

# *The Organizational Demography of Japanese Environmentalism\**

---

**Erik W. Johnson, *Washington State University***

**Yoshitaka Saito, *International University of Health and Welfare***

**Makoto Nishikido, *Hosei University***

## **Abstract**

Although a macro-organizational perspective has become increasingly commonplace in social movement analyses, few studies examine the full spectrum of organizations in any single social movement industry (SMI). Utilizing a unique source of data on Japanese environmental movement organizations, we compare characteristics of groups focused primarily on environmental issues with those for whom environmental issues are part of a larger multi-issue focus. We then profile across distinct, and theoretically important, organizational domains to assess how local, prefectural and national groups compare on a variety of organizational attributes, including: size, membership type, tactics and activities, and issues. We conclude by discussing the implications of our findings for understanding both Japanese environmentalism and the structure of SMIs generally.

In the nearly three decades since McCarthy and Zald (1977, 2002) and Zald and McCarthy (1987) first introduced an explicit organizational perspective into the study of social movements, researchers have come to focus on the interaction between social movement organizations (SMOs) and the complex political and social environments in which they operate. This move toward an open systems perspective (Scott 2002) has been accompanied by a shift in level of analysis, whereby organization-informed movements' research is increasingly performed at the social movement industry (SMI) level. Although an SMI is defined to include “[a]ll SMOs that have as their goal the attainment of the broadest preferences of a social movement...” (McCarthy and Zald 1977: 1219), work in this area has primarily been conducted on populations of national-level SMOs (e.g., McLaughlin and Khawaja 2000; Minkoff 1995).

More recently, movement scholars adopting macro-level organizational perspectives have examined populations of locally based SMOs (Andrews and

Edwards 2005; Edwards and McCarthy 2004; Kempton et al. 2001; Van Dyke and Soule 2002) as well as populations operating state-wide (Gray and Lowery 1996; McCammon 2001). Although geographic scope of operations is one of “four theoretically important dimensions along which SMOs can vary” (McCarthy and Zald 2002: 540), there has been a paucity of analyses that compare across geographically bounded conceptualizations of an SMI (though see Edwards 1994; Edwards and Marullo 1995). This absence limits our understanding of the demographic diversity among organizational components of an SMI. Moreover, nearly all of this macro, organizationally motivated research has been conducted in Western democracies and has included only “core” SMI members, organizations primarily focused on issues of concern to a particular social movement.

We utilize a unique source of data that allows us to examine the broad range of component organizations in the Japanese environmental SMI. The 2001 Kankyo NGO Soran (or Environmental NGO Database), a survey of 4,132 Japanese environmental movement organizations (EMOs), allows comparison of the characteristics of organizations primarily focused on environmental issues with those attending to such issues as part of a broader multi-issue agenda as well across geographic scope of operations (e.g., national versus local). Throughout the article, we strive to provide comparative context for our results by referencing environmental movements in the United States and Germany, although our data speaks only to the Japanese case. In the conclusion, we highlight important methodological implications of this work regarding the definition and sampling of organizational populations.

### **Social Movement Industries**

In their version of resource mobilization theory, McCarthy and Zald (1977) explicitly focus on SMOs, and “mobilizing structures” more generally, as relevant units of analysis. Subsequent social movement analyses adopting an organizational perspective have followed the larger trend in organizational sociology generally, emphasizing a macro-perspective focused on related groups of organizations (Scott 2002). However, although an SMI ostensibly includes all of the SMOs which share the goals of a movement, in practice they have typically been operationalized using populations of SMOs bounded by geographic scope of operations. Most commonly, scholars studying an SMI have examined populations of national SMOs in isolation (e.g., McLaughlin and Khawaja 2000; Minkoff 1995). Increasingly prevalent is research focused on populations of locally based SMOs (Andrews and Edwards 2005; Edwards and McCarthy 2004; Kempton et al. 2001; Van Dyke and Soule 2002), whereas still others examine state-wide or regional associations (Gray and Lowery 1996; McCammon 2001). Rarely, however, have studies captured

information on an entire SMI, including SMOs operating at the local, state/regional, and national levels.

The only comprehensive analyses elucidating the parameters of an entire SMI, of which we are aware, comes from studies of the U.S. peace movement. Edwards (1994) reports that 71 percent of peace movement organizations (PMOs) are organized locally and only about 7 percent nationally, with the remaining 22 percent operating at the state or regional level. National PMOs are both larger and more likely to be non-membership organizations (although 87 percent do have members) than are locally based PMOs (Edwards and Foley 2003). Utilizing a follow-up survey conducted in 1992, Edwards and Marullo (1995) are able to show that, consistent with other organizational populations, PMOs that are smaller, younger, local in scope, less legitimate, and less formal are more likely to disband. Collectively, this research demonstrates the advantages of a comprehensive approach to analyzing entire SMIs. The paucity of similar analyses makes accurate generalizations regarding the distribution of core organizational characteristics (such as organizational structure, size, and issue representation) across SMIs difficult.

### **The Japanese Context**

During the late 1960s and early 1970s Japan experienced dramatic growth in domestic protest movements (Krauss and Simcock 1980; Kuroda 1972; Takao 2001). The Japanese environmental movement, in particular, played a leading role during this period of heightened mobilization as locally based “citizens’ movements” (*shimin undō*) came to be seen as virtually synonymous with anti-pollution efforts in Japan (Krauss and Simcock 1980; Sasaki-Uemura 2001). Estimates suggest that 60 percent or more of Japanese citizens’ movement organizations in existence at the beginning of the 1970s were organized around ecological issues, with the vast majority of these focused on pollution-related issues (Kuroda 1972).

The early focus on pollution issues and their human health effects in the Japanese environmental movement was spurred through intense coverage between the early 1960s and 1970s devoted to the “Big 4 Pollution Cases” in Japan: mercury poisoning in Minamata and Niigata, Itai-Itai (ouch-ouch) disease in Toyoma, and Yokkaichi asthma cases. These cases hold a privileged position in histories of the movement and have been the subject of extensive analysis (Almeida and Stearns 1998; Kawamura 1994: chap. 6; McKean 1981; Tsuru 1999; Upham 1976). Each of these cases was successfully litigated in favor of the victims, and finally resolved between 1971 and 1973. Collectively, they galvanized attention to the human health effects of pollution and both legitimized and spurred mobilization in other localities based upon similar issues.

