ABSTRACT

Social movements are heterogeneous because they attract organizations from other movements and encourage activists to create organizations “indigenous” to the movement. This chapter examines the structural and technical differences between these kinds of organizations. Employing a contingency theory framework, it is shown that older “spill over” groups are much more likely to be multiissue national organizations with particular organizational structures. Then, it is shown that these older groups have correlated environments and internal structures, but not their more contemporary counterparts. Finally, it is shown that the adoption of a new technology, the Facebook group, is mainly a path dependency outcome, and not correlated with contingency factors.
INTRODUCTION

A visit to a movement rally usually reveals a wide variety of organizations. It is not uncommon to find organizations as different as unions, student groups, political parties, environmental clubs, ethnic associations, and women’s organizations all in support of a given issue. This diversity reflects “spillover,” the tendency of movements to affect each other (Meyer & Staggenborg, 1994). An important political and organizational process, scholars have argued that cross-movement contacts are important in shaping the composition of any political effort (e.g., Carroll & Ratner, 1996; Everett, 1992; Fisher, 2006; McAdam, 1995). Despite the attention given to movement spillover, an important issue remains: aside from their issues, are “native” and “foreign” movement organizations different? What is to be learned from the comparison of organizations according to their relationship to the “home” movement? Are “foreign” movement groups organized differently than “natives?”

This chapter uses contingency theory to frame an empirical comparative study of organizations that mobilize antiwar protesters. The basic observation is that groups preceding the movement often operate in different environments and have reached different life cycle stages, which may correlate with how they are internally organized and how they reach constituents. Organizations crossing over from other movements are more likely to be older, target a national audience, and thus have different structures and tools than younger organizations.

Theoretically, this chapter links two previously separate literatures. As noted, social movement research draws attention to the diverse origins of movement groups. However, there are remarkably few attempts to systematically examine structural and technical variation among movement organizations, though particular social innovations and technologies have been discussed (e.g., Myers (1994) discusses movements and e-mail; Polletta (2004) discusses democratic decision making within four movement organizations of the 1960s–1980s). Large-scale studies of movement organizations and their structures and technologies remain rare. Scholars rarely ask how contextual factors (e.g., organizational age or being “native” to a movement) might be linked with the way movement organizations conduct their business.

To address this gap, I draw from contingency theory, a well-established tradition within organization studies. Since the 1960s, contingency theory has argued that organizations and their internal structures are highly dependent on context. The essence of the theory is that there is no single way
to organize because organizations need to “fit” with variable contexts. Contingency theory, a vast literature, offers a lengthy discussion of size, life cycle stage, and other variables that may force organizations to change or modify their structures (e.g., Burns & Stalker, 1961; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Pennings, 1992; Woodward, 1965; Donaldson, 2001). As an organization grows in size, ages, or otherwise changes its context, leaders will adopt new tools and governing structures to exploit different situations to increase performance.

An important observation informs this chapter’s application of contingency theory to social movement research. Cross-movement contact appears to account for much of a movement’s internal diversity. Organizations that crossover may have a different character than “native” organizations. These outsiders are often larger organizations that are well adapted for carrying out political action in a broad range of contexts. This strongly suggests that being oriented toward national politics is correlated with a particular configuration of structures and technologies within an organization (e.g., Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967; Child, 1972; Shenhar, 2001).

A second related observation is that there should be an effect of historical era on the link between an organization’s chosen environment (e.g., national audience) and its structures and technologies. Here, I am not making a claim about ageing processes among political organizations, a claim that can’t be tested within the context of this paper. Rather, I argue for a selection process. There is a time that roughly defines a movement. Organizations founded before that time are created in a different environment, which entails a different bundle of traits than organizations created after that event. Within a political movement, organizations preceding the movement’s genesis are, by definition, crossover organizations. A comparison of organizations created before and after a movement started should reveal important differences in how environment, environment, and technology are linked.

The third motivation of this chapter is that organizations change in uneven ways, especially movement groups. Contingency variables, such as an organization’s environment or founding era, do not strongly determine all organizational structure. There are technical configurations within the organization that create their own path dependencies and shift an organization in some directions rather than others (Lorsch & Allen, 1973; Thompson, 1967; Gupta & Govindarajan, 1991). The result is that organizational fields, such as a coalition of movement organizations, display heterogeneity that can be ascribed to the effects of historical era, political environment, and technical path dependencies.
These comparisons are illustrated with data about organizations that recruited demonstrators for American anti-Iraq War demonstrations. The following empirical sections show that, within the antiwar movement, it is true that older movement organizations are less likely to focus on peace issues and more likely to be oriented toward national mobilization; being created before 2000 does affect the correlation between national orientation and organizational structure, but not technology; and the adoption of new technology, having a Facebook group, depends on the adoption of prior Internet technology but not on being a peace organization, nationally oriented, or being founded in a particular time period. The concluding sections discuss implications of this research for comparative organizational analysis and possible questions for future research.

**POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT AND HISTORICAL ERA AS CONTINGENCY FACTORS**

Though contingency research is a well-developed research tradition, there are elements of the theory meriting more exploration, especially those pertaining to social movements. Typically, contingency theorists focus on contexts such as organizational size and task uncertainty because these are viewed as determinants or indicators of strategy (Blau, 1970; Gresov, 1990). Task uncertainty will determine which structures are adopted and how they relate to measurable outcomes, such as efficiency or performance. Since organization type, performance, and work are such strong motivators for contingency theory, there is often less emphasis on factors of interest to scholars interested in socio-cultural processes, such as political environment and historical eras, and how they generate diversity within non-profit contexts. Political environment indicates an important facet of an organization’s niche. The nature of a political organization’s audience should be an important determinant of its structure (Hannan, Pólos, & Carroll, 2007). An organization that targets or tries to mobilize a broad audience is in much the same position as an organization in a large market. Such organizations would have to centralize their operations and develop the structures to do so.

Movement spillover suggests why thinking about niches or environments may be important. A movement coalition often includes organizations that operate in very different political environments, but meet over a specific issue (e.g., antiwar protests). These organizations may have been founded in different eras and operate in different political contexts, which may be
associated with different configurations of environments, structures, and technologies. These processes are similar to those examined by organizational life cycle researchers (e.g., Kimberly & Miles, 1980; Walsh & DeWar, 1987; Whetten, 1987; Barnett & Carroll, 1995). Crossover may be a sign that an organization has reached a new stage in its development and has adopted the practices that allow it to be effective in multiple political campaigns.

ORGANIZATIONS AND THE BIG TIME

This section builds on the observation that as certain interest groups and movement organizations “go national” as they age (e.g., Walker, 1991; Clemens, 1997; Jenkins, 1983; Heinz, Laumann, Nelson, & Salisbury, 1993). Shifts to new organizational stages are often accompanied by the need, or desire, to address a broader audience. For example, studies of public interest groups have found that they will move to Washington, DC because leaders feel that local political environments are limiting. The national capital is viewed as a place where policy entrepreneurs will have more access to legislators, media elites, and other resources that will help a particular interest group achieve its goal. Similarly, firms in local or state markets may reach the point where they have saturated their market, leading firms to enter larger markets. The upshot of these diverse studies is that organizations often feel the need, justified or not, to increase the range of their activities. The most prominent organizations often adopt a national profile to gain more influence.

Organizations switching to new political or market contexts may have to substantially change if they are to succeed. Changes may include increasing size, employing new technologies, or centralizing the organization. Contingency theory addresses this point with a distinction between “mechanistic” and “organic” types of organizations (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Drazin & Van de Ven, 1985; Pennings, 1992). Mechanistic organizations are supposed to be larger and more hierarchical groups designed for centralized decision making. In contrast, “organic” organizations are characterized by informal communication and flatter hierarchies. This is not completely different than the distinction made by organizational life cycle researchers, who note that firms go through different “life stages” corresponding to growth, stability, and decline (Whetten, 1987; Kimberly & Miles, 1980). Stable organizations may adopt new technologies to help them. This line of reasoning strongly suggests that changing organizational structures and a switch to new political environments should go hand-in-hand.
There may also be a selection process at work. Organizations that successfully establish broad clienteles may be less likely to disband (Baum & Oliver, 1991). With a large network of supporters and diverse streams of income, national organizations may be less prone to closure during bad economic periods, or when the public shifts attention to other issues. This network of supporters may provide more resources that help organizations weather turbulence. Both these arguments suggest that there should be an observed correlation between organizational age and targeting a national audience. The implication is that ageing and environment should be tied to how political organizations manage their activities and interact with the public.

**PATH DEPENDENCY AND SELECTIVE TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE**

The discussion so far has addressed contingency factors such as life cycle stage or environment. However, scholarship stresses that the link between these variables and organizational practices may be complex. The adoption of a particular structure or practice may depend on other practices and structures that mediate the effects of contingency factors. This argument stems from recent scholarship on the link between organizations and technology. Orlikowski (1992) argued against the view that technology use emerges from a simple utilitarian calculation. Technologies generate new conditions within and around organizations, which then affects how persons within organizations select, use, and modify technologies. When technologies are adopted, they create expectations and modify institutional environments. Thus technology and organizations are involved in a structuration process of mutual causation.

