In this dissertation I studied the role of organizers of protest events. Protest does not emerge out of the blue; it needs to be organized and mobilized. However, although scholars recognize that mobilization is one of the most important mechanisms of social movements, the process itself and the role organizers play in it has not been studied much. Most scholars and theories have focused on how ‘political opportunities’ may facilitate the rise of movements, or how the existence of (social movement) organizations may do this by bringing together resources or framing the message. Others have studied participants; when and why might they join an organization or protest event. But the organizers themselves have largely been absent from the picture. I proposed to add the protest organizers to the explanatory model of social movements.

I argued that, in fact, two mobilization campaigns are necessary (see Figure 24); first an initiator needs to mobilize other organizers and thereby assemble a mobilizing structure (see Figure 24 arrow 1), and second, the organizers in the mobilizing structure need to jointly set up a campaign and mobilize participants (see Figure 24 arrow 2). I discussed both processes in this dissertation, thereby following the mobilization process from beginning to end. By doing this, I showed the importance of the role of the organizers.

Neither organizers, nor participants, or mobilizing structures can be seen as independent of one another. Individuals shape, build and sustain structures, while, on the other hand, individuals are shaped, enabled and constrained by the very structures. When studying individuals we should consider them as embedded in their structures. In this study I therefore focused on the relationships between the two. The first question was: How do organizers build and sustain mobilizing structures and how are they in this process, enabled and constrained by the structures they are embedded in? And the second question was: How are individual participant’s actions and decisions to participate in an event influenced by their relationships? The participant’s relationship need not always be a personal relationship in order to be influential; identification with virtual or imagined communities can have a profound impact too. Online or imagined communities also shape individuals and their opinions and motivations and therefore their actions.

Relationships, structures, and networks thus play a paramount role throughout this dissertation. The most central was the mobilizing structure. Mobilizing structures form the connecting tissue between organizers and participants. It is through these structures that resources and participants are mobilized. Mobilizing structures may

---

**FIGURE 24: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZERS, MOBILIZING STRUCTURE AND PARTICIPANTS**

Neither organizers, nor participants, or mobilizing structures can be seen as independent of one another. Individuals shape, build and sustain structures, while, on the other hand, individuals are shaped, enabled and constrained by the very structures. When studying individuals we should consider them as embedded in their structures. In this study I therefore focused on the relationships between the two. The first question was: How do organizers build and sustain mobilizing structures and how are they in this process, enabled and constrained by the structures they are embedded in? And the second question was: How are individual participant’s actions and decisions to participate in an event influenced by their relationships? The participant’s relationship need not always be a personal relationship in order to be influential; identification with virtual or imagined communities can have a profound impact too. Online or imagined communities also shape individuals and their opinions and motivations and therefore their actions.

Relationships, structures, and networks thus play a paramount role throughout this dissertation. The most central was the mobilizing structure. Mobilizing structures form the connecting tissue between organizers and participants. It is through these structures that resources and participants are mobilized. Mobilizing structures may
include networks specifically designed for movement mobilization, or existing formal and informal networks that exist outside the movement. Anything from a friendship network, church, gay community, anarchist subculture or formal NGOs such as Greenpeace may be included in the structure. They may be, but it can never be taken for granted that they will be. In the case studies assembling groups and networks for a mobilizing structure was hardly ever easy. Organizers needed to build a structure for every campaign and the participation of networks could never be taken for granted. Organizers needed to make use of existing networks in civil society to build their structures. However, society is becoming more liquid. And as networks in civil society are changing, so are the possibilities for organizers. While in the past ‘traditional’ hierarchical organizations such as trade unions, political parties and churches, were the main ways through which to mobilize participants for action, nowadays many of these traditional organizations are losing their members and influence. However, at the same time new structures are emerging that are looser and more informal. Young people especially, prefer these looser and ad hoc connections over the more structural and restricting ones. People are still engaged in society but more often in personalized networks than in communities. Organizers thus can—and in the future will increasingly need to-make use of these new types of networks. Whether they are online or offline, liquid ties can be used to mobilize participants. The mobilizing repertoire of organizers has thus expanded.

The ‘new’ mobilizing structure can therefore take diverse shapes. I developed a model which shows that that organizers can use only formal networks, or only informal networks, or any combination in between. This creates a continuum of mobilizing structures that range from solid (only formal networks) to liquid (only informal networks) (see Figure 25).

