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ABSTRACT

In recent decades, social movements have been one of the most productive avenues of sociological inquiry. Environmental movements in particular have received significant attention from movement scholars. This manuscript-based dissertation contains five chapters examining different theoretical propositions relating to a single social movement: the environmental movement to protect old growth forests of British Columbia, Canada, during the highly contentious 1990s. An introductory chapter provides a background discussion and brief literature review; a concluding chapter summarizes the results and discusses how the individual manuscripts tie together. In between, three studies test and extend theoretical propositions concerning the roles of sociodemographics, values, social networks, framing, and movement-media interactions, as they relate to this particular social movement.

The first study compares and contrasts the environmental movement and its pro-forestry countermovement in terms of sociodemographic and value-based factors affecting participation. A significant contribution from this manuscript is the atypical treatment of 'participation'—instead of simply taking group membership or rates of involvement in group sponsored activities as indicators of 'participation', both aspects are explored, revealing different underlying processes. This study also challenges the existing premise that postmaterialism is a strictly environmental value, showing members of the countermovement also possess strong postmaterialist values.

Social movement researchers have long touted the significance of social networks in facilitating the mobilization process. The conventional wisdom is that ties to existing activists increases the likelihood of recruitment into movements, fostering greater levels of participation. The second study tests an adapted version of a well-accepted model of social movement mobilization (Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Klandermans 2004), emphasizing multiple possible pathways to mobilization, highlighting the role media exposure plays in the recruitment process.

The third study focuses on media coverage of social movements by examining how certain factors (gender, leadership, radicalism, and social network centrality) affected the likelihood that an activist was cited in the print-news media. This analysis is innovative in linking network and frame analysis. Results show that the network centrality of the activist is the strongest predictor of rates of citation. This result counters some existing explanations concerning the way media covers social movement activities.
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1 INTRODUCTION, LITERATURE REVIEW, AND OBJECTIVES

1.1 Introduction

Over the past couple of decades, the topic of social movements has become a common focus of study in the field of sociology and among this research ‘mobilization’ and ‘participation’\(^1\) have received a great deal of attention. This manuscript-based dissertation continues this agenda of exploring social movement mobilization and participation, focusing specifically on the environmental movement to protect old growth forests of Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada in the highly-contentious 1990s.

This work is comprised of this introductory Chapter 1, providing some background, an abbreviated literature review, and the overall research aims of each of the papers; three individual papers examining different facets of mobilization and participation (Chapter 2, 3, and 4); and Chapter 5, where findings are reviewed, limitations and future research directions are discussed, and an overall synthesis is provided.

It is worth emphasizing that though the three papers making up the body of this dissertation were initially drafted independently of each other, meant to examine separate theoretical issues related to social movement mobilization and participation, they nonetheless posses a certain continuity and relate to each other in two significant ways.

The first way in which these papers come together is theoretical. Four main themes are considered in this dissertation, best summarized as: (1) the sociodemographic and value-based correlates of social movement participation; (2) motivations for social movement participation; (3) collective action framing; and (4) social movement interactions with the media. While a model is presented in Chapter 5 providing a framework under which the relationships between these themes are more formally discussed, suffice it to say for this introduction that one of the main objectives of this dissertation is examination of the fundamental questions of ‘who’ and ‘why’ that occupy much of the social movement mobilization and participation literature.

Who participates in social movements? In the earliest stages of social movement research, academics often focused significant attention on attempting to characterize the people that participate in a social movement from those that do not. Concurrently, environmental

\(^1\) Note that though some distinguish ‘mobilization’ from ‘micro-mobilization’ – the former sometimes referring specifically to the broad acts of groups of actors participating in collective actions; the latter referring, more specifically, to the actions of individuals as they relate to joining or participating in a social movement – there is no consensus on this matter. For the sake of clarification, the terms ‘mobilization’ is used repeatedly throughout this dissertation, but almost exclusively refers to the latter of these two meanings, and is often used interchangeably with the more general term ‘participation’.
sociologists were trying to define the so-called "social bases of environmental concern".
Accordingly, innumerable classification schemes have been proposed describing the correlates of a pro-environmental orientation and subsequent participation in an environmental social movement. Much of the earliest work was based on sociodemographic differentiations; later, more sophisticated work incorporated other important considerations such as values, attitudes, and beliefs. In a related manner, others have also argued that values, attitudes, and beliefs can be used to characterize the pool of people—aptly named the ‘mobilization potential’—to which social movements appeal for support and membership. Thus, taken together from this array of literature, a valid response to the question of ‘Who participates in an environmental social movement?’ might be: a relatively young, well-educated, urban, female, espousing generally liberal views and postmaterialist values. Chapter 2 examines this issue by assessing the relationship between participation in the British Columbia environmental movement and a set of sociodemographics (age, gender, education, and employment) and relevant values and attitudes (postmaterialism/materialism and opposition to economic exploitation of the environment).

However, Chapter 2 also goes further by making this assessment by systematically and simultaneously examining data about the movement to its equally active countermovement—something rare in the social movement literature.

Why do people participate in social movements? In response to this question, the notion of social networks inarguably has taken the leading role. The generally-accepted view seems to be that activists are most commonly drawn into social movements through ties they have to others who are already active in the movement. However, regardless of the near hegemonic status social networks hold in the social movement mobilization literature, it is important we recognize that other things can motivate people to join a movement as well. Chapter 3 explores this particular issue by examining a familiar model of social movement mobilization, and in turn proposing a subtle revision to better incorporate the influence media can have in prompting people to mobilize. The third theme—collective action framing—is brought in here as well, as the critical conceptual link that explains how media exposure serves to prompt certain individuals to action.

The framing theme also comes into play in the final paper, Chapter 4, where I explore the complex and dynamic relationship between the media and the environmental movement by empirically examining the use of collective action frames in the print-news media coverage of the British Columbia forestry conflict. More specifically, this chapter examines how a set of
individual, activist-level characteristics (degree of centrality in the movements' communication network, formal leadership role, radicalism, and gender) relate to the frequency with which activists are cited in print-news media. Further, since the content of media coverage of contentious issues is usually a matter of saliently framing the issues, the analyses are based on the frequency with which individuals are cited in the print-news media using various types of collective action frames, namely, diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames a la Benford and Snow (2000).

The second, way in which the manuscripts are related is topically. Together, all the chapters of this dissertation comprise a multifaceted exploration of participation in a single social movement—the environmental movement to protect old growth forests of Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada in the highly contentious 1990s. This is important because even though cross-movement research is often touted as the most powerful tool for examining and developing social movement theory—this maybe due to the overly-zealous and sometimes-hazardous academic desire to derive broad generalizations—it is also critical that we gain more thorough understandings of particular movements at particular points in time.

While cross-movement research surely does provide insights into some more universal issues relating to social movements, typically such work is unable to capture the nuanced differences and inherent variability that exists across movements in terms of an array of factors such as attitudes, values, motivations, goals, objectives, and repertoires of action. Due to this, it is only with extensive research into individual movements that we are able to tell a coherent sociological story of how social movements operate.²

Importantly, it is worth noting that all of the data analyzed in this dissertation are secondary data collected by researchers in the 1990s to study an array of various research questions related to the British Columbia environmental movement. Telephone surveys with the general public in two communities; mail-survey data collected from members of three environmental movement organizations; a database of print-news media coverage of the British Columbia forestry conflict; and interviews with news-workers who were active in covering

---

² In this way, even though the work in this dissertation is presented as stand-alone research, it is worth noting that it also adds to an extensive, ongoing research programme examining different aspects of participation in this particular movement (Tindall 1994, 2002, 2004; Tindall and Begoray 1993; Tindall and Cormier 2008; Tindall, Davies, and Mauboulès 2003; Robinson et al. 2007; Cormier and Tindall 2005; Doyle, Elliott, and Tindall 1997). While this other work on the British Columbia environmental movement is cited extensively throughout the various chapters of this dissertation, a complete integration with this prior work was not an objective of this study and is beyond the scope of this dissertation.
forestry issues during the 1990s are all utilized. Accordingly, while the use of this secondary data allowed for the development and examination of the research questions assessed here, since it is historic, it did not always offer the flexibility often required for significant adaptation and revision of research objectives. I could not go back in time and collect additional data to further clarify certain issues or relationships. While the inclusion of other issues and variables might often have made certain analyses more powerful, the objectives sometimes had to be kept less ambitious, limited to what was available with the given data. That said, this should not substantially affect the results and conclusions discussed throughout this dissertation, and must be tempered with the fact that this is simply the nature of researching past events.

What follows is an abbreviated review of the relevant literature (more detailed reviews are included in each of the three manuscript chapters). However, before moving on to the literature review, an introduction to the British Columbia environmental movement of the 1990s follows.

1.2 The British Columbia Environmental Movement

British Columbia contains the largest tracts of untouched, old growth, temperate rainforests in the world. Thick forests blanket vast areas of the province, valued by the forest industry, many rural communities, and others as a valuable, harvestable commodity. Almost from its inception as a British colony, the forest industry has been the single greatest contributor to the provincial economy—at times contributing over 80 percent of total exported goods from British Columbia (Marchak, Aycock, and Herbert 1999)—and came to employ tens-of-thousands of provincial residents. However, by the latter half of the 20th century, this well-established industry was under attack.

For a growing contingent of the citizenry, anger mounted over what they saw as rampant environmental degradation of local forestlands. Widespread and growing use of clearcut logging practices, degraded watersheds and related detrimental impacts on local fisheries, and lack of adequate reforestation were oft-mentioned concerns. In sum, these concerned citizens claimed that relatively unchecked forest practices and weak or non-existent forest management regulations were effectively permitting—and even incentivizing—the decimation of the provincial forests. Recognizing that the local forests would soon be gone without concerted efforts to protect them, many of these concerned citizens began to organize into various groups aimed at confronting this situation.

3 The original survey questionnaires and interview schedules are presented in Appendix B.
The deeply entrenched forest industry proved a worthy opponent and decades of conflict ensued. This conflict, however, was not simply a matter of confronting the industry, and soon the growing environmental movement found itself challenging the government, residents of forest-dependent communities, and a substantial countermovement.

Nevertheless, by the 1990s, these individuals and groups demanding change (collectively, the ‘environmental movement’)(4) had gained notable influence and attention, both publicly and politically (Wilson 1998). While broad changes to forest management policy were always sought by the environmental movement, the primary tool used to “save our forests” during this period was to fight to have designated areas taken off the chopping block by having them assigned to protected status. Several notable successes resulted from these efforts, namely the declaration of the highly contested lower Carmanah Valley as a provincial park in 1990, followed by the addition of the upper Carmanah and Walbran Valleys to complete the 16,540-hectare Carmanah Walbran Provincial Park in 1995.

For many, the forestry conflict in British Columbia is probably best known for events occurring around Clayoquot Sound, western Vancouver Island, in the summer of 1993—inarguably the apex of the cycle of protest (Robinson et al. 2007). Prompted by plans to harvest timber from scenic and pristine locations throughout the sound, a mass of protestors formed—roughly 12,000 over the summer (Robinson and Tindall 2008)—intent on peacefully blockading logging access to the area. The result was a summer-long standoff where hundreds of protestors camped out in a local clear cut—dubbed the Clayoquot Peace Camp (McLaren 1994)—with many awakening before sunrise each morning to physically lay themselves across Kennedy Bridge, both symbolically and effectively impeding industry access to the local forestlands. As the size of the protest grew, local, national, and international news outlets soon swarmed this quiet and remote area propelling it into the worldwide spotlight. In the end, after a summer of conflict, over 800 protesters were arrested (MacIsaac and Champagne 1994) in what became known as

---

4 Note that a wide variety of different groups were interested in forestry issues during this time. Wilson (1998) suggests four main categories: (1) fish and wildlife clubs, (2) naturalist clubs, (3) recreational clubs, and (4) environmental advocacy groups. This dissertation, however, focuses exclusively on the last of these, as these are essentially the only groups that were interested almost exclusively in prompting political change—one of the basic tenets of many definitions of a social movement (see Diani 1992; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Melucci 1989; Tilly 1978)—and were not primarily activity-based clubs, as the former three represent. These formal groups interested in promoting change have also been referred to elsewhere as the “Wilderness Preservation Movement” (Tindall 1994, 2002), and could be thought of as “Wilderness Preservation Movement Organizations,” though for stylistic reasons are referred to throughout this dissertation as “environmental groups,” or “the environmental movement.”
the single largest act of civil disobedience in Canadian history (also see Berman et al. 1994; Breen-Needham et al. 1994; Magnussen and Shaw 2002).

Widespread global media coverage of events surrounding Clayoquot Sound and the resulting critical view taken by many of British Columbia's forestry management practices helped to bring about significant change. By the later 1990s, the cycle of protest had ebbed and things had calmed down in the province as both the government and forest industry increasingly found themselves offering concessions to the movement. Representatives of the movement gained increased access to the decision-making process, often invited to sit down at the table to work with government and industry to define management plans. New regulations were drafted and forest management practices were adopted aimed at taking into account ecosystem health under the umbrella of 'sustainable forestry' (Shaw 2003). Nevertheless, the movement still exists today with a smaller contingent of dedicated activists continuing to fight to preserve British Columbia's forests.

1.3 Literature Review

1.3.1 The Evolution of Social Movement Theory: Collective Psychology to Resource Mobilization

In early social movement research—some call it the collective psychology phase—attention was primarily focused on protests, and collective actions were often seen as the reactive, emotionally driven actions of mass crowds (LeBon 2002; Smelser 1962). The basic premise was that some social and political institutions were unable to adapt effectively to overly rapid social change. This inability to incorporate new ideals, values, needs, and/or desires resulted in tension, and in many cases turmoil, as similarly aggrieved individuals amassed into groups as a means of voicing their concerns and demanding transformations (Turner and Killian 1972). Under this view, collective actions were seen as crisis behaviours, impediments to the efficient operation of the social sphere.

The socially volatile and contentious 1960s and 1970s—especially in the United States with the largely proactive and organized efforts to contest the unpopular war in Southeast Asia, the numerous orderly and mostly peaceful activities surrounding the fight for African-American civil rights, and the growing force behind women's rights—prompted many researchers to reconsider social movements. Instead of seeing groups of disassociated, anomic, unorganized, and reactive individuals amassing into mobs due to a breakdown in civil society, many came to view movements, instead, as a sign of a healthy social sphere. Under this new, 'resource
mobilization perspective (McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977; Oberschall 1973; also see Jenkins 1983), groups of similarly aggrieved individuals were largely seen as rational, proactive, and calculating, able to strategically and resourcefully organize to challenge unfavourable aspects of the status quo—often within the constraints of the existing political and social systems.5

Under the auspices of the resource mobilization perspective, several questions have emerged, dominating the literature. For example, why do certain people join social movements, but not others? What characterizes those who mobilize from those who do not? What motivates individuals to mobilize? Once someone does mobilize, why do certain actors participate in greater rates of activism than others? Supporters of the resource mobilization perspective answered questions such as these in terms of calculating and strategic conceptions of individual actions and social movement processes.

After a while, however, a growing contingent of researchers began to voice concerns, arguing that under resource mobilization’s often overly-rationalized, self-interested view, concepts fundamental to the study of social movements, such as emotion, feeling, culture, meaning, and identity, effectively disappeared from the equation (Swidler 1986; also see Johnson and Klandermans 1995). Many pondered complex questions such as: If the resource mobilization perspective is right and we are all rational and calculating actors, how is it that institutions such as social movements even arise? Why do some people sacrifice often scarce resources, such as time, money, or in some cases even personal safety and freedom, when they could free-ride on other people’s efforts? Clearly, while some people may actually determine their actions and behaviours based on overt cost-benefit analyses, always maximizing their own best interests, it is more likely that important and powerful social forces also play a part, which at times allow us to make personal sacrifices for the sake of the greater social good. Because of the resource mobilization perspective’s inability to adequately account for processes such as these, attempts were made to bring social and social psychological concepts back into the mix, the most notable

5 A somewhat parallel view arose in the 1970s that also saw social movements as collectivities of rational actors. However, this ‘political process’ perspective (McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001; Meyer 2004; Meyer and Minkoff 2004; Piven and Cloward 1977; Tarrow 1989; Tilly 1978; also see della Porta 1995; Kitschelt 1986; Kriesi et al. 1995) focused more on the complex and dynamic role between social movements and institutional political actors, placing attention on examining how political opportunities and constraints affect movement actions, and vice versa. An evolutionary derivation of this view became today’s ‘contentious politics’ perspective (McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996; McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001), which has drawn attention away from attempting to locate large, systemic structures relating to social movements, and instead reallocates focus on defining and explaining the causal mechanisms and processes that are at work in the broader, more inclusive class of socially contentious issues. While these two areas have created a wealth of knowledge and surely add to our understanding of social movement processes, attention on the political landscape is outside of the scope of this dissertation. They are just mentioned here for the sake of completeness.
effort being the introduction of collective action framing (Benford 1993; Gamson 1992; Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford 1988). Collective action frames, or culturally adapted and strategically formulated interpretations of events and situations, draw people into a social movement fostering a sense of collective identity. In this way, framing theory began to fill the gap between more rationalist views and reality.

Overall, the main objective of this dissertation is to examine different facets of the British Columbia environmental movement of the 1990s through the overarching lens of these existing theories. Embedded within this theoretical framework presented above are several more refined themes considered in each of the manuscripts included in this dissertation. We now turn to a brief introduction to these themes, followed by a discussion of the specific research objectives.\(^6\)

1.3.2 Sociodemographic and Value-Based Correlates of Social Movement Participation

In particular relation to environmental social movements, a significant amount of work, initially separate from social movement-specific research, evolved in the field of environmental sociology. The earliest stages of this research were often relatively simplistic, aimed at determining the so-called “social bases of environmental concern” (Jones and Dunlap 1992; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980). Here, certain sociodemographic characteristics were typically assessed (e.g., age, gender, employment, education, urban versus rural residence), and were often found to be associated with a pro-environmental orientation (for noteworthy examples see Arcury and Christianson 1993; Berenguer, Corraliza, and Martin 2005; Blake, Guppy, and Urmetzer 1996; Inglehart 1977, 1990; Jones and Dunlap 1992; Steger and Witt 1989; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980; Vaske et al. 2001; Zelezny, Chua, and Aldrich 2000).\(^7\) This collection of literature is largely responsible for providing us with the ideal-typical environmentalist as being a relatively young, well educated, urban, female.

Others, however, quickly came to criticize the theoretical simplicity of these earliest efforts. Critical of their overall inability to accurately predict environmentalism across varying specific circumstances, some researchers in this new vein rightly argued for the incorporation of

\(^6\) Note that a more extensive treatment of these literatures is included in each of the relevant chapters.

\(^7\) Note that, overall, there is actually a great degree of variability in the significance of individual predictors. For example, while many researchers have found gender to be significantly associated with a pro-environmental orientation (typically women are more environmentally oriented) (Blake, Guppy and Urmetzer 1996; Steger and Witt 1989; Zelezny, Chua, and Aldrich 2000), others have contradicted this claim (for example, see Tindall, Davies, and Mauboules 2003). A more in-depth discussion of the social bases of environmental concern is included in Chapter 2.
more social psychological considerations (e.g., ideologies, attitudes, values) (for noteworthy examples see Axlerod and Lehman 1993; Cotgrove and Duff 1980, 1981; Inglehart 1977, 1990; Mertig and Dunlap 2001; Stern 2000; Stern and Dietz 1994; Stern, Dietz, and Guagnano 1995; Stern, Dietz, and Kalof 1993; Stern et al. 1999). This set of literature added to the common ideal type by suggesting that the young, well-educated, urban female also tended to support a liberal political ideology, and held biocentric and postmaterialist values.

Within this contingent of researchers exploring the different sociodemographic and social psychological correlates of environmentalism was a group who recognized the significance of these efforts in potentially predicting not only just a pro-environmental orientation, but also actual participation in formal environmental movement organizations (see Stern et al. 1999). Oddly, however, despite the rich insight available from this environmental sociology and social psychology work, except for the work of Stern and his colleagues, little crossover exists with the social movement-specific literature.

Under the tenets of the resource mobilization perspective, social movement-specific research has generally centered on determining what factors affect one’s decision to join and participate in a movement (Diani 1995; Fernandez and McAdam 1988; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; McAdam 1986, 1989; McAdam and Paulsen 1993). Sociodemographic measures are also sometimes considered in the context of ‘biographical availability’ (McAdam 1989; Tindall 2002), or the opportunities and constraints presented by certain life cycle characteristics such as age, employment status, and number of children. The contribution of certain values and attitudes as they might relate to social movement participation are rarely considered outside of discourse and framing analyses (however, for an exception, see Diani 1995). Largely, proponents of the resource mobilization perspective have focused on social structural factors, and of these, the one that has inarguably received the greatest amount of attention in the literature is the effects of social networks.

### 1.3.3 Social Networks and Social Movement Participation

A great number of researchers have implicated social networks as the single most significant predictor affecting one’s decision to join a movement, as well as later rates of activist participation (Fernandez and McAdam 1988; Klandermans 1984; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; McAdam 1986, 1989; McAdam and Paulsen 1993). Sociodemographic measures are also sometimes considered in the context of ‘biographical availability’ (McAdam 1989; Tindall 2002), or the opportunities and constraints presented by certain life cycle characteristics such as age, employment status, and number of children. The contribution of certain values and attitudes as they might relate to social movement participation are rarely considered outside of discourse and framing analyses (however, for an exception, see Diani 1995). Largely, proponents of the resource mobilization perspective have focused on social structural factors, and of these, the one that has inarguably received the greatest amount of attention in the literature is the effects of social networks.

---

8 Note that literature on other more specific fields such as environmental risk has also greatly supplemented the work on environmental values. For some noteworthy examples, see Barke, Jenkins-Smith, and Slovic 1997; Finucane et al. 2000; Flynn, Slovic, and Mertz 1994; Slovic et al. 1995, 1997; Wagner et al. 1998.
1987; Marwell and Oliver 1993; Marwell, Oliver, and Prahl 1988; McAdam 1986; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Oberschall 1973; Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson 1980; Tindall 2002, 2004).

In one of the most commonly cited and well-accepted papers in the field, Bert Klandermans and Dirk Oegema (1987) distinguished between four necessary “steps toward participation.” These included: (1) being part of the mobilization potential, or the group of individuals who have values and attitudes compatible with the basic precepts of the movement including its grievances, goals, and objectives; (2) being a target of mobilization attempts, or the efforts of existing activists to contact prospective members with attempts at recruitment; (3) becoming motivated to participate, and; (4) overcoming barriers to participation, including personal reasons such as work or family obligations. This work is foundational to much of the subsequent research in the field.

The underlying premise here is quite simple: Having social ties to others already active in the movement increases the likelihood of mobilization. In conjunction with the rational, cost-benefit-oriented considerations of the resource mobilization perspective, these ties were seen to not only foster initial invitations to join, but they also reduce the uncertainties associated with movement mobilization and participation (McAdam and Paulsen 1993).

However, this perspective, while providing valuable insight into the dynamics of mobilization and participation for many, is not without problems. A critical point often overlooked is that ties are not the only path towards social movement mobilization. Even if we agree that some individuals are indeed drawn into a social movement by various social relations, in many cases we must also accede that there is a group of others who mobilize, not knowing anybody in the movement beforehand (Diani 2003; Tindall 2007). For example, Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson (1980) found that only about 4 percent of members in the Hare Krishna movement joined because of existing social ties; Luker (1984) showed that only about 20 percent of California anti-abortion activists mobilized due to social relationships to existing members; Andrews and Biggs (2006) found little support for the general claim that social networks affected participation in 1960s Civil Rights movement sit-ins in the United States. Interestingly, however, in this latter case, Andrews and Biggs found that media was the crucial element: “Protesters recalled first learning about sit-ins in other cities from newspaper, radio, or television” (ibid: 753). In effect, it was exposure to different media carrying and disseminating certain salient messages (or collective action frames) that motivated many of these sit-in participants to
mobilize. Thus, a more complete understanding of social movements warrants the exploration of factors such as collective action framing and media-movement interactions.

1.3.4 Collective Action Framing

In this complex age of modernity, we cope with a never-ending barrage of information. Daily, we face constant exposure to a wide range of information such as informal and formal interpersonal communications, mass media, and commercial and non-commercial (i.e., interest group) advertising and promotions. To fight cognitive overload a means of classifying clusters of ideas is needed. In the social sciences, the notion of framing (originally, see Goffman 1974) evolved to capture this idea of cognitive classification and categorization. Frames effectively sort the vast amount of information and events in our daily world into condensed, filtered, and simplified sets of ideas and concepts.

Specific to social movements, collective action frames are intentionally and strategically formulated interpretive packages used to condense and summarize the facts of the world in a way that eases uptake and understanding of collective issues (Benford 1993; Gamson 1992; Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford 1988). As Benford and Snow (2000: 614) state: “Collective action frames are action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organization.” They are strategically used both by social movements and by their challengers to garner support for their respective cause and to attract and mobilize potential constituents (e.g., “Help save the ancient forests!””, “Preserve the forests for future generations!” “Save trees to save jobs!” , “Kill a tree save a logger!”) (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Scheufele 1999; Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford 1988). Notably, however, they are simultaneously used by media to simplify presentation of complicated issues in the course of reporting the news (Anderson 1997; Gamson et al. 1992; Ryan 1991; Scheufele 1999; Tuchman 1978).

In efforts to strategically frame an issue, movement actors aim to align their frames with the values and attitudes of their potential recruits in the hopes that they can convince their audience that they are part of something much bigger. Such frame alignment is considered the primary antecedent of actual mobilization into a social movement (Snow et al. 1986; also see Klandermans and Oegema 1987). It is important to note, however, that framing is not a one-way street. Instead, it is an interactive and iterative process where multiple parties continuously battle over meaning construction. Benford and Snow (2000:613, citing Hall 1982) state that
movements “are deeply embroiled along with media, local governments, and the state, in what has been referred to as ‘the politics of signification’.”

Usually, media act as an intermediary in the information dissemination process in the sense that social movement messages (or collective action frames), are typically filtered through them. Social movements generally do not have direct ties to the public and decision makers, thus they need media to disseminate their message.

1.3.5 Social Movements and the Media

Snow and Benford (1988) argue that the central problems for all social movements are to simultaneously attract the support of the general public, mobilize adherents, and demobilize challengers (also see Gamson and Modigliani 1989). The most common means of accomplishing these tasks is through dynamic interaction with news media (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Oliver and Meyer 2003; Ryan 1991). There are reasons why working through media is not only a good plan for movements, but strategically, a necessary one as well.

In the broadest of terms, Cohn, Barkan, and Halteman (2003:312) contend that “social movements are unlikely to succeed if their members do not actively present the movements’ aims to the wider public and exert pressure on politically, economically, and culturally powerful institutions.” The news media facilitate this process by influencing the civic and political spheres by affecting interest in, opinions of, and maybe most importantly, exposure to, various contentious issues. More specific to environmental issues, Hutchins and Lester (2006:434) state “the avenue through which the majority of the public becomes aware of impending environmental threats.” In a related manner, Cracknell (1993:7) proclaims that a “cumulative build-up of media coverage on a set of related social problems can act both to stimulate and to reflect shifts in public opinion,” but also, “by alerting governmental institutions to public interest in environmental issues the mass media undoubtedly helps to push environmental concerns up the political agenda” (ibid.:9).

Within the array of literature on the social movement-media interaction, an array of factors are hypothesized to affect the way in which media covers social movements and their related issues. These can essentially be described as socioeconomic and operational.

From the socioeconomic side, the basic argument is that since the vast majority of media organizations are really media businesses, concepts such as profit maximization and market

---

9 It is also important to note that in addition to media interactions there are other avenues through which social movements can accomplish these tasks as well, such as direct mail, face-to-face appeals, and interorganizational requests for cooperation.
domination govern how the media covers the news (as well as what is covered) (see Croteau and Hoynes 2003; Ericson 1991; Gitlin 1980). Whether it is a matter of subservience to advertisers who provide the bulk of a news business’ revenues (Croteau and Hoynes 2003), or a question of overlapping ideologies and values between news editors and the dominant corporate interests in society (Gitlin 1980), the premise is that biased news coverage likely exists. On the one hand, with the former, news is predicted to include dramatic, sensationalized coverage of issues since this is what attracts readers, and thus, maximizes sales and market share; on the other hand, with the latter, social movement issues will be kept out of the news if they threaten hegemonic norms of the dominant corporate class. Some more extreme depictions of this interchange suggest that both of these processes are working simultaneously, leaving social movements at a great disadvantage.

While in some ways these socioeconomic issues indeed affect certain coverage, it is hard to find widespread evidence of such an extreme view in most democratic systems. The fact is that many social movement issues have indeed been catapulted into the public discourse through the media (Carroll and Hackett 2006; Rootes 2004). A more realistic portrayal of the relationship between social movements and media suggests an asymmetric dependency (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; also see Carroll and Hackett 2006). On the one hand, social movements rely on media to attract support and mobilize adherents by disseminating their message; on the other hand, media relies on movements to provide reportable subject matter that attracts an audience, thus affecting profits and market share. This relationship is asymmetric in the sense that the movements are generally more dependent on media than vice versa (Gamson and Modigliani 1989).

From the operational perspective, an array of other circumstances can also affect the way in which social movement issues are covered by media. Some argue that journalism is a profession where tensions exist between the theoretical ideal of objective coverage and more ‘managed’ approaches of the real world (Anderson 1997; Croteau and Hoynes 2003). The basic argument is that media depend for their legitimacy and commercial viability on presenting a wider variety of alternative positions to attract the maximum number of readers (Anderson 1997; Croteau and Hoynes 2003; Ericson 1991). Some also point to other factors affecting coverage such as journalistic routines, ideological or value-related orientations of news-workers (see Anderson 1997; Scheufele 1999; Tuchman 1978; Ryan 1981; Shoemaker and Reese 1996).
In sum, however, regardless of the specific processes at work, the role that the media plays in disseminating social movement-related issues and information is paramount. Without the mass media, movements would be at a tremendous disadvantage as compared to their entrenched representatives of the existing status quo.

1.4 Dissertation Objectives

In the most general of terms, the main aim of this dissertation is to explore the nature of ‘mobilization’ and ‘participation’ in the British Columbia environmental movement to protect the old growth forests of Vancouver Island in the 1990s. That said, each of the individual manuscripts presented here examines different facets of participation and also considers other, related issues. The following provides a brief overview of each chapter, highlighting the main objectives.

1.4.1 Chapter 2: The War in the Woods: Comparing and Contrasting the British Columbia Environmental Movement and Its Countermovement

It is useful to view social movements and their respective countermovements as two sides of the same coin. However, from the literature, two subtly different alternative perspectives arise. One perspective sees movements and countermovements as forces opposing and supporting, respectively, the existing social order. If we accept social movements to be one of society’s primary means of challenging some disagreeable aspect of the political or social order (Diani 1992; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Melucci 1989; Tilly 1978), countermovements can be viewed as groups of actors aimed at preserving the status quo (Gale 1986; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Mottl 1980; Zald and Useem 1987). In this way, Mottl (1980:620) claims that countermovements are “a conscious, collective, organized attempt to resist or reverse social change.”

The other perspective sees movements and countermovements as dynamic entities opposing each other. In this way, Gale (1986:205) states that a countermovement is “a complex, or formal, organization seeking to oppose movement objectives,” and similarly, Zald and Useem (1987:249) see it as “the mobilization of sentiments initiated to some degree in opposition to a movement.” Though this difference may seem trivial, it is important to highlight the latter perspective as it better underscores the rather interdependent nature of the two.

Since the objectives, strategies, and actions of a movement are significantly affected by the opposing actions of a countermovement (Meyer and Staggenborg 1996; Zald and Useem 1987), studying the two independently offers only a partial understanding of either. Interestingly, however, sparse theoretical attention has been given to movement-countermovement interactions
(for some of these exceptions, see Gale 1986; Meyer and Staggenborg 1996; Motl 1980; Zald and Useem 1987), and even more rarely are the two compared empirically.

If we consider the interdependent nature of social movements and their respective countermovements, many questions arise. What characterizes people who join or participate in a specific movement in contrast to its countermovement? What differentiates participants in the opposing groups? Are the factors affecting participation in a movement the same factors that motivate participation in a countermovement? Do these factors function similarly in both contexts?

The objective of this first manuscript is to examine the relationship between the environmental movement of British Columbia and its related countermovement. More specifically, using data from two different communities—relatively urban, pro-environmental Victoria, and rural, relatively pro-forestry Port Alberni—the environmental movement is compared and contrasted with its countermovement in terms of how a familiar set of sociodemographics (age, gender, education, and resource-based employment) and values (postmaterialism, materialism, and opposition to economic exploitation of the environment) relate to ‘participation’.

1.4.2 Chapter 3: Alternative Pathways to Social Movement Mobilization: Moving Beyond Social Networks

Social movement researchers have long-touted the significance of social network ties in facilitating the mobilization process. The general consensus is that embeddedness in certain networks of social ties facilitates initial recruitment and fosters greater levels of activist participation. In this way, social networks have been depicted as ubiquitous, the panacea of mobilization. However, is this necessarily the case, or are other pathways to social movement mobilization possible? If so, what other factors can be implicated? In addition, if other motivations do indeed exist, how do those motivated to join for different reasons compare and contrast?

In this manuscript, a well-accepted and popular theoretical model of social movement mobilization (Klandermans and Oegema 1987) is evaluated and adapted in a way that emphasizes multiple possible pathways to mobilization. Overall, the objective is to explain the role that various mass media can play in affecting the ‘frame alignment’ process—a step to participation that is emphasized in the adapted model—in a way that adds a degree of agency that was notably lacking in the original model.
To place this discussion in context, the model is applied to the specific case of mobilization into the environmental movement of British Columbia in the highly contentious 1990s. Data collected in 1992 from a sample of 381 environmental movement activists is used to explore how those who were motivated by social networks compare and contrast with a group motivated by media, across a set of demographic measures (age, gender, educational attainment), social network characteristics, level of identification with the movement, and level of activism.

1.4.3 Chapter 4: Framing the Wilderness: Activist Level Characteristics Affecting Rates of Citation in Print-News Media

A complicated and dynamic relationship exists between social movements and news media. Social movements and social movement organizations rely on news coverage to draw critically needed attention to their cause; the news industry values the attention that vociferous and contentious movement activities and events can attract.

The movement-media interaction is a complex process and an array of different factors can affect what movement messages—or collective action frames—actually make it into the news. Extensive research has theorized how certain social, political, and economic constraints affect movement access to media, and some broad generalizations have been posited. Unfortunately, there is still wide disagreement among these propositions.

