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ABSTRACT

What are the political outcomes of social movements, and how are these outcomes achieved? Existing studies focus almost exclusively on policy change, thus underestimating the broader political impact of social movements. I study the case of the Chilean student movement (2011-2015), and find that it had six political outcomes, which it achieved through three causal mechanisms. Using process tracing, content analysis, and interviews with student leaders, I conclude that the political outcomes of social movements extend beyond the realm of policy and that non-institutional outcomes—particularly changes in political consciousness—are important forms of political change. By altering the way citizens perceive and engage with their political institutions, non-institutional outcomes can have long-term implications for a country’s political system and culture. Moving beyond existing scholarship, I develop an original theoretical framework that offers a multidimensional conceptualization of the relationship between collective action and political change. To more fully understand the protests and social movements that continue to emerge across the globe, scholars must study their outcomes in both the institutional and non-institutional arenas.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Between 2010 and 2014, protests erupted in thousands of cities in over one hundred countries around the world.\textsuperscript{1} From the Arab Spring to the Occupy movement, and from the Spanish \textit{indignados} to anti-austerity protests in Greece, hundreds of thousands of people took to the streets to demand political change in their respective countries. Recent protests have been some of the largest in history.\textsuperscript{2} Over the course of 2013, for example, more than 100 million Indians took to the streets to protest low living standards and high levels of inequality. In the same year, 17 million Egyptians protested against, and ultimately toppled, President Hosni Mubarak’s authoritarian regime.\textsuperscript{3} In 2011, in the context of the global waves of dissent shaking the world that year, \textit{TIME} magazine named “The Protestor” as its Person of the Year.\textsuperscript{4}

Recent protests and social movements struggle for different goals. In their study of world protests between 2006-2013, for example, Isabel Ortiz et al. found that 18% of all protests in the past decade have protested against neoliberal reforms, including the privatization of public services and austerity cuts. These movements demanded reforms such as increased government spending on social services and more progressive

\begin{itemize}
\item[3] Ibid., 33.
\end{itemize}
taxation. Many social movements also demand greater influence over the political decision-making process, seeking to enhance the inclusivity of their country’s political systems.

Yet, while a large body of literature examines how and why social movements emerge, it is only in the past two decades that scholars have begun to study empirically their political outcomes. This is due to a number of methodological and conceptual issues that have hindered progress in this subfield of social movement studies. In particular, it is challenging to establish whether it was a social movement or another factor that caused a specific political outcome. This is because at any point in time there are multiple actors, including interest groups and political parties, involved in the

---

5 Ortiz et al., *World Protests 2006-2013*, 22.

6 Ibid., 42.


10 The following works analyze the particular issues that have hindered progress in the study of social movement outcomes: Felix Kolb, *Protest and Opportunities: The Political Outcomes of Social Movements* (Campus Verlag, 2007); Charles Tilly, “From Interactions to Outcomes in Social Movements,” in *How Social Movements Matter*, ed. Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly, Social Movements, Protest, and Contention, v. 10 (Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 253–70.
political arena. This is complicated further by the time lag between the emergence of a social movement and many of its observable outcomes. Furthermore, existing scholarship has focused almost exclusively on the policy outcomes of social movements, overlooking other forms of political change. Consequently, our understanding of social movement outcomes, and the mechanisms through which these outcomes are achieved, remains underdeveloped.

In a world where social movements have been, and continue to be, important drivers of political change, the need for a more thorough understanding of their political outcomes is ever more pressing. With this theoretical goal in mind, my thesis asks the following question: what are the political outcomes of social movements, and how are these outcomes achieved? I answer this question through a case study of the Chilean student movement of 2011-2015. Specifically, I ask: what were the political outcomes of the Chilean student movement and how were these outcomes achieved? By answering these questions, my thesis creates a framework for understanding the political outcomes of social movements and the causal mechanisms through which these outcomes are achieved. By mechanisms, I refer to “a delimited class of events that alter relations among specified sets of elements in identical or closely similar ways over a variety of

---

11 Tilly, “From Interactions to Outcomes in Social Movements.”

situations.”13 Mechanisms, in other words, are what determine the relationship between two or more variables, in this case social movements and political change.

**Key Terms**

Before discussing the central arguments and findings of this thesis, I clarify some key terms. For the purpose of this thesis, I adopt Sidney Tarrow’s widely cited definition of social movements as “collective challenges, based on common purposes and social solidarities, in sustained interaction with elites, opponents, and authorities.”14 I choose this definition because it encompasses the four empirical properties of social movements—collective challenge, common purpose, social solidarity, and sustained interaction—that, taken together, distinguish them from protests and other forms of contentious action. Indeed, social movements are but a subset of contentious politics, a broad category that includes political violence, civil wars, and revolution.15 At the same time, a large number of protests do not necessarily constitute a social movement. Instead, a protest only becomes a social movement when it “taps into embedded social networks…[and produces] supportive identities able to sustain contention against powerful opponents.”16 In other words, social movements are differentiated from protests...
in that they are based on existing social networks, collective identities, and can sustain themselves over time.

In this thesis, social movements are the independent variable; and the dependent variable is political change. Most social movement scholars have operationalized political change as changes in public policy. Others, however, offer broader definitions. Social movement scholar Felix Kolb, for example, defines political change as “outcomes that are related to the state and changes in its policies, politics, and polity.” Although this definition extends the concept of political change beyond policy outcomes, it excludes non-institutional changes that occur among social movement participants and the citizenry at large. I argue that non-institutional political outcomes are important because they can influence the way citizens perceive and interact with their political institutions. By fostering the development of a citizenry that is willing and able to claim a greater stake in politics, these non-institutional outcomes can transform the relationship between the state and society.

I argue that a more theoretically and practically useful definition of political change must therefore encompass changes both within and without the state. Thus, I broaden Kolb’s definition of political change to include changes in the political consciousness of movement participants and the broader citizenry. Adapting Michael

---


18 Kolb, Protest and Opportunities, 4.

McCann’s definition of rights consciousness, I define political consciousness as the “ongoing, dynamic process of constructing one’s understanding of, and relationship to,”
the political world. My definition of political change thus refers to changes in the state’s policies and politics, as well as non-institutional changes in the political consciousness of movement participants and wider citizenry.

**The Argument**

Most studies on the political outcomes of social movements have focused on institutional political outcomes, particularly policy change. These institutional outcomes include what Kolb terms “substantive change” (changes in the political agenda and public policy) and changes in political institutions and the policymaking process. A central contention of thesis is that, in focusing exclusively on these forms of political change, the social movement literature has overlooked an important category of political outcome: non-institutional change. This is not always accidental; some scholars explicitly exclude non-institutional changes from their analysis of movement-generated political outcomes, arguing that transformations in the values, beliefs, and political attitudes of movement participants and the larger population do not constitute a political change.

In contrast to existing scholarship, I argue that non-institutional outcomes—particularly changes in political consciousness—are an important form of political change.

---


21 Kolb, *Protest and Opportunities*, 4.

change. This is because by altering the way citizens perceive and engage with their political institutions, non-institutional outcomes can influence a country’s political system and political culture—“the attitudes, beliefs, and values that underpin the operation of a particular political system.”23 This argument is supported by my case study of the Chilean student movement. I find that, in addition to a significant policy outcome in the form of an education reform passed in January 2015, the movement also had a number of non-institutional outcomes. The most important of these was an increase in political consciousness among movement participants. Through their participation in the student movement, students became politicized citizens who feel empowered to engage directly with the Chilean government and to demand new rights. This increased sense of empowerment spread to affect Chilean society more broadly, as evidenced in public opinion data.

In regards to the mechanisms through which the student movement achieved its policy outcomes, I find that the students used informal (protest) and formal channels (meetings and correspondence with key political actors) to push the Piñera and Bachelet governments into responding to their demands with a series of policy reforms. The movement also shifted public opinion on the country’s education system, which influenced the Chilean government’s policy responses to the movement. The means through which the movement achieved its outcomes can be understood in the context of three causal mechanisms identified in the social movement literature: (1) the disruption mechanism, (2) the political access influence mechanism, and (3) the public opinion shift

mechanism. The disruption theory argues that the influence of social movements stems from their ability to disrupt the normal functioning of institutions. The political access theory argues that if social movements gain access to the policymaking process, they can successfully influence policies through formal political institutions. Finally, the public opinion shift theory claims that social movements do not directly influence public policy change but induce shifts in public opinion, which, in turn, influence policymakers’ decisions.

Figure 1.1 on the following page represents visually the central arguments of this thesis.

---


As illustrated in Figure 1.1, social movements achieve political change by engaging with the executive, the legislature, and the media. These actors, in turn, have the power to affect particular forms of political change. For example, when a social movement targets successfully the executive, it can achieve institutional change because the executive has the power to reform political institutions. The mechanisms through which a social movement achieves its outcomes are indicated on the figure by the solid arrows emanating from the social movement box. As shown by the dotted arrows, the political changes caused by the social movement subsequently affect it. For example, if the social movement manages to secure a favorable policy change, this has a positive effect on movement participants who benefit from this success.
Significance

Theoretical Significance

This thesis makes three theoretical contributions to the scholarly literature: (1) it proposes a framework of political outcomes that integrates various indicators of political change, offering a broader operationalization of political change, (2) it advances a theory of how social movements cause political change, and (3) it adds a new case, the 2011 Chilean student movement, to the political outcomes literature.

Most studies define and measure movement-induced political change as changes in public policy.\(^27\) This is because this is one of the most visible ways in which social movements cause political change and also because many movements have a particular policy change as their central goal.\(^28\) Yet, the results of studies that conceptualize political change so narrowly are likely to overlook other movement-generated political outcomes and underestimate the political impact of social movements.\(^29\) My thesis makes a conceptual contribution to the literature by adopting a broader view of political change that includes both institutional and non-institutional outcomes. By integrating various indicators of movement-induced political change, which have usually been


\(^{29}\) Kolb, *Protest and Opportunities*, 10.
examined separately, into a single framework, my thesis offers a tool for overcoming the narrow conception of political change that characterizes much of the existing literature.\textsuperscript{30}

This thesis makes another conceptual contribution by examining the mechanisms through which the Chilean student movement achieved its political outcomes. As Daniel Cress, David Snow, among others, have pointed out, specifying how movements cause change will enhance greatly our understanding of the influence of social movements.\textsuperscript{31} Yet, many studies argue that a social movement caused particular political outcomes but do not examine the mechanisms through which this occurred.\textsuperscript{32} I, on the other hand, trace the process through which the student movement influenced the Chilean policymaking process to obtain its desired policy outcomes.

Finally, this thesis examines the extent to which existing theories about the political outcomes of social movements, derived primarily from European or North American case studies,\textsuperscript{33} travel to other regions. Specifically, this thesis studies a recent social movement in Chile, a country in the developing world. By adding a new case to the political outcomes literature, this thesis offers insights into whether the political changes caused by a Latin American social movement are similar, or different, to those

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 6.


\textsuperscript{33} Kolb, \textit{Protest and Opportunities}, 2; Tarrow, \textit{Power in Movement}, 184.
uncovered in European or North American cases. This thesis also examines whether existing theories about the mechanisms through which social movements achieve their outcomes are applicable to a Latin American case. Overall, then, this thesis tests the applicability of existing theories of social movement outcomes beyond the regions in which they were originally created.

**Practical Significance**

This thesis also has practical implications for policymakers, governments, social movement participants, and ordinary citizens. Social movements have shaped history, influencing political systems, institutions, and cultures. As Hank Johnston argues, without social movements it is unlikely that the modern state would exhibit the degree of democratic participation that it does today.\(^{34}\) Johnston points to the women’s movement and the Civil Rights movement in the United States as example of two social movements that won the vote for previously excluded sectors of society. In addition, social movements are a visually powerful way for citizens to communicate their preferences to the government beyond the ballot box. Indeed, as Tarrow argues, “the protest demonstration has become the major non-electoral expression of civil politics.”\(^{35}\) Social movements also provide a mechanism of social accountability that, ideally, allows citizens to hold their leaders accountable between elections. Unlike electoral

---


\(^{35}\) Tarrow, *Power in Movement*, 113.
mechanisms, this form of accountability does not depend on fixed calendars but can be activated “on demand” by organized civil society.\textsuperscript{36}

It is therefore clear that governments and policymakers must take social movements seriously. A better understanding of movements and their political reach can help policymakers design policies that are more responsive to the demands of their citizens. In addition, governments will be able to reform institutions to increase opportunities for democratic participation. These practical implications are particularly significant given that many recent movements, including the Chilean student movement, have articulated a discontent with traditional political institutions, suggesting a crisis of representative democracy.\textsuperscript{37} This means that the need for democratic governments to reform their interactions with their citizens is increasingly urgent.

\textbf{Research Design}

\textit{Case Selection}

In order to examine the extent to which social movements cause political change and the mechanisms through which they do so, I study the case of the 2011 Chilean student movement. I study this case for three main reasons: (1) it is what Stephen Van Evera calls a typical case; (2) it is data rich; and (3) it is an example of a social movement in the developing world.


\textsuperscript{37} Ortiz et al., \textit{World Protests 2006-2013}. 
Chile is well known as the first country in the world to implement a comprehensive package of radical neoliberal reforms.  

Undertaken by the Pinochet dictatorship in the 1970s and 1980s with the guidance of Milton Friedman’s “Chicago boys,” these reforms privatized the education, health, and pension systems, along with other parts of the economy. The neoliberal reforms transformed Chilean education from a robust public system to one of the most privatized education systems in the world. The student movement has emerged as a challenge to this system, demanding free, quality public education. Like protests and social movements in other parts of the world, the Chilean student movement contests the presence of the market in the realm of public goods and is thus an example of the movements against neoliberalism that have occurred across the globe in the past decade. The movement is, therefore, what Van Evera calls a typical case: one that possesses “average or typical background conditions,” in this case a history of deep neoliberal reforms. According to Van Evera, theories that pass the tests posed by typical cases are likely to apply widely to other cases as well.

---


43 Ibid.
Furthermore, although the Chilean student movement started as a challenge to the country’s education system, it has evolved into a broader challenge of Chile’s political system, which was also altered under the Pinochet regime.\footnote{Koschützke, “Chile Frente a Si Mismo,” February 2012, 30.} In particular, the movement calls for institutional reform to improve the representativeness of the country’s democracy.\footnote{Ibid., 31.} Thus, the Chilean student movement is also a good example of the disillusionment with the state of representative democracy that, according to Ortiz et al., has spurred social movements around the world.\footnote{Ortiz et al., World Protests 2006-2013, 6.}

Finally, the Chilean student movement is a data rich case. As Van Evera argues, “the more data we have, the more questions we can answer.”\footnote{Van Evera, Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science, 79.} There is not only significant amounts of research on Chile’s political history, which allows me to understand the context in which my case study occurs, but the movement has also received a lot of media coverage both nationally and internationally. In addition, Chile has a flourishing press, its police force gathers data about protest participation, and both government agencies and think tanks regularly conduct public opinion surveys. This is especially important for my research because I study the mechanisms through which the movement achieved policy change. Such an in-depth examination is only possible if the researcher has access to substantial amounts of data. The wealth of available qualitative and quantitative data about the Chilean student movement facilitates the research process.
Approach

I choose a case study approach to answer my research question because, as Robert Yin argues, case studies are the best approach when “how” questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context."48 My research question encompasses all three conditions. Furthermore, I am interested in the mechanisms through which movements cause political change and, as Van Evera argues, a case study allows exploration of how variation in the independent variable affects the dependent variable, in a way that a large-n study does not.49

Although the central focus of this thesis is the relationship between the student movement and political change, my research would not be complete without a consideration of other independent variables that may influence processes of political change. These could include the ideological leanings of the current government and other social movements occurring at the same time as the student movement. Thus, my research design leaves room for consideration of these alternative explanatory variables. Table 1.1 on the following page presents the methods used to analyze the student movement’s political outcomes.


Table 1.1: Methods for analyzing the political outcomes of the 2011 Chilean student movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Operationalized</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Chilean Student Movement (IV)</strong></td>
<td>Movement Intensity and Strength</td>
<td>Number of movement-related protests that occur in a specific period and number of participants in each protest.</td>
<td>Number of protests (2011-2015) and number of participants in each protest.</td>
<td>- Newspapers: El Mercurio, La Tercera, El Mostrador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement Goals</td>
<td>The aims of a social movement, as expressed by the movement itself.</td>
<td>Movement demands and claims (content).</td>
<td>- Letters sent by movement to government - Interviews with former and current student leaders</td>
<td>- Coding and content analysis - Changes over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Impact</td>
<td>The influence of a social movement on the political agenda.</td>
<td>Discussion of education in presidential platforms and speeches.</td>
<td>- Presidential platforms (campaigns) - Presidential speeches (annual)</td>
<td>- Content analysis - Changes over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Impact</td>
<td>The influence of a movement on the adoption of legislation and policies over time.</td>
<td>Policies (including proposals) related to a movement’s demands.</td>
<td>- Lower and upper House websites - Newspapers (same as above)</td>
<td>- Content analysis - Changes over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Political Change (DV)</strong></td>
<td>Procedural Change</td>
<td>Change in the closeness and/or level of access in the relationship between a social movement and political elites.</td>
<td>Number and content of meetings between student movement and political elites.</td>
<td>- Newspapers (same as above) - Meeting memos - Letters exchanged between movement and government actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-institutional Change</td>
<td>When a movement alters the internal structure of a political sub-institution.</td>
<td>Emergence of new political parties and/or increased parliamentary representation.</td>
<td>- Newspapers (same as above) - Party websites</td>
<td>- Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-institutional Political Change (DV)</strong></td>
<td>Changes in Public Opinion</td>
<td>Public opinion shifts during the period in which the social movement was active.</td>
<td>Changes in public opinion about education system and public support for movement and its demands.</td>
<td>- Public opinion polls (CEP, Adimark, CERC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Political Consciousness</td>
<td>Changes in understanding of, and relationship to, the political world.</td>
<td>Claims of changed political consciousness by movement participants and evidence of enhanced political consciousness among broader Chilean public.</td>
<td>- Interviews with former and current student leaders - Public opinion polls (same as above)</td>
<td>- Coding and content analysis - Changes over time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of institutional political changes adapted from Felix Kolb, *Protest and Opportunities: The Political Outcomes of Social Movements* (Campus Verlag, 2007)
Sources and Analysis

To study the Chilean student movement’s non-institutional outcomes, I use a multi-methods approach that includes elite interviews with 10 former and current student leaders, and an analysis of public opinion data, presidential platforms and presidential speeches. To uncover the mechanisms through which the movement achieved its policy outcomes I use process tracing, a method that “attempts to identify the intervening causal process—the causal chain and causal mechanism—between an independent variable (or variables) and the outcome of the dependent variable.” I examine letters exchanged between the student movement and key political figures, meeting memorandums, government policy proposals, and student responses to these proposals. I also analyze public opinion data about Chileans’ concern for education, support for the student movement, and support for the movement’s demands.

Limitations

My research is limited in several ways. First, this thesis relies heavily on newspaper data, which is inherently biased. For example, newspapers choose to cover particular events and not others, and also portray these events in specific ways, according to various economic or political motives. Therefore, newspaper information about protest events and participation rates might not be fully accurate. At the same time, however, information about protest participation published by the student confederation might exaggerate numbers for political purposes. Indeed, the number of participants according


to student reports tends to be much higher than police data. To address these limitations, I triangulate these data sources to avoid relying exclusively on one source of information. I also address my personal biases: as a leftist and a student, I sympathize with the Chilean student movement and its demands. Therefore, I want to see that the movement has been successful in achieving its aims. In other words, I have an interest in finding evidence of political change. I must therefore ensure that my research design corrects for these biases. To do so, I triangulate my data sources and also consider other relevant variables that might have contributed to processes of political change in Chile. In this way, I reduce the likelihood of over-emphasizing the influence of the student movement on any particular political outcome.

Chapter Summary

Chapter Two establishes the theoretical context for my thesis by presenting, analyzing, and critiquing existing theories about the political outcomes of social movements and the mechanisms through which they achieve these outcomes. Chapter Three establishes the economic, political, social, and historical context for my case study of the Chilean student movement. It examines the effects of Pinochet’s neoliberal reforms on the country’s education and political system, and discusses the history of student organizing in Chile. Chapter Four presents my empirical analysis of the political outcomes of the Chilean student movement, focusing most closely on education policy reforms and changes in political consciousness among movement participants and the broader Chilean public. Chapter Five presents my analysis of the mechanisms through which the movement achieved its policy outcomes, through the construction of a causal narrative linking the student movement to the education policy changes discussed in
Chapter Four. Finally, Chapter Six summarizes my research findings and discusses their theoretical implications for the study of social movements and political change. The concluding chapter also makes recommendations for future research on the political outcomes of social movements.
CHAPTER TWO
THEORIES OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND POLITICAL CHANGE

This chapter presents, analyzes, and critiques the existing literature on the political outcomes of social movements, with the purpose of establishing the theoretical context for this thesis. Much of the scholarship on social movements and political change is motivated, either implicitly or explicitly, by three broad questions: (1) To what extent do social movements cause political change? (2) What are the political outcomes of social movements? (3) How do social movements achieve these outcomes? Each section of this literature review examines the scholarly debates and perspectives related to one of these questions.

