



Engendering Social Movements: Cultural Images and Movement Dynamics

Author(s): Rachel L. Einwohner, Jocelyn A. Hollander and Toska Olson

Source: *Gender and Society*, Vol. 14, No. 5 (Oct., 2000), pp. 679-699

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/190456>

Accessed: 05-04-2016 04:56 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Gender and Society*

ENGENDERING SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Cultural Images and Movement Dynamics

RACHEL L. EINWOHNER

Purdue University

JOCELYN A. HOLLANDER

University of Oregon

TOSKA OLSON

The Evergreen State College

The fields of gender and social movements have traditionally consisted of separate literatures. Recently, however, a number of scholars have begun a fruitful exploration of the ways in which gender shapes political protest. This study adds three things to this ongoing discussion. First, the authors offer a systematic typology of the various ways in which movements are gendered and apply that typology to a wide variety of movements, including those that do not center on gender issues in any obvious way. Second, the authors discuss the process by which movements become gendered. In doing so, they go beyond current scholarship by bringing "others" (e.g., opponents and the general public) squarely into the gendered analysis. The article concludes by speculating about the outcomes of these processes and suggests that movements that draw on feminine stereotypes face a double bind that hampers their success. Illustrations come from movements in the United States, Europe, and Latin America.

Despite tremendous growth in both research on gender and research on social movements during the past several decades, scholars have paid relatively little attention to how gender affects social movement structures and processes and how social movements, in turn, affect gender. Recently, however, there have been exciting new developments at the intersection of these two fields. A growing number of scholars have begun to reconceptualize the relationship between gender and social movements, and empirical research on gender-related movements has burgeoned. The recent special issues of *Gender & Society* on gender and social movements (1998, 1999) testify to this increasing interest.

AUTHORS' NOTE: *Our names are listed alphabetically. An earlier version of this article was presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Los Angeles, 1994. We wish to thank Paula England, Judith A. Howard, Kevin Neuhouser, Pamela Oliver, Sharon Reitman, the Gender & Society editors, and several anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions.*

REPRINT REQUESTS: *Rachel L. Einwohner, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 1365 Stone Hall, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907-1365; e-mail: einwohnerr@sri.soc.purdue.edu.*

GENDER & SOCIETY, Vol. 14 No. 5, October 2000 679-699

© 2000 Sociologists for Women in Society

Our goal in this article is to add to this ongoing discussion by further specifying and elaborating what has been identified by others, namely, the fundamental role of gender in social movements. While these new developments are both exciting and illuminating, we feel that current work could benefit from a more comprehensive exploration of the relationship between gender and social movements. For example, most research on gender and social movements tends to analyze movements that focus on gender-related issues, especially women's movements. An extensive literature exists, for instance, on the case histories of various women's movements (Freeman 1975; Hole and Levine 1971; Marx Ferree and Yancy Martin 1995; Ray 1998; Rupp and Taylor 1987; V. Taylor 1996; Whittier 1995), and the majority of articles in the recent special issues of *Gender & Society* focus on women's protests. While the influence of gender is relatively clear in these cases, it is less obvious—but nonetheless important—in movements that are less clearly focused on gender, such as the civil rights and labor movements. Other scholars have explored gender differences in various aspects of the activist experience, such as movement participation, paths to recruitment, the division of labor, feelings about protest efficacy, and the effects of activism (Rochford 1985; Cable 1991; Evans 1980; Fonow 1998; Irons 1998; Marullo 1991; McAdam 1988, 1992; McNair Barnett 1993; Robnett 1997). This, too, is an important contribution but does not fully capture the fundamental role of gender in social movement dynamics. In addition, much of the research on gender and social movements focuses on single cases, rather than applying their insights to a wider range of movements. Finally, most research focuses on social movement participants or the broader political context in which movement activity takes place, ignoring or downplaying the importance of other actors in the political arena.

In this article, we advance theorizing about gender and social movements in three ways. First, we extend and organize the contributions of other theorists by presenting a systematic typology of the ways social movements are gendered, drawing from a wide variety of movements, including those that do not obviously center on gender issues.¹ Although we incorporate insights from other scholars (especially V. Taylor 1996, 1999) in this typology, we also go beyond current theorizing by addressing the interaction between movement participants, targets, and observers, which we, along with others (Burstein, Einwohner, and Hollander 1995; Einwohner 1999; Marx Ferree and Roth 1998; Walsh 1986), believe is important in the study of social movements. In doing so, we bring the "others" (e.g., opponents, state officials, and the general public) squarely into the analysis, exploring how social movements affect those who witness and respond to social movement activity and how those others may influence movement dynamics, especially movement effectiveness. Specifically, we argue that gender can be used by social movement participants who wish to construct their image in a certain light, frame an issue in a particular way, or claim legitimacy as actors in a given arena. Gender can also be used against movement participants. Gendered images and associations can be used by social movement targets, countermovements, or observers to delegitimize the activists themselves or the movement as a whole. Thus, social movement

activity can be interpreted in light of cultural ideas about femininity and masculinity, whether or not that activity is specifically intended to address gender issues. In making this claim, we agree with V. Taylor's (1999) contention that gender is a fundamental feature of social movements, including those movements that do not directly target gender issues and arrangements; our goal is to illustrate that claim more systematically. Specifically, we suggest that gender is one kind of "cultural resource" (Williams 1995) that actors in a social movement arena can use to further their goals.

Second, we address the question of the processes by which movements are gendered. We draw from literature in social movements and social psychology to argue that framing and legitimacy processes are central to the gendering of social movement identities and attributions. We suggest that when particular images of gender become attached to movements, they evoke a particular framing of the issue at hand. This framing both implies a way of understanding the issues and designates certain actors as legitimate players in the issue arena.

Finally, we build on this analysis to suggest its implications for movement outcomes. Both social movement theorists and social psychologists claim that familiar framings of issues are likely to be more widely accepted than novel ones. This line of reasoning would suggest that movements that are associated with traditional meanings of gender will be more acceptable than those that resist such meanings. However, we speculate that because the political arena has been understood to be masculine (and male) in both the United States and other countries, movements that claim or are labeled with feminine identities face a double bind. In part because of the conceptual split between men's and women's separate spheres (the public, masculine world of work and politics and the private, feminine world of home and family²), political participation is perceived to be normal for men. In contrast, women's participation has been seen as anomalous, ineffective, and sometimes inappropriate because it contradicts gender expectations. Thus, while images and identities associated with femininity may help a movement in the short run because they resonate with widespread cultural beliefs, they may prove problematic in the long run because of the association of politics and political power with masculinity.