The primarily grassroots-based anti-pollution movement stagnated during the latter half of the 1970s and 1980s, a period that also witnessed the moderation of tactical repertoires (Nishikido 2003). Meanwhile, during this period, groups organized around nature conservation issues flourished, evidenced by, the founding of a number of national land trust organizations (Fukushimaken Shizen Hogo Kyokai 1993, as cited in Takao 2001 roughly akin to the Nature Conservancy in the United States). The transition from a nearly exclusive focus on pollution to a more broad-based issue focus within the Japanese environmental movement is reflected in the terminology employed to describe environmental problems, and the movement dedicated to ameliorating these issues. That is, the previously dominant terminology of Kogai (pollution) came to be replaced by Kankyo (environment) during the late 1970s and early 1980s (Tsuru 1999), to reflect the growing diversity of the movement.

There was some resurgence in Japanese environmentalism during the 1990s as the Liberal Democratic Party temporarily lost control of the national government (in 1993) for the first time in nearly four decades, opening new domestic political opportunities, and as international norms came to privilege government and domestic non-governmental organization (NGO) interactions (Reimann 2001; Schreurs 2002). Today, EMOs continue to play an important role in the Japanese social movement sector, although not the dominant one they held during the early 1970s. Of an estimated 85,000 citizens' voluntary organizations in existence in Japan in 2000, roughly 10 percent focus primarily on environmental issues (Takao 2001). Despite its importance and relatively large size, there appears to be a general agreement that, in contrast to other industrialized countries such as the United States, the environmental movement in Japan has a minimal national infrastructure (Broadbent 1998; Mason 1999; McKean 1981; Schreurs 2002).

### **Environmental Movements in Comparative Context**

Before presenting survey data on Japanese EMOs, we outline the organizational demography of the environmental movement in other nations to provide a comparative context. We focus on United States and German national environmental movements because of the relatively in-depth information on organizational characteristics available. In the conclusion to the article, we revisit these comparisons to include the newly collected data on Japanese EMOs.

#### ***United States***

As in social movements research generally (Crist and McCarthy 1996), analyses of the U.S. environmental movement are increasingly likely to focus on the organizational representatives of the movement. Increasingly, this work

has sought to move beyond the rich case study literature and extensive exploration of the largest 10 or 12 national EMOs to begin exploring the demography of the environmental SMI as a whole. A forerunner in this area is Brulle (2000; see especially chap. 5) who, relying on IRS tax data, estimates that more than 10,000 EMOs were in operation in the United States in 1995. For comparison, Brulle estimates the environmental SMI is roughly twice the size of the peace and three times the size of the civil right SMIs, but less than half the size of the population of business organizations which devote significant resources to environmental interests. These IRS data, however, likely lead to substantial mis-specification of population parameters as ostensibly political organizations do not qualify, and many others will choose not to file for tax-deductible charitable status.

Kempton et al. (2001) inventory local EMOs located in the Delmarva Peninsula and the state of North Carolina, identifying a total of 446 groups (excluding environmental clubs organized within high schools). From this, they estimate a total of between 13,000 and 22,000 local EMOs in operation in the United States. Andrews and Edwards (2005) similarly enumerate all local EMOs in North Carolina, identifying a much larger organizational population, however ( $N = 738$ ). Important to explaining the larger number of identified EMOs, their enumeration strategy includes both groups focused solely on environmental issues (39 percent of respondents compared with 44 percent in the Japanese sample) and those for whom environmental issues are part of a broader organizational agenda. Unfortunately, they do not present detailed information comparing these two groups' organizational demographics. Among all groups, in terms of the scope of operations, they find that 24.5 percent operate within a single locality and 58.8 percent across multiple counties or state-wide. Among the local groups, 63 percent are formally registered as tax-exempt entities (providing some indication of undercounting involved in methods relying on IRS tax-exempt data) and the mean organizational age is 13.34 years. This compares to 87 percent tax-exempt registration and a mean age of 17.58 for EMOs operating across multiple counties or state-wide.

If the environmental movement industry is anything like the peace movement, national organizations are significantly larger on average than local EMOs (Edwards and Foley 2003). Although not comparing across either issue primacy or geographic scope of operations, Brulle (2000) estimates that EMOs collectively control \$2.7 billion in annual income (with 70 percent of the organizations reporting no income and 3 percent reporting income of \$1 million or more) and had between 19 and 41 million individual members in 1995. It is doubtful that many organizations reporting no income operate at the national level.

At the other extreme, the “major” national EMOs identified by Brulle (see also Brulle 1995) control large amounts of resources. Examining 50 of these “majors” in 2000, the first author (Johnson 2006) reports an average of 96 full-time staff, more than 300,000 individual members, and a nearly \$15 million annual budget.<sup>1</sup> He also documents the increased attention over time among these major national EMOs to the “new” environmental issues of pollution and human health, although resource and wildlife conservation issues continue to dominate the collective agenda. Notably, issues that play a prominent role in the case study literature, such as environmental justice, are not necessarily highly represented on the agendas of the majors. Only 2 of the 47 (4 percent) major EMOs active in 2000 identify environmental justice as a salient organizational concern.<sup>2</sup> Examining a much larger population of 658 national EMOs, Johnson (2008) reports similar trends. However, growing issue diversity within the movement, particularly growth in the proportion of EMOs attending to both traditional resource/wildlife conservation and “new” or “second generation” quality of life issues such as pollution and human health, is associated with elevated rates of federal environmental law passage activity.

These findings concerning issue foci are generally supported in systematic analyses of local EMOs within the United States. Both Andrews and Edwards (2005) and Kempton et al. (2001) find that local EMOs focus attention predominately on issues of wildlife and natural resource conservation. Kempton et al. make particular note of their (and reviewers) “surprise” that the numbers of environmental justice groups are extremely low (no such groups are identified in the Delmarva Census and only 17, or 5 percent, in North Carolina). After re-checking their sample and conducting a second search for additional groups, they surmise that the number of environmental justice groups “are surprisingly low...not because of some bias in our methods, but because previous literature on local groups has been based on case studies that selected ‘interesting cases’ rather than on systematic enumeration of local groups” (574). This illustrates the importance of population-level studies as a complement to case studies which, despite many strengths, tend to highlight particularly novel aspects of a movement.

### *Germany*

The German and U.S. environmental movements demonstrate many similarities (Markham 2005; Rootes 2004; Rucht 1989). In both countries, nationwide nature conservation organizations were first established in a wave of mobilization begun at the turn of the nineteenth century, followed by periods of relative inactivity until after the end of World War II (WWII). The movements were then re-invigorated in the context of broader leftist movements in the 1960s and 1970s and increasingly came to focus on a broad array of new

environmental issues beyond those associated with conservationism. Finally, despite becoming increasingly institutionalized over the course of the 1980s and 1990s, both the modern U.S. and European environmental movements are generally seen as important new social movements (Dalton 1994; Hays 1987).

