

4

This chapter elaborates on the range of collective action tactics and organizing strategies that today's students invoke to pursue their ambitions for social change.

Campus-Based Organizing: Tactical Repertoires of Contemporary Student Movements

Cassie L. Barnhardt

Introduction

More than 50 years ago, university leaders and the general public expressed concerns that the campus activism of the free speech, civil rights, and Vietnam eras posed a threat to campus and public safety (American Council on Education, 1970). Amid these concerns, the U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations conducted a study accounting for all the campus riots and disorders that occurred between the fall of 1967 and spring of 1969 (Harris, 1969). This process documented 471 incidences occurring on 211 U.S. campuses with students engaging in public demonstrations, occupying spaces (buildings, offices, streets), boycotting classes, disrupting college extracurricular activities, and holding hostages. About one third of these campus incidences involved damage of some kind including bombings or attempted bombings, arson or suspected arson, property damage, or personal injury. In total, 6,158 arrests were reported as a consequence of the wave of campus protests from 1967 to 1969. The lingering residue of this tumultuous time period in U.S. history has been described as imparting society with “a set of terms and impressions” about campus activism that have since been ingrained in our culture (Zald, 1996).

Today, the sociopolitical issues that fuel particular campus organizing efforts have changed from the topics pursued 40 years ago, but the substantive task of needing to understand how college students pursue their collective ambitions for change remains a salient matter for campus educators and administrators, as well as for the students themselves. Views about campus mobilizing have evolved from being seen as problematic and something administrators must *deal* with (Scranton, 1970), to being concomitant with students' learning about and subsequently acting on democratic and

civic ideals (Hamrick, 1998; Hunter, 1988). This chapter draws attention to the enactment of college students' social change ambitions by examining what the study of collective action tells us about tactics, and how students employ tactics in contemporary campus contexts. Admittedly, college students' participation in social movement action (both historically and contemporarily) can exceed the geographic perimeters of the campus confines. For the purposes of procedural clarity then, the tactics discussed in this chapter are limited to those actions occurring within the physical or virtual boundaries of the campus.

Contemporary College Student Activism and Tactical Displays

Altbach and Cohen (1990) argue that the contentious and violent tactics of the late 1960s (described previously) were counterproductive for sustaining a robust ethos for student activism on campus as the 1970s brought on a marked decline in campus organizing. Even so, since the 1970s, numerous examples point to a steady flow of college student activism. In the 1980s, students pushed universities to divest their endowments from South Africa as an act of solidarity in support of the antiapartheid resistance movement; the 1990s were peppered with students organizing around the Persian Gulf war, working to expand the college curriculum (particularly in cultural and ethnic studies), protesting tuition increases, and marching to express concerns related to students' identities and the quality of the campus climate for underrepresented groups (Astin, Astin, Bayer, & Bisconti, 1997; Boren, 2001; Rhoads, 1998; Soule, 1997). More recently, student activists have expressed concerns about issues such as rising tuition and student debt (Brennan, 2012), campus fossil fuel investments (Gardner, 2013), access and opportunity for immigrant students (Jesse, 2012), and sexual assault on campus (Ramer, 2013).

Defining and Describing Tactics. In the study of social movement phenomenon, collective action is evaluated according to its component parts. The elements include deconstructing collective action according to who specifically is seeking a change (*mobilizing group or groups*), the entity whom the mobilizing group aspires to influence (*targets*), the *claims* (or substantive ideas being advanced), and the *tactics* used in advancing the group's claims. Tactics are the particular actions and behaviors used to communicate the group's message. Together these four pieces coalesce to form an overall strategy that is enacted to work toward bringing about a desired change in the “social structure or reward distribution, or both” (McCarthy & Zald, 1987, p. 20). Tilly (2004) is careful to note that movements are distinct from other forms of similar political behavior (e.g., trade union activities or electoral campaigns) by virtue of the interaction of these aforementioned elements. At times tactics have also been described as *repertoires of contention*, a phrase used to denote the range of forms and combinations

of behaviors that a movement group engages in (or might use if so desired; Tilly, 2004).

Tactics operate as a public expression—by a group—that challenges the taken-for-granted authority relationships (Hirsch, 1999) and results in generating varying degrees of uncertainty, challenge, and solidarity within a particular social context (Tarrow, 1998). Tactics derive their meaning relative to the specific structural and cultural features of the environment or context that the movement group seeks to influence and can be generally categorized as being either violent, disruptive, conventional, or a combination of these things (Tarrow, 1998). Mueller's (1992) synthesis suggests that violent tactics occur when prior tactical approaches have failed in an overall protest cycle; that is, earlier approaches have not garnered sufficient public attention, provoked change, or elicited the engagement of those in power. In fact, in the civil rights era the nonviolent philosophy, which served to frame the tactical approaches in the early 1960s, precipitated the subsequent violence that manifested in the 1967 to 1969 protest cycle on campuses (Benford & Snow, 1992; McAdam, 1983).

