THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF LOCAL ENVIRONMENTALISM[*]

Kenneth T. Andrews and Bob Edwards[†]

Based on a survey of the population of local environmental organizations in North Carolina, this article addresses fundamental questions about how local organizations are structured, their orientation toward strategy and social change, their activities, and their perceived impacts. By comparing subsets of local organizations in terms of their geographic scope, degree of professionalization, and tactical repertoires, we identify important patterns. First, locally oriented organizations that focus on a neighborhood, city, or county are more likely to be affiliated with a national organization than regional or state organizations, but they are less likely to participate in coalitions than groups working at the regional or state level. Second, organizations relying on a mixture of volunteers and professionals are more formalized and report higher levels of success at mobilizing people than those that rely exclusively on volunteers or professionals. However, groups that are volunteer-based are more likely to engage in partisan activity and have diverse environmental philosophies, but less likely to use conventional advocacy tactics like lobbying and less likely to have a nonprofit tax status. Finally, organizations engaging in disruptive and routinized protest strategies tend to be more similar to one another than they are to organizations that rely exclusively on moderate tactical repertoires such as lobbying or environmental education.

In recent decades, the United States has witnessed dramatic growth in the number and diversity of advocacy organizations. This trend has been documented most closely at the national level (Berry 1977, 2000; Schlozman and Tierney 1985; Shaiko 1999), but there has been a parallel expansion of advocacy organizations at the local level across many constituencies, issues, and institutional settings (Ferree and Martin 1995; Whittier 1995; Katzenstein 1998; Meyer and Tarrow 1998). We know very little about local social movement organizations. In this article we examine how local environmental groups are organized, the changes they seek to bring about, the strategies and tactics they employ, and the impacts they report. Studying local movement organizations raises questions about whether the theories and assumptions derived from research on national and transnational organizations have relevance for the diverse and numerous populations of local movement organizations.

Scholarship on interest groups, social movement organizations, and voluntary associations has developed in tandem since the 1960s. These traditions have similar biases and limitations, including a disproportionate focus on the most prominent organizations and forms of action and an over-reliance on national sources of data. The result is an unrecognized but significant distortion of prevailing conceptions of social movement organizations and activities (Andrews and Edwards 2004; Edwards and Foley 2003). In the absence of more fine-

---

[†] Kenneth Andrews is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3210. Bob Edwards is Associate Professor of Sociology at East Carolina University Greenville, NC 27858. Please direct correspondence to kta@unc.edu or edwardsr@mail.ecu.edu

grained studies, generalizations about the frequency and dispersion of core organizational characteristics—such as ideology, strategic orientation, and tactical forms—can become widely held among practitioners, scholars, and the broader public. To develop a stronger empirical foundation, we study the population of local environmental organizations in North Carolina. Our findings, offer new insights that challenge taken-for-granted assumptions about social movements.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT[1]

In the past, the environmental movement often has been characterized in terms of its middle-class, college educated, and professional constituency and by its tactics of using legal and scientific expertise to influence national policy debates. However, these characterizations are no longer persuasive (Bullard 1993; Gottlieb 1993; Arp and Kenny 1996; Bowman 1996). Currently, the environmental groups that rely heavily on lobbying and litigation work alongside groups using direct action, community organizing, and boycotts. The environmental sector includes groups with moderate goals working on specific resource management issues and radical groups advocating fundamental changes in production and consumption patterns. Groups that have been in existence for over one hundred years find themselves in competition with neighborhood activists with little or no prior involvement in politics or social movements. Not surprisingly, organizational structure is similarly diverse (Brulle 2000; Mitchell et al. 1992; Kempton et al. 2001). The wide range of goals and broad tactical repertoire span the conventional distinction between institutionalized and noninstitutionalized politics—a characteristic that makes environmentalism similar to other contemporary movements (Katzenstein 1998, Meyer and Tarrow 1998).

Historical Context

The origins of American environmentalism are typically located in advocacy leading to the federal government's establishment of the national park system in the late 1800s to preserve wilderness areas in the context of the closing of the frontier. Numerous monographs on the development of American environmentalism over the last century present it as a series of stages oriented around predominant or emerging issues emphasizing the role of exemplary individuals, federal government agencies, and national environmental organizations (Hays 1958; Schrepfer 1983; Shabecof 1993; Rothman 1997). Most scholars argue that an important transition occurred in the 1960s and early 1970s with the rise of a broader environmental movement (Mertig et al. 2001; Sale 1993; Tesh 2000). Key events from the mid-1960s through the early 1970s include passage of the Wilderness Act in 1964, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the first Earth Day in 1970, the founding of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), major legislative gains such as the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, as well as the publication of influential books by Rachel Carson, Paul Ehrlich, Barry Commoner and others (Sale 1993). McLaughlin and Khawaja (2000) document a rapid acceleration in the founding of national environmental organizations through the 1970s and 1980s. Available evidence also points to an equally dramatic, though less well documented, growth of local environmentalism during the same period. For example, Carmin's (1999) analysis using the *New York Times* index for the period of 1975-1990 finds that national environmental groups lagged behind their local counterparts by one to two years in the adoption of both issue priorities and tactics. These findings suggest that local environmentalism plays an important role in shaping national movement priorities and national organizations are often responsive to grassroots trends.

Although quantitative historical data on the growth of local organizations do not exist, scholars point to the emergence of separate regional trends through the1970s and early 1980s.

For example, throughout the U.S. local groups formed to defend community health and to protest the effects of toxic and hazardous materials in the 1970s—before the conflict at Love Canal vaulted such groups to national media prominence during the 1980 Presidential campaign (Freudenberg 1984a; Freudenberg 1984b; Edelstein 1988). In retrospect, during the 1970s and 1980s numerous urban and minority groups mobilized on issues that would now be seen within the broader frameworks of either environmental justice or urban sprawl (Molotch 1976; Boyte 1980; Schnaiberg et al. 1986). Last, the strong citizen-participation mandates in federal environmental legislation like the Clean Water Act of 1972 encouraged a broad range of local environmental activity (Sirianni and Friedland 2001). A synthetic reading of these trends enables a crude sketch of local environmentalism's contours. The research presented here provides the basis for a more detailed examination of the demography, philosophies, strategies, activities, and impacts of the movement and its organizations.

The Coevolution of Environmental Organizations and State Institutions

Environmental advocacy has developed alongside the growth and transformation of state institutions. Besides simply broadening the range of environmental issues, each wave of advocacy has built up a complex movement infrastructure and contributed to the development of a loosely coupled system of relevant public institutions and government agencies (Weick 1976). These national, state, and local agencies often have overlapping missions and separate bases of authority and present environmentalists with a wide-ranging and complex "supply" of advocacy targets and potential venues of participation.

Post-Watergate political reforms and strong citizen participation mandates in national environmental legislation required local public participation in many federal programs. In response environmental groups, agency staff and industry representatives have acquired experience and developed organizational capacity at the local and state levels. Many environmental initiatives pursue place-based strategies with direct citizen involvement in improving specific ecosystems and locales through good neighbor agreements, common ground projects, and policy dialogues to name a few. Such local initiatives take a range of forms from watershed alliances and societies to river watches and councils to land trusts and stewardships (Bernard and Young 1997; Shutkin 2000; Sirianni and Friedland 2001). On the one hand, these developments provide local environmental groups with increased access to the policy process thereby increasing opportunities for collaboration among stakeholder groups (Andrews 1999). On the other hand, this process has increased the potential for local environmental protest by strengthening local environmental infrastructures and diversifying the potential targets of protest.

Environmental Organizations in State and Local Contexts

Our study focuses on the local and state level for two reasons. First, in environmental politics, trends in policy devolution and localization of citizen participation open opportunities for social movement advocacy at the state and local levels (Lester 1994; 1995; Rabe 2000; Ringquist 1993). For example, in 1994 the EPA estimated that only fifteen percent of the costs of environmental efforts are funded by the federal government with the remaining costs coming from state and local government and private sources (Kraft and Vig 2000).

Second, focusing at the subnational level provides a needed corrective to a long-standing research emphasis on national arenas and organizations and captures important variation in mobilization, social and political context, and outcomes. State and local organizations are not merely the organizational substructure of national organizations and movements, rather they pursue independent and consequential agendas in local and state contexts. Our view is consistent with a growing recognition that broader social movements are embedded in and shaped

by characteristics of local environments (Amenta et al. 1999; Carmin 1999; Clemens 1997; Gray and Lowery 1996).