Throughout the article, we use examples from movements in the United States, Europe, and Latin America to illustrate our arguments. Most examples are drawn from secondary sources and are chosen for two reasons. They provide clear illustrations of our major points and, taken together, demonstrate the applicability of our analysis to a variety of diverse movements. We recognize that this approach has disadvantages. For example, in using secondary sources we necessarily rely on the description and interpretation of other scholars, which may contain inconsistencies or biases; in using these examples, we run the risk of replicating these flaws. However, we believe that the strengths of this approach outweigh the weaknesses. Although data from a single case would provide more depth, we would face the same dilemma we have criticized in other theoretical work, namely, how to argue that all social movements are gendered while making reference to only one. Presenting examples from many different movements, in contrast, demonstrates that

gender is relevant to a wide range of movements, not just those that are explicitly about gender.

We organize this article around the issues described above. We begin with a brief discussion of our conceptualization of gender. We then present a typology of the various ways that movements can be gendered. Next, we turn to the question of how the process of gendering works, focusing on the concepts of framing and legitimacy. We conclude with a discussion of the implications of our argument for movement effectiveness and for social movement research more generally.

ENGENDERING MOVEMENTS

The term *gender* is generally used to refer to the social and cultural interpretations and expectations that are associated with sex yet that go beyond biological characteristics.³ Gender operates at various levels: as an individual characteristic, as a social activity, as group-level expectations and patterns of behavior, and as a broader system of hierarchy. Capturing all of these dimensions, Lorber (1994, 1) describes gender as an institution, one that “establishes patterns of expectations for individuals, orders the social processes of everyday life, is built into the major social organizations of society, such as the economy, ideology, the family, and politics, and is also an entity in and of itself.”

We argue that social movements are gendered on all of these levels: individual, interactional, and structural. Acker defines the meaning of the term *gendered*:

To say that an organization, or any other analytic unit, is gendered means that advantages and disadvantages, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity, are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine. Gender is not an addition to ongoing processes, conceived as gender neutral. Rather, it is an integral part of those processes, which cannot be properly understood without an analysis of gender. (1990, 146)

When we say that a movement is gendered, we mean that some aspect of the movement constructs differences between women and men and/or elicits a certain set of social meanings because of its association, actual or assumed, with femininities or masculinities.

Our discussion focuses on the social meanings of gender evoked or invoked by movements or their opponents. In some cases, movement actors use gender strategically to further their goals; in other cases, people outside the movement manipulate gender for their own aims, such as to portray protesters negatively and thus detract from movement achievement. When, for instance, anti-Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) activists labeled feminists “straggly-haired whiners” (Marshall 1985), they were contrasting their adversaries with familiar cultural images of “real” women as quiet, demure people who do not clamor for change. On the other hand, when a group of women concerned about alcohol use identify themselves as “Mothers Against Drunk Driving,” they transform themselves—a group of women

who could just as easily be represented as “whiners”—into a group of women with a legitimate maternal concern for the well-being of their daughters and sons. In both cases, cultural meanings are tapped. Gender is used symbolically to represent clusters of characteristics believed to be associated with sex. More broadly, as a result of these processes, some aspect of social movement activity (in these cases, the protesters themselves) becomes associated with gender.

Yet, we do not mean to imply that these actors always *intend* to manipulate gender. While in some cases the manipulation of gender may be intentional, it is probable that in other cases, movement actors simply choose strategies that they expect to be successful without consciously thinking about gender. The centrality of gender in modern Western societies means that many of these strategies will implicate gender. In still other cases, the gendered nature of the activity may be imputed by the movement’s target or by other observers; indeed, the gendering of movement activity is an interactive process. Thus, the shared social meanings of actors’ behaviors, not their cognitions, are at issue here.

These meanings are not unitary or static, however. On the contrary, gender can be represented in many ways, even within a given culture. Subgroups of a given society, distinguished by factors such as race, class, religion, sexual orientation, or age often develop quite different norms and expectations for women and men (Landrine 1985; Romer and Cherry 1980). Even within a single subgroup of a culture, meanings associated with gender may vary (Deaux et al. 1985). For example, consider two common images of femininity: mother and (hetero)sexual partner. In these interpretations, women can be represented as asexual or sexual beings, and as affiliated with children or with men. Even within these two stereotypes, multiple interpretations exist; for example, in modern Western culture, mothers can be viewed both as nurturing and as overbearing.

Although it has received far less analytic attention from scholars of gender, masculinity⁴ is similarly multifaceted. Men are variously represented in the United States, for example, as fathers, warriors, and rational decision makers. These general stereotypes, like those of women, are further subdivided. Warriors can be conceptualized either as aggressors and perpetrators of atrocities or as protectors of women, children, and nations. As with femininity, however, these images are finite and are focused around certain culturally resonant stereotypes.

Thus, gender can be represented in a variety of ways. What is important is that the range of possibilities is more or less available to all members of a culture for use either in staging or evaluating protest activity. The entire set of meanings may be understood as a set of cultural tools (Swidler 1986) or a repertoire (Clemens 1993; Tilly 1978) on which individuals may draw in service of various ends. A growing literature suggests that political actors draw on existing “ideational elements” in framing political action and debate (see Tarrow 1992); gender is one example of such cultural materials. Therefore, although different groups may draw on different meanings associated with gender for their particular ends, they all share the same set of available meanings. As Williams notes, “cultural resources are . . . public. They are social level constructions that may be wielded by specific actors but

depend on consumption and interpretation by others for their effectiveness" (1995, 127). Social ideas about gender are thus fluid resources that must be negotiated within a specific context.

Our general thesis is that through these processes, ideas about gender become associated with various aspects of social movements and their participants. In making this claim, we argue that in all movements, participants, targets, and/or third parties construct and manipulate gendered meanings and identities, whether intentionally or unintentionally. This process, we suggest, affects movements' legitimacy and potential outcomes. Like Verta Taylor (1999), therefore, we argue that social movements are gendered, whether or not they pursue gender-related goals expressly or explicitly.