It is not requisite for a tactic to be violent to make an impact on a target. However, tactics tend to be more resonant when they cultivate disruption. Disruption is achieved when a particular mobilizing group's action (e.g., rally, sit-in, boycott, teach-in, political theatre) prompts a reaction from a target, be it the state, the campus administration, or a group of likely sympathizers (student peers) with the movement's cause. Therefore, disruption occurs when a tactic simply "breaks the routine, startles bystanders, and leaves elites disoriented, at least for a time" (Tarrow, 1998, p. 104). Disruptive tactics get people talking, thinking, or responding to the mobilizing group's substantive claims. Conventional tactics are behaviors that elaborate or rely on existing routines and come with a preestablished set of norms or meanings. Conventional tactics are often endorsed or facilitated by the group that is being targeted such as when a mobilizing group chooses to express an alternative point of view at an annual event, standing meeting, or through regular organizational activities. Therefore, a strike/work stoppage may be a conventional tactic when the mobilization is directed toward a corporate employer, whereas the distribution of information leaflets may be a conventional tactic when the mobilization is directed toward a neighborhood association. On campus, conventional tactics could consist of numerous acts including student activists speaking during the university's governing board's open-comment time while like-minded activists sport T-shirts or signs with pithy slogans exemplifying the substantive claims being asserted. Through events such as these, campus activists capitalize on established forums, or conventional venues, to pursue their movement's ambitions.

The ability of mobilizing groups to use conventional approaches to achieve maximum disruption with a specific social context is perhaps one of the most critical aspects of movement strategy. Insider groups often have an advantage, compared to external/outsider mobilizing groups, because

of the greater familiarity, legitimacy, and cultural knowledge of the organization they are targeting. Insider groups are those parties who are already established actors within an organization (in the case of campuses these would include stakeholder entities, such as students, faculty, alumni, staff, board members, etc.). Higher education institutions are thus more likely to experience challenges from insiders than from outsiders, and correspondingly, colleges are more likely to be subjected to the conventional tactics that build on the identities, behaviors, and values that the organization affirms and cultivates (Walker, Martin, & McCarthy, 2008). Walker and colleagues are careful to highlight, however, that insiders are quite capable of incorporating confrontation into conventional tactical approaches, which is why they prefer to describe tactics as existing along a continuum from being contained to being transgressive. Contained tactics tend to adapt to existing political process models or institutionalized modes of resolving conflict, whereas transgressive tactics tend to innovative or burst onto the scene in sporadic ways marking paradigmatic changes that bring about new frames of meaning or new actors to the substantive issue or overall protest cycle and dynamics (Tarrow, 1998; Walker et al., 2008).

In essence, contemporary college students, as organizational insiders, have privileged access to preexisting meanings of organizational routines and behaviors. They can then use this knowledge as a form of cultural competence for selecting their repertoires of contention (Clemens, 2004) for maximum impact upon their targets, who are often campus administrators. Arguably, the insider status that students currently possess may, in fact, be the byproduct of the campus violence associated with the late 1960s activism. Numerous scholars have highlighted the discernible shift from the punctuated violent tactics of the 1960s toward a softened or tamer approach in student activists' tactics since that time (Altbach & Cohen, 1990; Astin et al., 1997). It is feasible that the magnitude of the transgressive disruption from the 1960s violence reframed meaning in a transformative way—repositioning students' status from that of being outside the channels of campus organizational power to a new order that situated students as legitimate stakeholders with tangible power on campus. Social movement scholars have argued that a generalized softening of tactics has occurred in U.S. society in the post-1960s timeframe as the United States has expanded its basis of political organizing structures, moving from spontaneous outsider groups using tactics to express their grievances against the state, to a range of member-based interest groups engaged in sustained advocacy as a recurring component of democratic and civic life (Meyer & Tarrow, 1998; Soule & Earl, 2005). Zald and Berger (1978) characterize this transformation in social structure as a bureaucratization of discontent to describe how insiders use existing structures and organizational knowledge to engage in tactics for the purpose of bringing about changes in some aspect of organizational functioning. For student activism, it is possible to envision a similar phenomenon with the formal expansion of student identity-based and

interest-based groups that have proliferated and diversified on campus in the past several decades as changes in enrollment patterns have brought greater racial, ethnic, geographic, and class-based diversity to campus, and as extracurricular opportunities have grown (Altbach, 2006).