CASE SELECTION, SAMPLING FRAME, AND ORGANIZATIONAL SURVEY

Organizational surveys provide an important tool for examining questions about organizational populations.[2] Researchers have successfully used surveys to collect data on populations of interest groups, voluntary associations, and movement organizations (Baumgartner and Leech 1998; Chaves et al. 1999; McCarthy and Wolfson 1996; Edwards and Marullo 1995; Smith 1997). In this section we describe the case selection, sampling frame, and survey used in our study.

Case Selection

We assembled available data on environmentalism for all fifty U.S. states for the past thirty years including data on state budgetary expenditures, policy initiatives, and environmental quality. This evidence supports our selection of North Carolina for more intensive analysis because of its characteristics relative to other U.S. states and its internal variation in the set of environmental groups, issue orientation, and claims. The breadth of the organizational population includes groups working on air and water quality, development and sprawl, corporate farming, commercial fishing, coastal and wetland protection, forestry, nuclear and hazardous waste disposal, recycling, game management, and ecotourism. Data from the past thirty years on North Carolina shows that this state is close to the median on key measures of mobilization, policy, and environmental conditions. For example, in 1980, North Carolina ranked 29th among U.S. states in per capita expenditures on environmental quality (Lester 1995). The 1991 Green Index, a widely used measure of environmental policies and conditions based on 256 indicators, ranks North Carolina 23rd although the state ranked 34th in 2000 (Hall and Kerr 1991; Kromm et al. 2001). Other measures based on indicators of expenditures on environmental quality, state policy efforts, and congressional voting on environmental issues provides a similar portrait (Hall and Kerr 1991; Lester 1995). This design also follows a well-established tradition of using a single state for a fine-grained analysis of an organizational population of voluntary associations and nonprofits (Knoke and Wood 1981; McPherson and Rotolo 1995; Gronberg and Paarlberg 2001).

Sampling Frame

One of the major challenges in collecting this type of organizational data is enumerating the population for sampling. Knoke et al. (2002) note that the construction of sampling frames for organizational populations can account for up to half of the costs of conducting research on organizations. Nearly all previous research has been based on widely available national directories of nonprofit groups (Minkoff 1995; Baumgartner and Leech 1998). Yet, based on a preliminary analysis in North Carolina, such techniques would fail to identify the majority of the state's environmental groups (Edwards and Andrews 2002).

We compiled a comprehensive list of North Carolina environmental organizations in 2002. In doing so we relied upon twenty-seven major sources including state- and national-level directories ranging from those covering a specific type of issue to those attempting to capture all nonprofit or voluntary associations, as well as rosters of organizations attending or cosponsoring various environmental events throughout the state over the prior three years. We used five major criteria in constructing the sampling frame: (1) location, all groups have a North Carolina mailing address; (2) organization form, includes multiple subunits as separate organizations (e.g., each affiliate of the Audubon Society); (3) public claims, groups makes

public interest claims in contrast to private interest claims such as an industry group; (4) primarily adult, we excluded high school and college student groups on the assumption that these would be less stable over time and more focused on their institution rather than the broader community; (5) nonstate actors, we exclude state agencies. Because many SMOs operate across multiple movement domains, we did not limit our sampling frame to groups that made exclusively or even primarily environmental claims. Among our respondents, environmental issues were the only issues for 39 percent, one of the major issues for 52.4 percent, and one of the minor issues for 8.6 percent. [3] Nor did we make having individual members a criterion for inclusion as some studies have (e.g., Knoke 1990). Although we describe this as a study of local environmentalism, we do not exclude organizations that work on national or international issues or target institutions or actors beyond the state of North Carolina. We investigate this question below when we compare groups in our sample based on their geographic scope of operations.[4] Through this process we developed an initial list of nearly 1,000 organizations that was reduced to 738 groups after selecting on the criteria described above.

Organizational Survey

We selected a simple random sample of groups to participate in a structured 60-minute phone interview.[5] Most questions were in a closed-ended format and covered a wide range of characteristics and practices. In this article we examine organizational demography, environmental philosophy, strategic orientation, public activities and perceived impacts. We describe these categories and measures below. More broadly, the survey covered organizational networks and coalitions, issue focus, membership characteristics and participation, financial resources, organizational practices and formality, leadership, and media engagement. Surveys were conducted from September 2002 to October 2003, and a response rate of 59.1 percent was achieved. Respondents held a variety of positions in the organizations surveyed. More than half (54 percent) were executive directors, or program directors, 22 percent held a staff position, 19 percent sat on the group's board of directors, and 6 percent were volunteers. Although relying on a single individual to report on organizational characteristics raises some concerns, McPherson and Rotolo (1995) found this strategy to be at least as reliable as more intensive strategies for collecting data on voluntary associations.

To provide a clearer picture of these organizations, we describe the kinds of environmental issues that North Carolina groups focus on in their work. We asked organizational representatives about the importance of fifty different issues in their work. This list was constructed inductively through an examination of descriptions of organizations in directories and websites. Responses to the bank of fifty issue items were reduced to a smaller number of issue orientations. The eight most common issue orientations are: environmental education, sprawl and land use, nature protection, legal reform, local beautification, agriculture, sustainable lifestyles, and waste and recycling. Here, we see the value of analyzing a population of organizations. Numerous case studies have been conducted of environmental organizations, campaigns or issues including excellent studies of recycling, waste incinerators, logging, sustainable development, and environmental justice.[6] Despite their considerable strengths, case studies cannot answer key questions concerning the prevalence of particular issues, strategies or practices in the broader movement and may over-represent novel strategies or organizational forms. In contrast, population studies can examine prevalence collective action across major issues.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND MEASURES

We use our survey data to examine five major characteristics: organizational demographics, environmental philosophies, strategic orientation, public activities, and perceived impacts.

Table 1. Characteristics of North Carolina's Environmental Organizations

Characteristics	Description	Mean	SD	Alpha	Min.	Max.
Organizational Demography						
Age	Years since the organization's founding	16.51	14.64	n/a	1	92
Movement identification	Organization as part of the environmental movement	0.90	0.30	n/a	0	1
Affiliate	Affiliate or chapter of larger organization	0.40	0.49	n/a	0	1
Coalitions	Number of coalitions group participates in	1.97	2.47	n/a	0	12
Tax status	Group has or is affiliated with a group that has a nonprofit tax status	0.80	0.40	n/a	0	1
Task committees	Number of task committees	3.06	3.18	n/a	0	15
EnvironmentalPhilosophy						
Reform environ-mentalism	Pollution and environmental contamination threaten human health and well being, and society should protect environmental quality and reduce pollution.	4.51	0.90	n/a	1	5
Conservationism	Natural resources are limited and should be conserved so their benefits can be sustained for the greatest number of people over the longest time.	4.49	1.02	n/a	1	5
Preservationism	Wilderness areas and wildlife are threatened and should be preserved and protected because they are important to humans' physical and spiritual health	4.09	1.24	n/a	1	5
Ecotheology	Nature is Gods' creation and humanity has a moral obligation to be good stewards and care for it	3.62	1.53	n/a	1	5
Deep ecology	All species and wilderness areas on Earth are valuable in their own right regardless of their use-fulness to humans, and they should be preserved even if ir requires significant sacrifices.	3.47	1.35	n/a	1	5
Environmental justice	Lower-income and minority groups are more likely to be exposed to pollution and other environmental hazards, and policies to reduce this type of injustice should be implemented.	3.39	1.55	n/a	1	5
Game management	Careful management allows recreational hunting and fishing of wildlife without inflicting harm	3.39	1.56	n/a	1	5
Discourse Pluralism	Number of discourse that "fit very well"	3.43	2.03	n/a	0	7
Strategy						
Public Awareness	Environmental education, media, public awareness	4.01	0.91	0.78	1	5
Organizing	Networking with environmental networks and with others, local solutions, grassroots organizing	3.35	1.09	0.81	1	5
Policy Change	Influencing national policy, state policy, local policy, enforcement, influential people	3.03	1.14	0.84	1	5
Prefigurative ("NSM")	Models sustainable lifestyles and communities, promotes alternative organizations and products	2.83	1.10	0.74	1	5
Direct Action	Confrontational action, litigation, boycotts, does not seek moderate image	2.28	0.69	0.65	1	5
Public Activities						
Environmental Agencies	Contact staff of federal, state, local agencies	0.82	0.30	0.67	0	1
Citizen Action	Op-eds, letter writing,	0.56	0.33	0.83	0	1
State Commissions	Make presentation, members serve on state commissions	0.55	0.44	0.69	0	1
Local Commissions	Make presentation, members serve on local commissions	0.55	0.43	0.66	0	1
Monitoring Policy	Regulatory agencies, national legislation, state legislation, and local legislation	0.54	0.40	0.82	0	1