Combining these three ideas, leads to the model which I tested in this dissertation (see Figure 26): 1) initiators need to build a mobilizing structure (although not from scratch), 2) this mobilizing structure can take diverse forms (from solid to liquid), and 3) the composition and shape of the structure determines who will take part in the protest event, and for what reasons. I set out to answer two questions in this dissertation:

1. How do organizers of protest events shape the mobilizing structure (see Figure 26, arrow 1)?
2. How does the shape of the mobilizing structure affect who participates in the event, and the participants’ motivations (see Figure 26, arrow 2)?
When combined, the answers to these two questions showed how the organizers of a protest event, by shaping the mobilizing structure, influenced the composition of the crowd participating in their event, and the motives these participants had for joining.

**SUMMARY**

Question 1 was investigated in chapters 4 and 5. In chapter 4 I first described the process of building and maintaining a solid mobilizing structure (specifically, the Dutch Social Forum, ‘DSF’), as I expected that this type of structure would be the hardest to build and maintain. Indeed, cooperation in this structure proved problematic; in fact, the involved organizers encountered almost every problem imaginable. The description of this case provided an excellent opportunity to develop a model of the full process of building and maintaining mobilizing structures. In chapter 5 I described examples of more liquid or narrow mobilizing structures. When comparing the building and cooperation in these structures with the ‘full process’ described in chapter 4, the process indeed proved much less problematic.

Question 2, was investigated in chapters 6 and 7. I expected that what the mobilizing structure looked like would have major impact on who could be mobilized and why people participated. Different types of mobilizing structures used different types of mobilizing strategies. In chapter 6 I described that these different strategies reached different groups of participants and at different points in time. The type of mobilizing structure therefore had major impact on who was mobilized and when. In chapter 7 I demonstrated that different mobilizing structures and different mobilizing strategies also affected participants’ motivations.

**THE ORGANIZERS**

As expected, the building of the mobilizing structures started with the initiators trying to mobilize the organizers they already knew, liked and trusted. When these organizers had extensive networks, this often sufficed to mobilize enough other organizers, and the initiators did not try (hard) to recruit anyone else. Hence the mobilizing structure reflected the submerged networks of the initiator. When their own submerged networks did not suffice, initiators tried to use weak ties to mobilize new organizers. Weak
ties were only effective however, when the ideology, identity and tactics of the initiator were clearly congruent with those of the potential recruit. Consequently, the more specific the initiators’ ideology, identity and tactics, the less able they were to mobilize organizers beyond their own submerged networks. Thus, the eventual shape of the mobilizing structure came to reflect the submerged networks of the initiators and this effect was stronger the more specific the initiator’s identity, ideology and tactics were and the less he or she made use of weak ties to recruit other organizers.

In the case of the most solid mobilizing structure, the ‘DSF’, the initiators already knew many organizers whom they asked to join. However, because these organizers often did not know each other yet, they frequently held stereotypical ideas about each other. Therefore, they did not trust each other and consequently, were unwilling to join the structure. Furthermore, other organizers did know each other but had had negative experiences trying to work together in previous attempts to build broad mobilizing structures. These negative relationships led to negative expectations, which led to uncooperative behavior and thereby the reinforcement of negative experiences. Thus, although in some cases submerged networks of activists were conducive for building a ‘new’ structure, in other cases such submerged networks and the negative relationships and experiences contained in it, constrained the organizers’ possibilities. Indeed, the ‘newly’ built structure was never really new. Friendships, rifts and stereotypes were reproduced and sustained through the actions of the organizers. However, it wasn’t just a question of which networks organizers were embedded in and in which ones they were not. Identification —thus the perception of the organizers to which network they belonged— played an important role too. I found that if organizers identified with universalistic groups, such as the alterglobalist movement, they would build or join a mobilizing structure as a means to build and strengthen that movement. Organizers who identified with particularistic groups, on the other hand, built or joined mobilizing structures to strengthen their own particular group and reach their own group’s objectives. This also affected the type of structure organizers preferred to build, which caused great tension in the mobilizing structures. Identification was therefore a major determinant of who joined the structure, who stayed and who left, and how the cooperation developed.