We turn now to a description of the various ways in which social movements can be gendered. This typology builds on existing work (e.g., V. Taylor 1996, 1999); our goal in presenting it is to synthesize and summarize this research in a way that illustrates both the general and specific ways in which the gender system shapes social movements. We begin with a brief description of two aspects of social movements in which the role of gender is readily apparent: in the movements' composition and in their goals. We then move to the heart of our argument, which is that the gender system has a broader and more nuanced effect on social movements. Here we consider how gender shapes and is reflected in the strategies that activists use, in the identities claimed by movement activists and organizations, and in the attributions made by movement opponents. In providing illustrations of these gendered processes, we do not wish to imply that they are mutually exclusive; on the contrary, any particular movement may be gendered in a variety of ways, and these may be mutually reinforcing. Although the aspects of movement activity that we illustrate are diverse, the underlying process is the same. In each instance, movement participants, targets, and/or third parties construct or manipulate gendered meanings.

GENDER IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Gendered Composition

One of the most obvious ways movements can be gendered is in their composition. It makes a certain amount of sense that movements explicitly focused on women's or men's issues would draw larger numbers of women or men, respectively. Examples include the pro-choice movement in both the United States (Staggenborg 1991, 1998) and Ireland (J. Taylor 1998) and the postpartum depression self-help movement (V. Taylor 1996, 1999), all of which are predominantly female, as well as men's movements such as the Promise Keepers and the Million Man March (Messner 1997). In addition to these fairly obvious examples, some movements that are not explicitly organized around gender-related issues also have a gender-skewed composition. For example, in the United States, both animal rights activists (Einwohner 1999; Jasper and Nelkin 1992; Sperling 1988) and

toxic-waste activists (Gizzi 1997; Krauss 1993) are mostly women. In Israel, the majority of peace activists are women and there are a number of exclusively female peace groups (Rapoport and Sasson-Levy 1997). Beyond their membership, these movements are gendered because of the social images associated with sex, images that reflect stereotypes and expectations for protesters' behavior and may or may not explain the predominance of men or women. Protest organizations may also mobilize along gender lines as a result of preexisting connections (e.g., informal networks), and the organizations themselves may be structured differently (e.g., diverse as opposed to centralized leadership) based on gender (Stall and Stoecker 1998; V. Taylor 1999).

Gendered Goals

Gender is also an explicit component of many movements' goals. Some movements seek to change gender hierarchies or gender differentiation; other movements' goals reflect traditional gender stereotypes. The women's movement and the pro-choice movement, for instance, seek political and social change that will promote goals such as gender equality and reproductive freedom for women. In contrast, the antiabortion and anti-ERA movements are or were aimed at preserving traditional conceptualizations of gender. Beyond simply focusing on issues especially relevant to one sex, all of these movements address the social meaning of gender and seek either to reconceptualize or reinforce the attributes and expectations associated with both men and women.

Similarly, various men's movements focus on the meaning of masculinity. For example, Robert Bly, the leader of one contemporary men's movement, argues that "the images of adult manhood given by the popular culture are worn out" (1990, 1) and suggests that men adopt new models of masculinity. The Promise Keepers, a Christian men's movement founded by a former football coach, also strives toward a rediscovery of traditional ideas of masculinity (Messner 1997). In contrast, the gay liberation movement challenged traditional views of femininity, masculinity, love, marriage, and the family (Cruikshank 1992; D'Emilio 1983; Humm 1980).

Movements that are not directly concerned with gender per se may also implicate gender, either in their support for or their opposition to particular social arrangements. For instance, although the civil rights movement made the pursuit of racial equality its explicit goal, that overall goal was gendered; as Robnett explains, "Black men . . . were seeking access to the White man's power, and this power is associated with maleness. Moreover, tied to this perception is the view that without power, a man cannot truly be a man" (1997, 42). Despite the seemingly non-gendered nature of the movement's goals, then, the rights of African American men were more often of central concern than were issues specific to African American women (see also Stewart Brush 1999).

Gendered patterns in the composition and goals of social movements provide fairly straightforward examples of the role of gender in social movements. Yet, we argue that gender plays a more fundamental role in movements, even when a

movement does not primarily attract members of one sex or address gender issues explicitly. In the following sections, we consider the role of gender in shaping social movement tactics, the identities of movement activists, and the attributions made by those outside the movement.

Gendered Tactics

Movement tactics, broadly conceived, include behaviors such as marching or demonstrating as well as protest organizations' formal names or characteristic slogans, the language used by protesters, their clothing or costumes, and the "props" that they use during protest. Such activities are gendered in many movements; indeed, we argue that behaving in ways that highlight particular conceptualizations of gender is an explicit strategy of many social movements. For example, tactics used by activists who mobilized against the ERA in the 1970s and early 1980s reflected ideas about gender; such tactics included giving flowers and gifts of homemade baked goods to state legislators (Marshall 1985; Marshall and Orum 1986). Even when staging conventional protest activities such as marches and demonstrations, anti-ERA activists made conscious attempts to downplay the political nature of their activities and to present themselves as traditionally feminine, family-oriented women (Marshall 1985). Judith Taylor's (1998) analysis of feminist activism in Ireland also highlights the ways in which activists incorporate femininity into their tactics, for example, by singing, carrying balloons, and including children in protest activities. Similarly, women in many Latin American political movements have strategically manipulated traditional conceptualizations of femininity. For example, women have withheld sex from their husbands if the men opposed the movement, banged on pots during demonstrations, and protested in their roles as mothers and grandmothers (see Neuhauser 1995, 1998).

Other research has identified ways in which protesters' tactics reflect ideas and images associated with masculinity. For instance, Fonow's (1998, 722) account of a steelworker's strike describes male strikers who "dressed in black leather with lots of chains, riding loud and powerful motorcycles . . . the intention was to intimidate anyone who might cross the picket line." Finally, the interplay between femininity and masculinity may also be incorporated into movement activity. Actions taken by Chilean women during the movement to overthrow President Allende provide a good example of this strategy. Female activists repeatedly embarrassed soldiers and military officials by throwing grain at them to protest their lack of courage in opposing Allende, thereby characterizing the men as "chickens" (Mattelart 1980). Women thus used traditional meanings of masculinity to embarrass the soldiers and encourage them to take political action.

Protest activity can therefore be gendered even if the intended outcomes of the activity do not center on gender issues in any direct or obvious way. In other words, movements are gendered in the social arrangements enacted and reconstructed by their participants through the use of their tactics.

