WHAT STRIKES THE RESPONSIVE CHORD? THE EFFECTS OF FRAMING QUALITIES ON FRAME RESONANCE AMONG PROTEST PARTICIPANTS[*]

Pauline Ketelaars[†]

This study analyzes the extent to which collective action frames with certain qualities resonate with protesters. It goes beyond previous research on frame resonance by directly examining the frames that demonstrators use to motivate their participation and by comparing them with the frames of social movement organizations. The data consist of protest surveys from more than 5,000 participants in twenty-nine street demonstrations on various issues in three countries—Belgium, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. Results show that frames that appeal to people's everyday experiences resonate more than abstract or technical frames do. Also, resonance is higher when blame for the issue is put on a specific person or organization than when intangible forces or causes are held responsible. A comparison of two Dutch student demonstrations illustrates the results. These events were similar in most aspects but differed in framing and the extent to which protesters aligned with the organizers' frames.

Before people attend a street demonstration, they must first believe that something has to be done about a particular matter. Protest organizers therefore spend a significant portion of their time and energy framing the issue at hand as they try to convince people that action is warranted. Some frames are more successful in garnering support than others (Snow and Benford 1988), and social movement organizations (SMOs) frequently engage in debates about how to frame an issue in a way that resonates with potential participants (Benford 1993a). This study compares social movement frames across various street demonstrations and investigates which frames are aligned with the frames of people participating in these protest events. Which frames strike the responsive chord?

Frame qualities and the strategic functions of frames are gaining attention in social movement research. Some scholars focus on the influence of frame characteristics on movement consequences, like cultural change (Snow, Tan, and Owens 2013) and political outcomes (McCammon, Muse, and Newman 2007), and others discuss the effect on mobilization processes, like facilitating collective action (Chakravarty and Chaudhuri 2012) and recruiting new members (Mika 2006). This area of research has shown that frames with certain qualities have greater persuasive power than others. However, these studies examine the persuasiveness of frames indirectly. Authors show a positive relationship between the use of particular frames by SMOs and protest participation or movement emergence (e.g., Hewitt and McCammon 2004; McVeigh, Myers, and Sikkink 2004; Pedriana 2006), but the actual frames of the individuals who joined the movement remain unexamined. Most scholars who study frame resonance generally fail to assess which frames actually resonate with protest participants.

This study analyzes frame resonance by surveying protesters about their reasons for participating and by then comparing these reasons with the frames presented by the organizations staging the protest. I analyze whether features of collective action frames affect the extent to

which participants' reasons for engaging in street demonstrations align with the organizers' mobilizing messages. While most framing research relies on qualitative analysis (for exceptions see McCammon 2009, 2012; Snow, Vliegenthart, and Corrigall-Brown 2007) and case studies, I use a quantitative approach to systematically examine frames from multiple protest events in three countries. The data consist of protest surveys from more than 5,000 respondents in twenty-nine street demonstrations between 2009 and 2012 in Belgium, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. The results of the quantitative data are illustrated by a close comparison of two student protests from the sample.

Previous studies focused primarily on the framing quality of "narrative fidelity" or "cultural resonance"—i.e., the conjunction of movement frames with the culture of the targets of mobilization—while neglecting other characteristics (McCammon 2009). This study examines two frame qualities that have seldom been systematically tested, despite being mentioned frequently: the experiential commensurability of frames (Snow and Benford 1988), that is, what I call daily-life frames, and the specificity of the targets of the protest (Gamson 1992). The results indicate that frame resonance is higher when frames appeal to people's everyday lives than when frames are more abstract, technical, or distant. Also, frames that put responsibility on a specific person or organization foster greater alignment than frames that attribute blame to a general actor or to an intangible cause. The more specific the target, the more the frame resonates with protest participants.

PREVIOUS FRAMING RESEARCH

Since its development in the mid-1980s, the frame alignment approach has inspired an abundance of scholarship, becoming one of the foundational theories in the social movement literature (Snow, Benford, McCammon, Hewitt, and Fitzgerald 2014). Framing scholars consider how social movements interpret relevant situations (Snow, Rochford, Worden, and Benford 1986). An important tenet of the theory is that grievances do not automatically mobilize people to take part in collective action (Gamson 1992). Circumstances and events are subject to interpretation, and the way that people interpret them is critical to whether they will leave their house and engage in protest (Snow 2004). For example, Halfmann and Young (2010: 8) describe how before the 1830s, "the tone of antislavery [in the US] was moderate and advocates generally took for granted that Southern slaveholders had inherited an evil system that they would gradually abolish." From 1830 onwards, however, the abolitionist movement framed slavery as a national sin and spread grotesque depictions of the horrors of slavery. The movement thus shattered the popular opinion that "Southern slaveholders were good Christians who generally treated their slaves well and the assumption that this sin could be gradually reformed" (Halfmann and Young 2010:8). As this example shows, much of the work of movements is to construct and reconstruct frames in order to convince people that something must be done. Social movements use framing to try to align people with their version of reality.

Snow and Benford (1988) specify three core tasks of frames: diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing. Diagnostic framing identifies a problem in need of a remedy and the actor or cause responsible for the problem. In short, the diagnosis answers the questions, What is the problem? and Who or what is to blame? Prognostic framing stipulates possible solutions or goals, as well as strategies to achieve those objectives, asking, What should be done? The diagnosis and prognosis are part of consensus mobilization and are meant to generate support among possible constituents (Klandermans 1984). The third framing task, motivational framing, activates the people that agree with the movements' views and aims. It is the call to arms that must convince people that engagement is worthwhile. This study focuses on consensus mobilization, as frame resonance is essentially about achieving support. Also, since this study surveys protest participants, we already know that they have answered the call to arms.

Until now, framing has been studied mainly as a mesolevel phenomenon. The majority of framing contributions—and studies on strategic framing in particular (Oliver and Johnston 2000)—approach frames from an organizational point of view and neglect the microlevel analysis of individual constituents (Williams 2004). This oversight is remarkable given that frame alignment theory actually connects individuals to movements. Frame alignment is "the linkage of individual and SMO interpretive orientations, such that some set of individual interests, values and beliefs and SMO activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary" (Snow et al. 1986: 464). The framing perspective has the potential to bridge the gap between individuals and organizations, as it offers an understanding of how the micro-level and the mesolevel interact. Though scholars have analyzed frames of individual movement leaders and activists (see e.g., Johnston and Aarelaid-Tart 2000; Kubal 1998; Mooney and Hunt 1996), the values and beliefs of rank and file protest participants have rarely been studied (for exceptions see Alkon, Cortez, and Sze 2013; Hadler and McKay 2013; Wahlström, Wennerhag, and Rootes 2013).