Estimates of the size of the German environmental SMI are also similar, proportionally, to those made in the United States. In 1998 the per-capita EMO density rate estimated by Rucht and Roose (2001) was 1/7,143 in West Germany and 1/25,000 in East Germany. This compares very closely to the estimates of local EMO per-capita density in the United States (1/11,500–19,500; Kempton et al. 2001). Both nations' environmental SMIs are also characterized by organizations with a great diversity of forms (McLaughlin and Khawaja 2000; Rucht 1989). As in the United States, EMOs with greater geographic scope (e.g., national) are both older and larger on average than local EMOs (Rucht and Roose 2001).

Although these similarities make some sense given that Germany and the United States are both large nations with politically decentralized and relatively open political structures, comparative mobilization estimates should be interpreted with considerable caution. Within any particular nation there is often difficulty comparing across studies with diverse measures of interest and definitions of what it means to be an SMO. In the two existing studies which claim a systematic enumeration of local EMOs in the United States, for example, both focusing on North Carolina, Andrews and Edwards (2005) include organizations which are not primarily focused on environmental issues (a majority of the organizations sampled), whereas Kempton et al. (2001) do not (but do include high-school environmental clubs as organizational members in some analyses). The difficulties of comparing across studies are exacerbated in cross-national context.

The unique political and social characteristics of each nation will, of course, profoundly shape the size and characteristics of the organizations operating within it. German EMOs have been closely linked with ideological and political movements of both the right and the left, with profound impacts on the movement and individual EMOs. The Federal Alliance of Citizen's Initiatives for Environmental Protection (BBI), for instance, was founded with financial assistance from the Liberal Party and received substantial government funding of activities (Markham 2005). Markham (2002) also shows how the League for Homeland Protection's conservative ideology justifying rural preservation led to rapid growth and, later, close association with the Nazi regime that subsequently hindered development in the post WWII environment. Contrastingly, the Friends of Nature, founded in 1895 as a workers' association, was disbanded during WWII but quickly re-emerged and grew rapidly in the post-war environment. Perhaps in part because of close association with

movements of both the left and the right, the German environmental movement has also more readily and extensively been institutionalized in the political and business arenas in comparison with many other countries, including the United States and Japan (witness, for instance, the participation of the Greens in the ruling government beginning in 1998).

An additional barrier to comparing studies of movements in a cross-national context is the different criteria that organizations use to define what issues should be considered part of a particular SMI. In the Netherlands, for instance, animal welfare groups are considered part and parcel of the environmental movement, whereas in other countries they are distinct (Rootes 2004). Similarly, the German environmental movement is tightly intertwined with anti-nuclear issues, whereas in the United States there are two distinct movements (Joppke 1993).

### Hypotheses

What does this review of Japanese, U.S., and German environmental movements suggest for our analysis of the organizational structure of the Japanese environmental SMI? Despite the many difficulties in comparing social movements cross-nationally, some commonalities emerge. Primarily, in both the United States and Germany, EMOs with greater geographic scope (e.g., national) are both older and larger on average than those with more narrow geographic scope. There is no reason to think this pattern will not be repeated within the Japanese environmental movement.

H1: EMOs with wider geographical scope of operations will be older on average than those with narrower geographic scope.

H2: EMOs with wider geographical scope of operations will be larger on average than those with narrower geographic scope.

The major contrast between the countries demonstrated in this review is the way in which standard histories describe the role of issues in the emergence of the United States and the German environmental movements in comparison with the Japanese movement. In the United States, Germany, and many other Western nations, nature protection was the early focus of environmental movements at the turn of the century. Pollution and human health issues are seen to have spurred the modern period of mobilization, but as issues newly added to the movement agenda. This stands quite at odds with a Japanese movement, which initially emerged in reaction to industrial pollution after 1950 and only later came to focus significant amounts of attention on what are “traditional” concerns within the American environmental movement. This may have implications for issue foci today.



H3: There will be greater emphasis on “new” issues of environmental quality and pollution, as opposed to wildlife and resource conservation issues, within the Japanese environmental movement in comparison with the United States and Germany.

### Data and Methods

A significant methodological challenge in studying organizations at the industry level has been how to properly identify relevant organizations of interest. A common solution in organizational research is to draw on existing organizational registries enumerated by governmental agencies (Hannan and Carroll 1992), but no standard governmental data sources on social movement activity exist in the United States. United States SMOs are not required to register with the government, for example, unless they seek formal non-profit status, and many do not do so (Edwards 1994; McCarthy, Britt, and Wolfson 1991).

The relative scarcity of accessible and comprehensive governmental registries, or surveys of SMOs, has made the methodological challenge of identifying relevant units of interest particularly acute for movement scholars. Systematic data on populations of SMOs has generally relied on an *ad hoc* mixture of existing directories of organizations, developed on a case-by-case basis. As a result of the high costs of data collection, social movement scholars have relied on existing data sources or sampling strategies that enumerate only organizational populations of particular geographic scope. Although scholars have long noted the important theoretical distinction between SMOs which operate in the local, state, or national context (McCarthy and Zald 2002), data limitations have resulted in a paucity of analyses examining the entire range of organizations which compose an SMI. This examination of the distribution of Japanese EMO characteristics across geographic contexts is made possible by a unique data set compiled from a 2001 survey of the Japanese environmental SMI. The Kankyo NGO Soran (Environmental NGO Database) is produced by the Japan Environment Association (JEA 2001), the equivalent to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in America.

Soran editors compiled a comprehensive list frame of known NGOs in Japan that conduct substantial activities related to environmental issues. Importantly, this list frame includes organizations NOT officially recognized by the Japanese government. Soran editors relied heavily on organizational directories developed at the prefecture and large-city levels by divisions of the JEA. In addition, they searched independently for organizations which should be included in the list frame and advertised the project, encouraging previously unknown organizations to complete the questionnaire online.