Table 1. Continued

Public Activities, cont'd	Description	Mean	SD	Alpha	Min	Max
Building Networks	Sponsor conference, host environmental leaders from outside NC, travel outside NC to meet with environmental leaders	0.50	0.39	0.67	0	1
State Lobbying	Consult with state officials, draft state legislation	0.34	0.41	0.65	0	1
National Lobbying	Consult with national officials, draft national legislation	0.12	0.28	0.62	0	1
Partisan Electoral	Join parties, give money to parties, endorse candidates, participate in party activities, vote	0.11	0.24	0.84	0	1
Voter Mobilization	Voter registration, taking voters to polls	0.08	0.25	0.81	0	1
Confrontational Action	Boycotts, direct action protest	0.05	0.19	0.71	0	1
Perceived Impact						
Group Mobilization	Members gained greater sense of community, members developed a strong sense of solidarity, successful at mobilizing people for activities	3.66	0.87	0.76	1	5
Community Recognition	Support of influential individuals, support of businesses and business groups, gaining support for our group, raising awareness, satisfied with media coverage, increased knowledge, support of other environmental groups, recognized by people in the community as influential, bring greater attention to our issues and agenda, reports and statements influence debate	3.41	0.75	0.85	1	5
Political Legitimacy	Recognized as influential by state government leaders, state agencies, local government leaders, getting state or federal agencies to take stronger stands, state legislators to take stronger stands, local planning boards to take stronger stands, local elected officials to take stronger stands	2.68	0.91	0.85	1	4.71
Regulatory Impact	Blocked relaxing of environmental standards, delayed environmental issues, tougher enforcement, successfully used legal system	2.17	1.12	0.84	1	5

First, we summarize the aggregate patterns for North Carolina environmental organizations presented in table 1. Then, we investigate how group characteristics vary in relation to their geographic scope. Next, we compare groups based on their professionalization, specifically the extent to which they utilize volunteers or paid employees to undertake their activities. Finally, we assess differences across groups based on their tactical repertoire differentiating between the use of confrontational disruptive actions, nonconfrontational protest, or moderate reform tactics. We focus on these latter distinctions because, as we elaborate below, debates about professionalization and disruptive tactics have been at the center of most work on social movement organizations.

Organizational Demographics

The top panel of table 1 shows several organizational characteristics that merit attention. The very high level of self-identification with the environmental movement among these groups is noteworthy given the broad criteria for inclusion used in this study. This raises an interesting question because less than half of these groups use disruptive (8 percent) or protest (39 percent) tactics or emphasize them in their strategic orientation, criteria that some scholars use to define social movements and social movement organizations. Nevertheless, 90 percent see themselves as part of the broader social movement.[7]

The average organization was founded in the late 1980s. However, there is considerable variation and a skewed distribution with 10.9 percent founded before 1970 and 23.9 percent founded since 1996. The majority of these organizations hold a tax-exempt status, and 40 percent of North Carolina environmental groups are tied to a larger organization. Some of these affiliates were founded as part of a larger organizations (e.g. chapters of the Audubon Society or Sierra Club), while others were established as an independent organization and affiliated with a broader umbrella groups at a later point (e.g., NC Conservation Network, Dogwood Alliance, or Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League). Finally, we note that these organizations appear to participate actively in broader coalitions with the average group currently involved in two coalitions.

Environmental Philosophies

We asked respondents a series of questions designed to assess the set of environmental philosophies that characterize their approach to the environment. Specifically, group representatives were asked to indicate how well the following major environmental philosophies fit the group's approach: *game management, conservation, preservation, reform environmentalism, deep ecology, environmental justice, and ecotheology* (see table 1 for question wording).[8] This set of questions and categories is derived from Brulle's (1996) analysis of environmental discourses among national environmental organizations in the U.S. Brulle (2000) categorized groups using their published mission statements (p. 98).[9] Our strategy of measuring environmental philosophies differs from his in two important respects. By asking respondents to assess the "fit" of each statement, we allow organizations to identify with more than one philosophy because we do not see them as mutually exclusive. Second, by using a Likert-type scale for each statement, we allow organizations to vary in their intensity of commitment to particular views rather than treating these as containers within which organizations can be placed. In addition to Brulle's (1996) influential study, Dalton (1994) and others have argued for the central role of environmental beliefs in structuring the field of environmental organizations.[10]

Turning to table 1, we see that the descriptive profile of North Carolina environmental groups confirms some expectations and reveals some surprises. We find that *conservationism, reform environmentalism,* and, *preservationism* are the orientations that groups most embrace. We also find that the philosophies that groups are most likely to disassociate themselves from are *game management, environmental justice*, and *deep ecology*. The prevalence of *ecotheology* is intriguing given the secular characterization of the movement and its participants. This pattern could reflect a regional effect of the Bible Belt or a broader development in the environmental arena. We also measure *philosophical pluralism* as the number of philosophies that respondents indicate "fit very well" the approach of their group. Here, our results show that groups do not sort themselves into a small number of mutually exclusive categories. Instead, they embrace three to four nominally distinct frameworks for understanding the causes, consequences, and possible solutions to environmental problems. Long-standing environmental frameworks of *reform environmentalism, conservation,* and *preservation* garner the most support with fewer groups embracing newer or more radical orientations.

Strategic Orientation

Scholars of social movements have had an enduring interest in the strategies pursued by movements. Prior to answering questions about the adoption of strategies or their efficacy we need a clear picture of the types of strategies that prevail within a movement and their relationship to one another. We asked group representatives to tell us how well a series of twenty-one statements about strategy reflected their group's strategic orientation. As with issues, these strategies were identified through reference to prior scholarship on environ-

mentalism and social movements and an inductive analysis of descriptions and mission statements of North Carolina environmental organizations. Responses to twenty-one separate strategy items were reduced to five scales using a principle components factor analysis with a varimax rotation. Table 1 presents summary statistics and Alpha reliability for each scale as well as brief descriptors of their component questions.

As table 1 shows, moderate and nonconfrontational strategic orientations predominate within the movement. Our measure of a *public awareness* strategy, which includes environmental education, media attention, and outreach, has the highest value, followed by organizing, which builds networks with other environmental groups through local organizing and local solutions. This orientation reflects a broadly held view that environmental objectives can be achieved through greater awareness, knowledge, and cooperation rather than through political conflict and challenge. Nevertheless, an important subset of groups are committed to more assertive strategies and we also find a distinctive strategic orientation that fits early characterizations of new social movements with an emphasis on creating alternative institutions, transforming individual lifestyles, and "prefigurative politics"—modeling the types of changes desired for society as a whole (Brienes 1982; Dalton, Keuchler, and Burklin 1990).

Public Activities

Social movements employ a diverse range of activities and tactics in pursuit of social change, but specific organizations tend to utilize a relatively narrow range of tactics. Following previous research and an inductive cataloging of activities undertaken by North Carolina environmental groups, we asked respondents whether or not their group or individuals acting on behalf of their group engaged in each of 57 different activities during the prior twelve months. These results were subjected to a factor analysis, which guided the construction of eleven distinct scales. (See table 1 for Alpha reliability and descriptive statistics.) A variety of approaches are represented including outsider *citizen action* like writing Op-ed articles and letters to the press and office holders, and *confrontational actions* like protest events and boycotts. Groups that use *partisan electoral* tactics actively support and endorse candidates for office, while those engaging in *voter mobilization* pursue nonpartisan electoral tactics like voter registration and turnout efforts. Organizations seeking to *build environmental networks* sponsor conferences, host environmental leaders from outside North Carolina or abroad, and travel outside the state to forge ties. Other groups make presentations at *local commissions* or *state commissions* or have members appointed to such commissions. Two measures, s*tate lobbying* and *national lobbying,* indicate the extent to which groups consulted with legislative officials or staff to help draft specific pieces of legislation. Finally, *monitoring policy* involves monitoring local, state, and national legislation while *environmental agencies* captures activities related to contacting staff members of local, state and federal regulatory agencies. All activity scales and measures range between 0 and 1.

By far, the most frequent organizational activities are contacting staff at *environmental agencies*, with a mean score of 0.88—much greater than the next most prevalent set of activities. This is an important finding given current scholarship's focus on legislative bodies and courts as targets and arenas of movement claim making. This finding suggests that environmental organizations place an emphasis on policy implementation and on engaging government agencies in this process (Andrews 2001; Gale 1986). Other prevalent activities include *citizen action* (56 percent), *state and local commissions* (both 55 percent), *policy monitoring* (54 percent), and *building environmental networks* (50 percent). Not surprisingly, *state lobbying* (34 percent) is more prevalent in this population than is *national lobbying* (12 percent). Few groups engage in *partisan electoral* activities (11 percent) or *voter mobilization* (8 percent) though there were no statewide or national elections in North Carolina during the year preceding the survey. Lastly, *confrontational direct action* is relatively rare (5 percent).