First, I examine the most fundamental debate in the scholarly literature; the question of whether social movements cause political change in the first place. I find that while most political sociologists argue that they do, this is at odds with the conventional arguments advanced by the political science literature. Second, I examine existing scholarship on the political outcomes of social movements. I trace the development of this research and find that while scholars have developed new approaches to the study of movement outcomes, they have focused almost exclusively on movement-induced changes in public policy and overlooked other forms of political change.

Finally, I examine the literature on causal mechanisms. I find that only a handful of scholars have advanced theories about the mechanisms through which movements generate political change. In addition, existing theories of causal mechanisms are based exclusively on social movements in northern democracies and their utility for understanding causal processes in other contexts is unclear. In response to the shortcomings identified in the literature, this thesis proposes an integrated theoretical
framework of social movements and political change that offers a multidimensional conceptualization of political change.

To What Extent do Social Movements Cause Political Change?

Much of the scholarship on social movements rests on the assumption that they have the ability to cause at least some degree of political change. Yet, while this is a view shared by most political sociologists, many political scientists disagree. Indeed, the conventional view in the political science literature is that social movements have little influence on processes of political change.¹ As Doug McAdam and Yang Su argue, this is because political scientists tend to focus on formal political institutions, to the exclusion of alternative spheres of political action.² This is particularly true of those scholars operating within the liberal tradition, which, as Chantal Mouffe argues, is characterized by a rationalist, individualist approach that tends to underplay the importance of collective action.³

Yet, even among social movement scholars there is disagreement over the extent to which social movements cause political change and the conditions under which they do so. Some claim that, when compared to other political actors, social movements have relatively little influence on processes of political change.⁴ According to Marco Giugni,

for example, social movements can exert, at best, a moderate influence on public policy change.\(^5\) This argument is based on his study of the policy outcomes of the peace, ecology, and antinuclear movements in the United States between 1977 and 1995, in which he finds that movements only impact policy when they are supported by political elites and public opinion. Paul Burstein and Sarah Sausner support this perspective, arguing that collective action generally has little impact on policy change.\(^6\) For these authors, political parties and public opinion are more influential than social movements in causing policy change.

Another school of thought argues that social movements are the outcomes, not the causes, of political change.\(^7\) For these scholars, structural changes generate both the political outcomes attributed to social movements and the movements themselves. This argument is supported by Sarah Soule et al.\(^8\)’s study of the U.S. women’s movement of 1956-1979. The scholars find that protest events do not have an independent effect on the number of House and Senate roll calls and congressional hearings related to women’s rights issues. Instead, it is increased female labor force participation that explains the heightened attention to women’s rights issues by the political establishment as well as the increased incidence of protest. According to Soule and colleagues, their findings support the view that movements do not cause political change but, rather, are the outcomes of

---

\(^5\) Giugni, “Useless Protest?,” 45.


broad structural changes.8

Other scholars, however, argue that social movements are important forces behind processes of social and political change.9 Frank Baumgartner and Christine Mahoney, for example, claim that social movements have had enormous impacts on American politics, prompting changes in health care and environmental policies, among a host of other issues.10 Other scholars, such as Jon Agnone, argue that social movements are important because they have the power to place issues on the political agenda and to influence public opinion.11 In his study of the U.S. environmental movement of 1960-1998, Agnone finds that a higher level of protest activity was associated with increased public support for environmental issues and an increase in environmental legislation.12

Above and beyond the impact of social movements on particular policy issues, some scholars argue that social movements have played, and continue to play, key roles

8 Ibid., 251.
10 Baumgartner and Mahoney, “Social Movements, the Rise of New Issues, and the Public Agenda.”


12 Ibid., 1593.
in transforming authoritarian regimes into representative democracies. In their classic texts, McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly point to the correspondence between social movements and processes of democratization, arguing that social movements have been the driving force behind some of the most important political changes in history. Others agree, arguing that social movements push political institutions to be more democratic and participatory than they would be in the absence of such movements.

This thesis finds that the Chilean student movement had six political outcomes, with important consequences for the country’s education and political systems. In addition to its impacts on policy and political institutions, the student movement also increased the political consciousness of movement participants and the Chilean citizenry more broadly. Thus, my research supports those scholars who argue that social movements are key drivers behind processes of social and political change.

**What are the Political Outcomes of Social Movements?**

The political outcomes of social movements can be divided into two broad categories: direct outcomes, such as a movement-generated change in public policy, and indirect outcomes, such as changes in public opinion on a specific issue. Within these broad categories, scholars have developed more specific outcome typologies, focused

---

13 This argument is made by: Pedro Ibarra in *Social Movements and Democracy*, 1st ed (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 2.


primarily on policy outcomes. William Gamson’s *The Strategy of Social Protest*, published in 1975, was the first study to examine the political outcomes of social movements. In this landmark study, Gamson examined 53 social movements, which he called challenging groups, in the United States between 1800 and 1945 and measured how successful each was at achieving its goals. In defining movement success, he considered two factors: “acceptance”—whether the challenging group was acknowledged by those in power—and “new advantages”—whether the movement was able to attain its goals. Gamson evaluated the success of the movements against their stated goals and found that 38% of the challenging groups were unsuccessful, while 49% were successful. In other words, Gamson’s study showed that social movements caused at least some form of political change almost half of the time.

Gamson’s contemporaries, including Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward, also evaluated the outcomes of social movements using a success/failure dichotomy. However, this approach was limited in its usefulness because examining a movement solely in regards to its stated goals caused scholars to overlook unintended forms of

---


19 Ibid., 29.

20 Ibid., 36.

political change.\textsuperscript{22} In addition, as Kenneth Andrews argues, the goals of social movements are by their nature contested by both participants and observers, complicating definitions of success.\textsuperscript{23} What is more, a movement’s goals often change as the movement develops. Over time, therefore, scholars have modified Gamson’s pioneering work, discardino the success/failure approach and developing new criteria for measuring movement-generated political change.\textsuperscript{24} In particular, scholars have begun to focus on movement outcomes, an approach that allows them to study the unintended and negative consequences of social movements as well as their successes. This thesis adopts such an approach.

Yet, despite these theoretical advancements, there is still no consensus in the scholarly literature on how to define and measure political change.\textsuperscript{25} As discussed previously, the vast majority of studies have focused on movement-induced changes in public policy,\textsuperscript{26} because this is one of the most obvious ways that social movements can


affect political change and is relatively easy to measure. However, even those studies that operationalize political change as changes in public policy use different indicators to measure the policy impact of a movement. For example, in assessing a movement’s policy impact, some scholars examine passed legislation, while others measure public spending on a particular policy.

This is further complicated by the fact that other scholars operationalize movement-generated political change as shifts in public opinion, or a movement’s ability to place issues on the political agenda. This diverse array of dependent variables, each conceived of as a form of political change, means that the literature lacks a coherent and widely accepted theory of social movements and political change. Thus, it is vital that future research approach the study of movement outcomes in a more systematic way, guided by an explicit framework of political outcomes. This thesis proposes such a framework and, in so doing, provides a standardized tool that scholars can use to compare movement-generated political change across different cases. As discussed in Chapter

---


30 Burstein, “Public Opinion, Demonstrations, and the Passage of Antidiscrimination Legislation.”

31 Baumgartner and Mahoney, “Social Movements, the Rise of New Issues, and the Public Agenda.”

One, my framework builds on Felix Kolb’s typology\textsuperscript{33} of political outcomes, which classifies political change as either substantive (referring to policy change and changes in the political agenda) or institutional.\textsuperscript{34} To these two categories, I add non-institutional outcomes, which include changes in political consciousness. I now review the existing literature on each type of political outcome.

\textsuperscript{33} Kolb’s typology includes 5 types of substantive political outcomes (agenda, alternatives, policy, implementation, and goods impact) and 3 types of institutional political outcomes (procedural change, intra-institutional change, and state transformation). My framework, and hence literature review, does not include all of these forms of political change. For example, state transformation is a rare, and radical, form of change that is not relevant to the research at hand. My framework includes 2 types of substantive political outcomes—agenda and policy impact—and 2 types of institutional outcomes—procedural and intra-institutional change.

\textsuperscript{34} Kolb, \textit{Protest and Opportunities}, 21.
Substantive Political Change

Agenda impact

This is the ability of a social movement to place issues on the political agenda and/or influence their relevance. Studies on this form of political change have found that movements can be powerful agenda-setters. This is because, through disruptive protest, social movements can draw the attention of policymakers to issues that were previously ignored. In their study of movements across five different issue areas in the United States, for example, Baumgartner and Mahoney find that the number of social movement organizations dedicated to a particular issue was correlated significantly with the number of congressional hearings on that issue. Other scholars argue that it is during the agenda-setting phase of the policy cycle, as compared to the design or implementation phase, that movements are best able to exert influence. For example, Brayden King et al. find that while the American women’s suffrage movement successfully placed the issue of the female vote on the political agenda, it had less of an impact on the decision-making stage of the policy process.

35 Ibid., 28.
38 Baumgartner and Mahoney, “Social Movements, the Rise of New Issues, and the Public Agenda.”
40 King, Dahlin, and Cornwall, “Winning Woman Suffrage One Step at a Time.”
Policy impact

A movement is said to have impacted policy if it caused policymakers to adopt legislation related to its goals.\footnote{Kolb, \textit{Protest and Opportunities}, 28.} Many scholars argue that movements are able to exert at least some influence on public policy.\footnote{Cress and Snow, “The Outcomes of Homeless Mobilization”; Earl, “Methods, Movements, and Outcomes. Methodological Difficulties in the Study of Extra-Movement Outcomes”; Gamson, \textit{The Strategy of Social Protest}, 1975; King, Bentele, and Soule, “Protest and Policymaking”; McAdam and Su, “The War at Home”; Soule and Olzak, “When Do Movements Matter?”} However, while some argue that social movements have a direct effect on the policymaking process,\footnote{Andrews, “Social Movements and Policy Implementation”; Melinda D. Kane, “Social Movement Policy Success: Decriminalizing State Sodomy Laws, 1969–1998,” \textit{Mobilization: An International Quarterly} 8, no. 3 (2003): 313–34; McAdam and Su, “The War at Home”; Piven and Cloward, \textit{Poor People’s Movements}; Theda Skocpol et al., “Women’s Associations and the Enactment of Mothers’ Pensions in the United States,” \textit{The American Political Science Review} 87, no. 3 (September 1, 1993): 686–701.} others claim that movements only have an indirect effect.\footnote{Amenta, \textit{When Movements Matter}; Soule and Olzak, “When Do Movements Matter?”; Tarrow, \textit{Power in Movement}.} Melinda Kane, for example, argues that states were more likely to repeal the criminalization of sodomy when a highly mobilized movement actively pressured it to do so.\footnote{Kane, “Social Movement Policy Success.” 325.} Soule and Olzak, on the other hand, argue that protest only indirectly affects legislation. In their study of how protest activities influenced environmental legislation enacted between 1961 and 1990, they find that protest influenced the number of congressional hearings on environmental issues but did not have an effect on policy beyond this.\footnote{Soule and Olzak, “When Do Movements Matter?” 217.} Edwin Amenta, meanwhile, argues that a
movement’s outcomes are politically mediated; it is much more likely to influence policy impact if it receives support from members of the political elite.47

Other scholars, however, contend that social movements are either ineffective at generating policy change,48 or that when the influence of public opinion is taken into account, movement influence becomes less significant.49 According to Burstein and Sausner, for example, the influence of public opinion often trumps that of collective action and it is the former that determines congressional action on any particular issue.50 To measure a movement’s policy impacts studies have either examined the behavior of individual representatives,51 measured through House and Senate roll-call votes or sponsorship of bills, or the actual adoption of legislation favorable to a social movement.52 My thesis takes the latter approach, because it represents a stronger policy impact than the former.


48 Olson, The Logic of Collective Action.


52 Kane, “Social Movement Policy Success”; King, Bentele, and Soule, “Protest and Policymaking.”
Institutional Political Outcomes

While there is substantial scholarship on the policy and agenda setting impacts of social movements, less work has been done on their institutional outcomes. However, there is consensus in the literature that this form of political change is an important one and must be taken into account in studies of the political outcomes of social movements.\textsuperscript{53} Below I review existing studies on what Kolb refers to as procedural and instar-institutional outcomes.

\textit{Procedural change}

Procedural change refers to a change in the relationship between a social movement and a political sub-institution, such as a political party.\textsuperscript{54} This is the simplest form of institutional change and is, essentially, what Gamson termed acceptance—a change in the relationship between the challenging group and its antagonists.\textsuperscript{55} For Gamson, this involved a shift from a hostile or indifferent relationship to a more positive one and could be observed when the antagonist was willing to negotiate with the challenging group on a regular basis.\textsuperscript{56} Although procedural change can lay the foundations for more substantial institutional change in the future, it is, as Kolb notes, a

\begin{itemize}
  \item Kolb, \textit{Protest and Opportunities}, 34.
  \item Ibid., 32.
\end{itemize}
Intra-institutional change

Intra-institutional change occurs when a movement alters the internal structure of a political sub-institution. This type of change is what Gamson referred to as inclusion: “the integration of challenging group leaders or members in positions of status or authority in the antagonist’s organizational structure.” While these outcomes are more difficult to achieve than procedural change, they are also more lasting due to the impact of path dependence. According to James Mahoney, path dependence “characterizes specifically those historical sequences in which contingent events set into motion institutional patterns or event chains that have deterministic properties.” In the case of intra-institutional gains, path dependence means that once these outcomes have been achieved, it is difficult to reverse them. In addition, studies show that intra-institutional change can influence a movement’s policy outcomes in the future. Examples of intra-

57 Kolb, Protest and Opportunities, 34.

58 Ibid.


62 Kolb, Protest and Opportunities, 35.
institutional change include the founding of new political parties, and the extension of voting rights for previously excluded groups. Social movements can also create less tangible forms of intra-institutional change. As Elizabeth Clemens argues in her study of the American women’s movement, women’s groups helped create new political institutions through an ongoing process of organizational innovation. Clemens contends that the women’s movement was able to adapt “nonpolitical models of organization for political purposes.” Following the call for increased scholarly attention to movement-generated institutional change, this thesis examines forms of intra-institutional change caused by the Chilean student movement.

---


66 Ibid., 758.
Non-institutional Outcomes

Very few studies consider forms of political change beyond the institutional outcomes outlined above (here, I am using the term “institutional outcomes” to refer to both the substantive and institutional outcomes discussed in the previous sections). While some scholars recognize that social movements can induce forms of cultural change, or have implications for the life-course of movement participants, these are usually not considered to be forms of political change. Kolb, for example, explicitly excludes non-institutional change from his typology of political outcomes, arguing that changes in the political attitudes of movement participants, for example, do not constitute a political outcome. I, on the other hand, contend that non-institutional outcomes—particularly changes in political consciousness—are important forms of political change. Movement participation can, for example, empower citizens by providing them with the political tools and networks to mount future collective action. Consequently, I add non-institutional change to Kolb’s typology of political outcomes. In doing so, I build on the work of scholars who have studied movement-generated changes in political consciousness and public opinion. Specifically, I draw on Michael McCann’s Rights at Work, in which he studies the female pay equity movement in the United States.

67 Earl, “The Cultural Consequences of Social Movements.”

68 McAdam, Freedom Summer.

69 Kolb, Protest and Opportunities, 4.

Changes in political consciousness

As Tarrow argues succinctly, “movement participation is politicizing.”\(^{71}\) Piven and Cloward were perhaps the first to draw attention to this phenomenon, which they discussed in their classic text *Poor People’s Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail.*\(^{72}\) They argue that when citizens begin to assert their rights and demand changes to the status quo, there develops “a new sense of efficacy; people who ordinarily consider themselves helpless come to believe that they have some capacity to alter their lot.”\(^{73}\) Others have proposed similar arguments.\(^ {74}\) Elizabeth Schneider, for example, contends that participation in social movements can be a transformative experience that politicizes participants in deep and enduring ways.\(^ {75}\) In *Freedom Summer*, meanwhile, McAdam describes movement participants returning to their college campuses with a lasting sense of political justice and a readiness to get involved in future activism. For movement activists, he writes, “politics became the central force in their lives.”\(^ {76}\)

In his study of the pay equity movement, McCann uncovers similar consequences of movement participation. Paying close attention to the idea of “rights consciousness,” McCann argues that movement participation allows individuals and groups to imagine

\(^{71}\) Tarrow, *Power in Movement*, 221.

\(^{72}\) Piven and Cloward, *Poor People’s Movements*.

\(^{73}\) Ibid., 4.


\(^{75}\) Schneider, “The Dialectic of Rights and Politics.”

\(^{76}\) McAdam, *Freedom Summer*, 186.
and claim rights not formally recognized or enforced by political elites.\textsuperscript{77} I argue that the concept of rights consciousness can be extended to include changes in political consciousness more broadly. Thus, I adapt McCann’s definition of rights consciousness\textsuperscript{78} and define political consciousness as the “ongoing, dynamic process of constructing one’s understanding of, and relationship to,”\textsuperscript{79} the political world.

According to McCann, although the pay equity movement achieved limited policy gains, it had a broader political significance not captured by studies that focus solely on policy impacts.\textsuperscript{80} Specifically, he argues that the movement induced progressive ideological change among movement participants, thus opening up new possibilities for empowering women at work.\textsuperscript{81} To measure these shifts in rights consciousness, McCann interviews 140 movement participants and finds that many activists claimed that the movement’s single most important outcome had been a transformation in their hearts, minds, and social identities.\textsuperscript{82} In agreement with McCann, I argue that this change in political consciousness is an important form of political change because it sets a precedent for what citizens can demand from the state and can lay the foundations for future mobilization. I argue that while this might be a less tangible form of political

\textsuperscript{77} McCann, \textit{Rights at Work}, 1994, 7.

\textsuperscript{78} McCann defines rights, or legal, consciousness as the “ongoing, dynamic process of constructing one’s understanding of, and relationship to, the social world through use of legal conventions and discourses.”

\textsuperscript{79} McCann, \textit{Rights at Work}, 1994, 7.

\textsuperscript{80} McCann, \textit{Rights at Work}, 1994, 227.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 277.

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., 230.
change, it is nonetheless an important one with significant future consequences.

Changes in public opinion

Many scholars agree that social movements can have a powerful influence on public opinion. Furthermore, as McCann argues, if a movement achieves policy gains, this achievement can “nurture new hopes and expectations” among movement participants and the citizenry at large. In the case of the pay equity movement, enhanced “rights consciousness” was experienced both by movement participants and society more generally. The increased capacity and willingness to demand rights at work was experienced both by movement participants and other citizens who had witnessed the movement. In other words, the changes in political consciousness experienced by movement participants can spread beyond the movement itself and influence society. Through this process, a movement can impact the broader political culture of the society in which it occurs. In addition to being a non-institutional outcome, public opinion change is also a mechanism through which movements can achieve other forms of political change. Thus, I examine this outcome more closely in the mechanisms section of this literature review.


84 McCann, Rights at Work, 1994, 103.
Critique of Political Outcomes Literature

An increase in scholarly attention to the political outcomes of social movements over the past two decades has advanced our understanding of movement-induced political change. However, theoretical progress in this subfield of social movement studies has been hindered by a disproportionate focus on the policy impacts of social movements. In particular, scholars tend to overlook non-institutional outcomes. This is problematic because studies that conceptualize political change so narrowly are likely to underestimate the political consequences of movements. Moreover, even those scholars who do examine changes beyond the realm of public policy tend to consider only a handful of political outcomes instead of approaching movement-generated political change from a more holistic perspective. As a result, despite the recent proliferation of studies on the political consequences of social movements, the scholarly literature has not moved towards generalizable theories of movements and political change. Future research must, therefore, approach the study of movement outcomes in a more systematic way, guided by a coherent framework of movement-generated political change. It is with this goal in mind that my thesis proposes such a framework.
How do Social Movements Achieve Their Political Outcomes?