Recent writings on technology in organizations have elaborated this view (e.g., Orlikowski, 2000; Orlikowski & Gash, 1994; Majchrzak, Rice, Malhotra, King, & Ba, 2000; Feldman, 2000). It is often argued that the implementation of information technologies depends on narratives created within an organization (e.g., Berg, 1999; Ackerman, 2000). Managers and workers may create a framing that encourages them to adopt a particular technology. These technologies are viewed as legitimate because they have been adopted in other organizations. The suggestion of this research is that technology adoption is highly dependent on the adoption of previous technologies that change practices within organizations and their environments. Thus, changes in technical configurations within organizations may
be ascribed not only to contingency factors that drive strategy, but also path dependency. Organizational actors layer new technologies on older similar technologies for technical and social reasons (Thompson, 1967).

The preceding discussions can be summarized in the following hypotheses. First, there should be an observed correlation between organizational age and shift to a larger environment because older organizations are crossover groups that have chosen to pursue policy change in multiple domains. Second, organizations that have made this shift should have a particular bundle of technologies and social structures that facilitate “fit” with this environment, but this bundle depends on the historical era of an organization’s birth. Third, technologies may be highly path dependent and not always linked to contingency variables, leading to further heterogeneity.

THE CONTEXT: MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS, STRUCTURES, AND TECHNOLOGIES

Social movement research touches on these topics, but without the unifying framework of contingency theory, or any of the qualifications provided current social studies of technology. For example, Lipset, Trow, and Coleman’s (1956) study of unions made the argument that as unions became larger, there was a tendency toward centralization of decision making and oligarchy, and away from inclusive and democratic structures. Fitzgerald and Rodgers’ (2000) theory of radical social movement structure suggested that as organizations went “mainstream,” they lost the tendency for democratic decision making and become more hierarchical, a theme echoed in Polletta’s (2004) work on discussion and democracy in movement organizations. The collective message of this scholarship is that movement organizations are subject to similar contingencies as other organizations, but this comparative view has not been incorporated into the literature.

Contingency arguments also appear in research that discusses the importance of the Internet and web-based applications, such as e-mail, for movement groups (e.g., Myers, 1994, 2000). The Internet is particularly useful because it increases the control that political activists have over their message when competing for attention in national politics. Activists no longer rely on allies in the mass media to publicize their ideas and actions. Instead, activists can choose what is sent, when it is sent, and to whom it is sent. Furthermore, there are great efficiencies associated with the Internet. Millions of e-mails can be sent for as little as a few hundred dollars.
A popular web site can attract multitudes of readers. The efficiency and level of control over mass communication offered by the Internet makes it an integral tool for modern political groups. Thus, movement organizations that switch to a mass audience environment would find it valuable to adopt these new technologies.

There are other reasons that movement organizations might adopt Internet-based technologies, aside from succeeding in the environment of mass national politics. These technologies help organizations define their own environment through the establishment of distinctive online communities (Ayers, 1999; Cloward & Piven, 2001; Edwards, 2004; Earl, 2007; McCaughey & Ayers, 2003; Schneider, 1996). Older styles of politics often require a substantial degree of face-to-face interaction, such as political meetings or campaign volunteering. This may have discouraged people who hold unpopular views, or simply disliked the need to meet. The Internet allows people to create virtual personas and interact with others who share the same views. In fact, a distinctive feature of the 2004 Democratic primary was the use of online “meet ups” by the Howard Dean campaign (Wolf, 2004). Sympathizers could log into various web sites, share their views, exchange e-mail, and organize offline meetings. Similar tactics were used by the Obama presidential campaign, which employed a former Facebook designer to assist with online outreach (Sullivan, 2008).

THE CASE OF THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

The rise of the Internet has reshaped politics and the anti-Iraq War movement provides a valuable opportunity to study the links between historical cohort, political environments, structures, and technologies. The contemporary antiwar movement, which traces its origins to the period immediately following 9/11 (Hayden, 2007), has at its disposal an unusually broad range of technologies. By 2001, Internet access was widely available in the United States. It is relatively easy for any organization to create a web site, maintain mailing lists, or publicize a blog. There have even been antiwar demonstrations staged in the web site known as “Second Life,” which creates a virtual reality for millions of participants (Skall, 2007).

Researchers draw attention to organizations that operate primarily over the Internet because this strategy is viewed as an unusually strong adaptation to the environment of mass politics. In some cases, organizations have decided that it is better to operate with a minimal physical presence and emphasize online interactions. A well-known example is Moveon.org.
Founded in 1998, Moveon.org’s original issue was fighting the Clinton impeachment. But instead of traditional movement mobilization, Moveon.org cultivated an extremely large e-mail list of sympathizers and donors (Chadwick, 2005, 2007). After Clinton’s impeachment acquittal, Moveon.org focused on other activities such as fundraising for political candidates and advertising against the Iraq War. They try to influence the political climate by sending out weekly e-mails to millions of readers. These e-mails not only inform people about Moveon.org’s issues, but may also ask for money or participation in political events. The emphasis on the Internet stems from the technology’s characteristic ease of use, which allows Moveon.org to mobilize millions with a staff of a few dozen. In a sense, Moveon.org is a good example of the older national oriented organization that has adapted to the Internet so it can easily act in multiple political campaigns, which has helped it spillover into the post-2001 anti-Iraq War movement.