For example, some claim that economic, market-oriented criteria determine what makes it into the news (Ericson 1991; Gitlin 1980). Under this view, the belief is that sensationalized and dramatic depictions should dominate because they generally attract the greatest amount of attention and readership (Carroll and Hackett 2006; Gitlin 1980). This interpretation is probably best symbolized by the familiar proclamation ‘what bleeds leads’. Proponents of another view, however, argue that the ideals of objectivity and balance govern news coverage. Here, the belief is that coverage is generally equitable among the various interests in a contentious battle, such as the forestry conflict, because news organizations rely quite heavily on legitimacy to attract readership (Anderson 1997; Croteau and Hoynes 2003; Ericson 1991).

Another widespread claim is that social movement leaders have the primary responsibility of communicating with media (Benford and Snow 2000; Morris and Staggenborg 2004; Snow and Benford 1988). However, others suggest that leadership in social movements does not necessarily adhere to a formal structure, as many movements inherently challenge bureaucracy and formal leadership roles (see McCarthy and Zald 1977; Tilly 1978; Touraine 1981; Turner and Killian 1987). In response to this, some argue that issues like social network
centrality come into play when determining which movement representatives interact with the media. The basic claim is that certain individuals more central to certain social networks, such as communication networks within a movement, have control over the flow information, and these people are the ones who interact with the media (for example Diani 1995, 2003).

The objectives of this third manuscript are to explore issues such as these. More specifically, using both quantitative and qualitative data related to the conflict over preserving the old growth forests of coastal British Columbia in the highly contentious 1990s, the objective of this manuscript is to evaluate how a certain set of individual-level, personal, activist characteristics (degree of centrality in the movements' communication network, formal leadership role, radicalism, and gender) relate to the frequency with which activists are cited in print-news media. However, to further add depth and insight to the discussion, and since the content of media coverage of social movement issues is usually a matter of saliently framing the issues, the analyses are based on the frequency with which individuals are cited in the print-news media using various types of collective action frames.

We now turn to the individual manuscripts followed by a more detailed synthesis discussion in the concluding chapter.
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2 THE WAR IN THE WOODS: COMPARING AND CONTRASTING THE BRITISH COLUMBIA ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT AND ITS COUNTERMOVEMENT

2.1 Introduction

Social movements are comprised of diverse sets of people with varying rationales and motivations for participating in acts of activism, and significant efforts have gone into determining some of the specific personal characteristics that differentiate those who participate from those who do not (see Diani 1995; Fernandez and McAdam 1988; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; McAdam 1986, 1989; McAdam and Paulsen 1993). At the same time, there has also been an expansive, complementary array of research in the fields of environmental psychology and environmental sociology looking specifically at the attitudes and values related to environmentalism (see Dietz, Fitzgerald, and Shwom 2005; Dietz, Stern, and Guagnano 1998; Dunlap et al. 2000; Fransson and Gärling 1999; Kalof and Satterfield 2005; Satterfield 2001; Stern, Dietz, and Guagnano 1995; Stern, Dietz, and Kalof 1993; Stern et al. 1999; Stern 2000), and the so-called “social bases of environmental concern” (Jones, Fly, and Cordell 1999; Jones and Dunlap 1992; Tranter 1996; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980; Vaske et al. 2001). From the latter set of literature arises a commonly-held (but sometimes-contentious) ideal-type of an environmentalist activist—a relatively young, well educated, female, from an urban area, who espouses certain values, such as opposition to exploitation of the environment for economic gain and a postmaterialist orientation.

A growing collection of literature by other researchers has also been aimed at trying to gain a more holistic understanding of social movement dynamics by considering the opposing role and influence of groups organized to directly challenge the efforts of some social movements (Gale 1986; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Meyer and Staggenborg 1996; Mottl 1980; Satterfield 2002; Zald and Useem 1987). In general, these countermovements have been described as contradictory forces aimed at diminishing the effects of social movements, thus perpetuating the status quo (Gale 1986; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Mottl 1980; Zald and Useem 1987). Most of this latter work has been rather theoretical, focusing on the broader-scale nature of social movement-countermovement dynamics and interactions; empirical research into the

1 A version of this chapter has been submitted for publication. Malinick, Todd E. 200X. “The War in the Woods: Comparing and Contrasting the British Columbia Environmental Movement and Its Countermovement.”
characteristics of countermovement participants—similar to what has been done for movements—however, is notably sparse. Even sparser is empirical literature comparing a social movement specifically to its related countermovement. Nevertheless, movement-countermovement comparisons such as these are potentially quite valuable for multiple reasons.

First, from a practical standpoint, if movements and countermovements truly are opposing forces, how can we ever claim to really understand one without simultaneously considering the other? While initially a social movement typically organizes independent of a countermovement—after all, you can’t have a countermovement before a movement—once the latter takes hold, a back-and-forth, inter-dependent discourse entails with each front continually responding and adapting to the other. Thus, studying only a particular social movement without considering its related countermovement only gives us half of the story regarding certain contentious issues that shape society.

Second, from a more conceptual perspective, evaluating a social movement independent of its countermovement can lead to misleading or even false conclusions about the factors affecting participation. While we might claim to implicate a certain characteristic or factor in affecting social movement participation, can we really be so certain of its driving force until we also know more about how this particular characteristic also relates to countermovement participation? For example, consider the ideal-typical environmental activist already mentioned. If we conclude that certain characteristics such as being a relatively younger, more educated, female, espousing certain values, explains environmental movement participation, can these same measures be useful in explaining countermovement participation? Or, will a countermovement participant be a relatively older, less educated, male, who supports the use of the environment for economic purposes and holds relatively materialist values? If, as many proclaim, these characteristics truly are powerful predictors of environmental movement participation, then simple logic says their converse should define a countermovement activist.

Consider another example (and one that we will examine in more detail in this paper). Some researchers argue that support for postmaterialist values is a significant predictor of a pro-environmental orientation (Inglehart 1990, 1995, 1997; Gilham 2008; Göksen et al. 2002; Lowe and Rüdig 1986), presumably translating into a positive relationship with environmental movement participation. Logically, however, if postmaterialism is indeed a significant nexus of environmental movement participation (i.e., those revealing higher levels of support for postmaterialist values are also more likely to participate in an environmental movement), should
we then infer that someone who participates in an environmental *counter*movement group will be relatively *less* supportive of postmaterialist ideals? If they are not, and postmaterialism truly *is* a useful predictor of environmental movement participation, then this person never should have participated in the countermovement—they should have been an environmentalist! In this way, in a general sense, this paper shows that considering a social movement in conjunction with its countermovement allows us to draw out and capitalize on information that would otherwise be masked by more singularly-focused analyses. More specifically, a significant contribution of this paper is that it provides a new and insightful interpretation of the postmaterialist construct as it relates to social movement-countermovement participation.

In this paper we compare and contrast participation in the environmental movement (EM) to protect old growth forests of Vancouver Island, British Columbia in the 1990s to its related countermovement (ECM). The analyses compare a set of common sociodemographics (gender, age, level of educational attainment, and resource-based employment) and value orientations (postmaterialism and support for economic use of the environment) to see if they are useful for differentiating participants in the EM from those in the ECM. In general, the findings suggest that the EM and ECM are not necessarily the converse of each other, but instead participation is more complex, each driven by different factors.

Another subsidiary, but still significant, contribution of this paper comes from the more sophisticated conceptualization of ‘participation’ than is usually considered in the social movement literature (see 2004; Klandermans 2004; Klandermans and Smith 2002). While most researchers have considered *either* level of activism (typically a scale measure) or membership in formal environmental groups (usually a dichotomous variable), both forms of participation are considered here to show that the sociodemographics and values relate differently to both of these. The implications for these results to future research are also discussed, but before moving on to a discussion of the relevant literature, a brief introduction to the British Columbia forestry conflict follows.

**2.2 British Columbia Forestry Conflict**

British Columbia, and especially Vancouver Island, is a vast region characterized by large-scale, intensively-managed, industrial forest lands. Resource extraction has been a vital part of this region’s history and forestry holds an especially longstanding and deeply rooted place in the provincial economy and society. This mostly rural region, however, also contains some of the last remaining old growth temperate rainforests in the world—considered a valuable
commercial resource by timber companies and many area residents; considered priceless by others for its natural beauty and ecology.

In more recent years, significant changes have occurred not only to British Columbia’s natural environment, but also to the economic and social landscape. Typically, the burden of these transformations has fallen disproportionately on the residents of rural communities (Hayter 2000; Hayter and Barnes 1997; Marchak 1983; Marchak, Aycock, and Herbert 1999), where in some areas resource dependence is not only common, but the norm. Rural residents have increasingly found themselves squeezed between the weights of two behemoths: the forest industry and the EM.

From the one side, a combination of increasing resource scarcity, competition and related market demand, international agreements, and globalization have forced the industry to become more efficient, embracing a “flexible specialization” production regime (Hayter 2000; Hayter and Barnes 1997). Efficiency gains resulting from specialization, the mechanization of production processes, and continual rationalization of the labour force resulted in dramatic fluctuations in rural employment, though the overall trend has been notably downward. For example, in the face of global market pressures, the large forestry corporations have invested substantially in timber mill upgrades that while notably increasing efficiency and lowering operating costs, at the same time, have had significant detrimental impacts on rural employment levels.

From the other side public dissatisfaction with the management of the provincial forests has increased and consequently numerous grassroots environmental social movement organizations have arisen with the goal of changing the way forestry is conducted in the province (Tindall and Begoray 1993). These organized, concerned citizens began to voice their dissatisfaction in the 1960s, and through their continued efforts by the 1990s the EM had gained significant influence and attention—both publicly and politically. While broad changes to forest management policy and practices were continually being sought by the EM, the primary tool used to “save our forests” during the 1980s and 1990s was to obtain protected status for designated areas. Several notable successes resulted from these efforts, namely the designation of the lower Carmanah Valley as a provincial park in 1990, followed in 1995 by the addition of the upper Carmanah and Walbran Valleys, to complete what is today the 16,540-hectare Carmanah Walbran Provincial Park.
As the different movements collided residents of rural communities whom relied on the supply of timber for their livelihoods found themselves ‘stuck in the middle’. Crucially, however, many forestry workers and their supporters were not just passive observers – as economic and social conditions worsened in their communities many organized and mobilized.

A great number were already members of the local forest workers union, the Industrial Wood and Allied Workers of Canada (IWA). Though the IWA historically focused on employee-employer-based issues, the escalating threats to their careers and livelihoods resulted in a growing angst and an action-oriented realignment. Instead of focusing on wage- and seniority-related issues, during the highly contentious 1990s, a major goal of the union (and ECM) became efforts to directly oppose the EM (Wilson 1998).

A more direct challenge to the EM also arose from some rural communities where the industry promoted the development of a series of worker-led support groups (Wilson 1998:37). These ‘Share’ groups (‘Share the Clayoquot’, ‘Share our Resources’, and others) directly opposed any setting aside of forestlands for park or protected status, and were formed to promote more multiple use-oriented and participative land management. In addition, in 1991, 13 forest companies joined forces to create and fully fund the BC Forest Alliance, tasked with battling the increasing influence of the EM. By 1994, the Forest Alliance was spending upwards of $2.7 million a year on various media efforts to neutralize the environmentalists (Doyle, Elliott, and Tindall 1997; Wilson 1998). Together, the IWA, the Forest Alliance, and Share represent the dominant players in the ECM.

2.3 Literature

2.3.1 Social Movements and Their Countermovements

Gale (1986:205) states that a countermovement is “a complex, or formal, organization seeking to oppose movement objectives.” Similarly, Zald and Useem (1987:249) see it as “the mobilization of sentiments initiated to some degree in opposition to a movement.” In a related manner, Mottl (1980:620) claims that it is “a conscious, collective, organized attempt to resist or reverse social change.” Accordingly, if we accept social movements to be one of society’s primary means of challenging some aspect of the political or social order (Diani 1992; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Melucci 1989; Tilly 1978), we must also see countermovements as organizations aimed at preserving the status quo (Gale 1986; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Mottl 1980; Zald and Useem 1987).
In British Columbia, the relevant status quo was incontestably a pro-forestry orientation held not only by the industry, but also by the provincial government. The relationship between the forestry corporations and the provincial government had historically been rather symbiotic. The corporations provided substantial provincial employment and a significant proportion of provincial government revenues; in turn, though often implicitly, the government tended to draft and enact policies and practices that benefited the industry by granting continued, inexpensive access to timber. The first significant challenge to this status quo arrangement came from the EM, which sought to integrate non-economic concerns into provincial forest management plans. Correspondingly, the ECM fought to continue the existing arrangement and was thus a proponent of the status quo.

Researchers argue that the likelihood of countermovement emergence increases with the successes of the movement (Meyer and Staggenborg 1996, Zald and Useem 1987). Not only did the actions of the EM directly motivate mobilization because of its obvious threat to the countermovement constituency’s lifestyle and economic livelihood, but the EM’s success also likely signalled to the ECM constituents that collective action could be an effective way to organize against the growing threat (Zald and Useem 1987). In this way, Meyer and Staggenborg (1996:1638) argue that, “when movements effectively create or exploit events, they are likely to encourage countermovement mobilization at the same time they advance their own causes.” In British Columbia, the ECM was nonexistent prior to successes of the EM. In fact, the Forest Alliance was created for the primary purpose of countering claims by the EM, which had proven detrimental to the forest industry’s interests (Doyle, Elliott, and Tindall 1997; Wilson 1998). Similar circumstances were the motivation for the industry’s promotion of the countermovement Share groups (Wilson 1998).

The mobilization of a countermovement is dependent upon its ability to define appropriate values, typically directly conflicting with and/or challenging the original movements’ goals (Lounsbury, Ventresca, and Hirsch 2003; Zald and Useem 1987). It is such values (as well as attitudes and broader ideologies) that provide the basis for the collective identity that defines group boundaries (Satterfield 2002). The EM, being the first to arise, had the opportunity to essentially define the initial framing of the forestry conflict. Some of the most commonly cited collective action frames appearing in the media included “ancient forests/old growth,” “giant spruce trees,” “preservation,” “wilderness, and “sustainability” (Cormier and Tindall 2005). Once the ECM appeared on the scene, they had the two-fold task of formulating
frames emphasizing the collective economic threat they faced from increasing forest regulations, which served to attract relevant constituents, but in accordance with Zald and Useem’s proposition, the ECM needed to do so in a way that contrasted it with the EM. These efforts can be seen in the most common ECM frames appearing in the media, which included notions such as “save current jobs to save communities/way of life,” “cut trees to save jobs,” and “trees versus people.”

From all this it is apparent that the movement and countermovement represent two sides of the same coin. In some ways their interactions appear as a debate or game; in other ways it can be seen as a battle or war (della Porta and Diiani 1999; Zald and Useem 1987). Zald and Useem (1987:249) argue that the movement-countermovement interaction is an “inter-collectivity conflict.” However, from a practical standpoint, this also raises the important question: Can we define the boundaries of the different collectivities? While the preceding discussion outlines some of the functional processes that operate differentially—or more correctly, conversely—between a movement and its countermovement, are other more micro level factors also implicated? In response to these questions this study looks at how certain sociodemographic and value-based factors differentiate ‘participation’ in the EM and ECM, and results show that these basic measures are helpful in describing patterns of participation in both groups. However, before proceeding to a discussion of the specific sociodemographic and value measures analyzed in this study, the notion of social movement ‘participation’ warrants clarification.

2.3.2 Social Movement Participation

Researchers have allocated great effort to determining what factors are associated with ‘participation’ in a social movement organization (Diani 1995; Fernandez and McAdam 1988; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; McAdam 1986, 1989; McAdam and Paulsen 1993). However, while much of this research provides important insights, others rightly argue that much of it fails to capture the inherent complexity of ‘participation’ (see Barkan 2004; Klandermans 2004; Klandermans and Smith 2002). For example, while some people are ‘members’ of a movement simply because they pay annual dues to a formal movement organization, others are ‘members’ because they actively participate in numerous movement activities such as letter-writing campaigns and high-risk protest demonstrations.2

2 An important distinction needs to be highlighted. There is a conceptual difference between membership in a social movement organization, which can be determined simply via a response to a survey question such as “Are you a member of [particular social movement group]?” and membership, more broadly, in a social movement, which could be ascertained with a question such as “Do you consider yourself to be a member of the environmental movement?” In this study, the focus is on the former, and not the latter.
Some may hesitate to call these fee-paying-only individuals ‘members’ in the truest sense of the word—maybe because they are not the on-the-ground participants social movement scholars like to focus on—but the importance and influence of this group should not be overlooked. Some of the most influential social movement organizations gain their power and overall effectiveness from their sheer size (Brulle 2000; della Porta and Diani 1999; Oberschall 1973). Others point out that, in many ways, the efficacy of a social movement is a function of the resources available to dedicate to their cause, and financial support is often singularly critical for supporting and sustaining continued action (Brulle 2000; McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977). Often, an organization’s budget is a function of its size as many groups receive a substantial proportion of their funds from membership dues. Consider an example.

In their ongoing fight to protect the environment Greenpeace claims 2.9 million members (Greenpeace 2008). At the same time, about 75 percent ($15.2 million) of their $20.3 million total 2006 annual revenues came from “contributions and donations” (Greenpeace 2008) (their budget category representing membership dues). Undoubtedly, many of these members actively participate in overt acts of activism, but at the same time, it is surely reasonable to assume that an even greater number do not. Thus, while there is certainly overlap between those holding membership in a social movement and those that actively participate in forms of activism, there is also a discrete difference between the two groups—some members likely do not partake in acts of activism; some people partaking in numerous forms of activism likely are not members of formal movement groups.

There is also another, more methodological reason we might want to focus on members versus non-members. A very significant proportion of existing empirical social movement research suffers from what some have referred to as ‘sampling on the dependent variable’ (see McAdam and Paulsen 1993). What this means is that in their efforts to examine social movements, researchers often approach movement organizations and collect survey data from existing members. Conclusions are then drawn, most generally, about how social movement processes operate. The problem here is that we try to draw conclusions about movements non-comparatively. For example, there is a commonly held belief that social networks are a significant facilitator of social movement mobilization, but much of the research deriving this conclusion was done without simultaneously examining non-members. What if those who do not mobilize also have dense networks of social ties—many even to existing members of social
movements? Clearly this would lay into question the significance of social networks in facilitating the mobilization process.

In sum, I argue that the failure to adequately capture the complexity inherent in the notion of social movement ‘participation’ generally derives from the way in which the concept is typically operationalized and measured. Many researchers have represented participation as a single, dichotomous measure simply indicating whether or not someone joined a certain group or took part in a specific event (Fernandez and McAdam 1988; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; McAdam 1986); others have constructed a measure representing one’s level of participation in certain forms of activism (McAdam 1989; McFarlane and Boxall 2003; McFarlane and Hunt 2006; Séguin, Pelletier, and Hunsley 1998; Tindall 2002, 2004; Tindall, Davies, and Mauboules 2003). On their own, however, neither of these individual measures accurately portrays the complexity of participation.

Differentiating the two aspects of participation is important because it is likely that different processes affect the two—an insight that would be lost by focusing exclusively on one or the other. Klandermans (2004: 360) argues: “From a social-psychological viewpoint taxonomies of participation are relevant because one may expect different forms of participation to involve different motivational dynamics.” For example, constraints affecting membership in a movement or countermovement group may be less burdensome than those affecting activism. Simply paying monetary dues to an organization likely requires less sacrifice (e.g., time, effort, risk) than actively participating in, say, letter-writing campaigns and protest marches. Also, circumstances that motivate one to join a movement or countermovement group can differ from those motivating one to participate in various forms of activism. For example, on the one hand, membership in a group may be prompted or facilitated by existing membership in certain groups (e.g., the IWA)—a form of bloc recruitment (McCarthy and Zald 1977; Oberschall 1973)—or even social pressure and influence of peers. Variable rates of activism, on the other hand, may be affected more by one’s perceptions of how the forestry conflict directly threatens them personally as individuals.

Thus, while significant effort has been allocated to assessing the factors that relate to participation in social movements, and especially environmental social movements, the imprecise conceptualizations of the outcome measures have left the interpretation of the results

---

3 Note that the latter is more common in studies where the sampling frame consists of movement organization rolls, as all individuals studied are inherently members, and because of this, the best way to differentiate them becomes levels of activism.
open to debate. Hence, from the extent literature on social movement participation, an important theoretical question arises: Do the factors that have found to be related membership behave similarly in relation to activism? To address this issue, both membership and activism are examined in this paper—a new and novel approach in the literature—and important differences are revealed.

2.3.3 Postmaterialism

In the literature discussing environmental values and participation in environmental movements, one topic receiving substantial attention—including aggressive debate—is the postmaterialist values thesis as proposed by Ronald Inglehart (1971, 1977, 1990, 1997). Inglehart puts forward the contention that the younger, pre-World War II generations, because they have experienced less economic strife and higher levels of personal security than older generations, generally have more inclusive, participative, and outwardly-oriented values and worldviews. Hence, in the simpler terms, Inglehart argues that a postmaterialist value orientation is a product of one’s environment. Premised on Maslow’s (1943, 1954) ‘hierarchy of needs’, the basic idea is that not until certain more primitive, physiological needs are fulfilled (i.e., food, clothing, shelter, personal and economic security) will people strive for the attainment of other more psychological needs (i.e., love, belonging, esteem, and self-actualization).

The basis for Inglehart’s postmaterialist thesis is his belief that a broad-scale, age-related, value shift is taking place across the modernized, industrialized societies of the West (Inglehart 1971; Inglehart and Flanagan 1987). He claims this cohort-based shift is primarily detectable by a notable de-emphasis on ‘materialism’, or values oriented at material and security issues (both physical and economic), accompanied by a simultaneous surge in emphasis on ‘postmaterialism’, or values oriented not against, but “beyond” materialist ones (Moors 2003:397). More specifically, postmaterialist-type values are those that include:

“An emphasis on personal and political freedom, participation (more say in government, in one’s community, and on the job), equality, tolerance of minorities and those holding different opinions, openness to new ideas and new lifestyles, environmental protection and concern for the quality of life issues, self-indulgence, and self-actualization.” (Inglehart and Flanagan 1987:1304)

Inglehart’s thesis has become very widely applied—some even decrying its virtual “hegemonic status” among scholars debating global environmental issues for a period of time (see Brechin and Kempton 1994; Dunlap and York 2008; Guha and Martinez-Alier 1997; Lowe
and Rüdig 1986). Nevertheless, the postmaterialist thesis is by no means universally accepted and probably the greatest debate ensuing over the years concerns the implied relationship between postmaterialism and environmental concern (for one segment of this debate see Abramson 1997; Brechin and Kempton 1997; Dunlap and Mertig 1997; Kidd and Lee 1997; Lee and Kidd 1997; though also see Böltken and Jagodzinski 1985; Inglehart 1985; Lafferty and Knutsen 1985 for another sometimes quite spirited exchange).

Though the range of criticisms vary, probably the most discussed are those challenging the thesis' tenets by proclaiming that cross-national comparisons indicating both industrialized (wealthy) and relatively less-developed (poor) countries reveal significant levels of environmental concern—sometimes with poor nations revealing even higher levels of concern than wealthy countries (notably, see Brechin 1999; Brechin and Kempton 1997). Further, these authors and others also contend that the evidence of an actual shift in values is anecdotal at best. However, the validity of claims in both of these areas of critique relies on our accepting as fact a one-to-one relationship between wealth and postmaterialism (note that postmaterialism is never actually measured in these particular studies, but instead, GDP or GNP is used as a proxy). Thus, it seems surprising to me that these particular debates have received so much attention given that wealth only evaluates a single component—namely the materialist part—of the postmaterialist thesis as proposed by Inglehart.

Despite the specifics of these aforementioned criticisms, it is also worth considering a fundamental issue not at all confronted in them. Namely, regardless of some of the perceived flaws in extending and applying Inglehart's postmaterialist thesis, why is it that the concept has proven so useful in explaining environmental concern and environmental participation in the industrialized world in so many different studies (Inglehart 1990, 1995, 1997; Gilham 2008; Göksen et al. 2002; Lowe and Rüdig 1986)? Maybe it is not a globally-applicable thesis about factors affecting environmentalism, but surely it does seem to explain some detectable social patterns in certain cases. Clearly, the book is not yet closed on the issue, and as Dietz, Fitzgerald, and Shwom (2005:361) rightly conclude after their review of the concept, “more research on the subject is certainly warranted.”

In response to this, the question visited in this study is not whether Inglehart’s proposed value change is applicable globally, across diverse cultures and social orders as much of the criticisms attest, or even whether this value change is even taking place—the jury is clearly still
out on both these accounts. Instead, the question examined here is somewhat less ambitious but equally unresolved.

This paper assesses whether the basic values underlying the postmaterialist paradigm are useful in describing and differentiating participation in the British Columbia environmental movement and its related countermovement. To do this, two separate value measures are constructed: one representing materialist values; another representing postmaterialist values (see the Methods section for a more complete discussion of this process). In short, the specific issues examined are: (1) whether the underlying principle measures or value sets (i.e., materialism and postmaterialism) embedded in the overall postmaterialist construct can differentiate pro-environmental social movement participation from countermovement participation, and (2) whether these two measures relate similarly or differentially to the different forms of participation (i.e., activism and membership) in the two groups. If the value sets of postmaterialism and materialism really do capture the ideas of the quest for personal and economic security (materialism) versus a desire for a more open and participative worldview (postmaterialism) respectively, differences should be expected.

Clearly economic concerns are of paramount importance to residents of rural, resource-dependent communities along the British Columbia coast. Thus, in the most general of terms, one should expect a measure of materialism to be related to participation in the ECM; but not related—or possibly even negatively related—to participation in the EM. In terms of postmaterialism, however, recall that much of the literature suggests that environmentalism is a postmaterial concern. If so, one would expect that participation in the EM would be related to higher levels of postmaterialism, while participation in the ECM would be related to lower levels of postmaterialism. In this paper, however, it is shown that this is not the case. Instead, while postmaterialism is indeed positively related to participation in the EM, it is also positively related to participation in the ECM. Nevertheless, regardless of the claims regarding environmentalism in particular, this result should really not be surprising if postmaterialism truly is an indicator of a more participative and outward oriented worldview. In short, this paper proposes that postmaterialism is not so much an indicator of environmentalism as it is an indicator of ones willingness to participate in and openness to social change \textit{in general}—a critical distinction that is lost in non-comparative analyses of social movements. Thus, it is not until we compare a movement to its countermovement that we see the true role of postmaterialist ideals.

\footnote{Note, however, that this particular finding only arises in relation to activism, and not membership. The reasons for this are discussed in detail in the Discussion section.}
2.4 Comparing and Contrasting a Movement and Its Countermovement

A significant amount of early work, initially separate from social movement-specific research, evolved in the field of environmental sociology, where researchers attempted to determine the so-called “social bases of environmental concern” (Jones, Fly, and Cordell 1999; Jones and Dunlap 1992; Tranter 1996; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980; Vaske et al. 2001). Here, certain common sociodemographics were generally found to be associated with a pro-environmental orientation (Blake, Guppy, and Urmetzer 1996; Inglehart 1977, 1990; Jones and Dunlap 1992; Steger and Witt 1989; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980; Vaske et al. 2001; Zelezny, Chua, and Aldrich 2000). This collection of literature is largely responsible for providing us with the ideal-typical environmentalist as being a relatively young, well educated, urban, female. This ideal-type, however, is not universally accepted, running up against frequent challenges as contradictory or conflicting results often arise across studies.

Thinking optimistically that broad generalizations were still possible across varying specific circumstances, another branch of research later argued that sociodemographics were simply not enough for predicting environmentalism. Instead (or in addition), proponents proclaim that accurately predicting environmentalism across society necessitates the incorporation of important concepts such as values, ideologies, and attitudes (see Dietz, Fitzgerald, and Shwom 2005; Dietz, Stern, and Guagnano 1998; Dunlap et al. 2000; Fransson and Gärling 1999; Inglehart 1977, 1990; Kalof and Satterfield 2005; Mertig and Dunlap 2001; Satterfield 2001; Stern 2000; Stern and Dietz 1994; Stern, Dietz, and Guagnano 1995; Stern, Dietz, and Kalof 1993; Stern et al. 1999). Here, an incredibly diverse set of concepts have been assessed—postmaterialism versus materialism, liberalism versus conservatism, altruism versus self-interest, biocentricism versus anthropocentricism, economic versus non-economic concerns, and these are only a select example. Though often touted as a superior means of describing or predicting environmentalism, proponents of the social psychological perspectives rarely discuss one of the approach’s most dominant characteristics: Results are actually as variable and unstable as the sociodemographic perspective (see Dietz, Fitzgerald, and Shwom 2005 for an overview of the array of results).

Nevertheless, regardless of the debates, one point that we can confidently take from the collection of findings is that environmentalism is a complex, contextual issue. Peoples’ reasons for supporting environmentalism (and subsequently participating in an environmental movement) are as diverse as the array of environmental issues present in society today, and
pinpointing a societal segment that holds common attitudes towards environmentalism in general is likely a fleeting endeavour. There is clear appeal in deriving and presenting conceptually sound generalizations applicable across very wide swaths of the social world, but this leads to much of the contention over approaches. For example, is it really valuable to overall social theory to show that the postmaterialist thesis is not applicable in every conceivable circumstance, so it must be wrong? Or is it safer (and more useful) to infer that the postmaterialist thesis is likely applicable to specific cultural populations under certain social conditions. It seems reasonable to assume that an array of idiosyncratic factors will affect rates of environmentalism (and subsequently, participation in an environmental movement), and most importantly, assessments of specific movements need to be closely tied to and discussed in the context of the particular contentious issue. Now, it is the aggregation of empirical, issue-specific research, instead of searches for broad generalizations, which will help us sort through and explain the differences that arise between these studies.

Thus, in this study we look at a selection of sociodemographic (age, gender, education, employment) and value measures (postmaterialism, opposition to economic exploitation of the environment) as they relate to participation in the environmental movement to protect old growth forests in British Columbia in the 1990s, paying special attention to interpreting the results in the context of the particular contentious issue. At the same time, this study also promotes a call for more context-based research by showing that simultaneous examination of a movement to its countermovement adds helpful and informative insights likely elusive if taking the typical approach of just examining participation versus non-participation in the movement. What follows is a brief introduction to the variables considered in this study and the hypotheses tested.

2.4.1 Age

Many have found that younger individuals are generally more environmentally concerned than older (Inglehart 1977, 1990; Jones and Dunlap 1992; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980; Vaske et al. 2001). One potential reason for this is premised on generational differences related to the postmaterialist thesis posited by Ronald Inglehart (1977, 1990). Most generally, Inglehart

1 Note that the literature on the sociodemographic and value-based correlates of environmentalism has examined an incredibly wide array of different measures, and there is no doubt that a very wide assortment of factors actually affects peoples' rates of participation in social movements. The data evaluated for this study, however, is secondary data, gathered for prior research, and thus the number of measures and concepts assessed is limited by the foci of prior research questions. The sociodemographic measures (age, gender, education, employment) are typical; the values examined focus specifically on environmentally-oriented issues (materialism/postmaterialism, opposition to using the environment for economic gain).

6 A more thorough discussion of Inglehart's postmaterialist values thesis is presented in Section 2.3.5.2.
argues that older generations, especially those born before World War II, experienced far more hardship and privation in their formative years than younger generations since the latter have been raised during one of the greatest periods of economic expansion and peace in the world's history. Inglehart believes that this relative life-of-luxury experienced by younger generations has provided the foundation for a more inclusive and outwardly oriented worldview.

In addition to the postmaterialist thesis, other factors can also play a part. Today, in contrast to earlier decades, discussions of global climate change, tropical deforestation, air and water pollution, fisheries depletion, and many other issues are commonplace. Worse, in more recent years, high profile examples of environmental destruction have been brought into our living rooms with media describing events such as the 1984 Bhopal, India chemical disaster, the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident in Ukraine, and the 1989 grounding of the Exxon Valdez oil tanker in Prince William Sound, Alaska. In addition, in many places environmental programs have been integrated into educational systems, exposing the younger generation to the issues and concerns that they will be dealing with for years to come.

Using the proposed converse nature of movements and countermovements as a basis for comparison, the following formal hypotheses are tested:

H1.1_{Activism(EM)}: Age will be negatively associated with activism in the EM.
H1.2_{Activism(ECM)}: Age will be positively associated with activism in the ECM.
H1.3_{Membership(EM)}: Age will be negatively associated with membership in the EM.
H1.4_{Membership(ECM)}: Age will be positively associated with membership in the ECM.

2.4.2 Gender

Commonly, gender is significantly related to levels of environmental concern, with women being more environmentally concerned than men (Blake, Guppy, and Urmetzer 1996; Martin-Brown 1992; Schultz and Zelezy 1998, 1999; Steger and Witt 1989; Stern, Dietz, and Kalof 1993; Zelezy, Chua, and Aldrich 2000). The general belief is that women are acculturated to be more nurturing, caring, and empathetic, which in turn translates to higher levels of care for the broader environment (Zelezy, Chua, and Aldrich 2000). On the other hand, Tindall, Davies, and Mauboulès (2003) found that in British Columbia forest conservation organizations, no significant gender differences existed concerning level of activism in these organizations. Nevertheless, the evidence for a gender bias is compelling in the majority of the literature. Thus, the hypotheses tested are:
H2.1_{Activism(EM)}: Females are more likely to participate in higher levels of activism in the EM.

H2.2_{Activism(ECM)}: Males are more likely to participate in higher levels of activism in the ECM.

H2.3_{Membership(EM)}: Females are more likely to be members of the EM.

H2.4_{Membership(ECM)}: Males are more likely to be members of the ECM.

2.4.3 Education

A higher level of educational attainment tends to be associated with a higher level of environmental concern (Inglehart 1977, 1990; Jones and Dunlap 1992; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980; Vaske et al. 2001). The general rationale for this is simply that the process of obtaining a higher level of educational attainment tends to expose individuals to a breadth of knowledge, as well as a liberal worldview. From this, the following hypotheses are evaluated:

H3.1_{Activism(EM)}: Education is positively associated with activism in the EM.

H3.2_{Activism(ECM)}: Education is negatively associated with activism in the ECM.

H3.3_{Membership(EM)}: Education is positively associated with membership in the EM.

H3.4_{Membership(ECM)}: Education is negatively associated with membership in the ECM.

2.4.4 Resource-Based Employment

Individuals employed in primary industries often reveal relatively less support for environment protection than those employed in other sectors of the economy (Jones and Dunlap 1992; Jones et al. 2003; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980; though also see Satterfield and Gregory 1998). Today, even though various factors affect levels of employment in the industry (e.g., global demand for timber products, increasing harvesting and production efficiency), many forest workers still attribute the 'war in the woods' to increased pressures from EM groups. Thus, the expected relationships here are:

H4.1_{Activism(EM)}: Resource-based employment is negatively associated with activism in the EM.

H4.2_{Activism(ECM)}: Resource-based employment is positively associated with activism in the ECM.

