functions of the traditional mass media and the multifaceted World Wide Web. Even as the social media venue remains an emerging channel for leisure, the preliminary effects of social media have already become apparent. Politicians, including President Obama, maintain a social media management team to make important announcements and explain his political agendas to connect with voters. Celebrities compete for more social media followers to keep their fan base mesmerized. Marketers are vying for electronic word of mouth to reach more consumers. Media are spreading entertainment information, content, and options across the social media landscape to reel in their audiences. Social scientific research on the leisure functions and effects of social media has only just begun. As the social media channels mature, it will be most interesting to ascertain the effects of social media on our leisure life and the larger digital information culture.
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Definition

The concept of social mobility refers to the phenomenon of shifting from one social position to
another, either in comparison with family background or with previous employment (Social Stratification, Occupational Status, Class Identification, Socioeconomic Status (SES)). The former case, called intergenerational social mobility, studies the transmission of social status from parents to children (Life Chance, Social Justice, Social Inequalities), whereas the latter case, often named intragenerational social mobility or occupational mobility, investigates individuals’ employment history over their life course (Life Course).

Social mobility can be measured in absolute and relative terms (Measurement Methods). Computed directly from mobility tables, absolute social mobility allows for the decomposition of measures such as immobility and mobility rates, vertical (long-range) and non-vertical (short-range) mobility rates, and upward and downward social mobility. In contrast, relative social mobility, also often referred to as social fluidity, tends to provide an intrinsic measure of social mobility as independent as possible from structural changes. In other words, it tells us about the degree of openness of a given society.

**Description**

The concept of social mobility is deeply rooted in the history of sociology (History of Social Indicators and Its Evolution). By the beginning of the twentieth century, social and political issues raised by social mobility attracted attention (Sorokin, 1927). But even in the late nineteenth century, the question of transmission of characteristics from one generation to another was of eminent importance. For example, Galton (1886), who conceptualized the rationale behind the popular linear regression model, depicted what he called “the law of regression” of hereditary transmission by finding that offspring becomes more mediocre than their parents.

Since the post-World War II years, the study of social mobility has become more systematic with the express purpose of standardizing mobility data and analysis to quantify cross-national differences in social mobility, as mentioned by Hout and DiPrete in their review of 50 years of social mobility research (Hout and DiPrete 2006, p. 3) (Comparative Analysis, Social welfare, Social trends). In fact, the study of social mobility in a comparative framework became a crucial issue in a context that faced conflicting theoretical propositions. On the one hand, the functionalist theory claimed that economic development would lead industrial societies to become more meritocratic and enjoy higher rates of social mobility (Blau & Duncan, 1967; Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison, & Myers, 1960; Parsons, 1960; Treiman, 1970). These societies would be characterized by greater equality of opportunity (Equality, Intergenerational equity). On the other hand, the Lipset-Zetterberg hypothesis (Lipset & Zetterberg, 1956), and later the renowned Featherman, Jones, and Hauser (Featherman, Jones, & Hauser, 1975), maintained respectively that mobility rates were invariant and that patterns of mobility would be very similar in industrial societies with a market economy and a nuclear family system.

To ascertain which thesis more accurately describes social mobility in industrial societies, large-scale empirical comparative research was conducted such as the Comparative Analysis of Social Mobility in Industrial Nations (CASMIN) project. Findings, Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992) published under the title “The Constant Flux,” demonstrated strong effects of class inheritance and similarities in patterns of social mobility over time and place.

However, over the last couple of decades, empirical research has placed greater emphasis on change and variation in social mobility (Social change). Notably, further comparative research (Breen, 2004) has found a general tendency toward increasing social fluidity, although the trend is not statistically significant in every country (Breen & Luijkx, 2004, p. 389). As well, for differences in the strength of social fluidity between some countries and within some countries over time, little difference was observed in the patterns of social mobility, in line with Erikson and Goldthorpe’s Constant Flux thesis (Breen & Luijkx, 2004, p. 400–401).
In other words, social changes such as globalization (Globalization and Well-being), the expansion of the service sector (Labour force participation rates, Labour market(s)), and educational expansion (Education, Educational inequality) may have increased, at least a little, equality of opportunity in countries such as Sweden, France, and the Netherlands. Yet, a significant number of people in industrialized countries still reach similar social positions as their parents did.

Besides the fascinating issues that the study of social mobility raises in democratic societies, it is also dependent on a certain amount of measurement assumptions. First and foremost, since the fundamental analysis of social mobility is based on the relationship between social origin and the social position attained, people who never have a job (or whose parents never had a job) are excluded. Studies also usually make no distinction between full-time and part-time jobs. What is more, because the conception of social class is in itself a theoretical construct often embedded in ideological visions such as Marxist or Weberian (Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992; Goldthorpe, 2000; Marshall & Rose, 1989; Wright, 1989), measuring social mobility is based on assumptions about the social world and how to measure it. The comparison of people’s occupations with those of their fathers over time also implies that they are strictly comparable. This is an artifact, because the same occupations can encompass different realities according to periods and/or contexts (Contextual indicators).