Until the late 1990s, the majority of framing research was descriptive and concentrated on the elaboration and application of framing concepts. The approach lacked systematic empirical studies and the primary research goal appeared to be to identify frames used by SMOs (Benford 1997). Since then, the empirical scope of the field has grown, and the bulk of the research has become explanatory (Snow 2004). Nevertheless, an important and still prevalent gap is the single case orientation (Johnston and Alimi 2013; Polletta and Ho 2006). Many framing studies only analyze one social movement or social movement organization. The focus on single cases makes it difficult to generalize about effects of framing. Furthermore, few researchers examine frames of specific street demonstrations or protest events (see Gerhards and Rucht 1992 for an exception). Most scholars scrutinize frames of a whole movement, analyzing newspaper articles, texts, or documents communicated by organizations over a longer period of time (e.g., Ferree 2003; Haalboom 2011; Noonan 1995). Accordingly, frames are usually operationalized in a broad sense. Researchers summarize movement's messages into two or three frames that encapsulate the core arguments without investigating the larger set of claims that make up the argumentation (see Babb 1996 for an exception). When SMOs try to mobilize people for collective action they typically provide elaborate frame structures with detailed diagnoses and prognoses (Johnston 2002). However, most authors only analyze the general description of a mobilization campaign without taking account of subordinate elements.

This study aims to address these lacunae—the disregard of subordinate frame elements, the focus on the organizational level, the neglect of protest events, and the use of the single case orientation—by dissecting protest organizers' frames in detail and by comparing them with the frames of individual protest participants in twenty-nine street demonstrations. By studying frame resonance at the level of individual participants, instead of at the meso level, it is possible to move beyond general observations and to assess with what kind of frames activists are actually aligned. While previous studies have shown that some frames positively affect movement and protest emergence, their design does not test people's alignment with different frame qualities in a multivariate way.

FRAME RESONANCE

Framing can be seen as the marketing task of social movements, packaging the issue and strategically linking ideas, beliefs, and values in such a way that the frame generates support from constituents and bystanders (Snow and Byrd 2007). Still, it is important to realize that SMOs cannot choose any framing they would like. Some social issues are easier to frame in an attractive way. "For instance, small-scale, single-issue campaigns may have clearer targets and cleaner recipes for success than larger, global problems, like racism or global warming, which entail complex webs of causes and solutions (Bergstrand 2014: 125).

When talking about frames' success or persuasiveness, scholars use the concept of resonance to explain why some frames appeal while others do not. As Opp (2009) observes, the framing literature is unclear about what resonance means and how it differs from frame alignment. I contend there is little difference between them: the more people align with an SMO frame, the more the frame resonates. The difference between the concepts is that frame resonance is a frame attribute, as in some frames resonating more than others, while frame alignment can be attributed to something individuals do, as in someone aligning with a certain frame or not. This study tries to unravel the mechanism behind frame resonance. Why do particular frames resonate? How can we explain why protest participants align with some of the frames put forward by social movement organizations but not with others?

The frame quality of cultural resonance—the conjunction of frames with the culture of the targets of mobilization (McCammon 2013)—has until now received most scholarly attention. Cadena-Roa (2002), for instance, shows how a movement in Mexico City successfully drew upon the Mexican wrestling culture to frame the corruption and mismanagement of the state. Similarly, McCammon (2001) finds a positive effect of cultural resonance on the emergence of women's suffrage organizations. While the use of the expediency frame, which claimed that women should be able to vote because they have special womanly skills, had a positive effect on the presence of suffrage associations in a state, the justice frame, which stated that women are citizens just like men, did not. The author argues that the latter frame was not culturally resonant, and thus unsuccessful, because it challenged traditional beliefs held at the turn of the twentieth century. The concept of cultural resonance is important for the effectiveness of frames (Taylor and van Dyke 2004). However, as McCammon (2009: 48) observes, "few scholars have moved beyond research on the importance of cultural resonance to consider that other qualities of social movement frames may also have significant persuasive capacity."

Another important factor that may contribute to a frame's resonance is what Benford and Snow (2000: 621) call experiential commensurability: "Are movement framings congruent or resonant with the personal, everyday experiences of the targets of mobilization? Or are the framings too abstract and distant from the lives and experiences of the targets?" When frames appeal to familiar matters and daily life, the issue appears more salient to people. Correspondingly, Snow and Benford (1988: 204) argue that diagnoses and prognoses should not be framed too much in a technological manner, because "to frame any issue in terms that are inaccessible to all but a select few . . . is to reduce potential participants to spectators and so make the issue nonparticipatory." Based on these insights, we can distinguish between frames that relate to daily life and frames that do not. Daily-life frames appeal to personal experiences and the life situations of the targets of mobilization. In the case of a workers' demonstration, for instance, daily-life frames could be asking for more respect at the workplace. Framing the workers' issue as a matter of international cooperation and solidarity, on the other hand, is less accessible, more abstract, and distant from everyday life. The core idea of framing is that an issue can be viewed from a variety of perspectives. I expect that, when protest issues are viewed from people's everyday-life perspective, frames will have more resonance. Frames that a person can personally relate to should resonate more than abstract or technical frames that are distant from a person's reality. The first hypothesis is:

H1. Daily-life frames resonate more with protest participants than other frames.

Furthermore, an important part of framing is blame attribution. In order to take part in collective action, identifying something or someone as responsible for the issue is essential (Javeline 2003). Gerhards and Rucht (1992) distinguish between two types of blame attribution (causes and causal agents), and they expect that targeting causal agents is strategically more advantageous for social movement organizations than identifying causes. When responsibility for an issue can be placed on a specific person or party, people more easily align with the frame than when something intangible is held accountable. When responsibility is specific, people believe that the grievance can actually be alleviated. Javeline

(2003), for instance, argues that workers are among the most frequent groups of protesters because their problems can usually be solved by a clearly identifiable actor: the employer. As Gamson (1992: 32) elucidates,

> When we see impersonal, abstract forces as responsible for our suffering, we are taught to accept what cannot be changed and make the best of it . . . . At the other extreme, if one attributes undeserved suffering to malicious or selfish acts by clearly identifiable groups, the emotional component of an injustice frame will almost certainly be there.

I therefore expect that protest participants are more aligned with SMO framing when blame attribution concerns concrete causal agents than when the culpability is assigned to more general targets and, in particular, when abstract forces are held responsible.

> H2. Frames that attribute blame to a specific causal agent resonate more than frames that blame a more general causal agent.

> H3. Frames that attribute blame to a specific causal agent resonate more than frames that blame an abstract cause.

The three hypotheses are tested using a dataset comparing twenty-nine street demonstrations. However, first I will illustrate my arguments by focusing on just two of the demonstrations in the sample. Here, I employ a most-similar-design comparison, looking at protests that are alike on most dimensions, but different regarding the frames that were used by the organizers. I focus here on two Dutch student protests, with the same main organizers, staged around the same time, on the same issue. The first was held in Amsterdam on May 21, 2010, and the second was organized eight months later in The Hague on the January 21, 2011.[1] Interviews with the organizers and analyses of the demonstrations' platforms reveal that both events condemned austerity measures on higher education, blaming the government for making studying more expensive by increasing student fees, replacing student scholarships with student loans, and giving students only a discount on public transportation instead of free public transport. Table 1 on the next page gives an overview of the similarities and differences between the two demonstrations.