For a social movement to achieve any political outcomes, it must activate at least one causal mechanism of political change. Uncovering these mechanisms allows scholars to understand how a movement caused a specific outcome, enhancing our understanding of the relationship between social movements and political change. For almost two decades, researchers have highlighted the need for increased scholarly attention to these mechanisms. In 2001, for example, McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly called for a shift away from static models of movement-generated political change towards an approach that considers the dynamic mechanisms at work in processes of political change. Others have echoed this call, arguing that in addition to establishing a causal relationship between a movement’s activity and a particular outcome, scholars should identify the mechanisms through which this outcome was achieved. Yet, despite growing consensus in the scholarly literature of the importance of studying causal mechanisms, few studies actually do so. As a result, our knowledge about how social movements cause political change remains underdeveloped. That said, a few scholars have advanced models of causal mechanisms, which I review below. These are: (1) the disruption mechanism, (2) the political access mechanism, and (3) the public opinion shift mechanism. I also discuss Andrews’ “movement infrastructure model,” which examines how a movement can activate more than one mechanism at once.

85 McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly, *Dynamics of Contention*.


**Disruption mechanism**

Much scholarship on the political outcomes of social movements assumes that they achieve these outcomes through their power of disruption.\(^88\) Gamson was one of the first to advance this argument. In *The Strategy of Social Protest*, he found that challenging groups that used violent and disruptive tactics—such as riots, strikes, and protests—were more successful than those that employed more moderate tactics.\(^89\) Piven and Cloward agreed, arguing that if scholars wanted to evaluate the effectiveness of a movement, the best way to do so was to examine its disruptive effects on institutions and the political ramifications of this disruption.\(^90\) The idea of the disruption mechanism\(^91\) and the disruptive protest mechanism\(^92\) developed in response to these early findings. According to these models, if movements want to achieve change, they must use tactics that disrupt the normal functioning of institutions. The idea is that, if a movement causes sufficient disruption, governments may concede to its demands with the goal of restoring public order.

---


92 McAdam and Su, “The War at Home.”
*Political access mechanism*

Also known as the “access-influence model,” this theory predicts that if movements are able to gain access to the policymaking process, they can successfully cause change from within the system. Unlike the disruption mechanism, this approach views social movements as capable of entering the official political process, rather than as perpetual outsiders. It also argues that disruptive tactics are not a successful approach to achieving institutional change. This model argues that, in order to become integrated into the formal political process, social movements will increasingly begin to employ moderate tactics such as lobbying. Gaining insider status allows a movement to achieve long-term political influence rather than simply short-term policy gains. Thus, to achieve political change, a movement must gain access to the formal political process and then struggle for policy change from within.

---


94 Ibid., 75.
Public opinion shift mechanism

Also known as the persuasion model,\textsuperscript{95} or the public preference mechanism,\textsuperscript{96} the public opinion shift mechanism examines how mobilization and public opinion interact to influence policymakers.\textsuperscript{97} Political scientists have long been interested in the relationship between public opinion and policy; according to pluralist theories of democracy, politicians modify their policy preferences according to changes in public opinion.\textsuperscript{98} In regards to social movements, scholars argue that public opinion on a specific policy issue can enhance or limit the chance that a movement will obtain its goals.\textsuperscript{99} Specifically, if the public supports a movement’s demands, it is more likely that policymakers will design and implement policies favorable to the movement.

According to the public opinion shift mechanism, social movements do not influence policymakers directly but, instead, do so indirectly by changing public opinion in a way that is favorable to the movement’s goals. Scholars who have developed the public opinion shift mechanism establish a number of caveats to their theories. Paul Burstein, for example, notes that public opinion is only relevant to the policymaking

\textsuperscript{95} Andrews, “Social Movements and Policy Implementation.”

\textsuperscript{96} Lipsky, “Protest as a Political Resource.”

\textsuperscript{97} McAdam and Su, “The War at Home.”


process when the salience of a particular issue is high, and when political elites are divided over the policy issue at hand.

Scholars study the public opinion shift mechanism at work in their case studies of particular social movements. Burstein, for example, studies the effects of public opinion and protest on the passage of antidiscrimination legislation between 1957 and 1977. He finds that Congress passes antidiscrimination laws when more than half of the public is in favor of a particular right and that protest activity precedes changes in public opinion. Meanwhile, Agnone proposes an “amplification model of policy impact.” This model posits that protest affects legislative decisions independently of public opinion and that public opinion has a greater impact on legislative action when protest levels are high. In his study of the U.S. environmental movement of 1960-1998, Agnone finds that more legislation is passed when protest raises the salience of public opinion on a particular policy issue, and that shifts in public opinion have a greater impact on the policymaking process when amplified by protest. Finally, in their study of state ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment between 1972 and 1982, Soule and King find


103 Agnone, “Amplifying Public Opinion.”

104 Ibid., 1594.

105 Ibid., 1609.

106 Ibid., 1597.
that the policymaking process is most sensitive to public opinion in the final ratification stage of policy development.\textsuperscript{107}

\textit{Movement Infrastructure Model}

Noting that the models discussed above each focus on a specific mechanism to explain how a movement causes political change, Andrews argues that a more holistic approach is needed. This is because movements tend to activate different mechanisms over time and achieve political change through various mechanisms instead of just one.\textsuperscript{108} Indeed, the models examined above focus on only one causal mechanism at a time, limiting our understanding of how movements adapt their strategies in light of their specific goals and the changing contours of the political context in which they occur. Andrews’ model, therefore, marks an important step towards a more integrated approach to studying causal mechanisms. He argues that to explain a movement’s influence on the policy process, three components of its infrastructure must be examined. These are: its leadership, organizational structure, and resources.\textsuperscript{109} According to this model, movements are best able to achieve policy gains if they have infrastructures that permit them to activate multiple causal mechanisms of change. In particular, movements that have a complex leadership structure, a large network, and a strong resource base are best


\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 75.
able to achieve political change.\textsuperscript{110}

Critique of Literature on Causal Mechanisms

Although scholars have long recognized the need for greater attention to the causal mechanisms through which social movements cause political change, few studies examine these mechanisms systematically. As a result, our theoretical understanding of how social movements cause political change remains underdeveloped. While existing theories provide an important starting point, more work is needed to advance our understanding. With the exception of Andrews’ movement infrastructure model, existing theories examine a single mechanism and do not consider the ways in which these mechanisms might interact. In addition, these models overlook the ability of a movement to activate various mechanisms at one time or over the course of the movement’s development.

Finally, existing theories of causal mechanisms have been developed almost exclusively in reference to social movements in established western democracies, particularly the United States and Europe.\textsuperscript{111} As a result, our understanding of the mechanisms through which movements cause political change in other parts of the world remains underdeveloped. It is likely that the ways in which movements cause change differ depending on the political, economic, and social contexts in which they occur; as Giugni points out, strategies that are effective in one context might be ineffective in

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 76.

\textsuperscript{111} Bosi and Uba, “Introduction: The Outcomes of Social Movements,” 411.
another. This thesis examines the extent to which the mechanisms discussed above are relevant to the Chilean student movement, a social movement in a Latin American country.

Conclusion: Towards an Integrated Theoretical Framework of Social Movements and Political Change

Research on the political outcomes of social movements has advanced significantly since Gamson’s *Strategy of Social Protest* first evaluated movement outcomes using a success/failure dichotomy. Meanwhile, a handful of scholars have also made a concerted effort to advance theories about the causal mechanisms through which social movements generate political change. However, taken as a whole, the theoretical literature remains underdeveloped. Specifically, scholars have focused almost exclusively on movement-induced changes in public policy, overlooking other forms of political change. In addition, existing theories of causal mechanisms are based exclusively on social movements in northern democracies and their utility for understanding causal processes in other contexts remains unclear.

In response to the shortcomings identified in the scholarly literature, this thesis proposes an integrated theoretical framework of social movements and political change. My framework builds on Kolb’s typology of political outcomes and offers a multidimensional conceptualization of political change. I extend Kolb’s typology of political outcomes by adding non-institutional outcomes, which include changes in political consciousness and public opinion. In doing so, I broaden McCann’s concept of

112 Giugni, “Was It Worth the Effort?” 379.
rights consciousness to apply to changes in political consciousness more broadly. In contrast to many scholars, I contend that non-institutional outcomes constitute an important form of political change because they can influence the citizens interact with their political institutions, altering a country’s political culture. Thus, even if a movement fails to achieve institutional political change, if it is able to change the political consciousness of movement participants and to shift public opinion, it has achieved a form of political change. Finally, this thesis also contributes to the literature by examining the means through which the student movement placed education on the Chilean political agenda and influenced educational policies passed between 2011 and 2015.
CHAPTER THREE
THE 2011 CHILEAN STUDENT MOVEMENT IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In 2011, numerous protests and social movements shook Chilean society. In what the New York Times dubbed the “Chilean Winter,”¹ thousands of Chileans took to the streets to demand improvements in indigenous rights, gay rights, and environmental policies, among other issues.² The largest and most emblematic of these mobilizations was the student movement, in which university students across the country organized massive protests, held strikes, and took over their universities. The students mobilized to demand reforms to Chile’s education system which, in addition to being one of the most privatized education systems in the world,³ is also one of the most expensive in per capita terms.⁴

While students initially protested against the high costs of university education and the considerable debts required to finance this education, the movement soon began demanding a complete overhaul of the entire tertiary education system. At the heart of the students’ demands was the argument that education is a universal human right and not a consumer good to be bought in the private market. The students also rejected the idea of a “subsidiary” state, involved only peripherally in the provision of education, and called for


the state to play a more central role in the provision and regulation of higher education.\textsuperscript{5}

In addition to their criticism of the Chilean education system, the students also critiqued the country’s economic and political system, framing their movement as a reaction against the neoliberal model imposed by Augusto Pinochet’s military dictatorship (1973-1990).\textsuperscript{6}

The 2011 student movement must be understood within the economic, political, social, and historical context in which it occurred. This is the goal of this chapter, which is organized into four main sections. The first examines the neoliberal reforms undertaken by the Pinochet regime in a broad sense. The second section focuses on the neoliberal reforms to the country’s education system specifically, highlighting the consequences of these reforms. The third presents the history of student organization in Chile, discussing briefly a number of student mobilizations that occurred prior to the 2011 movement. Finally, the fourth section examines the 2011 student movement in detail, discussing its demands, mobilization strategies, and outcomes.

The time frame of this chapter begins in 1973, with the military coup d’état, and ends in 2015, with the passage of the first portion of Bachelet’s education reform. It is important to note that although the student movement was strongest in 2011 it has been active, albeit at different levels of intensity, for the past four years, stretching into the first months of 2015. It is, however, most often referred to as the 2011 student movement, a


convention adopted in this chapter and throughout the remainder of this thesis.

**Pinochet: Authoritarianism and Neoliberal Reform**

To understand the emergence of the 2011 student movement, one must first examine the neoliberal reforms implemented by the Pinochet regime in the early 1980s. The first neoliberal experiment in the world, the reforms radically restructured Chile’s economy, political system, and public sector. The effects of these reforms on the education system and more broadly are at the heart of the student movement’s demands.

Augusto Pinochet came to power on September 11 1973, through a CIA-backed coup d’état that overthrew the government of Salvador Allende, the first democratically elected socialist president in history. Upon assuming the presidency, Allende began implementing what his government called “The Chilean Path to Socialism,” a program that involved the nationalization of the banking and copper mining industries, an agrarian reform and government administration of the country’s health and education systems. The program’s progress, however, ended abruptly with the military coup. The dictatorship suspended the country’s constitution, banned all political parties, shut down the Chilean Parliament, and arrested, tortured, and killed thousands of Allende supporters. Over the next years, the regime also implemented a sweeping series of neoliberal reforms, with the guidance of a group of U.S.-trained technocrats known as the “Chicago Boys.” The reforms included an opening up to free trade, a reduction in the state’s role in the economy, and the privatization of the health, education, and pension

---

systems. As Jorge Nef writes, these reforms made neoliberalism the “blueprint both for the economy and for the social context in which economic life takes place.” Under this new regime, the Chilean state took on a “subsidiary role,” which consisted of letting the market operate as freely as possible, intervening only when absolutely necessary. These reforms marked a departure from Chile’s history of substantial state involvement in the public sector.

Another significant political change was the implementation of Pinochet’s 1980 Constitution, which remains in place today. As Fernando Atria et al. argue, the constitution was designed to “safeguard” Pinochet’s economic and political project from democratic politics. Consequently, the constitution features so-called “authoritarian enclaves,” laws that restrict possibilities for political reform. These “authoritarian enclaves” include a binomial electoral system that results in the overrepresentation of the right in Congress, and nine designated senators, which ensured a majority for the right

---


12 Atria et al., *El otro modelo*, 19.

13 Salinas and Fraser, “Educational Opportunity and Contentious Politics,” 34.

14 Amendments to the Constitution under the Lagos administration eliminated designated senators in August 2005.
in the Senate.\textsuperscript{15} Scholars such as Jorge Nef and Margot Olavarría argue that by making it difficult to implement substantial political reform, the 1980 Constitution has restricted the quality of Chile’s contemporary democracy.\textsuperscript{16}

The 1980 Constitution also gave the Pinochet regime the power to control Chile’s democratic transition. The country’s transition to democracy has been characterized as “pacted,” because it occurred as a result of private negotiations between the military and leaders of the Concertación, the alliance of anti-Pinochet parties that won the elections in 1989.\textsuperscript{17} The “pacted” transition meant that for the political opposition to obtain a democratic process, it had to accept the conditions imposed by the outgoing authoritarian regime.\textsuperscript{18} Most importantly, the Concertación agreed to maintain the economic, social, and political model implemented under Pinochet.\textsuperscript{19}

As Rosalind Bresnahan argues, the Concertación’s program was therefore a contradictory mix of change and continuity, because the coalition promised political change (the return to democracy) along with economic continuity (maintenance of the neoliberal model.)\textsuperscript{20} Although the Concertación, now known as La Nueva Mayoría and made up of the four main parties of the center-left, introduced some reforms during its 20-year reign (1990-2010), these did not substantially alter the model inherited from the
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dictatorship. Consequently, the neoliberal model imposed during the dictatorship has remained essentially intact in the 25 years since Chile’s return to democracy.\textsuperscript{21}

Chile’s “pacted” democratic transition required the Concertación to pursue a strategy of social and political demobilization.\textsuperscript{22} This demobilization was founded, in part, on a belief that citizen mobilization might provoke another antidemocratic response from the military or the political right, plunging Chile back into authoritarianism. This process of demobilization replaced a strong tradition of citizen activism with a politics of elite accords, what has been termed “una democracia de consenos.”\textsuperscript{23} This approach to politics has resulted in a (growing) distance between the political elite and the citizenry, which has created a crisis of political representation\textsuperscript{24} that some scholars argue is at the root of many of the social movements that erupted in 2011.\textsuperscript{25} In addition, Chile’s political institutions, designed as they were under a nondemocratic regime, are suffering from an increasing level of citizen discredit and mistrust.\textsuperscript{26} This discredit is evident in the case of the 2011 student movement, which has called for reforms to various aspects of Chile’s
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Neoliberal Educational Policies and Their Consequences

The neoliberal reforms implemented under Pinochet affected Chile’s education system deeply. Before 1973, education was considered a public good and the primary, secondary, and tertiary education systems were administered and largely funded by the state. The country’s higher education system consisted of two state universities and six private establishments that were founded by charter and financed primarily by the Chilean state. Under the Pinochet regime, however, education was no longer considered a state responsibility but, instead, a service to be offered by an increasingly private market. The neoliberal educational reforms involved three central components. The first, and most important, was a sweeping wave of privatization, guided by economic theories of free competition, which implied that subjecting education to the logic of the market would increase both the quantity and quality of educational establishments. Privatization would also increase families’ freedom to send their children to whichever school they chose, as long as it was within their economic means.


The second component was the decentralization of primary and secondary education administration away from the national level to individual municipalities. Consequently, the quality of education in each municipality became dependent on that municipality’s resources and richer municipalities could provide better education to their inhabitants, while the reverse was true for less prosperous municipalities. The final component was the institution of a “voucher” system, to finance primary and secondary education. The voucher system consisted of a monthly payment to schools for each of its enrolled students and was based on the theory that, because a school’s revenue would be determined by the number of students enrolled in it, schools would have to compete against each other to attract students. This competition, it was argued, would increase educational quality.

The neoliberal reforms transformed Chilean education from a robust public system to a highly privatized one. The reforms created a market of education, with family spending replacing state funding as the main source of financing. In regards to tertiary education in particular, the neoliberal reforms divided the higher education system into
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two sub-systems: the “traditional” and the “new.” The former was comprised of public and private establishments, in which the state maintained its historical funding role. The latter, meanwhile, was composed exclusively of new private institutions, which received no financial support from the state. This structure has remained essentially intact in the decades since the return to democracy. For example, no new public institutions have been established since 1973, nor have existing traditional institutions been substantially developed. The private education sector, on the other hand, has mushroomed; in 2012 private institutions accounted for 72% of higher education enrollment.

In addition to creating one of the most privatized and market-oriented education systems in the world, the neoliberal reforms produced a tertiary education system characterized by contrasts. On the one hand, new private institutions augmented dramatically the supply of higher education, resulting in massive increases in the number of students who can access tertiary education. At the same time, however, weak regulation means that there are significant disparities in the quality of these educational institutions. Moreover, university in Chile is the most expensive in the OECD in per
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capita terms, and also has the highest family (versus state) contribution to higher education in the OECD. While the average OECD public expenditure on education was 83% in 2011, in Chile only 15% of university education costs were covered by public funds, while family resources covered 85% of costs. In order to finance their children’s university education, therefore, many lower and middle class Chileans must take on substantial debts.

The neoliberal reforms also created an education system with a high degree of socio-economic segregation, again the highest in the OECD. This high degree of segregation by class has been termed “educational apartheid” by Mario Waissbluth, a Chilean expert in educational policy. This “educational apartheid” is evident in the data. Before the 1980s, almost 80% of Chilean students were enrolled in public schools but, today, public schools are attended primarily by lower classes, while private-voucher schools serve the middle class, and private-paid schools are almost exclusively attended by the wealthiest sectors of Chilean society. Therefore, Chile’s education system reproduces existing socioeconomic inequalities, a state of affairs contested by the 2011 student movement.
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The 2011 Chilean Student Movement in Historical Context

Student organizations in Chile have a long history that is intimately linked with national politics. The two most important student federations in the country are the University of Chile’s Student Federation (FECH), founded in 1906, and the Catholic University’s Student Federation (FEUC), founded in 1939. The two federations have been at the center of numerous social and political struggles in Chile. The FECH, for example, played a key role in the 1931 movement that overthrew military dictator General Carlos Ibáñez and was also involved in protests against the Pinochet regime and its neoliberal reforms, although university federations were officially banned during the dictatorship. The FEUC, meanwhile, played a key role in Chile’s national university reform in the 1970s. At the national level, student federations are united by the Confederation of Chilean Students (Confech), which was founded in 1984. The Confech is composed of student representatives from approximately 30 public and private universities.

The Confech and individual federations such as the FECH and the FEUC have long been an important resource for student mobilization in Chile. Not only does the organizational structure of these federations make it relatively easy to mobilize large numbers of students, they also allow for the accumulation of memories and lessons over time. This means that student movements in Chile never start from scratch but, instead, build upon historical experiences. The 2011 student movement, therefore, must be understood within the context of this rich history of student organization with a strong political component.
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While the 2011 movement has been the largest and most important Chilean student movement to date, it was preceded by a number of smaller movements that occurred between 2000 and 2011. In 2001, for example, high school students took to the streets to demand a “pase escolar,” a pass that would allow students to use public transportation for free during the school year. In 2005, meanwhile, university students organized protests demanding increased financial support from the state.

The most important precursor to the 2011 movement, however, was undoubtedly the 2006 “Revolución Pingüina,” the Penguin Revolution. So called for the black and white colors of secondary school uniforms, this was the largest student movement in Chile’s history (until 2011). For two months in 2006, high school students organized rallies and occupied their schools, demanding free transportation for students and the elimination of the fee to take Chile’s standardized university admission exam, the PSU (Prueba de Selección Universitaria). Over time, however, the students’ discourse shifted to a criticism of the highly segregated, low-quality public secondary education system. The “Penguins” demanded free, public education, the elimination of profit in private institutions, and an end to discriminatory selection practices—demands that were taken up by the 2011 university student movement.

The Penguin Revolution’s central legislative target was the Organic Constitutional Law of Education (Ley Orgánica Constitucional de Enseñanza, LOCE).
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One of the most emblematic educational laws enacted by the Pinochet regime, the LOCE was the foundation of the country’s secondary education system. Signed by Pinochet on his last day in power, the law further reduced state involvement in the provision of education and promoted privatization.\(^\text{51}\)

Despite their persistent mobilization, however, the “Penguins” obtained only minor policy concessions. The most important of these was the replacement of the LOCE by the General Education Law (Ley General de Educación, LGE), signed by President Michelle Bachelet in August 2009. Although this new legal framework marked a departure from the laws imposed under Pinochet, it did not change the foundations of the Chilean education system in a substantial way.\(^\text{52}\) Although the policy outcomes of the Penguin Revolution were not as significant as the students would have liked, it set an important precedent for the 2011 student movement in at least two ways.