United for Peace and Justice (UFPJ) has a different history and uses the Internet in a much different way. Founded in 2001 as a response to the impending war in Afghanistan, UFPJ views itself as an umbrella group for a wide range of political organizations. The Internet is used mainly to notify followers of political events and to help coordinate the activities of its coalition members. It also espouses an egalitarian ethos and encourages member organizations to help write their policy platform and vote for leadership. As a younger organization, it has not yet attempted to become the multiissue organization that intervenes in other movements, though leaders do routinely say that they morally support activists on other issues.

These examples highlight the subtle links between environments, historical cohorts, technology, and structure. Moveon.org, though small, has a structure that illustrates the “mechanistic” tendency described by contingency theorists. It has multiple divisions aimed at elections, policy making, and publicity. It has hierarchical leadership and does not hold elections. The Internet is used to communicate messages from the leadership to sympathizers. It is in many respects an ideal version of the older, centrally coordinated political interest group. Moveon.org has crossed over to antiwar activism precisely because it is a successfully centralized organization. UFPJ is also a national organization but positions itself as a democratic platform for antiwar activism. By being so closely tied to the movement, it may choose to weaken the link between its environment (the national peace movement) and its internal structures (hierarchical leadership). It is these sorts of contingencies that are investigated in subsequent sections.
DATA

The empirical sections employ data on 293 organizations that recruited antiwar demonstrators, a sample of the broader coalition of groups that helped draw hundreds of thousands of demonstrators to antiwar protests. The organization list is created with the "hypernetwork" sampling method (McPhereson, 1982; Kalleberg, Marsden, Aldrich, & Cassell, 1990). That is, I used a sample of individuals to obtain a list of their organizational affiliations. I then removed repeat listings and added information about the organization obtained from websites and contacting the organizations.

Survey Method

Surveys of antiwar demonstrators were conducted in 2005 at the following locations: the January 2005 antiwar protests at the second inauguration of George W. Bush in Washington, DC; the March 19, 2005 protests on the second anniversary of the Iraq War, which occurred in multiple cities; the May Day demonstrations in New York; and the September 24, 2005 demonstrations in Washington, DC. These events were identified through discussions with antiwar activists, observations of movement websites and mailing lists, and monitoring of the mainstream and alternative media (e.g., Indymedia). In our readings of press accounts of the protest, these appear to be the most significant demonstrations.

The March 19, 2005 demonstrations occurred in dozens of cities. Surveys were fielded at the demonstrations held in Washington, DC, North Carolina, New York, Chicago, Indianapolis, San Francisco, and San Diego. These events occurred in the North, Midwest, South, and West. Although we did not cover every significant protest event in 2005, we surveyed demonstrators at the largest events in major metropolitan areas. Additional sites, such as North Carolina, were chosen because they were designated as important by the major antiwar movement groups, or they provided opportunities to collect data from smaller metropolitan areas (Indianapolis and San Diego). In our study of the May Day 2005 protests, we attended the events sponsored by the UFPJ-ANSWER coalition and a separate event organized by the Troops Out Now-Million Worker March coalition.

At each event, surveyors were instructed to choose an initial “anchor” that was not surveyed. Surveyors were asked to skip this person because their initial choice might be biased. Instead, the surveyor would count five more persons into the crowd and interview that person and then to repeat the process. After
two surveys were completed, we asked surveyors to choose a new anchor. One
expects this process to reduce bias because the surveyor does not affect who is
standing a fixed distance away from a selected person. At each event, we asked
surveyors to start at the front of the protest area and move toward the back.
We attempted to have surveyors cover the major areas of the crowd to ensure
even coverage. Although producing a perfectly random sample is not feasible
in such circumstances, prior protest survey research indicates that data from
such a quasi-random sample produces reliable and valid data about the crowd
of demonstrators (see Walgrave, 2007, for a review).
In total, 2,276 surveys were collected from antiwar demonstrators at these
events. We asked surveyors to indicate the number of nonrespondents and
estimate the race and gender of nonrespondents. Prior analysis of our data
shows that there is an overall response of 89% (self-citation 2007). A t-test
shows that there is not significant variation in the response rate between
protest events (i.e., the 2005 Inauguration protest has a similar response rate
as most of the March 19 demonstrations). Analysis of nonresponse by race
gender shows little demographic differences – male response rate is 86% and
female 91%. Racially, most groups have similar response rates, except that
African-Americans appear to respond at a 79% rate, whereas “Others”
(e.g., Arabs or Native Americans) reported a response rate of 96%. Whites,
Asians and Latinos respond at a rate similar to the rest of the population.