Perceived Impacts

Four distinct dimensions summarize our measures of organizational influence. These dimensions of impact are success at *group mobilization*, *community recognition*, *political legitimacy*, and *regulatory influence*. The last two measures correspond to Gamson's (1975) categories of "acceptance" and "new advantages." Our measure of community recognition assesses the cultural and social influence that many contemporary movements seek. Respondents completed a bank of twenty-six Likert-style questions about how they perceived their group's impact on its members, community, government, or the environment. Responses ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). Responses were factor analyzed and grouped into the four scales described above. Table 1 presents Alpha reliability results and descriptive statistics for each measure.

These measures are dependent on the self-assessments provided by organizational leaders, so they are shaped by the inherent biases of self-reported evaluations. Although this strategy of measuring organizational influence is rare in studies of political organizations, our strategy is similar to research using subjective assessments of "organizational performance" by representatives of work organizations (e.g., Kalleberg and Moody 1996). We find substantial variation across groups on the same measures, and we find that the basic trend across types of impact is consistent with theoretical expectations. Groups report the greatest success at mobilizing support within their own group, followed by gaining favorable recognition for their organization and its work in the community. On average, groups report much lower impact on political legitimacy (almost a full point lower than group mobilization) and even lower levels of regulatory impact. This rank ordering corresponds to the relative challenge of affecting each of these domains found in studies using independent measures of influence as well as current theoretical models of influence (Andrews 1997, 2004; Burstein et al. 1995; Burstein 1998; Gamson 1975; Giugni 1998).

Geographic Scope

We begin by comparing groups based on the geographic scope of an organization's focus. Overall, we find a preponderance of "localism" in the work of these environmental organizations. In our survey, we asked representatives to indicate which of the following levels described their group's primary focus: (1) neighborhood, 5.3 percent; (2) city/county, 20.3 percent; (3) region in NC, 36.9 percent; (4) entire state, 21.9 percent; (5) region of U.S., 10.7 percent; (6) entire US, 3.7 percent; (7) global or international, 0. Only 14.5 percent focus on environmental concerns beyond the state, and none of the organizations reported that they see the international or global arena as the primary geographic focus for their group. This is a striking finding. Despite the proliferation of a transnational environmental movement, a global focus is not reflected in the orientation of environmental groups that many environmentalists encounter in their communities. Rather, the kinds of environmental groups that have emerged throughout North Carolina reflect a clearly local orientation that is also demonstrated by the issues addressed.

In table 2, we examine whether there are important variations within this population by comparing three categories of an organization's geographic scope of operations—local (neighborhood, city or county), regional within North Carolina, and statewide and/or broader—in terms of organizational demography, environmental philosophy, strategic orientation, public activities, and perceived impact. The organizational demographics indicate a pattern that is surprising on initial review. Local organizations are more likely to be an affiliate of a larger organization (e.g., local chapters of the Audubon Society or Sierra Club), but they are less likely to participate in coalitions. Thus, along one measure they have important extralocal connections through their affiliate status, but local groups are more isolated than regional or statewide groups in terms of their participation in coalitions. Local

Table 2. Geographic Scope of North Carolina Environmental Organizations

	Mean Values			Significance Test		
	Local (n=48)	Regional (n=69)	State (n=68)	Local / Regional	Local / State	Regional / State
Organizational Demography						
Organization age	13.34	16.24	18.91	ns	-	ns
Movement identification	0.85	0.97	0.88	- -	ns	+
Affiliate of larger organization	0.60	0.34	0.33	+ + +	+ + +	ns
Coalitions	1.19	2.25	2.25	- - -	- -	ns
Tax status	0.63	0.90	0.84	- - -	- - -	ns
Task committees	2.89	3.01	3.23	ns	ns	ns
Environmental Philosophy						
Conservationism	4.45	4.46	4.60	ns	ns	ns
Reform environmentalism	4.57	4.51	4.44	ns	ns	ns
Preservationism	4.04	4.00	4.29	ns	ns	ns
Ecotheology	3.55	3.58	3.72	ns	ns	ns
Environmental justice	3.38	3.35	3.45	ns	ns	ns
Game management	3.50	3.13	3.64	ns	ns	-
Deep ecology	3.21	3.48	3.70	ns	-	ns
Discourse Pluralism	3.25	3.45	3.55	ns	ns	ns
Strategic Orientation						
Public Awareness	4.06	4.06	3.90	ns	ns	ns
Organizing	3.05	3.65	3.19	- - -	ns	+ + +
Policy Change	2.84	3.12	3.03	ns	ns	ns
NSM/Prefigurative	2.88	2.92	2.68	ns	ns	ns
Direct Action	2.23	2.32	2.23	ns	ns	ns
Public Activity						
Environmental Agencies	0.69	0.86	0.87	- - -	- - -	ns
Citizen Action	0.47	0.60	0.58	- -	-	ns
State Commissions	0.47	0.59	0.58	ns	ns	ns
Local Commissions	0.47	0.58	0.55	ns	ns	ns
Monitoring Policy	0.35	0.60	0.60	- - -	- - -	ns
Building Networks	0.35	0.54	0.56	- - -	- - -	ns
State Lobbying	0.20	0.36	0.42	- -	- - -	ns
National Lobbying	0.01	0.10	0.22	- -	- - -	- -
Partisan Electoral	0.18	0.08	0.08	+ +	+ +	ns
Voter Mobilization	0.18	0.03	0.05	+ + +	+ +	ns
Confrontational Action	0.02	0.04	0.08	ns	ns	ns
Perceived Impact						
Group Mobilization	3.66	3.76	3.53	ns	ns	+
Community Recognition	3.27	3.52	3.29	-	ns	+
Political Legitimacy	2.69	2.77	2.57	ns	ns	ns
Regulatory Impact	2.09	2.28	2.07	ns	ns	ns

Notes: Significance (two-tailed) when the category listed first has a higher value than the comparison group: $+$ $p < .10$, $++$ $p < .05$, $+++$ $p < .01$. Significance (two-tailed) when the category listed first has a lower value than the comparison group: $-$ $p < .10$, $--$ $p < .05$, $---$ $p < .01$.

groups are less formalized as measured by nonprofit tax status, although there is no statistically significant difference in the number of task committees.

We find no major differences in the environmental philosophies of local, regional, or statewide groups. Similarly, there are minimal differences in their strategic orientations. One exception is that regional groups are more likely to contact environmental agencies, monitor policy, build networks, and lobby at the state and national level. Although their strategic orientations are similar, their pattern of public activity shows clear differences. In particular, local groups are less likely to contact environmental agencies, monitor policy, build networks, lobby at the state or national level, or internally communicate. Further, local groups are significantly more likely than both regional and state-wide environmental organizations to engage in partisan electoral activities and nonpartisan voter mobilization efforts. This pattern is consistent with their reduced likelihood of having a tax-exempt status, which constrains engagement in partisan electoral actions. Overall regional and state-wide organizations are quite similar, although regional groups are less likely to lobby at the national level.

Finally, as with environmental philosophies and strategic orientations, there are few differences related to perceived impacts. Still, local groups see themselves as less effective at community recognition than regional groups. In addition, regional groups see themselves as more successful at mobilization and gaining community recognition than state groups.

VOLUNTARY AND PROFESSIONALIZED ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Professionalization is considered one of the most consequential characteristics of movement organizations (Oliver 1983; Staggenborg 1988, 1991). Critics have argued that reliance on paid staff displaces volunteer participation and leads to greater focus on organizational maintenance and less responsiveness to constituency concerns. By contrast, others have argued that staff can, under certain conditions, develop programs and activities that provide a "supply" of accessible volunteer opportunities and are able to mobilize greater participation than groups that rely solely upon volunteer leadership (Edwards and McCarthy 2004). We examine the relationship between volunteer and paid leadership and broader organizational characteristics in the environmental arena.

We find that the dichotomous conceptualization of professionalized versus voluntary does not reflect the major organizational forms in the environmental arena. For this analysis we divide North Carolina environmental groups into three categories. *Voluntary* groups (41.6 percent) are those that have no paid staff and, thus, undertake all of their activities with volunteer labor. *Mixed* groups (30.9 percent) have paid staff, but also rely on volunteers to carry out organizational activities and administration. *Fully professionalized* groups (27.5 percent) employ paid staff, but do not mobilize any volunteer labor.

