sit-in protests, hunger strikes), and

- **people's war**: guerrilla struggles/warfare/resistance that focus on violent armed resistance and the overthrowing of regimes by force

She highlights five strategic aims that both may share (2012: 30–41):

- **winning majority support** for the struggle: gain the sympathy of most of the population, whether against a brutal dictatorship or to build belief in national identity, democracy and social justice

- **mobilising excluded sections of the population** who have faced discrimination based on ethnicity, gender or age, for example

- **encouraging defection of troops and police**, which may be crucial in the final phases of a resistance movement confronting a regime or in the case of sudden mobilisations of citizens

- **building alternative institutions from below** to generate constructive responses for protesting constituents or to sustain resistance, for example

- **promoting solidarity and fearlessness** to transform apathy or despair into political consciousness, inculcate self-reliance and self-belief, and make the fearful courageous; strategies for promoting solidarity include coalition-building with other movements, groups or organisations

Targets

Social movements may target one or more actors, both within and outside the movement. Batliwala's list of feminist movements' possible targets (2012: 3-4) is relevant more broadly:

Target	Examples
Own membership or communities	Aim to tackle discriminatory customs and social practices like female genital mutilation (FGM), violence against women, machismo, etc.
Society at large	Aim to change negative attitudes, biases or perceptions – e.g. based on gender, caste, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or occupation
Other social groups that violate their rights or exclude them	Aim to tackle discrimination and violence by majority groups against racial, religious, ethnic or sexual minorities, or to claim land rights or fair wages from landowners or employers
The state or regimes in power	Demand greater democracy, transparency, accountability, legal reforms or policy changes
Extra-state actors, such as criminal networks	Aim to stop the use of direct and indirect violence against women as a means of control
Warring factions in civil or military conflicts	Aim to stop the use of violence against women as a weapon of war
Private sector actors	Aim to prevent corporations and employers from violating labour rights, causing environmental damage or restricting access to natural resources etc.
Intl. institutions, e.g. World Bank, UN, IMF, WTO	Aim to influence policies that affect lives directly and indirectly

Source: Adapted from Batliwala (2012).

3. Why do social movements matter?

> **Key points**
>
> - Vibrant, non-violent social movements reflect a citizen-centred approach to building effective states and improving state-society relations.
>
> - Social movements as a site for identity formation can transform people from state subjects to active and engaged citizens.
>
> - Social movements have the potential to create impact at scale and sustained change at levels that policy and legislation alone cannot.
>
> - To be a valuable driver of progressive change, social movements need to hold not just governments but also themselves accountable in the larger interests of civil society.

Social movements and civil society mobilisation indicate a lively civil society. They have existed across centuries, and are formidable political forces that 'affirm the importance of "civil society actors" in the processes of social and political change' (Bebbington, 2010:4).

Social movements matter because they can:

- press for better governance

- help develop a sense of citizenship and self-identity to encourage citizen participation and voice

- create 'collective power' through strength in numbers and solidarity

- play an important role in nation-building and democracy

- provide opportunities to learn about emerging issues that matter to citizens

3.1 Promotion of improved governance

Stephan, Makhani and Naviwala (2015:1) note that organised movements in India, Afghanistan, Kenya, Turkey and elsewhere have challenged acute corruption. Movements have also successfully confronted their governments about: (1) repressive and discriminatory governance practices; (2) discrimination or mismanagement in development practices or outcomes; and (3) failure to provide security, basic civic services, and livelihood opportunities (ibid.).

Further, non-violent campaigns against authoritarian regimes across the Middle East and North Africa and protests against government policies in Hong Kong, Brazil and Venezuela have helped empower citizens to voice their concerns publicly (Stephan et al., 2015:2). Supporting this argument, Touraine (2002: 95) asserts that the core importance of social movements is their ability to revive civil society to 'avoid a totalitarian world'. They seek to hold governments to account while also being accountable themselves to their constituents and wider society.

<div style="border: 1px solid #9e2b25; padding: 20px;">

Movement against large dams

The movement against large dams on the Narmada River in India stalled the construction of such dams and pressured the World Bank to alter lending policies and priorities to take social and environmental concerns into account. It also led to the establishment of the World Commission on Dams (WCD). The WCD has recognised that in many cases large dams have led to avoidable impoverishment and suffering for large numbers of poor people. It has established firm standards and guidelines for future dams, including consultation with tribal people and others affected by their construction.

The enthusiasm for large dams is resurfacing as a 'green energy' response to climate change. China is now the single biggest funder of large dams, and Chinese corporations and banks are set to build new dams in Sarawak and Ethiopia. Social movements will continue to have a critical role in demanding adherence to WCD principles.

Source: Adapted from Fernando (2012).

</div>

3.2 Encouragement of citizen participation and voice

Eyben and Ladbury (2006:19) note that nurturing an empowered and engaged citizenry is a vital function of an effective state: 'State institutions are built, re-shaped and built again through the action of citizens engaged in struggles among themselves and with the state for power and voice… However, they are particularly vulnerable to fragility when large numbers of people living within their boundaries are disconnected from state institutions or when state institutions are accountable only to an elite minority.' In other words, as Bebbington (2010:4) puts it, 'Much of the contemporary state has origins in struggles within society, with new state institutions emerging to mediate, regulate and/or implement the outcomes of those struggles… [so] civil society and the state need to be understood in relation to each other.'