Factors That Shape Campus Tactics. Theory tells us that student movements will be efficacious in advancing their claims when they are skillful in properly matching their tactics to the substantive issue and to the intended audience. Klandermans (2004) asserts that the viability of a movement tactic is predicated on criteria such as organizational history and culture. For campuses, distinctive tradition, culture, curriculum, characteristics, and behavioral norms are some of the most foundational elements of higher education institutions (Clark, 1972; Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991). Mobilizing groups (student activists) are embedded in their campus communities where their interests are conditioned by the institutional context including its history, norms regarding moral indignation or injustice, individual and collective identities, and the social construction of emotions (Goodwin, Jasper, & Polletta, 2004; Klandermans, 2004; Kurzman, 2008). Campus activists can gain legitimacy with their targets (administrators and peers) when they anchor their tactical approaches to the master frames that are promoted in familiar rhetoric, policy, or administrative practice (Benford & Snow, 1992). Einwohner and Spencer's (2005) work highlighted the ways in these dominant master frames in use on campus shaped students' tactical displays. In their qualitative study of two structurally similar campuses, the campus culture that espoused a values-based problem-solving approach was associated with activists pursuing conventional tactics such as awareness campaigns and negotiating with administrators to seek procedural changes. When the local campus culture emphasized an overriding rational basis for decision making, activists pursued more disruptive forms of dissent including a sit-in, hunger strike, and demonstrations. This work emphasizes the ways in which tactics build on existing ideologies and correspond to broader cultural themes and values (Klandermans, 2004). This does not suggest that the viability of a given tactic presumes compatibility or conformity to the existing norms of conduct on campus. Rather, campus activists can finesse their tactical displays by choosing conventional activities of campus life and imbuing them with new meanings so they disrupt administrators' and peers' understandings of social life or organizational practices. That is, the student activists' task is to transform the mundane into the profane so that it compels campus administrators and/or peers to respond, or to take ameliorative action.

Research on tactics highlights the extent to which the tactics exhibited in a single event can be reflective of a larger, more geographically dispersed movement network (Smith, 2001; Soule, 1997). This has been well documented in a study of the shantytown protests that took place across U.S. college and university campuses in the late 1980s (Soule, 1997). Distinctive campus features such as offering a liberal arts curriculum and being

more selective were associated with similar tactical displays (Soule, 1997). Other work has suggested that tactical displays are class-based, with middle-class collective action tending to take on a beneficent or philanthropic tone and largely consisting of conventional forms such as telephone canvassing or awareness campaigns (Mueller, 1992; Oliver & Marwell, 1988). Both of these patterns reflect that the choice of tactics that student activists adopt is partially influenced by external factors. Federated interest-based or ideological organizations, as well as philanthropic foundations, have long provided organizational advice to campus movement groups. Both left- and right-leaning organizations advise similar tactics to the pursuit of very different causes (Cowan et al., 1995; Gora, Goldberger, Stern, & Halperin, 1991; Smith, 1993; Stefancic & Delgado, 1996). Binder and Wood's (2012) recent research provides an intimate look at the ways in which conservative organizations and their thought leaders have worked to prepare college students for ideologically based activism on their campuses and in the wider community. This work points to many examples of conservative students being conflicted with the tactical advice coming from the parent organization that encourages confrontational and transgressive tactics, when students' preference is to engage in more conventional tactics that are more compatible with campus norms (Binder & Wood, 2012).

Campus Tactics in Comparative Contexts

I now turn to two examples of research that provide insights into how college student activists are advancing their social change ambitions through tactical displays on campus. The first example provides comparative insights based on a survey of campus administrators that reported on forms of tactics that college students have used over a 20-year period. The second example reflects the driving tactical approaches that students utilized in the college student antisweatshop campaign from 1998 to 2002.

Tactical Forms Utilized by Contemporary Student Activists. In 2010, a random sample of U.S. four-year public and private college campuses was surveyed for the purpose of inquiring about various forms of tactical behaviors that college students utilized on their campuses to pursue their social change ambitions. For each campus, an informed respondent was identified to participate in the survey. In nearly all cases, this most knowledgeable person was the senior student affairs officer (vice presidents of student affairs and deans of students); in a few instances the senior student affairs officer redirected the survey to an alternate staff member who possessed the appropriate institutional memory to report on student activism patterns during the 20-year time period (1989–2010). Survey items presented respondents with an array of possible tactical approaches. Respondents were asked to identify which forms of activism or tactics students on their campuses had utilized over the years in question. Staff members were also asked to rate the tone of the activism and to provide information

Table 4.1. Percentage of Campuses Experiencing Specific Tactical Displays From Student Activists From 1989 to 2010