H4.3_{Membership(EM)}: Resource-based employment is negatively associated with membership in the EM.
H4.4 Membership(ECM): Resource-based employment is positively associated with membership in the EM.

2.4.5 Postmaterialism

Inglehart describes a materialist orientation as one that values things such as economic and physical security, while postmaterialist values include notions such as non-economic quality of-life and membership and participation in civic society. In many studies, postmaterialism is measured as a single scale variable, with one end of the spectrum representing complete support for materialist values, the other complete support for postmaterialist values. Conceptually, such an approach is problematic.

Materialism and postmaterialism are distinctly different concepts. The former represents one’s sense of personal and economic security, while the latter encompasses the notions of a more open worldview and participative society (Rootes 2004). I find it untenable to conceive of these concepts and the values they represent as two ends of a single spectrum. Other researchers have also highlighted this problem and have suggested that materialism and postmaterialism be measured separately (Moors 2003; also see Flanagan 1987; Hellevik 1993; Bean and Papadakis 1994; Sacchi 1998; Davis and Davenport 1999; Davis, Dowley, and Silver 1999), and this is the approach taken in this paper.

Inglehart (1985) highlights the idea that one aspect of a postmaterialism is a tendency to support social change and participation in civic society, and this should directly relate to participation in social movements. Rootes (2004, 1995) also supports this notion when he contends that even though it may be a significantly variable and unstable predictor of environmental concern, “postmaterialism is a better predictor of environmental activism.” When we consider the role of postmaterialism as it relates to the EM, the expectation is clear: those revealing higher levels of postmaterialist values should also tend to participate more in the EM. But, I propose here that the same relationship should also exist for participation in the ECM. Many rural residents felt that their biggest weapon in challenging the EM was organizing and collectively challenging the EM through active participation ECM. Thus, the hypotheses tested are:

H5.1 Activism(EM): Postmaterialism will be positively associated with activism in the EM.
H5.2 Activism(ECM): Postmaterialism will be positively associated with activism in the ECM.
H5.3 Membership(EM): Postmaterialism will be positively associated with membership in the EM.
H5.4 Membership (ECM): Postmaterialism will be positively associated with membership in the ECM.

The way of life and economic livelihood of residents of rural, resource-dependent communities are significantly threatened by actions of the environmental movement. Increased forest land protection translates directly to a decrease in timber supply to these communities that already suffer significant threats from changing global economic conditions. In this way, economic concerns should be more important to supporters of the ECM and materialism should be significantly, positively related participation in the ECM; this same measure, however, should be less important to supporters of the EM.

H6.1 Activism (EM): Materialism will be negatively associated with activism in the EM.

H6.2 Activism (ECM): Materialism will be positively associated with activism in the ECM.

H6.3 Membership (EM): Materialism will negatively associated with membership in the EM.

H6.4 Membership (ECM): Materialism will be positively associated with membership in the ECM.

2.4.6 Opposition to Economic Use of the Environment

A fundamental, value-based divide exists between those associated with the movement and countermovement in terms of how they feel about using the natural world for economic gain or livelihood (Eckberg and Blocker 1989; Klineberg 1984; Van Liere and Dunlap 1981; Satterfield 2002). The environmental movement is inherently about preserving natural resources from the threats of the extraction-based industry (Wilson 1998); the countermovement is about preserving their forest-based economic livelihoods, and often, lifestyle (e.g., see Satterfield 2002).

The expectation is that those associated with the EM will reveal lower levels of support for the idea that the environment should be used for economic purposes, while those associated with the ECM will show higher levels of support.

H7.1 Activism (EM): Opposition to use of the environment for economic gain will be positively associated with activism in the EM.

H7.2 Activism (ECM): Opposition to use of the environment for economic gain will be negatively associated with activism in the ECM.

H7.3 Membership (EM): Opposition to use of the environment for economic gain will be positively associated with membership in the EM.
H7.4 \( \text{Membership(ECM)} \): \textit{Opposition to use of the environment for economic gain will be negatively associated with membership in the ECM.}

2.5 \textbf{Methods}

2.5.1 \textbf{Data}

Data for this study come from two surveys conducted in Victoria and Port Alberni, British Columbia.\(^7\) Victoria is the economically diverse, relatively urban, provincial capital; Port Alberni is a relatively rural community with a long history of timber dependence. The survey given to residents of both communities was virtually the same with the important exception that it was EM-orientated for Victoria residents, and ECM-oriented for Port Alberni. This approach was taken because the ECM was effectively inoperative in Victoria, while the EM was virtually nonexistent in Port Alberni. In this study, the two samples are kept separate and evaluated in parallel as the EM and ECM, respectively.

Telephone interviews were conducted with samples of the general population selected randomly from residential area telephone directories from the two communities.\(^8\) Upon contacting the household, the interviewer asked to speak with an adult in the home over the age of 18 who had the last birthday. Respondents were informed that their responses were to be kept anonymous. If nobody answered or no one over the age of 18 was available, up to five call backs were attempted before a number was discarded and replaced. Interviews took roughly 15 minutes to complete. Residents of Port Alberni were contacted in 1998 \((n=100)\) and Victoria residents \((n=150)\) in 1999.\(^9\) The response rate was somewhat higher in Port Alberni (51.0 percent) than in Victoria (47.5 percent) – both acceptable rates in social science research (Babbie 2004:261). Sample data were compared to Canadian Census data for the two communities across the three measures available for comparison: gender, age, and education. Though some minor differences are noted, no major differences that would indicate a significant sampling bias were detected.\(^10\) Findings from this data have never been published before.

\(^7\) The instruments are presented in Appendix B, sections B.1 and B.2.

\(^8\) The questionnaire was pre-tested with a sub-sample of the population prior to actual data collection in order to test for factors such as unclear instructions, ease of administration, ambiguous wording, and confusing questions.

\(^9\) Note that in terms of this study, one case from Port Alberni is lost due to incomplete information, thus the effective sample is \((n = 99)\).

\(^10\) Specifics on these comparisons are available from the author upon request.
2.5.2 Variables

2.5.2.1 Dependent - Activism

Eight items were presented to surveyed residents inquiring about their participation in various forms of activism, ranging from relatively low commitment, individual actions (e.g., donating money, signing a petition) to higher commitment, collective activities (e.g., attending a rally or protest demonstration on the lawns of the legislature). Though residents of both communities were asked about the exact same forms of activism, for the ECM in Port Alberni the question was whether the respondent “ever contributed or participated in actions designed to support forestry,” and for the EM in Victoria, it was whether they “ever contributed or participated in actions designed to help conserve wilderness.” Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had ever participated in each of the specific activities. These items were combined into a single scale measure by summing the total number of activist behaviours, thus arriving at an unstandardized count of the number of forms of activism in which they had participated.

2.5.2.2 Dependent - Membership

Respondents were presented a list of the most visible and active EM and ECM organizations in the region, and were asked if they held current or past membership in any of these groups. This is summarized into a single dichotomous variable, indicating whether the respondent was ever a member of an EM/ECM group.

2.5.2.3 Independent - Age, Gender, Education, and Resource-Based Employment

Age is included as a continuous variable, while gender is dichotomous. Education is measured in years. The respondent’s occupation was originally asked as an open-ended question, but was subsequently recoded into a dichotomous variable representing whether or not the respondent worked in the resource sector.

2.5.2.4 Independent - Materialism/Postmaterialism

As already stated, materialism and postmaterialism are distinctly different concepts. However, instead of simply accepting the constructs proposed in prior research as a given, analyses were conducted to verify the appropriateness of such an approach.

---

11 Though this was not a complete list of all possible environmental/countermovement groups a respondent could be affiliated with, the groups included were the major players in the British Columbia forestry conflict.
Respondents were asked to rate the importance of the following six goals—all commonly used items to evaluate the postmaterialist thesis—on a scale from 1 to 10:

- Maintaining a high rate of economic growth.
- Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities.
- Fighting rising prices.
- The fight against crime.
- Progress towards a society where ideas count more than money.
- Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted.

Table 2.1 shows the mean values (and standard errors) for these items, highlighting differences and similarities between Victoria and Port Alberni; Table 2.2 shows the results of factor analyses using varimax rotation conducted for both the Victoria and Port Alberni samples. Though specific loading values differ, the pattern is quite constant and adheres to the separate constructs that others have also derived.

In general, two distinct three-item components arise for each community with the same items comprising the same components for each sample. "Fighting rising prices," "The fight against crime," and "Maintaining a high rate of economic growth" all clustered into a single component, describing the degree to which someone presents a materialist orientation; "Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted, "Progress towards a society where ideas count more than money," and "Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities" all cluster into the other component, indicating the degree to which someone presents a postmaterialist orientation. Thus, it is clear that two separate constructs are being measured—one describing values concerning economic and security concerns; the other relating to environmental concerns and views about participative society—and even more interesting is their relative stability and constancy across both populations.

For analytic purposes, separate scale scores for both materialism and postmaterialism were created by summing the three responses for each construct and dividing by three. The final
measures range from 1 to 10 with larger numbers indicating a higher degree of support for the value set.  

**2.5.2.5 Independent - Opposition to Economic Use of the Environment**

Responses to five questions (five-point scale, ranging from completely agree to completely disagree) were used to measure the respondent’s opposition to using the environment for economic gain:

- We should relax our efforts to control pollution in order to improve the economy.
- Pollution control measures have created an unfair burden on industry.
- We should maintain our efforts to control pollution even if this slows down the economy and increases prices.
- If an industry cannot control pollution, the industry should be shut down.
- Natural resources must be preserved for the future, even if people must do without.

The items here were recoded so that they all indicated ‘opposition’, the recoded variables were then summed, and the total was divided by five (the number of items in the scale), to arrive at the final scale measure (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.67$). It is also worth noting that though these items specifically inquire about pollution, this construct has been found to be a valid measure, used in past studies, to represent the issue of using the environment for economic gain (Eckberg and Blocker 1989; Van Liere and Dunlap 1981).

**2.6 Results**

Table 2.3 shows the descriptive statistics for the variables examined in this study comparing EM-oriented Victoria to ECM-oriented Port Alberni (Tables 2.4 and 2.5, not discussed, contain the intercorrelations between all the variables for each community). Worth noting first from Table 2.3 is that while rates of activism do not differ between the two groups,

---

12 Total variability explained for the two-factor solutions were: Victoria = 56.5 percent; Port Alberni = 68.2 percent. The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for these scales were as follows: Victoria-Material $\alpha = 0.575$; Victoria-Postmaterial $\alpha = 0.565$; Port Alberni-Material $\alpha = 0.757$; Port Alberni-Postmaterial $\alpha = 0.694$. While these values are not substantial, three points are worth noting: (1) these same factors have been derived in other studies, (2) over half of the total variability in the individual constructs is explained by these factors, and (3) few items in a scale can dramatically affect the reliability score (Carmine and Zeller 1979; Nieme, Carmines, and McIver 1986). Thus, though somewhat low in terms of Cronbach’s reliability coefficient, use of these scales was still deemed appropriate.

13 A factor analysis was also conducted on this construct, and a single factor resulted (results not shown, but available from author upon request).
membership does differ. More specifically, while a significant proportion of the population of ECM-oriented Port Alberni indicated they were members of the countermovement (38 percent), in EM-oriented Victoria a much smaller proportion indicated membership (21 percent).

Also from Table 2.3, while the average age of the Victoria sample was about 47 years old, this is not statistically different than the mean of about 46 years for Port Alberni. Also, while the Victoria sample was about 51 percent female, the Port Alberni sample was 46 percent, which is also not a statistically significant difference. In general, residents of Victoria were slightly more educated, having completed about two years of college or trade school, as compared to Port Alberni, where the average resident held a high school diploma. Finally, note that a much greater proportion of the Port Alberni sample indicated they were employed in the resource sector (about 42 percent), than of Victoria where it was only about 5 percent of the sample, emphasizing the extent of resource-dependence in this community.

Table 2.6 presents the bulk of the analyses for this study and the information needed to test the formal hypotheses, showing the results of a series of regression models used to evaluate how the sociodemographic measures (age, gender, educational attainment, and resource employment) and orientations (materialism, postmaterialism, and support for economic use for the environment) relate to the dependent variables (activism and membership).14

From Table 2.6, starting with activism in EM-oriented Victoria, note that when only the sociodemographics are included (Model 1), gender and education are significant. However, when the orientations are included (Model 2), the significance of gender and education disappear. In short, of the measures considered in this paper, for the EM, only a postmaterialist orientation is positively associated with activism (support for H5.1) and a materialist orientation is negatively associated with activism (support for H6.1); we reject the other five hypotheses (H1.1, H2.1, H3.1, H4.1, and H7.1).

Contrast the former with activism in ECM-oriented Port Alberni sample. When only the sociodemographics are included (Model 3), only gender is significant. However, when we add the orientations (Model 4) gender (male) remains significant (support for H2.2) and postmaterialism also achieves significance (supporting H5.2). Thus, we fail to support five of the hypotheses (H1.2, H3.2, H4.2, H6.2 and H7.2).

---

14 Note that the models shown for activism are Poisson generalized linear models because the dependent variable is a highly skewed count measure representing the total number of 6 specific types of activist behaviours the individual has participated in. The models for membership are binary logistic regression because membership is dichotomous variable indicating whether the respondent is a member of an EM/ECM group.
Now, also from Table 2.6, let’s consider the membership measure in the four right-hand columns. Note here that the two general patterns detected with activism are present: (1) for EM-oriented Victoria, initially some sociodemographics are significant when only sociodemographics are considered (Model 5), but their significance fades once the orientations are included (Model 6); (2) for ECM-oriented Port Alberni, when only sociodemographics are considered (Model 7), some are significant, and when the orientations are included (Model 6), they remain significant. What differs between activism and membership, however, are the specific measures that are significant in the various models.

For EM-oriented Victoria, none of the sociodemographic measures remain significant in Model 6 (thus, rejection of HH1.3, H2.3, H3.3 and H4.3), while lower levels of materialism (support for H6.3) and higher levels of opposition to the use of the environmental (H7.3) do reach significance. Hence, we can generally say that of the selection of characteristics and values considered here, only counter-economic concerns tend affect membership in the EM.

While there is a similar pattern when comparing activism in Victoria to membership in Victoria (i.e., females with a higher level of education are associated with both until orientations are included, then the sociodemographics tend to lose significance while values orientations achieve significance), the pattern differs when comparing activism to membership in ECM-oriented Port Alberni. In the former, only gender (male) was associated with level of activism, while in the latter gender (male) (support for H2.4), a lower level of education (support for H3.4), and employment in the resource sector (support for H4.4) are all related to membership. None of the value orientations are significant (failure to support H5.4, H6.4 or H7.4). Thus, in the most general of terms, we see that while only the orientations are associated with activism and membership in the EM, only sociodemographics tend to be associated with activism and membership in the ECM.

2.7 Discussion

Significant research has gone into determining what characterizes individuals who are concerned about the environment (and in turn participate in environmental movement organizations). But, if these characterizations are correct and these proposed factors truly are effective in predicting or explaining environmental concern or participation in a pro-environmental movement, simple logic says that they cannot also be useful for predicting participation in an environmental countermovement. If they are, then it’s not environmental concern or environmental group participation that they are predicting—it must be something
broader. For example, some suggest that a postmaterialist ideological orientation is associated with environmentalism and formal environmental organization participation. But if postmaterialism really is a useful construct for explaining environmental group participation, it cannot simultaneously be useful for predicting environmental countermovement participation.

Several questions were examined in this paper that relate to social movement and countermovement participation. First, possibly the most significant question was: Are social movements and their countermovements simply the converse of each other? The data evaluated here suggest the answer is no. The results presented suggest that social movements and their related countermovements are more complicated, and participation in each is related to and driven by different considerations. The implication of this finding is that there appears to be significant value in considering both a movement and its countermovement simultaneously—assessing only one or the other tells only half the story.

The second question examined in this paper was whether differentiating the specific forms of participation (activism versus membership) is useful. To this question the answer is yes. The characteristics and values assessed in this study relate differentially to levels of activism and membership respectively. Since most prior research into social movement participation has typically used one measure or the other to draw conclusions and generalize about 'participation', this result suggests we may want to rethink the implications of this previous work, and be especially careful to clarify what aspect of participation we are assessing in future studies.

The third major question examined was whether the specific set of characteristics and values explored in this study is useful for describing participation in an environmental social movement and its countermovement. The results in this case are less clear. Of the array of twenty-eight specific hypotheses formulated based on commonly held precepts about what affects environmental movement participation (and presumably countermovement participation), we found that only eight of them were supported. One thing that is very clear from these results, however, is that the familiar ideal-type often forwarded of an environmental activist is of little value in explaining rates of activism or membership in formal environmental groups for this population—none of the sociodemographic measures were found to be significant once the values were entered into the models. On the other hand, it is interesting that sociodemographics were so useful for explaining participation in the countermovement.

In general, of the variables assessed in this paper, the value orientations were the only measures related to participation in the EM (this was the case for both activism and
membership). The flip-side of this was generally the case for participation in the ECM, where sociodemographics seemed most related to both forms of participation, though support for postmaterialist ideals was also significant in predicting activism for this group. That said, it is useful to ponder what this data tells us, more practically, about what drove these people to participate in the respective movements.

Consider levels of activism as they related to the EM. Here it seems that there is support for Inglehart's thesis, as only support for postmaterialist ideals and lack of support for materialist ideals seemed to affect activism (at least in terms of the measures considered in this study). Thus, anecdotally, we might say that one participated in greater amounts of pro-environmental activist behaviours if they felt that: (1) the social world was a participative sphere that required active efforts to enable social change, and (2) they tended to place relatively less value on economic and security concerns.

Membership, however, is driven by a different set of variables. For EM-oriented Victoria, membership was only related to lower levels of materialism and higher levels of opposition to environmental economic exploitation. Thus, in contrast to the findings concerning activism, one's support for postmaterialist ideals does not affect their decision to become a member of an environmental social movement group.

In terms of activism as it relates to ECM-oriented Port Alberni, it seems that only males holding generally postmaterialist ideals were more active. As noted earlier, initially the countermovement arose through the efforts of the IWA, the local woods workers labour union, to organize collectively as a means of directly confronting the growing threats posed by the environmental movement. In this way, the significance of resource employment to) membership in the ECM makes clear sense. Also, after controlling for resource employment, we saw that gender was still significant. Since forestry employment was dominated by males, the makeup of these countermovement groups was likely mostly male, which in turn, through processes such as homophily (see McPherson and Smith-Lovin 1987; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001), probably tended to attract more additional males. ECM membership, however, was not affected by perceptions of self-efficacy—postmaterialism was not significant. Thus, it may be that while membership in the ECM was generally a function of employment in the resource sector, actual acts of ECM-oriented activism were taken on by those who felt equally anxious about their circumstances and future prospects, but importantly, also felt their actions could make a difference—a feeling that appears to be absent from the ECM members.
Overall, the results concerning postmaterialism are especially salient because in some ways they hint at why some prior studies may have found problems with the thesis. The findings here, while supporting the common belief that Inglehart’s postmaterialist thesis is useful for explaining levels of environmental concern and in turn environmental movement group participation, at the same time also counters the thesis by showing that postmaterialist ideals are also related to activism a countermovement—this is the case regardless of whether it relates to participation in an environmental group or its countermovement. In short, it seems likely that postmaterialism captures just what Inglehart proposed: people’s perceptions of their role in broader society in terms of civicness and collective participation. Whether this result arose because the postmaterialist thesis is often inappropriately operationalized (in terms of differentiating materialism and postmaterialism as empirical measures), or because it has usually been evaluated only in the context of examining environmental concern or environmental group participation (and not, say, a pro-forestry orientation or countermovement participation), remains to be seen. Nevertheless, the results here suggest this issue deserves more attention in further studies.

When examining different aspects of the overall postmaterialist construct, Table 2.1 showed that in some ways the EM and ECM are indeed different, but in other ways they are the same. Residents of resource-dependent, ECM-oriented, Port Alberni placed significantly more importance on economic and personal security than residents of the more economically diverse, EM-oriented, Victoria. Perhaps this is not surprising considering the historic volatility and economic uncertainty that goes with residing in a resource-dependent community in western Canada. Ideas such as “Fighting rising prices” and “Maintaining a high rate of economic growth,” though rather contextually broad, point to the generalized desire for greater economic stability.

Maybe more interesting is the findings that the two communities do not differ in terms of the three aspects that best capture the postmaterial essence of Inglehart’s postmaterialist thesis. Most interesting here is that there was no difference in how residents of EM-oriented Victoria and ECM-oriented Port Alberni rated the importance of “Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted.” This is actually surprising, especially considering how some activists and the media represented many rural communities and their residents as rather anti-environmental. This

---

15 It is worth highlighting that I am not proclaiming that Inglehart was right or wrong in terms of his overall thesis. Instead, I simply argue that the underlying value sets he considered (materialism and postmaterialism) are useful constructs for assessing social movement participation.
result could, however, also be an issue of context. It is quite possible that “spoiled and polluted” have different meanings to the two groups. It is likely that many residents of rural, resource-dependent communities—especially those employed in the forestry sector—do not see clearcuts or widespread logging as detrimental to nature. At the same time, residents of more urban areas, whose primary interaction with the outdoors is often recreational, see clearcuts as highly invasive and damaging.

Though the main aims of this study—to compare and contrast the relationship between participation in a social movement and its countermovement by assessing certain sociodemographics and values—were achieved, it also contributes to the overall literature on social movement theory by showing the value of more contextually specific evaluations. Though it is nice to be able to propose very broad generalizations about social phenomena, we always need to remember that people and the social processes in which they participate and interact in are contextual, varying greatly from situation to situation. Thus, considering the context in which specific contentious issues prevail is critical if we really are to proclaim that we are gaining a broader understanding of social movements.
### Table 2.1 Examining the Postmaterialist Thesis – Comparing Postmaterialist Construct Items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Victoria (Movement)</th>
<th>Port Alberni (Countermovement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (S.E.)</td>
<td>Mean (S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting rising prices</td>
<td>7.49 (.165)</td>
<td>8.22 (.195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fight against crime</td>
<td>8.30 (.167)</td>
<td>9.28 (.146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a high rate of economic growth</td>
<td>7.63 (.152)</td>
<td>8.80 (.178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted</td>
<td>8.79 (.114)</td>
<td>8.72 (.171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards a society where ideas count more than money</td>
<td>7.70 (.171)</td>
<td>7.95 (.197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities</td>
<td>8.31 (.142)</td>
<td>8.66 (.182)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: Victoria (n = 150); Port Alberni (n = 100).

* p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001 (Two-tailed).

### Table 2.2 Examining the Postmaterialist Thesis - Factor Analysis Component Loadings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Victoria (Movement)</th>
<th>Port Alberni (Countermovement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting rising prices</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fight against crime</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a high rate of economic growth</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards a society where ideas count more than money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes*: Results from principal components factor analysis using varimax rotation.
Table 2.3 Descriptive Statistics for Victoria (Environmental Movement-Oriented Community) and Port Alberni (Countermovement-Oriented Community).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Victoria (Movement)</th>
<th>Port Alberni (Countermovement)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (S.E.)</td>
<td>Mean (S.E.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism</td>
<td>2.51 (.161)</td>
<td>2.37 (.214)</td>
<td>0 to 7</td>
<td>8-item scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>.21 (.034)</td>
<td>.38 (.049) **</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>Past or present membership in formal group (0 = no; 1 = yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>47.03 (1.332)</td>
<td>46.38 (1.357)</td>
<td>18 to 88</td>
<td>Respondent's age in years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.51 (.041)</td>
<td>.46 (.050)</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>Respondent's gender (0 = male; 1 = female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14.34 (.198)</td>
<td>12.67 (.203) ***</td>
<td>6 to 18</td>
<td>Respondent's level of educational attainment in years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Employment</td>
<td>.05 (.018)</td>
<td>.42 (.050) ***</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>Resource-based employment (0 = no; 1 = yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaterialism</td>
<td>8.27 (.106)</td>
<td>8.44 (.145)</td>
<td>1 to 10</td>
<td>3-item scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td>7.81 (.119)</td>
<td>8.76 (.143) ***</td>
<td>1 to 10</td>
<td>3-item scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose Economic Use of</td>
<td>4.01 (.058)</td>
<td>3.71 (.075) ***</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>5-item scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Victoria (n = 150); Port Alberni (n = 100).

* * p .05; ** p .01; *** p .001 (Two-tailed).
### Table 2.4 Intercorrelations (EM Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activism</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Postmaterialism</th>
<th>Materialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>0.38 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = female)</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.181 *</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.200 *</td>
<td>0.169 *</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Employment</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaterialism</td>
<td>0.316 ***</td>
<td>0.207 *</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>0.317 ***</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td>-0.202 *</td>
<td>-0.224 **</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.175 *</td>
<td>-0.246 **</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.256 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose Economic Use</td>
<td>0.25 **</td>
<td>0.301 ***</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.245 **</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>0.351 ***</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** n = 150

* p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001 (Two-tailed).

---

### Table 2.5 Intercorrelations (ECM Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activism</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Postmaterialism</th>
<th>Materialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>0.357 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = female)</td>
<td>-0.387 ***</td>
<td>-0.475 ***</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.280 **</td>
<td>-0.245 *</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Employment</td>
<td>0.290 **</td>
<td>0.503 ***</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-0.460 ***</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaterialism</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.545 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose Economic Use</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>-0.222 *</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.226 *</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** n = 100

* p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001 (Two-tailed).
Table 2.6 Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for Models Predicting Forms of Participation in the Environmental Movement in Victoria and the Countermovement in Port Alberni.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Victoria (Movement)</th>
<th>Port Alberni (Countermovement)</th>
<th>Victoria (Movement)</th>
<th>Port Alberni (Countermovement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.002 (.003)</td>
<td>.000 (.003)</td>
<td>-.004 (.005)</td>
<td>.003 (.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = female)</td>
<td>.289 (.106) **</td>
<td>.144 (.114)</td>
<td>-.625 (.160) ***</td>
<td>-.663 (.163) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.071 (.022) **</td>
<td>.040 (.023)</td>
<td>.011 (.033)</td>
<td>.014 (.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Employment (1 = yes)</td>
<td>.337 (.209)</td>
<td>.361 (.211)</td>
<td>.269 (.148)</td>
<td>.214 (.149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaterialism</td>
<td>.209 (.050) ***</td>
<td>.116 (.059)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.417 (.229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td>-.133 (.038) ***</td>
<td>-.032 (.059)</td>
<td>-.484 (.179) **</td>
<td>-.137 (.225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose Economic Environmental Use</td>
<td>.103 (.088)</td>
<td>-.156 (.093)</td>
<td>1.123 (.467) *</td>
<td>-.581 (.402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.183 (.377)</td>
<td>-.887 (.670)</td>
<td>.625 (.576)</td>
<td>.558 (.844)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Victoria n = 150; Port Alberni n = 100.

Models predicting activism are Poisson generalized linear models.

Models predicting membership are logistic regression models.

Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

* p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001 (Two-tailed).
2.8 References


3 ALTERNATIVE PATHWAYS TO SOCIAL MOVEMENT MOBILIZATION: MOVING BEYOND SOCIAL NETWORKS

3.1 Introduction

Over the past few decades, the (micro-)mobilization process has been one of the most focused-on topics in social movement research, and of this research, social networks have been implicated as perhaps the single most significant factor predicting mobilization into a social movement (Fernandez and McAdam 1988; Klandermans 1984; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Marwell and Oliver 1993; Marwell, Oliver and Prahl 1988; McAdam 1986; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Oberschall 1973; Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson 1980; Tindall 2002, 2004). The basic premise is simple: Embeddedness in certain networks of social ties facilitates initial recruitment and later fosters greater levels of activist participation. Or as McAdam and Paulsen (1993:644) expound: “Strong or dense interpersonal networks encourage the extension of an invitation to participate and they ease the uncertainty of mobilization.”

Significantly, however, even if we accept that some individuals are indeed drawn into social movements through personal relationships they have to others already participating in the movement, we must accede that there is also a group of people who mobilize but were unconnected, not knowing anybody in the social movement organization beforehand (Diani 2004; McAdam 2003; Tindall 2007). For example, Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson (1980) found that very few members (only 4 percent) of the Hare Krishna movement joined because of previous relationships. Similarly, Luker (1984) point out that only about 20 percent of anti-abortion activists in California mobilized due to social ties.

Almost certainly, initially-unconnected individuals make a considerable contribution to the size of a social movement organization. Consider that in their ongoing fight to protect the environment the Sierra Club claims 1.3 million members (Sierra Club 2008); Greenpeace 2.9 million (Greenpeace 2008). Reasonably, how many members of the Sierra Club or Greenpeace do you think really know each other? How many of them have ever interacted? And of these, how many can we reasonably expect knew someone else in the group before joining? Clearly a

---

1 A version of this chapter will be submitted for publication. Malinick, Todd E. “Alternative Pathways to Social Movement Mobilization: Moving Beyond Social Networks.”

2 Note that though some distinguish ‘mobilization’ from ‘micro-mobilization’—the former referring specifically to the broad acts of groups of actors participating in collective actions; the latter referring, more specifically, to the actions of individuals as they relate to joining or participating in a social movement—there is no consensus on this matter. For the sake of clarification, the term ‘mobilization’ is used repeatedly throughout this chapter, but almost exclusively refers to the latter of these two meanings.
substantial proportion of these membership rolls are comprised of people without ties to the movement organizations, but oddly, even considering the potential size and influence of this initially-unconnected cohort, most theories of social movement mobilization fail to incorporate (or even mention) them at all. This is hazardous.

Some of the most influential social movement organizations gain their power and influence from their shear size (Brulle 2000; della Porta and Diani 1999; Oberschall 1973), and in many ways, the overall efficacy of a social movement is a function of the resources available to dedicate to their cause and financial support is critical (Brulle 2000; McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977). Often, an organization’s budget is a function of its size as many groups receive a substantial proportion of their funds from membership dues. For example, about 75 percent ($15.2 million) of Greenpeace’s $20.3 million total 2006 annual revenues came from “contributions and donations” (Greenpeace 2008) (their budget category representing membership dues). Thus, these unconnected individuals deserve attention because as a cohort they can substantially influence a social movements’ ability to attain its overall goals and objectives.

Consequently, numerous questions arise: What motivates these initially unconnected individuals to join a movement? If they are not drawn in by their network ties, what is motivating and facilitating mobilization? In what ways can we distinguish those motivated via network relations from those motivated by other factors? Where and how do these individuals fit into existing models of social movement mobilization?

I do not disagree that some people are indeed motivated to join a social movement due to the influence of social ties. However, the fact that people become social movement organization members for other reasons must be considered as well. Andrews and Biggs (2006:753) found little evidence that social networks affected participation in sit-ins on behalf of the 1960s Civil Rights movement in the US, while in contrast, media was deemed crucial: “Protesters recalled first learning about sit-ins in other cities from newspaper, radio, or television.” Likewise, as others have also suggested (Diani 2004; Jasper and Poulsen 1993; Tindall 2007), a main argument proposed here is that movements have the ability to mobilize actors in the absence of existing social network ties through channels such as the mass media.

More specifically, this paper investigates multiple pathways to social movement mobilization (i.e., social networks versus exposure to media) into the highly contentious environmental movement to protect old growth forests of the 1990s in British Columbia, Canada. In general, the empirical findings show that initially-unconnected participants did
make up a sizable proportion of the movement and media was indeed their main motivator. To this end, I present an adapted version of a familiar and well-studied model of social movement mobilization (Klandermans and Oegema 1987) that effectively incorporates this group into existing social movement theory. However, before proceeding to a review of the relevant literature, I provide a brief description of the British Columbia environmental movement.

3.2 The Environmental Movement in British Columbia

In British Columbia, the forest industry has been one of the greatest contributors to the provincial economy for most of the province’s history (Barnes and Hayter 1997; Drushka 1999; Drushka, Nixon, and Travers 1993; Hayter 2000; Marchak 1983; Markey et al. 2005).\(^3\) This economic dependency has resulted in a complicated set of relationships between the various stakeholders, including the forest industry; the forest workers and rural communities; the government; and the provincial citizenry. Historically—and in many instances and areas still today—significant primary and secondary employment was provided by the industry and, thus, support for its well-being has been fairly widespread (Marchak 1983). Laws and regulations were typically drafted greatly favouring industry access to timber (Drushka 1999), while providing few enforceable environmental protections.

Decreasing amounts of old growth forest and the related damages to the environment by widespread and often unchecked logging became widely recognized as critical issues by the provincial citizenry and became an important political issue by the late 1980s and 1990s (Wilson 1998). As a result, a substantial environmental movement arose active in fighting for greater restrictions on the forest industry.

For many, the longstanding battle to preserve old growth forests in coastal British Columbia was best symbolized by the summer of 1993—inarguably the apex of the cycle of protest—when over 800 protesters were arrested for peacefully blockading logging access to forestlands in Clayoquot Sound, Vancouver Island—an event that became known as the single largest act of civil disobedience in Canadian history. Prior to this, the British Columbia forestry conflict was a common topic of media coverage locally, provincially and nationally. The Clayoquot Sound protests and its aftermath, however, also brought the forestry conflict in British Columbia to an international audience with even more intense and widespread media coverage.

\(^3\) Note that the province has been home to aboriginal, or First Nation, peoples for many thousands of years. Though they have extensively used the forest resources for subsistence throughout history, the forest industry that I speak of did not become relevant until after white settlers arrived from Europe in the late 18th century.
3.3 Literature
Explaining, or sometimes even defining, a "social movement" as a highly dynamic weave of socially involved, participative, activists (for example, see Diani 1992, 1995) is appealing. It suggests a certain continuity across place and time of a nebulous-yet-structured, dedicated, social collectivity that can effectively organize to challenge injustices, forward grievances, and even seek subtle (or not-so-subtle) changes in the social milieu. The idea that people who share feelings of outrage or discontentment are able to work together to obtain collective social benefit, against sometimes oppressive opposition—and sometimes at substantial personal risk—can be inspiring.

However, while we have focused so heavily on discovering, examining and furthering our network-based understanding of social movements, we have left at the theoretical wayside the often substantially-sized group of people who did not get drawn in through preexisting social ties. Consequently, a central issue examined in this paper is how this group of initially-unconnected individuals can be incorporated into existing models of social movement mobilization. To this end, probably the most familiar and well-studied model of social movement mobilization (Klandermans and Oegema 1987) is adapted to effectively incorporate this group into existing social movement theory.

3.3.1 A New Take on an Old Model: Alternative Pathways to Social Movement Mobilization
More than twenty years ago, in a highly-cited and well-accepted work in the social movement mobilization literature, Bert Klandermans and Dirk Oegema (1987) distinguished between four necessary “steps toward participation.” These include: (1) being part of the mobilization potential, or the group of individuals who have values and attitudes compatible with the basic precepts of the movement including its grievances, goals and objectives; (2) being a target of mobilization attempts, or the efforts of existing activists to contact prospective members with attempts at recruitment; (3) becoming motivated to participate; and (4) overcoming barriers to participation, including personal reasons such as work or family obligations. A version of this model is shown in Figure 3.1.

