

6-30-2016

## Growth of Citizen Movements and Changes in the Political Process in Korea and the US: Similarities and Differences

Sung-jin Yoo

*Ewha Womans University, KOREA*, [sjinny1@ewha.ac.kr](mailto:sjinny1@ewha.ac.kr)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/apssr>

---

### Recommended Citation

Yoo, Sung-jin (2016) "Growth of Citizen Movements and Changes in the Political Process in Korea and the US: Similarities and Differences," *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*: Vol. 16: Iss. 1, Article 13.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59588/2350-8329.1078>

Available at: <https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/apssr/vol16/iss1/13>

This Research Brief is brought to you for free and open access by the DLSU Publications at Animo Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Asia-Pacific Social Science Review by an authorized editor of Animo Repository.

RESEARCH BRIEF

# Growth of Citizen Movements and Changes in the Political Process in Korea and the US: Similarities and Differences

**Sung-jin Yoo**

Ewha Womans University, KOREA  
sjinny1@ewha.ac.kr

Recently, we have observed a new wave of citizen movements around the world. Starting with the Jasmine revolution in Egypt, a series of new citizen movements has arisen in many countries of democracy. To list some, the “occupy-like movements” and the “Tea-party movement” in the US are contemporary citizen movements, representing different responses of citizens from the liberals and the conservatives to the global financial crisis. In Korea, arising mainly from the mad cow disease controversy, the candle light vigil had shown a huge influence as a new type of citizen movement.

Like traditional citizen movements, new citizen movements are derived from dissatisfaction with the political process of representative democracy and its decision-makers, such as government and congress. However, these new citizen movements have several differences from traditional ones. In contrast to traditional movements, led by elites or activists, these new citizen movements are typical grass-root movements, based on local organization and there is no national organization for the movements. While organizational leaders play a significant role in many processes of traditional movements, new citizen

movements emphasize a horizontal network, in which most participants have their own voices in decision-making processes. Additionally, there is no doubt that technological developments such as internet and social network services have contributed to galvanizing these new citizen movements and making them influential. Thanks to these technological developments, participants in new citizen movements can readily raise problems about the current system of representative democracy and request reforms.

This new wave of citizen movements we have observed recently drives us to the issues of how we can understand it and what we can learn from it. Who joins these movements? What motivates them to join these new movements? Why do these movements gain such an enormous participation and support? What makes these movements peculiar in comparison with traditional citizen movements? What are their impacts on representative democracy? Is there anything in common in new citizen movements in different countries? How different are the movements across countries?

This paper attempts to examine the characteristics of these new citizen movements and to find how

different they are from traditional ones. Also, comparing citizen movements in Korea and the US, this paper tries to investigate what the movements in both countries share and how they differ. Based on the findings of the comparison, I suggest the impacts of the movements on political processes in representative democracy.

### **Theoretical Framework: Issue Public and Network Social Movements**

The emergence and success of social movements have been understood as a paradox in the field of interest group politics. Unlike the arguments of pluralism, which claim that if there are shared interests, individuals are likely to get together to achieve their common interests (Bentley, 1908; Dahl, 1961, 1967; Truman, 1951), Olson (1965) had shown persuasively that the success of any group is dependent upon its capability of solving the "collective action problem." According to Olson, mainly due to in-exclusiveness of profits provided by group activity, no group is free from the collective action problem and thus to be successful, the group should be equipped with means to prevent free-riders. It is well-known that selective incentives can be effective in preventing free-riding and contributing to the success of the group.

In reality, despite the absence of shared material interests and the collective action problem, we have observed oftentimes the emergence of social movements and some of them indeed exert huge influence on society. To explain this paradoxical phenomenon, a group of scholars have suggested several ways beyond selective incentives. Taking some as examples, Wilson (1973) raised the need to subdivide the selective incentives into several different kinds, or material, solidary, and purposive incentives. In the same vein, Salisbury (1969), while acknowledging that for a group to organize and sustain, any incentives should be provided first emphasized the role of entrepreneurs and activists at the initial stage of group activity. Also, Moe (1980, 1981) has shown that the orientation and attitude of the members would be critical to the success of social movement, suggesting that to identify what

kinds of people join the group is an important task to understand group activity. Finally, the experience of participating in group activity has been raised as important in individuals' decisions to join a group activity (Rothenberg, 1988). This expansion of the literature on group activity has gone further, to the discussion of norms and social institutions, social pressure of members, and the role of public sponsors, such as governments (Axelrod, 1984; Ostrom, 1990; Sandler, 1992; Taylor, 1987; Walker, 1983, 1991).