<i>Tactic</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Petitioning	71.1
Rallies	56.6
Letter-writing campaign	51.3
Protests	34.2
Demonstrations	30.3
Leafleting	27.6
Pamphleteering	26.3
Political theatre	18.4
Press conferences	15.8
Teach-ins	15.8
Sleep-ins	13.2
Boycotts	10.5
Sit-ins	9.2
Pursuing law suits	6.6
Strikes	3.9
Building blockade/riot/attack/lie-in	1.3

Source: *N* = 79, four-year public and private campuses.

about the range of topics associated with contemporary campus-based mobilization activities. Overall, the survey yielded a 53% response rate from the sample group of campuses, for a total of 79 campuses responding. These 79 colleges and universities were representative of the randomly drawn sample according to campus characteristics such as institutional type, size, selectivity, geographic location, history of experiencing civil rights era protest, and the types of state-level statutory restrictions on campus dissent.

Survey findings revealed that from 1989 to 2010, petitioning was the most common tactic used on campuses to mobilize around a cause (see Table 4.1). The vast majority of all campuses experienced this approach, with 71% citing the occurrence of petitioning. Only two other tactics were displayed on a majority of campuses in the sample: 57% indicated that they experienced rallies, and 51% reported that students used letter-writing campaigns. These data further indicate that one third of all campuses experienced student protest or demonstration in the 20-year period, and one fourth reported that their students engaged in distributing leaflets and pamphlets in this same timeframe. When campus administrators were asked to evaluate the scope of the impact that students' tactics had on the campus, 44% of campus administrators reported that few or no members of the campus community noticed the mobilization.

Based on the reports of campus administrators, the use of violent tactics by activist college students was rare over the 20-year period. Riots and attacks were only reported at one campus in the sample. Likewise, 92% of administrators indicated that the tone of students' activism was best described

as having been "orderly and peaceful." Only 5.3% of campuses reported that their students' activism resulted in creating an "uncomfortable" tone on campus, and none of the campuses chose the response options of "disruptive" or "violent or fearsome." These findings strongly support the idea that insiders utilize conventional tactics and campus activists tend to pursue contained rather than transgressive tactical approaches. Lawsuits were another tactical approach that student activists rarely deployed, with just slightly less than 7% of campuses reporting activism that unfolded in this manner. This finding is compatible with Walker et al.'s (2008) work noting that college students are less likely to pursue lawsuits, at least compared to their nonstudent counterparts such as outsider external organizations. Administrators indicated that strikes were a seldom-utilized tactic, with only 4% of campuses reporting having experienced a strike in the 20-year time period covered by the survey. The relative low occurrence of strikes is to be expected on account of strikes connoting work stoppages, and an accompanying labor relationship between parties. The nature of the student–university relationship (with the notable exception of graduate student labor; see Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005) does not satisfy the requisite political–opportunity structure required for matching the strike tactic to the institutional context.

Tactics Utilized Within a Specific College Student Movement.

The campus tactics that college students used in the antisweatshop movement from 1998 to 2002 were evaluated as part of a larger mixed-method study examining contemporary campus mobilization (Barnhardt, 2012). The findings presented here were based on a dataset of 638 local, regional, and national newspaper articles that described all campus-based antisweatshop activities occurring across a sample of 149 four-year public and private colleges and universities. In total, 15% of the sample organized for the antisweatshop cause, resulting in news and opinion articles recounting instances of antisweatshop activity on 23 campuses. The articles were analyzed using protest event analysis or the process of compiling and classifying news accounts of mobilization activities that are dispersed over geographic time and space (Koopmans & Rucht, 2002). This method is a content-analytical technique to systematically organize the component properties of movement action and has been used as a staple of social movement research (Earl, Martin, McCarthy, & Soule, 2004; McCarthy, Martin, & McPhail, 2007; Tilly, 2004; Walker et al., 2008).

Context. In the mid-1990s, major U.S. retailers (Disney, JC Penney, and Bloomingdales) and celebrity-endorsed clothing lines made news because of their entanglement with sweatshop-made apparel that was being manufactured both domestically and abroad (Apgar, 1995). In 1996, in response to mounting consumer outrage and with backing from the Clinton White House, the U.S. Department of Labor began working with garment manufacturers, labor leaders, and human rights groups to establish an organization that came to be known later as the Fair Labor Association (FLA;