Surveys were mailed to all relevant NGOs ( $N = 14,250$ ) and an additional 140 environmental organizations self-identified through the online survey.<sup>3</sup>

The survey editors, while working hard to list organizations, make no systematic attempt to purge dead organizations from the sampling frame, a common problem in list samples resulting in underestimation of organizational response rates (Knoke, Marsden, and Kalleberg 2002). The implications of failing to purge a list frame are likely to be particularly acute among SMOs, a relatively volatile organizational sector with high rates of entry and exit. Here, 11 percent of responding organizations indicate that they are either “misidentified” as conducting environmental activities (6.2 percent) or are currently “inactive” (i.e., defunct or temporarily defunct, 4.7 percent). It is reasonable to assume the “ineligibility” rate is at least this high in the non-responding population. Indeed, disbanded/inactive organizations and those believing a survey topic irrelevant are probably much less likely to respond to survey inquiries than are others.

In surveys of EMOs in the United States, list sources have been found to have inactivity rates of around 20 percent (Bob Edwards, pers. comm., February 24, 2006). Assuming a similar 20 percent rate of inactivity among the Japanese EMOs in this sample frame and that the misidentification rate ranges between the 6.2 percent reported in responding organizations and a similar 20 percent rate yields a valid response rate of between 38 and 47 percent for the 4,132 organizations included within the 2001 Kankyō NGO Soran.

This is an acceptable response rate for an organizational survey, especially a survey of NGOs. In a review of articles published in *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* from 1996 to 2001 employing mail surveys of non-profits, Hager et al. (2003) estimate an average return rate of 42 percent. Examining other populations of organizations, Paxson, Dillman, and Tarnai (1995) report a mean response rate of 51 percent (range, 28–95 percent) for 26 business surveys completed by the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center. Further, there is some evidence that non-response bias is less of a concern for surveys of organizations than it is for surveys of individuals (Smith 1997).<sup>4</sup>

The directory does include a broad spectrum of organizational types, ranging from small relatively informal groups to large national organizations with extensive memberships. For each EMO, information is collected on membership composition, issue focus, adopted activities, the geographic scope of activity, and organizational demographics (e.g., founding date, annual operating budget). In addition to indicating whether or not organizations attend to a number of discrete environmental issues (forests, resource conservation, water pollution, global warming, etc.), the Soran reports whether the primary focus

is on environmental issues or if these are part of a broader, multi-issue agenda (self-report data, missing for six cases). Information on self-defined geographic scope of activities (missing for 30 cases) was used to divide the SMI into five distinct populations: (1) “local” EMOs which operate within a city or town (52.3 percent of the valid sample), (2) “prefecture-wide” EMOs, defined as those organizations which operate in more than one city or town within a prefecture (29.1 percent), (3) “regional” EMOs which operate in more than one prefecture (6.2 percent), (4) national EMOs with operations across Japan (10.2 percent), and (5) organizations which are based in Japan but focus on environmental problems in other countries or in the transnational arena (2.2 percent).<sup>5</sup>

We first compare the population of organizations primarily focused on environmental issues with those for which environmental issues are part of a broader multi-issue agenda. We then focus on the theoretically important distinction between local, state (prefectural), and national organizations.

## Results

### *EMO Demography: Primary and Multi-Issue Organizations*

Table 1 presents means and frequencies on a number of organizational characteristics from the sample of 4,132 Japanese EMOs divided into two groups, those focused primarily on environmental protection and those multi-issue organizations for which environmental protection is “only” part of a broader issue agenda. The final column in the table presents a ratio computed by dividing the values for “primary” EMOs by that of “multi-issue” EMOs. Significance levels reported in all tables are from a *t*-test of means or, for categorical variables, a *z*-test for proportions. In Table 1, we test for a significant difference between primary and multi-issue EMOs.

For each EMO, age was computed by subtracting the founding date from 2001, the year in which the survey was conducted. With a mean age of 14.5 years, primary EMOs are generally younger than multi-issue EMOs by a factor of .63. The next four rows of Table 1 display results of several measures of organizational size. Organizational budget and staff levels directly correspond to resource levels available for organizations to advocate for change. Budget data represents an organization’s income over the previous year. Paid staff represents the number of full-time staff employed by an organization. Both measures vary widely. There are 4 organizations reporting income of only 2,000 yen and 17 reporting yearly income of 10 billion or more yen (roughly 90 million US dollars). Similarly, although 378 organizations employ only one staff member, five organizations employ 1,000 or more staff (we recoded budget and staff for a maximum of 10 billion yen budget and 1,000 staff).<sup>6</sup> Groups focused primarily on environmental issues control

**Table 1**  
 Japanese Environmental Movement Organization (EMO) Demography, Issues,  
 and Activities

Organizational demographics	All organizations ( <i>N</i> = 4,132)	Primary EMOs only ( <i>N</i> = 1,820)	Multi-issue EMOs only ( <i>N</i> = 2,303)	Ratio of primary/ multi-issue
<b>Age of EMO</b>				
Mean	19.2	14.5	23.1	.63***
(SD)	(14.4)	(11.2)	(15.5)	
Median	16.0	11.0	21.0	
<i>N</i>	4,064	1,798	2,257	
<b>Annual budget (1000s of yen)</b>				
Mean	98,402.8	37,806.8	146,577.5	.26***
(SD)	(799,856.7)	(335,299.6)	1,026,820.3	
Median	580.0	500.0	600.0	
<i>N</i>	3,229	1,424	1,799	
<b>Paid staff</b>				
Mean	16.0	9.5	21.6	.44***
(SD)	(65.6)	(19.4)	(86.9)	
Median	5.0	4.0	5.0	
<i>N</i>	1,892	861	1,027	
<b>Individual members</b>				
Mean	1,774.0	492.9	2,763.4	.18**
(SD)	(19,400.1)	(2,905.7)	(25,651.7)	
Median	76.0	70.0	80.0	
<i>N</i>	3,413	1,480	1,927	
<b>Organizational members</b>				
Mean	78.7	64.1	94.1	.68
(SD)	(318.9)	(256.1)	(373.7)	
Median	17.0	16.0	16.0	
<i>N</i>	1,285	654	627	
<b>Scope of operations</b>				
% local	52.3	47.9	55.8	0.86***
% prefectural	29.1	31.6	27.1	1.17
% regional	6.2	7.7	5.1	1.51***
% national	10.2	11.1	9.4	1.18
% abroad	2.2	1.8	2.6	0.69
<i>N</i>	4,102	1,807	2,286	

