Tidying what never should have been untied: Social Movements, Capitalism, and Class

Master's in Latin American, Caribbean and Iberian Studies.

Álvaro C.

2023-07-31

Abstract

Political processes, social movements, and collective action inquiry have a large and long tradition in social science research. However, most of these studies have relied on traditional approaches to address such research, ignoring the effects that capitalism has on politics, political action, social movements, and collective action. This phenomenon has been repeated all over the globe, particularly in the Global North, in which repertories of mobilization, political processes, and framing analyses have dominated the scholarly debate around collective action. Although some theories have been influenced by Marxism, none of them take capitalism and, thus, class as central in their analyses. Drawing on Marxist collective action theory, Erik Wright's class model analysis, multivariate regression analysis, and the ISSP Survey (ISSP 2014 – Citizenship II, N = 49.807), the purpose of this paper is to examine the influence that class structure has on participation in different activities of collective action. In consonance with the theory, the results show that belonging to the working class has a negative effect on participation in collective action. Conversely, the middle groups show positive effects in collective action. Lastly, belonging to upper class show a negative effect.

Writing recordatory

1. Paragrpah main idea
2. Examples
3. Sum

Introduction

Social Movements, capitalism, and class

Social Movement classic research agenda

Social movement studies have a long-standing tradition of studying conflict, social change, and what some scholars contentious politics .

However, with the recent protests located in the Global North have shown that

Social movement research has a long-standing tradition in academia. Its development, some argue, started from what scholars have called the "psychological" approach (Eidlin & Kerrissey, 2018). Drawing on psychological theory, this approach focused on the individual and sought to understand the reasons that led actors to take part in mobilization. To put it in other words, this analytical framework delved into the internal factors that caused actors to participate and, thus, create social movements.

Drawing on the limits of this approach, the resource mobilization theory quickly gained adepts within academia, particularly in America, to explain that social movements didn't occur simply due to individual deviations but depended on the resources that participants held (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). As such, actors that were able to mobilize a varied array of resources had the capacity to maintain continuous participation in movements.

This perspective, although criticized, remained dominant for a long period of time, even serving as a background for contemporary academic work. Nonetheless, during the 1980s and influenced by Marxist tradition, a new theoretical framework developed and served as a milestone for social movement scholars. The political process model (McAdam, 1999), McAdam argues, is an alternative to resource mobilization theory and the classical model (psychological). In an attempt to synthesize the social movement theory to date, the theory proposes that insurgency occurs when internal and external factors develop collective action.

In McAdam's words McAdam (1999),

(McAdam et al., 2004)

(Re)turning to Capitalism

The classical social movement agenda led the research on diverse aspects and perspectives on social movement inquiry. However, as Marxist scholars have always argued, capitalism as a social structure is always creating antagonistic forces that clash against each other, and this has been demonstrated by the various conflicts throughout the world that claim a reorder of the economic and political balance. The #OccupyWallstreet movement, the anti-austerity movements in Europe (della Porta & Portos, 2020), and the anti-neoliberal movements in South American countries (Somma et al., 2020) have prompted many scholars to return to including capitalism in social movements analysis.

Regarding the European scenario, della Porta & Portos (2020) claim that recent European state policies have prompted heterogeneous organizations, movements, and other groups to walk to the street against such policies. In such a scenario, the authors argue that

, although academia has left the political economy since 1970, it su

Methodology

Data

This article uses a quantitative methodology based on the Social Survey Programme 2014 - Citizenship II (ISSP)[1] ($N = 49.087$). This dataset applies a similar[2] questionnaire in every country in which it is applied. The sampling procedure differs for each country: in some countries, partly simple random samples were applied, whereas in others, partly multistage stratified random samples. The data was collected in two ways. The first one was through interviews (face-to-face, Computer Assisted Personal interviews, or completed on the telephone) or Self-administered questionnaires (Computer Assisted self-interviews or Computer-Assisted web interviews). The analysis is mostly applied to individuals that are 18 years or more with some exceptions[3]. After processing the dataset, the sample was reduced to 33.582 individuals nested in 34 countries.

Methods

(Huntington-Klein, 2022)

The hypotheses that led this study were tested by calculating OLS. According to Linear regressions are the "*best linear approximation of the relationship*" between two variables.

As the literature says, Linear Models are appropriate when we seek [. . . .]. In this case, since we are testing the effect that class structure has on the working class participation in collective action activities, other models that provide a better understanding of probability, such as Logistic and Logit, aren't required. To put it in other words, since we are not measuring the *probability* that the working class has to undertake collective action activities but the *influence* that class structure itself has on

Analysis

Prior to the statistical analysis, all the coding workflow was done using R and its many packages[4].