From the literature, it can be seen that social movements can be influential if the movements can succeed in advertising the movements' purpose to the mass public, and the members of the community agree with the claims of the movements. In addition, the role of voluntary activists would be crucial to the success of the movements, given that social movements are usually not targeting group members with shared interests. Also, if the members of community have some experience in social movements participation, it may be good to activate another social movement. Relating to this, institutional factors, like the breadth of political opportunity structure and the ease of mobilization, provide favorable circumstance for social movements (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996).

As mentioned, new citizen movements differ from traditional ones in several ways. These are mostly local-based and there are no specific leaders in the movements. Also, it is hard to find any national organization acting as the control tower for the movement. Frequently, new citizen movements have arisen with various issues of life beyond political issues. In these movements, individual citizens decide to join, mostly with personal issues, but the participants share the belief that the issue can be solved with collective efforts. To put it simply, these new citizen movements are organized oftentimes with an issue-based, not an interest-based, focus and the participants in these new citizen movements are properly described in terms of the issue.

It becomes common sense that the rise of new citizen movements has been possible with the assistance of technological developments such as internet and social networks. The information revolution has enabled individual citizens to share

their problems together by providing them with useful ways to deliver their problems to others. Also, the information revolution has made it much easier for individual citizen to be aware of a variety of agendas, which leads to meaningful discussion among members of the society. Moreover, it provides citizens with various channels to mobilize other members of community. These changes have affected the patterns of citizen movements in a different manner from traditional social movements.

Typically, these new citizen movements are different from traditional ones in several ways. First, the participants in new social movements are voluntary individuals, unlike those in traditional social movements, which have usually been organized and mobilized by civic groups and non-governmental organizations. Second, such a voluntary participation of individual citizen changes the internal structure of movement from hierarchical to horizontal. Third, oftentimes new citizen movements have emerged in the fragile network of cyberspace and have the potential to develop offline protests with strong solidarity. Finally, new citizen movements, consisting of creative individuals, can take various strategies to present their voices.

### **Similarities and Differences of New Citizen Movements in Korea and the US**

Taking the theoretical framework suggested in the previous section into account, this section compares new citizen movements in Korea and the US. The cases selected here are “2008 Candle Light Vigil” in Korea, the Tea-party movement and the “Occupy Wall Street movement” (OWS) in the US. These three cases are good examples of new citizen movements in that all were based on voluntary participation of individuals and have the form of grass-root movements.

The data analyzed here were as follows: For the 2008 Candle Light Vigil in Korea, I analyzed survey data collected from face-to-face interviews with the participants in the vigil.<sup>1</sup> For the Tea-party movement, I used relevant items from several national survey datasets, including NYT/CBS News national survey

(April, 2010), a post-election survey collected by the Pew Research Center (Nov. 4-7, 2010), and American National Election Survey 2010.<sup>2</sup> The analysis of the OWS is based on the dataset collected by the CUNY research team (Ruth Milkman, Stephanie Luce, and Penny Lewis).<sup>3</sup>

### **Who Joins?**

Who participate in these new citizen movements? Identifying who joins would be the first task to examine the patterns of new citizen movements. Table 1 shows characteristics of the participants in the 2008 Candle Light Vigil in terms of several socio-political variables. As shown, the participants in this movement were relatively young and highly educated citizens. Women joined this movement a little bit more than men did. Also, most of the participants were from middle income households (71.2%). The most interesting point from the table is that the movement attracted those who supported opposition parties at that moment. Among the participants, while supporters of incumbent party were less than 1%, those of out-parties were about 60%. Also, the independents are another group in the movement, accounting for 30% of all participants.