Inequality, poverty and injustice can have a crippling effect on equal access to citizenship rights, especially among marginalised populations. Case studies from the Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability demonstrate that social movements often enable participants to develop a sense of self-identity and citizenship, which does not necessarily emerge initially through engagement with the state. They help participants transform their shared grievances into a sense of collective experience of injustice and collective power that can trigger action for social change: 'A sense of citizenship normally starts with people's own agendas – they create a political identity around a matter that immediately affects their lives… Group membership amongst those who are marginalized and the sense of dignity and solidarity that comes with this can stimulate people to aspire as a precursor to political engagement' (Eyben & Ladbury, 2006:19).

Additionally, Earle (2008) notes that the concept of citizenship is intrinsically linked to service provision. Therefore, framing basic rights as 'citizenship rights' can powerfully support social movements' state-focused campaigning.

The Seringuiero, or Amazonian rubber tappers, movement

In the 1970s and 1980s, Brazil was under a military dictatorship that encouraged the clearing of the Amazon for livestock production. Under this policy of expanding the agricultural frontier, ranchers who wanted to clear the forest expelled rubber tappers from the rubber plantations. Families were offered relocation by the government to places where many already struggled with poverty, disease and social dislocation.

Against this background, union leader Chico Mendes started a powerful grassroots movement of Brazil's rubber tappers in Acre. Mendes had already set up a rural workers' union and had begun a collective fight for rural rights. The new movement later became the National Council of Rubber Tappers—creating an alliance of 'peoples of the forest' (rubber tappers, river dwellers and indigenous people). They campaigned for the rights of poor people and against deforestation. Under Mendes' presidency, the National Council of Rubber Tappers allied with the international conservation movement and pioneered the idea of 'extractive reserves' to ensure local forest dwellers were able to preserve the forests they depended on while providing for themselves.

Source: Evans (2013).

3.3 Creation of 'collective power'

Social movements galvanise civil society actors to create collective power, visible in public demonstrations, grassroots work and policy advocacy. As Mitlin (2006:7) explains:

> Social movements gain power by building a critical mass of engaged participants who recognise their common interest in taking action. The underlying orientation is one of solidarity rather than divide and rule. Their legitimacy comes in part from their mass appeal, and their ability to draw together large numbers of people with a commonality of purpose regardless of diverse interests. Movements have been successful despite these difficulties and numerous achievements have been secured.

For example, Batliwala (2012:7) argues that major achievements in advancing sexual and reproductive rights and gender equality were the culmination of decades of organised lobbying by women's organisations and feminist advocates that created momentum based on collective power. Social movements use this power of numbers and/or solidarity to reform situations of disempowerment, sustain themselves and protect participants from violence.

Egypt's Taskforce against FGM

To counter the widespread practice in Egypt of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM), a coalition of diverse actors – who do not normally associate with each other – came together. The movement's critical mass was made up of grassroots activists, professionals and development practitioners working in community development, health, women's rights and education. But more significantly, it brought together faith-based NGOs and left-wing feminist activists who often had conflicting interests and values. Together, they created a loose, decentralised Taskforce against FGM in 1994 under the guidance of Marie Assaad. The Taskforce engaged with its targets on various levels: academic, policy-making, development practice and national public opinion. It also sought alternative interpretations from Muslim scholars, who affirmed that the practice of FGM was not Islamic (Tadros 2016:119-120). As a result of the Taskforce's efforts, the Egyptian government issued a law criminalising FGM in 2008, and the first case was tried in 2015. Tadros (2016) argues that legislation not supported by a popular movement would at best be ineffective and at worst could trigger a backlash that would help perpetuate FGM. While the Taskforce may not be conventionally seen as a social movement, it offered a unique model of collective action and collective power that achieved consensus in challenging circumstances (ibid.).   *Source*: Tadros (2016).

3.4 Support for nation-building and democracy

Social movements challenge a government's ability to protect the constitutional rights of its citizens and are vital tools in setting the governance agenda (Eyben & Ladbury, 2006). They imply an active and organised citizenry, empowered in unity, in numbers and by the worthiness of and commitment to their cause, and motivated to carry out a sustained campaign to demand their rights and defend their interests. Collective action for democracy and political transformation has, to varying degrees, led to: the extension of democratic rights and opening-up of democratic spaces; new forms of political participation and political voice; and the formation of new political parties. Examples include the 2011 India Against Corruption movement, and movements in Egypt and Tunisia that led to the overthrow of long-standing politically repressive regimes (Horn, 2013:10).

3.5 Insight into emerging issues

Social movements provide early warning of emerging issues that matter to citizens. They provide insights into grassroots struggles and access to constituencies before formal development organisations respond. They also provide local knowledge and expertise (such as on impacts of biodiversity loss or climate change). Social movements can also provide valuable alternative solutions to problems that conventional top-down approaches fail to tackle.

4. Technology, digital activism and social movements

> **Key points**
>
> - ICTs have had a significant impact on social movements, and can both promote and repress their activity and communication.
> - Digital activism has broadened participation in movements in terms of both collective and connective action.
> - Access to ICTs is not a level playing field, and the dynamics of social exclusion are evident.
> - ICTs have helped build, expand and sustain both transnational and resource-poor movements, especially by allowing participants to document and upload real-time and user-generated content.

4.1 The role of ICTs in facilitating social movements

Earl, Hunt, Garrett and Dal (2015) discuss three ways information and communication technologies have played a pivotal role in the political protests and social movements of the past two decades, especially in the global arena:

Short-lived forms of contentious activity

New forms of protest enable 'ephemeral' collective action or engagement, such as email campaigns and online petitions that do not require long-term commitment. Such engagements create a 'flash flood' of activism and thereby new forms of power to influence public opinion, public policy and media coverage. However, some scholars and activists criticise it as merely 'slacktivism', which can elicit repressive measures from governments.