In many ways this model is sound, inarguably and accurately explaining a single pathway taken by many people towards mobilization into a social movement. Nevertheless, there are also problems that limit its applicability.
Klandermans and Oegema clearly state that “a person can be targeted by mobilization attempts through one or more of the following routes: mass media, direct mail, ties with organizations, and friendship ties” (1987:520, italics added). In a puzzling manner, however, they immediately follow this by proclaiming, “the mass media are not very effective in convincing and activating people” (ibid. 520), and then focus solely on network ties throughout their analyses. No rationale for this broad denouncement of other pathways is provided, though they do state that media and mail are less likely to work specifically for high-risk/cost activism. Since they ignore mass media, are we to infer that the focus of their study—the 1983 peace demonstration at The Hague—is high-risk activism? Surely not, and attributing to this is their concluding statements where they proclaim: “Knowing other participants turned out to be an important variable in the mobilization process, not only in the case of high-risk activism like McAdam (1986) demonstrated but in the case of low-risk activism as well” (Klandermans and Oegema 1987:530). Further confusing matters, though they brush aside non-network targeting attempts in their analyses, they still make an effort to specifically highlight the significance of media when they mention that the major efforts of the local peace campaign leading up to the protest were publicity oriented and “reinforced by a national publicity campaign” (ibid. 522).

In addition to these conceptual issues, there are also methodological problems with the manner in which they exclude non-network targeting attempts in their analyses. In their article, the authors differentiate between informal and formal networks. Informal networks, they proclaim, are comprised of individuals who had “several or even many acquaintances or friends who planned to go to the demonstration” (ibid. 525). Formal networks, on the other hand, include those who: “visited the peace stand downtown (31 percent), read appeals in local newspapers (23 percent), were reached through organizations linked with the movement (16 percent), or saw posters, billboards, banners (4 percent). A brochure that was delivered at every address was mentioned by only 13 percent of the respondents” (ibid. 525, italics added). They continued by stating that 40 percent of the respondents had no informal ties, and when combining the formal and informal networks they found that “20 percent of the mobilization potential had virtually no links at all with peace movement networks; 19 percent were reached through formal links only; 21 percent had only informal links; and 40 percent reported both formal and informal links to the movement” (ibid. 525).

It is not clear how all of the components of their formal networks are network-related at all. While contacting a person at “the peace stand downtown” and being “reached through
organizations linked with the movement” surely amount to actual network-based, person-to-
person interactions, it is less clear how “appeals in local newspapers,” seeing “posters,
billboards, banners,” or a “brochures that was delivered at every address” would be network-
oriented at all. Instead, it seems that the latter are really a matter of exposure to media. If this
is the case, and as they say, 19 percent were reached through formal links only and another 40
percent were linked through both formal and informal links, it is entirely possible that 59
percent, or significantly more than half, of the mobilization potential were actually targeted
through various forms of media.

More recently, Klandermans has advanced his views on mobilization by distinguishing
between action and consensus mobilization (see Klandermans 1997, 2004). He now proposes
that his earlier work (Klandermans and Oegema 1987) focused primarily on action
mobilization or “the transformation of those who adopted the view of the movement into
active participants” (369). In contrast, consensus mobilization focuses on the “dissemination of
the views of a movement” (369). Action mobilization is about attitudes, values and
motivations to act; consensus mobilization is about collective action framing and
communication. Under this new conceptualization, Klandermans proposes that action
mobilization is constrained by and comes after effective consensus mobilization—until a
movement declares its aims by defining some sort of problem, there really are no
“sympathizers” and “non-sympathizers,” no “us” and “them.”

While this new view on social movement mobilization brings into account important
concepts and processes—namely collective action framing (see next section)—that have been
expounded in the literature over the past 20 years since Klandermans and Oegema (1987), the
newer conceptualization errs in two important ways. First, it allocates media exposure to a
preceding role (i.e., consensus mobilization). It appears that people become aware of a
movement and its cause through various channels (such as media), and it is at this point, or due
to the content of this communication, people fall into the “sympathizer” versus “non-
sympathizer” roles—the first step of the model. The second, but related, problem is that
It’s clear he still sees targeting strictly as a function of social networks when he states: “The

4 While the term ‘media’ is sometimes used specifically in reference to the news, technically, in a broader sense,
it also includes promotional material such as poster, brochures, and other materials produced by the movements
themselves. Though much of the following theoretical discussion is couched in terms of an explicit focus on news
media, the general implications (i.e., that media can be used intentionally for framing purposes by movements)
can be extrapolated to promotional media as well.
second step is about networks. Networks to a large extent determine whether someone becomes a target of mobilization attempts. 

The ultimate impact of these problems, in the bigger picture, is that the model provides no possible pathway for unconnected individuals to join a movement—even under the new conceptualization. Careful examination reveals no pathway under which people having no prior ties can be motivated to mobilize—in essence, using his network-based conceptualization of targeting, they are never targeted! While these issues surely call into question some of the interpretations and conclusions (namely, the singular significance of networks at the expense of media in the mobilization process), we need not discard this useful model. Instead, these concerns simply emphasize the need for researchers to elaborate and include various forms of targeting attempts in their mobilization studies.

Accordingly, Figure 3.2 shows an adapted model highlighting multiple pathways to social movement mobilization and participation. Such a model is appropriate because by expanding the notion of targeting attempts to include media, it highlights the intentional manner in which media is often used to foster recruitment.

Note that in the adapted model shown in Figure 3.2 ‘frame alignment’ has been inserted as an intervening step between Klandermans and Oegema’s second step (target of mobilization attempt) and third step (becoming motivated to join). This is meant to emphasize the underlying process through which actors making recruitment attempts (be they direct, person-to-person attempts, or indirect media-based attempts) are actually able to motivate mobilization. More specifically, it stresses the intentional act of cognitively merging or aligning the characteristics that define the mobilization potential with the grievances, goals, and objectives of the movement (also see Tindall 2007). It is not enough to simply state that the eventual recruit had attitudes or values congruent with the movement, and that they were subsequently contacted by some targeting agent. We need to ask what occurred in the targeting attempt that actually motivated someone to go as far as taking action on behalf of the cause. While there are notable differences based on the form of targeting (i.e., social networks versus media), I argue this is generally an issue of linking the contentious issue with a collective identity through frame alignment processes (also see Tindall 2007).

---

5 Another, related issue is the fact that media and networks can also involve an interaction effect. Knoke (1990; also see Katz and Lazarsfeld 1955) suggests that neither media communication nor the influence of social networks alone motivate mobilization. Instead, people hear about things in the news, then in the process of discussing these issues with homophilous others, motivation and intention to participate develop. While this is indeed an interesting and important issue, for conceptual and methodological reasons this avenue of research is not pursued in this paper (see Footnote 7).
In some ways, this is not new—Klandermans himself has examined and strongly promoted the significance of framing by presenting the notion of consensus mobilization (Klandermans 1997, 2004). The problem is where he conceives of its role in the overall mobilization process. While he sees it as a preceding condition of mobilization, coming into play before his four-step process even begins; I see it as a component piece.

Under his latter view, people are not “sympathizers” until a specific issue is forwarded in the media or some other channel of communication. Instead, I prefer Klandermans older perspective (Klandermans and Oegema 1987) when this same group of people were referred to as the “mobilization potential”. This is preferred because it implies that people’s views, attitudes, opinions, and values are not entirely a function of what they get from the media, which seems to be the implication of Klanderman’s newer view. Instead, people have latent values or beliefs that are accessed or capitalized on by certain strategic framing episodes, formulated by movements, to attract participants.

This is not a big change to the commonly-cited model, though I argue it is a necessary one. While both Klandermans original and revised models inarguably describe a potential pathway under which certain connected people may come to participate in a social movement, as it stands, it is a model of limited use because it provides no possible means through which the great number of unconnected people can come to participate in a social movement. The proposed revision presented here overcomes this problem by allowing pathways under which both groups can come to participate in a social movement. The key to this revision lies in the way collective action framing is seen as a means of linking collective identity with factors such as shared values, attitudes, and beliefs.

3.3.2 From Potentiality to Action: The Collective Framing of Contentious Issues

Collective action frames are intentionally and strategically formulated interpretive packages used to condense and summarize the facts of the world ‘out there’ in a way that eases public uptake and understanding of an issue (Benford 1993; Gamson 1992; Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford 1988). They are strategically used by social movements (and similarly by their challengers) to garner general public support for their cause and to attract potential constituents and mobilize them (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Scheufele 1999; Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford 1988); they are simultaneously used by the media to simplify presentation of complicated issues in the course of reporting the news (Anderson 1997;
Dispensa and Brulle 2003; Gamson et al. 1992; Ryan 1991; Scheufele 1999; Tuchman 1978). In efforts to strategically frame an issue, movement actors aim to align their frames with the values and attitudes of their potential recruits, or targets, in the hopes that they can convince the recruit that they are part of something much bigger, hence triggering some reaction that motivates them to take action and mobilize into the social movement. This process is a matter of linking the individual and their personally held values and attitudes with a wider collectivity, or collective identity.

Though many sociologists and social movement researchers have considered the issue of collective identity (e.g., Brulle 1996; Friedman and McAdam 1992; Gould 1993; Melucci 1988; McAdam 1986; Polletta and Jasper 2001; Tindall 2002, 2004; Touraine 1981), most empirical work on the concept originates from the field of social psychology, where researchers highlight the fact that collective identity is a matter of individual, subjective, self-categorization (see Ashmore, Deaux, and McLaughlin-Volpe 2004; Drury et al. 2005; Drury and Reicher 2005; Klandermans 1984; Klandermans et al. 2002; Simon et al. 1998; Simon and Klandermans 2001; Stürmer and Simon 2004; Turner et al. 1987). One of the most oft-used definitions of collective identity refers to “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel 1978:63). These groups—their boundaries defined by shared collective identities—attempt to differentiate themselves from other groups in positive ways, competing with each other for social resources (Tajfel 1981; Turner et al. 1987; though also see della Porta and Diani 1999 and Touraine 1981 for a more sociological perspective on this).

In the process of targeting potential recruits, “organizers often concentrate on recasting constituents’ identities to include participation as one of the responsibilities or benefits of group membership. Identities need to be integrated with injustice and agency frames so as to clearly distinguish ‘us’ from opponents and bystanders” (Polletta and Jasper 2001:292). In addition,

Movement discourse also provides a link between collective action and individual beliefs and actions, since in the process of becoming a member of a social movement, individuals experience a transformation in their perceptions of society. A new narrative of self is adopted that reconstitutes the individuals in a new symbolic reality. By providing rhetoric that supports such a personal sequence of transformation, a movement’s discourse serves as a means to reconstruct experience and constitute a new self (Brulle 1996:62; also see Hermans, Kempen, and van Loon 1992).
This general description is the case regardless of the form of targeting. However, there are important differences in the process when considering those motivated through social networks versus those motivated through exposure to media. When we are dealing with an actual interpersonal tie, the specific target of the recruiting attempt is often known and the interaction is reciprocal and open-ended; when we are looking at appeals through media, the specific target is typically not known and the exchange is unilateral and finite.

With those motivated to join through social networks, the content of the message can be much more precise, the issue explored more in-depth, and the appeal can be formulated and targeted to a particular person (e.g., “Sue, I know you love the outdoors and especially those ancient woods in the lower Carmanah Valley where we went hiking a couple months ago, don’t you want to help protect them from logging?”). But even if the target is just an unacquainted other exposed to an anonymous targeting attempt, reasoning and interactive discussion can be used to pressure or convince the potential recruit that they are needed (e.g., “Yeah Mr. Smith, I know, I don’t have a lot of free time either, but I really love the Carmanah Valley and I’m sure you do too, and membership in our group really doesn’t demand too much. Can’t you spare just a little time?”).

With those motivated to join because of media (and who are generally unconnected to existing members), the net must be cast much wider, and the message needs to be generalized in a way that will potentially affect action from a less focused target (e.g., “Help save the ancient forests!” or “Save trees for jobs!”). In many cases, it is also a one-time deal where the movement has a single opportunity to capture a target’s interest deeply enough that they will be motivated to act (e.g., “Act now before it’s too late!” or “Time is running out!”). The question now becomes: Why is it that the media serves to facilitate this process?

In contrast to social network-based targeting attempts, where interpersonal ties and the bilateral relationships that foster them are often used as the basis for communication, Polletta and Jasper (2001:291 emphasis added; also see Jasper 1997) claim that “moral shocks’ produced, for example, by a photograph of a tortured animal or the disaster at Three Mile Island can mobilize people who do not know each other or the organizers.” And further, “since mobilization does not always require preexisting collective identities, activists’ efforts to strategically ‘frame’ identities are critical in recruiting participants” (Polletta and Jasper 2001:291). Klandermans (2004:363), too, sees this when he states: “Activists work hard to
create moral outrage and anger and to provide a target against which these can be vented." But also:

It is not just the cognitive component of ideology that social movements are the conduits of. Emotions, that is, the affective component of ideology are equally important. After all, people are angry, morally outraged, and movement organizations provide the opportunity to express and communicate those feelings (Klandermans 2004:369).

Two other points with regards to collective identity and recruitment warrant mention. First, it is important to note that those motivated by social ties may not be acting in response to some sense of collective identity prompted or affected by framing processes. While some form of identity may still be relevant, this may be due more to other social factors such as influence or obligation (Chong 1991; Friedman and McAdam 1992), social comparison (Gartrell 1987; Passy 2003), ‘soft incentives’ such as emotional satisfaction (Jasper 1997), or social or moral incentives (Opp 1986; Teske 1997). Thus, it may be less a matter of collective identification with, say, the environmental movement per se, and more a matter of identification with a particular group of people who just so happen to be members of the environmental movement. This is represented in Figure 3.2 by the dotted line bypassing frame alignment.

The second issue worth mentioning is that even though some form of a collective identity may indeed come into play between the recruitment and joining steps, it is not a static, unchanging characteristic. Instead, a collective identity is a dynamic, constantly changing, social-interactive phenomenon that is in flux throughout ones activist career and lifetime. This point is not immediately relevant to initial mobilization, though it can play a significant part in affecting later rates of activist participation (Tindall 2004).

3.3.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses

The preceding discussion raises an array of interesting research questions that can be investigated empirically: Are multiple pathways to social movement mobilization actually possible? If so, which are most relevant (i.e., which path motivates the most members to join)? How do social movement organization members who mobilized along different pathways compare and contrast with each other? Can they be differentiated in terms of sociodemographics? How about levels of identification with the movement or levels of subsequent activism? These questions and others are empirically investigated in this study in the context of the British Columbia environmental movement of the 1990s.
The first and probably most important issue empirically examined in this study is whether or not multiple pathways to mobilization actually exist. In addition to social networks, are other motivations for joining evident, namely, exposure to various media? To investigate this issue, and provide initial support for the adapted model presented in this study, the following general guiding hypothesis is tested:

H1: Both social networks and exposure to media are significant motivating factors affecting one’s decision to join the British Columbia environmental movement.

Next, the analyses will move on to compare and contrast those motivated to join the movement by social ties, to those motivated to join because of media exposure. Several different measures are considered in this study, falling into four main categories: (1) sociodemographic controls, (2) social networks, (3) level of identification with the environmental movement, and (4) level of activism.

In terms of sociodemographics, three specific characteristics are included as control variables: (1) gender, (2) age, and (3) educational attainment. These are typical measures used in sociological studies useful for describing subgroups, and especially for examining issues like environmentalism.

The next set of measures look at the role that social networks play in differentiating subgroups, and two specific tie types are examined: (1) in-group ties, or ties one has to other individuals who are also members of their immediate environmental movement organization, and (2) ties to other movement groups. However, before proceeding to the hypotheses, some points of clarification are warranted here.

First, it is important to note that social networks as examined here—in contrast to how they have been discussed so far—are not referring to the role that social relationships play in motivating people to join a social movement (though to some degree this may be embedded in the issue). These types of network ties can effectively be viewed as pre-mobilization ties (see Fernandez and McAdam 1988; Klandermans 1984; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Marwell and Oliver 1993; Marwell, Oliver, and Prahl 1988; McAdam 1986; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Oberschall 1973; Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson 1980; Tindall 2002, 2004). Instead, it is looking at the nature of social ties in a post-mobilization sense (see Diani 1995; McAdam and Paulsen 1993), or after the individual has already joined the group.
From a methodological perspective, we need to recognize that the sampling frame was defined by social movement organization membership (see Methods section). At the time of the survey, all respondents were potentially exposed to (and quite likely embedded in) post-mobilization movement networks. Thus, differentiating pre and post-mobilization effects is not possible with the data examined in this study. Respondents were simply asked how many people they knew who were members of the group, and further inquiry into which of these they knew before and which they met after joining was not attempted. Thus, the real issue examined here is not how social networks differentially affected the motivations of the two subgroups to join the movement, but instead, is how the social networks of the two subgroups of respondents (delineated by their differing motivations for joining) compare and contrast after joining. There is reason to believe they should differ.

Do those who were motivated to join because of preexisting social ties generally have more ties after joining? Presumably, if someone is drawn into a movement by, say, a friend or relative, this tie will also likely facilitate introductions to others who are already members, thus providing the opportunity for the development of larger post-mobilization networks as well—an opportunity not available to those motivated to join via media. Alternatively (or in addition), it may simply be that those with more pre-mobilization ties are just more social, and will reveal more ties post-mobilization as well. From this, the following hypothesis is tested:

H2: Those motivated to join the environmental movement through social networks will have more social network ties to others in their group than those motivated through media.

The second social network measure investigated in this study—the number of ties one has to other movement groups—looks at a subtly different question: How embedded are these individuals in the overall environmental movement (in contrast to the former hypothesis which effectively examines how embedded they are in their respective groups)? The expectation is that those motivated to join the movement through social networks will also be more embedded in the environmental movement than those motivated through media. Individuals motivated via social ties will likely be introduced to others not only in their immediate group (as already mentioned), but quite possibly others also participating in the broader environmental movement. Participation in activities such as rallies or protests allows individuals from different groups within the same movement to socialize, and one who is
already active in the movement likely has ties to other groups through which they can introduce the new recruit. Thus, the hypothesis tested is:

H3: Those motivated to join the environmental movement through social networks will have more social ties to others in other environmental movement groups than those motivated through media.

The next variable considered is level of identification with the movement. Conventional wisdom might suggest that those drawn into a movement through social networks will generally identify more with the movement. The belief here is that a collective identity is part of embeddedness in a movement network (Collins 1981, 1988; McAdam, McCarthy and Zald 1988). Tindall (2002:421) argues that embeddedness in social networks “facilitates the possibilities for, and the likelihood of, conversations with others about movement events, issues, and ideology. Such conversations—or interactional rituals—in turn strengthen one’s level of identification with the movement.” Nevertheless, earlier, when introducing the proposed adapted model, I argued that identification plays a critical (and maybe even more important) role when media motivates individuals to join a social movement.

Because the attempt to target an individual through media is a relatively disconnected interaction where factors such as social obligation are not used to prompt people to action, the media must rely on ‘moral shock’. In doing so, these messages tend to tap into deeper moral, emotional, and sentimental components of the psyche that more directly relate to and affect one’s notion of membership in a collectivity. Thus, further support for this adapted model would be evident if those motivated through media actually reveal higher levels of identification with the environmental movement than those motivated through social ties. Thus, the hypothesis tested here is:

H4: Those motivated to join the environmental movement through exposure to media will reveal higher levels of identification with the environmental movement than those motivated to join through social networks.

Finally, the last measure considered in this study is level of activism. The question is: Do the different motivations actually affect subsequent rates of participation in the movement?
The expectation is based on existing literature which suggests that those motivated through social networks will tend to be more active, as the social ties convince the recruit to participate, and offset the uncertainties of participation (McAdam and Paulsen 1993). Hence:

\[ H5: \text{Those motivated to join the environmental movement through social networks will reveal higher levels of activism than those motivated through social networks.} \]

### 3.4 Methods

#### 3.4.1 Data

The data used in this paper were originally collected for a prior study looking at the factors leading to participation in the environmental movement in British Columbia during the highly contentious 1990s (see Tindall 2002, 2004). The survey was conducted in 1992, one of the most active periods of the forestry conflict (Wilson 1998). In total, mail surveys were returned by 381 members of three formal environmental groups located in the Victoria, British Columbia region—all quite active in the highly contentious forestry conflict on Vancouver Island at the time.

Group 1 was a relatively small, grassroots social movement organization comprised of several hundred members at the time of the survey; Group 2 was a midsize social movement organization with membership of about 3,000; Group 3 was a large social movement organization with a total membership near 25,000 (British Columbia Environmental Network 1992). Due to its relatively small size, a census was attempted for Group 1, while Groups 2 and 3 were sampled using a systematic random sampling procedure.

---

6 The survey is presented in Appendix B, Section B.3.

7 Note that 381 cases existed in the original data set, but only 264 are used in the analyses in this paper. Of the 13 possible responses to the question “Was your decision to become a member of [your group] in response to any of the following?” it was not possible to determine whether the motivation to join the social movement organization was really an effect of networks or media for three of these. These responses included: (1) “You heard about the ‘Carmanah Giant’ and decided something had to be done to preserve old-growth forests,” (2) “You heard about the threat to the Marbled Murrelet’s nesting grounds,” (3) “You attended a pro-wilderness preservation rally and decided to join the [your group].” In addition, some respondents indicated that both social networks and media affected their decision to mobilize. This created a problem with statistical independence when comparing the two groups, but also a conceptual hurdle as it would be virtually impossible to differentiate the actual effects of the networks and media. However, using ANOVA to compare the three groups—motivated by media (n = 214), motivated by social networks (n = 19), and motivated by both (n = 31)—revealed that those motivated by both are not statistically significantly different from those motivated by networks across the variables of interest in this study. Thus, those who indicated they were motivated by both were grouped together with those who implicated solely networks to retain a more sizable sample size for subsequent analyses (media: n = 214; networks: n = 50).

8 More precise membership rates were unavailable.
Group 1 returned 48 valid surveys (response rate = 26.2 percent); Group 2 returned 146 surveys (response rate 29.6 percent); Group 3 returned 187 surveys (response rate 7.5 percent). Thus, the overall response rate was 12 percent. Because of strict confidentiality constraints enforced by the three participating groups (which helped administer the surveys), follow-ups with non-respondents to increase these rates were not possible. Nevertheless, though considered somewhat low by some standards, the response rate is comparable to other studies in the field (Muller and Opp 1986; Opp 1986). Furthermore, the purpose of this study is to examine theoretical relationships, not to make empirical generalizations. If indeed some bias is present in the data, specific parameter estimate values may be affected (and in this way, generalization is hazardous), but the underlying relationships between the variables should remain relatively stable (Tindall 2004).

3.4.2 Measures
Table 3.1 provides descriptive statistics for the variables investigated in this study.

3.4.2.1 Sociodemographic Controls
The respondent’s gender is a dichotomous (0 = male; 1 = female); their age and level of educational attainment are measured in years.

3.4.2.2 Social Networks
Two social network measures are evaluated, representing various facets of one’s social structural milieu. Firstly, the variable in-group network degree is derived from the question: “Please specify the approximate number of [your group] members you know?” This measure, thus, represents the number of interpersonal ties the respondent has to others in their immediate social movement organization, or alternatively, their level of social embeddedness in their social movement organization.

The second measure, ties to other social movement organizations, was derived from the questionnaire item where respondents were presented a list of seven of the most prominent environmental movement organizations operating in the region and asked if they knew a member of these groups (range = 0 to 7), thus representing a measure of more broad embeddedness in the environmental movement.

3.4.2.3 Level of Identification
A single survey item was used to inquire about respondent’s perceptions of collective identity, namely: “Do you think of yourself as being a member of the wilderness preservation
movement?" Possible responses and their values included: 0 = I oppose the wilderness preservation movement; 1 = I do not think of myself as a member; 2 = I identify myself somewhat as a member; 3 = I identify myself very strongly as a member. Thus, higher values indicated a relatively greater level of identification with the movement than lower values.

3.4.2.4 Level of Activism

A summary score is calculated representing respondents’ level of activism. In the survey, respondents were presented with 17 different forms of activism, ranging from relatively low-risk/cost activities such as donating money, signing a petition, and writing a letter, to relatively higher-risk/cost activities such as attending a rally, acting as a representative on an advisory board, and giving a lecture or presentation on the forestry issue. The variable level of activism consists of the count of the 17 possible activities in which respondents’ have participated (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.843$).

3.5 Results

3.5.1 Motivating Factors

The starting point for this analysis was to investigate the fundamental question: What motivates individuals to mobilize into a social movement? Proponents of the resource mobilization perspective, and their structurally-oriented descendents, have long implicated social ties as a fundamental hook used to reel in new recruits. As a matter of fact, much of the literature seems to imply that social networks are the predominant, if not singular, factor affecting mobilization. In this vein, it was useful to examine whether social networks were indeed as ubiquitous a factor in the mobilization process as many claim. A single hypothesis was formulated to examine if multiple possible pathways are evident (H1), and to investigate this issue, responses to a single survey item were examined. Table 3.2 shows the number and proportion of individuals with affirmative responses to the question: “Was your decision to become a member of [your social movement organization] in response to any of the following?”

Table 3.2 undeniably challenges the broad generalization that social networks were the predominant motivating factor in the movement recruitment process, at least for these British Columbia environmental movement members, and instead provides strong support for the argument that multiple possible pathways to participation need to be considered. Without exception, the four least mentioned motivations were the network factors—being asked to join
by a friend (5.8 percent), an acquaintance (3.4 percent), a family member (2.4 percent), or a co-worker (1.8 percent). On the other hand, the two motivations mentioned most were exposure to print-news media of either the wilderness preservation issue in general (43.9 percent) and/or the particular group and its activities (37.4 percent). Additionally, about one-quarter of all respondents also stated that movement-disseminated media, such as flyers (26.1 percent), posters (23.9 percent), direct mail (15.0 percent), or posters (13.7 percent) influenced their decision to join. Cumulatively, only 13.1 percent of the respondents indicated that social ties affected their decision to join, while 56.2 percent implicated some form of media. Thus, the evidence from Table 3.2 supporting H1 is persuasive—social networks are not the panacea of mobilization that many claim, and further, exposure to media far outpaces other motivations.

Finding that alternative motivations exist was important, but this basic result also begs other questions. In what ways do individuals who were motivated to join the movement by social network ties compare and contrast with those motivated to join due to exposure to various media? What role do social ties actually play in the mobilization process? Do the different motivations result in different levels of subsequent activism? We now turn to questions such as these with Table 3.3, which shows the mean values comparing the two motivations across the several sociodemographic, social network, collective identification, and activism measures.

3.5.2 Group Differences

The top part of Table 3.3 shows that those environmental movement members who stated that were motivated to join the movement because of social ties were not statistically different than those motivated by media in terms of any of the sociodemographic control measures. Both groups were roughly half male and half female; the mean age was about 45 years old; they spent approximately 16 years obtaining their education.

The middle third of Table 3.3 reveals that with regards to the social network measures statistically significant differences did arise; both the in-group network degree (H2) and ties to other groups measures (H3) differed across the two motivations. As the hypotheses predicted, in both cases, those who were motivated by social networks had significantly more ties than those motivated by media.

Maybe most importantly, from Table 3.3 we also see that the media-motivated respondents identified more with the movement than those that were network-motivated.
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While the conventional understanding is that a collective identity will be more predominant among members of a group of individuals that interact (i.e., were motivated to join the movement through social networks) than those that decided to join because of relatively non-social factors (i.e., media effects) (for example, see Diani 1995; McAdam and Paulsen 1993), this notion was not supported. Instead, critical support is lent to the notion that targeting through the media builds on emotionally salient values and attitudes contributing to group-differentiating characteristics, while this is less the case with targeting through social ties. The variable level of emotional salience arose as a notable difference in identification, since the bond between a person and the group is a function of the degree to which targeting attempt was able to access and build off of relevant values and attitudes.

Table 3.3 also shows that regardless of the activist's initial motivation for joining the environmental movement, levels of subsequent activism are about the same (failing to support H5), with respondents indicating they participate in roughly 5 of the 17 different activism-oriented behaviours. Initially, one might expect that individuals drawn into the movement through networks ties should reveal higher levels of activism, as the ties that pulled them into the movement are thought to foster greater levels of activist participation (McAdam and Paulsen 1993). But before drawing any conclusions, we also need to take into account the role that identification plays.

Individuals who identify more with the movement, holding all else constant, are apt to participate in more activities than those who identify less. If these people were indeed attracted to the movement because of relatively strong emotional or moral convictions, greater rates of participation should follow. Thus, it is quite possible that two processes are interacting, confounding the results with regards to levels of activism. On the one hand, those motivated to join via social networks likely participate in activism-oriented activities at higher rates due to social influences and obligations; on the other hand, those motivated by media likely participate in a higher number of activist behaviours because they feel stronger about the issue. Unfortunately, these effects cannot be differentiated here, but this issue clearly warrants further exploration in future research.

In summary, we can say that the respondents motivated to join the environmental movement through social ties did not differ from those motivated to join due to media exposure in terms of sociodemographics or levels of activism. Where they do differ is in term of social networks and identification with the movement. Differences were detected in terms of in-group ties and ties to other social movement organizations, where in both cases, as one
might expect, those motivated to join through social networks revealed *more* ties than those motivated by media.

Also and maybe most surprising, the two groups did differ in terms of identification with the environmental movement: those motivated by media identified *more* with the movement than those motivated by social networks. Though not easily understood within the context of Klandermans and Oegema’s original depiction of the “four steps towards participation,” this last finding makes sense when viewed under the framework of the adapted model presented here. These media-motivated individuals identify more with the movement because the targeting attempts used to attract them were likely emotional, sentiment-based, moral appeals, which proved to be quite salient and aligned with their underlying personal identity.

### 3.6 Discussion and Conclusion

Today, if social movement researchers were tasked with defining a wide-ranging, general model of activist recruitment and mobilization, it would probably highlight the role of existing social networks in drawing people into active participation more than any other factor. At first glance, this seems reasonable and convincing. Many of us would have little problem approaching a close friend, relative, co-worker, or maybe even acquaintance, and convincing them to attend a meeting with us of a group or organization we have just recently discovered. On the flipside, we might feel a certain obligation if a close friend or relative asked us to attend a meeting of theirs. Then again, maybe I just ran into an old acquaintance I made when volunteering with Group X who told me about a great new Group Y that I should check out and possibly join. Clearly, an abundant array of other scenarios supporting the significance of social networks in mobilizing individuals into social movements are easily imaginable and numerous studies have supported the idea that social ties play an important part in facilitating such recruitment.

That said, however, it is also critically important to recognize that there are others who, quite simply, did not know anybody affiliated with the movement when they first decided to join. Even the staunchest supporter of the social networks perspective surely needs to concede the fact that other people have joined movements who simply did not know any others already in the group—thus, social networks are not the panacea of the mobilization process.

All the same, the drawback of the social networks perspective is not that it fails to accurately describe a path towards social movement mobilization, for surely, in many cases it
successfully does this. Rather, the dilemma with existing network perspectives is that they do not provide reasonable explanations of alternative paths to mobilization and participation for those where social networks were not a significant factor in getting them to join. Nevertheless, I am not proposing that we start over, throwing the proverbial ‘baby out with the bathwater’. Instead, this theoretical divergence can be remedied by adapting a familiar and well-accepted model of social movement mobilization (Klandermans and Oegema 1987) to better integrate notions of framing and collective identity—a means of inserting a greater degree of agency into the phenomenon of social movement mobilization. This paper presented this revised model and explained its operation and significance in the context of a specific social movement, namely the British Columbia environmental movement top protect old growth forests of the 1990s.

The proposed model suggests that initial recruitment into a social movement may be facilitated by factors other than (or in addition to) social network ties (H1). In this expanded view, I argue that media presentations (be they news or materials originating from the movement) of a social movement issue or conflict can provide the initial impetus for one to act. Particular messages and symbols—or “collective action frames” a la Snow and Benford (2000)—presented in the media resonate with a member of the audience and they find that the movements’ goals and objectives are congruent with their own individually-held beliefs, values, and attitudes. If this alignment resonates enough with the individual, they will be prompted to action.

For example, if the audience member is an environmentalist who holds certain values and attitudes towards the way in which humankind should relate to and treat the natural world, they may be especially shocked and affected by images in the media of a massive clearcut devastating a pristine old growth forest in coastal British Columbia. If these images resonate with the potential recruit, an initial ‘frame alignment’ can occur between the individual and the movement or movement group. Resultantly, this alignment facilitates (or at least eases) the process of social movement mobilization. If other barriers can subsequently be overcome, the new activist will continue to participate in various forms of activism over time. In reality, this is not a new perspective, but what is novel is that in this paper such a trajectory is integrated into a model that also explains network-based mobilization.

When comparing and contrasting the survey respondents differentiated by the two motivating factors, based on our current understandings, some expected and some unexpected results arose—all, however, explainable in the context of the adapted model.
As should be expected, the network-motivated respondents revealed more ties to other individuals in their immediate social movement organization (H2) than the media-motivated respondents, as well as other groups in the environmental movement (H3). More notable, however, are the results with regards to the respondents’ level of identification with the environmental movement. Interestingly, the level of identification significantly differed between the two groups. Most work on the social network pathway has suggested that socialization into a movement group will generally reinforce and bolster the collective identity associated with that group. Instead, it was shown here that those individuals with a relatively weaker, more disassociated network (the media-motivated respondents) revealed higher levels of identification (H4). But this too can be explained using the adapted model.

In many cases, and especially for those not motivated through networks, attitude- and value-oriented group identification and differentiation are the primary avenues in which targeters attempt to rouse emotion- and moral-based action in potential recruits. Via media, targeting is unilateral and finite; through network ties, it is reciprocal and open-ended. Generalized, nonspecific recruitment attempts need to be cast in much broader terms to capture the widest possible audience, and some sense of moral shock is often what is needed to actually spur action. With such appeals, distinct lines are drawn in the sand between ‘us’ and ‘them’ more clearly differentiating the in- and out-groups. This differentiation results in a stronger sense of collective identification for those attracted to the movement via media. Such distinction is not always necessary for those pulled into the movement by a social relation, because other factors can facilitate (or even bypass) the frame alignment the step.

A recruiter and potential recruit can personally interact in ways that rely more on reason, and less on emotion, to bolster an alignment of the recruit’s values and attitudes with the movements’ goals and objectives. Also, it is possible that this alignment step can be entirely bypassed if the recruiter, instead of appealing to attitudes and values, relies on other factors such as personal obligation, social influence, social comparison, or other factors to get the potential recruit to mobilize into the movement. Either way, the end result can be exactly what was found here—a relatively weaker sense of identification for those respondents who were motivated to join the movement through networks as compared to those motivated to join because of media exposure.