Gendered Identities

Movements can also be gendered on the basis of the collective or individual identities they claim. Previous research (e.g., Neuhouser 1998; V. Taylor 1996, 1999) has illustrated the role that gender plays in framing protest around particular identities; what we add to this discussion is the explicit suggestion that movement participants actively manipulate gender identities. Social movement actors often strategically claim or construct gendered identities to achieve their goals, whether or not those goals are explicitly gender related. In doing so, movement actors incorporate elements of cultural meanings about gender into their individual and collective identities and use those identities to lay claim to certain issues. For instance, members of peace movements often use feminine or maternal⁵ images, as the names of movement organizations (such as Mothers Embracing Peace and Disarmament, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament) attest. Women's assumed "feminine" qualities (e.g., peacefulness and nurturance) are presented as a rationale for expressing opinions on peace and war; as Marullo notes, "The solution to this problem of violence is believed to lie in feminine characteristics and feminist principles" (1991, 136). Since war making has historically been considered a masculine domain that has been difficult for women to enter (Enloe 1987), the strategic use of gendered images of motherhood claims a voice for a population that would otherwise be ignored and legitimizes its participation in the conflict. Beckwith (1996) notes that women have also used their relationships with men (as sisters, wives, daughters, or mothers) to claim political standing or a legitimate right to participate in a movement.

Claiming gendered identities does not necessitate allegiance to traditional roles, however. As we have argued above, there are many possible representations of gender, even within a single culture. Movement actors may therefore draw on different elements from the set of cultural meanings available to them.⁶ For example, members of the antiabortion movement often present themselves not simply as women but as mothers; motherhood, they believe, is the highest calling for women (Luker 1984). Activists emphasize this identity by dressing in pastels at rallies, bringing children to protests, and forming groups based on motherhood. In contrast, many pro-choice activists have eschewed motherhood as their primary identity (Luker 1984) and therefore cannot use maternal images. Instead, members of the pro-choice movement call on images of women as human beings with a right to free choice to lend moral authority and legitimacy to their claims. Protest slogans such as "My body, my life, my right to decide!" and "Against abortion? Then don't have one!" demonstrate this connection. Like peace activists and antiabortion women, the pro-choice women draw on gender as a resource to support their position. Unlike the others, however, pro-choice activists claim a nontraditional gender identity: that of a woman who has multiple roles and who has the right to decide to what uses she will put her body.

Gender identity can also be central to protests that do not focus explicitly on gender. For example, Fonow's study of steelworkers' strikes notes the following:

Women who entered the steel industry were contesting normative notions of gender-appropriate behavior by the very act of seeking such employment. Furthermore, by protesting through their strike activism the conditions for jobs that women were not supposed to want—jobs that in effect signified that they were “not women”—they were again violating gender conventions that define political action as masculine. (1998, 711)

Regardless of whether a movement supports or resists gender stereotypes, however, it cannot avoid *responding* to them; these stereotypes are always available as a means of evaluation (West and Zimmerman 1987, 137).

Gendered Attributions

Culturally available ideas about gender are not simply something that social movement actors manipulate by and for themselves. These meanings are also available to other cultural actors and therefore may be attributed to movements by opponents and other observers. As Beckwith argues, “The context of collective action is a gendered context, and . . . political movements, their opponents, their struggles, and their effects develop and are modified with reference to the gender of the actors” (1996, 32). Thus, movements are also gendered to the extent that opponents and other third parties evaluate them in terms of gender. As we discuss below, these evaluations may either hamper or facilitate protest efforts.

The U.S. animal rights movement provides an excellent example of the ways in which opponents use cultural images of gender against social movements. Einwohner’s (1992) study of animal rights activists found that some claimed to have been jeered with cries such as “Go home and do the dishes!” and “You stupid housewife, why don’t you go get a job?” As one activist said,

People in the movement are labeled as little old ladies in tennis shoes looking for something to do. We’re also called terrorists, or people that are rich and lonely with lots of time on their hands and just looking for something to do. This is packaging by the opposition, and it’s used to make us look like we have all this time on our hands and we’re not something serious and that no one should take us seriously. (Einwohner 1992, research notes)

Conversations with hunters (Einwohner 1997, 1999) reinforce the view that the movement’s targets, especially those who are male and/or participate in stereotypically masculine practices, view activists in terms of gender and use these attributions of femininity to discredit the activists’ stance. Many hunters attributed stereotypical feminine traits to the activists, saying that the protesters act on the basis of emotion rather than reason. Hunting, in contrast, is seen as a practice that is based on the logic of “wildlife management” and supported by biological data (Worsnop 1992). Because they believe that activists are emotional rather than rational, hunters feel that animal rights activists do not have a legitimate voice in the issue of hunting:

The law says I have the right to do what I do . . . as long as I'm not depleting the source, and it's backed with scientific and biological information. Not emotions, emotions has no place in the management of wildlife. . . . But so many of your anti [hunting] people base their information on emotions, you know. (Einwohner 1997, 129)

This lack of credibility, which stems from the meanings associated with femininity, hampers activists' ability to convince targets to change their behavior.

The case of the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo in Argentina provides another example of the ways in which culturally specific ideas about gender shape interactions between activists and their targets. In April 1977, the Mothers began a series of public demonstrations protesting the "disappearances" of their children, husbands, friends, and other relatives by Argentina's military government (Fisher 1989; Simpson and Bennett 1985). Although such demonstrations were illegal, the government's initial response to the gatherings was to ignore the protesters and to label them *las locas* (crazy women) who posed no threat to the regime. Thus, the gendered meaning attributed to the protesters was that they were harmless, albeit grieving, mothers and grandmothers with no real power to sway public opinion or attract attention. Fisher (1989) argues that the military government treated the Mothers differently than they treated other groups. Because the Mothers were not seen as a threat, the military assumed that arrests would be enough to disband the protesters. Such treatment was relatively mild considering the imprisonment and torture of students and other "subversives" occurring at the time. As one of the Mothers explained,

They didn't destroy us immediately because they thought we couldn't do anything and when they wanted to, it was too late. We were already organized. They thought these old women will be scared off by the arrests, that it would be enough. (Fisher 1989, 60-61)

Similarly, Beckwith argues that the British protest group Lancashire Women Against Pit Closures was successful in their occupation of a British Coal tower because the tower's management "could not conceive of wives and mothers doing this" (1996, 26). Stereotypes about gender significantly delayed the targets' response to the women's activism: "Management and security were slow to respond to a guard's report that four women were in the winding tower, because they thought it was a joke." The women's status "provided them with some legal and political autonomy . . . some protection against physical attack and arrest, and some advantage in taking political action by doing the 'unimaginable'" (p. 26). Thus, gendered attributions were central to protest success.