In table 3 we compare voluntary, mixed, and professional organizations in relation to our set of major organizational characteristics. *Voluntary* groups are younger, less involved in coalitions, less likely to have nonprofit tax status, and have fewer task committees than *mixed* groups. Compared to *fully professionalized* groups, voluntary ones are also more likely to be affiliated with a larger organization, but less likely to have nonprofit tax status and to be involved in coalitions. When compared to fully professionalized groups, those with a mixed operating strategy are more likely to be affiliated with a larger organization and a larger number of task committees.

Overall, there are few differences in the environmental philosophies employed by voluntary, fully professionalized, and mixed organizations. Voluntary groups demonstrate greater pluralism, which most likely stems from their greater propensity to utilize ecotheology and deep ecology frameworks than mixed groups. Mixed groups are less likely to endorse environmental justice than fully professionalized environmental organizations. Thus, we find some modest support for the idea that voluntary groups hold more radical orientations, but

Table 3: Voluntarism and Professionalization of North Carolina Environmental Organizations

	Mean Values			*Significance Test*		
	Voluntary (n=74)	Mixed (n=55)	Professional (n=49)	Voluntary/ Mixed	Voluntary/ Professional	Mixed/ Professional
Organizational Demography						
Organization age	14.69	20.76	15.58	- -	ns	ns
Movement identification	0.90	0.91	0.94	ns	ns	ns
Affiliate of larger organization	0.47	0.43	0.25	ns	+ + +	+
Coalitions	1.36	2.51	2.57	- - -	- - -	ns
Tax status	0.62	0.95	0.96	- - -	- - -	ns
Task committees	2.32	4.45	2.82	- - -	ns	+ + +
Environmental Philosophy						
Reform environmentalism	4.63	4.37	4.48	ns	ns	ns
Conservationism	4.33	4.57	4.56	ns	ns	ns
Preservationism	4.13	4.13	4.11	ns	ns	ns
Ecotheology	3.86	3.25	3.68	+ +	ns	ns
Deep ecology	3.70	3.13	3.53	+ +	ns	ns
Environmental justice	3.42	2.96	3.75	ns	ns	- - -
Game management	3.49	3.44	3.28	ns	ns	ns
Discourse Pluralism	3.78	2.96	3.45	+ +	ns	ns
Strategic Orientation						
Public Awareness	3.90	4.04	4.08	ns	ns	ns
Organizing	3.46	3.17	3.38	ns	ns	ns
Policy Change	3.36	2.63	3.03	+ + +	+	-
Prefigurative ("NSM")	3.03	2.55	2.79	+ +	ns	ns
Direct Action	2.41	2.22	2.21	ns	ns	ns
Public Activity						
Environmental Agencies	0.78	0.86	0.88	ns	-	ns
Citizen Action	0.58	0.54	0.58	ns	ns	ns
State Commissions	0.43	0.66	0.64	- - -	- - -	ns
Local Commissions	0.51	0.61	0.56	ns	ns	ns
Monitoring Policy	0.53	0.55	0.57	ns	ns	ns
Building Networks	0.37	0.61	0.62	- - -	- - -	ns
State Lobbying	0.24	0.39	0.46	- -	- - -	ns
National Lobbying	0.05	0.16	0.20	- -	- - -	ns
Partisan Electoral	0.20	0.07	0.02	+ + +	+ + +	+
Voter Mobilization	0.12	0.06	0.05	ns	ns	ns
Confrontational Action	0.06	0.05	0.03	ns	ns	ns
Perceived Impact						
Group Mobilization	3.65	3.80	3.52	ns	ns	+
Community Recognition	3.34	3.40	3.49	ns	ns	ns
Political Legitimacy	2.70	2.68	2.71	ns	ns	ns
Regulatory Impact	2.36	1.94	2.20	+ +	ns	ns

Notes: Significance (two-tailed) when the category listed first has a higher value than the comparison group: + p < .10, ++ p < .05, +++ p < .01. Significance (two-tailed) when the category listed first has a lower value than the comparison group: - p < .10, -- p < .05, --- p < .01.

overall we find that environmental philosophies do not vary greatly in relation to profes-sionalization. All three types of organizations are equally likely to pursue public awareness, organizing, and direct action strategies. However, voluntary groups are more likely to pursue policy changes than both moderately and fully professionalized groups. They are also more likely to use a prefigurative strategy promoting environmental change by modeling sus-tainable life-styles and communities and promoting alternative organizations and products. Not surprisingly, fully professionalized groups are more likely to support legislative strate-gies than mixed ones.

Turning to activities, we see that voluntary groups are the most likely to engage in par-tisan electoral activities while the fully professionalized groups are least likely to do so. The greater involvement in partisan politics by voluntary groups is an important pattern given the broader debates about how professionalization may foster greater conservatism in organi-zations. This relationship is likely connected to the role of tax-exempt status as it constrains partisan activity. Voluntary groups are less likely than both other types to build environmental networks, participate in state environmental or resource management commissions, or engage in state or national level lobbing. In addition they are less likely to contact staff of local, state or federal environmental agencies.

We find that professionalization does not have a strong relationship to a group's per-ceived impact. Most notable is that the mixed groups see themselves as more successful at mobilization than fully professionalized groups. Voluntary groups consider themselves to be more successful at influencing policy than mixed groups.

In sum, voluntary groups are the most distinctive organizational type. Volunteer-based groups are less involved in coalitions and less engaged in state and national level lobbying and with state resource commissions. They embrace a wider array of environmental philoso-phies and are more involved in partisan politics, which is consistent with their reduced likelihood of having a federal tax status. We find very few differences between the moder-ately and fully professionalized environmental organizations. Compared to the fully profess-sionalized groups the mixed groups tend to be affiliates of larger organizations with more internal task committees and report greater success in mobilizing people for action and greater involvement in partisan politics.

DISRUPTIVE TACTICAL REPERTOIRE

As our final set of comparisons, we examine groups in relation to their tactical repertoire. A long line of research has examined the causes and consequences of tactical repertoires within social movements (Gamson 1990; Ganz 2000; McAdam 1982, 1983, Minkoff 1999, Piven and Cloward 1979, Tarrow 1998, Zald and Ash 1966). For our analyses, we divided groups into three categories. First, groups used *disruption* (8.2 percent) if they engaged in unruly or disruptive actions such as blocking roads or unauthorized sit-ins. Second, groups used *protest* (39.3 percent) if they organized or participated in rallies or demonstrations locally or in the state capitol. Third, groups used *moderate* tactics (53.5 percent) if they used neither disruption nor protest relying instead on "insider" tactics as well as activities focused on education and awareness. By distinguishing between *disruption* and *protest* we attempt to separate the relatively small number of groups that use more assertive and unruly direct action tactics from the much larger number of groups that organize legal, permitted rallies and demonstrations in cooperation with local authorities. Recent studies of protest have shown that a large proportion of events are highly routinized, following clear norms and involving extensive collaboration between protest leaders and authorities (McCarthy et al. 1996; McCarthy and McPhail 1998; Oliver and Maney 2000; Oliver and Myers 1999).

In table 4 we examine differences between organizations that use disruptive, protest, and tactical repertoires. It shows that disruptive groups are younger, less likely to be affiliated

Table 4: Use of Disruption and Protest by North Carolina Environmental Organizations