9 This is not to say that emotion- or moral-based appeals cannot flow through interpersonal ties, just that they are not necessary to get a potential recruit to join a movement through social ties.
This work is clearly just a first step toward gaining a better understanding of this initially-unconnected cohort. But this cohort can potentially have tremendous impact on the overall efficacy of a social movement and more attention on it is clearly warranted if we are to claim we really understand a particular social movement.
Figure 3.1 Klandermans and Oegema's (1987) Model of the Four Steps towards Participation (adapted from Klandermans 2004).

Figure 3.2 Model depicting Alternative Pathway towards Social Movement Participation (adapted from Klandermans and Oegema 1987 and Klandermans 2004).
Table 3.1 Descriptive Statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Valid n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociodemographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female = 1)</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment (in years)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Networks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group network degree</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to other groups</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Identification</strong></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Activism</strong></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 Responses To: Was your decision to become a member of [your group] in response to any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read a newspaper or magazine article about a wilderness preservation issue.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read a newspaper or magazine article about [your group] activities.</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You heard about the “Carmanah Giant” and decided something had to be done to preserve old growth forests.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You read a flyer produced by [your group].</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You saw a poster about a wilderness preservation issue.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You heard about the threat to the Marbled Murrelet’s nesting grounds.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You received a mailed request from the [your group] to join.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You saw a poster about [your group] activities.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You attended a pro-wilderness preservation rally and decided to join the [your group].</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friend who belonged to the [your group] asked you to join.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An acquaintance who belonged to [your group] asked you to join.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family member who belonged to [your group] asked you to join.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A co-worker who belonged to [your group] asked you to join.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 381.

Multiple responses possible--percentages do not sum to 100.
Table 3.3 T-Tests Comparing Social Networks as a Motivation for Mobilizing Versus Media as a Motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Motivation for joining the movement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Networks (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociodemographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = female)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48 (.51)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.22 (17.17)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.76 (1.93)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group network degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.16 (.80)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to other groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.85 (1.83)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14 (.57)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Activism</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.29 (3.22)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001 (Two-tailed).
3.7 References


4 FRAMING THE WILDERNESS: ACTIVIST-LEVEL CHARACTERISTICS AFFECTING RATES OF CITATION IN PRINT-NEWS MEDIA

4.1 Introduction

A complicated and dynamic relationship exists between social movements and the news media. Social movements rely on news coverage to draw critically needed attention to their cause; the news industry values the attention that vociferous and contentious movement activities and events can attract. As Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993:115) state, “most conversations between social movement actors and journalists take a drearily predictable form, ‘Send my message,’ say the activists; ‘Make me news,’ say the journalists.”

The movement-media interaction is a complex process and an array of different factors can affect what movement messages actually make it into the news. There is a rich collection of literature positing how certain structural (social, political, and economic) opportunities and constraints affect movement access to media, with the foci typically being issues of power and dependency; another avenue of research looks at how cultural factors such as the battle over meaning and message construction affect the movement-media interaction; and yet another avenue of inquiry looks at individual journalist characteristics, such as personal values and ideologies, and news reporting practices, such as deadlines and routines.

While certain structural and cultural factors, as well as various journalist characteristics, undoubtedly affect the movement-media interaction (and thus, what gets into the news), other factors surely do as well. Questions remain about how more individual, source-level factors affect the movement-media interaction. The movement-media relationship has long been viewed as a complex and dynamic interaction (see Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993), but where in this supposedly two-sided exchange do the actions and interests of movement actors fit in? What role do activist level characteristics play in the broader theories of media coverage? Little empirical work has looked at how various characteristics of movement activists affect media coverage, and this is the purpose of this paper.

More specifically, using multiple datasets related to the conflict over preserving the old growth forests of coastal British Columbia in the highly contentious 1990s, I evaluate how a certain

---

1 A version of this chapter will be submitted for publication. Malinick, Todd E. “Framing the Wilderness: Activist-Level Characteristics Affecting Rates of Citation in Print-News Media.”
set of individual-level, activist characteristics (degree of centrality in the environmental movements' communication network, formal leadership role, radicalism, and gender) relate to the frequency with which activists are cited in print-news media using various types of collective action frames (diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational).

Before proceeding to a more detailed theoretical discussion of the issues examined in this paper, a brief introduction to the forestry conflict and the resulting environmental movement of British Columbia follows.

4.2 The Forestry Conflict and Environmental Movement of British Columbia

For many, the battle to preserve old growth forests in coastal British Columbia was best symbolized by the summer of 1993, when local, national, and international news covered the arrests of over 800 protesters throughout the summer who collectively blockaded logging access to forestlands in Clayoquot Sound, Vancouver Island—an event that became known as the single largest act of civil disobedience in Canadian history. However, while this summer of 1993 is familiar to many, the forestry conflict in the province has a much longer history.

The debate over wilderness preservation in British Columbia has generally been centered in the western part of the province, primarily on the rural, coastal mainland and adjoining Vancouver Island. This vast area contains some of the largest remaining intact tracts of old growth temperate rainforest in the world, but also contains some of the largest and most productive industrial forests on the globe.

In British Columbia, the forest industry has been one of the greatest contributors to the provincial economy for most of the province’s history (Barnes and Hayter 1997; Drushka 1999; Drushka, Nixon, and Travers 1993; Hayter 2000; Marchak 1983; Marchak, Aycock, and Herbert 1999; Markey et al. 2005). This economic dependency has resulted in a complicated set of relationships between the various stakeholders, including the forest industry, the forest workers and rural communities, the government, and the province’s citizenry. Historically—and in many instances and areas still today—significant primary and secondary employment was provided by the industry and, thus, support for its well-being has been fairly widespread (Marchak 1983). Laws and

2 Note that the province has been home to aboriginal, or First Nation, peoples for many thousands of years. Though they have extensively used the forest resources for subsistence throughout history, the forest industry that I speak of did not become relevant until after white settlers arrived from Europe in the late 18th century.
regulations were typically drafted greatly favouring industry access to timber (Drushka 1999), while providing few enforceable environmental protections.

Decreasing amounts of old growth and the related damages to the environment by widespread and often unchecked logging became widely recognized as critical issues by the provincial citizenry and became an important political issue in the late 1980s and 1990s (Wilson 1998). As a result, an environmental movement active in fighting for greater restrictions on the forest industry arose.

4.3 Literature

4.3.1 Media and Social Movements

Central problems for all social movements include attracting the support of the general public, mobilizing adherents, and demobilizing challengers (Snow and Benford 1988; also see Gamson and Modigliani 1989). Movements accomplish these tasks in a multitude of ways (e.g., direct mail, face-to-face appeals, and interorganizational requests for cooperation), but the most common avenue involves interaction with news media (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Oliver and Meyers 2003; Ryan 1991). Strategically, there are reasons why working through media is not only a good plan for movements, but a necessary one.

Cohn, Barkan, and Halteman (2003:312) contend that “social movements are unlikely to succeed if their members do not actively present the movements’ aims to the wider public and exert pressure on politically, economically, and culturally powerful institutions.” News media play a critical role in facilitating this process by significantly influencing the day-to-day operations of civic and political society by affecting interest in, opinions of, and maybe most importantly, exposure to, various contentious issues. Further, in terms of the interests of certain actors such as the environmental movement, media are “the avenue through which the majority of the public becomes aware of impending environmental threats” (Hutchins and Lester 2006:434). In this way, Cracknell (1993:7) proclaims that a “cumulative build-up of media coverage on a set of related social problems can act both to stimulate and to reflect shifts in public opinion,” but also, “by alerting governmental institutions to public interest in environmental issues the mass media undoubtedly helps to push environmental concerns up the political agenda” (ibid. 9; also see Brulle 1996; Dispensa and Brulle 2003).

Since social movements usually do not have direct ties to the public and decision makers, they often rely on media to disseminate their message. In this way, the news media act as an
intermediary in the information dissemination process by filtering social movement messages. Thus, a social movement must act strategically to get its interpretation of events, causes, and potential solutions to the public. The notion of collective action framing has arisen to help explain these efforts.

4.3.2 Framing

In this increasingly complex age of modernity, we constantly face a never-ending bombardment of information—informal and formal interpersonal communications, print- and broadcast-news stories, commercial and non-commercial (i.e., interest group) advertising and promotions, etc.—and a means of classifying clusters of ideas is needed to fight cognitive overload. In the social sciences, the notion of framing (see Goffman 1974) has evolved to capture this idea of cognitive classification and categorization. Frames effectively sort the vast amount of information and events in our daily world into condensed, filtered, and simplified sets of ideas and concepts.

In the specific context of social movements, a more specific form of framing has been discussed, namely collective action framing. Collective action frames consists of intentionally and strategically formulated interpretive packages functioning to condense and summarize the facts of the world ‘out there’ in a way that eases public uptake and understanding of a collective issue (Benford 1993a, 1993b; Gamson 1992; Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford 1988). They are strategically used by social movements—and analogously by their challengers such as countermovements and representatives of the state—to garner general public support for their cause and to attract potential constituents and mobilize them (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Scheufele 1999; Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford 1988); they are simultaneously used by media to simplify presentation of complicated issues in the course of reporting the news (Anderson 1997; Dispensa and Brulle 2003; Gamson et al. 1992; Ryan 1991; Scheufele 1999; Tuchman 1978).

In efforts to strategically frame an issue, movements aim to align their frames with the values and attitudes of potential activists with the hope of convincing them that they are part of something much bigger, hence triggering some reaction that motivates them to take action and mobilize into the social movement (Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Snow et al. 1986; also see Brulle’s 1996 discussion of ‘environmental discourse’). “Collective action frames are action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimize the activities and campaigns of a social movement organization” (Benford and Snow 2000:614). It is important to note, however, that framing is not a one-way street where information is simply imposed on a passive public by interest
groups and media. Instead, it is an iterative process where actors and audiences interact in complex, recursive ways to constitute and reconstitute meaning (Benford and Snow 2000; Doyle, Elliott, and Tindall 2000; Gamson 1992; Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Hansen 1991). Benford and Snow (2000:613, citing Hall 1982) state that movements “are deeply embroiled along with media, local governments, and the state, in what has been referred to as ‘the politics of signification’.”

In their extensive literature on the subject, Robert D. Benford and David A. Snow (2000) present three core framing tasks critical to the functioning and success of a social movement: (1) diagnostic, (2) prognostic, and (3) motivational. While together as a set these core framing tasks serve to make the contentious issue relevant and ‘resonant’ to an audience, independently each of them accomplishes different functions. Diagnostic frames involve not only identifying the problem—undeniably the starting point of any social movement—but also attribution of cause, blame, or culpability for the situation to someone or some group. Prognostic frames consist of statements meant to explore and define possible solutions to the problem and strategies meant to resolve them. Motivational frames are what Benford and Snow (2000:617) quite simply refer to as a moral “call to arms.” The strategic use of the frames can vary across activists and social movement organizations, as well as over time as the cycle of protest ebbs and flows (Cormier and Tindal 2005; Diani 1995; Tarrow 1998).

Collective action framing, though important, is not the only factor determining what actually makes it into the news and how these issues are covered. The literature also suggests that there is an array of social, political, and economic considerations to take into account.

4.3.3 Other Considerations Affecting News Coverage

Some argue that social movement activists tend to have relatively little control over the stories that are covered by media (Entman and Rojecki 1993; Gitlin 1980; McCarthy, Smith, and Zald 1996), or how media eventually represent the sources claims (Baylor 1996; Klandermans and Goslinga 1996). Gamson and Modigliani (1989) suggest an asymmetrical dependency exists between social movements and media (also see Carroll and Hackett 2006). On the one hand, social movements rely on media to attract support and mobilize adherents by disseminating their message; on the other hand, media relies on movements to provide reportable subject matter that attracts an audience, thus affecting profits and market share. This relationship is asymmetric in the sense that the movements are much more dependent on media than vice versa. Further complicating matters, however, are other, more specific factors affecting the way in which news is reported.
Some argue that journalism is a profession where tensions exist between the theoretical ideal of objective coverage emphasized in academic journalism programs, and the more ‘managed’ demands of the real world. Researchers have discussed an array of factors that can affect the way in which news is presented (Croteau and Hoynes 2003; Scheufele 1999; Shoemaker and Reese 1996; Tuchman 1978). For example, some argue that because media organization are, with few exceptions, *media businesses*, overriding organizational objectives such as profit maximization and the appropriation of market share play a dominant part in determining what makes the news (Ericson 1991; Gitlin 1980). Embedded within this view is the notion that sensationalized, dramatic depictions of situations prevail (e.g., ‘what bleeds leads’), as this type of coverage attracts the most attention and readership (Carroll and Hackett 2006).

Another important vein of research suggests that there is an inherent tendency for media to promote hegemony. The basic argument here is that factors such as close personal relationships between media executives and advisory board members or other influential friends (Gitlin 1980), overlapping and interlocking boards of directors between media organizations and powerful corporate interests (Marchak 1983), and the fact that the vast majority of a media organizations income comes from corporate advertising (Croteau and Hoynes 2003) contribute to the tendency of the media to promote status quo-supporting interests.

Some also point to an array of other factors that can also affect the way in which the news is reported (see Anderson 1997; Scheufele 1999; Tuchman 1978; Ryan 1981; Shoemaker and Reese 1996). Among other things, norms and values like balance and objectivity in reporting, the pressures of interest groups, journalistic routines, and ideological or political orientations of journalists can work to offset the economic or hegemonic influences.

It soon becomes clear, however, that *en masse* all of these perspectives cannot simultaneously be true. Can media promote sensationalize and dramatic events while at the same time offering objective and balanced coverage? If the dominant capitalist ideology truly does govern or affect media operations, how is it that favourable coverage of social movement issues even makes it into the news? Further, this literature is also incomplete, as it fails to take into account other important factors that govern what makes it into the news, namely characteristics of the social movement sources. However, this study shows that integrating certain source characteristics into the mix reveals important insight into the sometimes inconsistent and generally unanswered question of what actually gets into the news.
4.3.4 Source Characteristics

While numerous theories exist regarding how social, political, and economic factors, cultural issues, and journalistic-level considerations affect media coverage of social movement activities, there is a relative dearth of work empirically examining more individual, source-level characteristics. Four specific source characteristics are considered in this study, including (1) whether or not the source holds a formal leadership position in the movement; (2) the source’s degree of social network centrality in the movements’ communication network; (3) whether or not the source is radical; and (4) the source’s gender. Because leadership and social network centrality are so closely related, they are discussed together, while radicalism and gender are introduced separately.

4.3.4.1 Leadership and Social Network Centrality

Formal social movement organization leaders have certain responsibilities and tackle an array of different tasks: “They inspire commitment, mobilize resources, create and recognize opportunities, devise strategies, frame demands, and influence outcomes” (Morris and Staggenborg 2004:171). In sum, leaders strive to garner general public support for the movements’ cause and promote mobilization of constituents (Snow and Benford 1988). Media operate as a crucial link between movements and the public and a valuable tool for interacting with media includes strategic use of ‘salient’ and ‘resonant’ frames (Benford and Snow 2000; Snow and Benford 1988). Morris and Staggenborg (2004:186) clearly argue:

Social movement leaders, as actors most centrally engaged in movement framing, devise media strategy, make judgments regarding information provided to media, conduct press conferences, and are usually sought out by media to serve as movement spokespersons.

The notion of leadership in social movement research, however, is not nearly that straightforward. For example, some suggest that “there is an ingrained tendency in social movement organizations to question leadership positions” (Klandermans 1989:217). Since social movements inherently challenge the existing order—some would say this even defines a social movement (for example, see McCarthy and Zald 1977; Tilly 1978; Touraine 1981; Turner and Killian 1987)—bureaucratic, hierarchical structures are avoided in favour of less centralized, more egalitarian organizational forms. In this way, the relative influence and importance of particular individuals is downplayed and the intentions of the movement as a whole are, instead, the focus (Morris and
Staggenborg 2004). Maybe because of this view many researchers have come to define ‘leaders’ more in terms of factors such as influence, authority, and status, and less as a symbolic title or role (Diani 1995, 2003; Nepstad and Bob 2006).

Under a social network conceptual framework, actors possessing greater influence, authority, and/or status are those that are more central to their networks (Bonacich 1987; Cook et al. 1983; Diani 1995; Faust 1997; Freeman 1979; Knoke 1994; Knoke and Burt 1983; Marsden 1983; Wasserman and Faust 1994). Speaking more specifically in terms of the type of network evaluated in this study, those figures who are more central in a movements’ communication network have control over the flow and transmission of information (see Freeman’s 1979 discussion of work by Bavelas 1948; Cohn and Marriott 1958; Shaw 1954; Shimbel 1953). As Freeman (1979:219) states: “With respect to communication, a point [actor] with relatively high degree [centrality] is somehow ‘in the thick of things’.” This person not only has direct links with multiple others inside the movement, affecting intra-movement flow, but because of their unique central location, also provide indirect paths through which they affect inter-movement information exchange with otherwise unconnected individuals or groups (Diani 1995, 2003; Friedkin 1982). In this way, an actor more central to a social movement communication network likely has a dramatic effect on the information (and thus, frames) provided to media.

Mario Diani (1995, 2003) looks extensively at the issue of social networks as they relate to social movements, especially in his study of the Italian environmental movement of the 1970s and 1980s. When discussing the role of network centrality in delineating de facto leader groups, he states:

The most central [social movement organizations] were more likely than others to have access to the media...The most central actors were, in other words, more likely to be perceived by media and external observers as the actors entitled to speak up on behalf of the movement as a whole (2003: 110).4

Thus, leadership and network centrality need not be entirely movement-based designations—they can also be a function of how media (or other outsiders) makes certain actors

---

3 ‘Network centrality’ is discussed in more detail in the Methods section, but suffice it to say here, most simply, more central actors are individuals who have a relatively greater number of ties or relationships with others in their network—someone with more social ties relative to someone with fewer is, thus, more ‘central’.

4 Though speaking specifically of social movement organizations, there is little reason to believe a similar process does not operate at the level of the individual activist.
more visible within the movement (Diani 2003; Kielbowicz and Scherer 1986). Benford and Snow (2000) argue that status plays a significant role in deciding who a journalist will go to as a source. Similarly, Tuchman (1974:112, also see Morris and Staggenborg 2004) argues that credibility is the key and journalists seek out a "responsible spokesman," and not necessarily a formal leader.

4.3.4.2 Radicalism

Della Porta and Diani (1999:173), citing Dalton (1988:65), propose that forms of action rest along a continuum from least to most extreme, with four primary thresholds defining the steps along the continuum. First, is the transition from conventional to unconventional politics; second, is a tendency towards more active, direct action forms of protest; third, involves the move from legal to illegal, but nonviolent, actions; fourth, are violent forms of action.

Degrees of radicalism can vary across different social movement organizations in the same movement as well as activities initiated by a single social movement organization. Dalton (1994) shows how some familiar environmental groups in Britain, such as Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace, were quite radical in terms of the image they tried to present to media to attract initial attention, but in regards to their actual agendas, operated squarely within the existing social and political systems. Rootes (2004, 2007) suggests that while some radical groups use showy and dramatic actions to attract media attention and affect change, other radical groups use such tactics only as a means of disrupting the specific activities they oppose (also see Seel and Plows 2000). The moniker ‘eco-terrorists’ has arisen to define some of these radical activists and groups that espouse vandalism and sabotage, the most familiar possibly being Earth First! and the Earth Liberation Front, both found responsible for an array of destructive actions across the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom.

---

5 In this study, causal direction is empirically indeterminate—does the structure of movements make individuals more central, or is this a function of outside factors? That said, however, in a practical sense, it seems likely that communication network centrality is really a function of influences both internal and external to the movement. Though not testable with the existing data, this is the perspective taken in this paper.

6 Other, more refined typologies have been suggested in the literature. For example, Button et al. (2002) classify the Earth Liberation Front as a terrorist group, while Earth First! is considered a militant environmental pressure group. However, though a notable range of radicalism likely exists across the activists examined here, the basis for classifying an activist in this study as ‘radical’ relies on the first stage along Dalton’s continuum, which implies that all ‘radicals’ will tend to operate, at a minimum, in a way that challenges existing system. As such, radicals generally operate ‘outside the box’, and tend to promote or propose ideas and values that are not mainstream or aligned with the current social system (della Porta and Diani 1999).
Proponents of one popular view of social movements, namely the resource mobilization perspective, have typically portrayed activists and social movement organizations as actors relying on rational, pragmatic, and instrumental criteria for deciding upon the appropriate “strategies, tactics, targets, organizational forms, and deliberative styles” (Polletta and Jasper 2001:292). But, they argue, other factors can also affect such decisions. Namely, a collective identity “can supply criteria for making decisions that compete with instrumentally rational ones” (ibid. 293) and “tactical and organizational identities often coincide as organizations embody forms of action” (ibid. 293). Automatically linking terms and labels such as ‘eco-terrorism’ and ‘eco-terrorists’ embodies this notion.

Fitzgerald and Rogers (2000), while noting that identity can play a part, steer away from elevating identity to too high a role. Maybe more important, they argue that radicals are typically anti-capitalist in ideology, and as such, usually espouse views and actions that diverge from the status quo, sometimes maybe too far. In contrast to non-radical social movement groups and activists, who tend to aim their efforts at reforming the current political or economic system in some way, radicals tend to look outside the existing system and are inherently emancipatory. This tendency can even be observed at the organizational level, as radical groups generally opt for non-institutionalized and non-bureaucratic structural forms. Most notable for our purposes, however, Fitzgerald and Rogers also argue that radical social movement organizations tend to be ignored or misrepresented by media. In this way, Snow and Benford (1992) discuss the issue of radicalism and framing when they state that more radical social movement organizations get relegated to the periphery in the contest over meaning because the moderates are the ones who develop the ‘master frames’.

However, opinions vary as to how radicals get integrated (or fail to get integrated) into the framing discourse and the news. As already mentioned, some believe that media selects content based on the dual objectives of maximizing profit and market share (Croteau and Hoynes 2003; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996), and most typically, these objectives are met by covering issues in a contentious, exciting, or sensationalized way. In this way, some propose that since radicals typically present rather extreme views, or commit dramatic actions, they provide ideal content and they are valued by reporters (Killian 1972; McCarthy, Smith, and Zald 1996; Mueller 1997; Snyder and Kelly 1977). This perspective suggests that radicals would commonly be cited using diagnostic frames, because they need to define their own perceptions of the problem—the
further ‘out there’ their perceptions, the better as far as the media is concerned—and also that they would get cited using motivational frames, because of their emotional value. In terms of prognostic frames, however, this perspective implies that citations from radicals should be fairly few in number, simply because the shock value diminishes once reasonable solutions and paths of action are suggested.

Others, however, suggest that radical views and behaviours are too far outside the norm and actually serve to confuse matters (Fitzgerald and Rogers 2000; Rootes 2007; Snow and Benford 1992). Instead, reporters opt for balance and objectivity, and generally steer away from these types of citations as they only serve to muddy the waters and direct attention away from the real issues. Under this perspective they will opt for more authoritative and accepted sources. Thus, radicals will tend not to get cited as frequently across all types of core framing tasks.

4.3.4.3 Gender

Carolyn Merchant (1997) estimates that globally, roughly 80 percent of grassroots environmental activists are female. There is a substantial amount of literature that finds women are generally more environmentally concerned than men and more likely to participate in environmental organizations (Blake, Guppy, and Urmetzer 1996; Steger and Witt 1989; Zelezny, Chua, and Aldrich 2000). However, Merchant (1997) also notes that a distinct minority of these women are actually formal leaders.

Nevertheless, many researchers have found that it is more likely that males will be leaders of social movements than females (see Brinton 1952; Flacks 1971; Merchant 1997; Morris and Staggenborg 2004; Oberschall 1973; Paxton, Kunovich, and Hughes 2007). Morris and Staggenborg (2004:180) state that “insofar as men have traditionally occupied positions of authority and dominated mixed-sex interaction, the gendered character of leadership in many movements is not surprising.”

Work has also been done on the networking roles that females play in social movements. Robnett (1997:191), in her detailed study of the role of African-American in the U.S. civil rights movement, argues that while females generally did not hold formal leadership roles, they did often function as an “intermediate layer of leadership,” bridging the formal leaders with the movement constituents. In a similar sense, Wilson (1998:50), when discussing the environmental movement of British Columbia, says:
Although men continue hold a disproportionate share of leadership positions in the movement, women are well represented at the activist level, with women such as Colleen McCrory, Vicky Husband, Tzeporah Berman, Sharon Chow, Rosemary Fox, Valerie Langer, and Adrianne Carr exerting a strong influence on the movements' priorities and strategies, it seems fair to say that women are closer to attaining equality here than they are in political parties or most other interest groups.\(^7\)

This literature poses an array of yet unexplored research questions. For example, all else being equal, if we take two leaders (or non-leaders), one male and the other female, is there reason to believe that journalists will show a preference for either in terms of using them as a source? Does this vary by type of framing task? Further, how do gender, social networks, leadership, and radicalism interact in terms of affecting citation rates?

### 4.4 Analytic Strategy and Hypotheses

The overall objective of this study is to investigate how source characteristics affect rates of citation in the print-news media coverage of the British Columbia forestry conflict. This is a many-faceted issue and an array of different issues are considered in the analyses. However, to formalize some of these issues, a series of hypotheses were developed and are tested. First, correlational analyses are utilized to explore three particular bivariate relationships. Second, multiple regression analyses are used to explore three guiding hypotheses regarding the relationships between three of the independent variables (social network centrality, leadership, and radicalism) and the dependent variables. Finally, interviews with print-news media-workers who were key players in covering the British Columbia forestry conflict are used to supplement findings, adding further insight to the interpretation of the results.

The first issue examined is the bivariate relationship between leadership and social network centrality. Though it has not empirically been tested in earlier research, an important question is: Are the formal movement group leaders also the most network-central actors? To explore this issue, the following hypothesis is tested:

\[ H1: \text{Formal leaders will have higher communication-network centrality scores than non-leaders.} \]

\(^7\) Most of these named women are included in the social network data evaluated in this paper.
Gender is included in this study because of a series of expected interactions with other independent variables. Some suggest that males tend to be leaders of social movement groups (Brinton 1952; Flacks 1971; Merchant 1997; Morris and Staggenborg 2004; Oberschall 1973; Paxton, Kunovich, and Hughes 2007). Hence the following bivariate hypothesis is tested:

**H2: Males will be more likely to be leaders than females.**

Work by Robnett (1997) and others suggests that women may hold more central roles in the movement outside of formal leadership positions, and Wilson (1998) has suggested that women held key positions in the British Columbia environmental movement. Thus:

**H3: Women will have relatively higher centrality scores than males.**

While bivariate relationships are useful for providing insight into how the various measures are related to each, information garnered from correlational analyses is of limited use because of the expected interrelated nature of this data. Thus, the analyses next turn to multiple regression analyses to investigate more complex relationships.

The literature suggests that actors who are more central to their movements’ communication network will have influence over the flow and dissemination of information (Bavelas 1948; Cohn and Marriott 1958; Freeman 1979; Shaw 1954; Shimbel 1953), and this should directly relate to who journalists approach for information. Thus:

**H4: Network centrality will be positively associated with citation rates for all core framing tasks inclusive of the effects of the other variables in the model.**

Researchers also argue that one of their primary responsibilities of formal leaders is the task of communicating with the public, and this typically occurs via the media (Morris and Staggenborg 2004; Snow and Benford 1998). To examine this issue, the following hypothesis is explored:

**H5: Formal leadership will be positively associated with citation rates for all core framing tasks inclusive of the other variables in the model.**
Finally, some suggest that the media selects content based its ability to attract market share, and tends to be dramatic and sensationalized (Croteau and Hoynes 2003; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996). In this way, we could expect that radicals would be cited more in the print-news media. Others, however, suggest that radicals tend to be marginalized in the media because of the relative extremeness of their views (Fitzgerald and Rogers 2000; Rootes 2007; Snow and Benford 1992). In this way, radicals should be cited less than their more moderate counterparts. In this study, the latter is used as the basis for the hypothesis:

H6: Radicals will be cited less (using all core framing tasks) than non-radicals inclusive of the other variables in the model.

4.5 Methods

4.5.1 Data
Two quantitative datasets originally collected for different projects were are combined for this study. The first is a database containing records of print-news media citations relating to the forestry conflict in western British Columbia between 1986 and 1992; the second is social network tie data for 34 individuals active in the environmental movement in the Vancouver and Victoria, British Columbia regions in the late 1980s and early 1990s. In addition, qualitative data from face-to-face interviews held with key news-workers operating in the field during the 1980s and 1990s is also used to supplement the findings and discussion.

4.5.1.1 Citation Database
The citation database was previously compiled for a study of media coverage of the forestry conflict in British Columbia over the period 1986 to 1992 (see Cormier and Tindall 2005). This database contains an array of information on citations from 957 print-news articles collected over the time period that mentioned certain place names, topics, or phrases. Among this information is

---

8 The matrix used for collecting the social network data is presented in Appendix B, Section B.4.

9 The interview schedule is included in Appendix B, Section B.5.

10 The following places, topics, and phrases were used to select articles “Carmanah,” “Walbran,” “Clayoquot,” “logging and BC” (British Columbia), “forestry and BC,” “timber and BC,” “environment$ and BC,” “conservation and BC,” “park$ and BC” (‘$’ is a wildcard character).
a tally of the number of 19 particular keyword statements used in each individual article, along with the name of the source that provided it.\footnote{The database also contains information on 30 general ‘themes’, but because of a much higher degree of inter-coder reliability, only the 19 more specific ‘keywords’ are used for this study.}

The collection of keywords was derived by the original researcher in conjunction with an extensive review of the forestry conflict and personal experience. Newspaper articles, social movement organization publications (posters, flyers, and reports), broadcast-news reports, and discussions with social movement organization members and others active in the conflict were all considered when compiling the keyword list. Subsequently, each of the 19 keywords was later classified as a type of core framing task—diagnostic, prognostic, or motivational. Table 4.1 provides the classification scheme for these keyword frames.

Data entry and coding of these articles was done by four coders. Each was given a coding dictionary containing the keywords frames (and themes) and a subsample of articles to evaluate. For all, the entire article was read and the relevant data entered into the database. Intercoder reliability was assessed by selecting 20 articles at random from each coder, and then having the other three coders also enter them. The proportion of times three of the four coders agreed on each keyword frame in each article was calculated. Overall, the mean intercoder reliability was 0.86 and the median was 0.93.

Two types of sampling were used to collect this citation data, with the intent of best representing national, regional, and local coverage of the issues, as well as ideological orientations (liberal versus conservative). The first sample—representative of the national and regional coverage—was actually a census, and came from searches of Canadian Business and Current Affairs Index using the place names, topics, and phrases mentioned in Footnote 10. A broad range of print-news sources were sampled, including the Vancouver Sun, the Globe and Mail (National Edition), MacLean’s, and Western/B.C. Report. This sample represents the more national and regional coverage of the forestry issue. Four hundred and seven (407) articles were located for the time period January 1986 to December 1992.

The second sample, representing the more local coverage, originated from a different study (Tindall 1994, 2002), and though not strictly probability-based, was collected using the same criteria as the first sample. This sample was also collected prior to the formulation of the keyword frame coding scheme, and, thus, there is little reason to believe any bias exists in terms of the actual
frames analyzed in this paper. Sources included *Monday Magazine* and the *Victoria Times Colonist* for the period March 1990 to December 1992. This sample contains 550 articles.

### 4.5.1.2 Social Network Data

The second set of data is social network data collected for prior studies focused on gaining a better understanding of the underlying structure and functioning of environmental movement groups active in the British Columbia forestry conflict (see Tindall 1994, 2002; Tindall, Davies, and Mauboulès 2003). Included in the array of information collected for this study was a survey instrument presented to 28 respondents chosen because they were active in the environmental movement. In this instrument, respondents were asked to indicate whether they had ties to a predetermined list of other individuals active in the forestry conflict.

Originally, the survey instrument asked the 28 respondents (egos) about ties to a wide range of actors (targets) who participated in the forestry debates, including environmental groups, individual activists, representatives of business, politicians, union leaders, and First Nation members/supporters. Since the focus of this paper is on how the media interacted specifically with the social movement organizations in terms of selecting sources, only the relational data for the 34 targets that were members of environmental movement organizations was retained.

Respondents were asked about several different types of social ties, though only data from three of these was used in this study. These relations include:

- *I've talked to this person at least once.*
- *I talk to this person at least a few times a year, but less than once a month.*
- *I talk to this person at least once a month (or more often).*

Responses for these three tie types were aggregated into a single measure indicating whether or not the ego had *ever* communicated with the target. The resulting dataset consisted of a two-mode

12 It is worth noting that the time periods covered are not identical: the first sample covered the full time period January 1986 to December 1992, while the second represented a truncated period from March 1990 to December 1992. Note, however, that the focus of this study (the unit of analysis) is not the article, but the cited activist. The information of primary interest is the frequency that certain environmental social movement organization members were cited using certain collective action frames. Thus, this divergence between the time frames is not a serious methodological issue.

13 In addition to the tie types presented in survey but not included in the analyses in this paper were: “I've never heard of this person”; “I've heard of this person but have no contact with him/her”; “I've worked with this person”; “This person is a close friend”; “I like this person”, and, “I dislike this person”.
(28 egos x 34 targets), single-relation sociomatrix, where each cell \( x_{ij} \) equalled 1 if ego \( i \) had a tie to target \( j \); otherwise the cell value was 0 (for a detailed discussion of two-mode social network data see Borgatti and Everett 1997; Faust 1997; Wasserman and Faust 1994).

This communication tie data was used to calculate the social network indegree centrality score for each of the 34 targets.\(^\text{14}\) This score was calculated by summing the total number of survey respondents \( i \) who communicated with target \( j \). For example, if 23 of the 28 survey respondents indicated that they had communicated with a Target X, the indegree centrality score for Target X is 23. Hence, those targets with a higher indegree score are relatively more central to the British Columbia environmental movements' communication network.

4.5.1.3 Data Management and Data File Creation

The 957 news articles contained in the citation database account for a total of 22,004 total citations. Most relevant to this study, however, is that 210 of these citations were from environmental social movement organization members that were listed as targets in the social network instrument. Consequently, for each of the 34 targets (now the cases in a new data file), in addition to their social network indegree centrality score, data on the number of times they were cited in the print-news media mentioning each of the 19 different keyword frames (and thus, the number of times they were cited using each of the three core framing tasks) also exists. In addition, for each of the 34 cases three dichotomous variables were created indicating: (1) whether or not the activist held a formal leadership position in the movement (1 = yes); (2) whether or not the activist was a member of the radical contingent of the movement (1 = yes); and (3) the individuals' gender (1 = female). All of this information was compiled in a single SPSS data file used for the analyses in this paper. Table 4.2 shows the descriptive statistics and brief descriptions for each of the measures.