*(Continued)*

**Table 1**  
(Continued)

Organizational demographics	All organizations (N = 4,132)	Primary EMOs only (N = 1,820)	Multi-issue EMOs only (N = 2,303)	Ratio of primary/ multi-issue
<b>Organizational structure</b>				
% individual members	60.2	54.8	64.6	0.85***
% organizational members	8.7	9.5	8.2	1.16
% both individual and organizational members	22.4	26.5	19.1	1.39***
% non-membership	8.7	9.2	8.2	1.12
N	4,132	1,820	2,303	
<b>Issues</b>				
% forests	22.2	27.7	17.9	1.55***
% resource conservation	49.0	60.7	39.9	1.52***
% water pollution	36.5	44.2	30.4	1.45***
% desertification	1.7	2.0	1.4	1.43
% waste and recycling	42.4	30.9	51.6	0.60***
% air pollution	9.5	10.0	9.2	1.09
% over-consumption	30.3	15.4	42.1	0.37***
% local	28.3	31.5	25.8	1.22***
% global warming	5.0	6.2	4.0	1.55***
<b>Activities</b>				
% program	78.3	82.2	75.2	1.09***
% education	72.0	74.3	70.0	1.06**
% research	47.2	51.0	44.2	1.15***
% support	29.5	28.5	30.4	0.94
% lobby	23.2	30.4	17.4	1.75***
% other	7.6	6.7	8.4	0.80*
% maintaining web page	16.7	17.9	15.7	1.14
% producing a publication	57.1	56.3	57.7	0.98
<b>Incorporation</b>				
% 1998 or earlier	6.8	5.4	7.9	0.68**
% after 1998	4.2	5.1	3.4	1.50**
Total	11.0	10.5	11.3	.93

Significance level: \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$  (two-tailed test).

considerably fewer financial resources than the typical multi-issue EMO in our sample (mean budget of 37,806,800 yen for primary EMOs compared with a mean 1,026,820,000 yen budget for multi-issue groups). Along the same lines, primary EMOs employ less staff by a factor of .44 than do multi-issue EMOs.

As another indication of organizational size we assess membership levels, reporting individual and organizational memberships separately as each organizational member of an EMO represents its own constituency and resources that contribute to environmental advocacy.<sup>7</sup> Primary EMOs claim a mean individual membership of 492.9, about one-fifth of the membership of multi-issue EMOs (mean 2763.4). Although primary EMOs report an average of only 64.1 organizational members, compared with 94.1 for multi-issue EMOs, this difference is not statistically significant. On all four measures of organizational size, primary EMOs are smaller than multi-issue EMOs, and these differences are statistically significant on three of these dimensions.

Among both primary and multi-issue EMOs, the greatest proportions of organizations in our sample operate at the local, prefectural, and national levels in that order, with much smaller proportions operating regionally or abroad. For both primary and multi-issue EMOs, the most common organizational structure is individual membership, followed by combined individual and organizational memberships. Primary EMOs are somewhat less likely than multi-issue EMOs, however, to contain only individual members (by a factor of .85), and more likely to contain both organizations and individuals (factor of 1.39).

Overall, the issues to which Japanese EMOs are most likely to attend are, in order: resource conservation, water pollution, waste and recycling, over-consumption, local issues, and forests. Less than 10 percent of the total sample attends to issues of desertification, global warming, or air pollution. Multi-issue EMOs are particularly likely to attend to the issues of waste and recycling (51.6 percent) and over-consumption (42.1 percent), significantly more so than primary EMOs. Primary EMOs are more likely than multi-issue EMOs to attend to forests, resource conservation, water pollution, local issues, and global warming. Fairly equal proportions of primary (14.3 percent) and multi-issue (14.5) EMOs contained in the sample focus on only one environmental issue.

The most commonly reported activities of Japanese EMOs are, in order: programmatic activities, education, research, support, lobbying, and other. Primary EMOs are somewhat more likely to conduct programs, education, and research than are multi-issue EMOs and much more likely (by a factor of 1.75) to lobby. However, there is no difference in the proportions of primary and multi-issue EMOs offering support to other non-profits. There is also no statistical difference among primary and multi-issue EMOs in the proportions which maintain a web page or produce a publication. Overall, 16.7 percent of

the EMOs sampled maintain a web page whereas more than half (57.1 percent) produce a publication. Finally, there is no significant difference between primary and multi-issue EMOs in the proportions incorporated, although primary EMOs are more likely (ratio = 1.50) to have been incorporated after the loosening of registration guidelines with passage of the 1998 Nonprofit Organization Law (also known as the 1998 NPO law) (Hasegawa 2004; Pekkanen 2000).

### *Comparing across Geographic Scope of Operations*

Table 2 presents the means and frequencies, for primary EMOs only, on a variety of organizational characteristics according to geographic scope of operations. The final column in Table 2 presents a means, or likelihood, ratio comparing the populations of national EMOs with local EMOs. Counter to expectations, and contrary to the pattern in German and U.S. environmental movements, primary EMOs operating in local environments report the highest mean age of any geographic sector (mean 16.0 years), significantly older than the mean age of 13 years among national EMOs.

As expected, however, measures of organizational size generally increase as the geographic scope increases from the local to national levels. The major exception to this pattern is paid staff, where there is no significant difference in the mean staff size reported by local and national EMOs, both of which employ larger staffs than organizations at the prefectural or regional levels. The relationship between organizational size and geographic scope is most clear when examining annual budgets, which rise steadily from the local to the national levels. Mean annual budgets of 150,063,800 yen for national EMOs are nearly 12 times that of local EMOs (12,784,900 yen). National EMOs also report having 3.42 times as many individual members as do local EMOs. As with mean staff size, however, both local and national EMOs have larger individual memberships than do EMOs operating at the prefectural and regional levels. Finally, national EMOs have greater numbers of organizational members than any other category (with a mean of 98.9 among those organizations reporting that they include organizational members) and significantly more, by a factor of 3.20, organizational members than do local EMOs.