Broader participation

ICT usage has expanded the scope of social movement participation beyond formal SMOs, enabling individuals and loose networks to organise spontaneous protests. This has in some ways contributed to a new 'logic of connective action', which mobilises people through the exchange of personally relevant information across fluid networks (Bennett & Segerberg, 2013 cited in Earl et al., 2015). Connective action has also reduced movements' 'free-rider' dilemma.

Transnational protests and movements in the global South

Earl et al. (2015) argue that the visibility, continuity, size and connectivity of transnational and/or resource-poor movements in the global South would be impossible without ICTs. In particular, ICT-enabled user-generated content (documenting evidence and sharing information on social media through posts, photos, online videos, tweets, hashtags) has created transnational movement cultures and shared identities across national borders. It has also significantly increased access to, and the reach of, protest information; invited international pressure; and reduced reliance on news and mainstream media organisations that ignore contentious protest activities or are often bound by government or elite restrictions. However, access to ICTs is unequal, reflecting a digital divide across lines of gender, class, caste, education etc. As such, ICTs do

not necessarily create an inclusive and equitable arena for participation and mobilisation. Further, there is a real threat of ICT service providers being pressured into acting against users' interests.

4.2 ICTs' impact on a social movement's mode of activism

Much of the literature linking ICTs, social media and social movements looks at particular micro-level case studies. Examples include the use of the internet by the Mexican Zapatista movement to attract global solidarity in the 1990s, mobile phones' centrality in the coordination of protests to oust President Estrada in the Philippines in 2001 and the Twitter revolutions, from Moldova and Iran in 2009 to the Arab Spring of 2011 (Heeks & Seo-Zindy, 2013). Perspectives about technology's catalytic role tend to be positive and technologically deterministic. Technology has certainly contributed to the rapid mass coordination, mobilisation and organisation of protest movements. It has also added new meaning to the phrase, 'the whole world is watching', with collective actors and participants communicating and broadcasting their events in real time to local and international audiences.

However, scholars have questioned ICTs' transformative potential, with some seeing technology rather as an 'amplifier of familiar contentious politics' (Gardener, 2013: 1191). The emergence of online petition platforms like Change.org is seen as inimical to social movement philosophy, promoting 'clicktivism' and undermining sustained collective action.

Critics also highlight unequal access to different online mobilising tools and the use of these technologies by repressive, authoritarian regimes (Hindman 2008; Shirky, 2011). The literature points to how platforms and internet intermediaries collude with state actors in cutting out voices, censoring views and groups seen as anti-establishment. Corporate policies on appropriate online behaviour tend to be non-transparent, and reflect expediency with respect to what politics are admitted.

Some argue that online spaces have been appropriated by causes amenable to simple evocative messaging, and that social movements not connected to the 'global networks of hope' (Castells, 2012) have been marginalised (Shirkey 2011; Hindman 2008; Gurumurthy 2016). For instance, indigenous communities may find it hard to get their critiques of their loss of the right to access natural resources heard.

4.3 Technology for liberation and repression

In measuring the impact of technology on social movements, two dominant views emerge: ICTs as 'liberation technology' or as 'repression technology'. The liberation perspective focuses on four benefits for social movements of ICTs: (1) a dramatic reduction in communication and participation costs; (2) accelerated and more extensive information diffusion; (3) independent mobilisation opportunities for an emergent civil society; and (4) the transcending of time and space barriers to create a collective identity and a sense of community (Garrett, 2006; Diamond, 2010; Heeks & Seo-Zindy, 2013). Technology empowers citizens living under authoritarian rule to build and mobilise domestic support. It creates spaces for dissent followed by the possibility of political change, which would otherwise have been more difficult to achieve.

Conversely, authoritarian regimes may use ICTs for control or repression. Hachigen (2002) talks about a 'dictator's dilemma': technology cannot be completely controlled as it is necessary to advance economic growth. However, regimes may block access to or censor internet-based platforms, either constantly or just during heightened civil unrest. Repressive measures may entail monitoring, surveillance and hacking of electronic communication, websites and mobiles to gather information about dissenting individuals and networks; circulation of propaganda and misinformation; or cyber-warfare tactics such as planting disinformation or viruses (Gurumurthy 2016; Heeks & Seo-Zindy 2013). Civil society actors can play an equally repressive role if their online interactions foster hatred and fundamentalist ideology.

5. Effectiveness and impacts of social movements

Key points

- Social movements can empower their constituents and/or potential beneficiaries through a variety of means, such as education, policy reforms, mobilising and formalising collective action and forming self-help groups.

- Social movements are important for marginalised groups, especially those with no formal representation. Impacts on voice and participation may include people developing critical awareness of their social reality or social worth, or being able to create coalitions and develop community solutions.

- Social movements are not singular entities, so their impacts are difficult to assess.

Back in 1900, people who called for women's suffrage, laws protecting the environment and consumers, an end to lynching, the right of workers to form unions, a progressive income tax, a federal minimum wage, old-age insurance, dismantling of Jim Crow laws, the eight-hour workday, and government-subsidized health care and housing were considered impractical idealists, utopian dreamers, or dangerous socialists. Now we take these ideas for granted. The radical ideas of one generation have become the common sense of the next (Dreier, 2012).