Organizers who identified with universalistic groups saw all other organizers as part of the same movement, and thus part of ‘us’. Therefore, they were motivated to include ever more groups and organizers in the structure, and tried to keep everyone involved, even when cooperation was difficult. Because their aim was to strengthen the movement, they wanted to do this on a long-lasting or even permanent basis. Consequently, they tried to build broad solid structures.

Those who identified mainly with their own particularistic group, were less concerned about keeping everyone involved, and were less determined to stay involved themselves. They participated for instrumental reasons and usually eventually evaluated the cooperation by asking: what did we invest, and what did we get back? When they felt they were not getting back as much as they put in, they simply left the mobilizing structure. They were therefore unwilling to attach themselves unconditionally to a mobilizing structure and preferred liquid structures, which they could join and leave whenever they wanted to.

In addition, organizers who identified with particularistic groups saw most of the oth-
er organizers involved in the mobilizing structure as ‘them’. They were therefore not very inclined to make compromises to accommodate the others’ opinions. Those with more universalistic identifications saw this as an unwillingness to cooperate or even an attempt to sabotage the mobilizing structure. They reciprocated by not making any compromises in return. From this point on, organizers could vent their opinions, but they were ignored. Eventually, they became inactive because they felt they were not taken seriously. Their disengagement was in turn seen as proof that they did not want to cooperate, and it started a downward spiral.

There was thus constant tension in the mobilizing structures between those who saw the structure as a means to build a broad and long-lasting movement, often the initiators, and those who joined solely to join forces. While the former were willing to put up with differences, the latter were less willing to do so, and would rather see difficult organizers leave. This conflict emerged even in more liquid mobilizing structures. As a consequence, initiators were often deeply disappointed in the other organizers’ lack of commitment and perseverance.

Cooperation was not equally difficult in all types of mobilizing structures however. In solid structures differences in ideological and cultural backgrounds became problematic as there was pressure for conformity. The more solid the structure was, the more difficult it was to build, cooperate in and sustain. Cooperation in liquid structures that did not aim for unity or long term sustainability, and cooperation in narrow structures where there simply was much less diversity, proved a lot easier.

In liquid structures there was room for diversity and identity differences among organizers in the mobilizing structure were not an issue. The aim was never to become unified or speak with one voice, so discussions over ‘who we are’ and ‘what we want’ were not necessary. Organizers cooperated to coordinate practical tasks. Other than that, they were free to do what they wanted. Cooperation was therefore smooth.

THE PARTICIPANTS

I distinguished three types of mobilizing strategies: strong ties (the organizers themselves and social bonds); semi-open online channels (websites and email lists); and open channels (the mass media, posters and flyers). Each strategy reached different groups of participants at different points in time.

The organizers themselves reached and mobilized mainly their active members, these active members then started to mobilize people in their social environment, who then proceeded to mobilize those in their social environment, and so forth. A mobilization snowball through strong ties thus developed, whereby those closest to the organizers (the active members) were mobilized first, followed by those who were informed by those members and those further removed were mobilized later. The strong tie strategy was the most effective strategy, through which the largest group of participants was mobilized.

However, not everyone could be reached and mobilized through this strategy. People who were not active members themselves, and who thus not had a direct personal relationship with the organizers, and who also did not know any members, could only be reached through semi-open online channels or open channels. Passive members did not have a personal connection with the organizers, but usually did receive informa-
tion from them. Organizers used semi-open online channels, mainly mailing lists and newsletters, to reach and mobilize these people. Non-members, who also did not have this online connection could only be reached through open channels. People were mobilized by mailing lists, mass media or posters and flyers as soon as the organizers spread their message through these channels. As media attention always started very late, the participants who depended on these open channels were usually the last to be mobilized.

The three types of strategies thus reached and mobilized different groups of participants at different points in time. The further removed one was from the organizers, the less likely it became that one was reached and mobilized, and if one was mobilized it was at a later point in time. Taken together, these results meant that the composition of the mobilizing structure was reflected in the composition of the demonstration crowd.