In some respects the framing of the issue differed. In Amsterdam, the organizers spoke primarily about education as the motor of the economy, as the most important exported product of the Dutch, and as a crucial element to overcome the economic crisis. They observed that while the Dutch government wanted the Netherlands to be in the global top five of knowledge-based economies, the country had descended to the twelfth place and was still dropping. In The Hague, the economic (and thus relatively abstract and technical) framing was present as well, but featured less prominently and extensively. Moreover, in The Hague protest campaign, the organizers argued that students would no longer have opportunities for personal development alongside their studies. They claimed that for a good position in the labor market, students must do more than study for four or five years; in addition, they need to do an internship, get foreign experience, or become a member of the board of a fraternity. The austerities would make spending time on other activities too expensive for most Dutch students. Thus, the framing of the protest demonstration in The Hague was more relevant for students' daily life than the predominant macroeconomic framing of the event in Amsterdam.

Furthermore, the blame in The Hague was attributed to more specific actors. In Amsterdam, responsibility was placed on the previous and current governments, and on politics in general. In The Hague, besides the government, a specific politician—State Secretary of Education Halbe Zijlstra—and a specific political party—the Christian Democrats (CDA)—were held accountable for the announced cuts on higher education. The framing underlying the demonstration in The Hague thus was more connected to students' everyday experiences and offered more specific blame attributions. The final hypothesis therefore is:

> H4: The organizers' frames of the student demonstration in The Hague resonated more amongst protest participants than the organizers' frames of the student demonstration in Amsterdam.

Table 1. Comparing Two Dutch Student Demonstrations

	Amsterdam	**The Hague**
Date	May 21st, 2010	January 21st, 2011
Organizers	National Students Union (LSVB) National Chamber of Associations (LKvV) Intercity Student Council (ISO) Committee SOS Youth Org. of Vocational Education (JOB)	National Students Union (LSVB) National Chamber of Associations (LKvV) Intercity Student Council (ISO)
Main issue	Planned government cuts on education	Planned government cuts on education
Demands	No increase of student fees Student scholarships instead of student loans Free public transport for students Invest in education (instead of cuts) The Dutch education system should be in the international top five	No increase of student fees Student scholarships instead of student loans Free public transport for students Invest in education (instead of cuts)
Macro-economic framing	A knowledge-based economy is the motor of economic welfare Knowledge-based economy is our best export product	The cuts are bad for our knowledge-based economy
Daily-life framing	Students should not have to pay more to study	Students should not have to pay more to study Students will no longer have opportunities for personal development
Who is to blame?	The (previous/current) government Politics in general	The government Christian Democrats Halbe Zijlstra (State Secretary)

DATA AND METHODS

The study's data come from an international collaborative research project called "Caught in the act of protest: Contextualizing Contestation" (CCC, also see Klandermans 2012). In this project, protest participants were surveyed during or shortly after protesting (Walgrave, Wouters, and Ketelaars 2016; Walgrave and Verhulst 2011). In total, twenty-nine street demonstrations were covered between 2009 and 2012 in three countries: Belgium, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. The selected events are the most important (i.e., most visible) street demonstrations occurring in these countries during the research period. As a consequence, only relatively successful mobilization campaigns were included. It must be noted as well that, for the safety of the interviewers, we only covered nondisruptive events. Sixteen of the events are antiausterity protests, including one politicized May Day event. The other demonstrations that are included covered environmental issues (n = 4), antidiscrimination issues (n = 4) (e.g., protests against racism and women's rights demonstrations), and events regarding democracy or the political system (n = 5). The three countries under study are Western European nations with long traditions of parliamentary democracy. The selection of the countries was pragmatic, because interpreting and coding frames requires sufficient knowledge of the language. The three countries nevertheless present a robust test for the hypotheses presented here.[2] More than 20,000 postal surveys were distributed in the twenty-nine street demonstrations in the sample, of which 6,096 were send back. Overall the response rate was 29.7 percent.[3]

Coding Frame Resonance: The First Stage

Frames are defined and operationalized based on the work of social movement scholar Hank Johnston. In several articles and book chapters he develops a methodology to systematically compare collective action frames (e.g., Johnston 1995, 2002, 2005; Johnston and Alimi 2013). While he particularly develops the method to compare frames across movements and time, it is used here to compare frames of protest participants and protest organizers. Johnston (2002) defines frames as cognitive schemata that shape people's behavior and that consist of multiple elements. An important aspect of the method is identifying the various frame components that make up frames: "If we acknowledge that frames are constructed from a cultural fabric and that they have a specific content, we can describe the 'materials' that make them up—that is, the components of an interpretative schema" (Noakes and Johnston 2005: 7). Instead of analyzing frames as broad categories that cover a range of concepts, I identify all materials that compose them and examine each component separately (for an example, see Gerhards and Rucht 1992). The units of analysis, hence, are frame components, and they all give a different answer to one of the following questions: What is the problem? Who or what is to blame for it? How can the problem be solved?

I measure frame resonance by comparing the discourse of the frame articulators (social movement organizations) and the frame receivers (participants). The degree of frame resonance is measured by examining to what extent protest participants use the same arguments and refer to the same concepts, actors, and institutions in their responses to the survey as the movement organizations did in their campaign material. The more the participants' reasoning corresponds with that of the staging organizations, the higher the frame resonance. Since framing is about meaning and interpretations of reality, I compare congruence of content, instead of simply comparing exact use of particular words.

Although framing is about the production of meaning and it is "a set of dynamic, negotiated, and often contested processes" (Benford and Snow 2000: 56), to measure congruence between SMOs and protest participants it is necessary to freeze frames at a particular point in time (Johnston 2002). In the first stage of the coding process, the official platform texts of the twenty-nine protest demonstrations are collected. These are the official claims and points of view underlying the demonstration. Of course, the platforms might not cover all relevant frames. When putting together these texts, people within social movements engage in framing disputes about how to articulate their version of reality (Benford 1993b), and as a result some frame components might not be included in the final cut. It is also possible that organizations do not want to trumpet all their reasons to protest in an official leaflet, because some might be considered politically incorrect. Nevertheless, the platform texts are a meaningful source and the best available point of reference. They represent a shared interpretation and these texts are what the organizers present to the outside world. According to Gerhards and Rucht (1992: 573–74), the leaflets produced by all supporting groups of a protest event are "valid indicators for the groups' common frames." The platform texts of the demonstrations in the sample were published in print flyers or online, and the responsible teams of the CCC project gathered them per country. Also, before each demonstration, scholars from the project interviewed the protest organizers. They asked organizers about the issues they mobilized for and reasons why the demonstration was held. The answers to these questions were compared with the protest pamphlets for verification and for more insight into the organizers' standpoints.

I worked with two colleagues to convert the full platform texts into a series of frame components. Each distinct statement or argument in the platform text was operationalized as a frame component. If a certain element was mentioned multiple times in the platform, it was only recorded once. In total, the analysis identifies 583 frame elements for the twenty-nine demonstrations. Each frame element is coded as either a diagnosis (292 elements), a prognosis (189 elements), or a blame attribution (186 elements). On average, the demonstration pamphlets contain twenty frame elements.

Coding Frame Resonance: The Second Stage

The second stage of the coding process analyzes the overlap between the frame components of the organizers and the answers of participants to three open questions in the protest survey[4]:

Q1. Please tell us why you participated in this protest event?

Q2. In your opinion, who or what is to blame for [demonstration issue]?

Q3. What should be done to address the issue?