Table 2 shows socio-political characteristics of supporters of the Tea-party movement and OWS movement. Tea-party movement supporters are mostly men, whites, 45 years or older, leaning towards the Republican Party, somewhat highly educated, and relatively rich, compared with total respondents.<sup>4</sup> As an exemplar of a recent conservative grass-root movement, such characteristics of the Tea-party supporters are understandable. The participants in OWS showed a contrasting caricature to the Tea-party supporters. Like the Tea-party supporters, men and whites were a majority, but the percentages were lower, suggesting that participants in OWS consisted of various groups. In terms of education and income, the participants in OWS are highly educated and even rich, in comparison with supporters of the Tea-party movement. The contrast becomes salient in party identification and age. The participants in OWS

were younger than those in the Tea-party movement, and the majority of OWS participants said that they were Democrats. Finally, independents accounted for a considerable proportion of participants in both movements.

In short, the participants in new citizen movements in Korea and the US have several characteristics in common. They were highly educated and relatively rich. Additionally, the movements attracted fair amounts of support from independents. However, while the participants in 2008 Candle Light Vigil and OWS are from younger generations, supporters of the Tea-party movement were somewhat older.

Why do citizens participate in these movements? What motivates them to join? Like traditional grass-root movements, the participants in new social movements decide to join because they want to express their dissatisfaction with the current system of representative democracy, especially disapproval of the government and incumbent party. As Table 3 shows, almost every participant in the 2008 candle light vigil agreed with the statement that the Lee Myung Bak (MB) administration was

undemocratic, and showed an extreme level of distrust in the President. In addition, more than 90% of the participants had a negative attitude towards governmental policies. A similar pattern was found for the supporters of the Tea-party movement. It is interesting that Tea-party supporters showed dissatisfaction with both the incumbent party and the opposition party, suggesting that they have negative feelings for the whole system of US representative democracy.

The participants in the OWS movement are not so exceptional in such a negative evaluation of government. They want to raise problems in politics, and to see change and reform. The following statements from interviews with actively-involved participants inform us how dissatisfied they are with government and the political process and how desperately they want to see “change.”

A Democratic president elected on a platform of “Change” coming to power at a moment of economic crisis so profound that radical measures of some sort were unavoidable, and at a time when popular rage against the

**Table 1** 2008 Candle Light Vigil Participants

Percent			Percent		
Gender	Men	46.6	Income	~2 mil.	16.2
	Women	52.7		2-4 mil.	38.5
Age	~18	10.6		4 mil. +	32.7
	19~29	37.5	Supporting Party	No Response	12.6
	30s	28.5		Hannara	0.9
	40s	18.1		Minjoo	18.8
	50~	5.3		Minno	15.0
Education	Mid. School	9.9		Jinbosin	26.3
	High School	14.2		others*	9.8
	College and more	76.0		Independent	29.2

Source: The data were collected by the research institute of the department of political science in Sogang University, June 6, 2008. The number of respondents was 1,347. I appreciate the institute allowing me to analyze the data.

Entries are percentages (%) of a given item.

\* Jayousunjin(1.5%)/Chinbakyoendae(1.4%)/Changjohankook(6.9%)

**Table 2** *Tea-party/OWS Participants*

		Tea-party		OWS	
		Supporters	All Resp.	Activists	All Particip.
Gender	Male	59	49	55	55
	Female	41	51	42	42
Race	White	89	77	68	64
	Non-White	8	21	32	36
Age*	~30	7	23	40	37
	31~44	16	27	60	63
	45~64	46	34		
	64~	29	16		
Partisanship	Republican	54	28	1	1
	Democrat	5	31	57	57
	Independent	36	33	42	42
Education	HS degree	29	47	8	6.4
	College	33	28	48	47
	Graduate	37	25	41	41
Household Income	~\$30,000	18	32	8.2	8.4
	30,000~50,000	17	16	20.1	19.6
	50,000~75,000	25	18	24.0	22.1
	75,000~	31	26	47.5	50.0

Source: NYT/CBS News Opinion Survey (April 5-12, 2010, All respondents 1,580). Milkman, Luce, and Lewis (2013).