Different types of mobilizing structures employed different mobilizing strategies. Broad formal coalitions could use their extensive formal organizational ties with their constituency to reach out and mobilize participants. They did not need to make much use of open or semi-open channels. In the cases of narrow coalitions or liquid mobilizing structures however, organizers needed to employ open and semi-open channels to reach beyond the very small group that they could reach through strong ties. When organizers succeeded in mobilizing participants through open or semi-open channels, they attracted a wider and more diverse crowd. However, such open and semi-open channels were only effective when the costs of participation were relatively low. Thus, in the case of low cost/low risk events, when organizers decided to employ open and semi-open channels to mobilize, a broader audience could be mobilized and the composition of the mobilizing structure was less strongly reflected in the composition of the demonstration crowd.

Lastly I looked at the participants’ motivation to join the event. First, although motivational strength was always quite high (on average 5.5 on a scale of 1-7), I found that some participants were more motivated than others. Those who participated in high cost action were more motivated than those who participated in low cost action. Obviously, people need higher levels of motivation to participate in high cost action as opposed to low cost action. In addition, those participants who were mobilized by their friends or family were less motivated to participate than others. Although counterintuitive, this finding becomes logical when taking into account that people’s friends and family can exert social pressure on them. Therefore, the individual does not need to be as highly motivated himself, and may simply tag along. Second, I found that some participants had different types of motives to participate than others. I discerned three types of motives: 1) Identification motives, 2) Ideological motives, and 3) Instrumental motives. Mobilizing channels were not expected, nor found to have an effect on these motivations, ties with the organizers and types of mobilizing structures did have an effect.

Identification with the movement or the crowd was stronger the closer one’s connection to the organizers was. This seems logical and was expected. Ideological motives were stronger, the stronger the formal tie (i.e. membership) with the organizers. It seems plausible to assume that people with strong ideological motives are more likely
to join an organization, and by sending them ideological appeals, the organization will strengthen the participants’ ideological motives. However, differences between participants’ levels of ideological motives were small. It seemed that a strong ideological motive was almost a precondition for participation in any case. Instrumental motives were not influenced by the tie with the organizers.

The type of mobilizing structure used to stage the event also influenced participants’ motivations. Formal coalitions seemed to attract participants with stronger ideological motives, independent of whether they were members or not. The link between organizations and ideology thus seems more general pattern. Solid structures seemed to attract participants with weaker identification motives. It may be that the crowd in these events was too diverse for participants to identify strongly with it. Just as organizers in coalitions need to give up some of their own identity, so must participants in coalition events. Lastly, liquid structures appeared to attract participants with stronger instrumental motives. This was unexpected but it may be explained by the assertion that instrumental motivation is needed to overcome uncertainty. Uncertainty is higher at events staged by liquid as opposed to solid structures. Solid structures usually organize events in which people know what to expect; a routine is offered, with a route, speakers and stewards. Liquid structures often organize more fluid events, hence stronger instrumental motives are needed to overcome the uncertainty barrier.

The fact that different participants had different types of motives had an indirect effect on their motivational strength. Stronger motives led to a stronger motivation to participate, but ideological motives had the strongest impact on participants’ motivational strength, followed by identification motives, while motivational strength was the least affected by the level of instrumental motives.

**SCIENTIFIC IMPLICATIONS**

In this dissertation I developed a new explanatory model for social movement events in which I dedicated an important role to the organizers of protest campaigns. I combined three ideas: that organizers need to build a mobilizing structure for every campaign, that this structure may take diverse forms, and that the composition and shape of the mobilizing structure determines who takes part in a protest event and for what reasons. Combining these ideas provides us with a clear and testable link between the organizers and the participants of events. Although it seems logical that organizers would affect an event and its participants, exactly what impact they make and how has not been studied much. This model provides a new way of thinking about the organizers’ impact, and how to study it. This may provide us with further insight in the processes which take place within social movements, an understanding necessary in order to understand the macro-level of social movements (Jasper 2004; Lichbach 1998).

**BUILDING THE STRUCTURE**

In current literature mobilizing structures are often seen as static or pre-existing (Emirbayer and Goodwin 1994; Goodwin and Jasper 1999). However, this study shows that they need to be created for every campaign and participation can never be taken for granted. This means that there is room for agency of organizers of social movements.
and points to the importance of studying this in order to understand the shape protest events, and thereby indirectly, social movements may take.