Table 1: Descriptives Statistics

	var	label	n	NA.prc	mean	sd	range
3	acc	Collective Action Participation	33582	8.51	1.39	1.32	4 (0-4)
4	acc2	Dummy Collective Action	33582	8.51	0.65	0.48	1 (0-1)
6	css	Social Class	36706	0.00	6.67	2.45	8 (1-9)
5	cs_sub	Top-Bottom self-placement	34224	6.76	0.96	0.74	2 (0-2)
1	AGE	Age of respondent	36627	0.22	48.86	16.67	87 (15-102)
2	SEX	Sex of Respondent	36696	0.03	1.51	0.50	1 (1-2)
7	partner	Living in steady partnership	35142	4.26	0.69	0.46	1 (0-1)

Table 2: Multivariate regression models predicting determinants of collective action within capitalist structure (SE on parenthesis)

	Dependant Variable				
	acc				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
css2	−0.10	−0.02	−0.02	−0.12	−0.04
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
css3	−0.43***	−0.33***	−0.31***	−0.45***	−0.34***
	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
css4	0.54***	0.52***	0.54***	0.52***	0.51***
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
css5	0.46***	0.46***	0.49***	0.44***	0.44***
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
css6	0.06	0.13*	0.14*	0.05	0.12
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
css7	−0.26***	−0.17**	−0.15*	−0.27***	−0.17**
	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
css8	−0.21***	−0.09	−0.09	−0.22***	−0.10
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
css9	−0.60***	−0.46***	−0.44***	−0.61***	−0.47***
	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)
cs_sub21		−0.29***	−0.29***		−0.29***
		(0.02)	(0.02)		(0.02)
cs_sub22		−0.48***	−0.48***		−0.46***
		(0.02)	(0.02)		(0.02)
sex2		0.12***			0.13***
		(0.01)			(0.01)
AGE			−0.002***	−0.003***	−0.003***
			(0.0004)	(0.0004)	(0.0004)
partner				0.15***	0.12***
				(0.02)	(0.02)
Constant	1.66***	1.75***	1.90***	1.71***	1.79***
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Observations	33,582	31,427	31,372	32,141	31,217
R^2	0.09	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.11
Adjusted R^2	0.09	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.11

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Descriptives

Models

Discussion

Conclusions

References

Dahl, D. B., Scott, D., Roosen, C., Magnusson, A., & Swinton, J. (2019). *Xtable: Export tables to LaTeX or HTML*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=xtable

della Porta, D., & Portos, M. (2020). Social movements in times of inequalities: Struggling against austerity in Europe. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, *53*, 116–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2020.01.011

Eidlin, B., & Kerrissey, J. (2018). Social Class and Social Movements. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 515–536). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119168577.ch29

Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An {r} companion to applied regression*. https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion/

Hlavac, M. (2022). *Stargazer: Well-formatted regression and summary statistics tables*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stargazer

Huntington-Klein, N. (2022). *The Effect: An Introduction to Research Design and Causality*. CRC Press.

Lüdecke, D. (2018). *Sjmisc: Data and variable transformation functions. 3*, 754. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00754

Lüdecke, D. (2022). *Sjlabelled: Labelled data utility functions (version 1.2.0)*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1249215

Lüdecke, D. (2023). *sjPlot: Data visualization for statistics in social science*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=sjPlot

McAdam, D. (1999). *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. University of Chicago Press.

McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2004). *Dynamics of contention*. Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*(6), 1212–1241.

Schauberger, P., & Walker, A. (2023). *Openxlsx: Read, write and edit xlsx files*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=openxlsx

Somma, N. M., Bargsted, M., Disi Pavlic, R., & Medel, R. M. (2020). No water in the oasis: The Chilean Spring of 2019–2020. *Social Movement Studies*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2020.1727737

Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., Grolemund, G., Hayes, A., Henry, L., Hester, J., Kuhn, M., Pedersen, T. L., Miller, E., Bache, S. M., Müller, K., Ooms, J., Robinson, D., Seidel, D. P., Spinu, V., . . . Yutani, H. (2019). *Welcome to the {tidyverse}. 4*, 1686. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686

Wickham, H., Miller, E., & Smith, D. (2023). *Haven: Import and export 'SPSS', 'stata' and 'SAS' files*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=haven

---

the individuals were between 17 and 79 years old.

[4]Most of the coding, wrangling, and analyses were used with tidyverse(Wickham et al., 2019), haven (Wickham et al., 2023), sjPlot (Lüdecke, 2023), sjmisc(Lüdecke, 2018), sjlabelled (Lüdecke, 2022), summarytools (Comtois, 2022), car (Fox & Weisberg, 2019), openxlsx(Schauberger & Walker, 2023). For presentation purposes stargazer (Hlavac, 2022) and xtable (Dahl et al., 2019) were used.