These questions touch upon the first thoughts of participants and them to explain in their own words what the demonstration is about and why they participated. Such written motivations only reveal some of the motives that may have played a role when weighing the cognitive pros and cons of participation. Such an incomplete picture is not a disadvantage, per se, because respondents emphasize what is most important to them.

Q1 indirectly asks for the diagnosis, meaning the event or situation that is problematic and needs to be repaired. Respondents might interpret this question differently and mention other reasons why they participated (for instance, because their friends went as well), instead of referring to the issue or problem underlying the protest event. However, of all arguments written down by respondents on the three open questions, only six percent do not refer to the issue at stake. These answers are left out of the analysis. Q2 goes into blame attribution, meaning who or what is responsible for the problematic situation. Q3 tries to elicit a prognosis, that is, a possible solution for the problem. Only respondents who answered all three questions are included, which leaves us with 5,495 respondents. Table 2 provides examples of platform frame components and corresponding answers of respondents.

Respondents' triple answers are parsed into quasi-sentences containing one argument or statement. For every quasi-sentence, coders examine whether it is congruent with one of the SMOs' frame elements. Congruence is interpreted broadly. Demonstrators do not have to use literally the same words as in the platform text for a frame element to overlap. An organizers'

Table 2. Examples of Platform Frame Components and Congruent Respondent Answers

Million Women Rise (UK)

Frame platform	Women experience a lot of violence.
Respondent	"Violence is committed against women all over the world in domestic and political situations."
Frame platform	Women have been socially, culturally, and economically conditioned to defer to men.
Respondent	"Men" [answer to Q2]
Frame platform	We can change the attitude towards women via education and awareness
Respondent	"Address the issues in schools"

Take Back Parliament (UK)

Frame platform	The current voting system is not fair / is broken.
Respondent	"FPTP [First-Past-The-Post] is not a good system."
Frame platform	The political elite
Respondent	"Political elite" [answer to Q2]
Frame platform	A proportional system should be installed.
Respondent	"A move to PR [proportional representation], either fully or partly."

frame is only coded one time per respondent. Six coders completed the coding. Each demonstration was coded by at least two different people who each coded approximately 1,000 respondents. Ten percent of the sample was double coded and Krippendorff's alpha (Hayes and Krippendorff 2007) was measured for the number of identified quasi-sentences in a respondent's answer (K-alpha = .93), the number of quasi-sentences congruent with the organizers (K-alpha = .72) and the number of incongruent quasi-sentences (K-alpha = .71). With this information I created a dataset with frame components as units of analysis, containing 583 cases.

Variables

The dependent variable is frame resonance, which counts how many respondents in a demonstration have mentioned an organizers' particular frame component when asked about their reasons for participation. As is often the case with count data, I have to account for the number of times that frame resonance could have happened. Thus, the exposure variable is the number of respondents in each demonstration, controlling for how often a certain frame element could have been mentioned.[5] To test the hypotheses, I run negative binomial regression models. Poisson regressions are not appropriate because of overdispersion. As frames elements are nested in demonstrations, I use multilevel modeling.[6]

There are two independent variables. First, a dummy variable measures whether each component is a daily-life frame (1) or not (0). Concretely, coders have to answer the following question: "Does the frame component talk about problems/consequences/solutions regarding the protest issue that affect or are important to people's daily life?" (no = 0; yes = 1). When coding this variable, the targets of mobilization are taken into account. In case of a women's rights demonstration, for instance, frame components are coded as "daily-life" when they are considered familiar to women, recognizing they might not be part of daily life for men. Frame elements that are coded "yes" include, "Students shouldn't have to pay more to study," "The attitude/behavior towards women is very bad," "There is too little respect for people working for the military," and "People's jobs are threatened." Examples that are coded "no" are, "Fiscal transparency is too low," "There is need for a socially just transformation regarding climate change," "More cooperation between governments, employers and unions is needed," "Education is the motor of a knowledge-based economy," and "The government must show leadership at the climate summit/take the lead." This variable is not coded for frame components that attribute blame and therefore only occurs in 397 of the 583 cases. Coding is done by the author and a colleague (K-alpha = .84).

The second independent variable is blame attribution. Each frame component that attributes blame is coded into one of three possible categories. When something abstract or immaterial is blamed, the blame is categorized as a cause and coded 0. For the coding of this category I follow Gamson's (1992) passage about "abstract targets that render human agency as invisible as possible," which according to him are "actorless entities such as 'the system', 'society', 'life', and 'human nature'" (1992: 32). Examples of this blame category from the sample are "privatization," "the economic system," "the way of life," and "people's attitudes." When blame is attributed to something less abstract, it is classified in the category general causal agent (1). This category includes, for example, when the blame was put on "banks," "rich countries," "world leaders," "the financial sector," or "the media." Finally, the third category is specific causal agent (2), which accounts for frame elements that blame specific people, political parties, or organizations. The staging organizations in the sample blamed, for example, "the minister of defense," "Geert Wilders," "the current government," "the Tories," and "the British National Party." This variable is only coded for frame components that attribute blame, which was the case for 186 of the 583 frame elements.

I measure four control variables. First, I code whether each frame element is a primary frame component (1) or not (0). Frame components can have a higher or lower degree of saliency in a mobilization campaign. Frame elements are hierarchically organized, and in a frame scheme one can distinguish different levels (Johnston 2002). The primary frame

components are situated at the top level of this hierarchy. They summarize the overarching reason why the demonstration was held and cover the main diagnosis and prognosis. They communicate the most visible and, generally, the most appealing message. I control for them because one expects that protest participants align more with the primary elements. While adherents might disagree with some of the specific proposed solutions or secondary diagnoses, we can expect them to be largely aligned with the central frame components when they decide to protest. Coders identify the primary frame components by looking at the titles and slogans of the demonstration. They are easily identifiable because of the use of large and bold letters on the pamphlet. In some pamphlets there is only one central slogan or heading, while others use more (see appendix B for an overview). Second, I control for the number of frame elements included in a protest platform. When there are many mentioned in a mobilization campaign, the alignment with each separate frame element is expected to be lower. Third, I add dummies of the demonstration issues as control variables, distinguishing between antiausterity, environmental, democracy, and antidiscrimination events. Finally, because there are not enough countries to warrant a separate level in the multilevel regressions, three country dummies are added as variables at the demonstration level. Table 3 presents an overview of all variables.