At the same time, organizers do not start building such structures from scratch. They are enabled and constrained by the relationships they are embedded in. This causes the shape of the mobilizing structure to reflect the submerged networks of the initiators. Importantly, this implies that abeyance structures are not always conducive for the building of a mobilizing structure or a social movement. Although McAdam and Paulsen (1993) have already pointed out that social ties may constrain as well as encourage activism, abeyance structures are generally regarded as having a positive impact. This study however, showed that this is often not the case. In fact, abeyance structures more often deterred the building of mobilizing structures and organizing of campaigns, through the negative experiences they brought with them.

The building and maintenance of mobilizing structures and the cooperation in them, was not always problematic though; building and cooperating in liquid structures proved much easier than in solid ones. These liquid structures resemble what Gerlach and Hine (1970) (see also Gerlach 2001) have termed: segmentary, polycentric, and integrated networks (SPIN). They suggested that this type of organizing is not only easy and well suited for social movements, it is also adaptive under conditions of turbulence or opposition. Gerlach (2001) suggests that SPIN may therefore be the organizational form of the future. Empirical evidence in my study suggests that liquid structures may indeed be an easier and well suited organizational form for movements, and I would expect to see a rise of campaigns and movements organized in this way.

**Negotiations**

The study of organizers and their activities has to date gotten little attention. We know most about formal coalitions, but even these studies are not very common (van Dyke 2003). Moreover, the interaction process that takes place in these structures has rarely been studied (but see: Polletta 2002). However, we may understand more about the cooperation that takes place in these structures if we make better use of the knowledge that is available in the extensive literature that exists on negotiations in social psychological literature. Although social psychologists in this field focus mainly on dyads or small groups, laboratory experiments and business(-like) negotiations, there is a lot to be learned from their results. I have imported concepts from these social psychological studies, in order to better understand and explain the processes at work within negotiations in the mobilizing structures.

However, I found that negotiation theory alone, could not accurately describe the processes I discovered in my data. Specifically, I found that identification played a paramount role in both the building and the cooperation within mobilizing structures. By including the concept of identification into my theoretical framework, I have started to integrate the knowledge from both social psychological negotiation theory and social movement theory to gain a deeper understanding of the processes at work in the interaction between social movement organizers.

I found that it was identification, rather than identity which was the explanatory factor. It did not particularly matter which identities a person had, or which groups they actually belonged to. Instead, what was important was with which group a person identified, whether they had actual relationships with other people in this group or
not, or whether they may be seen by others as belonging to that group or not. People behaved in line with the group of which they most strongly felt to be part. My results thus show that it is less important of which groups one is objectively a member, than to which groups one feels affectively connected. This finding is in line with suggestions by Huddy (2001, 2003). She makes a distinction between *acquired* and *ascribed* identities. Ascribed identities are imposed on people (thus the groups/categories one is objectively a member of) while acquired identities are voluntary. Huddy argues that voluntary identities tend to inspire stronger identification (2003), and the stronger the identification, the stronger a person’s readiness to act on behalf of the group is influenced (2001). My empirical findings support this idea. This has important implications for the study of the role collective identities play in social movements. To understand the process of building and cooperating in the mobilizing structure, a focus on the perceptions and feelings of organizers is needed, rather than on the categories they may belong to.

**Mobilization**

In this dissertation I developed a model of mobilizing sequences. This model made three important points visible. First, it showed why the composition of the mobilizing structure is reflected in the composition of the crowd: because different mobilizing strategies reached and mobilized different groups of participants. The further removed one was from the organizers, the less likely it became that one was reached and mobilized. This shows how some micro-level mechanisms affect meso-level outcomes.

Second, the model showed that these different channels mobilize at different points in time. By focusing on when participants were mobilized I developed a new way to visualize mobilization patterns. Through this focus on time, I was able to show mobilization ‘snowballs’, which grew from the organizers outwards to increasingly further removed participants. This had not been empirically shown before.

Third, by discerning between different types of strategies and studying who they reached, the model showed that it is important to discern between different online strategies, rather than speak of ‘the Internet’ as a whole. Email lists mobilized a specific group of people, namely the passive members of groups and organizations, while websites mobilized mainly active members. Because email lists come to the receiver, whether they want the information or not, they were able to reach passive as well as active members. Although this made little impact on the active members (who where often already mobilized through other channels) it was crucial for the mobilization of passive members. A message on a website, on the other hand, can only be seen when the receiver goes out and looks for it, and therefore only reached active members. These findings suggest that websites act more like closed channels than email lists do, and that the two should be studied and analyzed separately in future research.