Social movements are vital ingredients in the processes of change and reform, but the causal link between social movements and social and political change is a complex one – difficult to anticipate and assess (Fernando 2012). The literature discussing the impact and effectiveness of social movements is scant and highlights a need for deeper understanding of how change happens. Most existing work focuses on movements' political and policy outcomes, and pays little attention to their cultural and institutional impacts at the grassroots. Further, social movements are not homogenous but diffused entities, and change outcomes may be made possible by a host of actors, rather than social movements alone (Giugni, McAdam & Tilly 1999). There is also a lack of empirical evidence about movements' indirect and unintended impacts on constituents and potential beneficiaries.

This section therefore focuses on movements' roles in enhancing voice, participation, empowerment, transparency and accountability, and on movements' political impacts. It draws insights from individual case studies.

Social movements seek change on behalf of sections of society that are excluded, marginalised or powerless, to collectively voice common interests and promote inclusive participation in society. Movements mobilise masses around equal access to and control over resources; fair access to basic services such as clean water or healthcare; access to markets or decent working conditions; and greater representation in local politics – that is, ideas that give movement constituents new forms of political and social identity (Fernando, 2012).

Shack/Slum Dwellers International

In the 1970s, Joackin Arputham founded the National Slum Dwellers Federation of India, and in 1996 helped found Slum Dwellers International so that federations of slum and shack dwellers in different countries could support and learn from each other. Today, Shack/Slum Dwellers International (SDI) is a formalised movement of the urban poor. It seeks to build local movements at a neighbourhood level, primarily around land and basic services. The network grew from the seven founding members in 1996 (South Africa, India, Zimbabwe, Namibia, Cambodia, Nepal and Thailand) to 15 core affiliates by 2006 (plus Kenya, Malawi, Uganda, Ghana, Zambia, Sri Lanka, Philippines and Brazil), with a further 10 countries interested in participating.

The movement is significant in many ways. It places considerable emphasis on the lowest level of organisation and on the inclusion of the poorest and most vulnerable (notably women). Direct action methods include helping local communities to design solutions tailored to their needs and refining these solutions through practice. It is also non-confrontational in its relations with local authorities, in the understanding that agreement needs to be reached.

SDI affiliates have been significantly effective at securing tenure in South Africa, India, Namibia, Thailand and Philippines. Additionally, in all five contexts, they have been able to bring in state subsidies to assist the urban poor to secure land. This experience highlights the importance of strong local politicised organisations if community solutions are to prevail and if communities are to have the capacities they need to take up new challenges once they move to permanent sites.

Source: Mitlin (2006).

Early debates on measuring the political impacts or the 'success' of movements looked at whether movements had gained 'acceptance' (as politically legitimate actors or through inclusion in state politics) or had created 'new advantages' (political opportunities for movement constituents) (Gamson, 1990). Since then, the focus has shifted to looking at how they contribute to the expansion of democratic rights and state processes (e.g. a disenfranchised group winning the right to vote or take part in decision-making – see the Citizenship Schools Movement case below), or at how they create new forms of political institutions (e.g. political parties) to bring about change at a structural level. Legislative changes and changes in state policies are a more concrete example of impacts, particularly for reformist movements.

Citizenship Schools Movement

Citizenship schools originated in South Carolina, US, in 1959, based on the belief that education was key to political empowerment, and quickly spread throughout the south from the Highlander Folk School in Tennessee. The Citizenship Schools Movement galvanised more than 1,000 grassroots, independent schools operating in the segregated south and played a significant role in educating African Americans towards full citizenship rights. During the 1950s and 1960s, thousands of disenfranchised African Americans passed through citizenship school classes, as many southern states had literacy tests that required people to be able to read and write, and sometimes answer 'citizenship' questions that were generally designed to exclude African Americans from voting. Hence, teaching large numbers of adult African Americans in the south to read, write and learn about citizenship was critical in the larger struggle for civil rights. In addition to preparing adults to gain access to the voting booth, the citizenship schools taught them how to wield the power of the ballot to transform their everyday lives.

Source: Levine (2004).

The COPINH case study below outlines some of the unintended consequences of social movements that are politically engaged in challenging and resisting power-holders – that is, repressive measures from the state and a violent backlash that resulted in the deaths of important movement torchbearers.

Civic Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations of Honduras (COPINH)

COPINH is an indigenous Lenca network of organisations that represents 200 Lenca communities in the western Honduran states of Intibuca, Lempira, La Paz and Santa Barbara. Founded in 1993, COPINH has been fighting the growing threats posed to Lenca communities by illegal logging and for their territorial rights and improved livelihoods. So far, it has stopped at least 50 logging projects and 10 hydroelectric dam projects. COPINH has also successfully lobbied the Honduran government to ratify International Labour Organization Convention 169 on the Rights of Indigenous People, which solidifies the right of indigenous communities to free, prior and informed consultation. It has also worked to obtain communal land titles for indigenous communities.

Since the 2009 military coup, there has been an explosion in land allocations for mega infrastructure projects that have the potential to be environmentally destructive and cause massive displacement. With almost 30% of the country's land earmarked for mining projects, the government has approved hundreds of dam projects to meet the need for cheap energy. For example, the government approved a plan to build Agua Zarca Dam on the Gualcarque River— considered sacred by the Lenca communities – with no prior consultation with the local communities, violating the international treaties it was bound by. The proposed dam would cut communities off from vital food and medical supplies.