Firstly, the Penguin Revolution triggered what McAdam terms “cognitive liberation,” the process by which people collectively recognize a situation as unjust and start to believe that they have the power to change the situation through collective action.\(^\text{53}\) The Penguin Revolution exposed the injustices of Chile’s secondary education system and showed that a student movement could achieve at least some degree of political change. Secondly, as Giorgio Jackson, one of the main leaders of the 2011 movement argues, the experience of the Revolución Pingüina generated an enormous

\(^\text{51}\) Ibid.
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amount of distrust in Chile’s political system among the student population.\textsuperscript{54} This is because the Bachelet government regained control of the discussion on education by channeling the Penguin’s demands through formal political institutions and, once it began to negotiate formally with the government, the Penguin Revolution disintegrated.\textsuperscript{55} Thus, the experience showed how a social movement could lose momentum once it engages with formal political institutions. This made the 2011 protesters wary of negotiating with the government and accepting its policy proposals at face value.

The 2011 Student Movement: Emergence and Development

In 2008, the FECH and the FEUC began organizing nation-wide assemblies about Chile’s higher education system. Building on the lessons of the Penguin Revolution, these assemblies allowed students to discuss ideas and draft proposals for education reform. These meetings helped to create a consensus around the need for radical changes to Chile’s education system and, by 2011, students were prepared with concrete proposals for reform.\textsuperscript{56}

In March 2010, as this process of consciousness building and preparation continued to progress, Sebastian Piñera won the presidential elections. Piñera, a billionaire businessman, was the first right-wing president to gain power since Chile’s return to democracy in 1990 and his administration supported a neoliberal approach to
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education. For example, although Piñera’s campaign platform included an agenda to reform the education system, his approach involved further privatizations of educational institutions. In addition, Piñera appointed Joaquín Lavín, the owner of a private university and a former member of the “Chicago Boys,” as his Minister of Education. Unlike the left-wing Concertación, therefore, the new presidential administration provided a clear “other,” whose ideology and policies the student movement could oppose. Piñera’s announcement that 2011 would be the year of higher education provided the perfect context for the student movement to erupt.

While the change in government is a proximate factor that explains why the student movement erupted in 2011, the educational issues at the heart of the movement had been present for decades. The student movement challenged two foundational elements of the neoliberal model of education: (1) the idea that education is a consumer good and (2) profit-making in private educational institutions. Students claimed that education is not a consumer good to be bought by individuals, but instead a social good that should be provided by the government. This argument responded directly to a statement made by Piñera on July 19 2011 that education is a “consumer good.” The student movement also rejected profit making in higher education. Although the law


officially prohibits for-profit universities, the student movement pointed to instances in which profit making in universities was exposed, arguing that this was unacceptable.

**Demands and grievances of the 2011 student movement**

Like the 2006 Penguin Revolution, the 2011 student movement initially demanded relatively small concessions from the government, such as the more prompt delivery of scholarships. It was not long, however, before the students began to articulate demands related to more structural aspects of the Chilean education system. The movement’s central demands are captured concisely in the popular slogan: “educación pública, gratuita y de calidad:”\(^61\) public, free, quality education. On August 23 2011, the movement sent a letter to President Piñera, outlining their 12 central demands. These included increased equality in access to higher education, the eradication of profits from all higher education institutions, the de-municipalization of primary and secondary education, and for education to be constitutionally recognized as a human right.\(^62\) The students argued that for their demands to be achieved, the state would need to resume its historic role in the provision and administration of education.

As the movement developed, the students began to critique other aspects of the country’s neoliberal model and make demands that stretched far beyond the education system. The two most important of these were: (1) calls for tax reform, which the students argued was necessary to finance educational reform, and (2) demands for a new
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constitution, to be created by citizens through a constituent assembly. By calling for such radical changes, the student movement sparked national debates about Chile’s economic, social, and political model that had been in place since the Pinochet regime. As Cesar Guzman-Concha argues, the student movement therefore challenged the elite consensus that had governed the country since the return to democracy.

Mobilization strategies and “repertoires of contention”

To achieve its goals, the student movement employed various strategies, or what Charles Tilly called repertoires of contention: the “ways that people act together in pursuit of shared interests.” Repertoires of contention, in other words, are the set of actions a social movement can use to make its claims. The 2011 student movement utilized both “traditional” and “new” repertoires of contention. The traditional repertoires included large marches, the first of which occurred on May 12 2011 and was attended by 30,000 people, with 20,000 in Santiago alone. The protests organized by the student movement were the largest since Chile’s return to democracy. On June 30 2011, for example, 100,000 people participated in a march in Santiago, while student leaders
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claimed that 1 million people attended an August 21 “family rally for education” held in the capital city\(^\text{69}\) (although police put the number at 100,000). Other traditional forms of contention included “tomas,” in which students occupied their universities and “paros,” strikes in which thousands of students refused to attend their classes.

In addition to these traditional repertoires, the 2011 student movement gained national and international attention through its creative protests that used music, theatre, and dance to express its demands in innovative and entertaining ways. For example, a group of 4,000 students dressed up as zombies and recreated Michael Jackson’s “Thriller” music video, to symbolize that they would be paying back their education debts long after their deaths.\(^\text{70}\) Students also held a kiss-in, in lieu of the more traditional sit-in, outside the presidential palace, and an 1800-hour run around the palace,\(^\text{71}\) symbolizing the $1.8 billion per year that the students were demanding to reform Chile’s public education system.

Besides highly visible acts in public spaces, the students also organized an online media campaign to raise public consciousness about the movement and its demands.\(^\text{72}\) In doing so, the student movement relied heavily on social media, particularly Facebook and
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Twitter. As numerous scholars have argued, social media has become central to many social movements that have occurred in the past decade.\(^\text{73}\) Social media can play a key role in mobilization because it facilitates access to large amounts of contacts, contributes to the development of collective identities, and serves as a site for information sharing.\(^\text{74}\)

Scholars are quick to point out, however, that social media does not necessarily create new forms of protest or alter traditional organizing in fundamental ways. As Valenzuela et al. contend, “activism does not confine itself to separate online and offline spheres, but instead online interactions can aid offline forms of citizen participation.”\(^\text{75}\) In other words, social media tends to support or facilitate traditional protest forms. In addition to using Twitter and Facebook to coordinate protests and to denounce police violence, the 2011 student movement used social media as an alternative information source, a space to publish a counter-narrative to the version being portrayed in traditional media such as newspapers and television.\(^\text{76}\)

The 2011 student movement benefited from the strong leadership of its main leaders, Camila Vallejo and Giorgio Jackson. Vallejo, a member of the Communist Youth Party, was president of the FECH in 2011, while Jackson was president of the FEUC at the same time. Both articulate individuals, the two leaders were able to
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communicate the movement’s demands and aims to the mass media.\textsuperscript{77} The charisma of its leaders, along with its creative and attention-grabbing protests, helped the student movement gain widespread public support.\textsuperscript{78} This support was clear in public opinion polls, which showed that at the end of 2011, 70\% of the Chilean population supported the student movement and its demands.\textsuperscript{79}

In addition to their efforts to involve as many student organizations as possible in their movement, the leaders of the student movement also made a concerted effort to form links with other social movements and organizations beyond the student population.\textsuperscript{80} The most important of these were the country’s national labor and teachers’ unions. These unions participated in student-organized protests and also collaborated with the movement to organize joint marches. The student movement also gained support from the Chilean environmental movement.\textsuperscript{81} In addition to forming explicit links with other social movements, the student movement was able to garner widespread support among the Chilean public because its demands resonated with large swaths of the population. Indeed, because most Chilean families have, or have had, some of its members enrolled in tertiary education, many Chileans have direct experience with the


\textsuperscript{78}Salinas and Fraser, “Educational Opportunity and Contentious Politics,” 33.


\textsuperscript{80}Salinas and Fraser, “Educational Opportunity and Contentious Politics,” 22.

\textsuperscript{81}Somma, “The Chilean Student Movement of 2011-2012,” 305.
economic burden of educational loans.\textsuperscript{82} Thus, the student movement’s demands made sense to many Chileans, which contributed to widespread support for the movement among the Chilean public.

**Government Response: Concessions and Repression**

The Chilean government approached the student movement differently over time. Initially, the Piñera administration downplayed the movement, arguing that the protestors were a minority of the student body.\textsuperscript{83} When it became clear that the movement’s intensity was not abating, the Piñera government offered concessions in the form of policy reforms. Although Piñera rejected the movement’s demands for free, public education, his government announced the Grand National Agreement for Education (Gran Acuerdo Nacional de Educación, GANE), on July 5 2011. GANE included an increase in available scholarships, an expansion of the “voucher” system, a reduced interest rate for university loans, and some increases to the country’s education budget.\textsuperscript{84} The student movement, however, rejected these reforms, arguing that they were superficial and did not transform the Chilean education system in a substantial way.
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In November 2013 Michelle Bachelet won Chile’s presidential elections for the second time, formally re-assuming the Presidency in March 2014. Bachelet campaigned on a platform that promised radical reform, particularly to the country’s education system. In May 2014, President Bachelet sent the first part of her education reform to Congress. The bill, which eliminates co-payment, profit, and selective entrance policies, was passed in January 2015 and involves a radical overhaul of the Chilean education system and eliminates many of the policies implemented by the Pinochet dictatorship.

Although Bachelet is considered to be more supportive of the student movement’s demands than Piñera was, both governments repressed the student movement. Much of this repression was violent, as police used tear gas and water bombs at demonstrations and, in some cases, arrested and harassed student protesters. Repression by the Piñera government also took on non-violent forms, as the administration attempted to suppress the movement by portraying it negatively in the media. To this end, media coverage by Chile’s primarily conservative newspapers often focused on episodes of violence and disorder that occurred at protests organized by the student movement. While the students’ demonstrations were largely peaceful, they often ended in violent episodes, as hooded protesters, “encapuchados,” would loot stores, start fires, or throw objects at the police. Although student leaders denied any connection to the encapuchados, their presence at many student marches allowed the Piñera government to frame the students as violent and radical.
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Conclusion

The largest social movement since Chile’s return to democracy, the 2011 student movement took the country and the international community by surprise. Picking up where the Penguin Revolution left off, the 2011 student movement called for radical changes to Chile’s education system, communicating its demands through massive marches and innovative protests that captivated the national and international media. Although some of the political outcomes of the student movement will only become evident in the years to come, several important outcomes are already evident. Not only did the movement succeed in placing, and maintaining, the issue of free, public education on the political agenda, it also pushed the government to commit to a comprehensive education reform, the first portion of which was passed early this year.

Beyond its gains in the educational sphere, the student movement has also had important implications for Chilean politics more broadly. Like the 2006 Penguin Revolution before it, the 2011 student movement sparked national debates about Chile’s neoliberal model, which has remained essentially intact since it was implemented under the Pinochet regime. The movement can thus be understood as a manifestation of a broader “social malaise” with Chile’s neoliberal institutions and policies.\(^86\) The student movement also exposed the flaws of a political system designed in a non-democratic regime. Arguing that the current political system is non-representative and illegitimate, the student movement called for a new constitution to be drafted in a constituent assembly to ensure popular participation. The next chapter presents an in-depth examination of some of the student movement’s most important political outcomes.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE-political outcomes of the 2011 student movement

This year, Bachelet promised three big reforms in her campaign: tax reform, education reform, and constitutional reform. These are the reforms that the social movements have demanded. The fact that today politicians talk about education as a right is precisely because the people in the streets have said that it is a right… The student movement is responsible for this, that today politicians dare to talk about citizen rights, about social rights. This is, I think, the paradigm shift that the movement has caused. A paradigm shift, an awakening; there’s no longer a fear of the streets, of protest but, instead, quite the contrary.
—Grace Arcos, Federation President 2014, Bernardo O’Higgins University

Through an analysis of the empirical evidence, I find that the 2011 student movement had two key political outcomes: (1) policy change in the form of an education reform passed by Bachelet’s government in January 2015, and (2) changes in political consciousness among movement participants and the wider Chilean citizenry, a non-institutional outcome. These were certainly not the movement’s only outcomes; other political outcomes included agenda setting and procedural change in the form of the student movement’s increased level of access to, and influence over, formal political institutions. These outcomes, however, are also the mechanisms through which the student movement was able to achieve the educational policy change discussed in this chapter. I therefore address these outcomes in the following chapter.

This chapter consists of two main sections. The first addresses educational policy change. Although this section briefly discusses policy changes under Piñera, the focus is on the first portion of Bachelet’s education reform. The second section discusses the student movement’s non-institutional outcomes; changes in the political consciousness of movement participants and the wider Chilean citizenry, as reflected in student interviews and public opinion polls. A central contention of this thesis is that changes in political
consciousness are not simply cultural or biographical changes, as many scholars have claimed, but rather forms of political change.

**Educational Policy Change**

Beginning in 2011 and continuing into 2015, the Chilean student movement positioned itself as an important political actor capable of engaging in dialogue and negotiations with the Chilean government and influencing policy decisions. Not only did Chilean students place education on the political agenda, they also pushed the government into implementing reforms that responded to their demands. The educational reforms implemented by the Piñera and Bachelet administrations are some of the student movement’s most significant political outcomes. Although this section briefly discusses the policy changes implemented by the Piñera administration, the focus of this chapter is on the educational reforms passed under the Bachelet government. This is because these new laws and policies are those that will govern Chile’s education system into the foreseeable future.

*Education policy change under the center-right Piñera administration*

Sebastian Piñera won the 2010 presidential elections after running a campaign that promised to reduce crime, increase citizen security, and boost the economy. With the emergence of the student movement in 2011, however, Piñera was forced to shift his attention to addressing the educational demands raised by the movement. The President’s initial step in this regard was the designation of 2011 as the year of higher education.¹

Although the Piñera administration disagreed with the student movement's fundamental demands for free university education,\(^2\) it did propose and implement some education policy changes. Piñera announced his first education policy proposal on July 5 2011—two months after the student movement emerged—in what he termed the National Agreement for Education, (Gran Acuerdo Nacional por la Educación, GANE). GANE’s principal objectives were to improve the quality of university education, improve access to higher education, and provide increased funding for students.\(^3\) The main policy changes proposed and/or implemented by the Piñera administration are outlined below.

One of GANE’s main aims was to increase the funds available for higher education. This was to be achieved in two ways: (1) a reduction in the interest rate for student loans from 5.6% to 2%, and (2) a new higher education fund of US$ 4 billion.\(^4\) This fund would be used to increase the number of scholarships granted each year, guaranteeing financial support for the poorest 40% of students.\(^5\) While the Piñera government framed the reforms as far-reaching, the student movement rejected the proposal, arguing that it maintained the logic of a neoliberal education model and did nothing to strengthen public education.\(^6\)

\(^2\) Bellei and Cabalin, “Chilean Student Movements,” 118.
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GANE also proposed the creation of new agencies and institutions to regulate Chile’s higher education system. These included the Agency for Educational Quality, an Undersecretary of Higher Education, and a Higher Education Superintendence.\textsuperscript{7} The student movement rejected the proposed institutions, arguing that they did not reposition the state as the guarantor and administrator of higher education. Indeed, one of the student movement’s main demands was to have the state, instead of private actors, play a central role in the provision and administration of education. While the bills to create these institutions were sent to Congress during Piñera’s presidency, they were not passed into law. When Bachelet came to power, she suspended the bills, arguing that the proposed institutions treated education as a consumer good instead of a social one and, therefore, did not align with her education reform.\textsuperscript{8}

Although the reforms implemented by the Piñera administration did not eliminate profit or make education free, they did decrease the cost of a university education, lessening the economic burden of obtaining a tertiary degree. The student movement, however, rejected Piñera’s reforms outright and vowed to stay mobilized.\textsuperscript{9} The students substantiated their rejection by arguing that the reforms maintained the neoliberal model in which demand for education is subsidized through loans and scholarships, and that the
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reforms did nothing to strengthen public education nor did they eliminate illegal profit making in higher education.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{Bachelet’s 2015 Education Reform}

In her second presidential campaign in 2013, Michelle Bachelet ran on a platform of radical reform. At the heart of her campaign were three key reforms: a tax reform, a constitutional reform, and an education reform. Unlike Piñera, Bachelet’s education program incorporated all of the student movement’s central demands, including free education and the elimination of profit. When Bachelet won the elections in a landslide victory on 15 December 2013, she promised to implement the reforms promised in her campaign as quickly as possible.\textsuperscript{11} On 26 January 2015, after eight months of debate in the Chilean Congress, the first part of Bachelet’s emblematic education reform was approved and sent to the President to be signed into law.\textsuperscript{12} Already approved in the Senate, the bill was ratified by the Lower House, with 69 votes in favor and 38 against.\textsuperscript{13}

The initial portion of the reform focuses on primary and secondary education and, according to the government, will eliminate structural inequalities in Chile’s school


system. The next portion of the reform, which includes reforms to the higher education system, will occur later in 2015 although specific dates and details remain scarce. The first portion of Bachelet’s education reform has three main components: (1) it mandates that all schools that receive public funds become non-profit institutions, (2) it puts an end to the copayment system, and (3) it eliminates the ability of schools to select students based on socio-economic background, ethnicity, or any other arbitrary characteristic. The reform, which applies exclusively to the public sector, will be implemented gradually, with the goal of ensuring an “orderly” transition to the new system. Below, I discuss each component of the reform in more detail.

---


18 All information sourced from the official government website dedicated to the educational reform: http://reformaeducacional.gob.cl/
End to profit

Under the voucher system implemented under the Pinochet regime, for-profit institutions were eligible to receive state subsidies in the same way that public and private non-profit schools did. Under Bachelet’s reform, however, for-profit institutions will no longer be able to receive state funding. According to the new law, all educational institutions that receive public funds must be designated as non-profit entities by 2018. In addition, all public funds received by educational institutions will have to be dedicated exclusively to education. Schools that are found profiteering will be subject to civil and criminal sanctions. In addition, the school will have to refund the state the value of the misused funds, in addition to a fine of 50% of the value of these funds. The Higher Education Superintendence will be charged with ensuring compliance with this section of the law.

End to co-payment (free education)

Currently, many Chilean families pay at least part of their children’s school fees through the co-payment system established under Pinochet. The education reform gradually eliminates co-payment so that by 2018, more than 730,000 students will have access to free education. State support will increase progressively, beginning with the poorest sectors of society. According to the timeline established by the government, 93% of Chilean students will study for free by 2018. The goal is that, in 10 years, the co-payment system will be eliminated completely.
End to selection

The reform makes it illegal for schools to select students on the basis of religion, nationality, ethnicity, culture, socio-economic background, and disability. Under the new law, schools will no longer be allowed to require interviews, admission tests, or information about a family’s socio-economic status. In addition, all admission fees will be eliminated. Under the new law, if a school has enough open spots available, it has to admit every student who applies. If there is excess demand for a particular school, students will be admitted by a lottery system to avoid “arbitrary” selection. The Ministry of Education will be charged with supervising adherence to this portion of the law, and schools that violate these new rules will be subject to a fine.

Student response to Bachelet’s education reform

While the first phase of the education reform addresses primary and secondary education, it echoes the discourse and demands of the 2011 university student movement. For example, Bachelet’s government has framed the reform as a “paradigm shift,” arguing that the new law makes education into a social right instead of a consumer good,\textsuperscript{19} language that echoes explicitly the demands made by the students since 2011. In addition, Bachelet argues that a central feature of her educational reform is that it repositions the state as the entity responsible for the provision and regulation of

education,\textsuperscript{20} a claim that also responds directly to one of the student movement’s main demands.

Compared to the minor policy concessions offered by the Piñera government, Bachelet’s reform represents a radical change in the laws governing Chile’s education system. The reform incorporates all of the student movement’s central demands—such as ending profit in education and making education free for all—and marks an important break from the neoliberal model of education imposed by the Pinochet regime. Despite this, however, the student movement has been critical of Bachelet’s reform. Students argue that, like Piñera’s policy changes, Bachelet’s education reform does not alter fundamentally the neoliberal model of education against which the movement has protested for years.\textsuperscript{21} In addition, students argue that legal loopholes in the new law will permit educational institutions to continue profiteering. Thus, three days after the reform was passed, the FECH (University of Chile’s Student Federation) posted a YouTube video criticizing the reform.\textsuperscript{22} Arguing that they were excluded from the design of the reform and, therefore, that it does not adequately respond to their demands, students vowed to remain mobilized.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.