**Motivation**

This dissertation also contributes to the knowledge on participants’ motivations to participate. I found that motivational strength was influenced the most by ideological motives, followed by identification and the least by instrumental motives. This corroborates with the findings of van Stekelenburg (2006), suggesting a more general pat-
tern. Second, I found that participants had to be more strongly motivated to participate in high cost events as opposed to low cost events. In this study the difference seemed to lie between events that took place in someone’s own neighborhood and those events that were further away. If people needed to travel more than 10 minutes to get to the place of action, motivational strength jumped up. If costs rose even further, motivational levels stayed the same, as they seemed to have reached a ceiling. If this is the case it would mean that even events with objectively quite low costs and risks are (motivationally) not so different from ones with objectively much higher costs. This has important implications for our understanding of the difference between high and low cost action. It should be noted however, that really high cost (life-threatening) types of events were not included in my study, which may have very different motivational dynamics.

Third, I found that the mobilization channel affected motivational strength. Importantly, those mobilized by social bonds (i.e. friends, family, colleagues) did not need to be as motivated as those mobilized by other types of channels. Previous research has suggested that strong ties are better motivators than weak ones (Klandermans 2000; Oliver and Myers 2003), and informal ties inspire stronger motivation to participate than formal ties (Klandermans and Oegema 1987). This study suggests that it is not (inner) motivation that is inspired by these ties. In fact, the motivational strength of participants mobilized by informal strong ties was weaker than the motivational strength of participants mobilized by other channels. It seems thus that informal strong ties are effective mobilizers because they can exert social pressure and therefore weaker inner motivation suffices.

Fourth, I found that the type of mobilizing structure influenced motivations. At events organized by liquid structures, instrumental motives were much higher. The explanation I gave was that uncertainty at these events is higher. It has been suggested that instrumental motives are needed to overcome such uncertainty (Chaikalis-Petritsis and Abrams 2011). However, this idea has to my knowledge not been tested empirically. My study provides a clue towards operationalizing and studying this assertion.

Overall, the influence of ties, mobilization channels and types of event, on motivation has not been studied much in the way I have done in this dissertation. This study may therefore open up new avenues and provide ideas to further investigate motivation to participate in social movement events.

The continuum

In this dissertation I developed a continuum of mobilizing structures. On the solid side of the continuum I placed mobilizing structures that consisted of only formal networks, and on the liquid side I placed mobilizing structures that consisted of only informal networks.

Several authors have asked for, and tried to include, more agency and dynamism in social movement theory (Jasper 2004; McAdam 2003; Goodwin and Jasper 1999). In particular the theories on resource mobilization and mobilizing structures have been accused of being overly structural and static (e.g. Jasper 2004). The continuum of mobilizing structures attempts to give space for agency and dynamism within the theory of resource mobilization. The classification of mobilizing structures on a continuum
makes it possible to think in terms of resource mobilization without necessarily needing to include (social movement) organizations in the equation. The concept of ‘liquid structures’ enables us to place this theory in a new light and a new era, so that we can draw from the insights of this theory and apply them to a liquid reality.

However, my findings suggest that formal and solid, and informal and liquid do not necessarily go together. The relationship between solid-liquid and formal-informal, was not always easy. For instance, ‘Dissent’ was clearly composed of informal small groups and most organizers in the Dissent network treated it like a liquid structure. However, some of the initiators wanted it to become a more long-lasting and unified, solid structure. Thus, although for most organizers in the Dissent network informal and liquid did go hand in hand, for some –the core group of organizers– it did not. They were informal groups who wanted to ‘build something together’ and become a solid mobilizing structure.

‘Turn the Tide’ on the other hand, the coalition that organized the ‘Surround of the Government’ event, was a formal coalition with many larger and smaller formal organizations and groups. The initiators intended Turn the Tide to be a solid structure and bring the left together against the government. However, the specific ‘Surround the Government’ campaign included a diverse group of organizers, who all mobilized their own people and used their own demands and slogans. For this campaign ‘Turn the Tide’ acted more like a coordination structure, which served to bring everyone together at the same place and time, but not to speak with one voice. In fact, it aimed specifically to speak ‘with a 1000 voices’, and show the diversity of all those opposed. Similarly in the Dutch Social Forum, it was the practice to treat the Forum as a liquid structure, although initiators had intended to build one (long lasting) movement.