COPINH launched a fierce grassroots campaign that included reaching out to the international community, including the Inter-American Human Rights Commission and the Agua Zarca Dam's funders. Following the death of community leader Tomas Garcia, who was shot and killed during a peaceful protest at the dam office, the campaign successfully pressured the Chinese company Sinohydro to pull out of the project in 2003. Construction then stalled. However, members of COPINH have faced death threats, violent attacks and eviction attempts by the Honduran armed forces and private contractors. On March 3, 2016 Berta Cáceres, the founder of COPINH, was murdered by gunmen in her home. Her colleague and fellow COPINH member Nelson García was also killed just 12 days later.

Source: McKay (2016); https://www.copinh.org/

Horn (2013:40) argues that feminist and women's movements have been influential in developing and articulating important political frameworks and concepts to help deepen gendered understandings of social, political and economic life. Examples include concepts such as the public/private dichotomy, Moser's (1993, cited in Horn, 2013) 'triple burden' of productive, reproductive and care labour, notions of patriarchy, gender identity and the framework of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991, cited in Horn, 2013).

These frameworks and concepts have been further used by labour, LGBT, racial, ethnic and caste justice movements to build a vision for social justice. In addition, feminist and women's movements have helped generate a gender-aware understanding of human rights, as the case study below demonstrates.

Movements against corruption and for the right to information (RTI) mobilise citizens to demand transparency and accountability of their governments. The RTI movement in India is a prominent example of such a movement for sustained work, having put in nearly three decades of grassroots mobilisation combined with networking with thought-leaders through a broad-based advocacy strategy. The movement has been effective in putting pressure on the government for RTI legislation but has also promoted people's active participation in local governance.

The Right to Information (RTI) movement

The RTI movement sprang up in the 1990s in the village of Beawer in Rajasthan, India. It was led by organisations such as Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS, or Organisation for the Empowerment of Workers and Peasants), a driving force of rights-based movements, and Parivartan, which is member of a larger network, the National Campaign for People's Right to Information.

Faced by money being siphoned off from development projects, land-grabbing and rampant corruption in famine relief services, the movement galvanised poor and marginal grassroots groups. They demanded legislative change so that citizens could access information and government records, so as to make the government accountable to its people, reduce corruption and deepen democracy.

Following a nationwide campaign of over a decade, the RTI Act was finally enacted in 2005, but has since been weakened by amendments made by successive governments. RTI activists remain at the forefront in exposing cases of corruption. Grassroots activists, organisations, lawyers and ordinary citizens use the RTI Act to hold those in power accountable and to create positive social change. However, some have been targeted, harassed or even murdered for seeking information.

RTI activists led the 2011 India Against Corruption movement, demanding the setup of an ombudsperson bill to root out political corruption. A section of the constituency broke away from the movement to form a political party, the Aam Aadmi Party.

In December 2015, MKSS began a 100-day campaign, Jawaabdehi Yatra, or the March for Accountability. This passed through 33 districts in Rajasthan to raise awareness of the need for an accountability bill. The bill would support a bottom-up structure in which citizens can ensure the government delivers promised services on deadline. Such a bill would allow citizens a greater stake in governance and policy-making.

Sources: Baviskar (2008); Majumdar (2016).

6. Social movements and external actors

6.1 Role of external actors in supporting social movements

The literature on external actor engagement with social movements is extremely limited, and rarely discusses whether external actors have a role to play or why such a role is necessary. Instead, discussions usually coalesce around the value in supporting movements, policy guidance to help donors keen to engage with movements, the impacts of such arrangements or reviews of existing relationships between external actors and movement actors or networks.

However, there are many examples of external engagement. For instance, donors (bilateral and philanthropic) have been working with social movements on major rights-based issues. This has included the following (Fernando, 2012):

- support by DFID, Norad and Sida to Samat land rights activism in Bangladesh
- GTZ's support for Latin America's indigenous peoples' movements
- Danida's support to the pastoralist movement in Tanzania
- Mama Cash's support to women's rights movements
- support for movements by INGOs such as Oxfam and Survival international, to name a few

Most of the reviewed literature calls for caution, or is critical of such engagements as being ineffective or counterproductive rather than facilitating change (Tadros, 2011; Fernando, 2012; Sogge & Dütting, 2010; Joyce & Walker, 2015; Peiffer, 2015; Stephan et al., 2015). One prominent reason is that the political nature of social movements often stands at odds with the neutral stance donors may wish to maintain. In addition, there is little evidence of collective action theories informing development programmes, although external actors may have used such a lens to analyse obstacles (Peiffer, 2015:2).

Gurumurthy (e-discussions, 2016) argues that when a donor does decide to engage with a social movement, they do so in full acknowledgement of its overt political nature. In fact, donor funding brings new dynamics into voluntary and impassioned campaigns of claim-making. Donors create their own local agenda though their funding, which may also generate new dynamics in a local democracy. For example, donor focus on men and masculinities may be seen to reduce emphasis on gender-based structures of violence and prejudice (ibid.). Meanwhile, even donors that choose not to fund a movement may advocate a certain vision of politics that influences a local movement in its early stages. Thus, depending on the context, interventions or engagements initiated by donors may intentionally or unintentionally alter the interests and incentives of movement constituents to work together and find solutions to their common problem (Peiffer, 2015).