**Higher education reform**

With the first phase of Bachelet’s education reform passed, university students now await the discussion of reforms to the higher education system, scheduled for later in 2015. While details on the exact nature of the higher education reform remain scant, Bachelet has announced that, by 2016, 70% of Chilean students will have access to free education and that within six years university education will be free for all.\(^{24}\) Other aspects of the reform include the creation of new regulatory agencies, including the Subsecretary of Higher Education and the Higher Education Superintendence.\(^{25}\) While the Piñera government proposed the establishment of the same agencies, the Bachelet administration has scrapped those proposals and created its own. These agencies will be charged with ensuring that public funds are used correctly and that no illegal profit making occurs in higher educational institutions. The reform will also create state universities in the two regions of Chile in which there are currently none and establish publicly funded technical training centers in all of country’s regions. In addition to reforming the higher education system, the second half of Bachelet’s reform will include improvements in teacher pay and working conditions, and the de-municipalization of secondary education.\(^{26}\)

Overall, the education reform passed by the Bachelet administration constitutes one of the student movement’s greatest achievements, as it incorporates virtually all of the movement’s demands. The reform involves a radical overhaul of the Chilean education system and eliminates many of the policies implemented by the Pinochet

---

\(^{24}\) Guerra, “Diputados Analizan Claves En Educación Para 2015.”


\(^{26}\) Ibid.
dictatorship. Yet, despite this, the student movement has been critical of Bachelet’s reform. Beyond critiques of the reform’s content, students have criticized the manner in which the reform was designed. Specifically, students claim that they were not offered opportunities for active, meaningful participation in the formulation of the reform.

**Non-Institutional Outcomes of the 2011 Student Movement**

In addition to the education reform discussed above, the student movement had a number of outcomes that can be characterized as non-institutional. As discussed in Chapter One, non-institutional outcomes include changes in the political consciousness of movement participants and a country’s citizens, public opinion change, and changes in a country’s political culture. These outcomes are important because they can influence the way movement participants, and the wider citizenry, perceive and interact with their political institutions. Yet, because non-institutional changes occur in the minds of individuals, and are thus relatively hard to measure, many social movement scholars overlook this form of political change. In addition, some scholars purposefully exclude non-institutional outcomes from their analysis of movement-generated political change, arguing that these outcomes are not political, but rather biographical or cultural.

In order to uncover the non-institutional outcomes of the Chilean student movement, I used a multi-methods approach that included interviews with 10 former and current Chilean student leaders, and an analysis of public opinion data, presidential platforms, and presidential speeches. Through this research, I gained insight into the following questions: (1) How do student leaders understand themselves as political actors? (2) How do they understand the significance of their movement for Chile’s
democracy? (3) Are their claims regarding their movement’s impacts supported by empirical evidence? I found that through their participation in the movement, the students interviewed became politicized citizens who feel empowered to make demands of the state. An analysis of public opinion data and the public agenda shows that this augmented political consciousness has not been limited to movement participants but has affected Chilean society more broadly.

My analysis of non-institutional outcomes focuses on changes in political consciousness and public opinion. I do not attempt to measure empirically shifts in political culture; such an analysis is far beyond the scope of this thesis. I do, however, indirectly address potential changes in political culture through an examination of the ways in which the students discuss the implications of their movement for Chile’s democracy and an analysis of public opinion data. The remainder of this chapter is organized into three sections. The first presents the methodology used for data collection and analysis. The second contains an analysis and discussion of my interviews and other empirical data. The third section, which is also the chapter’s conclusion, discusses the implications of my findings.

Methodology: Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection

In May 2014, I returned to Santiago, Chile (where I studied abroad in 2013) to interview 10 former and current student leaders. All of the individuals interviewed were involved in the student federations at their respective universities. Most of the interviewees were presidents of their student federation, although a few were spokespeople or secretary-generals. The students interviewed were chosen through what
Joseph Maxwell calls “purposeful selection,” an approach in which “particular settings, persons, or activities are selected deliberately in order to provide information that can’t be gotten as well from other choices.”

The selection process thus consisted of reading newspaper articles and talking to local contacts in order to identify the relevant student leaders.

These were “elite interviews,” a type of interview in which the researcher knows that the interviewee participated in a particular situation and is able to provide specialized knowledge that cannot be obtained from other individuals. Elite interviews are useful in establishing what a group of people thinks, and what their beliefs, values, and attitudes are. In addition, elite interviews can allow researchers to draw inferences about the characteristics of a larger population. In the context of my thesis, the student leaders interviewed can be classified as “elites” because many of them were the leaders of the two most important student federations in Chile: the FECH and the FEUC. Along with the Confech at the national level, these federations have been largely responsible for the organization and coordination of the Chilean student movement. Furthermore, all of the interviewees were elected by the student bodies at their respective universities. Therefore, although my sample only consisted of ten student leaders, these individuals are representative of the larger population of student leaders and movement participants from which they were selected.

---


With the goal of hearing a variety of perspectives within a relatively small sample, the interviewees were selected from 5 different universities, all located in Santiago. 3 of the students interviewed were leaders of the student federation at the Catholic University (FEUC), 4 were involved with the student federation at the University of Chile (FECH), 1 was the president of the student federation at the University of Santiago (Feusach), and 2 were the presidents of student federations at private universities. The names and positions of the specific individuals interviewed are listed below:

1. Noam Titelman, FEUC President (2012)
2. Diego Vela, FEUC President (2013)
3. Naschla Aburman, FEUC President (2014)
4. Cristóbal González, FECH Secretary General (2011)
5. Andrés Fielbaum, FECH President (2013)
6. Melissa Sepúlveda, FECH President (2014)
8. Takuri Tapia, Feusach President (2014)
10. Carolina Jara, Federation President at Santo Tomás University (2012-2013)

I contacted each of these individuals by phone, email, or by approaching the relevant student federation. All of the interviews were one-on-one, in person, and conducted in Spanish using a pre-formulated interview script (see appendix). The length of the interviews ranged from 30 minutes to 1 hour. Each interview was recorded and subsequently transcribed.

To determine the validity and generalizability of the claims made by the students interviewed, I analyzed public opinion data and presidential platforms and speeches—which reflect changes in the political agenda. My analysis of this data is discussed in
more detail below. Public opinion data was obtained primarily from two prominent Chilean think tanks, CERC (Centro de Estudios de la Realidad Contemporánea) and CEP (Centro de Estudios Públicos), which conduct annual opinion surveys.

Data Analysis

The first step in the interview analysis process was to transcribe the interviews and read through them. Second, I organized the responses by question to facilitate comparison between the interviewees’ responses. Third, I coded the responses. I did not analyze the data using pre-set codes; instead, codes emerged through a close reading of the interview transcripts. This is what Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin refer to as an “open-coding” approach. Through the coding process, I identified four central concepts that emerged from the data. I then selected quotations that illustrate the way in which interviewees discussed these concepts.

To study changes in the political agenda, I analyzed presidential speeches and platforms. Each year on May 21, the Chilean President gives a speech before Congress that discusses the political state of the nation and the government’s main policy aims. Analogous to the State of the Union in the United States, these annual speeches provide a good indication of the political agenda. The presidential platform, meanwhile, is a document published during presidential elections in which candidates present the policies

---


and programs they will implement if they are elected. A candidate’s presidential platform offers an indication of the issues that will be central to the country’s political agenda if that candidate is elected.

I analyzed each presidential speech that occurred between 2006 and 2014, covering all of the speeches made by Bachelet in her first administration, all of Piñera’s speeches, and Bachelet’s first speech in her second term as president. In addition, I analyzed Bachelet’s 2005 and 2013 presidential platform and Piñera’s 2009 platform. For each speech and platform, I analyzed the frequency with which the phrases “education,” “public education,” “higher education,” “non-profit education,” and “education reform” were mentioned, as well as the context in which these phrases or words appeared. I conducted this analysis using NVivo’s word frequency and word tree functions.

Discussion and Analysis

Through the process of coding the interview responses, I identified four main categories of non-institutional change and grouped the interviewees’ responses accordingly. These categories are: (1) agenda setting, (2) a paradigm shift in how education, and the broader neoliberal model, are perceived, (3) re-legitimization of protest, and (4) the awakening of the Chilean citizenry. These categories are not discrete; instead, there is significant overlap between them, a reflection of the complex and interrelated nature of non-institutional outcomes. However, such a separation is necessary to present and discuss each outcome clearly. Taken as a whole, these four categories represent a change in political consciousness—a shift in how students, and the broader Chilean citizenry, understand and relate to the political world. The students’ claims about
their movement’s non-institutional outcomes are supported by data on public opinion and the political agenda.

Neither the student leaders nor I referred to “non-institutional” outcomes during the interviews. Similarly, the students did not explicitly classify outcomes into the categories presented here. Instead, the terminology used in this chapter has been applied *ex post*, in the process of interpreting the interview data. The majority of the quotations included in this chapter come from interviewees’ responses to questions about the impact of the student movement. The questions were posed as follows: (1) What has been the impact of the [student] movement? (2) Do you think the movement has transformed Chile’s democracy?

Before turning to my analysis of the interview data, it is important to note that the student leaders expressed different perspectives in response to a number of questions posed in the interviews. Divergence occurred, for example, around whether the movement could be interpreted as anti-neoliberal, whether violence was an acceptable form of resistance, and whether political change was more likely to happen through formal or informal political channels. Yet, in regards to the movement’s impact there were notable similarities among the students’ responses, with divergence occurring primarily around the *degree* of change that the student movement has achieved. This convergence makes sense; not only do the students interviewed have a vested interest in presenting their movement as successful, they are also part of a highly organized social movement. Through meetings, assemblies, debates, and discussions, the student movement has been able to create a notable sense of coherence and unity among its many participants. This general coherence was reflected in my interviews and, therefore, in the
quotations presented here. Nevertheless, to avoid painting an over-simplified picture, I have been careful to include quotations that show nuances and different perspectives in regard to particular concepts. I translated all of the quotations included in this chapter from Spanish to English.

**Agenda setting**

For me, our biggest achievement is that the government is developing an education reform. Beyond the content of the reform, the way they are doing it, it doesn’t matter. We had presidential elections with nine candidates and all nine had an education reform [in their platform]. Today, there is an education section in the newspaper. I’m not talking about the content of the reform, because I don’t really agree with their approach, but we put an issue on the table and generated a debate that has lasted a long time.

—Naschla Aburman, FEUC President 2014

An idea that arose in many of the interviews was that the student movement had successfully placed education on the national political agenda. While agenda setting is an example of what Kolb calls substantive political change, the students’ claims of agenda-setting ability can also be interpreted as a non-institutional outcome. This is because *claims* of agenda-setting power reveal how students understand their movement’s political influence. For example, some interviewees claimed that because their movement made education a central issue on the political agenda, Bachelet was obligated to include the students’ demands for education reform in her campaign platform in order to return to power. This shows that student leaders perceive themselves as relevant actors in at least the first stage of the policy making process.

In the quotation above, Naschla Aburman points to agenda setting as the student movement’s main achievement. Although she is quick to point out that she disagrees with the reform’s content, she argues that the education reform is a direct outcome of the
student movement’s ability to place education on the national agenda. Noam Titelman, who was the FEUC president in 2012, echoed this idea:

Last year, in 2013, there were presidential elections and one of the things that happened is that a lot of the issues posed in 2011 were adopted by almost all of the candidates in their presidential platforms, at least as a slogan. In fact, the President who won, Bachelet, included end to profit, free education, that sort of thing. You can say that there’s still a ways to go, that it’s not enough, but the entire focus of the discussion has changed. I mean, these were issues that the same Bachelet didn’t even mention when she was president the first time around.32

Here Noam points out that Bachelet’s 2013 campaign platform included the student movement’s specific demands of free, non-profit education, noting that these were issues that Bachelet had not talked about in her first presidential term. The suggestion is that the student movement was able to change the focus of the President’s agenda in a tangible way. Yet, for Noam, like Naschla, this change is important but insufficient.

Andrés Fielbaum, FECH president in 2013, takes the arguments advanced by Noam and Naschla a step further, stating:

It’s clear that to return to the presidency for a second time, Michelle Bachelet had to include the student movement’s main demands, at least as slogans, in her program. That the political world had to explicitly recognize the agency of social actors in defining its agenda is something that hasn’t happened in Chile for a long time.33

Andrés, like Noam and Naschla, suggests that Bachelet would not have been able to return to power without incorporating the student movement’s demands into her platform. He goes a step further, however, arguing that this represents a shift in how politics is practiced in Chile. In his view, the student movement has changed the way society and formal political institutions interact, pushing the political world into acknowledging the demands of social actors. Taken as a whole, the quotations presented here show that the

32 Noam Titelman, interview by Yelena Bidé, Santiago, June 3, 2014

33 Andrés Fielbaum, interview by Yelena Bidé, Santiago, June 9, 2014
student leaders perceive themselves as influential political actors, capable of pushing politicians into responding to and/or adopting the movement’s demands.

An analysis of the political agenda, operationalized in the form of presidential platforms and presidential speeches, shows the validity of the students’ claims.

**Figure 4.1: Frequency of education-related words in presidential platforms, 2005-2013**

As seen in Figure 4.1, there was a significant increase in the frequency with which presidential platforms mentioned words related to education over time. Although Piñera’s 2010 presidential platform refers to “education,” “higher education,” and “public education,” more frequently than Bachelet’s 2005 presidential platform, the most interesting comparison is between Bachelet’s 2005 and 2013 presidential platforms. This is because in 2005, neither the Penguin Revolution nor the university student movement
had occurred, whereas in 2013 both had. In 2013, Bachelet’s platform mentions the word “education” almost twice as many times as in 2005, 146 and 76 times respectively. Furthermore, in 2005 Bachelet makes no mention of “public education,” “education reform,” or “non-profit education;” in 2013, she mentions these phrases 13, 17, and 10 times respectively. That the same individual discusses education in such different ways in 2005 and 2013 is significant and suggests that the student movement was at least partly responsible for altering the way in which Chilean politicians discussed education.

The increased frequency of education-related words that reflect the student movement’s main demands is also evident in presidential speeches.

**Figure 4.2: Frequency of education-related words in presidential speeches, 2006-2014**

![Bar Chart](http://www.camara.cl/camara/media/docs/discursos)

Source: Data from [http://www.camara.cl/camara/media/docs/discursos](http://www.camara.cl/camara/media/docs/discursos) (accessed March 8, 2015).

Figure 4.2 shows that, after the emergence of the university student movement in 2011, there was an increase in words related to the student movement’s demands in
presidential speeches. This was true of both Piñera and Bachelet’s presidential speeches. It is interesting to note that after the emergence of the Penguin Revolution in 2006, a similar trend occurred. However, this dissipated after 2008. One of the most notable features of the above figure is that the term “education reform” was not mentioned in any presidential speech before 2011. This suggests, as claimed by the students interviewed, that the student movement was responsible for putting education reform on the political agenda.

Finally, the student movement’s agenda setting power was evident in the presidential elections in November 2013, in which education was a “hot” campaign issue.34 As Naschla states in the quotation at the opening of this section, all nine presidential candidates included education reform in their platforms,35 and the only presidential candidate to rule out free higher education was Evelyn Matthei,36 the right-wing candidate against whom Bachelet eventually faced off in the second round.


Paradigm shift

The student movement’s biggest achievement is that all Chileans now understand that education needs to be a right, that education needs to be accessible to anyone who wants to claim this right, to exercise this social right.

—Carolina Jara, Federation President 2012-2013, Santo Tomás University

Almost all of the students interviewed claimed that the student movement has changed the way Chileans think about education, arguing that it is now considered a social right instead of a consumer good. Along the same lines, a number of interviewees asserted that it is now taken for granted that education should be free, a change in perception so radical that some categorized it as a paradigm shift. While almost all of the interviewees claimed that the student movement had challenged the neoliberal education system imposed under Pinochet, some students also claimed that the movement had challenged the neoliberal model in a broader sense.37

Gabriel Ossandón, a student leader who ran for the FECH presidency in 2014, expressed a similar idea to Carolina Jara, quoted above. Gabriel said that, although the movement had yet to earn any tangible victories, it was able to change terms of the debate. He claimed that:

To talk about free education in 2010 was inconceivable. But to talk about free education today, it’s like yes. Now, the question is: what is this free education going to look like?38

These two quotes show that the student leaders believe that their movement changed how Chileans perceive education, making them think of it as a social right instead of a good to

37 However, divergences occurred around whether the movement itself could be categorized as anti-neoliberal. While some claimed that the student movement is an anti-neoliberal social movement, others said that although anti-neoliberal currents are present within the movement, it cannot be categorized that way as a whole.

38 Gabriel Ossandón, interview by Yelena Bidé, Santiago, May 30, 2014
be bought on the market. As Gabriel underscores, the idea of free education was almost
unthinkable prior to the emergence of the student movement. Yet today, Gabriel and
other interviewees claim, it is taken for granted that education should be free and the
discussion now centers on what an ideal education system would look like.

Melissa Sepúlveda, FECH president in 2014, described the outcomes of the
student movement as a “cultural change,” claiming that:

There’s been an important cultural change as a result of the 2011 mobilizations.
We began to realize that many things that we considered normal were actually the
result of a market system, a political model, a capitalist neoliberal economy that
favors business, that privileges the benefits of a few over the rights of the
majority.  

According to Melissa, the student movement de-naturalized aspects of everyday reality.
This assertion alludes to Chile’s high rates of inequality that, for decades, have been
considered an inevitable side effect of the country’s neoliberal economic system. Takuri
Tapia, the 2014 Feusach president, echoed this idea:

We see that questioning education also becomes an opportunity to question the
economic system, the system of domination.

Here Takuri, like Melissa, argues that the student movement’s critique of the Chilean
education system provided the opportunity for students to critique other aspects of
Chile’s socio-economic model. This occurred because the issues the students were
protesting against in the country’s education system were just one manifestation of the
inequality perpetuated by the neoliberal model more generally.

39 Other student leaders who raised the same point included Diego Vela and Melissa Sepúlveda.
40 Melissa Sepúlveda, interview by Yelena Bidé, Santiago, June 9, 2014
41 Takuri Tapia, interview by Yelena Bidé, Santiago, June 5, 2014
Gabriel Ossandón echoed the ideas raised by Melissa and Takuri, but took the analysis a step further. In response to the question of how the movement’s demands have changed over time, Gabriel expressed the following ideas:

The interesting thing is that, because of our economic system, the structure of Chile’s education is replicated in other areas. So you can use the same logic to critique, I don’t know, work, health. What happened is that our demands made a lot of sense to people because it was the same experience that they would go through when they went to the hospital, when they paid for their children’s’ education, when they went to work. This generated massive public support, which was hard to achieve because our parents’ generation is a generation that fears protest…So for them to support us, for our demands to make sense to them is really important. It was a landmark event.⁴²

Although there are many ideas contained within this response, two are particularly salient. First, Gabriel argues that critiques of Chile’s education system can be applied to other parts of Chilean society, such as the health system. Second, and related to the first point, is the idea that this movement is not just about education. Instead, education became the focal point around which citizen’s could gather to critique the Chilean model more generally. In other words, the “cultural change” provoked by the student movement was not limited to education but applied to many other aspects of Chilean society. In this way, Gabriel claims, Chilean citizens began questioning aspects of the neoliberal model that they had not before, and became aware of the power of mobilization to challenge the existing model.

The ideas expressed by the students regarding a movement-provoked “cultural change” reflect McCann’s findings in his study of the American pay equity movement, discussed in Chapter Two. McCann argues that by making demands of the state, a social movement can “nurture new hopes and expectations” not only among movement

⁴² Ossandón, interview
participants but also the citizenry more broadly. In other words, the changes in political consciousness experienced by movement participants can influence society and the way citizens understand their daily reality. This is precisely what is captured by the quotations above. Furthermore, according to the students interviewed, the movement’s significance was not limited to the sphere of education. Instead, by critiquing education, students opened up opportunities for critiques of Chile’s socio-economic model on a more general level. Thus, not only did Chileans begin to support the students’ demands for education reform, they also began to question other aspects of their daily experience.

Public opinion data supports the assertions made by the student leaders. For example, polls show that in May 2011, the percentage of Chileans who claimed that education was one of the top three problems facing the country spiked.

---

As seen in Figure 4.3, prior to the emergence of the movement, the percentage of Chileans who considered education to be a priority issue hovered around 25%. In September 2011, however, this number rose to a remarkable high of 73%. Public opinion data also shows that there was widespread support among the Chilean public for the student movement’s demands. According to a CERC poll, in December 2011, 77% of Chileans were in favor of free higher education and 78% agreed that for-profit higher education institutions should not exist. This empirical evidence supports the student leaders’ claims that their movement transformed education into a key issue of public concern and altered the way Chileans think their country’s education system should function.