There are also significant differences in the organizational structure of EMOs according to their geographic scope of operations. Moving up in geographic scope from the local to national levels, the proportion of EMOs containing solely individual OR organizational members steadily drops although the proportion claiming either non-membership status or BOTH individual and organizational members steadily rises. The most common membership form for local, prefectural, and regional EMOs is exclusive reliance on individual members. But, although nearly two-thirds of local EMOs are composed

**Table 2**  
 Japanese Primary Environmental Movement Organization (EMO)  
 Demography, Issues, and Tactics by Scope of Operations

Organizational demographics	Primary EMOs ( <i>N</i> = 1,788)				Ratio of national/local
	Local <i>N</i> = 865	Prefectural <i>N</i> = 571	Regional <i>N</i> = 139	National <i>N</i> = 200	
<b>Age of EMO</b>					
Mean	16.0	13.2	13.2	13.0	.81**
(SD)	(11.8)	(10.2)	(10.4)	(11.0)	
Median	13.0	11.0	10.0	10.0	
<i>N</i>	851	565	139	199	
<b>Annual budget (1000s of yen)</b>					
Mean	12,784.9	15,180.1	106,610.3	150,063.8	11.74****
(SD)	(1,60,135.9)	(1,33,447.5)	(9,04,945.3)	(4,46,483.8)	
Median	255.0	583.0	1,500.0	7,000.0	
<i>N</i>	662	438	123	160	
<b>Paid staff</b>					
Mean	11.0	8.1	6.9	11.2	1.02
(SD)	(24.4)	(11.3)	(8.6)	(24.2)	
Median	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	
<i>N</i>	551	267	86	157	
<b>Individual members</b>					
Mean	432.1	325.9	231.7	1477.0	3.42****
(SD)	(2,421.8)	(1,854.1)	(552.1)	(6,401.7)	
Median	50.0	70.0	90.0	170.0	
<i>N</i>	685	483	114	162	
<b>Organizational members</b>					
Mean	30.9	91.4	46.3	98.9	3.20****
(SD)	(56.9)	(398.9)	(118.3)	(239.3)	
Median	15.0	16.0	12.0	36.0	
<i>N</i>	247	215	58	115	
<b>Organizational structure</b>					
% individual members	62.0	56.2	47.5	28.5	.46****
% organizational members	11.3	9.3	7.2	5.0	.44*
% both individual and organizational members	17.2	28.4	34.5	52.5	3.05****
% non-membership	9.5	6.1	10.8	14.0	1.47
<i>N</i>	865	571	139	200	

(Continued)



**Table 2**  
(Continued)

Organizational demographics	Primary EMOs (N = 1,788)				Ratio of national/local
	Local N = 865	Prefectural N = 571	Regional N = 139	National N = 200	
<b>Issues</b>					
% forests	22.9	29.8	38.1	29.5	1.29
% resource conservation	59.2	65.5	64.0	52.5	.89
% water pollution	46.7	46.8	39.6	32.5	.70***
% desertification	0.5	1.4	2.2	4.0	8.00***
% waste and recycling	33.4	30.1	23.0	31.5	.94
% air pollution	6.6	10.9	10.1	21.0	3.18***
% over-consumption	13.3	16.3	16.5	23.0	1.73***
% local	37.8	26.4	26.6	24.0	.63***
% global warming	1.8	7.7	10.8	17.0	9.44***
<b>Activities</b>					
% program	90.9	79.5	75.5	57.0	.63***
% education	63.8	83.5	78.4	91.5	1.43***
% research	36.2	57.6	73.4	77.5	2.14***
% support	19.3	37.3	45.3	34.0	1.76***
% lobby	20.2	37.1	37.4	51.0	2.52***
% other	4.7	8.2	8.6	9.0	1.91*
% maintaining a web page	6.7	15.6	38.8	53.0	7.91***
% producing a publication	41.5	63.0	72.7	84.0	2.02***
<b>Incorporation</b>					
% 1998 or earlier	1.5	4.0	6.5	24.0	16.00***
% after 1998	1.5	5.8	12.2	13.0	8.67***
Total	3.0	9.8	18.7	37.0	12.33***

Significance level: \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$  (two-tailed test).

entirely of individual members, only 28.5 percent of national EMOs are structured the same way (a ratio of .46). Instead, the bulk of national EMOs (52.5 percent) contain both individual and organizational members. This joint membership structure is more common at the national domain than any other, more than three times as common as among local EMOs.

We might also expect organizations of different geographic scope to attend to different issues, and there is mixed evidence for this. The overarching issue uniting the field is that of resource conservation. For every category, the majority of EMOs indicate that they attend to this issue and it is the issue that is most commonly represented on organizational agendas. Regardless of geographic scope, the next most commonly represented issue is water pollution followed by, variously, local environmental issues, forests, and waste and recycling. It does appear however that, particularly for some of the less well-represented issues, there is some association between the natural scope of an issue and the geographic scope of those organizations which attend to them. The issues of air pollution and global warming, for instance, receive increasing levels of attention as one moves from the local to the national levels whereas local environmental issues and water pollution receive decreasing amounts of attention.

The types of activities conducted by Japanese EMOs do clearly vary by geographic scope. Moving from the local to the national levels the proportion of EMOs conducting programs decreases by a ratio of .63, although rates of education (1.43), research (2.14), lobbying (2.52), and other activities (1.91) steadily increase. National EMOs are also 1.76 times as likely to engage in supportive activities as are local EMOs, although this activity is most commonly employed by regional organizations.

Moving from the local to the national levels there is a steady increase in the proportion of Japanese EMOs maintaining a web page, producing a publication, and achieving formal incorporation. Only 6.7 percent of local EMOs maintain a web page, but 15.5 percent of prefectural organizations, 38.8 percent of regional organizations, and a majority of national EMOs (54 percent) do so. Similarly, although a minority of local EMOs produce a publication, nearly two-thirds (63 percent) of prefectural organizations, 72.7 percent of regional organizations, and 84.0 percent of national EMOs do so. With fully 37 percent of national EMOs incorporated, these groups are 12.33 times as likely to incorporate as local EMOs, only 3.0 percent of which are formally recognized as legal entities. For comparison, 63 percent of local EMOs in the United States are formally registered as tax-exempt entities, with even higher rates of registration for EMOs operating state-wide or nationally (Andrews and Edwards 2005).

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

Although social movement scholars have increasingly adopted an open-systems perspective in studying SMOs, analyses of entire social movement industries remain extremely scarce. Owing to data limitations, our understanding of the demography of SMIs has drawn primarily from empirical analyses

limited to geographically bounded segments of any particular industry (most often national-level populations of SMOs but also, increasingly, local- and state-level populations as well) and have relied heavily on conjecture for estimation of industry-wide parameters. Here, we employ a unique data source that provides two significant advantages in estimating the population parameters for one SMI in Japan. First, the survey employed as the basis of analysis captures both organizations focused primarily on environmental issues and those for whom environmental issues are part of a larger multi-issue agenda. This allows for comparison of primary or "core" organizational members of the environmental movement, the only organizations captured in most analyses, with those organizations which play a more tangential or conditional role. Second, the data presented here allow for a comparison of EMOs according to geographic scope of operation. We focus, in particular, on the comparison between organizations operating at the local, prefectural, and national levels.