6.2 Engaging with social movements and non-traditional forms of civil society

Social movement actors' marginalisation and lack of resources or skills (such as language, technical know-how, accounting and management, or grant-writing) can make it difficult for them to engage with external actors and to access donor support (Joyce & Walker, 2015). In addition, while social movements require a variety of resources to sustain themselves (educational, financial, legal etc.), they are often aware of the risks of co-optation as result of collaborating with external actors (Fernando, 2012). Joyce and Walker (2015:2) note that external actors tend to fund organisations or collectives that have a familiar or similar organisational structure to their own, for example 'technocratic, highly-specialised, Anglophone'. Finally,

support to grassroots movements, especially those that are 'diffuse, decentralised and leaderless', is neither 'straightforward nor uncontroversial' (Stephan et al., 2015:1).

Sogge and Dütting (2010) note that movements cannot be built or engineered because their fluid nature makes them a 'moving target'. Thus, Gurumurthy (e-discussions, 2016) suggests new forms of entrepreneurial funding may be needed to explore potential of ways of challenging old ideas to achieve positive social transformation. Further, she notes that development ideologies, such as those enshrined in the Sustainable Development Goals, prefer public–private partnerships. Also, funding then tends to go towards reformist, rather than radical change, may overlook marginalisation that is acute or even invisible.

Despite the challenges to effective engagement outlined above, development problems have been increasingly conceptualised as collective action problems (Peiffer, 2015:1). Gurumurthy suggests (e-discussions, 2016) that donors need to see collectivisation not as a technical process but as a deeply political one. These problems arise 'when members of a group fail to act collectively to ensure that a desired outcome, which will benefit the whole group, is realised to its full potential' (ibid.). Furthermore, while civic campaigns and movements may act as 'key drivers of social and political development', they seldom receive adequate attention or support from development actors Stephan et al. (2015:1).

Stephan et al. (2015) call for a shift in how donors and INGOs understand and engage with non-traditional civil society actors and for creative approaches and strategies to support such initiatives. In other words, external actors need to adopt a 'movement mindset' (ibid.). Researchers suggest caution with regard to including social movements in development programming. However, they unequivocally point to a constructive role that supporting actors can play by building, promoting, facilitating or strengthening an 'enabling environment' for social movements to help sustain and expand outreach efforts such as campaigning and advocacy, and coalition or movement-building efforts.

Haider (2009:1) notes that an enabling environment can be achieved by, for example, 'supporting mobilisation processes within civil society, protecting the right to form independent associations and the right to protest, and supporting social movements to communicate in public debates and be visible in the media'. Similarly, Fernando (2012:13) recommends supporting 'institutions and activities that offset the attempts by governments, corporations and national elites to weaken, de-legitimise, incorporate or repress social movements; providing support to Ombudsmans' offices for the protection of human and civil rights'. However, external actors may not want to be seen as becoming involved in local mobilisation or taking a particular political position.

6.3 Strategies and lessons

Peiffer (2015:1–2) proposes that external actors keen on supporting development-related collective action examine:

- **The nature of the relationships among actors.** For example, levels of trust: groups that already have high levels of trust may be more prepared for effective collective action, whereas lower levels of intra-group trust may need close monitoring.

- **The nature of the collective action** that is being sought. For example, whether benefits of collective action affect constituencies' immediate or long-term interests.

- **The environment** in which collective action takes place. For example, assessing the factors beyond the group's control that may affect their demands and goals.

Supporting social movements and scaling up their impact entails a degree of politicisation and risk. Donors interested in working with movements could bear in mind the following issues highlighted by Fernando (2012: 7):

- Long-term movement goals cannot be fitted into project cycles and log frames.

- Movement leaders (if any) are representatives, advocates and activists – not administrators.

- Tensions may exist between international agendas and the immediate development goals of a local movement.

- Strategies need to be built around the capacities and traditional repertoires of the movement.

- There is a risk of being viewed as politically aligned and siding with social movements and the socially excluded.

- Donor grant-giving or reporting practices need to avoid altering the movement's relationship with its constituency or imposing unrealistic management practices.

- Donors need to be receptive to social movements challenging dominant paradigms such as market liberalisation, globalisation and patriarchy.

In relation to working in politically closed and socially conservative or restrictive environments, Tadros (2011) suggests donors need to be willing to think outside the box to support unconventional forms of collective action. She recommends that in such contexts donors remain low key and avoid creating local coalitions themselves. She also emphasises the importance of developing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that are appropriate for understanding processes of consensual decision-making, ownership and participatory leadership, rather than a sole focus on the delivery of outputs or the quality or outcomes of interventions.

6.4 A movement mindset

In conclusion, social movements are powerful, complex and dynamic drivers of change. Donors keen to play a role need a movement mindset. This includes (1) conducting a scoping study to fully understand the politics and context of the movement; (2) being willing to take the risk of being exposed to a certain degree of politicisation; and (3) using flexible and innovative forms of support. The emergence and popularity of networked movements in the age of ICTs also suggests a need for new ideas, visions and engagement to further common goals and progressive change, as well as new forms of funding (e.g. crowd funding, entrepreneurial funding) to be able to challenge unjust practices and institutions.

Further, the literature suggests external actors keen to engage with social movements focus on creating an enabling environment for social movements rather than pursuing direct engagement. An enabling environment allows movements to be visible and vocal in public spaces through media, workshops, communications, research activity and publications. It also means social movement agendas are respected and the concerns of the constituency are heard and used to inform decisions. However, such an approach is not without risks.

Just as there are gaps in evidence on the impact and effectiveness of social movements, there is also a need for discussion on whether and how external actors can constructively support social movements.