Saucier, 1998). The group's purpose was to ensure that manufacturers complied with a code of conduct that addressed a range of issues from worker health and safety to child labor, freedom of association, collective bargaining, and antiharassment practices (Ross, 2003). No sooner was the FLA code established than faith and labor groups began to highlight its flaws, which included the lack of external monitoring to check that garment factories were adhering to the provisions outlined in the code (Esbenshade, 2004). In the summer of 1997, the antisweatshop cause gained momentum within the field of higher education. A small group of college student summer interns working for the Union of Needletrades, Industrial, and Textile Employees (UNITE) joined forces to explore whether their campus-branded athletic apparel had ties to the sweatshop manufacturing (Boris, 2002); they concluded that ties existed. By the fall of 1998, college students began organizing in response to the shortcomings of the FLA code, demanding that their collegiate-branded apparel be produced under sweat-free conditions. Students' efforts contributed largely to the creation of the Workers Rights Consortium (WRC), an entity conceived with the specific purpose to ensure that labor codes were enforced in university-branded apparel manufacturing (Featherstone & United Students Against Sweatshops, 2002; Ross, 2004). From 1998 to 2002, the college antisweatshop activists worked to urge campus administrators to sign on to the WRC, thus exerting the financial power and brand recognition of their universities in ways that could influence the garment industry more broadly to engage in humane labor practices. In 2002, the FLA changed its position on external monitoring, prompting a new phase of labor and human rights organizing on college campuses that wasn't so exclusively tied to the garment industry (Featherstone, 2003).

The college student antisweatshop movement was sandwiched between the student divestment movement from the 1980s that was principally concerned with the social responsibility of college endowment investments (i.e., divesting from any financial ties to apartheid South Africa; Soule, 1997) and a resurgence in graduate student labor union mobilization and campus labor organizing in general (Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005). The antisweatshop problem itself intersected with an array of students' interests, involving strands related to human rights, labor and trade policy, gender and women's equity, immigrant rights, environmental sustainability, and social justice. This intersection compelled students from a range of campus organizations to become involved as allies in the campus mobilization activities. Campus clubs included newly formed organizations with a loose organizational apparatus (e.g., Student Labor Action Coalition, No Sweat!), to preexisting clubs (Amnesty International), to mainstream long-established groups such as student government.

(Re)branding Meaning Through Symbols. In the antisweatshop movement, student activists pursued tactics that were highly effective at pointing out inconsistencies between a college or university's espoused values and

those that were enacted through their apparel and licensing agreements. Many of the critiques consisted of forms of political theatre, creating displays that contrasted the integrity of the school's brand/logo and the labor abuses associated with the manufacturing of the apparel. Displays consisted of things such as creating clotheslines of university-branded apparel in common areas of campus and labeling the pieces with the wages that workers' received for making the items. On other campuses, students performed sweatshop fashion shows outside the main campus administration building or on the quad. Fashion shows consisted of modeling outfits, and then removing the university-branded pieces that were likely to have been made in a foreign sweatshop. Such tactics were an effective tool for the activists on account of their abilities to merge likeable trends in college-youth culture, such as fashion, popular dance music for the "catwalk," and school pride, with a stinging message about how campus apparel was being made. In another instance, activists used the campus homecoming parade to urge the administration to join the WRC and to cultivate public awareness of the sweatshop problem. In the parade, students created a caricature of a battle between students wearing only their boxers or underwear while chained to a shopping cart that was held by another student dressed as the Chairman of Nike. With this type of tactic, students put a twist on a typically lighthearted display of campus pride with floats of the homecoming team's mascot battling the opponent's mascot by offering a different type of battle. The "antisweatshop battle" tied the symbolic honor and integrity associated with the university logo to seemingly incongruent foes. A student activist, commenting on the choice to use tactics involving the logo, shared with the local newspaper: "Every student has some kind of [university] clothing, but we have little idea under what conditions these items are made The college shirts and hats that we wear with pride shouldn't be manufactured in demeaning and abusive conditions" (Collier, 1999, para. 4).

Political-theatre tactics remained a central component of the antisweatshop cause beyond just the focus on university institutional logos; other symbols of the textile industry offered innovative tactical messaging as well. Campus mobilization events included peaceful "knit-ins" along with variations on the sit-in and sleep-in tactic. Activists created symbolic scenes depicting the plight of sweatshop working conditions such as creating a mock sweatshop outside the dean's office and a makeshift hut outside the president's office to communicate the terrible conditions of textile workers. These sit-ins became sustained occupations of campus spaces in a few instances. Even in such contexts, the occupations remained peaceful and were generally nondisruptive to the normal proceedings of university life. Anti-sweatshop organizers also staged campus rallies, consisting of the routine components of such public displays, including brandishing signs, offering speeches, and chanting, but these displays were also peppered with theatrical elements. Rallies occurred in tandem with the aforementioned fashion shows where students stripped to their underwear to symbolize their

indignation with the labor conditions thus choosing to “wear nothing” versus wearing items produced in sweatshops. On other campuses, rallies took on a livelier tone (much like that of a sports pep rally) and promoted awareness of labor abuses through gestures such as presenting a giant check to the university president for 3 cents or the amount of payment a worker would receive for a \$15 to \$20 T-shirt. Although not political theatre, antisweatshop organizers infused textile themes into routine tactics such as petition and letter-writing drives by crafting the slips of signatory paper in the shape of T-shirts in the school’s colors so as to have maximum symbolic effect when these were delivered to campus administrators.