	Mean Values			*Significance Test*		
	Disruption (n=15)	Protest (n=72)	Moderate (n=94)	Disruption / Protest	Disruption/ Moderate	Protest / Moderate
Organizational Demography						
Organization age	9.53	16.06	18.12	-	- -	ns
Movement identification	1.00	0.97	0.84	ns	ns	+++
Affiliate of larger organization	0.13	0.45	0.40	--	- -	ns
Coalitions	3.80	2.50	1.23	+	+++	+++
Tax status	0.67	0.79	0.83	ns	ns	ns
Task committees	2.20	2.77	3.36	ns	ns	ns
Environmental Philosophy						
Reform environmentalism	4.87	4.64	4.34	ns	++	++
Conservationism	4.60	4.58	4.39	ns	ns	ns
Preservationism	4.00	4.31	3.96	ns	ns	-
Ecotheology	4.20	3.72	3.48	ns	+	ns
Deep ecology	4.07	3.69	3.22	ns	++	++
Environmental justice	4.27	4.07	2.74	ns	+++	+++
Game management	2.93	3.25	3.58	ns	ns	ns
Discourse Pluralism	4.33	3.91	2.90	ns	+++	+++
Strategic Orientation						
Public Awareness	4.20	4.07	3.93	ns	ns	ns
Organizing	3.95	3.65	3.00	ns	+++	+++
Policy Change	3.69	3.44	2.59	ns	+++	+++
Prefigurative ("NSM")	3.51	2.95	2.64	+	+++	+
Direct Action	2.80	2.44	2.06	+	+++	+++
Public Activity						
Environmental Agencies	0.96	0.88	0.75	ns	++	+++
Citizen Action	0.84	0.80	0.34	ns	+++	+++
State Commissions	0.79	0.49	0.55	+++	+	ns
Local Commissions	0.80	0.58	0.47	+	+++	+
Monitoring Policy	0.82	0.62	0.43	+	+++	+++
Building Networks	0.69	0.58	0.40	ns	+++	+++
State Lobbying	0.53	0.40	0.25	ns	+++	+++
National Lobbying	0.27	0.15	0.07	ns	+++	++
Partisan Electoral	0.33	0.15	0.04	++	+++	+++
Voter Mobilization	0.33	0.10	0.02	+++	+++	+++
Confrontational Action	na	na	na	na	na	na
Perceived Impact						
Group Mobilization	4.11	3.54	3.68	++	+	ns
Community Recognition	3.96	3.33	3.31	+++	+++	ns
Political Legitimacy	3.30	2.76	2.50	++	+++	+
Regulatory Impact	3.05	2.50	1.73	+	+++	+++

Notes: Significance (two-tailed) when the category listed first has a higher value than the comparison group: + p < .10, ++ p < .05, +++ p < .01. Significance (two-tailed) when the category listed first has a lower value than the comparison group: - p < .10, -- p < .05, --- p < .01.

with a larger organization and participate in more coalitions than groups using protest or moderate tactics. Groups using protest are more likely to identify with the environmental movement and participate in more coalitions than moderates. Nevertheless, fully 84 percent of the moderate groups identify themselves as part of the environmental movement.

Turning to environmental philosophies the most notable pattern is the lack of significant differences between groups that use disruptive tactics and those that use less confrontational protest. Both have greater enthusiasm for reform environmentalism, environmental justice, and deep ecology than do moderate groups. Moreover, they evidence greater philosophical pluralism than the groups with a more conventional repertoire. Thus, a group's discursive radicalism is associated with its tactical radicalism.

All of the groups are equally likely to use public awareness strategies, which include environmental education and media outreach. Yet, moderates are less likely than both disruptive and protest groups to use all of the other social change strategies. Disruptive groups are, however, more likely than protest groups to endorse direct action strategies that include litigation and boycotts; nor do they seek a moderate public image. They are also more likely than protesters to support a prefigurative strategy of modeling sustainable lifestyles and communities.

The broad pattern of results for undertaking specific activities is similar to the one above for social change strategies. Disruptive groups are more likely than protesters to make presentations or speak at local and state commissions and more likely to monitor policy at the local, state, and national levels. They are also more likely to undertake electoral political activities, including both voter mobilization and partisan activities such as endorsing candidates, participating in political party events, and raising money for candidates.

Disruptive groups see themselves as more successful across all four dimensions of impact than demonstrators or moderates, while demonstrators see themselves having more policy influence than moderates. As self-reported measures, these data must be treated with caution. At a minimum, these patterns challenge the notion that confrontational tactics are associated with a collective sense of desperation. Moreover, these findings are consistent with Gamson's (1975) findings and other research broadly examining movement influence that point to the collective efficacy of more assertive tactics.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The groups in this study work on issues including pollution, natural resource conservation or preservation, wildlife, urban and coastal sprawl, energy, sustainability, and environmental justice, to name a few. Also, included are concerns about the "built environment" such as occupational health and safety, lead paint, and sprawl. Like most social movement organizations, the groups involved often pursue environmental issues as one part of a broader agenda. Numerous studies have focused on a single subset of the environmental sector such as environmental justice. This selective attention leads some scholars to exaggerate the distinctiveness or even the prevalence of organizational characteristics. For example, Cable and Benson (1993) argue that the presence and recognition of environmental injustice are necessary for the emergence of grassroots environmental groups (see also Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992). Yet, many local and voluntary organizations are motivated by other factors such as traditional preservationist goals or concerns about economic growth and development. Other scholars have focused on a single dichotomy such as the distinction between mainstream (i.e., professional) and grassroots organizations (e.g., Salazar 1996; Shaffer 1995), but we find dichotomizing the organizational field also has the effect of obscuring our understanding of the population of movement organizations. Even the contrast of national and local environmental organizations has some limitations as many local organizations are the affiliates of broader national organizations and other local groups engage national legislative and

regulatory processes. These groups and their relationships to the broader environmental movement are missing from characterizations based on national organizations and often are included only selectively in most analyses of local and/or grassroots groups. Our study confirms findings from several prior studies about the prevalence and the tactical and issue diversity of local environmentalism. For example, our findings support Kempton et al.'s (2001: 575) claim that local environmental groups are "more numerous, more diverse, and more politically focused than suggested by most of the research literature on the environmental movement" (see also Ansell 2002).

Our objectives in this article include generating a more comprehensive and complex understanding of contemporary environmentalism and environmental organizations. The descriptive findings presented here offer new insights and question taken for granted assumptions. For example, the moderate ideological, strategic, and tactical orientation of the groups in this study combined with the self-defined affiliation with the environmental movement challenge assumptions about the boundaries between interest groups and social movements. Our analysis of the environmental philosophies of organizations shows that groups are more pluralistic than many analysts would assume and less easily categorized. The size and scope of the environmental sector in North Carolina raise questions about the predominant focus of research at the national and increasingly international level.

The disproportionate focus on national and transnational arenas has led us to neglect many aspects of organizational form, mobilization potential, and political contention at the local level. Our analysis finds that groups relying on a mixture of volunteers and professionals are more formalized and report greater levels of success at mobilizing people than groups that rely entirely on volunteers or professionals. Importantly, we also find that volunteer-based organizations are more likely to have strategic orientations and a profile of activities based on the pursuit of political and social change. In other words, they more closely resemble broader conceptions of social movement actors through their pursuit of electoral activities and their use of a new social movement framework. However, somewhat surprisingly, volunteer groups are no more likely to use confrontational direct action tactics than even fully professionalized groups. When examining the tactical repertoire of groups, our findings suggest that those that engage in disruptive and routinized protest tend to be more similar to one another than to those moderate groups that do not protest. This is especially true for a group's environmental philosophy, strategic orientation, and public activities. Thus, despite the important variation across types of protest, our findings suggest that the key difference is between groups that engage in any type of protest and those that do not.

Taken as a whole, these patterns invite a broader focus on the characteristics of local movement organizations to advance core questions in the field. The kind of cross-sectional analysis of a population of organizations can speak to ongoing debates about strategy, tactics, ideologies, and organizational structures, as we have done here. An especially promising strategy would combine the kinds of surveys used here with fieldwork, in-depth interviews, or organizational records. Moreover, this focus on populations of local movement organizations can be extended to further questions and topics such as the recruitment and development of leaders, the mobilization of resources, and the relationship between movements, the state, and other institutions such as the media, churches, and schools.

NOTES

[1] Given its prominence among contemporary social movements and the volume of environmental literature in the popular press, surprisingly little sociological research exists on American environmentalism. For exceptions, see, Brown and Mikkelson 1990, Brulle 2000, Carmin 1999, Carmin and Balser 2002, Dunlap and Mertig 1992, Gale 1986, Kempton et al. 2001, Lichterman 1996, Siriani and Friedland 2001, Szasz 1994.

[2] See Klandermans and Smith 2002 and Knoke et al 2002 for overviews. For key studies, see Chaves et al. (1999) on religious congregations, Kalleberg et al. (1996) on workplaces, Knoke (1990) and McPherson and Rotolo (1995) on voluntary associations, Galaskiewicz and Bielefeld (1998) and Gronbjerg and Paarlberg (2001) on nonprofit organizations.

[3] Our inclusive strategy will allow us to assess the differences and the distributions of single and multi-issue groups, and the overlap between environmentalism and proximate domains of movement activity in subsequent papers.

[4] We recognize that there are a small number of states or cities (e.g., New York, Washington, DC) where using geographic location would lead to a much larger subset of organizations with a national and international focus. However, this strategy of using a region, state, or metropolitan area is appropriate for the vast majority of settings. See Ansell's (2003) analysis of environmental organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area for one example using a strategy like ours in a location with a higher proportion of national and international organizations.

[5] Some respondents preferred to complete a written version of the survey (n = 68).