References

Batliwala, S. (2012). *Changing their World: Concepts and practices of women's movements*. Toronto: AWID.
http://www.awid.org/publications/changing-their-world-concepts-and-practices-womens-movements

Baviskar, A (2008) *Winning the Right to Information campaign in India* (IDS Research Summary). Brighton: IDS
http://www.powercube.net/wp-content/uploads/2009dia_final1.pdf/11/Rs_In

Bayat, A. (2000). *Social movements, activism and social development in the Middle East* (Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper Number 3). Geneva: UNSRID
http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/search/9C2BEFD0EE1C73B380256B5E004CE4C3?OpenDocument

Bebbington, A. (2010). *Social movements and poverty in developing countries* (Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper Number 32). Geneva: UNSRID.
http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/(httpPublications)/BF0E452A815E5A80C12577CF00558A72?OpenDocument

Bhattacharjya, M. (2013) *A tale of two movements: How human rights became women's rights*. Brighton: BRIDGE, IDS.
http://socialmovements.bridge.ids.ac.uk/sites/socialmovements.bridge.ids.ac.uk/files/case-studies/Human%20rights%20case%20study_0.pdf

Carter, A. (2012). *People power and political change: Key issues and concepts*. Abingdon: Routledge

Castells, M. (2004) Informationalism, networks, and the network society: A theoretical blueprinting. In M. Castells (Ed.), *The network society: A cross-cultural perspective*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
http://annenberg.usc.edu/sites/default/files/2015/04/28/Informationalism,%20Networks%20and%20the%20Network%20Society.pdf

Castells, M. (2012). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the internet age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Chesters, G., & Welsh, I. (2011). *Social movements: The key concepts*. Abingdon: Routledge

Berta Cáceres: 2015 Goldman Prize Recipient (n.d.). *The Goldman Environmental Prize*.
http://www.goldmanprize.org/recipient/berta-caceres/

COPINH. (2016). *Civic Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations of Honduras - COPINH*. https://www.copinh.org/

Costoya, M. (2007). *Toward a typology of civil society actors* (Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper Number 30). Geneva: UNSRID.
http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/search/0451352E376C1031C12573A60044CE42?OpenDocument

Diamond, L. (2010). Liberation technology. *Journal Of Democracy*, *21*(3), 69–83.
http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/liberation-technology

Diani, M. (2013). Networks and social movements. In *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*. Oxford: Wiley. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470674871.wbespm438

Diani, M. (1992). The concept of social movement. *The Sociological Review*, *40*(1), 1-25.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1992.tb02943.x

Dreier, P. (2012). Social movements: How people make history. *Mobilising Ideas*.
https://mobilizingideas.wordpress.com/2012/08/01/social-movements-how-people-make-history/

Earle, L. (2008). Social movements and citizenship: Some challenges for INGOs. Oxford: International NGO Training and Research Centre. http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/121/Briefing-Paper-20-Social-movements-and-citizenship.pdf

Earl, J., Hunt, J., Garrett, R., & Dal, A. (2015). New technologies and social movements. In D. Della Porta & M. Diani (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of social movements*. Oxford University Press.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199678402.013.20

Edelman, M. (2001). Social movements: Changing paradigms and forms of politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30(1), 285-317. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.285

Evans, K. (2013). Martyr of the Amazon: The legacy of Chico Mendes. *Forest News*. http://blog.cifor.org/17295/martyr-of-the-amazon-the-legacy-of-chico-mendes

Eyben, R., & Ladbury, S. (2006). *Building effective states: Taking a citizen's perspective*. Brighton: IDS.

Eyerman, R., & Jamison, A. (1991). *Social movements: A cognitive approach*. Cambridge, UK: Policy Press.

Fernando, P. (2012). Working with social movements. In *Poverty Reduction and Pro-Poor Growth: The Role of Empowerment* (ch. 8). Paris: OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/dac/povertyreduction/50157985.pdf

Foweraker, J. (1995). *Theorizing social movements*. London: Pluto Press.

Gamson, W. (1990). *The strategy of social protest* (2nd ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Gardener, B. (2013) Social media. In *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopedia of social and political movements* (1st ed.). Oxford: Wiley. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470674871.wbespm487

Garrett, R. K. (2006). Protest in an information society: A review of literature on social movements and new ICTs. *Information, Communication, and Society*, *9*(2), 202-224. http://www-personal.umich.edu/~garrettk/Garrett-ProtestInfoSociety.pdf

Giugni, M., McAdam, D., & Tilly, C. (1999). *How social movements matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gurumurthy, A. (2016) *Internet governance as seen from the Right to Development*. Open Democracy. May 28. https://www.opendemocracy.net/anita-gurumurthy/internet-governance-as-seen-from-right-to-development

Haider, H. (2009) Donor engagement with social movements (Helpdesk research report). Birmingham: GSDRC. http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/hd645.pdf

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude*. New York: Penguin.

Hachigian, N. (2002) The internet and power in one-Party East Asian states. *The Washington Quarterly*, *25*(3), 41–58. www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/www/external/international_programs/capp/pubs/washquarterly.pdf

Heeks, R., & Seo-Zindy, R. (2013). *ICTs and social movements under authoritarian regimes: An actor-network perspective* (Development Informatics Working Paper Series, No.51/2013). http://www.gdi.manchester.ac.uk/research/publications/other-working-papers/di/di-wp51/ Manchester: Institute for Development Policy and Management.