These cases also illustrate the point that gender need not be emphasized intentionally by social movement participants for it to shape movement activity. Fisher (1989) argues that the Mothers organized as mothers because that is what they were, not because motherhood was an identity that they were trying to manipulate. Thus, they linked their actions more to the experience of mothering than to politics. Whether or not their emphasis on motherhood was intentional, however, the

outcome was the same. The gendered meanings associated with mothers and grandmothers protected the Mothers and allowed them to continue their protests (for additional research on motherhood as an impetus for political activism, see also Krauss 1993; Naples 1995; Neuhouser 1998; Pardo 1995). Thus, regardless of intention, gender representations are always available as a means of evaluation. Even when individuals or organizations are not purposefully behaving in a gendered manner, they may be viewed through a gendered lens or evaluated against gendered expectations (West and Zimmerman 1987).

Gender can therefore be manipulated strategically by *all* actors in a political arena, not only by movement participants themselves. Cultural ideas about gender are one weapon in the arsenal used by movements and countermovements as each attempts to promote its own version of issues and events (see Meyer and Staggenborg 1996). Movement actors may accept these gendered attributions and incorporate them into their collective identity, or they may resist them and seek to replace them with other characterizations. Gender is thus contested terrain: something to be struggled over through the claiming of identities and the attribution of characteristics.

FRAMING AND LEGITIMACY

We have discussed several ways in which social movements can be gendered. Although diverse, all share one feature: that some aspect of the movement—its composition, goals, strategies, identity, or others' perceptions of it—invokes gender-laden meanings. Using examples from a variety of social movements, we have also suggested that the use of particular gendered meanings can affect social movement dynamics such as achievement. We turn now to a discussion of the processes through which gendered meanings affect these dynamics. We suggest that when particular images of gender are claimed by or attributed to movement actors, a larger process of framing is undertaken, with implications for evaluation (and especially for legitimacy) and therefore for movement effectiveness.

When a group uses gendered meanings, it is proposing a particular framing of an issue (Gamson 1992; Snow and Benford 1988, 1992; Snow et al. 1986). Frames are analogous to the social-psychological concept of schemata. According to Snow et al., "By rendering events or occurrences meaningful, frames function to organize experience and guide action, whether individual or collective" (1986, 464). As Stone (1989) notes, politics is largely a competition between alternative causal stories proposed to explain a given phenomenon. Claiming or attributing a particular gendered meaning suggests a story that fits with that meaning, together with implications for action. For example, pro-choice activists often construct an image of women as people who have a right to choose whether the roles they play in society will include that of parent. This characterization implies a larger causal story in which access to abortion must be preserved to preserve women's right to autonomy (Luker 1984). As discussed above, every culture has multiple representations of

gender that could be used similarly; the choice of a particular frame is therefore a strategic decision.

These frames are not simply coherent stories about the world, however. Rather, they have important implications for the movement's perceived legitimacy and, therefore, its chances for success. The choice of frame implies not only a causal story, to use Stone's term, but also suggests that some actors (but not others) have legitimate roles in a particular arena. For example, causal stories can "legitimate and empower particular actors as 'fixers' of the problem" (Stone 1989, 295); similarly, Snow and Benford write that collective action frames can "inspire and legitimate social movement activities and campaigns" (1992, 68). One of a movement's tasks is to design a causal story that shifts responsibility for a problem onto political actors (e.g., claiming an injustice that must be rectified with a policy change). The causal story may also designate legitimate claimants on an issue. Thus, groups such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving and Mothers Against Violence Everywhere use motherhood as the source of their legitimacy to speak on issues that are at least superficially unrelated to motherhood. Gamson (1990) notes that being accepted as a legitimate actor in a given arena is in itself one type of movement success. Establishing legitimacy may also, of course, lead to more tangible outcomes. As Snow and Benford note, movements attempt to frame issues "in ways that are intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists" (1988, 198).

Although any issue may be framed in a variety of ways, it is clear that some framings are more convincing than others. Both the social movements and the social psychology literatures suggest that strategies using frames that "resonate" with preexisting belief systems will be more effective. Within the social movements literature, Snow and Benford (1988, 210) call this type of frame resonance "narrative fidelity": Does the framing "ring true with existing cultural narrations"? Frames that are consonant with the ideas already widespread in society may be more effective because they evoke ideas that are familiar and compelling to the society's members. By aligning themselves with traditional framings of gender, for instance, members of social movements can make themselves seem familiar and therefore unthreatening. Stone suggests that this type of association facilitates political success:

Assertions of a causal theory are more likely to be successful . . . if the theory accords with widespread cultural values; if it somehow captures or responds to a "national mood"; and if its implicit prescription entails no radical redistribution of power or wealth. (1989, 294)

Social psychologists come to similar conclusions, although they explain this phenomenon in terms of cognitive processes rather than cultural ideology. According to Fiske and Stevens, people who do not fit common stereotypes tend to make others uncomfortable; as a result, they may be evaluated negatively. Moreover, the violation of prescriptive norms

gives rise to the perception that one is dealing with a “difficult” person, someone who simply does not fit in. The point is that such people are stereotyped and the blame for their problem is laid at the door of their own personal attributes. (1993, 191)

West and Zimmerman make a similar claim with regard to gender: “If we fail to do gender properly, we as individuals—not the institutional arrangements—may be called to account (for our characters, motives, and predispositions)” (1987, 146). Similarly, activists who use gender in unfamiliar ways or otherwise violate gender expectations may find themselves delegitimated instead of the practices and arrangements that they challenge. This blame shifting can seriously damage movements’ credibility. It may also harm their chances for success, because others may attribute responsibility for the problem (and therefore its solution) to the victims of the problem instead of to the movement’s targets. Thus, violating gender norms and expectations carries dangers for both individuals and social movements.

THE DOUBLE BIND

We began this article by describing the various ways that movements are gendered. Doing so allowed us to illustrate our central point: that movements are gendered in that movement participants, targets, and/or third parties, in various ways, construct or manipulate gendered meanings. We have also suggested that the literature on framing and legitimacy is useful for explaining the process by which these meanings are constructed. This literature also suggests that some framings will be more successful than others. We now turn to the final part of our argument, which is that the effect of particular framings on social movement outcomes is itself a gendered process, one that requires a more nuanced analysis than those that have been offered to date.