---

As argued by the students interviewed, the movement’s critiques extended to other aspects of Chile’s society, economy, and political system. This, too, is borne out by the empirical evidence. For example, public opinion data on the perceptions of how Chilean democracy is functioning reflect increasing levels of popular discontent.

**Figure 4.4: Perceptions of how Chilean democracy is functioning, 2008-2011**

![Bar chart showing perceptions of how Chilean democracy is functioning, 2008-2011.](http://www.cepchile.cl/dms/archivo_4936_3022/EncuestaCEP_nov-dic2011.pdf)


Between 2008 and 2010 the percentage of Chileans who considered their country’s democracy to be functioning well or very well increased steadily, while the percentage who considered democracy to be functioning badly or very badly decreased. In 2011, however, this trend was reversed, correlating with the emergence of the student movement. Discontent with the quality of Chilean democracy is also reflected in the high levels of support for constitutional reform. As shown in Figure 4.5, when asked whether the constitution should be reformed, 71% of Chileans said yes.
The combination of increasing public concern for education and increasing discontent with the quality of Chilean democracy following the emergence of the student movement suggests that it was able to influence the ways in which the Chilean public perceived their country’s political, social, and economic institutions.
Re-legitimization of protest

I think that thanks to the student movement it has been possible to change Chile’s paradigm. I mean, in 2011 people were talking about the “Chilean Spring,” where people dared to go out to the streets. There is still a lot of fear around social mobilization because of the dictatorship. That we students dared to go out to the streets signified a paradigm shift, an awakening because, essentially, we aren’t afraid anymore.

—Grace Arcos, Federation President 2014, Bernardo O’Higgins University

Although the notion of a change in political consciousness is perhaps rather subtle in the two categories discussed above, the idea that the student movement re-legitimized protest as a form for political action speaks directly to the concept. The students interviewed made explicit claims about the ways in which their movement changed how Chileans view protest as a means of political participation. Many students claimed that theirs is a generation “sin miedo,” without fear. This fearlessness, they said, stands in contrast to the fear of mobilization so pervasive in their parents’ generation. Indeed, because the former generation lived through the Pinochet regime, in which mobilization was brutally repressed (especially in the first years of the dictatorship), a fear of protest has persisted even since the return to democracy. The student leaders argued that, by daring to take to the streets to make their educational demands, they re-legitimized protest as a way to achieve political change.

The quotation above echoes the responses discussed in the previous section, in regards to the student movement causing a paradigm shift in how Chileans understand their socioeconomic model. For Grace Arcos, however, this paradigm shift has occurred around political participation and the willingness to take to the streets to make demands of the state. In her view, the student movement dispelled the fear that had existed around mobilization since the years of the dictatorship.
Gabriel Ossandón expressed a similar idea. When asked about the movement’s impacts, he responded:

The first thing, I think, is that it validated a form of citizen expression…In 2011, we showed that through a social movement you could put issues on the table.\textsuperscript{45} It is notable that this is the first point Gabriel raises in regards to the student movement’s impacts. He argues that the movement revealed the power of protest to put issues on the agenda and thus validated collective action as a way for citizens to make their voices heard.

Carolina Jara agreed that the student movement re-legitimized protest as a form of political action. In addition, she argued that this method of political participation has already become naturalized in the years since the student movement first emerged. When asked whether the student movement has transformed Chilean democracy, Carolina paused before responding that perhaps the student movement has not recognized its transformative power:

One starts to naturalize certain practices, such as going to a protest or attending an assembly, but these are things that didn’t happen prior to the emergence of the student movement. In fact, these days students think it is normal to make demands in this way, to protest. And this is the case not only for students but also for workers.\textsuperscript{46}

In Carolina’s view, over the course of the four years since the student movement first emerged, students have normalized claim making through protest and other forms of collective action. Another interesting idea that emerges in Carolina’s response is that this naturalization of protest has spread beyond the student movement to affect laborers.

\textsuperscript{45} Ossandón, interview

\textsuperscript{46} Carolina Jara, interview by Yelena Bidé, Santiago, June 5, 2014
The idea that the re-legitimization of protest was one of the student movement’s most important outcomes was repeated time and time again in the interviews.\(^{47}\)

Interestingly, even those interviewees who claimed that the student movement’s impacts are still not completely evident cited the re-validation of protest as an important outcome. For example, when asked about the movement’s impacts, Takuri responded:

I think that the impact still isn’t totally visible...I mean, there are ex-student leaders in parliament, they’ve had a political career, but we’ve also seen that in regards to mobilization, the student movement has had consequences beyond the students themselves. For example, in 2011 there was an increase in labor movements. So, in reality, mobilization and organizing started to become more legitimate.\(^{48}\)

Although Takuri begins by claiming that some of the movement’s outcomes are still not visible, he goes on to say that the movement has had important consequences in the sphere of mobilization, both for students and other sectors of society. Naschla echoed this idea in the following assertion:

We introduced the idea that things have to change and, as a result, citizens started protesting for other things. For example, it’s really unfair that health is so segregated, and people protest. It’s unfair that labor conditions are bad, and people protest. People protest for other things, too, for gender equality, for academic freedom, for a lot of things. The citizenry found a channel, which unfortunately isn’t a formal one, but it found a channel to protest, to protest democratically. Now we can protest democratically without fear.\(^{49}\)

Here, Naschla argues that the student movement has encouraged Chileans to protest for a vast variety of issues beyond education, such as better labor conditions and health care. Like Grace, Naschla emphasizes the idea that citizens now feel that they can protest democratically without fear of repression. Although she laments the fact that protest is

\(^{47}\) This idea was raised by Andrés Fielbaum, Carolina Jara, Diego Vela, and Naschla Aburman.

\(^{48}\) Tapia, interview

\(^{49}\) Aburman, interview
not a formal channel for political participation, she emphasizes that is still an opportunity for participation that was not employed previously.

Taken as a whole, the interviews show that the student leaders believe their movement has reactivated, and re-legitimized, protest as a repertoire of contention. There appears to be consensus that, by taking to the streets to express their demands, the student movement showed their fellow citizens that protest is a legitimate way to make political claims and thus encouraged other sectors of society to protest as well. This is an idea captured by theories of social movement outcomes. Tarrow, for example, argues that “movement participation is politicizing,” an assertion that seems to hold true in the case of the Chilean student movement. However, this increased politicization was not limited to movement participants but affected society more broadly. Today, Chileans no longer accept existing power structures and view protest as a tool they can use to contest the status quo.

The increased propensity of Chileans to protest is reflected in a 2012 study on political culture in Chile by the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP). The study shows that protest participation among Chilean citizens increased dramatically between 2010 and 2012. In 2010, only 4.7% of Chileans had participated in a protest the prior year. In 2012, on the other hand, 11.1% had done so. According to the study, the Chilean student movement was largely responsible for the increase in protest rates, although after the movement emerged in 2011, protest also became more prevalent in

50 Tarrow, Power in Movement, 221.

other policy areas, most notably the environment. These findings support the student leaders’ claims that their movement encouraged Chileans to protest for a range of issues beyond education.

“Un despertar ciudadano”: an awakening of the citizenry

I think that there has been an increase in the level of consciousness for a society that, I insist, was really passive, that wouldn’t protest. I think that this has been the most rewarding aspect of this movement.

—Takuri Tapia, Feusach President 2014

One of the most interesting ideas expressed in the interviews was that the student movement “woke Chile up.” While this is related to the re-legitimization of protest, the notion of an “awakening” speaks to the larger implications of the student movement for the country’s political culture. The interviewees talked about a reduction in citizen apathy and claimed that Chileans now demand more opportunities for political participation beyond elections. For many student leaders, this was their movement’s most important outcome. When asked about the impacts of the student movement, Diego responded:

I think that today the citizenry is more empowered, the student movement showed that if we organize, we are capable of generating changes.  

Grace expressed a similar idea, claiming that:

The student movement helped awaken the population, to empower both students and parents. It’s really gratifying for us because, before 2011 there was mobilization of course, but not of the same magnitude as the 2011 protests.


53 Diego Vela, interview by Yelena Bidé, Santiago, May 30, 2014

54 Grace Arcos, interview by Yelena Bidé, Santiago, June 12, 2014
Both Grace and Diego mention citizen empowerment as a key outcome of the student movement. In addition, both student leaders claim that this empowerment was not limited to participants of the student movement but, instead, spread to affect Chilean society more broadly. Naschla echoed this idea, arguing that:

The student movement was a breaking point in that the citizenry felt, essentially became convinced, that we could do more, that we could demand our rights, that we could set the agenda. I think that this has been the movement’s greatest success.  

Like Grace and Diego, Naschla points to citizen empowerment as the movement’s most important success. For her, and many of the other student leaders, the student movement showed students and Chilean citizens that, through social movements, citizens can make claims on the state and influence the national agenda. Gabriel echoed the responses of his peers, but stressed the idea that the student movement tapped into a desire for change that was already present in society. When asked whether the movement has transformed Chile’s democracy, he said:

I think that the student movement woke Chile up, but also because there was something to awaken…There are many people who want to do things. So, the movement woke Chile up but there was also something germinating already.  

Here, Gabriel claims that the student movement’s ability to “wake Chile up” was facilitated by an existing desire for change and increased political participation.

While the quotations above reflect the consensus among the students interviewed that their movement had caused Chileans to become more empowered and willing to participate politically, a number of interviewees stressed that these shifts had yet to be

---

55 Naschla Aburman, interview by Yelena Bidé, Santiago, June 3, 2014

56 Ossandón, interview
reflected in concrete institutional changes. For these students, therefore, the answer to the question about whether the student movement had transformed Chile’s democracy was a firm no. However, in discussing these answers, it is important to note that my interviews were conducted in 2014, before the passage of Bachelet’s education reform. Thus, the students could not point to Bachelet’s policy reforms as examples of political change caused by their movement. Nevertheless, it is interesting to examine negative answers to the question of whether the movement had transformed Chilean democracy because it offers insights into how some of the student leaders conceptualize political change.

When asked whether the student movement had transformed Chilean democracy, Noam responded:

No, I don’t think that the movement has transformed Chilean democracy. It’s what I was telling you before; its effects haven’t been reflected in institutional changes. I think that there certainly has been a change in people’s common sense, in how the average citizen perceives politics. But, there still hasn’t been an important change in [the country’s] democracy.  

While for some of the students interviewed, the increase in citizen empowerment and political consciousness represented a transformation of Chilean democracy, for Noam and a few other interviewees, the lack of institutional change meant that the student movement had not transformed Chilean democracy. While Noam agreed that there has been a change in how people understand politics, in his view this is not enough to be considered a transformation of the country’s democracy. Andrés expressed a similar idea in response to the same question:

---

57 Titelman, interview
No, not in structural terms. I mean, the student movement, the 2011 mobilizations, have been the most democratizing thing that has happened in Chile in the last years, in the sense that demands that were really important for society but were always excluded from the political discussion are now a part of the political discussion…. In this sense, yes, it’s a democratizing movement because it has democratized the political discussion, at least in education. But I’d say that the political system is still more or less the same, with the same political parties and their detachment from social actors.  

Like Noam, Andrés made a distinction between institutional and non-institutional change, and appeared to give greater weight to the former. He argued that, although the movement had been a democratizing force it had not managed to alter the political system in any structural way. In Noam’s view, in other words, for the student movement to have transformed Chile’s democracy, it would have to have altered the political system. This suggests that, even among the student movement, there are actors who perceive political change as necessarily involving a change in formal political institutions. Overall, however, the students interviewed agreed that their movement had important outcomes in the form of enhanced citizen empowerment.

---

58 Fielbaum, interview
Conclusion

Reclaiming their historic role as drivers of social and political change, Chilean students put education onto the political agenda and pushed the government into passing a series of policy changes in response to their demands. In addition to its policy outcomes, the student movement also created a group of politicized and emboldened citizens who feel empowered to claim new rights from the state. This enhanced political consciousness, a non-institutional outcome, was not limited to movement participants but also affected the larger Chilean citizenry.

In regards to policy change, the student movement pushed both the Piñera and Bachelet administrations into proposing and implementing educational policies in response to its demands. Although the Piñera government offered the student movement some policy concessions, it did not address the movement’s fundamental demands for free education and the elimination of profit making in education. Bachelet, on the other hand, picked up the student movement’s demands and incorporated all of its central demands into her presidential platform. In January 2015, the Bachelet administration passed the first phase of its education reform. While the initial portion of the reform focuses on primary and secondary education, the next phase will focus on higher education.

The student movement also generated non-institutional outcomes, which can be separated into four categories: (1) agenda setting, (2) a paradigm shift in how education and the broader neoliberal model are perceived, (3) the re-legitimization of protest, and (4) the awakening of the Chilean citizenry. Taken as a whole, these four categories represent a change in political consciousness, a shift in how students understand and
relate to the political world. Data from public opinion polls show that this enhanced political consciousness has also been experienced by the Chilean society more generally.

As argued in Chapters One and Two, social movement scholars have overlooked non-institutional outcomes as a form of political change. My research shows that this is a mistake. Although my interviews were conducted in 2014 before the passage of Bachelet’s education reform, the students interviewed still claimed that their movement had generated important political impacts. Indeed, for many of the interviewees, the movement’s “subjective” outcomes were the most significant. This echoes McCann’s study of the pay equity movement in the United States, as he finds that many participants considered the movement’s most important political outcome to have been a transformation in their minds and social identities.59

My research shows that scholars should pay more attention to non-institutional outcomes. This is especially relevant in instances where a movement has not achieved policy or institutional changes. In these cases, scholars might claim that a movement has achieved no political change, when important non-institutional outcomes might actually have occurred in the hearts and minds of movement participants and a nation’s citizenry. While these changes might only be evident in the long-term, they can have important implications for the incidence of collective action, political participation, and the relationship between state and society.

59 McCann, Rights at Work, 1994, 230.
CHAPTER FIVE
PROTESTS, NEGOTIATION, AND PUBLIC OPINION:
MECHANISMS OF POLITICAL CHANGE

As discussed in the first two chapters of this thesis, scholars have consistently reiterated the need for studies to pay close attention to the causal mechanisms through which social movements achieve their outcomes. Yet, few scholars have actually advanced comprehensive theories of causal mechanisms. Consequently, our understanding of how social movements cause political change is relatively underdeveloped. My thesis aims to contribute towards filling this theoretical gap by paying close attention to the means through which the 2011 student movement (1) placed, and maintained, the issue of education on the Chilean political agenda and (2) influenced educational policies passed between 2011 and 2015. The purpose of this chapter is, therefore, to construct a causal narrative linking the student movement to the education policy changes discussed in Chapter Four.

To uncover the mechanisms through which the student movement achieved its outcomes, I use process tracing, a method that “attempts to identify the intervening causal process—the causal chain and causal mechanism—between an independent variable (or variables) and the outcome of the dependent variable.”¹ I find that the student movement used both informal (protest) and formal channels (meetings and correspondence with key political actors) to pressure the Piñera and Bachelet administrations into responding to its demands with a series of policy reforms. The movement also influenced public opinion, changing the way in which Chileans perceive their country’s education system, which in turn influenced policy responses by the political establishment. Although the focus of my

¹ George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, 206.
analysis is the 2011 student movement, this is not meant to imply that it was the only relevant actor in the policy change process. Furthermore, I do not claim that education was absent from the political agenda before the emergence of the student movement. I do argue, however, that the 2011 student movement played a crucial part in placing education at the center of the Chilean political agenda and in changing the way Chileans perceive the country’s education system.

Following a brief discussion of my methodology, the remainder of this chapter is divided into three sections, each corresponding to a particular time period. The first section examines the issue of education on the political agenda and in public opinion before the emergence of the student movement (2005-2011). The second traces interactions between the student movement and the Piñera government and concurrent changes in public opinion and the political agenda (2011-2014). The third section conducts a similar analysis but with respect to interactions between the student movement and Bachelet’s government (2014-2015).

**Methodology: Data Collection and Analysis**

To construct a narrative linking the student movement to educational policy change I trace (1) shifts in the political agenda, (2) meetings and correspondence between the student movement and key political figures, and (3) changes in public opinion over time. Changes in the political agenda, as reflected in presidential speeches and platforms, and public opinion were already analyzed in Chapter Four. This chapter focuses on tracing the *process* through which these changes occurred. I also trace interactions

---

Other important educational actors that also influenced the process of policy change include the Council of Rectors of Chilean Universities (CRUCH), the national teacher’s union, and high school students.
between the student movement and political elites (2011-2015), focusing especially on 2011 because this was the year in which engagement between the movement and the Piñera government was strongest. I examine letters exchanged between the student movement and Education Ministers, meeting memorandums, policy proposals by the government, and student responses to these proposals (including protests). Figure 5.1, on the following page, is a timeline that presents a summary of some of the most important student protests, government policy proposals, and other political events between 2011 and 2015.
Figure 5.1 Timeline of events: student protests and government responses, 2011-2015

- **Piñera Administration**
  - 16 June 2011: first student protest (15,000 participants)
  - 30 June 2011: social strike (494,000 nationwide)
  - 21 August 2011: family rally for education (1 million participants)
  - 5 July 2011: Piñera proposes GANE
  - 18 July 2011: Education Minister Lavin fired

- **Bachelet Administration**
  - 8 May 2014: first student protest under Bachelet’s second administration (100,000 participants)
  - 1 August 2011: Education Minister Bulnes proposes “Action Plan for Chilean Education”
  - 3 August 2011: Piñera meets with Confecch and other educational actors
  - 10 June 2014: students protest against Bachelet’s education reform (40,000 participants)
  - 19 May 2014: Bachelet sends education reform bill to Congress
  - 26 January 2015: first portion of Bachelet’s education reform is passed

- Student protests and other actions
  - 12 May 2011: first student protest (15,000 participants)
  - 27 July 2011: Confecch publishes Grand Social Agreement for Education
  - 21 August 2011: family rally for education (1 million participants)
  - 30 July 2011: Confech publishes Grand Social Agreement for Education
  - 3 August 2011: Piñera meets with Confech and other educational actors
  - 29 January 2015: Fech publishes a video criticizing reform and calls for renewed mobilization
  - 10 June 2014: students protest against Bachelet’s education reform (40,000 participants)
  - 29 December 2011: Education Minister Bulnes fired
  - 18 May 2014: first student protest under Bachelet’s second administration (100,000 participants)
Time Period 1: Pre-emergence of the Student Movement (2005-2011)

Education in public opinion

In each of its annual public opinion surveys, CERC (Centro de Estudios de la Realidad Contemporánea) asks the following question: what are the three most important problems in Chile today? Over time, the issues of biggest concern to Chileans have consistently been health, crime, and education.

Figure 5.2: Public perception of Chile’s three main problems, 2005-2013

As seen in Figure 5.2, although education was an issue that Chileans cared about before the emergence of the student movement, it was not nearly as central an issue as it became post-2011, particularly in comparison with concern for crime and health. Before 2011, concern for education was relatively stable, hovering around 20%. With the emergence of the movement, however, there was a significant spike in the percentage of Chileans who
consider education as one of their country’s top three problems, reaching a peak of 73% in September 2011. Although this number fell in 2012, it has remained substantially higher than in the years pre-2011.

In examining public opinion data, it is important to note that before the student movement emerged, many public opinion surveys (including those conducted by CERC) did not include specific questions about education. This makes comparison between how Chileans thought about specific facets of their education system before and after the emergence of the student movement difficult. However, the inclusion of detailed questions about Chile’s education system in surveys conducted from May 2011 onwards speaks to the student movement’s ability to insert the issue of education into the public debate.  

Education on the political agenda

The relatively low level of public concern for education, as compared with concern for crime and health, before the student movement emerged was reflected in Bachelet’s approach to education in her first term as president. While Bachelet’s 2005 presidential platform featured education as a central focus, her plans for education reform were centered primarily on improving access to kindergarten.  

\textsuperscript{4}To achieve this aim, she planned to increase funding for this education level by incorporating it into the

\textsuperscript{3}For example, both CEP’s July 2011 survey and CERC’s May and December 2011 surveys included sections dedicated especially to the theme of education and the student movement.

educational subsidy system. Bachelet’s approach to improving access to education by increasing scholarships, loans, and credits was also applied to secondary and tertiary education. In her 2005 platform, for example, the President writes: “our financial support system for higher education will guarantee funding for all talented students…through a combination of scholarships, credits, and subsidies.”

This approach to funding education was, essentially, a continuation of the neoliberal financing system implemented under Pinochet, in which demand for education is subsidized on an individual basis. The ideology underpinning this approach is based on a perception of education as a good to be bought by individuals on the market, instead of a social right that should be provided for all citizens by the state. As discussed in more detail in the final section of this chapter, this approach to funding marks a stark contrast with Bachelet’s commitment to free public university education in her second term as president.