Hindman, M. (2008). *The Myth of Digital Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Horn, J. (2013). *Gender and social movements: Overview report*. Brighton: IDS. https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/123456789/10898

Jasper, J. (2013). Strategy. In *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopedia of social and political movements* (1st ed.). Oxford: Wiley. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470674871.wbespm206

Joyce, M. & Walker, T. (2015). A Movements Perspective on Transparency and Accountability. Think Piece Part 2. Transparency & Accountability Initiative. http://transparencyinitiative.theideabureau.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Movements_Perspective.pdf

Leach, D. (2013). Prefigurative politics. In *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopedia of social and political movements* (1st ed.). Oxford: Wiley http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470674871.wbespm167

Leach, M. & Scoones, I. (2007). *Mobilising citizens: Social movements and the politics of knowledge* (IDS Working Paper 276). Brighton: IDS. www.ids.ac.uk/publication/mobilising-citizens-social-movements-and-the-politics-of-knowledge

Levine, D. (2004). The birth of the Citizenship Schools: Entwining the struggles for literacy and freedom. *History of Education Quarterly*, *44*(3), 388-414. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-5959.2004.tb00015.x

Mackay, D. (2016, March 12). Drugs, dams and power: The murder of Honduran activist Berta Caceres. *The Intercept*. theintercept.com/2016/03/11/drugs-dams-and-power-the-murder-of-honduran-activist-berta-caceres/

Maeckelbergh, M. (2011) Doing is believing: prefiguration as strategic practice in the alterglobalization movement. *Social Movement Studies*, 10(1): 1-20. tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14742837.2011.545223

Majumdar, R. (2016). Accountability law: Whose law is it anyway? *Policy Pulse*, *1*(16). http://www.mkssindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Policypulse-16-31-March-2016.pdf

McAdam, D. (1996) The framing function of movement tactics: Strategic dramaturgy in the American civil rights movement. In D. McAdam, J. McCarthy, & M. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures and cultural framings*. Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803987.017

McKeon, N., Watts, M., & Wolford, W. (2004). *Peasant associations in theory and practice* (UNRISD Civil Society and Social Movements Programme, Paper No 8). Geneva: UNRISD. unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/search/EB035306BD930F87C1256F6A0056A117?OpenDocument

Mitlin, D. (2006). *The role of collective action and urban social movements in reducing chronic urban poverty* (CPRC Working Paper 64). Manchester: Institute of Development Policy and Management. http://www.chronicpoverty.org/uploads/publication_files/WP64%20Mitlin.pdf

Mitlin, D., & Bebbington, A. (2006). *Social movements and chronic poverty across the urban-rural divide: concepts and experiences* (CPRC Working Paper 65). Manchester: Institute of Development Policy and Management.

https://www.gov.uk/dfid-research-outputs/social-movements-and-chronic-poverty-across-the-urban-rural-divide-concepts-and-experiences-cprc-working-paper-no-65-184129

McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2001). *Dynamics of contention*. Cambridge University Press. http://www.cambridge.org/gb/academic/subjects/sociology/political-sociology/dynamics-contention

McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*(6), 1212-1241. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2777934

McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (2015). Social movement organisations. In J. Goodwin & J. Jasper (Eds.), *The social movements reader: Cases and concepts* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Olson, M. (1965). *The logic of collective action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pande, S. (2014, March 13). The invisible history of people's movements. *The Telegraph*. http://www.telegraphindia.com/1140313/jsp/opinion/story_18068459.jsp#.Vw4rWRMrLB

Peiffer, C. (2015). *Collective action* (DLP Concept Brief 06). Birmingham: The Developmental Leadership Program. http://publications.dlprog.org/CollectiveAction.pdf

Shirky, C. (2011) The political power of social media Foreign Affairs, 90 (1): 28-41 https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2010-12-20/political-power-social-media

Sogge, D., & Dütting, G. (2010). *Moving targets: Notes on social Movements* (Civil Society Building Knowledge Working Paper 2/2010). The Hague: Hivos. https://www.tni.org/files/movingtargets.pdf

Snow, D. (2013). Social movements. In *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopedia of social and political movements* (1st ed.). Oxford: Wiley. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470674871.wbespm192

Stephan, M., Lakhani, S., & Naviwala, N. (2015). Aid to civil society: A movement mindset. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace. http://www.usip.org/publications/2015/02/23/aid-civil-society-movement-mindset

Tadros, M. (2011). *Working politically behind red lines: Structure and agency in a comparative study of women's coalitions in Egypt and Jordan* (Research paper 12). Birmingham: Developmental Leadership Program. http://www.dlprog.org/publications/working-politically-behind-red-lines-structure-and-agency-in-a-comparative-study-of-women-s-coalitions-in-egypt-and-jordan.php

Tadros, M. (2016). *Resistance, revolt, and gender justice in Egypt*. New York: Syracuse University Press.

Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement*. Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813245

Tilly, C. (1984). Social movements and national politics. In C. Bright & S. Harding (Eds.), *Statemaking and social movements* (1st ed). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Tilly, C. (2006). *Regimes and repertoires*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/R/bo4100797.html

Touraine, A. (2002). The Importance of Social Movements. *Social Movement Studies*, *1*(1), 89-95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14742830120118918

Turner, R., & Killian, L. (1957). *Collective behaviour*. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

van de Sande, M. (2013) The prefigurative politics of Tahrir Square - an alternative perspective on the 2011 revolutions. *Res Republica*, 19: 223–229. http://www.academia.edu/25524761/The_Prefigurative_Politics_of_Tahrir_Square_An_Alternative_Perspective_on_the_2011_Revolutions_Res_Publica_2013_