\* Data for OWS participants categorized respondents only by age under/over 30.

nation's financial elites was so intense that most Americans would have supported almost anything. If it was not possible to enact any real progressive politics or legislation at such a moment, clearly it would never be. Yet none were enacted. Instead, Wall Street gained even greater control over the political process. (Milkman et al., 2013, p. 17)

I definitely supported Obama and voted for Obama. I've done the door knocking and house calls and things like that. The Obama presidency was disillusioning to a lot of people, and that's why Occupy Wall Street spread so much. (Milkman et al., 2013, p.18)

The analysis so far suggests clearly that the new citizen movements examined here began with distrust

in government and policy-makers, and this was derived from recognition that the current system of democracy is not so good at reflecting social changes. Raising objections to government, they want to ask the representative institution of politics to listen to the citizens' voices.

Distrust in political institutions can make the problem worse in that it causes citizens to become cynical about politics. Furthermore, such distrust and cynicism may lead citizens to be apolitical, which raise a serious problem on the effectiveness of representative democracy as a political system. Does such distrust in politics lead the participants in new social movements to be cynical or apolitical?

Table 4 shows that such speculation is not supported by the participants in these new citizen movements. In reality, it turns out that most of the



**Table 3** *Attitude toward Politics: Candle Light Vigil/Tea-party Participants*

2008 Candle Light Vigil Participants		Tea-party Supporters (2010)	
	(%)		(%)
MB administration is undemocratic	99	Distrust of Government	92
Distrust in President	99	Dissatisfaction with Obama and Democratic Party	92
Negative on Governmental Policy	92	Dissatisfaction with GOP Leadership	87

*Source: The Data for Candle Light Vigil Participants collected by Sogang University. Pew Research Center for the Tea-party supporters(Post-Election Survey, 2010/11/4).*

participants in the candle light vigil had high levels of political interest and they believed that they can change with their efforts the troubled political situation. Moreover, a fair number of participants had experiences in achieving their goals in a variety of ways. Based on the evidence, it can be said that the participants in new citizen movements are active enough to solve the problems in politics, although they dislike the current political process.

### Issues to Lead Participants to Support Movements

While the participants in new citizen movements in Korea and the US share distrust in the government and representative institutions, such as the President and political parties, they differ in what they want to change. Tables 5 and 6 summarize specific reasons for participation and the issues that lead them to join the movements in Korea and the US, respectively.

Most of the participants in the candle light protest in Korea decided themselves to join the movement; 79.5% of all respondents voluntarily decided to take part in the movement after watching TV news. Participants asked by others accounted for just 15%. Given that they are likely to be interested in politics and their high level of political efficacy, there should be no surprise in such a result. Regarding the reasons for participation, most of the respondents decide to participate to protest against the government and President, to show their dissatisfaction with the administration's policies, and even to call for the

impeachment of the President. Interestingly, only 22% of the respondents gave the reason to seeking the re-negotiation of Korea-US treaty on beef import, the issue supposedly galvanizing the movement. This shows that the government's handling the issue was the main reason for joining the protest, not the issue itself.

Due to limitations in the data sets, it is difficult to compare directly the participants in candle light vigil with those in the new citizen movements of the US. However, we do know from previous analyses that the supporters of the US movements were also dissatisfied with the government.

One big difference between the Korean citizen movement and US citizen movements examined here is that the issues raised by the movement were more specific and varied, respectively. The variety of issues raised by the movement is striking for OWS. As can be seen from the catchphrase of OWS "We are the 99%," economic inequality was the top issue for OWS participants. However, they also raised issues from economic, social, cultural, and political problems. They were questioning economic issues like corporate greed, capitalism, and unemployment. Also, political issues were raised, like money in politics, rights of labor union, and civil liberties. Social issues like education, health care, environment, and health care also made some participants join the movement. Cultural issues, such as immigration and racism, also played roles in mobilizing citizens. Such a variety of issues attracting citizens in the movement explain why it spreads so fast and why it gained large support from the people.