Table 3. Overview of the Variables

Variable Name	Response Categories	N	Mean	Share	Min.	Max.
Frame component level						
Frame resonance	No. of respondents that mentioned frame component	583	20.8		0	188
Daily-life frame	0 = not daily life	397		54.8	0	1
	1 = daily life			45.2		
Blame attribution	0 = cause	186		32.8	0	2
	1 = general causal agent			41.9		
	2 = specific causal agent			25.3		
Primary frame component	0 = secondary frame component	583		87.1	0	1
	1 = primary frame component			12.9		
Demonstration level						
No. of respondents	No. of respondents for event	29	189.5		35	334
No. of frame components	No. of frame components in platform[a]	29	13.7		3	26
No. of blame components	No. of blames in platform	29	6.4		1	13
Issue	Austerity	29		55.2		
	Democracy			17.2		
	Environment			13.8		
	Valence			13.8		
Country	Belgium	29		27.6		
	The Netherlands			34.5		
	United Kingdom			37.9		

Note: [a] Number of frame components in platform without the blame-attribution elements

RESULTS

We know that SMOs cannot choose any framing they want. Some issues are easier to frame in an attractive way. Table 4 shows the share of frame elements with particular qualities across issues. The platforms for antiausterity demonstrations on average contain most daily-life frames. Almost two-thirds (60.8 percent) of the identified frame components appeal to people's everyday experiences. Environmental protest platforms contain substantially fewer of these (18.0 percent), which makes sense, as austerity demonstrations deal with "bread-and-butter issues." They focus mostly on basic needs and topics that often have a direct impact on people. Environmental issues tend to be more complex and address less familiar matters like nuclear energy and climate change. Furthermore, there are some notable differences regarding who or what is held responsible in the protest campaigns. Abstract forces or causes are least blamed in democracy events (11.1 percent), and most blamed in antidiscrimination protests (41.5 percent). Social movements asking for political change often target the political elite. Politicians are deemed responsible for the current political situation and thus are expected to solve the problem. Actorless causes emerge more frequently for SMOs addressing discrimination, such as people's negative attitudes in general, but the blame is also attributed to extreme-right parties. On average, pamphlets from antiausterity demonstrations contain most specific targets (41.9 percent) but environmental SMOs often put responsibility on specific organizations as well (40.2 percent).

Table 4. Average Share (Percent) of Frame Components with a Certain Quality

Issue (n demonstrations)	Austerity (n = 16)	Environment (n = 4)	Discrimination (n = 4)	Democracy (n = 5)	Total (n = 29)
Daily-life frames					
Daily-life	60.8	18.0	44.1	32.0	47.6
Other	39.2	82.0	55.9	68.0	52.4
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Blame attribution					
Cause	20.8	37.1	41.5	11.1	26.3
General causal agent	37.3	22.7	30.1	55	37.4
Specific causal agent	41.9	40.2	28.4	33.9	36.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Testing Hypotheses 1 and 2

A considerable part of the protest platforms (15 percent) is not mentioned at all when activists are asked to talk about the reasons why they joined a demonstration. Some problems and solutions that protest organizers deemed important enough to include in their communication about the protest demonstration appear less important to the people who joined the event. Of the frame elements that nobody mentioned, only eight percent were daily-life frames. Of the blame attributions that were never mentioned, only twenty percent were a specific causal agent. Furthermore, only a few frame components were ubiquitous: 1.3 percent were referred to by more than half of the respondents in a demonstration. These elements often assigned blame, particularly to the government or a political party.

Table 5 shows two multilevel negative binomial regressions with the dependent variable frame resonance. Model 1 includes the 397 diagnostic and prognostic frame components, because the independent variable "daily-life frame" is only coded for those elements. Similarly, model 2 contains the 186 elements that attribute responsibility, because the independent variable "blame" is only coded for those frame elements. The model fit statistics in the bottom panel compare the intercept-only models (empty models) with the full models and indicate that the full models fit the data better. The log likelihood, the BIC, and AIC are reduced

by adding the predictors. Besides the regression coefficients, standard errors, and significance levels, the table reports incidence-rate ratios (IRR) to make sense of the size of the effects. Marginal effects are reported throughout the text below. When calculating marginal effects, other variables are kept at their means or, in cases of dichotomous variables, they are kept at 0 or 1 (whatever was most common).

Table 5. Two Multilevel Negative Binomial Regressions

	Model 1		**Model 2**	
N frame components	397		186	
	Coef. (Std. E.)	*IRR*	*Coef. (Std. E.)*	*IRR*
Independent variables				
Daily-life frame	**.324 (.103)****	**1.382**	–	–
Blame (ref. = cause)				
General causal agent	–	–	**.470 (.173)****	**1.600**
Specific causal agent	–	–	**.859 (.196)*****	**2.361**
Control variables				
Primary frame component	**1.168 (.115)*****	**3.214**	**.664 (.172)*****	**1.942**
No. of frame components	**-.047 (.008)*****	**.955**	–	
No. of blame components	–	–	.005 (.016)	1.005
Issue (ref. = Austerity)				
Democracy	-.065 (.146)	.937	-.089 (.185)	1.093
Environment	-.128 (.151)	.880	**-.568 (.212)****	**.567**
Discrimination	-.215 (.180)	.807	-.067 (.243)	.935
Country (ref. = Belgium)				
Netherlands	**-.285 (.130)***	**.752**	-.067 (.180)	1.069
United Kingdom	-.091 (.122)	.913	-.108 (.178)	.897
Constant	-5.118 (.212)***	.006	-5.856 (.247)***	.002
Wald chi2 (df)	203.45 (8)		65.26 (9)	
Prob > chi2	.000		.000	
Log likelihood	-1424.339 [-1491.001]		-718.101 [-745.926]	
Δ Log Likelihood	66.662		27.825	
BIC	2914.5 [2999.953]		1498.91 [1507.528]	
Δ BIC	85.453		8.618	
AIC	2870.677 [2988.002]		1460.201 [1497.851]	
Δ AIC	117.325		37.65	

Notes: N demonstrations = 29. Empty models are in brackets in bottom pane. "Frame resonance" is the dependent variable. "Number of respondents" is used as an exposure variable. *** p<.001; **p<.01; * p<.05

H1 predicts that daily-life frames foster more alignment than other frame components. Model 1 in table 5 shows that this indeed is the case. Controlling for other determinants, frame elements that have bearing on the daily lives of protest participants are mentioned more with a factor of 1.382 (IRR) compared to the ones that are more distant from everyday experiences. Marginal effects indicate that daily-life frames are on average mentioned by 13 percent of the respondents, while other frame components are referred to by 7 percent.

H2 and H3 concern the frame elements that attribute responsibility to something or someone. These hypotheses are tested in model 2. I expect in H2 that frames that impute the problem to a concrete person or organization resonate more than frames that assign the blame to more general actors. The results support this expectation. Blames that fall into the general causal agent category have a 22 percent chance of being written down. This chance increases to 35 percent when blame is put on something or someone specific. H3 predicts that frames resonate more when blame is assigned to a cause rather than to something intangible. Activists are more than twice as likely to align with blaming concrete people or organizations (IRR = 2.361) than with abstract or intangible forces. Marginal effects show that a cause is on average mentioned by only thirteen percent of the respondents.

In addition, model 1 shows that resonance is higher for the primary or central frame components of a demonstration. Primary elements are on average mentioned three times as often (IRR = 3.214) than the secondary components of the demonstration platform. Using marginal effects shows that almost half of respondents (49 percent) write down a primary frame, compared to 13 percent of participants who reference secondary frame components. Furthermore, the number of frame elements in a platform text has a clear negative effect (B = -.047). The more elaborate the pamphlet, the more dispersed the frame alignment. The country dummies in the analysis show that there is less frame resonance in the Netherlands compared to Belgium, which suggests that Belgian activists are more on-message than their Dutch counterparts. The model shows no difference in frame resonance between demonstrations on different issues. Participants in democracy, antidiscrimination, and environment, protests are neither more nor less aligned than the activists in the austerity events[7]. Nevertheless, note that this is the case while controlling for frame qualities. When only the issues are included as independent variables, democracy participants are more aligned and environmental protesters are less aligned than people joining austerity demonstrations. Hence, participants protesting against various issues have different alignment patterns, but these differences can be attributed to framing characteristics. Model 2 indicates that fewer participants refer to blame attributions formulated by environmental organizers than to the blames developed by antiausterity organizations. Activists in environmental demonstrations agree less with the protest organizers about who is responsible, which is logical, given that one could blame a whole range of actors and causes for environmental problems.