Two dimensions are thus important for a mobilizing structure: 1) Who participates, formal or informal groups? 2) How do they cooperate, ad hoc or long lasting, with one voice or 1000 voices? In other words, how is the structure organized, solid or liquid?

Figure 27 depicts a new continuum of mobilizing structures, which takes these inter-relations into account. On the horizontal axis I placed ‘who participates’ (formal or informal networks), and on the vertical axis ‘how they are organized’ (solid or liquid). In the left top corner I placed the ‘Formal Coalition’. In a coalition formal organizations get together to cooperate on a long term basis to stage several events together in which they make a common demand. In the left bottom corner I placed the ‘Platform’ or ‘Functional Alliance’. In this mobilizing structure formal organizations join forces to stage a single event together, on a topic that is particularly pressing at that point in time. In this case, organizers do not aim to become a long lasting collective; rather, they want to stand strong against an immediate evil. ‘Turn the Tide’ was such a ‘Platform’, which functions similar to a coordination structure.

On the right top corner I placed the ‘Subculture’. When informal networks come together and stay together for a long period of time they start to form a solid structure. In fact, they become a subculture or activist milieu. These are the submerged networks or abeyance structures scholars (e.g. Taylor 2012) have noted play such an important role in the organization of protest.

On the right bottom corner I placed–for lack of a better word– ‘ad hoc social (virtual) networks’. This is the mobilizing structure that forms when informal networks come
together for ad hoc organization. In fact, in these cases it is hard to speak of organization at all.

The coordination structure holds a position in the middle of the figure; formal as well as informal groups join forces to jointly coordinate different actions and events for a common goal. Coordination structures can be more or less solid (in the figure I placed it in the middle); they may cooperate only for one event (as was the case with ‘Step it Up’), or they may exist for a period of time, bringing together different individuals and groups for different purposes (as was the case for the ‘University Activists’).

Figure 28 displays the new explanatory model for protest events. According to this model, initiators may assemble a mobilizing structure including formal as well as informal networks of organizers. And they may organize themselves in a solid or liquid structure. The solid-liquid dimension has the most impact on the organizers. With which group the organizers identify determines what type of structure they will want to build, and how smoothly cooperation is likely to be. The determining factor was the level with which organizers identified (the alterglobalist movement versus the Amsterdam Anarchists), not whether they were embedded in formal or informal networks. The formal-informal dimension had the most impact on the participants. Structures composed of formal networks used these strong ties to mobilize, while structures composed of mainly informal networks more often used open and semi-open channels to mobilize. Consequently, they mobilized different groups of participants. Step it Up, the coordination structure in my sample, which held a mid-position between formal and informal, also used a two-tiered mobilizing strategy. From the start they used strong ties, as well as semi-open online channels.

My study thus provides a new model for looking at protest events. This model starts at the organizers and traces the process until the event. It shows that organizers affect
the shape of their events in complex ways.

**LIMITATIONS**

I collected data on five different campaigns and their participants. Some of the mobilizing structures involved were more liquid while others were more solid, some were more formal and others more informal. To truly verify the model developed in this study, more cases should be studied. However, the fact that I found some strong general tendencies, despite the diversity of the samples, suggests that there is reason to believe this model is a step in the right direction towards understanding mobilization and participation.

The continuum described in this dissertation was developed throughout the study. As it was not my point of departure, sampling was not geared towards filling all the positions on the continuum. Consequently, I did not include an example of the most liquid and informal type of mobilizing structure, one that was completely comprised of informal networks that came together on an ad hoc basis. To further develop the model for the organization of protest events, inclusion of such examples in the study, is necessary. Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans (Forthcoming) studied such a mobilizing structure. Their findings seem to indicate that such structures fit into the model in the expected manner. Van Stekelenburg and Boekkooi (2012) describe such a formal coalition, a coordination structure and ad hoc informal networks. They show that in all three cases, the structure had to be built by the organizers, and the type of structure they built affected who they mobilized and what the protest event looked like. Apart from these studies however, research on this type of liquid structure is rare, and more systematic research of more different cases is necessary to draw firm conclusions. The same goes for the study of coordination structures; although there has been some
study of such type of protests (see: Fisher and Boekkooi 2010), more detailed study is necessary.