**Table 4** *Political Interests, Efficacy, and Participation*

		Candle Light Participants	<u>Tea-party</u>		<u>OWS</u>	
			Support	All	Under age of 30	Over age of 30
Political Interests	A lot	54.2				
	Average	27.9				
	Little	14.1				
Efficacy*	High	84.5				
	Average	7.2				
	Low	4.3				
Participation **	Participating in protest	46.5	17.3	12.7		
	Signing a petition	73.1				
	Ask others to participate	47.4			25.8	42.9
	Participating in civic reporting	16.4				
	Donating money	40.7	23.6	16.8	45.2	72.2
	Participating in campaign	37.3	10.1	8.5	8.0	11.3
	Voted		94.2	84.7		
	Visit candidates' websites		33.7	27.0		

Source: *The Data for Candle Light Vigil Participants collected by Sogang University. Pew Research Center (Post-Election Survey, November 4, 2010).*

Cell entries are percentages (%).

\* Response to the question "A person like me has no say about what government does": Yes: Low efficacy, No: High efficacy. \*\* Percentage of those who have participated.

**Table 5** *Reason for Participation: Candle Light Vigil Participants*

How did they participate?		Why did they participate?	
Voluntarily after watching TV news	79.5	To show protest against government/President	29.2
Asked by friend	6.3	To show citizens' dissatisfaction with MB administration's other policies	23.9
Asked by Internet network	4.8	To ask for re-negotiation of Korea-US treaty on beef import	22.3
Asked by family member	4.0	To impeach President	17.1
Other	3.9	Other	6.1

Source: *Survey for Candle Light Vigil Participants by Sogang University*

Cell entries are percentages (%).



**Table 6** *Issues that Led Respondents to Support Tea-Party/OWS*

Tea-party*		OWS**		
Supporters	All Respondents	Issues	Actively Involved	All Respondents
		Inequality	45.4	47.5
Government Spending/Deficit	Economy	Money in politics	29.4	25.5
Economy	Government Spending/Deficit	Corporate Greed	18.8	18.5
Moral decline	Moral decline	Education	19.0	17.4
Immigration	Health care	Unions / labor rights	10.9	13.0
	Immigration	Health care	12.4	12.4
	Environment	Jobs / Unemployment	9.9	11.9
	Education	Antiwar / Environment / Women's rights	13.3	11.4
		Solidarity with Occupy-like Movements	11.9	11.0
		Immigrant Rights	6.9	10.4
		Capitalism as a system	13.1	9.2
		Civil liberties	9.4	8.2
		Racism	5.4	7.1
		Housing/Foreclosures	5.4	6.5

Source: American National Election Studies 2010 for the issue of Tea-party.

\* The most important problem facing the United States today. Only the issues with more than 10% of responses reported. \*\* Total adds to more than 100% because respondents could give more than one answer.

The issues that lead citizens to support the Tea-party movement were more focused than OWS. Citizens supported the Tea-party movement mostly because they considered government spending, the deficit, and the economy were the most important problems facing the US today. Although some of the supporters also pointed to moral decline and immigration as important problems, the economy was *the* issue leading them to support the movement. Their issue is well focused if we compare it with that of all respondents.

As examined so far, new citizen movements in Korea and the US started with dissatisfaction with government and policy-makers, the participants in the movements have high levels of interest in politics and political efficacy, and most of them have previous experience in various ways of political participation. With these similarities, the movements in both countries also show differences. While citizens'

complained about the way government handled the mad cow issue, especially that the government did not listen to the requests of citizens, was an issue in the candle light vigil in Korea, the movements in the US have other issues at hand to mobilize citizens. That is, whereas the Korean citizen movement exploded due to a negative impression of the government, the US citizen movements were more issue-based. Also, it can be pointed out that the Tea-party movement and OWS are different in that the former was mobilized mostly focusing on economic issue, while the latter was supported by participants with various issues at hand.

Comparing with traditional social movements, the recent citizen movements are different in the structure of the movement and the pattern of decision-making. As described in Figure 1, these new citizen movements have network-based mobilization with a horizontal structure of movement, far different from

traditional hierarchically structured social movements. Also, unlike traditional social movements, mobilized by broad political discourse, such as ideology, the current ones are more likely to be organized with voluntary participation regarding various issues of livelihood, often leading to the realization of a living community in the movement. Such characteristics are found in the new citizen movements discussed in this paper. Especially, the 2008 candle light vigil in Korea and OWS in the US were mostly organized and mobilized from cyberspace to offline, and the decision-making process was in cyberspace; that is, a horizontal process of decision-making with voluntary participation and free opinion exchange became dominant in the movements.<sup>5</sup> The following statements from two participants in OWS showed such a horizontal way of decision-making and how fascinated people in the movement were about it.