Organizational Contingency Variables

Two key variables are “national orientation” and whether the organization
was created in 2000 or afterwards. I define a “national” organization as any
group that targets, serves, or mobilizes a national audience. Groups that are
not national are those that target and mobilize people in specific states,
cities, or towns (e.g., Michigan for Peace). Founding year of an organization
was obtained by first examining the group’s web site (current or cached) to
see if it listed a start date, then looking for the earliest media mention of that
group in electronic data bases.

Organizational Structure Variables

I coded four aspects of an organization’s internal structure. An organization
is said to have “multiple divisions” if it has departments or sub-groupings
dedicated to multiple policy areas such as elections, lobbying, fund raising,
peace issues, or labor. A “coalition group” is one that serves as an umbrella group for multiple constituent groups. An organization is said to have “local chapters” if the group has a branch, franchise, or office for followers at more than one location. “Appointed leadership” means that the organization does not have elections where members can vote for the leaders. These organizations either have governing boards who appoint leaders or the group is based around a charismatic leader.

Internet-Based Technologies

To study the link between environments and technologies, I focused on the Internet because it is now a major tool that political organizations use to contact followers. First, using standard web browsers, I determined if the organization has a web site. Then, I determined if they solicit funds through the web site, have public mail for followers, have a blog, or maintain MySpace! and Facebook groups. These technologies were chosen because they indicate capture the range of Internet technologies used to contact people, ranging from passive contact (having a web site), to extracting resources (funds donated through the web site), to active participation (Facebook). All of these, except Facebook, were measured in 2005. Facebook pages were observed in December 2008 and can be used to study adoption of technologies over time.

Organizational Control Variables

The organizational control variables have straightforward interpretations, such as year founded, location in New York or Washington, DC, or whether it is a peace organization. An organization’s identification with the peace movement was determined by examining the group’s self-description on their web site. If they mentioned peace, ending war, supporting veterans, opposing violence, antimilitarism, or eliminating guns or nuclear weapons as goals, they were labeled a peace group. Conversely, a nonantiwar organization is one that defines itself as an organization dedicated mainly to issues other than peace. These other issues include education, labor, or feminism. “Member count in sample” denotes the number of respondents in the survey who indicated they were a member of that organization. This is used as a proxy for the organization’s popularity among antiwar demonstrators and as a very rough correlate of total size (Table 1).
The hypernetwork sampling approach has limits that merit discussion. First, the method samples organizations that participate in antiwar recruitment. Organizations that exclusively participate in other ways, such as fundraising, would not be included in this sample. This method is not appropriate, by itself, for obtaining data about the larger “field” of organizations that have any level of participation in antiwar politics. However, for answering questions about organizations that adopt communication technologies that can be used to reach activists, a sample based on contacts is appropriate.

Second, the hypernetwork sampling method produces a list of organizations that successfully contacted at least one person. It does not yield data on groups that failed to reach any person because the probability they will be mentioned is zero. The question is whether this biases the results. This is partially addressed by the comprehensive sampling scheme for protesters.

If an organization is not mentioned by thousands of respondents in multiple cities at multiple times, that suggests that the organization is not a

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Recruiting Organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Valid Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple divisions</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition group</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local chapters</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed leaders</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National orientation</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has web site</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has public e-mail list</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations through website</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has blog</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls and other variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace organization</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in DC</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in New York</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member count in sample</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founded 2000 or later</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Organizations that recruited 2,276 protesters at antiwar demonstrations in 2004–2005.

Limitations

The hypernetwork sampling approach has limits that merit discussion. First, the method samples organizations that participate in antiwar recruitment. Organizations that exclusively participate in other ways, such as fundraising, would not be included in this sample. This method is not appropriate, by itself, for obtaining data about the larger “field” of organizations that have any level of participation in antiwar politics. However, for answering questions about organizations that adopt communication technologies that can be used to reach activists, a sample based on contacts is appropriate.
significant movement participant. An alternative sample with organizations that failed to recruit demonstrators would bias estimates toward organizations with minimal contact to the movement.

Third, there may be a regional bias; organizations are more likely to be mentioned if they are located near the protest site or be part of the network behind the major antiwar demonstrations. This cannot be corrected within the framework of this study. A study that included smaller protests outside major cities and those not sponsored by the leading antiwar organizations would produce a different sample that can be the subject of future research.

**HISTORICAL ERA AND NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT**

This section explores the relationship between founding period, crossover, and orientation toward a non-local audience. Fig. 1 shows, by decade, the proportion of national organizations. The figure groups together the oldest organizations, those founded in the 1950s or earlier, due to small numbers. The pattern is clear. The older organizations are almost always nationally oriented (85%). In contrast, only 40% of the youngest organizations have a non-local mission. Fig. 1 also shows the proportion of crossover groups by founding decade. The pattern is reversed. The organizations native to the movement are by far the youngest organizations.