Lastly, one could criticize that I only studied participants of protest-events, not non-participants. Thus, that I sampled on the dependent variable and cannot make comparisons between participants and non-participants, and therefore not determine what makes people participate. However, such a comparison was not the central question in this dissertation. Rather, I started out to explain differences (and similarities) between different groups of participants: participants of different events, participants with different structural ties and participants mobilized through different strategies. For these comparisons non-participants were irrelevant.

This is not to say that a comparison between participants and non-participants would not be interesting. Klandermans and Oegema (1987) give a famous example of the insights such a comparison can make. Studying non-participants however is difficult, because where do you find a comparable group of people who did not participate? I attempted to study non-participants of the G8 protest, by approaching participants at the Dutch Social Forum. These people could in principle agree with the concerns voiced at the G8 protests, and would know that events were taking place. Although my own attempt to study the non-participants did not work because of high levels of non-response, it does show opportunities to study non-participants can be imagined. A fuller understanding of non-participation would surely contribute to our understanding of participation.

The same goes for the study of non-participation of organizers. In this study I have included several organizers who were not, or only partially, involved in the campaigns. This provides important insights into the reasons why organizers may decide not to participate in a campaign; especially, it points to the important role of pre-existing relationships, stereotypes and identification. However, the sample of non-organizers included in this study is small and it often proved difficult to find non-organizers willing to participate in an in-depth interview. They often felt they had nothing to say on the issue. Further study of these organizers may shed light on additional processes that work to keep them from participating.

CONCLUSION

Despite the shortcomings and additional samples that could have been included in the study, this dissertation is—to my knowledge—the first time that campaigns were studied, from beginning to end. This design of the study of protest events, enabled me to explicitly connect organizers and participants and develop a framework including both roles in the emerging protest event.

I showed that the meso-mobilization campaign, the mobilization of organizers, and the micro-mobilization campaign, the mobilization of participants, were intimately linked. When the meso-mobilization was started informally within one limited submerged network (for example ‘Dissent’) than micro-mobilization appears to have occurred mainly within the same boundaries, mobilizing mainly people from the same submerged network. If meso-mobilization had a two-fold strategy, targeting formal organizations and an online campaign (for example ‘Step it Up’) than micro-mobilization too, appears to have occurred through organizations on the one hand and online channels on the
other. And when meso-mobilization encompassed mainly the mobilization of large formal organizations (‘Turn the Tide’ and ‘Klimaschutz jetzt’), than micro mobilization too, occurred mainly through organizational channels. Especially in the cases where there were more informal and liquid strategies, a clear distinction between meso- and micro mobilization could not be made. Mobilizing people to organize simultaneously mobilized people to participate and mobilizing participants simultaneously recruited individuals who were willing to help with the organizing. This was clearly the case with ‘Step it Up’ and ‘Dissent’; the liquefying of protest organizing thus blurred the boundaries between meso- and micro mobilization.

The two processes cannot be seen as separate from each other; meso-mobilization determines micro-mobilization, which underlines the important role of the organizers. Not only were the networks of the initiators reflected in the mobilizing structure, the composition of the mobilizing structure was in its turn reflected in the composition of the crowd. Who takes an initiative is thus paramount to understanding what the eventual event will look like. Existing structures were reproduced.

Organizers were however not bound by existing structures. Sometimes new organizers were recruited, old distrust and stereotypes were overcome, or new distrust and splits evolved. Thus, to fully understand the outcome of a campaign, it is not possible to solely look at existing structures, nor do organizers organize in a vacuum. This study showed that although there was a clear role for agency of the organizers, since they had to make an effort and decide who to recruit for their mobilizing structure and who not to recruit, there was a clear impact of structure too. A careful study of the organizing and mobilizing process is therefore necessary to understand the sustaining of old structures and the creation of new ones, and the possibilities organizers and actors in general may have within the structures in which they live. Only by carefully zooming in on the organizers and their actions can we unravel the effects of structure and agency in social movements.