Horizontalism is what I see as the one non-negotiable element of Occupy Wall Street. Many people are not used to decision-making that is so direct. It takes a lot of time, and it is not necessarily accessible to everyone, but part of the beauty of consensus is that it's actually a very natural form of decision-making. Informally, we do it all the time. But people see voting as the only legitimate form of decision-making, and it's hard to undo that conditioning. This horizontal structure is really exciting for people who have never experienced it before. (Milkman et al., 2013, p. 29)

I love that nobody can really take the lead and run things. I love the process of having points of conversation and not going here and there, and being very focused. I love the way that people don't talk over each other, that we use these other forms of gesture-based communication to talk with each other. (Milkman et al., 2013, pp. 29-30)

### **Possibilities and Limitations of New Citizen Movements**

Even though they started with distrust in politics, new citizen movements in Korea and the US could

attract explosive support from the mass public, thanks to a high level of political interest and efficacy among the participants and previous experiences of joining social movements. The movements have in common a horizontal structure of decision-making process, voluntary participation, and network-based social movement, making them different from traditional social movements.

Although new social movements gained large support in the area of new media, such as SNS, the mass media played an important role in expanding these movements. Innovative behavioral patterns of new social movements, or the horizontal decision-making structures and the emphasis on voluntary participation and consensus attracted the interests of news reporters from traditional mass media.<sup>6</sup> Through the mass media, new citizen movements could move across countries, making similar types of movement around the world. It shows evidently the possibility that any issue can be a stimulus to mobilize citizens' movement as well as political issue. That is, new citizen movements are powerful in that the new movement is easily reproduced if there is an issue attracting citizens' attention.

Milkman and his colleagues pointed out in their work the success of new citizen movements in the following two aspects. First, the new citizen movements changed the national political conversation. For example, during OWS, news media attention to inequality increased dramatically, making it a national concern. Similarly, facing the demands of the 2008 candle light vigil, the MB administration in Korea made an apology and promised to listen to the people. Second, the new citizen movements caused the participants to be awakened and to become politically active. With the experience of these new citizen movements, the people realized their power and understood how important they were in politics.

Despite the possibilities and positive outcomes, the new citizen movements are not without limitations. The most important problem to these movements is how to maintain its influence in the long run. As we observed now, new citizen movements, especially the candle light vigil in Korea and OWS in the US have lost their influence as time goes on. As observed, citizens decided to join these movements with various concerns at hand. Mobilizing with various issues is

one of the key characteristics of these movements and because of its diversity of issues, the movements could be successful in attracting citizens' support. Ironically, such diversity makes it difficult for new citizen movements to continue to be influential because it is hard to provide "selective incentives" to the participants necessary to maintain the power of the movement. In addition, given the preference for a horizontal structure and consensus-based decision-making process, the role of leaders or entrepreneurs, another condition to keep the movement influential, is limited.

Simply put, these new citizen movements, like traditional social movements, are also not free from the "collective action problem," and thus, the movements need ways to mobilize people and keep them active. Also, OWS lost its influence as soon as the mass media started not to cover it as a news item, and the candle light vigil became less influential as the government found ways to deal with the protest, showing that new citizen movements are also influenced by the factors external to the movements. It informs us that the durable success of new citizen movements is dependent upon how the participants in the movement find successful ways to broaden the political opportunity structure in the community and to keep political actors in representative democracy, such as political parties, concerned about its requests.

## Conclusion

New citizen movements have been successful in raising many issues and making the issues into political agendas. Also, they play a positive role in letting citizens experience social movements. As many have pointed out, the success and the achievements of new citizen movements produce the possibility of them providing a new driving force for reform and change. Most of all, the activation of new citizen movement, mainly driven by voluntary participation, alerts decision-makers in the political process to care about the requests of the movements.