4.5.1.4 Qualitative News-Worker Interviews

Information used to supplement the findings and discussion in this paper is taken from interviews held with key news-workers who were active in covering the British Columbia forestry conflict between 1996 and 2000. In total, interviews with 10 news-workers, including one editor and nine journalists are evaluated. The interview participants worked for a variety of British

\(^{14}\) The two-mode data were then converted into a bipartite graph of targets by targets, and various centrality measures were calculated. However, the current analysis only utilizes the point (in-degree) calculated on targets using the two-mode data.
Columbia print-news media outlets, including regional and local newspapers, as well as 'alternative' publications. All of the participants worked extensively either in forestry or environmental news. A semi structured interview schedule was used, consisting of open-ended questions. The questions covered a broad range of topics related to news work: how news-workers established new story ideas, how much freedom they had to choose their own stories, whether they had been pressured by editors because of their coverage of the environmental movement, and so on. The news-workers were also asked about their relationships with different types of news sources (government, forest industry, environmentalists), which tactics were particularly useful for gaining access to the news media, and their perceptions of the quality of media coverage of forestry conflicts.

4.6 Results

4.6.1 Intercorrelations

Table 4.3 shows the Pearson correlation coefficients for all the variables analyzed in this study. Three formal hypotheses are tested in this section. The first looks at the relationship between leadership and communication network centrality. From Table 4.3 we see that the leadership measure is not significantly associated with the centrality score, thus failing to support H1. This finding is noteworthy because it implies that formal leadership and social network centrality are indeed different phenomena—leaders are not the most central actors in the environmental movements’ communication network.

The next two hypotheses examine the role of gender. First note that the correlation between gender (namely males) and formal leadership is not significant, thus failing to support H2. Hence, the general claim that males are more likely to be social movement organization leaders is not supported with this data. Second, also notice that gender (females) is not associated with social network centrality, thus failing to support H3. Hence, it appears that women did not tend to have more central roles in the environmental movements’ communication network (but note, neither did men).

Before moving on to the regression analyses, there are also some interesting, unhypothesized findings from Table 4.3 showing intercorrelations that are worth mentioning. From this table, notice that all three of the core framing tasks are significantly, positively correlated with each other, implying that the activists were generally cited using a diversity of keyword frames—those cited using relatively more diagnostic keyword frames also tended to be cited using more
prognostic and motivational keyword frames; likewise, those cited using relatively more prognostic keyword frames also used more motivational keyword frames.

From Table 4.3 we also see that the centrality score is very significantly, positively associated with all three of the core framing tasks. Thus, for all the framing tasks, those who were more central to the movements' communication network were cited more—a finding that persists when simultaneously modelling all the independent variables in the next section.

The formal leadership indicator is not statistically significantly related to diagnostic and prognostic keyword frames, but is weakly associated with motivational frames. Hence, those who were formal leaders were not cited more than non-leaders using diagnostic or prognostic frames, but were cited more using motivational frames (but note, this latter relationship disappears in the multivariate regressions in the next section). 15

Looking at the associations between radicalism and the others measures in Table 4.3, we see that there is no association with diagnostic or motivational keyword frames, but there is a significant negative relationship with prognostic frames. Thus, while there is no detectable difference in the number of statements radicals used to assign blame for the forestry problems, or prompt action on behalf of it, there is evidence to suggest that they tended to be cited offering actual solutions or remediation less frequently than non-radicals. However, as we will see, some of these relationships change in the models assessed in the next section.

Though Table 4.3 shows that radicals were more likely to be leaders than non-radicals, this result should not be given too much weight as it is likely an artefact of sampling. The radical groups active in the British Columbia forestry conflict tended to be smaller groups, and the activists most people were aware of in these groups tended to be the leaders.

With regards to the last statistically significant result from Table 4.3, notice that the relationship between radicalism and gender is significant, but with a negative correlation, suggesting that, all else being equal, women were more likely to be radicals than men.

Overall, these results highlight some interesting relationships—some expected some unexpected—among these variables. However, simple bivariate analyses greatly limit our ability to

15 Note that keyword frames used for coding the citation data captured the vast majority of the statements cited in the print-news media covering the forestry issue in British Columbia. Thus, the possibility that leaders do indeed communicate most with media, but they just did not use these particular keyword frames, is possible, but highly unlikely. Hence, inferring that it is not leaders who are generally communicating most with media is justifiable.
get at the complex dynamics underlying these relationships. Because of this, we now turn to multivariate regression analyses.

### 4.6.2 Multiple Regressions

Table 4.4 shows the results for individual quasi-Poisson generalized linear models, where the three core framing tasks, as well as total citations, are evaluated as functions of the four source level characteristics.\(^{16}\) First, note that a higher level of centrality in the environmental movements’ communication network is associated with higher rates of citation for all framing tasks (supporting H4). Before moving on, it is important to highlight the significance of this finding. The fact that relatively network-central activists were cited more in the print-news media using the core framing tasks is an especially noteworthy finding because though it may seem logical, to date, this has not been shown empirically. A wide array of research shows that actors more central to networks—and communication networks in particular—have control over the flow and transmission of information (Bavelas 1948; Cohn and Marriott 1958; Freeman 1979; Shaw 1954; Shimbel 1953). This is especially the case with regards to social movements (Diani 1995, 2003). The results here support this claim, but go further by also showing that these more central actors are also the activists that reporters go to for information.

Table 4.4 also shows that non-radicals are more likely to be cited using the three types of frames (supporting H6).

Leadership is not significant in any of the models (failing to support H5), showing quite clearly that leaders are not the individuals that are communicating with the media. Also, gender is not significant in any of the models, suggesting that neither males nor females are a preferred source.

Another additional observation from Table 4.4 is the constant pattern of relationships between the core framing task and the independent variables. Without exception, only higher levels of social network centrality and non-radicalism are useful for predicting the rate of citation using these frame types.

---

\(^{16}\) Generalized linear modeling procedures were used instead of more familiar ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions because the dependent variables are counts. Further, quasi-Poisson distribution functions were chosen because all the dependent variables, in addition to being constrained only to nonnegative values, presented notable over-dispersion (most simply, the standard deviations significantly exceeded the means values—see Table 4.2). This approach results in more conservative and more accurate estimates than OLS procedures (Agresti 2002).
4.7 Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the role that source level characteristics play in determining what gets reported in the print-news media coverage of the British Columbia forestry conflict. An array of hypotheses were tested—some supported, some not—and additional insights were garnered from observing unhypothesized findings.

One interesting finding is that all three of the core framing tasks are positively correlated with each other, suggesting that individuals who were cited in the print-news media on the British Columbia forestry conflict were generally cited using a diversity of frames. Recall that diagnostic frames are statements meant to identify a problem situation and attribute blame for it, and prognostic frames are those statements that suggest solutions to the problems. The fact that those who tended to use diagnostic keyword frames also tended to use prognostic keyword frames makes sense. These are people that were both highlighting the problem and, at the same time, offering feasible means of resolving it. Others have suggested a similar correspondence in the use of diagnostic and prognostic framing (see Benford and Snow 2000; Gerhards and Rucht 1992; Nepstad 1997). For example, Gerhards and Rucht (1992:582) state that “the solutions are, in principle, the reversal of the defined problems and causes.” Benford and Snow (2000:616) contend that diagnostic and prognostic frames go hand-in-hand, and as a pair they can affect actual social movement actions by effectively placing a boundary around the strategies and actual repertoires of action available to groups.

It is also sensible that motivational keyword frames are associated with both diagnostic and prognostic frames. Statements of attribution (diagnostic) and proposals for resolving issues or problems (prognostic) are both apt to be used in conjunction with statements prompting action (motivational). Defining a problem and suggesting feasible solutions are, in themselves, worthy efforts, but keep in mind that one of the greatest tasks of framing in general is to motivate constituents to mobilize. As Gerhards and Rucht (1992:583) state: “the mobilization capacity of a frame is not only determined by the factors within the three dimensions of diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing, but also by its completeness and, above all, by the way the three dimensions are combined.”

A couple of noteworthy findings also arose relating to gender. First, the analysis did not show that men were more likely to be formal leaders (failing to support H2)—a notion that previously had significant support in the literature (but that said, at the same time, women were not
more likely to be leaders either). Another finding was that women were not more likely to central player in the environmental movements’ communication network (failing to support H3) (but neither were men). Robnett (1997) suggests that women often take on key, central roles in social movements as they attend to the day-to-day operations of the movement group, but this was not supported here. For the most part, gender was insignificant throughout these analyses (the only exception being that females were more likely to be members of radical groups). However, this general lack of significance actually does point to an interesting overall finding. Wilson (1998) suggests that women have played a more significant role in the British Columbia environmental movement than in many other movements, and these results may well point to the significance of women (or at least higher degree of gender equity) in this particular movement.

One of the most surprising results was found in terms of the relationship between social network centrality and formal movement group leadership. More specifically, it was the actual lack of significant relationship between the two that was most interesting (failure to support H1), indicating these are clearly two different phenomena.

Some have generalized, proclaiming that the main task of movement leaders is to forward the movements’ message (usually in the form of collective action frames) by interacting with media, and further, that the media seeks these leaders out to act as spokespeople (Morris and Staggenborg 2004). Others, however, have argued that instead of formal leaders, other uniquely placed individuals carry the responsibility of communicating with media (Diani 1995, 2003). When we note that without exception, social network centrality is significantly related to all three of the core framing tasks (supporting H4), while formal leadership is related to none (failing to support H5), we have clear support for the latter, but not the former.

In terms of network centrality, a wide array of literature cites the fact that individuals who are most central to the movements’ communication networks also effectively have control over the flow and transmission of information (see Bavelas 1953; Cohn and Marriott 1958; Freeman 1979; Shaw 1954; Shimbel 1953). This should also translate to rates of communication with the media. However, the nature of this relationship is complex. Is it a processes internal to a movement that affects who is elevated to positions of status and influence (and thus, network centrality), or is that journalists seek out credible and reliable ‘spokespeople’, regardless of the activists structural position? Though it cannot be determined definitively from the data examined in this paper, both internal and external processes are likely at work. On the one hand, internal factors such a
charismatic appeal, popularity, level of overall involvement in the movement, and responsibilities likely affect network centrality; on the other hand, journalists do have preferences and have established relationships that they continually turn to for information. Finding legitimate and publishable sources is a time consuming activity, and with often tight deadlines, reporters typically return to the same sources time after time. In this way, the collection of sources a journalist builds throughout their career is one of the most valuable tools they possess in their trade—maybe a form of social capital.

Significant theorizing has also been done with regards to the role that radicalism plays in media. As mentioned earlier, one commonly held view posits that journalists search out dramatic, confrontational, and exciting material and individuals to report on (Carroll and Hackett 2006; Gitlin 1980). The basic claim is that since economic concerns govern editorial decision making, sensational news is preferred because it tends to maximize readership and, thus, amass the greatest proportion of market share. Successful reporters will be those who are able to present the news in the most dramatic way possible. Consequently, under this view, sensationalized coverage of the radical contingent of a movement should frequently appear in the news. The other popular view portrays the news industry as being essentially governed by the operational values of objectivity and balance. Under this perspective, while certain social and organizational constraints certainly exist, they are mediated by the overarching goal of presenting the news in an unbiased manner.

The multiple regression results show that there is little support for the former, by showing that non-radicals are actually cited more using all the three core framing tasks. But this result also raises another interesting question: Does this mean that objectivity and balance prevail? Examination of the news-worker interviews provides critical insight not obtainable from the quantitative data, and suggests the answer to this question is a qualified: In some ways, yes; in other ways, no.

Reporters indicate that covering drama admittedly has some initial appeal, and is often necessary given the scale and scope of certain protest events such as the events surrounding Clayoquot Sound. More important, however, these reporters also state that when covering ongoing conflicts, at some point a shift must be made towards reporting on the underlying issues. Often, this will quickly steer coverage away from more radical groups who typically participate in the drama and reorient coverage towards the more moderate groups who are able to provide more credible and
reliable information. This point was repeated throughout the news-worker interviews when they were asked what factors affected their selection of stories and sources:

...after a while certain reporters get to a point in a beat, you’re not looking at covering another demonstration. You’re looking at sources who can point you to good information (Interview #4).

...what I was always looking for was the reliability of the information...there are some groups which are quite reliable and there are others who aren’t (Interview #2).

Credibility was the big factor (Interview #5).

In general, these workers indicated that they tended to filter sources, preferring those that “tended to be less zealous” (Interview #3)—thus disproving the general claim that media automatically favours sensationalization and drama. Instead, they preferred sources who they personally felt were more reliable and credible. Even so, at the same time, this did not necessarily translate to objectivity and balance as a notable bias could be detected. What is interesting, however, is that instead of the expected bias sympathetic to the hegemonic, status quo as proposed under the economically-driven perspective, often the actual bias favoured the environmental movement.

To some news-workers the notion of ‘objectivity’ was clearly viewed as an “untenable ideal,” and instead, the notion of ‘fairness’ seems to prevail (Stoddart 2007). To some reporters, because of personal values and ideals, a desire impelled them to present the forestry conflict in a way that symbolized the environmentalists as individuals working for a worthy cause. But, the pro-environmental bias was not unchallenged, and traces of the hegemonic norm sometimes arose. This was evident in one interview (Interview # 7) when a reporter was asked about the way in which his news organization viewed his coverage of the forestry conflict:

*News-worker:* There was, right from the word go, a lot of discomfort with what I was reporting...I was at some points taken aside and told that I had a bit of an agenda. And, you know, could I tone things down, or, could I concentrate a little bit more on the business end of things. And that happened on many occasions.

*Interviewer:* What kind of people would take you aside?

*News-worker:* The business editor, the managing editor, the city editor.

*Interviewer:* And when you say they felt you had an agenda, can you elaborate on that?

*Interviewer:* They quite clearly were uncomfortable with the fact that there were voices in my stories that were not from the business community.
From the statements of one news-worker, there is also the suggestion that in some cases the pro-environmental bias may have been indirectly related to social movement framing. This reporter felt that reporters were generally inexperienced and lacked knowledge of the forestry conflict. Because of this, they often presented relatively superficial, one-sided stories. This person felt environmentalists were easier to talk to than the representatives of industry because they usually take a pretty simple position. "They know how to talk to the media much better than people in the industry" (Interview #1). Surprisingly, he felt that this process even played out in magazines that he would not consider to be proenvironmental.

In summary, this paper shows that only two of the quantitatively evaluated measures are associated with rates of citation. However, this is not the whole story. In addition, the news-worker interviews reveal that credibility is a critical characteristic of an environmental movement source. That said, however, there is a note of caution worth mentioning regarding this paper and the analyses contained in it. The sample size used in the qualitative analysis is somewhat small (n = 34), and thus, the conclusions should be extrapolated with great care. Nevertheless, many of the results are highly statistically significant even with such a small number of cases.

This work opens the door for a wide range of future work looking at the movement-media relationship. What other attributes of activists affect the rates at which they are cited in the news? Who is more responsible for influencing news content, social movement actors or journalists? Do the results mentioned in this paper carry over to other formats, such as radio or television? These questions and an array of others need to be answered before we can say we really have a hold on the movement-media relationship.
Table 4.1 Keyword Frame by Core Framing Task.

**Diagnostic**
- Biological Diversity
- Clear cutting
- Ecosystems
- Marbled Murrelet
- Spotted Owl
- Pacific Yew
- Wilderness

**Prognostic**
- Civil disobedience
- Conservation
- Preservation
- Selective cutting/harvesting
- Sustainability

**Motivational**
- Ancient Forests/Old Growth
- Giants
- Gandhi
- Natural cathedral
- Sacred
- Martin Luther King and/or US civil rights movement
- Brazil of the North
Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Citations</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>8.325</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Total number of citations appearing in print-news media attributed to a particular activist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Frames</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.715</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Number of diagnostic keyword frames appearing in print-news media attributed to particular activist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prognostic Frames</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.893</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Number of prognostic keyword frames appearing in print-news media attributed to particular activist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Frames</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Number of motivational keyword frames appearing in print-news media attributed to particular activist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network Centrality</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>5.810</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Communication network indegree centrality score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indicator of formal leadership role (1 = yes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radicalism</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indicator of radicalism (1 = yes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indicator of gender (1 = female).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n = 34\).
Table 4.3 Intercorrelations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Citations</th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Prognostic</th>
<th>Motivational</th>
<th>Network Centrality (Indegree)</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Radical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Citations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>.89 ***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prognostic</td>
<td>.95 ***</td>
<td>.74 ***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>.87 ***</td>
<td>.57 ***</td>
<td>.84 ***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Centrality (Indegree)</td>
<td>.65 ***</td>
<td>.58 ***</td>
<td>.59 ***</td>
<td>.59 ***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.34 *</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>-.35 *</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.36 *</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.44 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = Male)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.46 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
n = 34.

Table 4.4 Quasi-Poisson Generalized Linear Model Regression Results for Models Examining How Source Characteristics Contribute to Getting Cited in Print-News Media Using the Three Core Framing Tasks and Total Citations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Citations</th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Prognostic</th>
<th>Motivational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network centrality (Indegree)</td>
<td>.14 (.032)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.13 (.042)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal leader (Yes = 1)</td>
<td>.51 (.303)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28 (.431)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical group (Yes = 1)</td>
<td>-1.46 (.416)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-1.22 (.559)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Male = 1)</td>
<td>-.23 (.272)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13 (.393)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.14 (.604)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.71 (.807)</td>
<td>-1.40 (.686)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 34 for all.
Standard errors in parentheses.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.
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5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The three manuscripts presented in this dissertation examined an array of different research questions. However, in aggregate, they also possess certain continuity and coalesce in two main ways. First, they are tied theoretically, examining different issues relating to the social movement mobilization and participation processes. Second, they are inexorably linked because they consider these issues through the lens of a single social movement—the environmental movement to protect old growth forests on Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada in the highly contentious 1990s.

However, before proceeding to a final discussion synthesizing this work and more formally linking the three manuscripts together, what follows is a brief summary of the significant findings of each of the three main chapters along with a discussion of particular limitations and future research directions relating to the various specific manuscripts. Limitations and future research directions are also discussed in the synthesis section, covering broader theoretical questions and applications relating to all three papers.

5.1 Chapter 2 — The War in the Woods: Comparing the British Columbia Environmental Movement and Its Countermovement

5.1.1 Summary of Findings

Theory suggests that a social movement and its related countermovement are essentially two sides of the same coin (Gale 1986; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Meyer and Staggenborg 1996; Mottl 1980; Zald and Useem 1987). After a movement arises to challenge some untenable aspect of the social sphere, a countermovement typically follows as a reactive, opposing force in support of the hegemonic, status quo (Gale 1986; Zald and Useem 1987).

In general, those with a pro-environmental orientation tend to be relatively young, well-educated, females, employed outside the primary sectors, oppose use of the environment for economic gain, and hold rather postmaterialist values (for example, see Jones and Dunlap 1992; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980; Zelezny, Chua, and Aldrich 2000).

If we accept the preceding as true, and expect such a characterization to be theoretically useful, then simple logic suggests that members of an anti-environmental, pro-forestry countermovement should be relatively older, less-educated, males, employed in resource-based industries, support using the environment for economic gain, and who hold materialist values. While this provides a theoretical prediction, Chapter 2 examines whether this is indeed the case.
More specifically, in Chapter 2, the British Columbia environmental movement (EM) was compared to the environmental countermovement (ECM) in terms how the aforementioned set of sociodemographic characteristics and value-based dispositions related to ‘participation’. Typically, researchers measure participation in one of two ways—either in terms of formal membership or in terms of rates of activism—in this chapter, however, both were examined. Such a treatment not only emphasized important distinctions between the movement and countermovement, but also revealed significant differences between the two components of participation. In addition, the findings also point to some significant divergences from the common environmental ideal-type.

In terms of the EM, when including both sociodemographic and value-oriented variables together as predictors (Table 2.6, Models 2 and 6), none of the sociodemographic characteristics were found to be statistically significant in relation to either formal social movement organization membership or levels of activism.1 In terms of the values dispositions of the EM, postmaterialism was significantly related to activism, while both postmaterialism (higher levels) and opposition to use of the environment for economic gain mattered in terms of membership. In terms of the ECM, gender (males), support for using the environment for economic gain and postmaterialism were all associated with activist behaviours; gender (males), lower levels of education, and resource-based employment were all related to formal membership. From this, it becomes clear that membership and rates of activism are two different processes, and only focusing on one or the other would fail to paint a complete picture of ‘participation’.

The results from this chapter also indicate that, in some ways, the EM and the ECM are the flipside of each other. Though not all variables are significant, it is useful to compare the signs of the coefficients from related models (see Table 2.6). In terms of activist behaviours, consider Models 2 and 4: Younger ages are associated with the EM, while older ages are associated with the ECM; males are associated with the EM, while females are associated with the ECM. In terms of formal group membership, consider Models 6 and 8: Older ages are associated with the EM, while younger ages are associated with the ECM; females are associated with the EM, and males are

---

1 As an aside, it is interesting to note that the research in this chapter also parallels the other work on the topic of environmentalism. Early efforts were aimed determining the ‘social bases of environmental concern’ (Jones and Dunlap 1992; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980), and this work gave us the familiar ideal-type of an environmentalist generally being a relatively young, well-educated, female living in an urban area. Later work focused more on factors such as ideologies, attitudes, and values, and found that once these factors were included into the models predicting environmentalism, the sociodemographic variables largely became insignificant (see Cotgrove and Duff 1980, 1981; Stern 2000; Stern and Dietz 1994; Stern, Dietz, and Guagnano 1995; Stern, Dietz, and Kalof 1993; Stern et al. 1999). This is similar to the findings presented in this chapter, which showed that when only sociodemographics were evaluated (Table 2.2, Models 1 and 5) gender and education were significant, but once the ideological measures were included (Models 2 and 6) the sociodemographics become entirely insignificant.
associated with the ECM; relatively higher levels of educational attainment are related to membership in the EM, while lower levels of educational attainment are related to the ECM.

From Chapter 2, probably the most interesting finding relates to the role of postmaterialism. Many have come to relate (and often equate) postmaterialism to a pro-environmental orientation. Inglehart (1990:259) even states that issues such as environmentalism are postmaterialist issues. The results here, however, show that postmaterialism is actually positively associated with greater levels of activism for both the EM and ECM. Further, though a statistically significant difference was found between the mean postmaterialism scale value (EM higher than ECM), it is important to note that on a scale of 0 to 9, both groups scored relatively high (EM = 5.224; ECM = 4.824). From all this, the implication is clear—postmaterialism is not strictly an environmental notion.

5.1.2 Limitations and Future Research Directions

Satterfield and Gregory (1998) argue that there may be a difference between the values that people express in terms of fundamental beliefs (which are what are measured in Chapter 2) and the expression of these values in terms of context-specific objectives or actions. Just because someone may claim to feel a certain way about something does not guarantee that their actions will accord with behavioural expectations under these beliefs. Individual experiential considerations also come into play and people often weigh the practicality of applying a value in the specific conditional context. Thus, behaviours can differ between two people revealing the same value disposition, or even across a single individual under different contexts.

In Chapter 2, I assumed a rather constant relationship between value dispositions (support for economic use of the environment and postmaterialism/materialism) and decisions to join and participate in movement and countermovement activism. However, if these values truly are “disembodied,” as Satterfield and Gregory suggest, the conclusions regarding values in this chapter, though not entirely invalid, may be unstable.

Effective treatment of this issue would necessitate additional data collection focusing on specific measures of basic beliefs, intentions, and contexts (for example, see Dietz, Fitzgerald, and Shwom 2005; Stern 2000; Stern et al. 1999). In this vein, research questions might include: What types of life experiences mediate between beliefs and action? Given two people with similar sets of beliefs or values, how do their ultimate actions vary? Given two people with different sets of beliefs or values, how are their ultimate actions the same? Satterfield and Gregory suggest the context of
the issue can help answer questions such as these, but more empirical work on this issue can add useful further insights, especially as it relates to social movement mobilization and participation.

Another potential limitation of this study (as well as the others in this dissertation) lies with the nature of using historic, secondary data to answer research questions. More specifically, it would have been preferable to include and test whether other factors (e.g., available time and resources, past social movement participation, obstacles to mobilization, and others) might also affect activism and participation, but it was not possible to go back in time and obtain this information. As such, it is important to note that we must view the analysis and findings in this chapter as only a partial description at best. In this vein, in the future, an array of additional research clearly warrants further attention. For example: What other values or attitudes might be significant? Do these other factors relate similarly or differentially across the movement and countermovement? How do they each relate to the different forms of participation? Do factors mediate the relationships between sociodemographics, values, and participation? Questions such as these require additional data, and while this was not possible here, these questions also point to important future research directions.

Probably the greatest limitation with the data and methods used in Chapter 2 relates to the fact that I am essentially using a single community to summarize the movement, and a single community to summarize the countermovement. While it is likely that some residents of Victoria participated in the countermovement, and some residents of Port Alberni participated in the environmental movement, it is also true that Victoria was the hub of activity for the movement during this time as events unfolded with regards to the highly contentious areas of Carmanah and Walbran (and to some degree Clayoquot Sound). At the same time, Port Alberni was the hub of activity for the countermovement. Though it would have been more powerful to sample a much wider geographical range—say Vancouver Island as a whole—to inquire about participation in the two sides of the conflict, the nature of doing research on historical events precludes such efforts.

Several other general directions for future research can be drawn from Chapter 2. First, sociodemographic and value-based factors were shown to be related differentially to membership and levels of actual activism. This suggests that focusing on only one aspect or the other will fail to accurately paint a complete picture of the participation process. Because different social processes likely underlie ‘membership’ and ‘activism’, when studying ‘participation’, it is important to clarify the precise nature of this phenomenon. Thus, as in this study, future research on participation should more precisely clarify the concept and delineate what component of participation is being studied. In doing so it will be important to collect data not just indicating whether someone is a member of a
movement or not, but also some measure of the degree to which they participate in activist behaviours. While membership is clearly a dichotomous variable, as in this study, it will be useful to measure activism on a scale, adding a degree of precision absent in much of the social movement participation literature.

Second, an accurate portrayal and understanding of a social movement may require an exploration of the related countermovement. In the past, generalizations such as postmaterialism being an exclusively environmental value were often unchallenged and accepted. However, if postmaterialism is related to activism in both an environmental movement and its countermovement, as it was here, can it really be a strictly environmental value? Surely, not. Instead, as the findings in this study suggest, it’s more likely that postmaterialism is a broader indicator of more specific underlying factors. Chapter 2 suggested that factors such as a more inclusive worldview may well predispose an individual to participate in actions they feel can change the world in which they live. Clearly, however, this needs verification and further clarification if postmaterialism is to be a useful construct in the future. This future work should involve a closer examination of the individual elements comprising the construct to see how they relate individually to postmaterialist values in contrast to materialist values. If we break it down in this way, can we find a better, more refined set of variables to measure the construct? Do these same factors (i.e., materialism/postmaterialism) operate and relate in the same way when we consider participation in a different type of social movement, or is this specific to the environmental movement? While I agree there is much disagreement and contention surrounding the notion of the postmaterialist thesis, it also seems clear that something is indeed being explained with the construct, and it will be the job of future researchers to better clarify exactly what this something is.

5.2 Chapter 3 — Alternative Pathways to Social Movement Mobilization: Moving Beyond Social Networks

5.2.1 Summary of Findings

It has long been held that social network ties are an important facilitator in the social movement mobilization process (Fernandez and McAdam 1988; Klandermans 1984, 2004; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Marwell and Oliver 1993; Marwell, Oliver, and Prahl 1988; McAdam 1986; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Oberschall 1973; Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson 1980; Tindall 2002, 2004). In addition to exposing potential activists to invitations to join a social
movement group, relationships with others in the movement help to alleviate some of the uncertainty associated with participating (McAdam and Paulsen 1993).

Much of the research on the significance of social ties in the mobilization process follows from a classic article by Bert Klandermans and Dirk Oegema (1987) (also see Klandermans 2004), where they present four ‘steps toward participation’. First, an individual needs to be part of the mobilization potential, or have values and attitudes congruent with the movement. Second, the individual needs to be a target of mobilization attempts, or the efforts of existing activists to contact prospective members. Third, a potential activist needs to become motivated to participate. And finally, fourth, the individual needs to overcome barriers to participation, such as personal, work, or family obligations.

What followed in much of the subsequent social movement mobilization research was a distinct focus on the second of these steps, ‘targeting’. Oddly, however, the agents active in the targeting process were often singularly defined as social network ties. The result has sometimes been the overly-broad generalization that social networks are ubiquitous, the panacea of mobilization. What falls to the wayside in this collection of work is the plethora of individuals who join social movements but do not know anyone already in the movement. It is important to emphasize that the claim is not that that social networks are insignificant, for in a great many cases they surely are critical factors motivating social movement mobilization. Instead, the proposition is that the existing models fail to account adequately for alternative pathways to mobilization.

In an effort to account for the often-large number of social movement group members who were initially unconnected to the movement, an adapted version of Klandermans (2004) revised model (Figure 3.2) is proposed in Chapter 3. Between the steps of ‘targeting’ and ‘becoming motivated to join’, the notion of ‘frame alignment’—or the linking of collective identity to shared values and/or attitudes—is introduced. This is done to emphasize the intentional act of cognitively merging or aligning the characteristics that define the mobilization potential with the grievances, goals, and objectives of the movement. This is useful because it now more cogently allows for multiple forms of targeting.

In addition to direct recruitment attempts through existing social ties, exposure to various media can also play a very important part in the mobilization process. The idea is simple: Particular messages and symbols—or ‘collective action frames’ (Benford 1993a, 1993b; Gamson 1992; Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford 1988)—presented in the media resonate with a member of the audience and these individuals find that the movements’ goals and objectives are congruent with
their own individually-held beliefs, values, and attitudes. If this alignment resonates enough with the individual, they will be prompted to action. Note that absolutely no social tie to the group is necessarily at play here. Instead, certain aspects of a collective identity are accessed through physically-disconnected (but cognitively-connected) social processes facilitated by the media acting as an intermediary.

In Chapter 3, evidence in support of this adapted version of the model was presented (see Table 3.1), showing that more than half of those surveyed (56.2 percent) indicated they were motivated to join the environmental movement because of media, while only 13.1 percent implicated social networks. These two groups were then compared in terms of sociodemographics (age, gender, and educational attainment), social networks (in-group network ties, ties to other groups, and membership in other social movement organizations), and identification.

Table 3.3 showed that neither the sociodemographic measures nor levels of activism distinguish the two groups. The social network measures were, however, significant, and they behaved as existing theory suggests—those motivated to join the movement through social ties revealed more sizable networks. Maybe most notable, however, was the finding that respondents’ level of identification with the environmental movement contrasts with existing theoretical expectations—the findings show that media-motivated respondents had a higher level of identification than network-motivated individuals. Most work on the social network pathway has suggested that socialization into a movement group will generally reinforce and bolster the collective identity associated with that group. However, the somewhat contrary results presented here can be understood with a new look at the role of identity.

Via media, targeting is unilateral and finite, meaning that messages and symbols typically flow to recipients with no further exchange with the sender, and they come in specific doses, such as a newspaper story or a brochure read by the recipient. Through network ties, targeting efforts are reciprocal and open-ended, meaning both sides take part in the exchange, and messages can be adapted and revised iteratively through discussion. Because of this, generalized, non-specific recruitment attempts (i.e., non-network-based recruitment appeals) need to be cast in much broader terms to capture the widest possible audience, and some sense form of emotional or moral appeal is often what is needed to actually spur action. Such appeals often serve to amplify the delineation of ‘us’ and ‘them’. The result of this is a stronger sense of collective identification for those attracted to the movement via media. This need not necessarily be the case with pulled into the movement by
a social relation, because other factors (e.g., social influence, obligation, social comparison) can facilitate (or even bypass) the frame alignment the step (represented as the dotted line in Figure 3.2).

5.2.2 Limitations and Future Research Directions

Probably the greatest limitation to this particular study involves the response rates. Recall from Chapter 3 that three different environmental groups were surveyed: a relatively small, grassroots organization (n=48), a mid-sized environmental group (n=146), and a rather large national organization (n=187). None of the individual response rates reached 30 percent, and one did not even reach 10 percent. Clearly there is potential for bias in that those who responded may have different levels of commitment to their groups or the movement as a whole. This greatly limits the generalizability of the conclusions. Unfortunately, there was no other data against which I could compare the respondents to determine if the samples were actually representative of the population of interest.

Also, since the three different groups were combined for the analyses prior to separating out the two subgroups of analytical interest—those motivated by networks and those motivated by media—the question of whether the differences detected and the conclusions drawn are really representative of all the groups remains. Could differences exist in terms of, say, how social networks influence mobilization into these different organizations? For example, it is feasible—and possibly even likely—that smaller, more grassroots participation may be more susceptible to the influence of social network ties than larger, more national groups who have more resources to dedicate to media. Here, however, the issue of sample size enters the picture as comparing those motivated by networks to those motivated by media at the movement group level would result in subgroup sample sizes too small to evaluate statistically. Thus, future research into this issue would benefit greatly from not only a larger sample as a whole, but also by sampling a greater number of groups of different sizes. Such a research design would allow for the use of more sophisticated hierarchical linear modeling procedures, more appropriate to these types of group-level research questions.

Another limitation to this study is the fact that the social networks variables were all measured post-mobilization—those surveyed were already members of the environmental movement. Because of this, it is not possible to differentiate which particular components of the networks actually motivated the individual to join (pre-mobilization ties) and which formed after
joining (post-mobilization ties). This difference may be important as the social processes underlying these two tie types may operate in different ways.

More specifically, a proposition was made regarding the possibility that frame alignment may not be a necessary step toward participation under certain situations, such as when close friend convince someone to join and processes such as social influence and obligation begin to play a part, but without being able to differentiate the actual pre-and post-mobilization ties, this remains only a supposition. A crucial question needs to be answered: What aspects of social relationships could affect someone's reason for joining a social movement? In this chapter factors such as social influence, social comparison, obligation, and moral pressures were suggested. But these are, admittedly, only hypothesized factors. Future research should look closely at each of these to see how these (and possibly other) mechanisms affect the mobilization process.

Another limitation centers on the choice to use rather simple, bivariate analytical techniques. This choice was born out of methodological concerns over sorting out the temporal flow of factors such as identification and networks. For example: Does identification with the movement precede mobilization, or is it something that develops as a function of membership? Are social ties a cause or a result of participation? Multivariate analyses would surely be useful for sorting out potential interaction effects which cannot be resolved with univariate or bivariate techniques, but data that clearly adheres to a determinate temporal order are necessary.