Normative Routines. One of the most foundational tactical approaches campus antisweatshop activists employed was educating and informing the campus community about the antisweatshop cause. Tactics included producing extensive research reports on the substantive problem and submitting these to campus administrators; sending a few activist students on fact-finding trips abroad to collect data on the factories that were complicit in manufacturing university apparel under sweatshop conditions (some of which were pursued through formal study abroad experiences); and holding educational conferences locally or in cooperation with other nearby campuses to teach the campus community about the sweatshop problem. By and large, one tactic stood out as the most common approach to antisweatshop mobilization; this was hosting panels and/or sponsoring intellectual forums on campus for the purpose of cultivating a conversation about the sweatshop problem and the range of accompanying lenses through which the issues could be evaluated and analyzed. Still other antisweatshop tactics fit neatly into the regular routines and activities of campus life as organizers pursued the passage of student government resolutions calling for administrative action on the sweatshop issue, and penned letters to the editor explaining and commenting on their substantive concerns about sweatshops.

The ubiquity of students’ choosing tactics that were highly compatible with the norms of campus life emphasizes the extent to which students worked from their insider status as members of the campus community to seek change. These educational tactics were both conventional and tended to be contained. Even so, the cultural symbols that antisweatshop activists used to amplify their cause took on a more transgressive quality. Homecoming parades and rallies were used in a conventional way by activists for they took advantage of the formal opportunities for student clubs and groups to display pride in their school or to gather together for a common cause on the campus quad. However, through conventional tactics, the student activists were successful in turning the normative meanings on their heads to dramatically reframe and disrupt the taken-for-granted views of campus pride. Activists offered a challenge to the way the community viewed its college T-shirts and university logos broadly, suggesting that they were morally suspect on account of the school being complicit in a supply chain that included questionable labor practices. Likewise, by challenging the

existing meanings, they challenged campus leaders to take action to restore the dignity of their institutional brands.

Concluding Thoughts

Contemporary campuses have some influence over determining the parameters of collective action tactics. Campuses have adopted rules and regulations that outline appropriate conduct for students' freedom of expression and dissent; these guidelines typically are codified in university policies specifying the acceptable time, place, and manner of such actions (Bussian, 1995; Davis, 2004). Policies are designed to conform to the interests of the safety and well-being of the campus community and to affirm the ideal that the academic space is a robust arena for dissenting views (Bernstein, 2001). That said, dissent by its very nature is disobedient, and therefore, it is often communicated by taking actions or exhibiting behaviors that exceed the established boundaries of normative meanings. Innovative transgressive tactics that fall outside the confines of campus regulations for expression and dissent can be creative, culturally resonant, and perhaps more likely to engage others on the substantive movement issue. The tactics adopted in the student antisweatshop movement were especially representative of such an approach.

For some student activists, a set of campus speech guidelines is nothing more than a manual of conformist behaviors—something that is largely antithetical to campus activists' social change ambitions. On the other hand, campus policies regarding acceptable conduct for tactical expression provide a template for action specifying how to address controversy and how to dissent respectfully. Campus policies are designed to be proactive and rational, and they make assumptions about what tactics dissenters will use—namely, formal protests or gathering in or on campus common spaces. If future student activists continue to adopt the tactical approaches described in the theory and research presented in this chapter, administrators (and the policies they design) may be less adept at anticipating when, where, and how disruptions will occur. If everyday, conventional routines of college or university life are the contemporary venues for largely peaceful tactical maneuvers, then the rational processes documented in campus policies, such as advanced registration to gather in a public space or specifying the types of signs that can be brandished (sticks or no sticks, for example), may not be as useful as they were at another point in history. These days it seems the homecoming parade, student organization office space sign-up, an open governing board meeting, or the prospective student weekend forum have all become tactical opportunities to use conventional opportunities to impart alternative views and assert movement claims.

The research presented here tells us that campus tactics tend to be conventional, but they don't have to be contained. College student activists' tactics are largely peaceful, but the peacefulness should not be construed

as inconsequential. Contemporary campus tactics may be disruptive and transgressive, but it takes a great deal of creativity and skillful timing to produce such meanings from everyday occurrences. That said, there are student activists that continue to engage in traditionally disruptive tactics or those behaviors that take on the form of civil disobedience. Sit-ins and occupations in various forms are very much alive and well in activist circles and remain to be part of the tactical repertoire of contemporary college students.