Despite their success, the movements have limits on maintaining influence and being able to bring about institutional reform through the current political

process. In other words, although these movements have been successful in raising questions on the process of representative democracy, they have failed to continue to be influential as a lasting power to change the structure of the current political process. To remain influential, new citizen movements need to consider how to connect the movement based on voluntary participation with political parties, the mediating actors of representative democracy. It is one thing to emphasize horizontal communication and consensus, but it is another to institutionalize the emphasis in the political structures of representative democracy. To institutionalize their requests, new citizen movements need to put more efforts into how to balance horizontal ways of decision-making with effective representative democracy. The first step is to broaden the political opportunity structure, and thus to establish a system in which citizens get chances to become involved in the decision-making process of our representative democracy.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> The data were collected by the research institute of the department of political science in Sogang University, June 6, 2008. The number of respondents was 1,347. I appreciate the institute allowing me to analyze the data.
- <sup>2</sup> It would be useful to have a data set for the participants in the Tea-party movement. Unfortunately, I could not find such a data set. Thus, using national survey data, I identified supporters of the movement and examined their orientation, attitude, and behavior.
- <sup>3</sup> The research team surveyed the OWS participants at Zuccotti Park in Manhattan. They reported the outcome from in-depth interview with 25 actively-involved participants and survey of 729 participants in the movement. For the details, see [http://sps.cuny.edu/filestore/1/5/7/1\\_a05051d2117901d/1571\\_92f562221b8041e.pdf](http://sps.cuny.edu/filestore/1/5/7/1_a05051d2117901d/1571_92f562221b8041e.pdf).
- <sup>4</sup> An analysis in New York Times describes the "Tea-party" supporters as Republican, white, male, married and older than 45. ([http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/15/us/politics/15poll.html?\\_r=2&ref=reapartymovement](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/15/us/politics/15poll.html?_r=2&ref=reapartymovement))
- <sup>5</sup> "Mic check" was a common way of communication in OWS. In this, when a participant makes a statement, people around her repeat the statement for other participants to hear. Repeating it several rounds allows

everybody to listen to the statement. Anyone can have a chance to do so if she wants.

- <sup>6</sup> Michael Ellick, a participant in OWS, asserts “Occupy’s approach was not to organize by policy but to organize by spectacle, and by archetype, and by emotion and idea, and to find a different way of speaking to people.” Milkman and his colleagues named it with the concept of “chains of equivalence,” where anyone who wants to share her pains and to get sympathy from others. (Milkman et al., 2013, p. 24)

## References

- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bentley, A. F. (1908). *The process of government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dahl, R. (1961). *Who governs?: Democracy and power in an American city*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dahl, R. (1967). *Pluralist democracy in the United States: Conflict and consent*. Chicago: Land McNally.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (Eds.). (1996). *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Milkman, R., Luce, S., & Lewis, P. (2013). Changing the subject: A bottom-up account of occupy Wall Street in New York City. Retrieved on July 12, 2013 from [http://sps.cuny.edu/filestore/1/5/7/1\\_a05051d2117901d/1571\\_92f562221b8041e.pdf](http://sps.cuny.edu/filestore/1/5/7/1_a05051d2117901d/1571_92f562221b8041e.pdf)
- Moe, T. M. (1980). *The organization of interests: Incentives and the internal dynamics of political interest group*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moe, T. M. (1981). Toward a broader view of interest groups *Journal of Politics*, 43(2) 531-543.
- Olson, M. Jr. (1965). *The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothenberg, L. S. (1988). Organizational maintenance and the retention decision in groups *American Political Science Review*, 82(4) 1129-1152.
- Salisbury, R. H. (1969). An exchange theory of interest groups *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 13(1) 132.
- Sandler, T. (1992). *Collective action: Theory and applications*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Taylor, M. (1987). *The possibility of cooperation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Truman, D. B. (1951). *The governmental process: The political interests and public opinion*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Walker, J. L., Jr. (1983). The origins and maintenance of interest groups in America. *American Political Science Review*, 77(2) 390-406.
- Walker, J. L., Jr. (1991). *Mobilizing interest groups in America: Patrons, professions, and social movements*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1973). *Political organizations*. New York: Basic Books.