The central finding of our research is that the distribution of a variety of organizational characteristics differs significantly according to both geographic scope of operations (e.g., local versus national) and whether organizations are primarily focused on environmental issues or not. Of particular significance, we find that multi-issue organizations, those organizations for which environmental issues are only part of a broader issue agenda, are on average both older and larger than are EMOs focused primarily on environmental issues. Substantively, the relatively resource-rich nature of multi-issue EMOs suggests the importance of leveraging resources by framing environmental problems, and organizing campaigns, in ways which draw support from outside the core environmental movement (e.g., Broadbent 1998). Methodologically, this finding implies that how researchers define an SMI in terms of movement affiliation (i.e., primarily focused on goals of a movement or part of a multi-issue agenda) and geographic scope can significantly affect the distribution of key organizational characteristics (including size, resources, age, organizational structure, issues, and activities) observed. Although these definitional issues pose a substantial impediment to comparing systematic studies of movements within a nation, they are exacerbated in a transnational context. Despite these difficulties, we can draw some conclusions based on the data presented here.

As expected, national EMOs in Japan are larger on average than locals, as in the United States and Germany. Japanese EMOs are also somewhat younger on average than their counterparts in the United States and Germany. But, surprisingly, among Japanese EMOs local organizations are the oldest and national EMOs the youngest, on average. This stands starkly at odds with the pattern observed within the United States and German environmental movements (and among U.S. SMOs generally). It may be that the unexpectedly

large mean age of local EMOs in Japan is attributable to the fairly recent emergence of a national-level environmental movement in Japan or to different mortality dynamics by geographic scope operating in Japan, as compared with the United States. We suspect that a partial explanation for this finding can be found in the relatively large percentage of local Japanese EMOs which rely exclusively on organizational members (11.3 percent, the largest percentage of any geographic domain). Japan has a strong tradition of vibrant and stable neighborhood associations (Bestor 1989) and the successful co-optation of these structures into the environmental arena may be a partial explanation for the apparent stability of local EMOs. As well, the difficulty in achieving tax-exempt status for Japanese EMOs has made the maintenance of national organizations relatively more problematic than in the United States or some other countries. Unfortunately, we are unable to assess here the veracity of these claims against alternative explanations for the greater mean age of local groups in our sample.

In terms of the issues to which Japanese EMOs are most likely to attend, the most commonly identified, in order, are: resource conservation, waste and recycling, water pollution, over-consumption, local issues, and forests. New environmental issues (i.e., water pollution, over-consumption and, we suspect, the majority of local issues) do appear to be at least equally prominent on the environmental SMI agenda in Japan as in the United States or Germany. Given that our historical review suggests the early environmental movement in Japan was primarily oriented around anti-pollution issues, the predominance of resource conservation issues is surprising. It appears that in Japan, as in the United States and Germany, general accounts and case studies emphasize new environmental issues, whereas systematic enumerations show that wildlife and nature protection EMOs numerically dominate the environmental social movement organizational landscape.

Although this research provides a starting point for elucidating the parameters of one particular social movement and places that movement in comparative context, it raises at least as many questions about the comparability of the Japanese environmental SMI, both to other Japanese SMIs and to environmental movements in other countries, as it answers. Is the large proportion of multi-issue organizations in the Japanese environmental movement, for instance, a uniquely Japanese phenomenon, unique to the environmental movement whose issues lend themselves to natural frame extension (Snow et al. 1986) or common across social movements? Although we know that environmental movements in a variety of national contexts employ diverse organizational structures, how does the distribution of organizational forms compare cross-nationally and with other social movements? Precisely what accounts for the unexpected pattern whereby local Japanese EMOs have a larger mean age

than national EMOs? The answers to questions such as these await further analyses examining the entire range, rather than just a small portion, of organizations that together compose an SMI.

#### ENDNOTES

\*The authors thank Bob Edwards, John McCarthy, Jennifer Schwartz and two anonymous *Sociological Inquiry* reviewers for providing constructive feedback on earlier versions of this article; Patricia Steinhoff and staff at the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Hawaii for providing assistance in identifying and tracking down this dataset; and Trisha Attai for her work in coding the data used herein. Please direct correspondence to Erik Johnson, Department of Sociology, Washington State University, Pullman WA 99164, USA; fax: (509) 335 6419; e-mail: ewj102@psu.edu.

<sup>1</sup>These reported means are underestimates. To reduce the influence of the Nature Conservancy, which acts as an outlier, its staff and budget were recoded as the same size as the next largest organizational staff and budget in the sample. Also, membership for the National Wildlife Federation was recoded in the same manner to account for its inclusion of school children as members (Rootes 2004).

<sup>2</sup>Brulle's (2000: 284) sample of majors likely over-represents such groups as "a special effort was made to include organizations from smaller segments of the U.S. environmental movement with discursive frames of Environmental Justice...."

<sup>3</sup>Response rates exclude from consideration the 140 organizations which self-identify.

<sup>4</sup>Although the dimensions of non-response bias remain under-researched, there is an extensive literature oriented toward improving response rates (e.g., Dillman 2000; Hager et al. 2003).

<sup>5</sup>When comparing across geographically defined organizational populations, we exclude EMOs operating in a transnational context owing to their small number ( $N = 32$ ).

<sup>6</sup>Only one organization with a very large budget or staff is coded as a primary EMO.

<sup>7</sup>For two organizations, individual members are recoded to a maximum of 500,000. For one organization, organizational members are recoded to a maximum of 5,000.

#### REFERENCES

- Almeida, Paul and Linda B. Stearns. 1998. "Political Opportunities and Local Grassroots Environmental Movements: The Case of Minamata." *Social Problems* 45(1):37-60.
- Andrews, Kenneth and Bob Edwards. 2005. "The Organizational Structure of Local Environmentalism." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 10(2):213-34.
- Bestor, Theodore C. 1989. *Neighborhood Tokyo*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Broadbent, Jeffrey P. 1998. *Environmental Politics in Japan: Networks of Power and Protest*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brulle, Robert J. 1995. *Agency, Democracy and the Environment: An Examination of U.S. Environmental Movement Organizations from the Perspective of Critical Theory*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, George Washington University, Washington DC.