Both the social movements and social-psychological literatures suggest that using familiar meanings of gender will be more helpful for social movements than using new or unusual framings. However, these arguments fail to note that the content as well as the familiarity of the frame may also have implications for movement success. We suggest that movements associated with traditional notions of femininity may be treated differently by targets, state officials, and the general public than are traditionally masculine movements, with important consequences for movement effectiveness.

In some ways, traditional gender stereotypes may facilitate movement efforts. For instance, Hardy-Fanta (1993) argues that in the Boston Latino community, women tend to follow a model of relational, interactive, participatory politics that is more effective than the traditional male model for mobilizing the Latino community and stimulating political participation. Similarly, in some cases gender stereotypes have allowed protest to be more effective, because the targets of the protest have not anticipated women’s political participation. In the case of the Brazilian women’s movement, for example, women activists were not taken seriously

because of their gender, and were therefore permitted to organize in a context in which male activists were repressed (Alvarez 1990). While the regime continued to repress more militant and “threatening” groups such as the student and labor organizations, it allowed women’s groups greater political latitude in their campaigns; they were even allowed public assembly when a similar “masculine” movement might have been repressed.

While the use of traditionally feminine images and strategies may help movements in some ways, however, these meanings may also prevent a movement organization from being effective in the political arena. The gendering of social movements has made it difficult for some “feminine” movements to be successful in certain political contexts because women are not seen as powerful political actors. Women have traditionally been ignored as political actors because femininity is associated with emotionality and passivity—characteristics that are thought to be at odds with the “masculine” traits of toughness, aggression, and objectivity believed necessary for political involvement. In addition, many feminist organizations and women’s self-help movements have deliberately chosen a decentralized, nonhierarchical form of organization (Stall and Stoecker 1998; V. Taylor 1996, 1999); as a result, members of these movements may have difficulty being accepted as serious political actors by their targets and observers.

Thus, movements that claim or are attributed with a feminine identity experience a double bind that more “masculine” movements do not. These representations of femininity may help them establish legitimacy, but limit their eventual effectiveness. For example, Montini shows how female advocates of breast cancer informed-consent laws find themselves caught between gender expectations and political power: “On the one hand, women are expected to present a feminine (i.e., emotional) self; on the other hand, they are judged incompetent and unstable for their emotional appeals” (1996, 20). This point is consistent with other recent research (e.g., V. Taylor 1999) that recognizes how the “gender regime in the institutional context” can create possibilities for collective action. For example, V. Taylor (1996, 1999) argues that the “emotion culture” of the postpartum depression movement, in which activists’ visible displays of emotion give them access to “acceptable” maternal identities, aids the movement in its efforts. At the same time, however, we suggest that this “emotion culture” is devalued in American society because of its association with femininity and may therefore limit these movements’ potential effectiveness in the long run.

Our point here is that within a given political and cultural context, movements that evoke traditionally feminine and masculine gender stereotypes have very different chances of success. The current Western political arena is deeply masculine, valuing qualities such as competitiveness, aggression, and rationality. Using gendered meanings associated with masculinity, then, will not only resonate with familiar cultural stereotypes but will also fit with accepted paths to power and political success. Using gender meanings traditionally associated with femininity, in contrast, can make a movement organization seem nonthreatening. These meanings suggest that women are “emotional, weak, dependent, passive, uncompetitive,

and unconfident" (Fiske and Stevens 1993, 179). How could a group identified with these attributes be dangerous (or even be taken seriously)? While this association may help movements gain short-term legitimacy or access, it may also reduce movements' chances for long-term success because these attributions are not associated with power and political effectiveness.

More broadly, this discussion helps to illustrate the point that gender is a flexible protest tool. It can be used against a movement to discredit it and by movement participants or organizations to help illustrate or legitimate their goals. Both movements and their opponents can draw on the same culturally available ideas about gender yet may end up using different meanings from that common set. As Tarrow writes, "Although their bases lie in pre-existing cultural traditions, new frames of meaning result from the struggles over meaning within social movements and from their clash with their opponents" (1992, 197).

CONCLUSION

Recent scholarship on the intersections between gender and social movements has shown that gender is more than simply a characteristic of individual movement participants. Instead, movements, their activities, and the arenas in which they operate are all gendered. Our goals in this article have been to expand current work on gender and social movements by systematically summarizing and extending that work and by drawing on the social movements and social-psychological literatures to explain the processes by which movements become gendered. Using examples from a variety of social movements across different cultures, we have illustrated how images of gender are frequently invoked by movement participants, reflected in movement strategies, incorporated in movement goals, claimed as identities by movement actors, and used as weapons by movement opponents. Thus, elements of culturally specific ideas about gender shape and are reflected in all social movements, including those movements that are not explicitly about reinforcing or challenging gender arrangements.

We suggest that gender is not a static or objective protest tool; instead, its meaning is heavily dependent on the broader social and political context. Gender is constructed and enacted by actors within cultures and is therefore dynamic and flexible. The substance of gender can vary across cultures. In addition, it may vary across the same culture at different points in time and across different groups within the same culture. Although we have focused on gender in this article, we believe that similar arguments can be made about the utility of strategies that emphasize or evoke other social statuses. Age, race or ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion are just a few examples.

Outlining the different ways in which movements are gendered helps illustrate an overall pattern. Movements are gendered in that various aspects of movement activity become associated with cultural meanings of masculinity and femininity.

We have also suggested that these associations have implications for movement success. The strategic use of gender identities and attributions may help either to establish or to challenge the credibility of a movement's stance with regard to particular issues and therefore may encourage the donation of resources by elites and others to movements or countermovements; this type of support can affect movement outcomes (Jenkins and Perrow 1977). In addition, as Clemens's (1993) account of organizational innovation in the "woman movement" shows, operating under the constraints of a cultural and/or political system that encourages gender-appropriate types of public activity may also lead to the adoption of new organizational forms, which, in turn, can protect the innovating groups from co-optation and demise.

Because of the multidimensionality of gender, the effects of the association between gender and social movements may vary across time and space. For example, in cultures where older women wield social power, a movement or protest staged by older women may be viewed positively (or at least neutrally) by targets and observers. However, in societies where older women are not highly valued, the use of gender may be less effective. Similarly, the strategic use of traditional gender stereotypes may prove to be effective at one point in time but useless at another. The point is that gender is constantly shifting within a culture, depending on other contextual factors such as the economy and the political situation. Gendered meanings are therefore unstable and subject to influence by institutions and actors, at the same time as they constrain individuals within a particular cultural and historical context. Since gender can have a range of meanings, social movement actors have a great variety of gendered representations that they can call on to further their goals.