It is highly instructive to examine this from a qualitative perspective. The oldest organizations include religious organizations, such as the politically liberal Mennonite Church; nearly all notable left/progressive political parties;

![Fig. 1. National Orientation and Identification with Peace Activism by Founding Decade among Antiwar Mobilizing Organizations.](image-url)
major unions; and the most prominent older peace organizations such as Peace Action and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF). Briefly, these organizations appear to have two profiles. First, there are organizations aimed as mass politics of the type described by Max Weber (1946). These “classical political organizations” mobilize large constiuencies to influence states. These would include parties and unions, and to some extent, some religious groups that draw on mass following when pursuing political causes. This is a very intuitive finding. Large, mature multipurpose political organizations are likely to be found in a variety of movements, such as peace activism.

The second population within the oldest organizations appears to be the “survivors” from previous eras of peace activism. For example, WILPF was founded in 1915 by Jane Addams and Carrie Catt and quickly became a clearing house political activism involving women’s issues, pacifism, and social justice (Bussey & Tims, 1980). The group acted as a focal point for activists in numerous countries and soon generated chapters in 37 nations, and received the Nobel Peace prize twice. Similarly, Peace Action emerged from SANE (the Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy) and the Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign. SANE was founded by prominent peace activists such as Coretta Scott King and Albert Schweitzer (Stassen & Wittner, 2007; Katz, 1986). With the help of these prominent leaders, SANE, later renamed Peace Action, became one of the most highly visible organizations working against nuclear weapons in the 1980s. Though it is beyond the scope of this chapter, these examples suggest that the survivors from previous eras of activism are likely to be those that are well integrated into elite networks, which allows these groups to maintain and expand their followings. The expansive structure is likely to survive for decades, if not longer.

The post-2000 organizations are the most common – 47% of the sample – but they are least likely to be focused on national or international audiences. Once again, it is instructive to describe this population. First, these organizations are much more likely to be focused on peace than the oldest organizations (56% vs. 13%). Many of these groups were founded specifically as a response to these wars – International ANSWER, United for Peace and Justice, and Code Pink: Women for Peace all fall into this category. However, these coalition leaders are not representative of this sample. Among recently created peace organizations, 66% are focused on local audiences, such as Chicagoans Against the War in Iraq. A question meriting future investigation is if these local groups will be absorbed into national organizations or disband. That would leave nationally oriented groups like ANSWER and UFPJ as the survivors who enter future movements.
These descriptive statistics suggest that the peace organization/crossover group distinction is important. The crossover groups are older, mature organizations who have developed the capacity to intervene in a wide range of political campaigns. The peace groups are younger and are more likely to be designed to activate local constituencies. Fig. 2 shows this heterogeneity in more detail. Peace groups, which might be designated as “indigenous” to the antiwar movement, are much more recent and are less likely to cultivate a national audience. The crossover groups are the opposite, older and much more national in orientation. This descriptive finding suggests that cross-movement contacts are not random or ad hoc. Rather, “spillover” diversifies movement politics in very specific ways by mixing up broader multipurpose groups with younger more narrowly focused organizations.

### NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, INTERNAL STRUCTURE, AND TECHNICAL CONFIGURATION

This section asks how an organization’s technical configuration, cohort, and environment are related. Political organizations have a number of internal social structures and technologies designed to help them exploit their
environment. The following models estimate the correlation between these characteristics and the probability that an organization has a national audience or mission. The model estimates the correlation between the independent variables and the probability that an organization is national. Each model includes measures of an organization’s political structures, technologies, and control variables. The examined governance structures are chosen to measure the organization’s tendency toward “mechanistic” structures. These include the adoption of multiple departments, the creation of local chapters to coordinate local activists, and the presence of appointed unelected leadership. Since one might expect groups that are coalitions to be national as well, I included that in the analysis. The technologies I examine are those designed for mass communication in the Internet age. These include whether the organization has a web site, a publicly available e-mail list, allows the public to donate to the organizations through the web site, maintains a blog, or has a MySpace! group. I included control variables such as the location of a group’s headquarters, whether it is a self-defined peace organization, and its presence within the movement, measured by the number of respondents who claim to be affiliated with the group (Table 2).

Model 1 is the basic model that shows the effect of governance structures, Internet technologies, and control variables. The control variables have predictable correlations. The number of group members in the survey sample and location in Washington, DC or New York has predictable results. The governance structures have an interesting pattern of effects. Having local chapters and appointed leadership both correlate with being a national organization, an intuitive result. However, having multiple departments or being a coalition group is not significantly correlated with environment. This basic finding is important for a number of reasons. As noted earlier, contingency theory would suggest that there should be a link between departmentalization and operating in a complex environment. Also, one might expect coalition organizations to be nationally oriented since there would more of a demand for such groups in national politics, as opposed to state or local politics. These correlations are not found within the antiwar movement.