Testing Hypothesis 4

The final hypothesis concerned the comparison of two demonstrations with similar frames in the sample: the Amsterdam student protest in May 2010 and the student demonstration in The Hague eight months later. Still, I hypothesized that protest participants' frames were more aligned with the organizers' frames in The Hague, because this campaign put more emphasis on daily-life experiences and blamed more specific causal agents. The results confirm this hypothesis. On average, the organizers' frame components in The Hague resonated with 12.5 percent of the protest participants, compared to 8.7 percent in Amsterdam. A difference of 4 percent is not big, but because the framing of the protests differed only on a few aspects, this difference becomes rather substantial.

The economic frame elements in both student demonstrations, which talked about education being the motor of economy, were on average mentioned by only 3.2 percent of the respondents, compared to an average of 11.4 percent for the other frame elements. Moreover, in The Hague, the daily-life frame that talked about the personal development of students

(excluding primary frame elements) was most often mentioned, together with the claim that the austerity measures would damage the quality of education (mentioned by 13 percent of the respondents). The blame attributions of the demonstration in The Hague also resonated more than the blames in Amsterdam. However, the difference is very small: in The Hague 24 percent of the respondents aligned with the organizers' blames, compared to 22 percent in Amsterdam.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This study explores why some social movement frames resonate with protest participants while others do not. Frame resonance considers the connection between individual and social movement interpretations of a protest issue. Previous studies mostly failed to examine the individual side of this linkage. Scholars studied the persuasiveness of frames without asking the receivers of those frames what their cognitive motivations to join actually were. This study examines frame resonance by comparing the individual frames of protest participants with the frames communicated by the organizers of demonstrations. It tests whether the extent to which protest participants align with social movement organizations can be explained by the characteristics of the frames that SMOs use. I go beyond previous studies by using a quantitative method, studying frame resonance in twenty-nine street demonstrations on various issues, and by analyzing the effect of two frame features that are rarely tested in a systematic manner, despite being mentioned frequently in the literature. Additionally, while most framing scholars operationalize frames vaguely and broadly by summarizing the movement's messages main themes, I investigate the larger set of claims that make up the organizers' argumentation, studying framing at the frame component level (Johnston 1995, 2002).

The results confirm that frames have more resonance when they appeal to people's everyday experiences. When joining a demonstration, people are more motivated by frame components that talk about familiar matters than by ones that are more technical or distant from their daily lives. How blame is attributed makes a difference as well. When abstract causes are held responsible (i.e., a certain situation, particular circumstances, or something intangible), frames are less convincing than when a concrete person, party, or organization is identified as the issue's culprit. When preparing protest frames, it would be useful for SMOs to formulate frames from the perspective of people's daily lives and to attribute blame to particular organizations, people, or institutions, instead of identifying abstract forces and causes. Of course, social movements cannot use any frame they want. Framing also depends on the sociopolitical context, and real world events limit the claims one can make. As Gamson (2006: 124) illustrates, "The accidents at Three Miles Island and Chernobyl have not made life easy for those who frame nuclear power development as technological progress." The organization's ideology also plays a role. I find that organizers of antiausterity demonstrations more often use daily-life frames and more specific blame attributions than SMOs staging events on other issues, like environmental protest events. Still, compared to other factors that influence protest participation (such as the political context), the framing of the issue is something social movements can control, at least to some extent.

This study has some limitations. First, the process of frame alignment is not examined, as only the outcome is taken into account. As a consequence, I cannot tell whether protesters have really adopted certain SMO frames, or whether the views of demonstrators and SMOs were already congruent before movements started their mobilization campaigns. In that case the frames of organizers and participants are aligned without a process of alignment taking place. Also, I am not able to disentangle who leads and who follows. Methodologically, I approach frame resonance as a top-down matter. I start with frames of social movement organizations and examine whether they resonate with protest participants. Vijay and Kulkarni (2012) show that frames can emerge at the grassroots level as well, and that frames might be

directed from nonelites towards the elites instead of the other way around. I cannot examine who influences whom, because I measure frame resonance at only one point in time, I only assess a degree of congruence, which is the outcome of an interactional and ongoing process between individuals and social movement organizers.

Second, only relatively successful mobilization campaigns are studied. Protest events where we expected two thousand participants or more were covered in the project. Therefore the study does not include negative cases, and I am not able to show why certain framing efforts fail.

Third, since only protest participants are included, I cannot tell to what degree nonparticipants are aligned with the organizers' mobilizing messages and whether their alignment is also dependent on the frame characteristics under scrutiny. Are frames with certain qualities more resonant with people in general, or are there differences between individuals who attend demonstrations and the larger public? Similarly, it is not clear whether the examined frame characteristics convince people of a certain view or whether daily-life frames and specific blames succeed in mobilizing people who were already aligned.

The present study focuses on the congruence between protest organizers and protest participants, trying to explain when their framing overlaps. Future research might want to explore frame elements that individuals use to motivate their participation that do not align with the organizers' frames. Coding the respondents' answers reveals that about half of the quasi-sentences they write down cannot be traced back to the protest platforms (also see Ketelaars, Walgrave, and Wouters 2014). Future studies could try to explain the other motives that people have to join a demonstration. Do they, for instance, pick up frame components that are apparent in the media coverage of the protest issue? Do their incongruent answers resonate with frames of other political actors?

This study shows which frames persist and stick with people engaging in a protest. The results indicate that frame alignment of protest participants is not self-evident and that particular frame qualities are important for the generation of ideational and attitudinal support. We cannot say for sure that the same types of frames resonate with nonparticipants, but probably they do. Only people who engaged in action, and who thus have a basic interest in the protest issue, were surveyed. Frames that do not resonate with these people probably will not resonate with nonparticipants either.

NOTES

[1] Please note that the Amsterdam event was held just before the national elections and that The Hague event took place after the new government was formed. The demonstration in The Hague also had a larger turnout than the one in Amsterdam.

[2] See appendix A for an overview of all covered demonstrations.

[3] Unfortunately I do not have information about the number of surveys that were distributed at the Second Student Demonstration in London. The surveys that were sent back from this demonstration were not included when calculating the response rate.

[4] These three open-ended questions are the first questions in the survey assuring that respondents are not influenced by the remainder of the questionnaire.

[5] Via the command *exp(varname)* in STATA. Note that using an exposure variable is usually better than running the regressions on a rate variable because it makes use of the correct probability distributions.

[6] The command *xtnbreg* in STATA.

[7] Taking another issue as the reference category does not make a difference for the results.