[6] For example, see Beamish (2002), Brown and Mikkelson (1990), Edelstein (1988), Freudenberg (1984a), Pellow (2002), Roberts and Tofflon-Weiss (2001), Satterfield (2002), Szasz (1994), Walsh et al. (1997).

[7] Martin (1990) raised this same question in regard to organizations that served feminist goals, but did not meet narrower ideological criteria for feminist organizational forms.

[8] We underscore the point that our survey asked respondent's to characterize the philosophy of the group rather than their own point of view.

[9] We have not included two of the categories used by Brulle—manifest destiny and eco-feminism—because our preliminary assessment based on available organizational documents suggested that these discourses were not common within the North Carolina environmental movement.

[10] Carmin and Balser (2002) have challenged the limitation of this approach for explaining organizational strategy and tactics arguing that experience, core values, and political ideology contribute to group action. Dreiling and Wolf (2001) challenge the focus on environmental philosophy arguing for a political economy analysis that includes a group's "material-organizational dependencies."

REFERENCES

Amenta, Edwin, Drew Halfmann, and Michael P. Young. 1999. "The Strategies and Context of Social Protest: Political Mediation and the Impact of the Townsend Movement in California." *Mobilization* 4: 1-23.

Andrews, Kenneth T. 1997. "The Impacts of Social Movements on the Political Process: The Civil Rights Movement and Black Electoral Politics in Mississippi." *American Sociological Review* 62: 800-819.

———. 2001. "Social Movements and Policy Implementation: The Mississippi Civil Rights Movement and the War on Poverty, 1965-1971." *American Sociological Review* 66: 71-95.

———. 2004. *"Freedom is a Constant Struggle": The Mississippi Civil Rights Movement and Its Legacy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Andrews, Kenneth T., and Bob Edwards. 2004. "Advocacy Organizations in the U.S. Political Process." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 30:479-506.

Andrews, Richard. 1999. *Managing the Environment, Managing Ourselves*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ansell, Christopher. 2003. "Community Embeddedness and Collaborative Governance in the San Francisco Bay Area Environmental Movement." Pp. 123-144 in *Social Movements and Networks*, Mario Diani and Doug McAdam, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arp III, William, and Chistopher Kenny. 1996. "Black Environmentalism in the Local Community Context." *Environment and Behavior* 28(3): 267-282.

Baumgartner, Frank R., and Beth L. Leech. 1998. *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and in Political Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Beamish, Thomas. 2002. *Silent Spill: The Organization of an Industrial Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bernard, Ted, and Jora Young. 1997. *The Ecology of Hope: Communities Collaborate for Sustainability*. Philadelphia: New Society Press.

Berry, Jeffrey M. 1977. *Lobbying for the People: The Political Behavior of Public Interest Groups*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Berry, Jeffrey M. 2000. *The New Liberalism: The Rising Power of Citizen Groups*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Bowman, Karlyn. 1996. "Attitudes Toward the Environment Twenty-Five Years After Earth Day." Pp. 179-189 in *Linking Science and Technology to Society's Environmental Goals,* National Research Council, eds. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Boyte, Harry. 1980. *The Backyard Revolution: Understanding the New Citizens Movement.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Brienes, Wini. 1982. *Organization and Community in the New Left, 1962-1968: The Great Refusal.* New York: Praeger.

Brown, Phil, and Edwin Mikkelson. 1990. *No Safe Place: Toxic Waste, Leuekemia and Community Action.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brulle, Robert J. 1996. "Environmental Discourse and Social Movement Organizations: A Historical and Rhetorical Perspective on the Development of U.S. Environmental Organizations." *Sociological Inquiry* 66(1): 58-83.

———. 2000. *Agency, Democracy, and Nature: The U.S. Environmental Movement from a Critical Theory Perspective.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bullard, Robert. 1990. *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality.* Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.

Burstein, Paul, Rachel Einwohner, and Jocellyn Hollander. 1995. "The Success of Social Movements: A Bargaining Perspective." Pp. 275-295 in *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements*, C. Craig Jenkins and Bert Klandermans, eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Burstein, Paul. 1998. "Interest Organizations, Political Parties, and the Study of Democratic Politics." Pp. 39-56 in *Social Movements and American Political Institutions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

———. 1999. "Social Movements and Public Policy." Pp 3-21 in *How Social Movements Matter*, Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly, eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cable, Sherry, and Michael Benson. 1993. "Acting Locally: Environmental Justice and Emergence of Grassroots Environmental Organizations." *Social Problems* 40: 464-77.

Carmin, JoAnn. 1999. "Voluntary Associations, Professional Organizations, and the Environmental Movement in the United States." *Environmental Politics* 8: 101-121.

Carmin, JoAnn and Deborah B. Balser. 2002. "Selecting Repertoires of Action in Environmental Movement Organizations: An Interpretive Approach." *Organization & Environment* 15: 365-388.

Chaves, Mark, Mary Ellen Konieczny, Kraig Beyerlein, and Emily Barman. 1999. "The National Congregations Study: Background, Methods, and Selected Results." *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion* 38: 458-476.

Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1997. *The People's Lobby : Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cress, Daniel, and David Snow. 1996. "Mobilization at the Margins: Resources, Benefactors, and Viability of Homeless Social Movement Organization." *American Sociological Review* 61: 1089-1109.

Dalton, Russell, and Manfred Kuechler, and W. Burklin. 1990. "The Challenge of New Movements." Pp. 3-20 in *Challenging the Political Order: New Social Movements in Western Democracies,* Russell Dalton and Manfred Kuechler, eds. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dalton, Russell. 1994. *The Green Rainbow.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dreiling, Michael and Brian Wolf. 2001. "Environmental Movement Organizations and Political Strategy." *Organization & Environment* 14: 34-126.

Dunlap, Riley E., and Angela G. Mertig, eds. 1992. *American Environmentalism: The U.S. Environmental Movement, 1970-1990.* Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.

Edelstein, Michael. 1988. *Contaminated Communities: The Social and Psychological Impacts of Residential Toxic Exposure.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Edwards, Bob, and Kenneth T. Andrews. 2002. "Methodological Strategies for Examining Populations of Social Movement Organizations." Paper to be presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, IL, August 2002.

Edwards, Bob, and Michael W. Foley. 2003. "Social Movement Organizations Beyond the Beltway: Understanding the Diversity of One Social Movement Industry." *Mobilization* 8 (1): 85-105.

Edwards, Bob, and Sam Marullo. 1995. "Organizational Mortality in a Declining Social Movement: The Demise of Peace Movement Organizations in the End of the Cold War Era." *American Sociological Review* 60(6): 908-927.

Edwards, Bob, and John D. McCarthy. 2004. "Resources and Social Movement Mobilization." Pp. 116-152 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi, eds. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Ferree, Myra Marx, and Patrcia Yancy Martin, eds. 1995. *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Freudenberg, Nicholas. 1984a. *Not in Our Backyards! Community Action for Health and the Environment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Freudenberg, Nicholas. 1984b. "Citizen Action for Environmental Health: Report on a Survey of Community Organizations." *American Journal of Public Health*, 74: 444-448.

Gale, Richard. 1986. "Social Movements and the State: The Environmental Movement, Counter-movement, and Government Agencies." *Sociological Perspectives* 29: 202-240.

Galaskiewicz, Joseph and Wolfgang Bielefeld. 1998. *Nonprofit Organizations in an Age of Uncertainty*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Gamson, William A. 1990 [1975] . *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Ganz, Marshall. 2000. "The Paradox of Powerlessness: Leadership, Organization, and Strategy in the Unionization of California Agriculture, 1959-1977." *American Journal of Sociology* 105: 1003-1062.

Gottlieb, Robert. 1993. *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Gray, Virginia, and David Lowery. 1996. *The Population Ecology of Interest Representation: Lobbying Communities in the American States*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Gronberg, Kristen A., and Laurie Paarlberg. 2001. "Community Variations in the Size of the Nonprofit Sector: Theory and Preliminary Findings." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 30: 684-706.

Hall, Bob and Mary Lee Kerr. 1991. *1991-1992 Green Index*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Hays, Samuel P. 1958. *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1980-1920.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jenkins, J. Craig. 1987. "Nonprofit Organizations and Policy Advocacy." Pp. 296-318 in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, Walter W. Powell, ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kalleberg, Arne L., and James Moody. 1996. "Human Resource Management and Organizational Pefor-mance." Pp. 113-129 in *Organizations in America*, Arne L. Kalleberg, David Knoke, Peter V. Marsden, and Joe L. Spaeth, eds. London: Sage Publications.