Gendered strategies are not always effective, however. Certain framings may be more effective than others, depending on the sociopolitical context and the movement's substantive issues. Gendered strategies may be more useful when the issues to which they are directed deal with gender in some respect (or when a plausible connection can be made between gender and the relevant issue). For example, although motherhood is a powerful symbol when addressing reproductive issues such as abortion, it might not be so effective in relation to other issues, such as congressional term limits. Similarly, the effectiveness of such strategies may differ depending on those to whom the strategy is directed. For example, the portrayal of male participants in the men's movement as nurturing and emotional may be a useful strategy when trying to garner support from parents' rights organizations, but this strategy may be less effective when approaching a group of labor activists in traditionally male occupations.

We have joined other scholars in arguing for the importance of gendered analyses of social movements. Variations in the content and utility of gendered images across different contexts provide evidence for the richness and strategic flexibility of gender but also complicate predictive analyses of its role in social movement dynamics. The next step is to determine when particular framings of gender are used, by whom, and with what consequences.

NOTES

1. We do not wish to present gender as isolated from other sets of cultural meanings. It is important to recognize that gender is intertwined with other statuses such as race, class, age, and sexual orientation (Connell 1987, 1995; Hill Collins et al. 1995; West and Fenstermaker 1995).

2. In reality, these spheres are not separate at all, as a number of feminist analyses have demonstrated (Epstein 1988). Nonetheless, these spheres continue to be differentiated at a conceptual level.

3. Note, however, that some authors argue that the notion of dichotomous biological sex is itself socially constructed (Kessler and McKenna 1978; Nicholson 1994).

4. Although movements may claim masculine and feminine gendered identities, women are the "marked" and visible case of gender. Thus, gender is obvious in situations where women and femininity are present but invisible (yet still important) when men and masculinity predominate. The fact that men are "unmarked" makes movements associated with masculinity appear to be ungendered like most organizations (Acker 1990). As such, gender may be an overt or salient aspect of a movement only if it invokes or evokes images of femaleness or femininity. Nonetheless, we contend that gender is also an important dimension of all movements, even those that seem ungendered.

5. Indeed, female status is often conflated with motherhood, such that defining oneself as a woman may evoke all the associations of motherhood (e.g., nurturing and closeness to nature).

6. As D'Emilio's (1983) account of the gay liberation movement shows, social movement actors may also work to introduce new identities to the culturally available set of ideas about members of different groups.

REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. 1990. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society* 4:139-58.
- Alvarez, Sonia. 1990. *Engendering democracy in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Beckwith, Karen. 1996. Lancashire women against pit closures: Women's standing in a men's movement. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 21:1034-68.
- Bly, Robert. 1990. *Iron John: A book about men*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Burstein, Paul, Rachel L. Einwohner, and Jocelyn A. Hollander. 1995. The success of political movements: A bargaining perspective. In *The politics of social protest*, edited by J. C. Jenkins and B. Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cable, Sherry. 1991. Women's social movement involvement: The role of structural availability in recruitment and participation processes. *Sociological Quarterly* 33:35-50.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1993. Organizational repertoires and institutional change: Women's groups and the transformation of U.S. politics, 1890-1920. *American Journal of Sociology* 98:755-98.
- Connell, R. W. 1987. *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- . 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cruikshank, Margaret. 1992. *The gay and lesbian liberation movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Deaux, K., W. Winton, M. Crowley, and L. L. Lewis. 1985. Levels of categorization and content of gender stereotypes. *Social Cognition* 3:145-67.
- D'Emilio, John. 1983. *Sexual politics, sexual communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Einwohner, Rachel L. 1992. Interviews with animal rights activists. Seattle, WA.
- . 1997. The efficacy of protest: Meaning and social movement outcomes. Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, Seattle.
- . 1999. Gender, class, and social movement outcomes: Identity and effectiveness in two animal rights campaigns. *Gender & Society* 13:56-76.

- Enloe, C. H. 1987. Feminist thinking about war, militarism, and peace. In *Analyzing gender: A handbook of social science research*, edited by B. B. Hess and M. M. Ferree. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Evans, Sara. 1980. *Personal politics*. New York: Vintage.
- Fisher, Jo. 1989. *Mothers of the disappeared*. Boston: South End.
- Fiske, S. T., and L. E. Stevens. 1993. What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In *Gender issues in contemporary society*, edited by S. Oskamp and M. Constanzo. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fonow, Mary Margaret. 1998. Protest engendered: The participation of women steelworkers in the Wheeling-Pittsburgh steel strike of 1985. *Gender & Society* 12:710-28.
- Freeman, Jo. 1975. *The politics of women's liberation*. New York: McKay.
- Fuchs Epstein, Cynthia. 1988. *Deceptive distinctions: Sex, gender, and the social order*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ganson, William A. 1990. *The strategy of social protest*. 2d ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- . 1992. *Talking politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gizzi, B. 1997. Gender and activism: The implications of women's involvement in grassroots environmental movements. Paper presented at Annual Meetings, Pacific Sociological Association, San Diego, CA.
- Hardy-Fanta, Carol. 1993. *Latina politics, Latino politics: Gender, culture, and political participation in Boston*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Hill Collins, P., L. A. Maldonado, D. Y. Takagi, B. Thorne, L. Weber, and H. Winant. 1995. Symposium: On West and Fenstermaker's "Doing difference." *Gender & Society* 9:491-513.
- Hole, Judith, and Ellen Levine. 1971. *Rebirth of feminism*. New York: Quadrangle Books.
- Humm, Andrew. 1980. Personal politics and gay and lesbian liberation. *Social Policy* 11:40-45.
- Irons, Jenny. 1998. The shaping of activist recruitment and participation: A study of women in the Mississippi civil rights movement. *Gender & Society* 12:692-709.
- Jasper, James M., and Dorothy Nelkin. 1992. *The animal rights crusade: The growth of a moral protest*. New York: Free Press.
- Jenkins, J. C., and C. Perrow. 1977. Insurgency of the powerless: Farm worker movements 1946-1972. *American Sociological Review* 42:249-68.
- Kessler, Suzanne J., and Wendy McKenna. 1978. *Gender: An ethnomethodological approach*. New York: John Wiley.
- Krauss, Celine. 1993. Women and toxic waste protests: Race, class, and gender as resources of resistance. *Qualitative Sociology* 16:247-62.
- Landrine, Hope. 1985. Race x class stereotypes of women. *Sex Roles* 13:65-75.
- Lorber, Judith. 1994. *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Luker, Kristin. 1984. *Abortion and the politics of motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marshall, Susan E. 1985. Ladies against women: Mobilization dilemmas of antifeminist movements. *Social Problems* 32:348-62.
- Marshall, S. E., and A. M. Orum. 1986. Opposition then and now: Countering feminism in the twentieth century. *Research in Politics and Society* 2:13-34.
- Marullo, Sam. 1991. Gender differences in peace movement participation. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict, and Change* 13:135-52.
- Marx Ferree, Myra, and Silke Roth. 1998. Gender, class, and the interaction between social movements: A strike of West Berlin day care workers. *Gender & Society* 12:626-48.
- Marx Ferree, Myra, and Patricia Yancy Martin, eds. 1995. *Feminist organizations: Harvest of the women's movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Mattelart, M. 1980. Chile: The feminine version of the coup d'état. In *Sex and class in Latin America*, edited by J. Nash and H. I. Safa. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- McAdam, Doug. 1988. *Freedom summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1992. Gender as a mediator of the activist experience: The case of Freedom summer. *American Journal of Sociology* 97:1211-40.