- . 2000. *Agency, Democracy, and Nature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Crist, John T. and John D. McCarthy. 1996. "If I had a Hammer": The Changing Methodological Repertoire of Collective Behavior and Social Movements Research." *Mobilization* 1(1):87–102.
- Dalton, Russell J. 1994. *The Green Rainbow: Environmental Groups in Western Europe*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dillman, Don A. 2000. *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. New York: John Wiley.
- Edwards, Bob. 1994. "Semiformal Organizational Structure among Social Movement Organizations: An Analysis of the U.S. Peace Movement." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 23(4):309–33.
- and Michael W. Foley. 2003. "Social Movement Organizations beyond the Beltway: Understanding the Diversity of One Social Movement Industry." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 8(1):85–105.
- 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* 60:908–27.
- and John D. McCarthy. 2004. "Strategy Matters: The Contingent Value of Social Capital in the Survival of Local Social Movement Organizations." *Social Forces* 83(2):621–51.
- Fukushimaken Shizen Hogo Kyokai. 1993. *Oze: Shezen Hogo undo no Genten*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shinbun Shuppanyoku.
- Gray, Virginia and David Lowery. 1996. *The Population Ecology of Interest Representation: Lobbying Communities in the American States*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Hager, Mark A, Sarah Wilson, Thomas H. Pollak and Patrick Michael Rooney. 2003. "Response Rates for Mail Surveys of Nonprofit Organizations." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 32(2):252–67.
- Hannan, Michael T. and Glenn R. Carroll. 1992. *Dynamics of Organizational Populations; Density, Competition, and Legitimation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hasegawa, Koichi. 2004. *Constructing Civil Society in Japan: Voices of Environmental Movements*. Melbourne, Australia: Trans Pacific Press.
- Hays, Samuel P. 1987. *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955–1985*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Japan Environmental Association, ed. 2001. *Kankyo NGO Soran*. Tokyo, Japan: Environmental Restoration and Conservation Agency.
- Johnson, Erik. 2006. "Changing Issue Representation among Major United States Environmental Movement Organizations." *Rural Sociology* 71(1):132–54.
- . 2008. "Social Movement Size, Organizational Diversity and the Making of Federal Law." *Social Forces* 86(3):967–93.
- Joppke, Christian. 1993. *Mobilizing against Nuclear Energy: A Comparison of Germany and the United States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kawamura, Nozomu. 1994. *Sociology and Society of Japan*. New York: Kegan Paul International.
- Kempton, Willett, Dorothy C. Holland, Katherine Buting-Howarth, Erin Hannan, and Christopher Payne. 2001. "Local Environmental Groups: A Systematic Enumeration in Two Geographical Areas." *Rural Sociology* 66(4):557–78.
- Knoke, David, Peter V. Marsden, and Arne L. Kalleberg. 2002. "Survey Research Methods." Pp. 781–804 in *The Blackwell Companion to Organizations*, edited by Joel A. C. Baum. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

- Krauss, Ellis S. and Bradford L. Simcock. 1980. "Citizens' Movements: The Growth and Impact of Environmental Protest in Japan." Pp. 187–227 in *Political Opposition and Local Politics in Japan*, edited by Kurt Steiner, Ellis S. Krauss, Scott C. Flanagan. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kuroda, Yasumasa. 1972. "Protest Movements in Japan: A New Politics." *Asian Survey* 12(111): 947–52.
- Markham, William T. 2002. "Seductions of the Left and Right: Environmental Organizations, Ideology and Social Movements in 20th Century German Environmentalism." Paper presented at International Sociological Association Meetings, Brisbane, Australia.
- . 2005. "Networking Local Environmental Groups in Germany." *Environmental Politics* 14(5):667–85.
- Mason, Robert J. 1999. "Whither Japan's Environmental Movement? An Assessment of Problems and Prospects at the National Level." *Pacific Affairs* 72(1):187–207.
- McCammon, Holly J. 2001. "Stirring up Suffrage Sentiment: The Formation of State Woman Suffrage Organizations, 1866–1914." *Social Forces* 80(2):339–480.
- McCarthy, John D., David W. Britt, and Mark Wolfson. 1991. "The Institutional Channeling of Social Movements in the Modern State." *Research in Social Movements: Conflict and Change* 13:45–76.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:1212–41.
- . 2002. "The Enduring Vitality of the Resource Mobilization Theory of Social Movements." Pp. 533–65 in *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, edited by Jonathan H. Turner. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- McKean, Margaret A. 1981. *Environmental Protest and Citizen Politics in Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McLaughlin, Paul and Marwan Khawaja. 2000. "The Organizational Dynamics of the U.S. Environmental Movement: Legitimation, Resource Mobilization, and Political Opportunity." *Rural Sociology* 65(3):422–39.
- 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.
- Nishikido, Makoto. 2003. "The Dynamics of Protest about Environmental Issues in Japan after WWII: Using Protest Event Data" (in Japanese). *Journal of Environmental Sociology* 9:107–23.
- Paxson, M. Chris, Don A. Dillman, and John Tarnai 1995. "Improving Response to Business Mail Surveys." Pp. 303–16 in *Business Survey Methods*, edited by Brenda G. Cox, David A. Binder, and B. Nanjamma Chinnappa. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pekkanen, Robert. 2000. "Japan's New Politics: The Case of the NPO Law." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 26(1):111–48.
- Reimann, Kim D. 2001. "Building Networks from the Outside. In: International Movements, Japanese NGOs, and the Kyoto Climate Change Conference." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 6(1):69–82.
- Rootes, Christopher. 2004. "Environmental Movements." Pp. 608–640 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rucht, Dieter. 1989. "Environmental Movement Organizations in West Germany and France." *International Social Movement Research* 2:61–94.
- and Jochen Roose. 2001. "Neither Decline nor Sclerosis: The Organizational Structure of the German Environmental Movement." *West European Politics* 24(4):55–81.

- Sasaki-Uemura, Wesley. 2001. *Organizing the Spontaneous: Citizen Protest in Postwar Japan*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Schreurs, Miranda. 2002. *Environmental Politics in Japan, Germany, and the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, Richard W. 2002. *Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*, 5th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Smith, Jackie. 1997. "Nonresponse Bias in Organizational Surveys: Evidence from a Survey of Groups and Organizations Working for Peace." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 26(3):359–68.
- Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr, Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4):464–81.
- Takao, Yasuo. 2001. "The Rise of the 'Third Sector' in Japan." *Asian Survey* 41(2):290–309.
- Tsuru, Shigeto. 1999. *The Political Economy of the Environment: The Case of Japan*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Upham, Frank. 1976. "A Sociological Analysis of Four Japanese Pollution Suits." *Law and Society Review* 10:231–32.
- Van Dyke, Nella and Sarah A. Soule. 2002. "Structural Social Change and the Mobilizing Effect of Threat." *Social Problems* 49(4):497–520.
- Zald, Mayer N. and John D. McCarthy. 1987. *Social Movement in an Organizational Society*. New Brunswick: Transaction Press.