Katzenstein, Mary F. 1998. *Faithful and Fearless: Moving Feminist Protest Inside the Church and Military.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kempton, Willett, Dorthy C. Holland, Katherine Bunting-Howarth, Eirc Hannan, Christopher Payne. 2001. "Local Environmental Groups: A Systematic Enumeration in Two Geographic Areas." *Rural Sociology* 66(4): 557-578.

Klandermans, Bert, and Jackie Smith. 2002. "Survey Research: A Case for Comparative Designs," Pp. 3-31 in *Methods of Social Movement Research* Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg, eds. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Knoke, David. 1990. *Organizing for Collective Action: The Political Economies of Associations*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Knoke, David, Peter V. Marsden, and Arne L. Kalleberg. 2002. "Survey Research Methods." Pp. 781-804 in *The Blackwell Companion to Organizations* Joel A. C. Baum, ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Knoke, David, and James R. Wood. 1981. *Organized for Action: Commitment in Voluntary Associations*. New Brunswick, NJ.: Rutgers University Press.

Kraft, Michael E. and Norman J. Vig. 2000. "Environmental Policy from the 1970s to 2000." Pp. 1-31 in *Environmental Policy*, Norman J. Vig and Michael E. Kraft, eds. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Kromm, Chris, Keith Ernst, and Jaffer Battica. 2001. *Gold and Green: Debunking the "Jobs vs. the Environment" Myth*. Durham, NC: Institute for Southern Studies.

Lester, James P. 1994. "A New Federalism? Environmental Policy in the States." Pp. 51-68 in *Environmental Policy in the 1990s*, Norman J. Vig and Michael E. Kraft, eds. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

———. ed. 1995. *Environmental Politics and Policy: Theories and Evidence*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Martin, Patricia Yancy. 1990. "Rethinking Feminist Organizations." *Gender & Society*. 4(2): 182-206.

McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1983. "Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency." *American Sociological Review* 48: 735-754.

McCarthy, John D., and Mayer Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 1212-1241.

McCarthy, John D., and Clark McPhail. 1998. "The Institutionalization of Protest in the United States." Pp. 83-110 in *The Social Movement Society,* David S. Meyer and Sidney Tarrow, eds. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

McCarthy, John D., Clark McPhail, and Jackie Smith. 1996. "Images of Protest: Dimensions of Selection Bias in Media Coverage of Washington Demonstrations, 1982 and 1991." *American Sociological Review* 61: 478-499.

McCarthy, John D., and Mark Wolfson. 1996. "Resource Mobilization by Local Social Movement Organizations: Agency, Strategy, and Organization in the Movement Against Drinking and Driving." *American Sociological Review* 61(6): 1070-1088.

McLaughlin, Paul and Marwan Khawaja. 2000. "The Organizational Dynamics of the U.S. Environmental Movement: Legitimation, Resource Mobilization, and Political Opportunity." *Rural Sociology* 65: 422-439.

McPherson, J. Miller and Thomas Rotolo. 1995 "Measuring the Composition of Voluntary Groups: A Multitrait, Multimethod Analysis." *Social Forces* 73(3): 1097-1115.

Mertig, Angela G., Riley E. Dunlap, and Denton E. Morrison. 2001. "The Environmental Movement in the United States." Pp. 448-481 in *The Handbook of Environmental Sociology*, Riley E. Dunlap and William Michelson*,* eds. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Meyer, David S., and Sidney Tarrow. 1998. *The Social Movement Society*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Minkoff, Debra C. 1995. *Organizing for equality: The Evolution of Women's and Racial Ethnic Organizations in America, 1955-1985*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

———. 1999. "Bending with the Wind: Strategic Change and Adaptation by Women's and Racial Minority Organizations." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1666-1703.

Mitchell, Robert, Angela G. Mertig, and Riley E. Dunlap. 1992. "Twenty Years of Environmental Mobilization: Trends Among National Environmental Organizations." Pp. 11-26 in *American Environmentalism: The U.S. Environmental Movement, 1970-199,* Riley E. Dunlap and Angela G. Mertig, eds. Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.

Molotch, Harvey. 1976. "The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place." *The American Journal of Sociology* 82(2): 309-332.

Morell, David. 1987. "Siting and the Politics of Equity." Pps. 117-136 in *Resolving Locational Conflict,* Robert W. Lake, ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Morrell, David, and Christopher Magorian. 1982. "Risk, Fear, and Local Opposition: 'Not in My Backyard'." Pp. 21-46 in *Siting Hazardous Waste Facilities: Local Opposition and the Myth of Preemption*, David Morell and Christopher Magorian, eds. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Oliver, Pamela. 1983. "The Mobilization of Paid and Volunteer Activists in the Neighborhood Movement." *Research on Social Movements, Conflict, and Change* 5: 133-70.

Oliver, Pamela, and Gregory M. Maney. 2000. "Political Cycles and Local Newspaper Coverage of Protest Events: From Selection Bias to Triadic Interactions." *American Journal of Sociology* 106: 463-505.

Oliver, Pamela, and Daniel Myers. 1999. "How Events Enter the Public Sphere: Conflict, Location, and Sponsorship in Local Newspaper Coverage of Public Events." *American Journal of Sociology* 105: 38-87.

Pellow, David N. 2002. *Garbage Wars: The Struggle for Environmental Justice in Chicago*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Piven, Frances F., and Richard Cloward. 1979. *Poor People's Movements: Why they Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage

Rabe, Barry G. 2000. "Power to the States: The Promise and Pitfalls of Decentralization." Pp. 32-54 in *Environmental Policy* Norman J. Vig and Michael E. Kraft, eds. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Ringquist, Evan J. 1993. *Environmental Protection at the State Level*. Armonk, NJ: M.E. Sharpe.

Roberts, Timmons, and Melissa Toffolon-Weiss. 2001. *Chronicles from the Environmental Justice Frontline*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University. Press.

Rothman, Hal K. 1997. *The Greening of a Nation? Environmentalism in the United States Since 1945*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth

Salazar, Debra J. 1996. "The Mainstream-Grassroots Divide in the Environmental Movement: Environmental Groups in Washington State." *Social Science Quarterly* 77: 626-643.

Sale, Kirkpatrick. 1993. *The Green Revolution: The American Environmental Movement, 1962-1992*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Satterfield, Terre. 2003. *Anatomy of a Conflict: Identity, Knowledge, and Emotion in Old-Growth Forests*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Schrepfer, Susan R. 1983. *The Fight to Save the Redwoods: A History of Environmental Reform, 1917-1978*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Schlozman, Kay Lehman, and John T. Tierney. 1986. *Organized Interests and American Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.

Schnaiberg, Nicholas Watts, and Klaus Zimmerman, eds. 1986. *Distributional Conflict in Environmental Resource Policy*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Shabecof, Philip. 1993. *A Fierce Green Fire: The American Environmental Movement.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Shaffer, Martin B. 1995. "The Internal Dynamics of Environmental Organizations: Movement Interest Groups, Communal Advocacy Groups, and the Policy Process." *Policy Studies Review* 14: 183-95.

Shaiko, Ronald G. 1999. *Voices and Echoes for the Environment: Public Interest Representation in the 1990s and Beyond*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Shutkin, William. 2000. *The Land That Could Be: Environmentalism and Democracy in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press.

Sirianni, Carmen, and Lewis Friedland. 2001. *Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy, and the Movement for Civic Reform*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Smith, Jackie. 1997. "Characteristics of the Modern Transnational Social Movement Sector." Pp. 42-58 in *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*, Jackie Smith, Ronald Pagnucco, and Charles Chatfield, eds. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1988. "The Consequences of Professionalization and Formalization in the Pro-Choice Movement." *American Sociological Review* 53:585-606.

———. 1991. *The Pro-Choice Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Szasz, Andrew. 1994. *Ecopopulism: Toxic Waste and the Movement of Environmental Justice.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tesh, Sylvia Noble. 2000. *Uncertain Hazards: Environmental Activists and Scientific Proof*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Walsh, Edward J., Rex Warland, and D. Clayton Smith. 1997. *Don't Burn It Here Grassroots Challenges to Trash Incinerators*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.

Warner, Kee, and Harvey Molotch. 2001. *Building Rules: How Local Controls Shape Community Environments and Economies*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Weick, Karl. 1976. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21: 1-19.

Weinberg, Adam S. 1997. "Local Organizing for Environmental Conflict: Explaining Differences Beteen Cases of Participation and Nonparticipation." *Organization & Environment* 10:194-216.

White, Lynn, Jr. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155: 1203-1207.

Whittier, Nancy. 1995. *Feminist Generations: The Persistence of the Radical Women's Movement.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Zald, Mayer N., and Roberta Ash. 1966. "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay, and Change." *Social Forces* 44: 327-341.