Other questions, however, also still remain to be answered in future research. While this chapter looked specifically at the roles of social networks and exposure to media as they relate to the mobilization process, could other factors also play a part? This research relied on responses to a closed-ended questionnaire item to determine what activists' motivation were for joining the movement. And, even though this question included a possible "Other (please describe)" response, an open-ended discussion would likely prove more informative.

Also, it would be useful to test these findings with larger-sample, longitudinal data to see if the adapted model holds up, and to explore how the composition of the two groups are affected by time.2 Does the emotion and sentiment accessed through media-related targeting attempts persist over time? How does the structure of social movements change over time? What about changes in

---

2 Actually, a second wave of this survey was completed in 1998, and an analysis of this data was included in an earlier draft of the manuscript presented in this chapter. Problematic, however, was the fact that the sample remaining after six years had gone by was quite small. After classifying the Wave 2 respondents according to their initial motivation to join, only about 6 individuals who claimed to have been motivated to join via social networks were available for analysis. Statistical analyses were, thus, inappropriate.
levels of activism? As the excitement and immediacy of a conflict ebbs and flows, who remains in the movement and who stays most active? Do social network ties play a more important part during low points in the cycle of protest, when dramatic and emotional frames are less likely to reach potential recruits through media? Answers to questions such as these require data across multiple points in time, spread throughout the cycle of protest—something quite rare but critically needed in subsequent social movement research.

5.3 Chapter 4 – Framing the Wilderness: Activist-Level Characteristics Affecting Rates of Citation in Print-News Media

5.3.1 Summary of Findings

A sophisticated and dynamic relationship exists between social movements and news media (Gamson and Modigliani 1989). Social movements and social movement organizations rely on news coverage to draw critically needed attention to their cause; the news industry values the attention and readership that vociferous and contentious movement activities and events can attract (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993).

The movement-media interaction is a complex process and an array of different factors can affect what movement messages—or collective action frames (Benford 1993a, 1993b; Benford and Snow 2000; Gamson 1992; Ryan 1991; Snow and Benford 1988, 1992, 1998; Snow et al. 1986)—actually make it into the news. Extensive research has theorized how certain social, political, and economic constraints affect movement access to media (see Anderson 1997; Croteau and Hoynes 2003; Gamson et al. 1992; Gitlin 1980; Ryan 1991; Tuchman 1978), and some broad generalizations have been posited in the literature. This paper looks at many of these issues, but from the much-understudied perspective of the social movement activist.

More specifically, using both quantitative and qualitative data related to the conflict over preserving the old growth forests of coastal British Columbia in the highly contentious 1990s, Chapter 4 evaluated how a certain set of activist characteristics (degree of centrality in the movements’ communication network, formal leadership role, radicalism, and gender) related to the frequency with which activists were cited in print-news media using various types of collective action frames (diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational).

Correlational results showed that formal leadership and social network centrality are distinctly different phenomena. In general, using regression models (Table 4.4), it was shown that
social network centrality was significantly related to all types of frames (diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational), while leadership was related to none.

Radicalism was also significant across all the models (see Table 4.4). Some researchers have argued that economic concerns usually govern news coverage, and since sensationalized and dramatic news is favored by news workers, radical perspectives and their related media circuses should be common (Carroll and Hackett 2006; Croteau and Hoynes 2003; Gitlin 1980). Another perspective argues that the ideals of balance and objectivity actually prevail (Anderson 1997; Croteau and Hoynes 2003). The results presented in Chapter 4, however, entirely support neither of these expectations. Instead, the results showed that non-radicals were cited more, regardless of the type of frame. In addition, qualitative interviews with some British Columbia news-workers showed that many of them actually had a pro-environmental bias.

Gender was not significant in any of the models (see Table 4.4). This, even though women have taken on key roles in the environmental movement in British Columbia—maybe even more so than in other social movements (Wilson 1998). That said, however, it is also important to point out that men were not cited any more than women using any of the types of frames. Together, this could be evidence that the British Columbia environmental movement was more gender-equitable than many other social movements.

5.3.2 Limitations and Future Research Directions

One greatest limitation of this study is that the small sample size (n=34) greatly limits generalizability. This, however, was due to the nature of the data used for the paper. Recall that two primary quantitative data sources were combined—the citation database and the social network data—and these were not originally designed to be used together. The constraint was that only 34 environmentalists were included in the social network questionnaires (which were later combined with the citation data). That said, however, sampling is a common difficulty when trying to effectively utilize social network data, and no consensus exists on the best way to do so. Research questions and results need to be tempered with the nature of the data collection method used, and the quality and representativeness of the data collected. Here it is also worth noting that the activists included in the social network questionnaire, though not all the actors appearing in the news, were actually quite representative of the citations from the environmentalists appearing in the citation database. Nevertheless, larger-scale studies intentionally designed to explore the links between media and movements would be of significant benefit.
From a strictly methodological perspective, it is worth emphasizing that the sampling procedures in Chapter 4 were not entirely consistent. As stated, certain print-news publications were sampled differently. The first sample (really a census) included more regional and national publications over the period January 1986 to December 1992; the second sample was a non-probability sample focused on more local coverage and consisted of the truncated time-period 1990 to 1992. Nevertheless, these differences should not affect the major conclusions as the unit of analysis in this study was not the publication or article, but rather, the activist. Recall from the discussion in the chapter that the social network matrix was used to derive a list of specific activists that was in turn used to extract citations from the database. A notable bias would exist if we were to state findings such as Publication A cited Activist 1 more than Publication B. This, however, was not the objective. Instead, the goal was to state findings such as Activist 1 was cited X number of times using a certain frame. Thus, the divergence between time frames is not a serious methodological issue.

It is important to emphasize that much of the data evaluated in this chapter was collected near the apex of the cycle of protest (the early 1990s). This is important because media coverage and the related framing process likely operate differently in the various stages of the cycle. When a contentious issue such as the British Columbia forestry conflict is at its peak in the cycle, press coverage is maximized and the interaction between media-workers and movement representatives may essentially be daily occurrences; when in the trough of the cycle, media coverage can be relatively sparse and interactions few and far between. When operating at or near the peak, formulating and getting out salient frames may be an easier process because of the ongoing, widespread attention. However, at the same time, there is also reason to believe that it may be harder, as challengers are also more active at this time. As such, it would be especially insightful to examine media coverage of social movement issues focusing specifically on different stages of the cycle of protest and across opposing views.

Another important consideration is that media can come in various forms. The most obvious is news coverage, but here only print-news was examined. Does the relationship between the broadcast or radio news and social movements operate in the same manner as described here? Video and audio of, say, a protest can add to drama to coverage that is hard to capture in print-news. Is there a greater tendency for, say, radical groups to get covered in these other media forms? Thus, similar analyses should be initiated in the future exploring different media forms.
In a related manner, media does not only involve the news. Materials produced by social movements themselves (e.g., pamphlets, reports, posers, etc.) can also play a big part in disseminating a group’s message. How do the frames integrated into these other forms of media differ from the frames appearing in the news? Surely they are different because of the variable role that the media would play in mediating of the message. When producing a pamphlet a movement can essentially say whatever they want.

Also, there is the question of how different forms of media (news versus movement-created) contribute to motivations to join at different phases of the cycle of protest. For example, when the cycle is at its peak, news coverage is paramount for a movement as it disseminates their message to the maximum number of people when mass support is needed most. When in a trough, however, movement-created media likely plays a much bigger role. At this time, news coverage can be virtually nonexistent and the only means a social movement has to get its message out is through their own materials.

**5.4 Bringing It All Together: A Synthesis**

**5.4.1 Revisiting a Familiar Model**

Mobilization and participation in a social movement are inarguably complex social processes. People do not simply wake up one day and decide to participate in a social movement. Instead, the decision to participate involves a series of steps or stages one progresses through along the pathway to participation.

As discussed in Chapter 3, one useful and familiar way of describing this process is Klandermans and Oegema’s (1987) widely cited model describing the “four steps toward participation.” Now, however, we will revisit this model, and its subsequent revisions, as this discussion also provides a concise framework for conceptually linking the three papers presented in this dissertation.

Probably the greatest overall effect of Klandermans and Oegema’s work on social movement participation research was to elevate the increasingly popular notion of social networks to a position of primacy. However, as the issues of meaning, culture, and identity gained ascendancy in the literature, weaknesses were soon seen with the model. As a result, Klandermans later amended his view by distinguishing between two types of mobilization—action and consensus (see Klandermans 1997, 2004).
While action mobilization involves “the transformation of those who adopted the view of the movement into active participants” (369, italics added), consensus mobilization involves the “dissemination of the views of a movement” (369). Under this new conceptualization, Klandermans argues that action mobilization is constrained by and effectively comes after consensus mobilization. Until a movement declares its aims by defining some sort of problem, its cause, and a means of resolving the issue, there really are no ‘us’ or ‘them’. Here, Klandermans drops the notion of “mobilization potential” as presented in the original model, and now refers to those populating this box more specifically as “sympathizers” (see Figure 5.1). In doing so, he also argues that the work presented in Klandermans and Oegema (1987) really only focused on the action mobilization. While indeed, Klandermans’ new view accomplishes the important feat of integrating the increasingly-popular notion of collective action framing into the model, as I argue in more detail in Chapter 3, a subtle revision can further allow for the theoretical incorporation of a substantially-sized, yet-unconsidered cohort of people—those who joined a movement without having a pre-existing tie to some existing member.

This proposed revision is based on two notable observations. First, I feel that many researchers have placed undue weight on the ever-popular notion of social networks. Today, the most common story told is one where individuals become motivated to mobilize into a social movement through the pulling effects of existing social ties. Whether these ties are to family, close friends, or simply acquaintances, various effects of social interaction are seen as possibly the single most significant factor prompting people to mobilize. The problem is that while this inarguably does describe the mobilization process for some recruits, it fails to accurately describe how unconnected people might come to participate.

Many people undeniably do get drawn into a movement through the people they know. Nonetheless, a great many others surely also join even in the absence of existing ties. Of Greenpeace’s 2.9 million members in 2008 (Greenpeace 2008), or the Sierra Club’s 1.3 million in the same year (Sierra Club 2008), how many can we reasonably presume knew someone in the group before joining and were motivated to participate because of the tie? Clearly other things must also prompt mobilization. The problem is that no existing models of mobilization manage to effectively incorporate unconnected individuals, though both Klandermans’ original and revised models provide an excellent foundation for expanding our understanding of this unconnected cohort.
The second issue prompting my proposed revision is what I see as a potential problem in generalizing Klandermans allocation of consensus mobilization—or the framing process—to an antecedent position occurring before action mobilization. Notice that he sees individuals as “adopting” the view of the movement, thus placing the framing process outside of the scope of the original model. However, while framing and issue dissemination clearly influence people’s decisions to act, the broader implication seems to be that framing drives people’s ideology and identity. It is not until they have been exposed to movement-related information that one becomes sympathetic to the cause. This seems problematic and undercuts much of the literature and research on personal and collective identities. Instead, it seems more likely that certain views, being a function of particular values, attitudes, and beliefs relevant to the movement, are already held by people, and the movement intentionally accesses and capitalizes on these to foster participation—a merging of the personal and collective identities.

Figure 5.2 presents the proposed adaptation to Klandermans’ model in a manner that makes it more generalizable. Notice that in the adapted model ‘frame alignment’ is inserted as an intervening step between being a target of mobilization attempt and becoming motivated to join. While I point the reader to the bulk of the discussion and analysis supporting this revision to Chapter 3, suffice it to say here that this revision better explains and emphasizes the underlying mechanism through which actors making recruitment attempts (direct person-to-person attempts in the case of social network ties, or indirect media-based attempts in other cases) are able to motivate and facilitate mobilization. In short, it stresses the intentional actions of a movement in targeting a particular cohort of people. This intentionality manifests itself through the merging or aligning of movement-produced frames (e.g., grievances, goals, and objectives of the movement) with the attitudes, beliefs, and values of a certain segment or cohort of the general public (also see Tindall 2007). It is not enough to simply state that the eventual recruit had attitudes or values congruent with the movement and that they were subsequently contacted by some targeting agent. Crucially, we need to also ask what occurred in the targeting attempt that motivated someone to make personal sacrifice and go as far as taking action on behalf of the cause. While there are notable differences based on the form of targeting (i.e., social networks versus media), I argue this is generally an issue of linking the contentious issue with a collective identity through frame alignment processes. Thus, while some researchers see frame alignment as a preceding condition of mobilization, I see it as a component piece of the overall mobilization process that provides multiple possible pathways to social movement mobilization.
While the original intent in drafting all three of the individual papers comprising this dissertation was not to formally test the entirety of this adapted model (other than what is presented in Chapter 3), noteworthy is that this adapted model also provides a useful framework under which the three papers presented in this dissertation can be tied together.

Note from Figure 5.2 that the heavy-lined box roughly indicates the components of the model considered in this dissertation. Starting at the beginning, as mentioned, originally Klandermans and Oegema saw the "mobilization potential" as comprising the latent group of individuals possessing attitudes, beliefs, and values that are congruent with those espoused by the movement, only later revising this step to instead encompass "sympathizers." I prefer to retain the original conceptualization. This is important because these attitudes, beliefs, and values are accessed or capitalized on by certain strategic framing episodes, formulated by movements, to attract participants. Chapter 2 begins to delve into this topic by looking at what characterizes participants of the British Columbia environmental movement to protect old growth forests of Vancouver Island in terms of a certain set of values (materialism, postmaterialism, and opposition to use of the environment for economic gain) and sociodemographics (gender, age, educational attainment, resource-based employment). While clearly not encompassing all possible values, attitudes, and beliefs aligning one with the movement, it does begin to describe the environmental movements "mobilization potential."

Chapter 3 considers in detail, using empirical evidence from the British Columbia environmental movement, the next two steps of the adapted model shown in Figure 5.2. In short, it shows that subtly revising the targeting step to incorporate media effects and inserting frame alignment prior to the motivation step allows the model to describe the mobilization process for a much wider range of social movement recruits, namely the substantially sized cohort of people who declare their greatest motivation for joining the movement was actually exposure to media depicting the conflict.

Chapter 4, while not fitting into any particular box in the model, actually overshadows much of the first half of the model by considering this movement-media interaction. The frames that movements disseminate are a function of the movements' desired target audience. Scarce financial resources and limited media coverage need to be carefully aimed and material must be directed to the appropriate audience if the fostering of interest and participation are expected. Thus, to understand the nature of participation, understanding a movements mobilization potential is key. Effective targeting of individuals involves aligning individual frames with those of the movement—
similar to target advertising, effective social movement targeting requires that the right market be considered (defined by the mobilization potential). Since one of the primary means a movement has to get its message out is through the media, improving our understanding of the media-movement interaction is critical. Do the movements’ desired messages actually make it out to the public via media or are they filtered? Is media balanced or biased in the way it presents highly contentious issues to the public? While not telling the entire story of how social movements and the media interact, Chapter 4 provides useful insights into questions such as these adding to our overall understanding of the role media plays.

5.4.2 Telling the Story of Mobilization and Participation in the British Columbia Environmental Movement

The work presented in this dissertation contributes to our overall understanding of social movements because of the way in which it examines multiple, related facets of the same social movement. By examining different aspects of the same social movement, we gained a fuller understanding of the environmental movement as a whole, and social movements in general, but further, this research also represents a certain degree of continuity that also tells a story about mobilization and participation in a particular movement—the British Columbia environmental movement to protect old growth forests.

In the most general of terms, this work suggests the following (also see Tindall 2007): Individuals generally joined the British Columbia environmental movement not because of certain sociodemographic characteristics, but instead, because they held certain ideologies and values congruent with the movement (Chapter 2). Importantly, however, this predisposition alone was not enough. Rather, it can be viewed as a necessary (though not sufficient) condition for mobilization into the environmental movement. In addition, some triggering event likely occurred where the movement reached out and contacted potential recruits trying to convince them to mobilize. These targeting attempts occurred predominantly through exposure to various media covering the issue, through social networks played a part for some. Regardless of the form of contact, in general, the targeting phase typically needs to involve some means of linking an individual’s identity (which, critically, is closely linked to factors such as held values and ideologies) to the collective identity of the movement—frame alignment (Chapter 3). I say ‘typically’ because other, usually network-based factors (i.e., social influence, obligation, social comparison, or social or moral incentives) can also play a part, indirectly affecting ones decision to join by bypassing the frame alignment stage (see dotted line in Figure 5.2). Chapter 4 supplemented this story by examining the way in which frames
make it into the media—often the only way a movement has to communicate with the general public.

In telling this story, it is maybe more appropriate to say that this dissertation is a study of participation in the British Columbia environmental movement, in contrast to a study of social movement participation in general. This is an important distinction. While all social movements are similar in the sense that they are all groups of people brought together and organized in opposition to some perceived untenable aspect of the social sphere, critically, each social movement is also different—the environmental movement is different from the gay and lesbian rights movement; the women’s right movement is different from the pro-life movement; the civil rights movement is different from the anti-nuclear proliferation movement. Further, even within what might be called a single social movement family such as the environmental movement (in the most general of terms), differences exist.

5.5 More Future Directions

Though some similarities may be present across movements (or within movement families), it is crucial that we also recognize that the characteristics of the people who rise to act, the reasons and motivations for action, the forms of organization, and the repertoires of action are all a function of the particular contentious social issue prompting action. Thus, it remains to be seen if the same processes and mechanisms discussed in this dissertation—and the specific story told about mobilization and participation into the British Columbia environmental movement in the previous section—operate similarly in different social movements. As a result, one critical, overall direction for future research prompted by this study would involve an empirical examination of a model depicting this process across movements.

However, before that is done, it is necessary that future research also attempts to finish this story. What was covered here in this dissertation only examined the first half of the model, and substantial work is also needed to integrate the second half. Without it, the story plot is incomplete and only part of the saga of social movement mobilization and participation can be effectively told.

Also, future research can also integrate important nuances to the model. A notable case involves the role that identity plays in affecting pro-environmental behaviours, and in turn, environmental movement participation. In this regard, it is insightful to note that Stets and Biga (2003:418) examined the variable role that attitudes and identity had in affecting pro-environmental behaviours and found that “one’s identity serves as an important motivator for behavior, because
people act in ways to verify their identity meanings.” Importantly, however, they also describe the relationship between attitudes and identity as potentially reciprocal, where “identities shape one’s attitudes and behavior toward objects, one’s attitudes and behavior serve to verify and maintain self-meanings contained in actors’ identities” (420). If this is indeed the case, it may suggest a bi-directional arrow is also needed in my revised model linking the frame alignment process back to the box depicting the mobilization potential. This, I believe is more of what Klandermans likely had in mind with his 2004 revisions, but misleadingly forced into the model by relying on the existing notions of action and consensus mobilization. Unfortunately, the nature of the historic, secondary data used in this dissertation do not allow for the testing of such a hypothesis. Nevertheless, this issue should be considered in later research.

Future research should also determine if the findings from studies such as this one generalize across other, similar movements, such as the environmental movement to protect the tropical forests of the Amazon Basin, as well as other disassociated movements, such as the growing gay and lesbian rights movements. Further, the factors that affect social movement processes such as mobilization, participation, and framing likely change over time as the cycle of protest ebbs and flows (Rootes 2007; Tarrow 1989; Tindall 2004). These are all important issues that warrant future examination if we are to truly say we understand the phenomena called social movements.

5.6 Conclusion

In the past few decades, significant advances have transpired in social movement research. We quickly moved away from rather individualistic, reactive, and irrational conceptions of collective actions to more rational, calculating, and proactive understandings of the phenomena under the auspices of the resource mobilization and political process perspectives. In this move, however, we sometimes left behind critical concepts, such as emotion, feeling, meaning, and identity. The latter development of the notion of collective action framing helped fill some of these gaps. In many ways, the research presented in this dissertation largely parallels this progression examining a single social movement—the environmental movement of British Columbia during the highly contentious 1990s—and exploring an array of existing theories.

In this study I systematically examined some specific propositions either extracted directly from or indirectly derived from the social movements, environmental sociology, and media studies literatures. From the collection of research presented in this dissertation it is clear that while many of the considered theoretical and conceptual propositions hold up, some others do not. That said,
however, these propositions are not entirely worthless and should not be simply discarded. Instead, they should be valued for providing a foundational base from which to proceed to more specific, fine-tuned understandings of the phenomenon called social movements.

For example, by comparing and contrasting an environmental movement and its related countermovement, Chapter 2 showed that postmaterialism is not a strictly environmental notion, as this value is significant in predicting participation in an anti-environmental movement as well. Thus, instead of discarding postmaterialism it warrants reconsideration in alternative terms. It seems more likely that postmaterialism is really an indicator of a more inclusive, participative world view, affecting participation in general, regardless of the specific movement (or countermovement).

Chapter 3 challenged the well-accepted idea that social networks are commonplace in the social movement mobilization process by showing that exposure to various mass media was much more of a significant factor affecting individuals' choices to join a movement group. However, instead, of discarding the foundational model of social movement mobilization as presented by Klandermans and Oegema (1987), this chapter showed that a relatively simple adaptation of the existing model easily accounts for this alternative pathway.

Chapter 4 evaluated different perspectives on how social movement issues make it into the print-news media. Many argue that 'what bleeds leads', and as a result, sensationalized and dramatic events are what make it into the news. This is sometimes true, but this chapter also showed that a variety of other factors such as characteristics of the news sources can also affect what and how events and issues.

One final point worth emphasizing is the value in pursuing social movement research within movements. Across movements a great diversity exists in terms of various factors such as goals, objectives, attitudes, values, and repertoires of action. Even though diversity also exists within a movement, it is likely not as variable as across movements and it is at this level of analysis that unique and informative patterns can be more easily detected. Can we really proclaim what processes and mechanisms affect mobilization and participation in social movements when cross-movement studies tend to force a level of generalization that obscures important detail? As we try to explain what factors generally affect all social movements in terms of mobilization and participation, we sometimes lose critical focus and find ourselves unable to tell a coherent story of how the mobilization and participation processes operate for any particular movement. Clearly this is hazardous and future efforts need to be aimed at merging cross- and within-movement research.
Material covered in this dissertation

- Member of "mobilization potential"
  - Not targeted
  - Targeted (Recruitment attempt through media)
  - Targeted (Recruitment attempt through network tie)
  - Incongruent frame
  - Frame alignment (linking the collective identity to shared values and/or attitudes)
  - Motivated to join social movement organization
  - Overcome barriers to participate
  - Barriers
  - Ceases participation
  - Ongoing participation and activism

Figure 5.2 Model depicting Alternative Pathway towards Social Movement Participation (adapted from Klandermans and Oegema 1987 and Klandermans 2004).
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APPENDIX B: STUDY QUESTIONNAIRES

B.1 Victoria Public Survey (1999)

ID#: ______________________________
Phone #: ___________________________
Interviewer: __________________________
Date: ______________________________
Time Started: _________________________
Time Completed: _______________________

Introduction:

Hi, my name is ______________________ and I am calling on behalf of Dr. David Tindall at the University of British Columbia, in the Departments of Forest Resources Management and the Department of Sociology.

We are asking a group of Victoria residents about their concerns regarding forestry and conservation on Vancouver Island and related social and political opinions. There are also some questions about your background (such as your age and education).

I would like to speak to an adult in the house who is over 18. Could you please tell me which adult in the house had the most recent birthday? Could I speak to that person?

[If person on phone is the correct one, proceed with Section A below, otherwise repeat introductory script with appropriate adult OR ask when is a good time to call back the appropriate person.]

Section A

The questions will take up about 15 minutes of your time. I want to let you know that I do not know your last name or address and so your answers will be anonymous. You have the right to refuse to answer any question at any time during the interview. Do you have any questions? Are you willing to proceed with the interview?

1 Note: The surveys included in this appendix are not exactly the same format as they were at the time of data collection. Though the actual content has not changed in any way, the layout has been altered slightly to meet the formatting specifications for this dissertation.
For one of the questions you will need a scrap of paper and something to write with, do you have access to that?

The format of many of the questions I will ask you will require you to choose the response that best describes your answer from a set of alternatives (such as strongly agree, agree, strongly disagree). I would like you to answer in this format but please feel free to provide additional information if you would like to.

For the first question, I will read to you some statements and ask you to indicate whether you completely agree, mostly agree, partly agree/disagree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree. Partly agree is the middle category and it means you inherently partly disagree as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Partly Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Mostly Disagree</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most jobs in the forest industry have been lost because of a reduced timber supply due to over-cutting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most jobs that have been lost in the forest industry are due to unnecessary environmental protection (e.g., the creation of parks, the Forest Practices Code, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most jobs that have been lost in the forest industry are due to necessary environmental protection (e.g., the creation of parks, the Forest Practices Code, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most jobs that have been lost in the forest industry are due to things like mechanization and market conditions (e.g., supply and price of wood fibre).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most job losses in the forest industry are due to the actions of environmental groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in forestry is a lifestyle as well as a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sustainable forestry,’ means that forestry workers’ children can continue to work in the forest industry doing similar jobs as their parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).
The next two questions are about your confidence in people running companies and financial institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Great Deal Of Confidence (a)</th>
<th>Only Some Confidence (b)</th>
<th>Hardly Any Confidence (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the people running major companies? Would you say:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the people running banks and financial institutions? Would you say:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).

The next few questions are about your opinions regarding government spending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think about government spending on:</th>
<th>Too Much Money (a)</th>
<th>Too Little Money (b)</th>
<th>About The Right Amount (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving and protecting the environment? Are we spending:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care? Are we spending:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education? Are we spending:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).

For the following statements please indicate whether you completely agree, mostly agree, partly agree/disagree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree. Partly agree is the middle category and it means you inherently partly disagree as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Partly Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Mostly Disagree</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We should relax our efforts to control pollution in order to improve the economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution control measures have created an unfair burden on industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should maintain our efforts to control pollution even if this slows down the economy and increases unemployment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an industry cannot control its pollution, the industry should be shut down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources must be preserved for the future, even if people must do without.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).
Now I am going to read to you the names of some organizations that have been involved in the conflict over forestry and conservation on Vancouver Island. For each group, I'm going to ask you if you've ever heard of it, if you are a current or former member, and if you know anyone who belongs to it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer: Please refer to the organizations listed below in ticking the applicable columns to the right</th>
<th>Has R ever heard of the group?</th>
<th>Yes or No.</th>
<th>If R has heard of group, are they currently a member? Yes or No.</th>
<th>Does R know anyone who belongs to the group? If yes, are they a &quot;strong ties&quot;?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberni Environmental Coalition</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Yes, Have heard of this group</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmanah Forestry Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Clayoquot Sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Our Resources (Port Alberni)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the Clayoquot (Ucluelet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canada Wilderness Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).
For the following statements please indicate whether you very strongly agree, strongly agree, somewhat agree/disagree, strongly disagree or very strongly disagree. Somewhat agree is the middle category and it means you inherently somewhat disagree as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You identify yourself as a member of the Victoria and area community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You identify yourself as a member of the forestry community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people identify you as a member of the forestry community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You identify yourself as a forest worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***For Current or Former SOR Members Only: You identify yourself as a member of Share Our Resources of Port Alberni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***For Current or Former SOR Members Only: Other people identify you as a member of Share Our Resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You identify yourself as an environmentalist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You identify yourself as a member of the environmental movement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people identify you as a member of the environmental movement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).
The next question is about whether you have ever contributed or participated in actions designed to support forestry on Vancouver Island. Have you ever:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>I HAVE participated in this activity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Been a member of Share B.C. or a local Share group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Donated money to a community organization that has concerns about forestry issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sent a letter, (fax or e-mail) to a newspaper about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Signed a petition regarding a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Attended a community meeting about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Attended a rally or protest demonstration on the lawns of the legislature about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Served as a representative on an advisory board around a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Purchased a book, t-shirt, poster, bumper sticker, mug or other merchandise to support forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Voted for someone because of their views about forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the next set of questions I am going to ask you to write down the scale for the answers. Do you have something to write with?

I am going to read to you a list of some goals which are frequently thought of as being important to society and ask you how you would rate these goals? We will use a scale of 1-10 where 1 is most important and 10 least important.

INTERVIEWER: GIVE EXAMPLE ...

[ ] ___ Maintaining a high rate of economic growth

[ ] ___ Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities

[ ] ___ Fighting rising prices

[ ] ___ The fight against crime

[ ] ___ Progress towards a society where ideas count more than money

[ ] ___ Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted

These last set of questions is about your background.

How old were you on your last birthday? ____________ (Years.)

[ ] ___
How long have you lived in the Victoria area? ________________________________.

Where did you live as a teenager? ________________________________.

While most people in Canada think of themselves as Canadians, what would you say is the main ethnic background (or nationality) of your ancestors? (e.g., Australian, First Nations, English, Scottish, French, Korean, Slovakian, etc.) Interviewer note below.

What is the highest level of education you have received? (Interviewer circle one of the following.)

[ ] a. part of primary school
[ ] b. completed primary school
[ ] c. part of high school
[ ] d. completed high school
[ ] e. some college or university
[ ] f. received a college or technical school certificate
[ ] g. received a university bachelor's degree
[ ] h. Please specify major or subject: ________________________________
[ ] i. some postgraduate training
[ ] j. received a postgraduate university degree
[ ] k. Please specify discipline: ________________________________
[ ] l. other
[ ] m. (please state) ________________________________

What is your occupation? Interviewer note if R is a homemaker or a student. If R is retired, or unemployed ask R’s former occupation.)

[ ] ________________________________ (Occupation.)

ASK NEXT TWO QUESTIONS IF R WORKS FOR PAY.

What does your company or employer do?

[ ] ________________________________

What industry (or sector) do you work in?

[ ] ________________________________

Interviewer note the person’s gender. [Ask if you cannot tell]

[ ] a. Female  b. Male

Thank you very much for your time this afternoon [or evening]. Your answers will help us better understand people’s values and opinions regarding forestry and conservation. Have a good afternoon [evening].

Goodbye.
Scripted Replies to Potential Respondent Questions

How was I selected?
We used a procedure to randomly select residential phone numbers from the telephone directory. We are using a list of randomly selected numbers to contact people to interview. Our list of phone numbers does not include information about either your name or address. This procedure ensures that your answers will remain anonymous and that we have a representative sample from the population of the Victoria area.

How long will it take?
The interview takes about 10 minutes.

Will it be confidential and anonymous?
First, I don't know your last name or address.
Second, none of the questions would allow you to be individually identified.
Third, data will be presented using summary statistics (i.e., percentages and averages, etc.) which prevents the identification of individuals.

How do I know you are who you say you are?
I can give you the telephone number of Dr. David Tindall and you can call him directly to confirm who I am...his number is (604) 822-2363.

[If they want the name of someone outside of the research group, they should call Professor Brian Elliott, Head of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, UBC, at 604-822-3160]

How will the information be used?
The information will be analyzed and results will be used in producing a Master’s Thesis at UBC, for academic journal articles, for reports that will be available to the general public (e.g., available through the public library) and possibly for a book manuscript.
B.2 Port Alberni General Public Survey (1998)

Introduction:

Hi, my name is __________________ and I am calling on behalf of Dr. David Tindall at the University of British Columbia, in the Departments of Forest Resources Management and the Department of Sociology.

We are asking a group of Victoria residents about their concerns regarding forestry and conservation on Vancouver Island and related social and political opinions. There are also some questions about your background (such as your age and education).

I would like to speak to an adult in the house who is over 18. Could you please tell me which adult in the house had the most recent birthday? Could I speak to that person?

[If person on phone is the correct one, proceed with Section A below, otherwise repeat introductory script with appropriate adult OR ask when is a good time to call back the appropriate person.]

Section A

The questions will take up about 15 minutes of your time. I want to let you know that I do not know your last name or address and so your answers will be anonymous. You have the right to refuse to answer any question at any time during the interview. Do you have any questions? Are you willing to proceed with the interview?

For one of the questions you will need a scrap of paper and something to write with, do you have access to that? The format of many of the questions I will ask you will require you to choose the response that best describes your answer from a set of alternatives (such as strongly agree, agree, strongly disagree). I would like you to answer in this format but please feel free to provide additional information if you would like to.
For the first question, I will read to you some statements and ask you to indicate whether you completely agree, mostly agree, partly agree/disagree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree. Partly agree is the middle category and it means you inherently partly disagree as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Partly Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Mostly Disagree</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most jobs in the forest industry have been lost because of a reduced timber supply due to over-cutting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most jobs that have been lost in the forest industry are due to <em>unnecessary</em> environmental protection (e.g., the creation of parks, the Forest Practices Code, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most jobs that have been lost in the forest industry are due to <em>necessary</em> environmental protection (e.g., the creation of parks, the Forest Practices Code, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most jobs that have been lost in the forest industry are due to things like mechanization and market conditions (e.g., supply and price of wood fibre).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most job losses in the forest industry are due to the actions of environmental groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in forestry is a lifestyle as well as a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sustainable forestry,’ means that forestry workers’ children can continue to work in the forest industry doing similar jobs as their parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).

The next two questions are about your confidence in people running companies and financial institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A Great Deal Of Confidence (a)</th>
<th>Only Some Confidence (b)</th>
<th>Hardly Any Confidence (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the people running major companies? Would you say:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the people running banks and financial institutions? Would you say:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).
The next few questions are about your opinions regarding government spending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think about government spending on:</th>
<th>Too Much Money (a)</th>
<th>Too Little Money (b)</th>
<th>About The Right Amount (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving and protecting the environment? Are we spending:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care? Are we spending:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education? Are we spending:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).

For the following statements please indicate whether you completely agree, mostly agree, partly agree/disagree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree. Partly agree is the middle category and it means you inherently partly disagree as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Partly Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Mostly Disagree</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We should relax our efforts to control pollution in order to improve the economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution control measures have created an unfair burden on industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should maintain our efforts to control pollution even if this slows down the economy and increases unemployment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an industry cannot control its pollution, the industry should be shut down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources must be preserved for the future, even if people must do without.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).
Now I am going to read to you the names of some organizations that have been involved in the conflict over forestry and conservation on Vancouver Island. For each group, I’m going to ask you if you’ve ever heard of it, if you are a current or former member, and if you know anyone who belongs to it. (Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).