Finally, it is worthy of mention that issueless riots and violent episodes have disrupted campus life in the latter half of the 1990s and early 2000s (Ruddell, Thomas, & Way, 2005). Scholars have described these as convivial and spontaneous events, occurring as beer riots or gatherings after the outcome of a campus sporting event; they are construed as issueless, without social organization, and absent of any instrumental purpose (McCarthy, Martin, & McPhail, 2005, 2007; Ruddell et al., 2005). Moreover, such issueless disruptions are an altogether different phenomenon than the collective action tactics being discussed in this chapter. Even so, McCarthy et al.'s (2007) work has demonstrated that the campus violence (and its reciprocal police response) is more likely to arise from these convivial campus gatherings than it is during college students' collective organizing efforts. Accordingly, campus community members should thus be careful to avoid conflating student mobilization tactics with campus-based convivial and spontaneous riot phenomena.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (2006). Student politics: Activism and culture. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 329–345). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Altbach, P. G., & Cohen, R. (1990). American student activism: The post-sixties transformation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61(1), 32–49.
- American Council on Education. (1970). *Campus tensions: Analysis and recommendations. Report of the special committee on campus tensions*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Apgar, S. (1995, September 5). Recent raids of sweatshops in California have illustrated a growing problem in major cities—The exploitation of a new wave of immigrant workers. Now federal regulators are asking retailers such as Dayton Hudson's Mervyn's to help solve the problem—Uncovering sweatshops. *Star Tribune: Newspaper of the Twin Cities*, p. 1D.
- Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., Bayer, A. E., & Bisconti, A. S. (1997). Overview of the unrest era. In L. F. Goodchild & H. S. Wechsler (Eds.), *The history of higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 724–738). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- Barnhardt, C. L. (2012). *Contemporary student activism: The educational contexts of socially-responsible student activism* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 133–155). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Bernstein, J. R. (2001). Right of expressive association and private universities' racial preferences and speech codes. *Williams & Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, 9, 619–643.
- Binder, A., & Wood, K. (2012). *Becoming right: How campuses shape young conservatives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boren, M. E. (2001). *Student resistance: A history of an unruly subject*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boris, E. (2002). Consumers of the world UNITE! Campaigns against sweating, past and present. In D. E. Bender & R. A. Greenwald (Eds.), *Sweatshop USA: The American sweatshop in historical and global perspective* (pp. 203–224). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brennan, D. S. (2012, March 29). *San Marcos: Occupy education protesters gather at Palomar College*. U-T San Diego. Retrieved from <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/Mar/29/san-marcos-occupy-education-protestors-gather-at/>
- Bussian, J. R. (1995). Anatomy of the campus speech code: An examination of prevailing regulations. *Texas Law Review*, 36, 153–189.
- Clark, B. R. (1972). The organizational saga in higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(2), 178–184.
- Clemens, E. S. (2004). Organizational form as frame: Collective identity and political strategy in the American labor movement 1880–1920. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 205–226). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Collier, R. (1999, April 7). A movement at nation's schools to fight sweatshops/college logo apparel makes up big market. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfgate.com/education/article/A-Movement-at-Nation-s-Schools-to-Fight-2935858.php>
- Cowan, R., Newton, N., Smith, J., Brozen, A., Burger, N., & Homstad, M. (1995). *Campus organizing guide for social justice groups*. Cambridge, MA: Center for Campus Organizing.
- Davis, T. J. (2004). Assessing constitutional challenges to university free speech zones under Public Forum Doctrine. *Indiana Law Journal*, 79, 277–308.
- Earl, J., Martin, A., McCarthy, J. D., & Soule, S. A. (2004). The use of newspaper data in the study of collective action. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 65–80.
- Einwohner, R. L., & Spencer, J. W. (2005). That's how we do things here: Local culture and the construction of sweatshops and anti-sweatshop activism in two campus communities. *Sociological Inquiry*, 75(2), 249–272.
- Esbenshade, J. (2004). *Monitoring sweatshops: Workers, consumers, and the global apparel industry*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Featherstone, L. (2003). Students against sweatshops: A history. In D. E. Bender & R. A. Greenwald (Eds.), *Sweatshop USA: The American sweatshop in historical and global perspective* (pp. 247–264). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Featherstone, L., & United Students Against Sweatshops. (2002). *Students against sweatshops*. New York, NY: Verso.
- Gardner, L. (2013, January 29). Divesting from fossil-fuel companies is unlikely to harm endowments, report says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/bottomline/divesting-in-fossil-fuels-shouldnt-harm-endowments-report-finds/>
- Goodwin, J., Jasper, J. M., & Polletta, F. (2004). Emotional dimensions of social movements. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kreisi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 413–432). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gora, J. M., Goldberger, D., Stern, G., & Halperin, M. (1991). *The right to protest: The basic ACLU guide to free expression*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hamrick, F. A. (1998). Democratic citizenship and student activism. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(5), 449–460.