Apart from these fundamental measurement issues, the study of social mobility has tended originally to be highly normative. Insofar as social mobility was traditionally embedded into the conception of the “male breadwinner,” the study of women’s social mobility had been largely neglected at least until the 1980s and 1990s (Gender, Gender Inequalities, Gender Discrimination, Gender Equality). Accused of “intellectual sexism” (Acker, 1973), social mobility scholars argued that the limited participation of women in the labor force rendered it difficult to measure women’s social positions (Occupational Sex Segregation, Women’s Status, Women’s Employment). To get around this problem, some researchers adopted the “dominance approach” that consists of inferring married women’s social positions according to that of their husbands. However, the extent to which this approach really captures women’s situations has been questioned. Since then, the focus has been much more widely placed on the “individual approach,” that is, women’s own employment situations, and their social mobility has been more systematically analyzed (Wright, 1997).

Different kinds of causes and consequences can be drawn to understand the ins and outs of social mobility (Causal Inference). As to causes of social mobility, research has shown the eminent importance of education as a crucial resource to attaining higher social position in most industrialized countries (Human Capital). Research on education and its effects is now a central question on the agenda of the International Sociological Association’s research committee on social stratification and mobility (RC28).

Beyond education, macrostructural considerations can also have important effects on life chances (Contextual Indicators). In fact, the historical context of childhood socialization can have a determining role on adulthood opportunities. For instance, Elder (1998) demonstrated how children who grew up during the Great Depression have seen their lives shaped by deprivations they experienced during their childhoods (Child Poverty). As a consequence, because historical context can generate different mobility chances, some generations are more likely to benefit from ascending social mobility, while others benefit from descending. Authors such as Chauvel (1998) demonstrated the increase of inequality of opportunity across generations in France. He depicted how the members of the post-World War II generation, who enjoyed the rapid increase of higher education (Higher Education: Human and Social Capital Effects) as well as favorable labor market entry conditions during the long boom period (“Trente Glorieuses”), still enjoy more advantages than do subsequent generations. Indeed, not only has this generation benefited from full-employment stability over their life course and major social
advances such as large pension benefits but also given that the governing elite tends to be more recruited from this generation, its members have enacted laws to protect their interests. In contrast, younger generations tend to be left behind. On average highly educated, they nonetheless face high obstacles in establishing themselves in the labor market for the long term (Working Poor, Workplace Flexibility). The difficulty of finding their first job, the increase of unemployment (Unemployment), and the accumulation of insecure short-term work contracts may have long-term lasting effects on the life course of these generations – that is, a scarring effect.

Consequences of social mobility on individuals’ well-being have not shown such strong trends up until now. Nonetheless, the dissonance between the social origin milieu and that of social destination can generate tensions among individuals. Although little is known about effects of these tensions on individuals’ well-being, two distinctive visions that summarize these tensions can be cited. First, the socialization hypothesis states that socially mobile individuals adhere to the dispositions acquired from their social context of origin. In this sense, they are disassociated from their social destination class. Secondly, the adaptation hypothesis sustains that they adapt attitudes and dispositions that are viable in their new social environment. This corresponds to a situation of acculturation in which the culture of origin is given up. On empirical bases, Veenhoven (2011) finds no correlation between social mobility and happiness. However, these conclusions can be questioned when it comes to distinguishing between downward and upward social mobility. Indeed, are those in descending mobility more likely to preserve attitudes of the milieu of origin than those in ascending mobility? A recent study in Switzerland (Samuel, Hupka-Brunner, Stalder, & Bergman, 2011) suggested that the well-being of individuals in downward mobility tends to reach lower stability over time. Such studies support the idea to refine a little bit more reactions to social mobility, in order to reach a better understanding of its effects on well-being.

In sum, these results show interesting aspects of social mobility: This is not only a change in social position but also, very often, a change in social and geographical context (Mobility) that is not without impact on social networks (Network Analysis) and values (Value Theories, Subjective indicators). Therefore, to understand the relationship between social mobility and quality of life (Inequality in Quality of Life), a more systematic focus on the whole life course, taking into account all changes that potentially influence such a transition, must be developed.
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Definition

What Is Social Movement Strength?

Social movements themselves are “collective challenges, based on common purposes and social solidarities, in sustained interaction with elites, opponents and authorities” (Tarrow, 1994: 4).

Scholars of social movements differ in how they define and measure social movement strength, with many often either leaving the definition implicit or looking to proposed outcomes (such as changes in political elite behavior or in mass political opinion) as signifiers of movement strength. By using hypothesized outcomes to define strength, however, scholars and observers are left without the option to understand the actual relationship between social movements and these political outcomes. Thus, scholars have begun to construct more concrete, standalone definitions and measures of social movement strength.

Tilly (1999) begins to construct a general scheme by which to approximate social movement strength when he states the following:

Since the emergence and spread of social movements as distinctive forms of popular contention,

This entry is largely drawn from Chartock (2011)