For the following statements please indicate whether you very strongly agree, strongly agree, somewhat agree/disagree, strongly disagree or very strongly disagree. Somewhat agree is the middle category and it means you inherently somewhat disagree as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer: Please refer to the organizations listed below in ticking the applicable columns to the right</th>
<th>Has R ever heard of the group? Yes or No.</th>
<th>If R has heard of group, are they currently a member. Yes or No.</th>
<th>Does R know anyone who belongs to the group?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberni Environmental Coalition</td>
<td>No, NEVER heard of this group</td>
<td>Yes, Have heard of this group</td>
<td>No, not currently or formerly a member of this group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmanah Forestry Society</td>
<td>Yes, currently or formerly a member of this group?</td>
<td>Yes, currently or formerly a member of this group?</td>
<td>Does R know anyone who belongs to the group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Clayoquot Sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Our Resources (Port Alberni)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the Clayoquot (Ucluelet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canada Wilderness Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>You</em> identify yourself as a member of the Victoria and area community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>You</em> identify yourself as a member of the forestry community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Other people</em> identify you as a member of the forestry community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>You</em> identify yourself as a forest worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><strong>For Current or Former SOR Members Only:</strong></em> <em>You</em> identify yourself as a member of Share Our Resources of Port Alberni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><strong>For Current or Former SOR Members Only:</strong></em> <em>Other people</em> identify you as a member of Share Our Resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>You</em> identify yourself as an environmentalist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>You</em> identify yourself as a member of the environmental movement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Other people</em> identify you as a member of the environmental movement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).
The next question is about whether you have ever contributed or participated in actions designed to support forestry on Vancouver Island. Have you ever:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>I HAVE participated in this activity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Been a member of Share B.C. or a local Share group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Donated money to a community organization that has concerns about forestry issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sent a letter, (fax or e-mail) to a newspaper about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Signed a petition regarding a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Attended a community meeting about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Attended a rally or protest demonstration on the lawns of the legislature about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Served as a representative on an advisory board around a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Purchased a book, t-shirt, poster, bumper sticker, mug or other merchandise to support forestry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Voted for someone because of their views about forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the next set of questions I am going to ask you to write down the scale for the answers. Do you have something to write with?

I am going to read to you a list of some goals which are frequently thought of as being important to society and ask you how you would rate these goals? We will use a scale of 1-10 where 1 is most important and 10 least important.

INTERVIEWER: GIVE EXAMPLE ...

[  ] ____ Maintaining a high rate of economic growth

[  ] ____ Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities

[  ] ____ Fighting rising prices

[  ] ____ The fight against crime

[  ] ____ Progress towards a society where ideas count more than money

[  ] ____ Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted
These last set of questions is about your background.  

How old were you on your last birthday? _______________ (Years.)

How long have you lived in the Victoria area? ____________________________ .

Where did you live as a teenager? ________________________________ .

While most people in Canada think of themselves as Canadians, what would you say is the main ethnic background (or nationality) of your ancestors? (e.g., Australian, First Nations, English, Scottish, French, Korean, Slovakian, etc.) Interviewer note below.

What is the highest level of education you have received? (Interviewer circle one of the following.)

[ ] a. part of primary school  
[ ] b. completed primary school  
[ ] c. part of high school  
[ ] d. completed high school  
[ ] e. some college or university  
[ ] f. received a college or technical school certificate  
[ ] g. received a university bachelor's degree  
[ ] h. some postgraduate training  
[ ] i. received a postgraduate university degree  
[ ] j. other (please state) __________________________

What is your occupation? Interviewer note if R is a homemaker or a student. If R is retired, or unemployed ask R’s former occupation.)

[ ] ___________________________ (Occupation.)

ASK NEXT TWO QUESTIONS IF R WORKS FOR PAY.

What does your company or employer do?

[ ] __________________________

What industry (or sector) do you work in?

[ ] __________________________

Interviewer note the person’s gender. [Ask if you cannot tell]

[ ] a. Female  
[ ] b. Male

Thank you very much for your time this afternoon [or evening]. Your answers will help us better understand people’s values and opinions regarding forestry and conservation.
Have a good afternoon [evening].

Goodbye.

Notes:
Scripted Replies to Potential Respondent Questions

How was I selected?
We used a procedure to randomly select residential phone numbers from the telephone directory. We are using a list of randomly selected numbers to contact people to interview. Our list of phone numbers does not include information about either your name or address. This procedure ensures that your answers will remain anonymous and that we have a representative sample from the population of the Victoria area.

How long will it take?
The interview takes about 10 minutes.

Will it be confidential and anonymous?
First, I don’t know your last name or address.
Second, none of the questions would allow you to be individually identified.
Third, data will be presented using summary statistics (i.e., percentages and averages, etc.) which prevents the identification of individuals.

How do I know you are who you say you are?
I can give you the telephone number of Dr. David Tindall and you can call him directly to confirm who I am...his number is (604) 822-2363.

[If they want the name of someone outside of the research group, they should call Professor Brian Elliott, Head of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, UBC, at 604-822-3160]

How will the information be used?
The information will be analyzed and results will be used in producing a Master’s Thesis at UBC, for academic journal articles, for reports that will be available to the general public (e.g., available through the public library) and possibly for a book manuscript.
**B.3 Wilderness Preservation Movement Member Questionnaire (1992)**

THE VANCOUVER ISLAND WILDERNESS PRESERVATION MOVEMENT STUDY

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SIERRA CLUB OF WESTERN CANADA MEMBERS

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE SIERRA CLUB IS REFERRED TO AS THE "SCWC" THROUGHOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN ORDER TO CONSERVE SPACE.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your willingness to participate in this study.

I wish to remind you that your identity will remain completely confidential, and the answers you provide will remain anonymous.

If you feel uncomfortable with any question you need not answer it.

Your participation is purely voluntary.

A report summarizing the results will be presented to the Sierra Club. The report will contain summary statistics (e.g., averages and percentages of group members' responses to various questions) but the results will be presented in a manner that will prevent the identification of individual participants.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

1. IF YOU HAVE PREVIOUSLY COMPLETED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AS A MEMBER OF ANOTHER ORGANIZATION, then please indicate that this by providing the name of the other organization in the space provided in Part B of the enclosed consent form (see reverse side of the enclosed letter).

   Then please mail the consent form (only) in the self-addressed envelope. Please recycle the unused questionnaire.

   IF YOU HAVE NOT PREVIOUSLY COMPLETED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AS A MEMBER OF ANOTHER ORGANIZATION, then, please read over and fill out Part A of the consent form (see reverse side of the enclosed letter), insert and seal it in the small blank envelope, and place the small blank envelope inside the business reply envelope.

2. This questionnaire is not designed to be a test of your knowledge, but rather to provide important scientific information. To ensure the quality of the results, I urge you to answer the questions as completely as possible. If you want to add more information about any question please feel free to do so. Many of the questions require you to place a check mark or circle a letter (or number) beside the applicable response category. Some questions require that you answer yes or no. For these questions simply circle YES or NO.

3. The questionnaire is printed on BOTH sides of the paper - please be careful not to skip any pages.

4. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it in the large self-addressed business reply envelope. You do not need to attach postage.

5. If you have any problems, questions, or comments, please call 721-4103. [Please leave your first name, your number, and a brief message on the answering machine and someone will return you call as soon as possible.]

This questionnaire has been printed on recycled paper.
Questions about Forestry, the Environment and Wilderness Preservation

Compared with other aspects of your life (e.g. your job, your hobbies), how important is wilderness preservation to you? (Circle one of the following.)

a. Most important
b. Very important
c. Fairly important
d. Not very important

Why (or why isn't) wilderness preservation important to you? (Please describe your views in a few sentences.)

What would you say about the use of clear-cutting as a forestry method?

a. It is used too widely.
b. Its level of use is just right.
c. It is not used widely enough.

What percentage of British Columbia do you believe should be protected as wilderness? (Please write a percentage from 0% to 100% in the space provided)

I believe % of British Columbia should be protected as wilderness.

Do you actively encourage friends, family, or coworkers to participate in helping to protect the environment? (Circle yes or no.)

a. yes b. no

Do you think of yourself as being a member of the wilderness preservation movement? (Please circle the response that best describes how you personally feel about yourself regarding the wilderness preservation movement.)

a. I identify myself very strongly as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
b. I identify myself somewhat as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
c. I do not think of myself at all as a member of the wilderness preservation movement, nor do I oppose the wilderness preservation movement.
d. I oppose the wilderness preservation movement.

Thinking about your friends, family, and coworkers - how strongly do you think they identify you as a member of the wilderness preservation movement? (Circle one of the following.)

a. Other people identify me very strongly as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
b. Other people identify me somewhat as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
c. Other people do not think of me as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
d. Other people think I oppose the wilderness preservation movement.
Did you agree with the decision to turn half of the Carmanah Valley into a park? (Circle one of the following.)

a. I strongly agreed with the decision
b. I agreed with the decision
c. I disagreed with the decision
d. I strongly disagreed with the decision
e. I am undecided

Please write a few sentences below to explain why you agreed, disagreed, or are undecided.

________________________________________

________________________________________

Below are listed some different values that Canadians have expressed regarding the importance of forests. How would you rank these values?

Place a 1 next to the most important value, place a 2 next to the second most important, a 3 next to the third most important, and so on down to 6 for the least important value.

_____ A place for recreation and relaxation
_____ A source of economic wealth and jobs
_____ As a habitat for a variety of animal and plant life
_____ Balancing the global ecosystem
_____ Protection of Canada's water, air, and soil
_____ Wilderness preservation

In your opinion, what are the most important environmental problems facing the country?

________________________________________

________________________________________

How do you feel about the present N.D.P. provincial government's actions with regard to forestry policy. (Circle one of the following.)

a. the government is doing a very good job.
b. the government is doing a good job.
c. the government is doing a poor job.
d. the government is doing a very poor job.

How do you feel about the previous Social Credit provincial government's actions with regard to forestry policy. (Circle one of the following.)

a. the government did a very good job.
b. the government did a good job.
c. the government did a poor job.
d. the government did a very poor job.

I would like to know how you feel about different kinds of protests which might be used to get the government to change its policies... (Please place a check mark under the column that best reflects your opinion.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often justified</th>
<th>Sometimes justified</th>
<th>Never justified</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. What about strikes? Do you think they are ... |
b. What about boycotts? Do you think they are ... |
c. What about legal and peaceful demonstrations, like marches, rallies, and picketing? Do you think they are ... |
d. What about illegal but **peaceful** demonstrations, like sit-ins? Do you think they are ... |
e. What about direct actions such as blockades of logging roads? Do you think they are ... |
f. And finally, what about violent demonstrations including actions such as fighting with the police and destroying property? Do you think they are ... |

**Involvement in environmental organizations**

Approximately how long have you been a member of the SCWC? (Please write the approximate number of years you have been a member below.)


Please indicate which of the following statements best describes your level of involvement with the SCWC. (Circle one of the following.)

a. I pay dues but do not participate in any other way.

b. I participate in some SCWC activities such as attending meetings or outings. Why did you join the SCWC? (Please answer by providing a few sentences below.)


What do you find rewarding about being a member of the SCWC? (Please answer by writing a few sentences below.)
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About how many people from the SCWC do you know? (For example, count all the people whom you know that you could hold a casual conversation with.)

Please specify approximate number of SCWC members you know. __________

Of these people, how many are:

- Close friends? ________ How many of these are women? ________
- Acquaintances? ________ How many of these are women? ________
- Coworkers? ________ How many of these are women? ________
- Family members who live in your household? ________ How many of these are women? ________
- Other relatives? ________ How many of these are women? ________
- Other? ________ (please specify type of relationship below.) How many of these are women?

About how often do you talk with someone about wilderness preservation and other environmental issues? (This could be with the same person, or with different people.) (Circle one of the following.)

a. Every day
b. At least once a week.
c. At least once a month.
d. Several times a year.
e. Once a year or less often.
f. Never.

Have you ever talked with a park warden or nature guide about wilderness or environmental issues?

a. yes b. no
For each organization listed on the left, please check under the applicable columns. Tick as many columns as are applicable. Tick under column 1 if you have never heard of the organization. Tick under column 2 if you have heard of the organization. Tick under column 3 if you know a member of the organization. Tick under column 4 if you have a close friend or relative who belongs to the organization. Tick under column 5 if you are a former member of the organization. Tick under column 6 if you are currently a member of the organization. Tick under column 7 if you are currently an active member of the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please refer to the organizations listed below in ticking the applicable columns to the right</th>
<th>I have never heard of this group</th>
<th>I have heard of this group</th>
<th>I know a member of this group</th>
<th>I have a CLOSE friend or relative who belongs to this group</th>
<th>I am a FORMER member of this group</th>
<th>I am currently a member of this group</th>
<th>I am currently an ACTIVE member of this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmanah Forestry Society</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Youth Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Carmanah and Walbran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Clayoquot Sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Tsitika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of Western Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canada Wilderness Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides being a member of the SCWC, are you a member of any groups involved in environmental/wilderness issues not listed above? (Circle yes or no.)

a. yes  b. no

If yes, please list them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you an active member?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About how often does someone encourage YOU to participate in SCWC activities? (Please circle one of the following.)

a. At least once a week.
b. At least once a month.
c. Several times a year.
d. Once a year or less often.
e. Never.

About how often do you encourage SOMEONE ELSE to participate in SCWC activities? (Please circle one of the following.)

a. At least once a week.
b. At least once a month.
c. Several times a year.
d. Once a year or less often.
e. Never.
Was your decision to become a member of the SCWC in response to any of the following: (Place a check mark beside any of the following as they apply to you.)

a. _____ You read a newspaper or magazine article about the SCWC's activities.
b. _____ You read a newspaper or magazine article about a wilderness preservation issue (e.g., the Carmanah or Walbran).
c. _____ You read a flyer produced by the SCWC.
d. _____ You saw a poster about the SCWC's activities.
e. _____ You saw a poster about a wilderness preservation issue (e.g., the Carmanah or Walbran).
f. _____ A friend who belonged to the SCWC asked you to join.
g. _____ A family member who belonged to the SCWC asked you to join.
h. _____ A coworker who belonged to the SCWC asked you to join.
i. _____ An acquaintance who belonged to the SCWC asked you to join.
j. _____ You received a mailed request from the SCWC to join.
k. _____ You attended a pro-wilderness preservation rally and decided to join the SCWC.
l. _____ You heard about the "Carmanah Giant" and decided something had to be done to preserve old growth forests.
m. _____ You heard about the threat to the Marbled Murrelet's nesting grounds.

l. _____ Other (please describe below).

Have the actions of the SCWC made a difference to wilderness preservation on Vancouver Island? (Circle yes or no.)

a. no b. yes

In a few sentences, briefly describe how:
Have you ever visited:

a. the Carmanah Valley? (Circle yes or no.)
    a. yes  b. no

If yes, how many times? ______

b. the Walbran Valley? (Circle yes or no.)
    a. yes  b. no

If yes, how many times? ______

Have your actions made a difference to wilderness preservation on Vancouver Island? (Circle yes or no.)

a. no  b. yes

In a few sentences, briefly describe how they have or have not:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Have you ever been approached by the SCWC to participate in an activity? (Circle yes or no.)

a. no  b. yes

If yes, was the most recent request:

a. by phone  b. by mail  c. face to face  d. other (please describe)

In a few sentences, please describe the activity.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Did you participate? (Circle yes or no.)

a. no  b. yes
Have you ever contributed to/participated in actions designed to help preserve wilderness on Vancouver Island? Would you be willing to participate in such actions in the future? See the list provided below and place a check mark in column 1 for each activity you have (in the past) participated in, and a check mark in column 2 for each activity you would be willing (in the future) to participate in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>I have participated in this activity in the past.</th>
<th>I would be willing to participate in this activity in the future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Be a member of the SCWC.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Donates money to a wilderness preservation or other environmental organization.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Write a letter to a government official regarding a wilderness preservation issue (such as preservation of the Carmanah or Walbran).</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Write a letter to a newspaper about wilderness preservation (or forestry related issues).</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Write a letter to a logging company about a forestry (or wilderness) issue.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Write a letter to another organization regarding a wilderness preservation issue.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Sign a petition to preserve a wilderness area.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Participate in trail building.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Attend a community meeting about wilderness preservation and/or forestry.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Attend a rally or protest demonstration on the lawns of the legislature to support wilderness preservation.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Participate in an information campaign for the general public about wilderness preservation.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Advertise in the media to promote wilderness preservation.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Make a presentation to a public body about wilderness preservation and/or forestry-related issues.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Give a lecture on wilderness preservation and/or logging practices to a school group or voluntary organization.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Participate in a press release/conference (regarding wilderness preservation and forestry-related issues).</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Serve as a representative on an advisory board formed around wilderness preservation or forestry-related issues.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Purchase a book, t-shirt, poster, mug or other merchandise from an environmental organization.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. OTHER ACTIVITIES (please describe in the boxes below and check off the columns to the right as they apply to you.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Behaviour and the Environment**

Have you ever contributed to/participated in actions designed to help preserve or protect the environment? See the list provided below and place a check mark in column 1 for each activity you have (in the past) participated in, and a check mark in column 2 for each activity you would be willing (in the future) to participate in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>I have participated in this activity in the past.</th>
<th>I would be willing to participate in this activity in the future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Recycling at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recycling at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Regularly walking, bicycling, or taking public transport instead of a car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Refusing unnecessary packaging and plastic bags.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conserving Energy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Buying organic produce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Using environmentally friendly household cleaning products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Regularly re-using and mending things instead of discarding them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Planting trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Picking up litter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Using a re-usable mug instead of paper or Styrofoam cups for beverages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Helping to maintain parks or natural habitats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Composting organic waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Other behaviours designed to protect the environment (please describe in the boxes below and check off the columns to the right as they apply to you.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would like to ask you about some kinds of clubs, organizations or groups that people may join. Please indicate whether or not you are NOW a member of each, and if you are a member, indicate whether you are very active, fairly active or inactive.

Please place a check mark under the applicable columns for each organization listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NO, I am NOT a member of this type of group</th>
<th>I am a FAIRLY ACTIVE member of this type of group</th>
<th>I am a VERY ACTIVE member of this type of group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Business, professional, or occupational associations other than labour unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Labour unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religious or church-related organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Charitable organizations, such as the United Way or Cancer Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Credit unions or co-ops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ethnic clubs or organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fraternal or service organizations, such as the Rotary Club.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Public interest group, such as a consumer group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Neighbourhood organizations, such as a ratepayers association.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Education or school-related organizations, such as a Parent Teachers group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Political organizations, such as a party association.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Entertainment and social groups such as card clubs or dance groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sport or fitness groups such as a softball or exercise group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Youth groups such as boy scouts/girl guides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Volunteer organizations, such as hospital auxiliary groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Hobby groups, such as a photography or gardening club.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Regimental or veterans organizations, such as the Canadian Legion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Women's organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Self-Help groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Other types of groups or organizations (please describe below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions about Business, Politics, Government, and Public Policy
Below is a list of some goals which are frequently thought of as being important to society. For you personally, how would you rank these goals? Place a 1 next to the most important goal, place a 2 next to the second most important, a 3 next to the third most important, and so on down to 13 for the least important goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a high rate of economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making sure that this country has strong defense forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining order in the nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving people more say in governmental decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting rising prices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting freedom of speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a stable economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress toward a less impersonal, more humane society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fight against crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards a society where ideas count more than money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much confidence do you have in the people running major companies? (Circle one of the following.)

- a. a great deal of confidence
- b. only some confidence
- c. hardly any confidence

How much confidence do you have in the people running banks and financial institutions? (Circle one of the following.)

- a. a great deal of confidence
- b. only some confidence
- c. hardly any confidence

Should the government: (Circle one of the following.)

- a. do something to reduce income differences between rich and poor, or
- b. should it not concern itself with income differences?
What do you think about government spending on improving and protecting the environment? Are we spending: (Circle one of the following.)

- a. too much money
- b. too little money
- c. about the right amount

What do you think about government spending on health care? Are we spending: (Circle one of the following.)

- a. too much money
- b. too little money
- c. about the right amount

What do you think about government spending on education? Are we spending: (Circle one of the following.)

- a. too much money
- b. too little money
- c. about the right amount

Did you vote in the last Provincial election? (Circle yes or no.)

- a. yes
- b. no

If yes, which party did you vote for? (Circle one of the following.)

- a. The Social Credit Party
- b. The Progressive Conservatives
- c. The Liberal Party
- d. The New Democratic Party
- e. The Green Party
- f. Other (please name)

Did you vote in the last Federal election? (Circle yes or no.)

- a. yes
- b. no

If yes, which party did you vote for? (Circle one of the following.)

- a. The Progressive Conservatives
- b. The Liberal Party
- c. The New Democratic Party
- d. The Reform Party
- e. The Green Party
- f. Other (please name)

Do you consider yourself: (Circle one of the following.)

- a. upper class
- b. upper middle class
- c. lower middle class
- d. working class
- e. other (please provide a brief description).
What country were you born in? ____________________________ (Country).

While most people in Canada think of themselves as Canadians, what would you say is the main ethnic background (or nationality) of your ancestors? (Please circle the number corresponding to the applicable category or if “other” write in your ethnic background on the line below.)

1 Australian  
2 English  
3 Irish  
4 Scottish  
5 Welsh  
6 Chinese  
7 Czech  
8 Finnish  
9 French  
10 German  
11 Hungarian  
12 Italian  
13 Japanese  
14 Jewish  
15 Native Indian  
16 American  
17 Netherlands  
18 Polish  
19 Russian  
20 Scandinavian  
21 Slovak  
22 Ukrainian  
23 West Indian  
24 African  
25 Korean  
26 Vietnamese  
27 East Indian  
28 Pakistani  
29 Portuguese  
30 Spanish  
31 Greek  
32 Other (please write in) ____________________________

Do you have any religious affiliation? (Circle yes or no.)

a. no  

b. yes  

If yes, please name ____________________________

If yes, how often do you attend your church, synagogue or temple? (Circle one of the following.)

a. once a week  
b. 2 or 3 times a month  
c. once a month  
d. a few times a year or less  
e. never
**Personal Network:** I am interested in whether you know people in certain lines of work in the Greater Victoria Area. If you know anyone in a certain type of work who is an acquaintance (rather than a close friend or relative) tick under "acquaintance"; if you know someone in a certain type of work who is a close friend, tick under "close friend"; if you know someone in a certain type of work who is a relative, tick under "relative". If any of the acquaintances, close friends, or relatives in a given occupation you know also belong to the SCWC, tick under "SCWC MEMBER". As in the example below, you may tick off more than one box per line. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF JOB</th>
<th>TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>SCWC MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you know anyone in the following types of work?</td>
<td>ACQUAINTANCE</td>
<td>CLOSE FRIEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 1: secretary ...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 2: teacher ...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 1, would indicate that you know at least one acquaintance and one close friend who are secretaries, but you do not know any relatives or SCWC members who are secretaries.

Example 2, would indicate that you know an acquaintance who is a teacher, a close friend who is a teacher, and at least one of these people is also a SCWC member.

**Now please complete for the following:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF JOB</th>
<th>TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>SCWC MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you know anyone in the following types of work?</td>
<td>ACQUAINTANCE</td>
<td>CLOSE FRIEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business owners (outside your own company) ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business managers who run an establishment (other than your own company) ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawyers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctors ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university or college professors ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary or secondary school teachers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional writers...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisors ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bankers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truck drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secretaries ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountants ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus drivers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION 45 CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**
### QUESTION 45 CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF JOB</th>
<th>TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you know anyone in the following types of work?</td>
<td>ACQUAINTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners/landscapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auto mechanics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plumbers ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiter/waitress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police officers ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loggers ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mill workers ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail sales clerks ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ministers, priests, or rabbis ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economists/financial specialists ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer/electronics technicians ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biologists ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pharmacists ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemists ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social researchers ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional painters or sculptors (artists) ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional writers ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architects ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social workers ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurses ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physiotherapists ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fishermen/fisherwomen ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>municipal politicians ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provincial politicians ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federal politicians ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university or college students ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school students ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you know anyone who works in the following industries in the Greater Victoria Area? (Please answer this question in the same manner as the previous question.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDUSTRY</th>
<th>TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you know anyone who works in the following industries?</td>
<td>ACQUAINTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fishing ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail sales (e.g. a department store) ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a newspaper, magazine, television or radio ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real estate ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a hotel, motel, or restaurant ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farming ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a utility (e.g. B.C. Hydro) ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a primary or secondary school ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a university or college ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the federal government...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the provincial government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local government ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a hospital ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health related fields (other than in hospital) ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the forest industry ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a nursing home ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a library, museum, or art gallery ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a religious organization ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism related industries not listed above ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feelings toward other groups
I would like you to think about your feelings about some groups. Below are listed a number of groups. Please indicate how you feel about each group on an imaginary thermometer that runs from 0 to 100 degrees. Ratings between 51 and 100 mean that you feel positive toward the group. 50 means that your feelings are neutral toward the group. Ratings between 0 and 49 mean that you feel negative toward the group. You may use any number from 0 to 100 to indicate how you feel.

For example:

0. How do you feel about Santa Claus? 90

The example above would indicate that you feel very positively toward Santa Claus.

Now please put a number beside each of the following statements to indicate your feelings toward that group.

How do you feel about small business? 
How do you feel about labour unions? 
How do you feel about native peoples? 
How do you feel about feminist groups?

Questions about your background
How old were you on your last birthday? (Years.)
What is your gender? (Circle one of the following.)

a. Female b. Male

Do you live in Greater Victoria? (Circle yes or no.)

a. yes b. no

If yes (to above), what municipality do you live in? (Write municipality below.)

If no (to above question), what city, town, or district do you live in? (Write city, town, or district below.)

What is your marital status? (Circle one of the following.)

a. married b. living common law with someone c. single (never married) d. separated e. divorced f. widowed

How many children do you have? 
How many are living at home? 
What are their ages?
What is the highest level of education you have received? (Circle one of the following.)

a. part of primary school
b. completed primary school
c. part of high school
d. completed high school
e. some college or university
f. received a college or technical school certificate
   Please specify major or subject: ____________________________

g. received a university bachelor's degree
   Please specify major or subject: ____________________________

h. some postgraduate training
   Please specify discipline: ________________________________
   received a postgraduate university degree
   Please specify type of degree and discipline:________________

j. other (please state) _____________________________________

Have you ever had taken a course (or other related training) in environmental studies?

a. yes        b. no

If yes, please describe below:

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

What is your occupation? (If you a homemaker or a student please state this. If you are retired, or unemployed please state this and list your former occupation.)

_________________________________________________________ (Occupation.)

Please describe your position and the paid work you do in detail.

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________
Did you have any special training for your job? (Circle yes or no.)

  a. yes  b. no

If yes, what sort of training?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

What does your company (or employer) do?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

What industry do you work in?

____________________________________________________________________

Do you work full-time or part-time? (Circle one of the following.)

  a. full-time  
  b. part-time  
  c. unemployed  
  d. other (please specify)

If you are employed, how many hours did you work last week?

____________________________________________________________________

Do you work for? (Circle one of the following.)

  a. a government department or ministry
  b. a large company
  c. a small business
  d. an institution
  e. yourself
  f. other (please provide a brief description below)

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Do you work in the public or private sector? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. public  
   b. private  

Approximately how many people, besides yourself, are employed at your workplace?  
(Print number in space provided.)___________  

About how many people, besides yourself, are employed by your company, or institution?  
(Print number in space provided.)___________  

How many people are working under you?  
(Print number in space provided.)___________  

If there are people working under you, do you supervise their work? (Circle yes or no.)  
   a. yes  
   b. no  

If you supervise others, how much say do you have in their hiring, firing, pay, or promotions? Would you say ... (Circle one of the following.)  
   a. no say  
   b. some say  
   c. a great deal of say  

Does anyone else supervise your work? (Circle yes or no.)  
   a. yes  
   b. no  

How much say do you have in what you, yourself, do in your work? Would you say ... (Circle one of the following.)  
   a. no say  
   b. some say  
   c. a great deal of say  

How many years have you been doing this kind of work? ___________
Would you say you are: (Circle one of the following.)

a. a business owner  
b. a manager  
c. a supervisor  
d. an employee in a non-management position  
e. other please specify

Now I would like to ask you something about the things which seem to you personally most important if you are looking for a job. Here are some of the things people usually take into account in relation to their work. Please RANK all of the following by placing a number from 1 to 4 to the left of each response, with 1 being most important, 2 being the second most important, 3 being the third most important, and 4 being the least important to you.

___ A good salary so that you do not have any worries about money.
___ A safe job with no risk of closing down or unemployment.
___ Working with people you like.
___ Doing an important job which gives you a feeling of accomplishment.

Below are listed several categories of income. Please circle the category that gives the best estimate of your personal income before taxes.

a. no personal income  
b. under $5,000  
c. $5,000 to $9,999  
d. $10,000 to $14,999  
e. $15,000 to $19,999  
f. $20,000 to $24,999  
g. $25,000 to $34,999  
h. $35,000 to $44,999  
i. $45,000 to $54,999  
j. $55,000 to $64,999  
k. $65,000 to $74,999  
l. $75,000 to $84,999  
m. $85,000 to $94,999  
n. $95,000 to $114,999  
o. $115,000 to $134,999  
p. $135,000 and above

Using the same categories would you please circle the category that gives the best estimate of total household income before taxes.

a. no personal income  
b. under $5,000  
c. $5,000 to $9,999  
d. $10,000 to $14,999  
e. $15,000 to $19,999  
f. $20,000 to $24,999  
g. $25,000 to $34,999  
h. $35,000 to $44,999  
i. $45,000 to $54,999  
j. $55,000 to $64,999  
k. $65,000 to $74,999  
l. $75,000 to $84,999  
m. $85,000 to $94,999  
n. $95,000 to $114,999  
o. $115,000 to $134,999  
p. $135,000 and above
The Sierra Club of Western Canada would like you to answer the following question to help it develop future strategies:

In your opinion, what are currently the most important environmental issues that need to be addressed? (Please write your answer below.)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

I would like to conduct a phone interview with a sample of participants who have completed this questionnaire. The questions I will ask will be similar in nature to those above, but will provide a bit more detail and give you a greater opportunity to present your views in your own words.

If you would be willing to participate in such a phone interview please write your first name and telephone number on the spaces provided below.

Your identity, and the information you provide will remain completely anonymous. Also, please note that your participation in this aspect of my research (as with the questionnaire you have just completed) is purely voluntary.

First name (only): __________________________
Phone number: __________________________
What are the best day(s) of the week to call you: ____________________________________________
What is/are the best time(s) to call you: ________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your participation. If you have any additional comments to make about any items on this questionnaire, about wilderness preservation more generally, or about the SCWC please write them below, and on the back of the questionnaire (or add them on a blank piece of note paper).

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

The End! Thank you again for your time and participation.
### B.4 Social Network Matrix (Names-removed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>I've never heard of this person</th>
<th>I've heard of this person but have never talked to this person</th>
<th>I've talked to this person at least once</th>
<th>I talk to this person at least a few times a year, but less than once a month</th>
<th>I've worked with this person</th>
<th>This person is a close friend of mine</th>
<th>I like this person</th>
<th>I dislike this person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**B.5 Media-Worker Interview**

**STUDY ON MEDIA COVERAGE OF FORESTRY/CONSERVATION**

**SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MEDIA WORKERS**

**Introduction**

I would like to request your participation in a study being conducted on "Media Coverage of Forestry Issues in B.C."

We are currently conducting research on the activities of key news media workers and news sources who shape coverage of environmental issues in B.C.

I would like to ask you about your views and professional activities involving coverage of forestry issues, your views on forestry issues, and your dealings with news sources and other news organizations involved in coverage of forestry issues.

The interview will take approximately an hour of your time.

Your participation in my study is completely voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question, and you may withdraw from the interview at any time.

The answers you provide will remain anonymous. For example, if I quote answers you provide (during the interview) in a published report, the material will be presented without any accompanying information that may identify you.

I will present my findings at several academic conferences and write articles to be published in academic journals.

I will be happy to answer any questions that you have about this research project (before, during, or after the interview takes place).
PART 1.

Who do you work for? (E.g., what media outlet).

What is your job title?

How long have you worked for this media outlet?

PART 2.

Now I'm going to ask you a few questions about your activities and the operations of your beat.

Do you have an assigned beat or area of news topics that you cover on a regular basis?

What is your beat?

What areas and topics are included in your beat?

In rough terms, what proportion of the stories you cover in your beat are devoted to forest issues?

Have the boundaries of the beat changed in recent years?

How long have you had this beat?

Why would you say you were assigned to this beat?

How does this beat compare and contrast with other news beats?

Please describe as much as possible your daily routine on the beat.

On a slow news day, what are some steps you might take to get story ideas?
Under what circumstances would stories about forests issues be written by another journalist at your organization?

Roughly what proportion of your story topics are assigned to you by an editor?

Roughly what proportion of your story ideas do you initiate yourself?

Of the stories you initiate yourself, how often and under what circumstances does your news organization decide not to run them?

Can you give me some examples of stories the organization has rejected?

PART 3.

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about news sources about forests issues whom you deal with.

Which news sources among environmentalists and environmental organizations do you use most often on your beat and why?

Which news sources in the forest industry do you use most often and why?

Which news sources in government do you use most often and why?

Which approaches do you think are most successful for groups and individuals in this area trying to get favourable media coverage?

Can you give me some examples of news sources contacting you with possible story ideas which you have decided to follow up?

Which you have decided not to follow up?
Which sources do you think are effective in dealing with the news media and why?

Which sources do you think are ineffective in dealing with the media and why?

On a scale of 1 to 9 with 1 being very ineffective and 9 being very effective, how would your rate each of the following tactics as a way of getting media coverage?

1. press releases
2. press conferences
3. demonstrations
4. boycotts
5. blockades
6. vandalism
7. other?

(Please specify)

PART 4.

Now I'm going to ask you some questions evaluating media coverage of forests issues.

What priority would you say your news organization assigns to forests issues?

How would you evaluate the coverage of forests issues by other news organizations besides your own?

Which other organizations have done a good job and why?

Which organizations have not done a good job and why?

Which aspects of the forests debate do you think the media have done a good job of covering?

Which aspects (if any) could the media do a better job of covering?

34. What effect on the ongoing debate would you say that media coverage has had?

PART 5.

Now I'm going to ask you a few questions about your personal views about the future of the forests.
If you had to sum up the key issues about the future of B.C. forests in a paragraph, how would you do so?

On a scale of 1 to 9, with 5 being neutral, 1 being the environmentalist position and 9 being the forest industry position, where would you rate your personal views on the future of B.C. forests?

On the same scale, rate the views of your organization's management.

How have your views about the forests debate changed during your time on the beat?

PART 6.
Questions about your background
How old were you on your last birthday? __________ (Years.)

What is your gender? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. Female       b. Male

Where do you live? (E.g., city, town, municipality).

What is the highest level of education you have received? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. some high school
   b. some college (name of U.)
   c. some university (name of U.)
   d. other (please specify)
   f. received a college or technical school certificate (name of C.)
      Please specify major or subject: __________________________
   g. received a university bachelor's degree (name of U.)
      Please specify major or subject: __________________________
h. some postgraduate training (name of U.)
   Please specify discipline: ____________________________

i. received a postgraduate university degree (name of U.)
   Please specify type of degree and discipline: __________

j. other (please state) ________________________________

[If applicable] Did you have any special training for your job? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. yes   b. no

If yes, what sort of training?
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

Have you ever taken a course (or had other related training) in environmental studies, forestry or related topics?
   a. yes   b. no

If yes, please describe:
   ________________________________
   ________________________________