- McNair Barnett, Bernice. 1993. Invisible southern Black women leaders in the civil rights movement. *Gender & Society* 7:162-82.
- Messner, Michael A. 1997. *The politics of masculinities: Men in movements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, D. S., and S. Staggenborg. 1996. Movements, countermovements, and the structure of political opportunity. *American Journal of Sociology* 101:1628-60.
- Montini, Theresa. 1996. Gender and emotion in the advocacy for breast cancer informed consent legislation. *Gender & Society* 10:9-23.
- Naples, Nancy A. 1995. Activist mothering. *Gender & Society* 6:441-63.
- Neuhouser, Kevin. 1995. "Worse than men": An analysis of gendered mobilization in an urban Brazilian squatter settlement, 1971-1991. *Gender & Society* 9:38-59.
- . 1998. "If I had abandoned my children": Community mobilization and commitment to the identity of mother in Northeast Brazil. *Social Forces* 77:331-58.
- Nicholson, Linda. 1994. Interpreting gender. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 20:79-105.
- Pardo, M. 1995. Doing it for the kids: Mexican American community activists, border feminists? In *Feminist organizations: Harvest of the women's movement*, edited by M. M. Ferree and P. Y. Martin. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Rapoport, T., and O. Sasson-Levy. 1997. Men's knowledge, women's body: A story of two protest movements. Paper presented at First Regional Conference on Social Movements, Tel Aviv, Israel.
- Ray, Raka. 1998. Women's movements and political fields: A comparison of two Indian cities. *Social Problems* 45:21-36.
- Robnett, Belinda. 1997. *How long? How long? African American women in the civil rights movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rochford, E. Burke Jr. 1985. *Hare Krishna in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Romer, N., and D. Cherry. 1980. Ethnic and social class differences in children's sex-role concepts. *Sex Roles* 6:245-63.
- Rupp, Leila J., and Verta Taylor. 1987. *Survival in the doldrums: The American women's rights movement, 1945 to the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, John, and Jana Bennett. 1985. *The disappeared*. London: Robson Books.
- Snow, D. A., and R. Benford. 1988. Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. In *From structure to action: Comparing social movement research across cultures*, edited by B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi, and S. Tarrow. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Snow, D. A., and R. Benford. 1992. Master frames and cycles of protest. In *Frontiers in social movement theory*, edited by A. D. Morris and C. M. Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Snow, D. A., E. B. Rochford Jr., S. K. Warden, and R. D. Benford. 1986. Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review* 51:464-81.
- Sperling, Susan. 1988. *Animal liberators*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1998. *Gender, family, and social movements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- . 1991. *The pro-choice movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stall, Susan, and Randy Stoecker. 1998. Community organizing or organizing community? Gender and the crafts of empowerment. *Gender & Society* 12:729-56.
- Stewart Brush, Paula. 1999. The influence of social movements on articulations of race and gender in Black women's autobiographies. *Gender & Society* 13:120-37.
- Stone, Deborah. 1989. Causal stories and the formation of policy agendas. *Political Science Quarterly* 104:281-300.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review* 51:273-86.
- Tarrow, S. 1992. Mentalities, political cultures, and collective action frames: Constructing meaning through action. In *Frontiers in social movement theory*, edited by A. D. Morris and C. M. Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Taylor, Judith. 1998. Feminist tactics and friendly fire in the Irish women's movement. *Gender & Society* 12:674-91.
- Taylor, Verta. 1996. *Rock-a-by baby: Feminism, self-help, and postpartum depression*. New York: Routledge.
- . 1999. Gender and social movements: Gender processes in women's self-help movements. *Gender & Society* 13:8-33.
- Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From mobilization to revolution*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Walsh, Edward J. 1986. The role of target vulnerabilities in high-technology protest movements: The nuclear establishment at Three Mile Island. *Sociological Forum* 1:199-218.
- West, C., and S. Fenstermaker. 1995. Doing difference. *Gender & Society* 9:8-37.
- West, C., and D. H. Zimmerman. 1987. Doing gender. *Gender & Society* 1:125-51.
- Whittier, Nancy. 1995. *Feminist generations: The persistence of the radical women's movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Williams, Rhys H. 1995. Constructing the public good: Social movements and cultural resources. *Social Problems* 42:124-44.
- Worsnop, R. L. 1992. Hunting controversy. *CQ Researcher* 2:49-72.

Rachel L. Einwohner is an assistant professor of sociology at Purdue University. She has previously done research on the animal rights movement, focusing on the relationship between class, gender, and protest outcomes. Currently, she is examining the role of age and gender in Jewish resistance during the Holocaust.

Jocelyn A. Hollander is an assistant professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. She is the author, with Judith Howard, of Gendered Situations, Gendered Selves: A Gender Lens on Social Psychology (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997). Her current research focuses on the construction of ideas about gender and vulnerability through talk about violence.

Toska Olson is a member of the faculty at the Evergreen State College. She received her Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Washington. Her current research focuses on the relationships between gender, parental involvement, and labor market outcomes.