APPENDIX A: OVERVIEW OF THE DEMONSTRATIONS

No.	Demonstration	Country	Date	Issue	No. of Frame Components in Platform
1	Climate Change	BE	05/12/09	Environment	34
2	No to Austerity	BE	29/09/10	Austerity	26
3	We Have Alternatives	BE	02/12/11	Austerity	37
4	Not in Our Name	BE	07/05/11	Democracy	17
5	Fukushima Never Again	BE	11/03/12	Environment	14
6	No Government, Great Country	BE	23/01/11	Democracy	9
7	March for Work	BE	29/01/10	Austerity	23
8	Non-Profit Demonstration	BE	29/03/11	Austerity	23
9	Retirement Demonstration	NL	21/11/09	Austerity	9
10	Culture Demo Amsterdam	NL	20/11/10	Austerity	15
11	Culture Demo Utrecht	NL	20/11/10	Austerity	15
12	Stop Budget Cuts (Care & Welfare)	NL	19/09/11	Austerity	14
13	Occupy Netherlands	NL	05/11/11	Democracy	33
14	Together Strong for Public Work	NL	17/02/11	Austerity	21
15	Stop Racism and Exclusion	NL	19/03/11	Discrimination	18
16	Student Demo Amsterdam	NL	21/05/10	Austerity	30
17	Student Demo The Hague	NL	21/01/11	Austerity	18
18	Military Demo	NL	26/05/11	Austerity	21
19	National Climate March 2009	UK	05/12/09	Environment	27
20	Unite Against Fascism	UK	06/11/10	Discrimination	15
21	Fund Our Future	UK	10/11/10	Austerity	18
22	National Climate March 2010	UK	04/12/10	Environment	17
23	Student National Demo	UK	09/12/10	Austerity	11
24	Occupy London	UK	12/11/11	Democracy	15
25	May Day Labour March	UK	01/05/10	Austerity	15
26	Million Women Rise	UK	05/05/11	Discrimination	35
27	Take Back Parliament	UK	15/05/10	Democracy	22
28	No to Hate Crime Vigil	UK	23/10/10	Discrimination	14
29	TUC's March for the Alternative	UK	26/03/11	Austerity	17
Total					**583**

APPENDIX B: PRIMARY FRAME COMPONENTS

No.	Demonstration	Primary Frame Components
1	Climate Change	UN Climate Summit in Copenhagen must be a success
		Climate change has many negative consequences and needs to be stopped
2	No to Austerity	Against the austerity policies/We need a recovery plan instead of austerities
		Economic crisis is a problem that has to be dealt with
3	We Have Alternatives	Against the austerities/We need alternatives for austerities
		The economic crisis is a problem that has to be dealt with
4	Not in Our Name	Political crisis drags on (200 days/too long)/Crisis has to be solved
		There should be a government
5	Fukushima Never Again	Nuclear energy is bad and should be banned
6	No Government, Great Country	Political crisis drags on/Crisis has to be solved/Negotiations keep failing
		There should be a government
7	March for Work	Unemployment is too high/We need more jobs
		Economic crisis is a problem that has to be dealt with
8	Non-Profit Demonstration	There should be a social agreement
		Negotiations have to be started
9	Retirement Demonstration	The pension age should not be raised to 67
10	Culture Demo Amsterdam	Against the austerities on culture, reconsider austerities
11	Culture Demo Utrecht	Against the austerities on culture, reconsider austerities
12	Stop Budget Cuts (Care & Welfare)	Against the austerities on care and welfare
		The weakest people are hit by the austerities, austerities are unjust
13	Occupy Netherlands	The 99% are forced to pay for a crisis we did not cause
		Against the austerity measures
		The political system is unsustainable, undemocratic, unjust, and/or unequal
14	Together Strong for Public Work	Public work gets too little respect, needs to get more respect
		The government wants to cut the public sector
15	Stop Racism and Exclusion	Racism, discrimination, and/or exclusion are commonplace and need to be stopped
16	Student Demo Amsterdam	Austerities on education are too much and need to be stopped
17	Student Demo The Hague	Austerities on education are too much and need to be stopped
18	Military Demo	Too little respect for defense personnel
		Against austerities on defense/Austerities are disproportionate
19	National Climate March 2009	UN Climate Summit in Copenhagen must be a success/Put pressure on the summit
20	Unite Against Fascism	There is a disturbing rise in racism, fascism, Islamophobia, and/or anti-Semitism, turn back the tide
21	Fund Our Future: Stop Education Cuts	Stop the planned cuts on education
		Our future should be funded
22	National Climate March 2010	UN climate talks in Cancún, Mexico must be a success/Put pressure on the summit
23	Second Student National Demo	Against the increase of the tuition fees
		Stop the planned education cuts
24	Occupy London	Current system is unsustainable, undemocratic, unjust, and/or unequal
		The 99% are forced to pay for a crisis we did not cause
25	May Day Labour March	Maintain tradition and celebrate mayday
		Support trade union rights
26	Million Women Rise	Women are continually discriminated against and discrimination should stop
		Women experience a lot of violence
27	Take Back Parliament	The parliament is not representative
		A new (fair) voting system is needed
28	No to Hate Crime Vigil	Hate crime has been rising the last few years and should be eradicated from society
29	'TUC's March for the Alternative	Government budget cuts should not be stopped
		Alternatives should be considered

REFERENCES

Alkon, Alison H., Marisol Cortez, and Julie Sze. 2013. "What Is In a Name? Language, Framing and Environmental Justice Activism in California's Central Valley." *Local Environment* 18(10): 1167–83.

Babb, Sarah. 1996. "'A True American System of Finance': Frame Resonance in the U.S. Labor Movement, 1866 to 1886." *American Sociological Review* 61(6): 1033–52.

Benford, Robert D. 1993a. "Frame Disputes within the Nuclear Disarmament Movement." *Social Forces* 71(3): 677–701.

———. 1993b. "You Could Be the Hundredth Monkey." *Sociological Quarterly* 34(2): 195–216.

———. 1997. "An Insider's Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective." *Sociological Inquiry* 67(4): 409–30.

Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26(611-39).

Bergstrand, Kelly. 2014. "The Mobilizing Power of Grievances: Applying Loss Aversion and Omission Bias to Social Movements." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 19(2): 123–142.

Cadena-Roa, Jorge. 2002. "Strategic Framing, Emotions, And Superbarrio—Mexico City's Masked Crusader." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 7(2): 201–16.

Chakravarty, Anuradha and Soma Chaudhuri. 2012. "Strategic Framing Work(s): How Microcredit Loans Facilitate Anti-Witch-Hunt Movements." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 17(2): 175–194.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 2003. "Resonance and Radicalism: Feminist Framing in the Abortion Debates of the United States and Germany." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(2): 304–44.

Gamson, William A. 1992. *Talking Politics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2006. "Movement Impact on Cultural Change." Pp. 103–126 in *Culture, Power And History: Studies in Critical Sociology*, edited by Stephen J. Pfohl, Aimee Van Wagenen, Patricia Arend, Abigail Brooks, and Denise Leckenby. Leiden, Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Gerhards, Jürgen and Dieter Rucht. 1992. "Mesomobilization: Organizing and Framing in Two Protest Campaigns in West Germany." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(3): 555–96.

Haalboom, Bethany. 2011. "Framed Encounters with Conservation and Mining Development: Indigenous Peoples' Use of Strategic Framing in Suriname." *Social Movement Studies* 10(4): 387–406.