The Internet technology variables have little connection with the dependent variable. This is also unsurprising. Though web sites and related technologies were developed to assist with communication within large groups, these technologies can also be easily tailored to small organizations, or those with limited constituencies. It is also the case that some technologies are so common that they expected features of any politically active organization. It is difficult to imagine a serious political group
operating without a website in 2000 as much as it would be to imagine a group in 1980 without a newsletter or direct mail. The exception to this tendency is the organization’s use of its website for financial solicitations. This correlation is to be expected from the point of resource dependency theory. As an organization shifts into a larger environment, it will more likely be change its structure to best capture funds.

Models 2 and 3 break the sample down by eras: pre- and post-2000. This cut-off was chosen for empirical and substantive reasons. Empirically, there are relatively few organizations in each year before 2000 and it was necessary to group them to obtain better statistical estimates. Substantively,

Table 2. Probit Regression Model of Organizational Characteristics and National Orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>s.e.</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple divisions</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition group</td>
<td>−0.27</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local chapters</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed leaders</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public e-mail list</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web donations</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MySpace! page</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace group</td>
<td>−0.28</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member count</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>−1.76</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>−106.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>141.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-$R^2$</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Complete cases used in analysis. Model 1, all organizations; Model 2, pre-2000 organizations; and Model 3, post-2000 organizations.

<sup>a</sup>No variance for this variable in this model.
the organizations in 2000 and later were formed while George W. Bush was
running for office or had taken office. The pre-2000 groups are those that
crossed over into peace politics and anti-Bush activism.

Many of the results are the same, with some notable exceptions. One
difference is the effect of being a peace organization. These organizations,
if they are older, are much less likely to be national. This is likely a selection
effect due to cross-issue spillover. Within a movement, the indigenous
groups would be more varied when compared to crossover groups, who
enter new political domains because they are large and well established on
the national stage. Another important difference is the connection with
appointed leadership. Model 1 showed that being a national organization is
correlated with having unelected appointed leaders, but this is not the case
in model 2. This might be attributed to the fact many national organizations
are unions or parties, which have elections, but there are also prominent
religious groups, which tend to have closed decision making. Since the raw
number of such groups is small, it is not possible to test that hypothesis. The
other main difference between models 1 and 2 is that model 2 shows no link
between Internet technologies and environment for older organizations.
This is important because it shows the weakening of the link between
national orientation and technologies for the most mature organizations.

Model 3, which uses data from recently created organizations, shows
similar results as model 1. The one exception is in the control variables. In
models 1 and 2, the organization’s presence within the movement, as
measured by affiliations between respondents and movement organizations,
is not correlated with being a national group, but it is for recently formed
organizations.

ADOPTION OF NEW TECHNOLOGY

How do environment and cohort affect the adoption of new technologies?
What sorts of path dependencies may be correlated with the adoption of
social networking technology in organizations? Table 3 presents a propor-
tional hazard model of Facebook adoption. This web site is important
because it has quickly become a highly popular social networking tool and
many political groups have established presences on this web site. In each
model, I use the organization’s characteristics in 2005 to estimate the effects
on the monthly adoption of Facebook, which was made open to the public
in September 2006.
As before, Table 3 presents three models. Model 4 uses valid data from all organizations, while models 5 and 6 use data on pre- and post-2000 organizations. First, governance structures have little effect on the adoption of Facebook. In all models, the different organizational structures have no effect. The exception is in the full sample. Organizations that have local chapters are more likely to adopt Facebook. This is an intuitive finding and speaks to the link between values and technologies. Organizations that find it important to create meeting spaces for dispersed constituencies are those likely to adopt social networking.

What is the link between having a particular technology and adopting Facebook? In these models, two Internet technologies have effects – MySpace pages and blogs. This is an intuitive finding. These two

### Table 3. Proportional Hazard Model of Facebook Adoption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>s.e.</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple divisions</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition group</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local chapters</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed leaders</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public e-mail list</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web donations</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MySpace! page</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace group</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National orientation</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member count</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founded &gt; 2000</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Complete cases used in analysis. Model 4, all organizations; Model 5, pre-2000 organizations; and Model 6, post-2000 organizations.
technologies are similar to Facebook because they encourage interaction with readers. This strongly suggests that technical configurations are linked with path dependencies within the organizations. To use Thompson’s (1967) terminology, technologies are “long linked.” New technologies are added alongside pre-existing similar technologies. It is not the case that environment, or age, account for Facebook adoption. Only model 6, for example, shows an effect of being a national organization. There, national organizations are more likely to use Facebook. It is important to note that this fit of environment and technology is contingent on time period. This last finding – the lack of link between environment, structure, and new technology – is important because it shows the additional factors behind the heterogeneity among organizations.