The Penguin Revolution

As discussed in Chapter Three, a few weeks into Bachelet’s first term, thousands of high school students took to the streets to demand free transportation passes, the elimination of the fee to take Chile’s standardized university admission test, and, most importantly, the elimination of Pinochet’s LOCE (Organic Constitutional Law of Education). The Penguin Revolution, the largest student movement before 2011,

---


represented a political crisis for the recently elected president. The movement revealed the inadequacy of Bachelet’s plans for education reform and forced the President to propose policies that had not originally been included in her presidential platform. For example, on June 1 2006, Bachelet announced a set of policies that would improve educational quality at the high school level, including the replacement of the LOCE with the General Education Law (Ley General de Educación, LGE).

Overall, however, Bachelet’s policy responses did not alter the foundations of Chile’s education system in a fundamental way. The President’s response to the 2006 Penguin Revolution provides an interesting comparison with the way she responded to the 2011 student movement in her second term. Unlike with the 2006 movement, where Bachelet’s government offered only minimal policy concessions, in her second term the President incorporated the 2011 movement’s demands into her presidential platform and committed to passing a structural reform of Chilean education at all its levels. In fact, the first portion of Bachelet’s reform deals with primary and secondary education, filling in the policy gaps left from the reforms passed in her first term. This suggests the political influence of the 2011 student movement; it took up the same educational issues raised by the “Penguins” in 2006 but was able to convince Bachelet to address its demands to a much more substantial degree. Bachelet’s willingness to pass a much deeper education reform in her second term was likely a strategic calculation. Aware that public opinion had shifted in favor of education reform following the emergence of the student

---

8 Donoso, “Dynamics of Change in Chile.”


10 Oliva, “Política Educativa Y Profundización de La Desigualdad En Chile,” 209.
movement, Bachelet realized that she could gain public support for her candidacy if she incorporated the students’ demands into her presidential platform.

2009 presidential elections: Piñera’s discussion of education

Piñera’s 2009 presidential platform focused on growing the economy, reducing crime, and increasing employment opportunities.\(^\text{11}\) While his platform promised to increase state support for public education and included a few policy proposals for improving the higher education system, it made no mention of a comprehensive education reform. Like Bachelet’s 2005 platform, Piñera’s presidential platform included plans to expand the neoliberal financing system implemented under Pinochet. Specifically, he committed to “gradually doubling education subsidies,”\(^\text{12}\) a commitment he reiterated in his first presidential speech in 2010.\(^\text{13}\) Subsidies and scholarships would be designated “towards the poorest sectors of society and towards degrees with the biggest social return, particularly teaching.”\(^\text{14}\) In other words, state funding would not be provided to all students but, instead, to those most in need of financial support.


\(^{12}\) Ibid., 82.


Time Period 2: The Student Movement and the Piñera Administration (2011-2014)

The emergence of the student movement in May 2011 forced Piñera to put aside the issues that had been at the center of his presidential campaign and to focus, instead, on addressing the educational demands raised by the students. Although Piñera designated 2011 as the year of higher education his government’s vision of education reform was radically different to that demanded by the students. The student movement used protests and formal interactions with members of the Piñera administration to pressure the government into designing policies that responded more closely to its demands. This continuous pressure resulted in what Kolb calls a “procedural change,” a shift in the relationship between a social movement and political institutions. This section traces and analyzes interactions between the student movement and the Piñera government, a back and forth process consisting of protests, meetings, and new policy proposals.

The student movement’s interactions with Education Minister Joaquin Lavin

Piñera’s second presidential speech, which he gave just weeks after the emergence of the student movement, reveals a shift in the President’s discussion of education. For example, in 2011 Piñera describes education as the “cradle of equal opportunity,” and claims that he has put educational reform at the “heart of [his]

15 Piñera, “Mensaje Presidencial.”

16 Kolb, Protest and Opportunities, 34.
government.” In 2011, in other words, Piñera presented education as one of his government’s main foci and highlighted his commitment to reforming the country’s higher education system, a marked shift from 2010 when he did not discuss substantial education reform at all. Although the President does not refer directly to the student movement in his speech he notes that the “battle for quality and equity in education isn’t won with speeches or promises, nor in the streets.” In this way, Piñera expressed his disagreement with the student movement’s protests, providing a precursor to the arguments he would use to discredit the student movement in the following months.

The student movement was not won over by Piñera’s avowed commitment to reforming the country’s higher education system; on May 26, Confech (Confederation of Chilean Students) sent a letter to Piñera’s Education Minister, Joaquín Lavín, expressing disagreement with the educational policies Piñera had proposed in his speech a few days before. In a type of “ultimatum,” the letter gave the Minister until June 1 to demonstrate willingness to dialogue with the student movement and address its demands. The students wrote: “if our demands are not met by June 1, we will extend our national student strike scheduled for that day.” Lavín responded almost immediately with a letter of his own, expressing his openness to dialogue with the students. A meeting on May 30 followed this initial correspondence. After the meeting, Lavín declared himself “very optimistic” about the prospect of resolving the conflict through dialogue. The Minister added that

---


18 Ibid.

“Chileans want this problem to be resolved through dialogue and not in the street,”

echoing the argument made by Piñera in his 2011 speech. The students, however, maintained their plans to strike on June 1. Following this strike, the students and Lavín exchanged a rapid succession of increasingly hostile letters.

In a letter to Confech on June 3, Lavín promised to increase the budget for higher education, invited the movement to elect three or four of its leaders to participate in a Ministry-organized working group on education financing, and formally invited student leaders to a meeting on June 14. Confech responded on June 5, with a harsh critique of the proposals outlined in Lavín’s letter. The students argued that Lavín’s response was “ambiguous” and did not respond concretely to their demands. The students asserted that they would not participate in a working group until “guarantees” were set.

Two weeks later, Confech sent Lavín yet another letter. As in their first letter to the Minister, the students threatened Lavín by alluding to their power of mobilization. The letter opened in the following way: “Dear Minister, we write to you after having sustained more than a month of protests and on course for a second.” The students cited their June 16 protest, attended by 80,000 people in Santiago and 200,000 nationally (the


largest since the return to democracy)\textsuperscript{24} as proof that their movement had “channeled the feeling of the majority of Chileans who reject the mercantilization of education and want to restore public education for all.”\textsuperscript{25} The students also threatened the Minister personally, mentioning his involvement with a private university (Universidad de Desarrollo) and demanding that he “clarify” the situation immediately.\textsuperscript{26} This letter and the one previous to it show that the student movement perceived itself as a powerful political actor, capable of directly engaging with, and confronting, key political figures.

In his letter to Confech the following day, Lavín did not respond directly to the threats or accusations leveled at him by the students. Instead, he reiterated his commitment to increase funding for university education and to decrease interest rates on student loans.\textsuperscript{27} To express their disagreement with the Minister’s proposals, the student movement organized a massive march on June 30. This was even larger than the protest two weeks before, with 200,000 people participants in Santiago, and a further 194,000 participating in simultaneous demonstrations in the rest of the country.\textsuperscript{28} The student movement’s simultaneous use of both informal and formal channels of political


\textsuperscript{25} Confederación de Estudiantes de Chile, “Carta Confech a Ministro Lavín, 20 Junio 2011.”

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.


expression is characteristic of its interactions with both the Piñera and Bachelet governments.

Piñera proposes GANE

Although the Piñera administration consistently rejected the student movement’s demands for free public education, it did respond with a number of other policy proposals. One of the most important of these came in the form of the Grand National Agreement for Education (Gran Acuerdo Nacional de Educación, GANE), announced by Piñera and Lavín on July 5. GANE increased scholarships, reduced university loan interest rates, and increased the education budget.\(^\text{29}\) As discussed in Chapter Four, the student movement rejected GANE outright, arguing that it maintained the neoliberal model of education, did not eliminate illegal profit making in higher education, and did nothing to strengthen public education.\(^\text{30}\) On July 27, three weeks after GANE was announced Confech, along with other educational actors, published an alternative policy proposal, which it termed the Grand Social Agreement for Education (Gran Acuerdo Social por la Educación). This document, intended to be an alternative to GANE, outlined the student movement’s perspective of what an ideal education system would look like. The document is notable for the movement’s explicit claims of agenda setting power. In the text they write that the student movement has “put the need for a structural reform to

\(^{29}\) Piñera, “Mensaje Presidencial: Gran Acuerdo Nacional Por la Educación.”

\(^{30}\) San Cristóbal, “Superintendencia de Educación Sigue Recibiendo Reparos En Su Paso Por El Senado.”
Chilean education at the center of the national debate.”

Lavín fired and replaced by Felipe Bulnes

After two months of back and forth between Lavín and the student movement characterized by continuous protest, a lack of agreement, and increasing hostility, Piñera removed Lavín from his position as Education Minister on July 18 and replaced him with Felipe Bulnes, the former Justice Minister. According to La Tercera, the student movement was responsible for this change because it had publicly called for Lavín’s removal, based on his questionable ties with the Universidad de Desarrollo. On August 1, two weeks after his appointment, Bulnes presented his first policy proposal: Action Plan for the Development of Chilean Education. This proposal marked a notable advance in the Piñera government’s approach to the education issues raised by the student movement. Specifically, the document incorporated two of the movement’s demands: (1) that the right to a quality education be included in the Chilean constitution and (2) the creation of a Superintendence of Higher Education that would enforce the ban on profit making in universities.


33 Ministerio de Educación, “Políticas Y Propuestas de Acción Para El Desarrollo de La Educación Chilena,” August 1, 2011, http://www.elmostrador.cl/media/2011/08/Politicas-y-Propuestas-de-Accion-Para-el-Desarrollo-de-la-Educaci%C3%B3n-Chilena-01.08.11.pdf.
However, the student movement rejected Bulnes’ proposal on the grounds that it did not respond entirely to the movement’s demands. In a press conference, Camila Vallejo announced that the students were giving the government six days to respond to their demands in a more satisfactory manner and that, if the government failed to do so, the movement would organize more protests. Yet again, it is evident that the student movement saw itself as a political actor with substantial power, capable of giving the government explicit ultimatums. The students’ threats worked; two weeks later, Bulnes presented another document that reiterated the Piñera government’s commitment to increasing loans and scholarships but also included an explicit mention of the government’s support for public education.

Yet, as with all previous policy proposals advanced by the Piñera government, the student movement rejected Bulnes’ second proposal. Vallejo explained the student movement’s rejection of the government’s latest proposal in the following terms: “Bulnes’ declaration does not constitute a step towards structural change. On the contrary, it reinforces the marketized model of education based on profit.” On August 21, to express its rejection of the government’s latest proposal and to manifest its continuing force, the student movement organized what was its largest protest to date.

---


According to students, 1 million people attended what was billed as a “family rally for education,” in Santiago, though police put the number at 100,000.\textsuperscript{37}

\textit{The student movement’s engagement with Piñera}

Two days after the massive march of August 21, Confech sent a letter to President Piñera. The letter emphasized the need for a: “paradigm shift: moving from education seen as a consumer good financed by families to education seen as a social right, that should be guaranteed by the state.”\textsuperscript{38} This demand referred explicitly to Piñera’s claim a month prior that education was a “consumer good.”\textsuperscript{39} The letter called upon Piñera to respond to a set of demands outlined in the body of the letter. For a group of students to address the President of a country in such forceful terms is significant and, once again, a clear indication that the student movement viewed itself as a powerful political actor. On August 26, after a national strike that lasted 48 hours, Piñera announced:

After more than three months [of conflict] the time for peace, unity, dialogue, and agreements has arrived. As the President of Chile, I invite all students, parents, professors, rectors, to convene and begin this dialogue in La Moneda [the presidential palace] and in Congress because that is what the immense majority of Chileans want from us.\textsuperscript{40}

Piñera’s invitation was well received by the student movement but they emphasized that their participation in the dialogue with the government would occur in

\textsuperscript{37} Emol, “Camila Vallejo cifra en un millón los asistentes a la marcha por educación.”


\textsuperscript{39} “Presidente Piñera afirma que la educación es ‘un bien de consumo.’”

parallel with continued mobilization. On September 3, Piñera met with Confech, CONES (the high school federation), and the national teacher’s union. In the meeting, the President reiterated his disagreement with the movement’s demand for universal free education but expressed his commitment to guaranteeing free education for the poorest 40% of students.

**Meetings with Bulnes**

Following the student movement’s meeting with President Piñera, Bulnes held two meetings with the movement on September 29 and October 5. According to media reports, both meetings were characterized by a high degree of tension. In the first meeting, Bulnes attempted to convince student leaders to call off their strike and return to classes but students refused, arguing that they would stay on strike until evidence of substantial policy change. The second meeting, meanwhile, broke down over “irreconcilable” differences in regards to the issue of free education; while students maintained their position that Chile needed to advance towards an entirely free, public education system, Bulnes defended the Piñera government’s commitment to expanding

---


the existing financing system. At the end of the year, Bulnes was removed from his position as Minister of Education and replaced by Harald Beyer, who would eventually also be discharged from his position. The removal of three Education Ministers is suggestive of the student movement’s ability to exert influence over Chilean politics. While it is impossible to be sure that it was the movement that was solely responsible for Piñera’s decision to fire his Education Ministers, it is likely that the movement played a part.

The Piñera government’s representation of the student movement in the media

As the Piñera administration engaged in negotiations and dialogue with the student movement, it simultaneously attempted to discredit the movement in the eyes of the Chilean public. This was particularly true in the months after the student movement first emerged. Indeed, the Piñera government’s initial response was to downplay the movement, presenting the protestors as a minority of the student body and arguing that the education system was not in crisis. In addition, as discussed in Chapter Three, the government waged an intense media campaign to portray the student movement as violent and destructive. To this end, media coverage by Chile’s primarily conservative newspaper and television channels focused on the episodes of violence, looting, and


vandalism wreaked by “encapuchados,” small groups of hooded protestors that would infiltrate the student protests.

In addition to framing the student movement as violent, Lavín and other members of the Piñera government argued that the student movement had overstepped and that its demands were “inappropriate.” In an interview with La Tercera, for example, Lavín argued: “in no modern democracy are these matters discussed with students. These are important national issues that are agreed upon in Congress.”

He also claimed that the students had overstepped in their demands for “tax reform, constitutional reform, and the nationalization of natural resources.” In Lavín’s view, these were “political and ideological” demands that were illegitimate for a student movement to make.

**Public opinion on education and the student movement**

The Piñera government’s negative portrayal of the student movement was unsuccessful in turning public opinion against it. Instead, polls showed broad support for the movement among the Chilean public. According to CERC’s December 2011 poll, for example, 89% of the Chilean public supported the student movement. The same poll showed that public support for the movement extended to the content of its demands, as 77% of Chileans agreed that education should be free, 78% claimed that for-profit higher educational institutions should not exist, and 82% believed that the student movement’s
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demands represented the right approach to reforming the country’s education system.\textsuperscript{50} 
Public opinion surveys also showed Chileans’ perceptions of how the Piñera government was handling the issue of education. According to CEP surveys, 32\% said the government had done a good job in 2010,\textsuperscript{51} while by December 2011, only 7\% agreed.\textsuperscript{52}

Yet, while support for the movement’s demands remained consistently high—a CEP survey in October 2013 found that 74\% of Chileans were in agreement with free university education—\textsuperscript{53} opinion polls also revealed a growing disagreement with some of the movement’s protest methods, especially strikes, university takeovers, and unauthorized protests. For example, an Adimark survey in September 2012 showed that 62\% of people disapproved of the way in which the movement had protested in the preceding weeks, a 9\% increase from the previous year.\textsuperscript{54}

Overall, however, public opinion data suggests that the student movement was able to utilize the public opinion shift mechanism discussed in Chapter Two. As shown in the first section of this chapter, prior to the emergence of the student movement, concern for education among the Chilean public was relatively low, particularly when compared to concern for health and crime. With the emergence of the movement, however, there was a significant increase in public concern for education. The empirical evidence supports the claims made by the student leaders I interviewed, who argued that their

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{54} Adimark, Encuesta de Opinión: Evaluación Gestión del Gobierno.
movement has changed the way Chileans conceptualize education. Polls also showed a large degree of support for the movement among the Chilean public. According to theories in the social movement literature, when the public supports a movement’s demands, it is more likely that policymakers will design and implement policies favorable to that movement.\(^{55}\) This seems to have been true in the case of the Chilean student movement, where high levels of public support combined with consistent pressure from the student movement, resulted in a series of policy proposals by the Piñera government.

**Intra-institutional change**

As discussed in Chapter Two, intra-institutional change occurs when a movement alters the internal structure of a political sub-institution. This type of change is what Gamson referred to as inclusion: “the integration of challenging group leaders or members in positions of status or authority in the antagonist’s organizational structure.”\(^{56}\) In the case of the Chilean student movement, two forms of intra-institutional change occurred. First, four former student leaders, including Camila Vallejo and Giorgio Jackson, were elected to Congress in the 2013 November elections, after winning 44% and 48% of the votes in their respective districts.\(^{57}\) Second, former student leaders including Jackson, created a new political party: Revolución Democrática. Founded in


2012, Revolución Democrática describes itself as a “political movement, born in the context of the 2011 social movement, that aspires to become a relevant actor in national politics.”

Both of these changes represent a degree of institutionalization of the student movement, through the incorporation of some of its emblematic leaders into traditional political institutions. Theoretically, this corresponds to what Andrews terms the political access mechanism. Andrews argues that, to achieve political change, a movement must gain access to the formal political process and struggle for change from within rather than from without. According to the political access mechanism, the greater the number of movement participants that are able to gain positions of institutional power, the stronger an impact a social movement can have. In the case of the Chilean student movement, former student leaders can now exert formal political influence on government policy.
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After winning the second-round elections in a landslide victory, Bachelet returned to the Chilean presidency for a second time in March 2014. Throughout her presidential campaign, Bachelet made it clear that education would be the central focus of her second term in office. Bachelet’s commitment to education was particularly evident in her 2013 presidential platform, in which education was presented as one of three fundamental reforms (along with tax and constitutional reform) that she would enact if elected. The difference in how Bachelet discussed education in her 2013 presidential platform, as compared with her 2005 platform, is striking. Bachelet’s 2013 campaign platform echoed the student movement’s demands, mentioning the phrases “public education,” “education as a social right,” and “not for profit” 16, 5, and 10 times respectively; none of these phrases appeared in her 2005 platform. In addition, in 2013, Bachelet referred repeatedly to her intention to give the state a more fundamental role in the provision and administration of education, a commitment that responds directly to one of the student movement’s main demands. She writes, for example, that “through public education, the state will play a fundamental role at each level of education. The state must guarantee the right to a quality education and strengthen public education.”

Furthermore, unlike in 2006, when her approach to education financing was based on increasing scholarships, in her second term as president Bachelet has promised to...
make university education free for all within the next six years. In her 2013 platform, the President described her commitment to free education as a “paradigm shift,” and argued that Chilean society “must abandon the policies that have allowed education to be treated as a consumer good,” because “education should be understood as a social right.” She repeated this idea in her 2014 presidential speech, arguing that her education reform would make quality education a “right and not a consumer good…returning to public education the value and importance that it never should have lost.” The language used by Bachelet in her presidential platform and speech echoes that used by the student movement, a point that Andrés Fielbaum, Noam Titelman, and other student leaders I interviewed raised. In addition, like Piñera in 2012 and 2013, Bachelet referred explicitly to the student movement in her 2014 speech. In the opening lines of her speech she says: “today, few people doubt that Chile is a different country…with more aspirations, that mobilizes for education…a country that recognizes and demands its rights.” That this is one of the first things she mentioned in her speech demonstrates the political influence of the student movement.
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Public opinion of Bachelet’s education reform

In January 2014, public opinion towards Bachelet’s education reform was largely positive; according to a CERC poll, 79% of the population supported the proposed reform.66 However, a CEP poll, in June 2014 showed that support for Bachelet’s reforms and, by extension, the student movement’s demands had fallen. While 50% of Chileans supported public education, 59% said they would prefer to send their children to a private-subsidized school instead of a public school.67 Furthermore, 38% supported free higher education for all, while 57% believed the state should only fund entirely the educations of the poorest families. Perhaps most of a blow to Bachelet’s reform was that, according to the CEP study, 49% of Chileans were fine with for-profit schools as long as the school offered high quality education.