Hadler, Markus and Jeffrey McKay. 2013. "Aligned Frames? The Basis of Political Actions against Offshoring in West Virginia and Austria." *Sociological Spectrum* 33(1): 57–72.

Halfmann, Drew and Michael P. Young. 2010. "War Pictures: The Grotesque as a Mobilizing Tactic." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 15(1): 1–24.

Hayes, Andrew F. and Klaus Krippendorff. 2007. "Answering the Call for a Standard Reliability Measure for Coding Data." *Communication Methods and Measures* 1(1): 77–89.

Hewitt, Lyndi and Holly J. McCammon. 2004. "Explaining Suffrage Mobilization: Balance, Neutralization, and Range in Collective Action Frames, 1882-1919." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 9(2): 149–166.

Javeline, Debra. 2003. "The Role of Blame in Collective Action: Evidence from Russia." *The American Political Science Review* 97(1): 107–121.

Johnston, Hank. 1995. "A Methodology for Frame Analysis: From Discourse to Cognitive Schemata." Pp. 217–46 in *Social Movements and Culture*, edited by Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans. London, England: UCL Press Ltd.

———. 2002. "Verification and Proof in Frame and Discourse Analysis." Pp. 62-91 in *Methods of social movement research*, edited by Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2005. "Comparative Frame Analysis." Pp. 237–60 in *Frames Of Protest: Social Movements And The Framing Perspective*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Johnston, Hank and Aili Aarelaid-Tart. 2000. "Generations, Microcohorts, and Long-Term Mobilization: The Estonian National Movement, 1940-1991." *Sociological Perspectives* 43(4): 671–98.

Johnston, Hank and Eitan Alimi. 2013. "A Methodology Analyzing for Frame Dynamics: The Grammar of Keying Battles in Palestinian Nationalism." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 18(4): 453–74.

Ketelaars, Pauline, Stefaan Walgrave, and Ruud Wouters. 2014. "Degrees of Frame Alignment: Comparing Organisers' and Participants' Frames in 29 Demonstrations in Three Countries." *International Sociology* 29(6): 504-24.

Klandermans, Bert. 1984. "Mobilization and Participation: Social-Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory." *American Sociological Review* 49(5): 583–600.

——— (special issue editor). 2012. "Dynamics of Street Demonstrations." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 17(3)

Kubal, Timothy J. 1998. "The Presentation of Political Self: Cultural Resonance and the Construction of Collective Action Frames" *Sociological Quarterly* 39(4): 539–54.

McCammon, Holly J. 2001. "Stirring up Suffrage Sentiment: The Formation of the State Woman Suffrage Organizations, 1866-1914." *Social Forces* 80(2): 449–80.

———. 2009. "Beyond Frame Resonance: The Argumentative Structure and Persuasive Capacity of Twentieth-Century U.S. Women's Jury-Rights Frames." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 14(1): 45–64.

———. 2012. "Explaining Frame Variation: More Moderate and Radical Demands for Women's Citizenship in the U.S. Women's Jury Movements." *Social Problems* 59(1): 43–69.

———. 2013. "Resonance, Frame." Pp. 1092–96 in *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Donatella della Porta, Bert Klandermans, and Doug McAdam. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

McCammon, Holly J., Courtney Sanders Muse, and Harmony D. Newman. 2007. "Movement Framing and Discursive Opportunity Structures: The Political Successes of the U.S. Women's Jury Movements." *American Sociological Review* 72(5): 725–49.

McVeigh, Rory, Daniel J. Myers, and David Sikkink. 2004. "Corn, Klansmen, and Coolidge: Structure and Framing in Social Movements." *Social Forces* 83(2): 653–90.

Mika, Marie. 2006. "Framing the Issue: Religion, Secular Ethics and the Case of Animal Rights Mobilization." *Social Forces* 85(2): 915–41.

Mooney, Patrick H. and Scott A. Hunt. 1996. "A Repertoire of Interpretations: Master Frames and Ideological Continuity in U.S. Agrarian Mobilization." *Sociological Quarterly* 37(1): 177–197.

Noakes, John A. and Hank Johnston. 2005. "Frames of Protest: A Road Map to a Perspective." Pp. 1–32 in *Frames Of Protest: Social Movements And The Framing Perspective*, edited by Hank Johnston and John A. Noakes. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Noonan, Rita K. 1995. "Women Against the State: Political Opportunities and Collective Action Frames in Chile's Transition to Democracy." *Sociological Forum* 10(1): 81–111.

Oliver, Pamela E. and Hank Johnston. 2000. "What a Good Idea! Ideologies and Frames in Social Movement Research." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 4(1): 37–54.

Opp, Karl-Dieter. 2009. *Theories of Political Protest and Social Movements: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Critique, and Synthesis*. Oxon, England: Routledge.

Pedriana, Nicholas. 2006. "From Protective to Equal Treatment: Legal Framing Processes and Transformation of the Women's Movement in the 1960s." *American Journal of Sociology* 111(6): 1718–61.

Polletta, Francesca and M. Kai Ho. 2006. "Frames and Their Consequences." Pp. 187-209 in *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*, edited by Robert E. Goodin and Charles Tilly. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

Snow, David A. 2004. "Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields." Pp. 380–412 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Snow, David A. and Robert D. Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization." *International Social Movement Research* 1(1): 197–217.

Snow, David A., Robert D. Benford, Holly J. McCammon, Lyndi Hewitt, and Scott Fitzgerald. 2014. "The Emergence, Development, and Future of the Framing Perspective: 25+ Years Since 'Frame Alignment.'" *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 19(1): 23–45.

Snow, David A. and Scott C. Byrd. 2007. "Ideology, Framing Processes, and Islamic Terrorist Movements." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 12(1): 119–136.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4): 464–81.

Snow, David A., Anna E. Tan, and Peter B. Owens. 2013. "Social Movements, Framing Processes, and Cultural Revitalization and Fabrication." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 18(3): 225–42.

Snow, David A., Rens Vliegenthart, and Catherine Corrigall-Brown. 2007. "Framing the French Riots: A Comparative Study of Frame Variation." *Social Forces* 86(2): 385–415.

Taylor, Verta and Nella van Dyke. 2004. "'Get Up, Stand Up': Tactical Repertoires of Social Movements." Pp. 508–30 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden/Oxford, USA/England: Blackwell.

Vijay, Devi and Mukta Kulkarni. 2012. "Frame Changes in Social Movements: A Case Study." *Public Management Review* 14(6): 747–70.

Wahlström, Mattias, Magnus Wennerhag, and Christopher Rootes. 2013. "Framing 'The Climate Issue': Patterns of Participation and Prognostic Frames among Climate Summit Protesters." *Global Environmental Politics* 13(4): 101–122.

Walgrave, Stefaan and Joris Verhulst. 2011. "Selection and Response Bias in Protest Surveys." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 16(2): 203–22.

Walgrave, Stefaan, Ruud Wouters, and Pauline Ketelaars. Forthcoming. "Response Problems in the Protest Survey Design: Evidence from Fifty-One Protest Events in Seven Countries." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly.*

Williams, Rhys H. 2004. "The Cultural Contexts of Collective Action: Constraints, Opportunities, and the Symbolic Life of Social Movements." Pp. 91–115 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.