Part I (Day 1).

Answer two of the following four questions.

1. Describe key differences between social movement organizations and other types of civic organizations. Draw upon sociological literature to discuss the extent to which theoretical tools used to account for social movement mobilization and social movement consequences may or may not be applicable to these other civic organizations.

2. Identify something about processes related to social movements that is relatively understudied or misunderstood. Discuss how you might engage existing social movement theory (e.g., expand upon it, contest it, etc.) in order to remedy this deficiency. What kind of empirical project would help you demonstrate that your theoretical contribution is on solid ground?

3. Why certain people but not others engage in social activism is arguably the micro-level question in the field of social movements and collective behavior. Review the literature on this question and critically evaluate it. Then, discuss ideas for how to advance the study of differential participation.

4. Much of recent social movement analysis has focused on protest within Western democracies, particularly on the US and Europe. Within this literature, certain important cases (e.g., the French Revolution, the American Civil Right movement) have been taken as paradigmatic for the development of many of the key concepts and explanatory frameworks. Recently, this work has been challenged by research focusing on other political contexts and regions of the world, including a) social movements in non-Western contexts, b) protest under repressive, authoritarian and/or partially democratic regimes; and c) transnational or global protest (which is not contained within national borders). Please discuss some of the ways in which this recent research both builds upon and challenges the major concepts and findings of Western-centric social movement theory, drawing upon specific examples of recent research. Discuss the major insights, problems, and questions raised by this work for future empirical studies.
Part II (Day 2).

Answer two of the following four questions.

1. Activists are passionate about social change and seeing their movements succeed. Imagine you are hired as a consultant to design a strategy for a particular movement to achieve its goals. Drawing on the scholarship on consequences/outcomes of social movements, what would you advise movement organizers and rank-and-file participants to do?

2. What do you think is the most important new theoretical insight pertaining to social movements that has been forwarded in the last ten years? Situate this insight within the broader literature in order to highlight both the importance and the originality of this contribution.

3. In 2001, three of the founding fathers of social movement analysis – Doug McAdam, Charles Tilly, and Sidney Tarrow – published *Dynamics of Contention* (DOC), a book that purported to overturn the analytical paradigm that they themselves had built. One of their claims was that in their own attention to *structure*, they had developed an analytical framework that paid too little attention to *process*. In this question, 1) discuss why the relationship between structure and process has been a problem for social movement analysis (including, but not limited to, the political process model); 2) explain how “McTeam” proposed to resolve this problem; and 3) critically assess the theoretical generativity of the DOC program for subsequent research. Please provide specific evidence from recent empirical studies (from people other than McTeam) to support your critical assessment.

4. One of the foundational debates of social movement analysis has focused on whether social movement participants are motivated mostly by *instrumental* or by *expressive* concerns; that is, whether they are strategic actors trying to maximize their own benefits, or whether they are more concerned with identities, moral values, and social solidarities. In recent years, however, the classical dichotomy between strategy and identity has been challenged by many movement scholars, in a number of different ways. In this question, (1) discuss the intellectual origins of (and major arguments in) this debate; (2) discuss at least two sources of challenge to this dichotomy; and (3) develop your own proposal for the most effective way to address these questions in empirical research.
Suggested Reading List

Note: The committee has done their best to organize the readings below by major theoretical traditions and important substantive topics. However, some works do not neatly fit under one rubric, but rather under several ones. Students should thus not put too much stock in how the readings are classified. What is most important is to understand the readings’ arguments and how they relate to the broader debates and themes in the field. Also, though it is recommended that students familiarize themselves with the readings on the list below, the social movement and collective action exam is not restricted to them.
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