The student movement in Bachelet’s second term

Bachelet’s return to the presidency has created a complex situation for the student movement. On the one hand, Bachelet incorporated the movement’s demands into her platform and committed to passing a reform that, at least on the surface, responds directly to the demands that the student movement has been making for over four years. On the other hand, the return of a socialist president who shares many of the student movement’s ideological perspectives means that the movement no longer has a common ideological “enemy” against which to fight, as they did when Piñera was in power. In addition, four former student leaders have been elected to Congress and thus been incorporated into the


traditional political institutions against which the student movement has been protesting. Within the student movement, diverging opinions towards Bachelet and her reforms have emerged; some claim that the Bachelet government has “co-opted” their demands, taking them on as slogans in order to win the elections, while others are more optimistic.\(^68\)

As a whole, however, the student movement vowed to remain mobilized and keep putting pressure on the Bachelet government through protest to ensure that the reforms passed were in line with the movement’s demands. The first student protest under the second Bachelet administration occurred on 8 May 2014, with 100,000 people participating, including the four student leaders now in Congress.\(^69\) The student movement argued that the purpose of the protest was to criticize the lack of clarity in Bachelet’s education reform and to demand student participation in the design of the reform.\(^70\) A month later, on June 10, students organized another protest, which they justified along the same lines but added that, like Piñera’s reforms, Bachelet’s education reform was simply “make-up” on the existing neoliberal model.\(^71\) In response to the protests, Bachelet promised that she would listen to the movement’s demands and incorporate the changes they wanted into the next portion of her reform.\(^72\)

\(^{68}\) O’Neill, “Is the Chilean Student Movement Being Co-Opted by Its Government?”


\(^{70}\) Ibid.


\(^{72}\) Ibid.
Despite Bachelet’s promises, the student movement organized yet another march on August 21, claiming that they were reclaiming their “role as protagonists in the debate through agitation in the streets.” Following these student protests, Bachelet’s Education Minister, Nicolás Eyzaguirre, met with more than 100 former and current student leaders on August 31. This meeting was considered the student movement’s first formal show of support for Bachelet’s educational reforms. Nevertheless, the following day Confech withdrew its participation in the “Citizen Participation Plan” working group organized by Eyzaguirre and called on the Minister of Education to initiate direct dialogue instead. Specifically, the students demanded a legislative negotiation table that would permit them to influence the bills being sent to Congress. FECH president Melissa Sepúlveda announced: “we reject the Citizen Participation Plan…and demand that the Education Minister create a truly participatory space that creates consensus with the social world.”

Student protests and negotiations aside, the first portion of Bachelet’s education reform passed on January 26 2015. Three days later, the FECH published a video criticizing the reform and calling for renewed mobilization. The students argued that one
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of the reform’s main deficiencies was the lack of student participation in its design.\textsuperscript{77} Thus, while the Bachelet government celebrated the passage of the first portion of its emblematic reform, the student movement protested against it in the streets.

\textit{Counterfactual}

The narrative presented above shows how the student movement used protest and negotiations to pressure both the Piñera and Bachelet governments into responding to its demands with a series of policy reforms. This chapter depicts the movement as a powerful political actor that was able to engage directly with, and exert substantial pressure on, the Chilean government. While this narrative links the student movement with the education reform passed in January 2015, as well as the numerous policies proposed by the Piñera government, it raises the following question: would educational reform have happened in the absence of the student movement?

It could be argued, for example, that the education reform can be explained as a function of the return to power of a socialist President, who was more amenable to structural reform than the Piñera government. In other words, Bachelet might have proposed and passed her education reform without the pressure exerted by the student movement. However, as discussed in the first section of this chapter, in her first term Bachelet’s educational policy proposals were radically different to those included in her 2013 presidential platform. In 2005, Bachelet’s plans for education reform included a deepening of the neoliberal model of education financing (through scholarships, credits, and loans) and made no mention of free education for all, a centerpiece of her 2013

\textsuperscript{77} “FECh lanza video que critica la reforma educacional y convoca a movilizarse.”
platform. In addition, in 2005, Bachelet’s focus was on improving access to kindergarten education and her plans for improving the higher education system were limited. In 2013, on the other hand, higher education reform was a centerpiece of her platform. A close reading of Bachelet’s 2013 presidential platform makes clear that the President integrated explicitly the student movement’s demands into her campaign platform and, subsequently, her education reform. I argue, therefore, that it would be difficult to explain Bachelet’s 2015 education reform without considering the student movement and its influence.

Furthermore, as highlighted in Chapter Three, before the student movements of 2006 and 2011, the Chilean education system had remained relatively intact in the years since the return to democracy. This suggests that, if not for the student movement and the impetus for change that it provided, Chile’s education system would have remained the same into the foreseeable future. This assertion is supported by public opinion data, which shows that, when compared to health and crime, concern for education had not been a priority for Chileans in the years prior to the emergence of the student movement. This suggests that without the student movement, which made education a key issue in public opinion, policymakers would not have had the incentive to design and implement education policy reform.
Conclusion

Empirical evidence including public opinion polls, presidential speeches, and presidential platforms makes clear that, between 2011 and 2015, education became a key issue on the Chilean political agenda. This heightened attention to education and the shift in the way in which it was discussed by politicians and perceived by the general public did not occur in a vacuum. I argue that this change was due, in large part, to the 2011 student movement, which made education a central issue on the Chilean political agenda and shaped the way in which education was perceived and discussed by policymakers, politicians, and the general Chilean public.

The movement used informal tactics such as protest and formal tactics, including meetings and negotiations, to pressure both the Piñera and Bachelet government into responding to its demands with a series of policy changes. The movement’s massive and creative protests, the largest since the return to democracy, drew attention to education in a compelling way and meant that the government could not ignore the issues raised by the movement. By demanding—and gaining—a seat at the political table, the student movement positioned itself as a powerful actor, capable of engaging in dialogue and negotiations with the Chilean government. In the process, the movement achieved more than just a favorable policy outcome; it also altered the way in which the Chilean policymaking process happens. Specifically, students set a precedent for the incorporation of a social movement’s demands into the Chilean policymaking and decision process.78
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The narrative presented in this chapter can be interpreted in the context of the causal mechanisms discussed in Chapter Two: the disruption mechanism, the political access mechanism, and the public opinion shift mechanism. In regards to the disruption mechanism, between 2011 and 2015, the student movement used protests, “paros” (student strikes), and “tomas” (student takeovers of universities) to place continuous pressure on the Chilean government. The movement made particular use of disruptive tactics in 2011, under the Piñera administration. However, the student also used protests in 2014 under the second Bachelet administration to hold the president accountable the promises she had made in her campaign.

While engaging in disruptive activities in the streets and universities, the student movement simultaneously used the political access mechanism. Specifically, the movement exchanged letters and held meetings with key political figures in both the Piñera and Bachelet administrations. In this way, the student movement showed its capacity for high-level dialogue and negotiation. Through its effective use of the disruption and political access mechanisms, the student movement succeeded in extracting policy concessions from the Piñera government and was arguably responsible for the dismissal of three Education Ministers. The movement was also able to gain widespread support among the Chilean population through its use of the public opinion shift mechanism. This was, in large part, because the movement’s criticism of the high cost of a university education resonated with the Chilean public, almost all of whom have at least some contact with the country’s education system.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION: RECONSIDERING THE POLITICAL OUTCOMES OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Perhaps the most important change has been the change in common sense. That a lot of things that people considered normal, acceptable, began to be seen as bad, as needing to be changed…People’s perceptions changed, even if this hasn’t been reflected, necessarily, in a political, structural change. People look at education differently, they look at protest differently. I think that today a lot of people think it is normal to protest on the streets, they think it is normal that presidents should have to listen to what the citizenry says.

—Noam Titelman, FEUC president 2012

This thesis began with the following research question: *what are the political outcomes of social movements and how are these outcomes achieved?* Answering this question is important for a number of reasons. First, it offers insights into the scholarly debate about the causes of political change, a key question in much of the political science and international relations literature. While many international relations scholars in both the realist and liberal traditions offer state-centric explanations of political change, this thesis shows that social movements can also be important drivers behind changes in political institutions, political discourse, and public opinion.

Second, current scholarship that *does* consider the role of social movements in political change has yet to provide a comprehensive account of the political outcomes of social movements. Although in the past two decades scholars have devoted more attention to movement outcomes, they have focused almost exclusively on the *policy* outcomes of social movements and, in doing so, have overlooked other forms of political change, particularly non-institutional outcomes. Consequently, our understanding of social movement outcomes, and the mechanisms through which these outcomes are achieved, remain underdeveloped.
I address the central research question of this thesis through a case study of the Chilean student movement (2011-2015). I find that the student movement not only achieved its aims of education policy reform but also had important non-institutional outcomes. These non-institutional outcomes included enhanced political consciousness among movement participants and the general Chilean population, and increased public concern for education. My empirical findings highlight the need for scholars to study movement outcomes in both the institutional (including policy change and changes in the political agenda) and the non-institutional arenas. With this aim in mind, my thesis develops a framework that integrates various political outcomes to offer a multidimensional conceptualization of political change. This broader perspective on political change more accurately reflects the complex reality of the political world and allows scholars to gain a better understanding of the importance of social movements and their political outcomes.

My thesis also contributes to the scholarly literature by offering an in-depth examination of the causal mechanisms through which the Chilean student movement achieved its outcomes. As scholars have reiterated time and again, it is only through close attention to mechanisms and processes that we can gain a comprehensive understanding of how movements generate political change. The remainder of this chapter examines my findings and their implications in greater detail.
Political Outcomes of the 2011 Chilean Student Movement

The student movement placed education at the center of Chilean politics, transforming the issue into one that could alter the political fortunes of the country’s top politicians. The movement also reshaped the way education is perceived and discussed by policymakers, politicians, and the general Chilean public. Ultimately, this allowed the student movement to gain a policy victory in the form of the radical education reform passed by the Bachelet administration in January 2015. The movement also had consequences far beyond the education field, impacting Chile’s political institutions and political system. By demanding, and gaining, a seat at the political table, the student movement set a precedent for the incorporation of a social movement’s demands into the Chilean policymaking process. The movement also impacted the political system through the creation of a new political party, headed by former student leaders, and the election of former student leaders to the Chilean Congress.

The 2011 student movement had six main political outcomes:

1. The education reform passed by Bachelet in January 2015 (policy change)
2. The student movement gained increased access to, and influence over, formal political institutions (procedural change)
3. Education became a key issue on the political agenda (agenda setting)
4. Four former student leaders were elected to Congress and a new political party, Revolución Democrática, was created by former student leaders (intra-institutional change)
5. The student movement, and its demands, gained widespread public support among the Chilean public (public opinion change; a non-institutional outcome)
6. Movement participants and Chilean citizens experienced an increase in their political consciousness (non-institutional change)

These six political outcomes can be classified into two broad categories: institutional and non-institutional change. The first four outcomes listed above fall under the category of institutional change. These outcomes, particularly policy change, have already been identified and examined in various case studies. In contrast, the non-institutional outcomes have been largely overlooked by the literature. This is particularly true of changes in political consciousness, which many scholars do not examine at all. My research moves beyond existing frameworks of political outcomes and adopts a broader conceptualization of political change.

Paying close attention to non-institutional outcomes is important because, as former student leader Noam Titelman expresses in the quotation at the opening of this chapter, these changes in “common sense” are some of the Chilean student movement’s most significant impacts. Today, Chileans are more aware of their rights and are more willing to use protest as a means to make demands of their government—reflected in the doubling of protest participation rates between 2010 and 2012. This enhanced consciousness has not been limited to the education sphere; Chileans have applied the student movement’s critiques of the country’s education system to other parts of Chile’s socio-economic model, including the health and pension systems.
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As discussed in Chapter Three, Chilean society has been largely demobilized since Pinochet overthrew Allende in a military coup d’état in 1973. Under the military regime protest was heavily repressed and, as a result, a fear of mobilization persisted into the decades following the return to democracy in 1990. By using framing techniques with wide popular appeal, the 2011 student movement reclaimed protest as a legitimate form of political participation. As evidenced in public opinion data, Chileans are now more likely to engage in collective action. For a society that has been demobilized since 1973, this re-politicization is a significant change and one that may outlast the specific policy gains obtained by the student movement.

Causal Mechanisms Through Which the Movement Achieved its Outcomes

Chapter Five used process tracing to uncover the causal mechanisms through which the student movement achieved policy changes under both the Piñera and Bachelet administrations. I found that the movement used three causal mechanisms to obtain policy change. These were: (1) the disruption mechanism, (2) the political access mechanism, and (3) the public opinion shift mechanism.

1. Disruption mechanism: The student movement used protests, “tomas” (student takeovers of universities), and “paros” (massive student strikes) and other forms of contentious action to place continuous pressure on the Chilean government between 2011 and 2015. The student movement’s use of disruptive tactics was particularly prevalent during the Piñera presidency, especially in 2011 when the movement was most active on the streets. However, students also used disruptive strategies, particularly protests, under the second Bachelet administration to hold the president...
accountable to her campaign promises and to demand opportunities for participation in the design of the reform.

2. *Political access mechanism:* While engaging in disruptive activities in the streets and their universities, the student movement simultaneously made use of the political access mechanism. This strategy entailed gaining access to political institutions and the policymaking process through meetings and correspondence with key political figures. In this way, the students showed that they were not simply capable of organizing large protests, but also had the capacity for formal dialogue and negotiation with the political elite. In gaining access to the policymaking process, the student movement was able to extract policy concessions from the Piñera government and was, arguably, responsible for the dismissal of three of Piñera’s Education Ministers.

3. *Public opinion shift mechanism:* as discussed in Chapters Four and Five, the student movement gained widespread support among the Chilean public. The movement was able to achieve this widespread support partly as a result of its simultaneous, and effective, use of the disruption and political access mechanisms. Most importantly, however, the student movement’s demands resonated with a large part of the Chilean public. One reason for this is that the movement’s criticism of the exorbitant expenses of university education made sense to Chileans, almost all of whom have at least some contact with the country’s education system. While public opinion change is a mechanism that the student movement used to achieve education policy change, it is also, as discussed in the previous section, a political outcome with consequences for the country’s political culture.
The student movement’s use of both the political access mechanism and the disruption mechanism increased its effectiveness. This is because the movement captured the sympathy and support of the Chilean public through its creative protests and the clear articulation of its demands while simultaneously demonstrating its capacity to interact with the political elite, suggesting a high degree of maturity and sophistication. My analysis of the causal mechanisms at work in the case of the Chilean student movement suggests that a multidimensional strategy that includes both informal and formal tactics may be a more effective way for social movements to achieve policy change, as compared with using only one of these strategies. It is important to note, however, that a social movement’s ability to use the political access mechanism is contingent on the willingness of politicians to engage with it. If no policymakers or other members of the political elite support a movement’s demands, it is unlikely that it will be able to achieve policy change, no matter how successful it is at drawing attention to an issue through disruptive tactics in public spaces.

My research findings are summarized in Figure 6.1 on the following page.
Theoretical Implications

One of the central theoretical implications of this thesis is that non-institutional outcomes are important forms of political change that many social movement scholars have overlooked. This thesis makes clear that non-institutional outcomes should not be regarded solely as biographical or cultural changes but also as forms of political change.

As shown by my research, changes in political consciousness and public opinion can have important implications for a country’s political system and culture by, for example, altering the rights that citizens feel they are entitled to and/or increasing the propensity of a citizenry to engage in collective action to demand particular rights from their government. As Sidney Tarrow and Michael McCann argue, participating in a movement is politicizing and empowering and can increase the likelihood of future participation in
other social movements. In addition, through social movements, new ideas and values can spread and become widely shared by a country’s citizens. In brief, non-institutional outcomes have important political consequences and should not be excluded from, or minimized in, studies on the political outcomes of social movements.

Related to the above point, my thesis shows that while policy change is certainly an important political outcome—indeed for many social movements, achieving a particular policy change is the main goal—an exclusive focus on policy underestimates the political impacts of social movements. This is especially true in cases where, although a social movement might have failed to achieve its policy goals, it might have induced changes in the political consciousness of movement participants and the wider citizenry that could enhance opportunities for political change in the long term. When I conducted my interviews with Chilean student leaders, many of the movement’s institutional outcomes, most notably Bachelet’s education reform, had yet to occur. However, despite the uncertainty of the student movement’s institutional legacy at the time of my interviews, many of the student leaders firmly believed that the non-institutional achievements they had gained were significant and transformative in and of themselves.

In regards to causal mechanisms, my thesis echoes the call made by many researchers for greater scholarly attention to the ways in which movements achieve their outcomes. It is only by looking into the “black box” of causal mechanisms that we can
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gain a comprehensive understanding of how movements generate political change. My research suggests that a social movement might have greater success in generating policy change if it activates various causal mechanisms at the same time. Interestingly, although I hypothesized that the mechanisms through which the Chilean student movement achieved its outcomes would differ from those used by movements in northern democracies, this was not borne out by the empirical evidence. Instead, despite the fact that existing theories of causal mechanisms are based almost exclusively on social movements in the developed world, these theories proved to be a useful analytical tool for uncovering how the Chilean student movement achieved its policy outcomes.

In addition to their implications for the social movement literature, my research findings are also relevant for theories on political culture and the quality of democracy. Political culture is generally theorized to be something that changes very gradually, if at all. In contrast, my research on the Chilean student movement suggests that it is possible for political culture to change quite quickly, at least in certain cases. Although the speed at which political culture changes is necessarily context-dependent, this thesis suggests that social movements can be catalysts behind relatively rapid changes in political culture.

Meanwhile, my research contributes to literature on the quality of democracy by offering an explanation of the ways in which social actors can enhance democratic quality from the bottom up. As seen in this thesis, social movements can make policymaking more representative by demanding inclusion in the decision making process. In addition, social movements provide a way for citizens to place an issue on the
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political agenda and hold politicians accountable between elections. In sum, my thesis suggests that theories of political culture and democratic quality can be updated and strengthened through a consideration of the role social movements can play in processes of political change.

**Future Research**

My empirical findings and their implications open up many opportunities for future research. In the case of the 2011 Chilean student movement, future research will benefit from the passage of time and be able to draw more robust conclusions about the movement’s political outcomes. For example, will the outcomes identified in this thesis persist into the future or will they dissipate with the passage of time? Why or why not? Only a longitudinal approach can provide answers to these questions.

The importance of taking a long-term approach to the study of social movement outcomes is also relevant in a more general sense. Adopting a longer time frame will allow scholars to distinguish between the short-term and long-term effects of a social movement. In this way, scholars will be better able to uncover the effects of non-institutional political outcomes, because the impacts of these forms of political change are likely to manifest more clearly with the passage of time. A long-term approach will also allow scholars to examine how different outcomes interact with and influence each other over time.

Future research should add more cases to extend my findings. Scholars could compare the outcomes of the Chilean student movement with those of other social movements in Latin America and other regions of the world. Do the non-institutional outcomes identified in the Chilean case occur in other contexts? Why or why not? What
determines the strength or durability of these outcomes? The framework developed in this thesis provides a tool that scholars can use in these comparative studies.

Scholars should also examine the causal mechanisms at work in their specific case studies. Further research on mechanisms can address the question of whether both the disruptive and political access mechanisms need to be activated for a movement to achieve political change, as suggested in this thesis. If both mechanisms are activated, might political change be more likely? Why or why not? A comparative approach will be especially beneficial in this regard. Scholars can, for example, examine a single mechanism at work in two or more cases to try and understand whether, and why, it worked more effectively in one case than another.

Finally, scholars should design studies that allow them to analyze the effects of social movements on political culture. While my thesis suggests that social movements can have substantial impacts on a country’s political culture, an empirical analysis of this hypothesis was beyond the scope of this thesis. Future research should, therefore, examine whether and how social movements affect political culture. Understanding the effects of social movements on political culture is important because this form of political change, which can include an increased propensity to engage in collective action and changes in the way citizens vote or interact with their political parties, can have deep and long-lasting consequences for a country’s democracy.

This thesis shows that social movements matter and that an exclusive focus on policy change underestimates their transformative power. It is only by adopting an integrated approach to the study of movement outcomes—that includes both institutional
and non-institutional change—that scholars can gain a deeper understanding of the importance of social movements in processes of political change.
APPENDIX: Interview Script

1. Para empezar, ¿me puedes hablar de cómo te involucraste en el movimiento estudiantil? [To start, can you tell me about how you became involved in the student movement?]

2. ¿Cómo crees que han cambiado los objetivos del movimiento en los últimos años? [How do you think the movement’s objectives have changed over the years?]

3. ¿Cual ha sido el impacto del movimiento? [What has the student movement’s impact been?]

4. ¿Cómo percibes la relación entre el movimiento y el gobierno chileno? [How do you perceive the relationship between the movement and the Chilean government?]

5. Y en general, ¿crees que el movimiento ha transformado la democracia chilena? ¿Cómo? [In general, do you think that the student movement has transformed Chile’s democracy? How?]

6. En tu opinión, ¿cómo sería una buena educación en Chile? [In your opinion, what would a good education in Chile be like?]

7. ¿Tienes algo más que añadir? [Do you have anything else to add?]
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