- Harris, D. (1969). *Staff study of campus riots and disorders, October 1967–May 1969*. Prepared for the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Hirsch, E. L. (1999). Sacrifice for the cause: Group processess, recruitment, and commitment in a student social movement. In J. Freeman & V. Johnson (Eds.), *Waves of protest: Social movements since the sixties* (pp. 47–64). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hunter, D. E. (1988). Student activism: Growth through rebellion. In K. M. Miser (Ed.), *Student affairs and campus dissent* (pp. 23–40). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Jesse, D. (2012). Student protesters urge U-M regents to offer in-state tuition to undocumented residents. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.freep.com/article/20121213/NEWS06/121213071/u-m-students-protest-tuition-undocumented-residents>
- Klandermans, B. (2004). The demand and supply of participation: Social-psychological correlates of participation in social movements. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kreisi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 360–379). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Koopmans, R., & Rucht, D. (2002). Protest event analysis. In B. Klandermans & S. Staggenborg (Eds.), *Methods of social movement research: Social movements, protest, and contestation* (Vol. 16, pp. 231–259). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kuh, G., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and personal development outside the classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kurzman, C. (2008). Introduction—Meaning-making in social movements. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 81(1), 5–15.
- McAdam, D. (1983). Tactical innovation and the pace of insurgency. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 735–754.
- McCarthy, J. D., Martin, A. W., & McPhail, C. (2005, August). *Constraints on the freedom of public assembly: Police behavior and the demeanor of citizens in disorderly campus gatherings*. Paper presented at the 2005 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Philadelphia, PA.
- McCarthy, J. D., Martin, A. W., & McPhail, C. (2007). Policing disorderly campus protests and convivial gatherings: The interaction of threat, social organization, and First Amendment guarantees. *Social Problems*, 54(3), 274–296.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1987). Resource mobilization and social movements. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *Social movements in an organizational society* (pp. 15–47). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Meyer, D. S., & Tarrow, S. (1998). *The social movement society: Contentious politics for a new century*. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mueller, C. M. (1992). Building social movement theory. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 3–26). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Oliver, P. E., & Marwell, G. (1988). The paradox of group size in collective action: A theory of the critical mass. II. *American Sociological Review*, 53(1), 1–8.
- Ramer, H. (2013, April 24). Dartmouth College cancels classes after protest. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://diverseeducation.com/article/52894/>
- Rhoads, R. A. (1998). *Freedom's web*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rhoads, R. A., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Graduate employee unionization as symbol of and challenge to the corporatization of U.S. research universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(3), 243–275.
- Ross, A. (2003). The rise of the second anti-sweatshop movement. In D. E. Bender & R. A. Greenwald (Eds.), *Sweatshop USA* (pp. 225–246). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Ross, R. J. S. (2004). *Slaves to fashion*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ruddell, R., Thomas, M. O., & Way, L. B. (2005). Breaking the chain: Confronting issueless college town disturbances and riots. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 549–560.
- Saucier, R. M. (1998, November 10). Sweatshop pact upset activists. White House task force produces deal on workers. *Bangor Daily News*.
- Scranton, W. W. (1970). *The report of the President's commission on campus unrest*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Smith, J. (2001). Globalizing resistance: The battle of Seattle and the future of social movements. *Mobilization*, 6(1), 1–20.
- Smith, R. B. (1993). The rise of the conservative student press. *Change*, 25(1), 24–29.
- Soule, S. A. (1997). The student divestment movement in the United States and tactical diffusion: The shantytown protest. *Social Forces*, 75(3), 855–883.
- Soule, S. A., & Earl, J. (2005). A movement society evaluated: Collective protest in the U.S. 1960–1986. *Mobilization*, 10(3), 345–364.
- Stefancic, J., & Delgado, R. (1996). *No mercy: How conservative think tanks and foundations changed America's social agenda*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (2004). *Social movements 1768–2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Walker, E. T., Martin, A. W., & McCarthy, J. D. (2008). Confronting the state, the corporation, and the academy: The influence of institutional targets on social movement repertoires. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(1), 35–76.
- Zald, M. N. (1996). Culture, ideology, and strategic framing. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 261–274). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Zald, M. N., & Berger, M. A. (1978). Social movements in organizations—Coup d'etat, insurgency, and mass movements. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(4), 823–861.

CASSIE L. BARNHARDT is an assistant professor in the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies at the University of Iowa's College of Education.

Copyright of *New Directions for Higher Education* is the property of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.