DISCUSSION

The antiwar coalition provided an opportunity to study the subtle relationship between cohort, environment, structure, and technology. It is worth summarizing a few key findings. First, the cross-sectional data do show an expected correlation between founding period and national orientation. A qualitative examination of older organizations suggested that this is likely a selection effect. Organizations survived from earlier peace movements or crossed over from other movements, having previously started or developed into national organizations. Second, there is little evidence of a link between Internet-based technologies and national orientation. There is substantial evidence that organizational structures, such as having local chapters, are correlated with national orientation. These findings do not depend much on whether the organization was recently created. Fourth, the introduction of a new technology, the Facebook group, depends on very specific technologies, not on organizational structure, or national environment, and the link depends on the founding period of the organization.

The disjunction between environment and technologies deserves discussion. Contingency theory would strongly suggest that technologies are adopted because they help the organization succeed in a particular context, which suggested that national political groups would be more likely to use various Internet-based technologies to reach large audiences. There was very limited support for this idea in the data. A few hypotheses are offered. One possibility is unmeasured variance. Perhaps there is another contingency that would be strongly linked to technical use. Here, in response to theories of cross-movement contact, I focused only on organizational life stage and
environment. Another possibility is commitment. As organizations mature, their members are more committed and they need less attention in the form of web sites, e-mail, or blogs. This would explain why there is a significant correlation between member count (i.e., respondents in the sample), national orientation, and Facebook adoption among recent organizations, but not older organizations. Younger movement organizations are busy creating their “brand” among activists, which older organizations are not compelled to do. Future research can assess these ideas.

An important implication of this research is for comparative studies of organizations. If one takes a “field” to denote those organizations operating within a given domain (Scott, 1991), for example, antiwar mobilization, then research on political fields must start out with the premise of crossover-induced heterogeneity, an assumption that may not be merited in other contexts. For example, it is often the case that for-profit sectors generate a multitude of organizational forms because entrepreneurs are experimenting with different firm structures (e.g., Baron, Burton, & Hannan, 1996). Then, as time passes, firms become less diverse as industries settle on legitimate and efficient firm types. In contrast, a political field has diversity stemming from movement crossover and maturation (Meyer & Staggenborg, 1994). The organizations that cross over into new movements have aged and acquired particular structures. If the patterns in this study generalize to other contexts, it might be expected that other movements would have a similar mixture of organizations, broad multipurpose groups with national goals and local groups created in response to specific political events.

This hypothesis speaks to a fundamental difference between commercial and political fields. Commercials fields are defined by niches and the ability of firms to dominate their niche. Although there is certainly competition within political niches, there is also a large role for organizations that bring deep mobilization capacity to new political movements. This leads to substantial diversification of political movements. In this research, these organizations would be the churches, the political parties, and the unions. This is consistent with other research showing that these mass political organizations were crucial actors in movements as diverse as the Civil Rights and conservative Christian movements.

This study also suggests new ways that organizational theorists can theorize the relationship between technology and the heterogeneity of organizational fields. The results are consistent with prior research linking organizational characteristics with adoption of technology, but more can be said about how the diversity of the field affects technical configurations and what the impact may be. The data indicate that age mediates the link...
between environment and the adoption of Facebook, which is designed to create communal spaces for activists. This implies that the processes associated with differences among organizations – age and environment – will also affect how the general public accesses the movement. As more people use the Internet as a place to enact their political identities, they will be more likely to encounter the organizations that successfully implement Facebook and similar technologies. Thus, ageing, environment, and prior technical configurations will create differences among organizations that lead to citizens having different access to politics.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study used a unique data set to explore the association between organizational structure, contingency factors, and technology. The strengths, and limits, of this data set point to questions for future research. First, the organizations were observed in a relatively early stage of the movement, 2005, which is the second year of the Iraq War. The political conditions have changed greatly since then. Democrats have gained control of the legislative and executive branches of government. Furthermore, the most urgent issues in late 2008 are related to the economy, not the Iraq War. The Iraq War has receded in importance for many citizens. The question is whether these conditions affect the processes described in this chapter. How do political cycles affect the heterogeneity of the movement?

A second question is how these new technologies affect participation in the movement. One could imagine, as suggested in the empirical results, that only some political organizations will develop a substantial online presence that will be determined by prior technologies, age, and environment. If that is the case, then it is unlikely that social networking, and virtual communities, will become standard features of the modern political organization. Instead, there will be “virtual niches” dominated by organizations who have adopted the relevant technical configuration. In short, there may be an emerging “digital divide” within a political movement, driven by ageing and crossover. A third question is how these online domains affect offline recruiting. Do organizations with successful Internet-based communities indeed have more influence or leverage in political processes? Are these activities substitutes or compliments for “real world politics?” Recent political history suggests that they compliment physical political activity.

Overall, this research shows the value in developing comparative approaches to studying political movements. By focusing on contingency
factors, this study was able to explain, in part, the emerging distinctions within a social movement. Continued research in this area can consider evolving political opportunity structures, new technologies, and their impact on political participation.
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