

Framing Participation and Using the Internet to Promote an Environmental Event

(Preliminary findings from a pilot study on *FânFest*, an environmentalist music festival at Rosia Montana,
Romania)

**Paper prepared for the Conference *Changing Politics through Digital Networks: The Role of ICTs
in the Formation of New Social and Political Actors and Actions*
5-6 October 2006, University of Florence, Florence,
Italy**

Dan Mercea
MPhil/PhD Student
Communication Studies
Department of Sociology
University of York
dmm505@york.ac.uk

DRAFT: PLEASE DO NOT QUOTE

ABSTRACT

FânFest was an environmentalist music festival at its fourth edition in 2007, held in Rosia Montana, Romania. Its organizers used this event as a soundboard for the central message of their campaign against a proposed gold-mine. Because of their need to legitimize and extend this protest and its appeal to new audiences, the coordinators of the campaign transformed the frame of membership in the local protest to mobilize new activists and supporters. The Internet was used as the key instrument for recruiting participants. It seems at this stage that the Internet has helped build new links with a large, young audience which was not necessarily concerned about the environment or the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign. This paper aims to discuss the implications of this and related findings on mobilizing support for this struggle.

1. Introduction

The present paper discusses some preliminary findings from a pilot study on the organization of and participation in the environmental music festival *FânFest*¹, in Rosia Montana, Romania. Rosia Montana is a village in West-Central Romania where a proposed gold and silver mining project has faced local opposition from a section of the community which lives in the impact area of the planned mine. Their struggle has developed and spread at the national and international level arguably making it the most notorious environmental campaign in Romania. I conducted my fieldwork in Rosia Montana and one other city where the activists in the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign were based, during the summer of 2007, from late July to early September. The results that I analyze here are only a small fragment of the data collected in this interval. This study is informed by an ongoing literature review that I have embarked on at the outset of my doctoral research.

In this paper I look at how participation at *FânFest* was conceptualized by its organizers and subsequently how the latter persuaded people to attend. The organizers of this event- in 2007 at its fourth edition-developed based on their aims and experience, an interpretive framework of participation. Their values, particularly those concerning the environment, their interests, to encourage the participation of young people and their activities, both environmental and cultural were articulated

¹ In Romanian, ‘the Hay Festival’.

in their presentation of the festival to its audience. An initial working hypothesis was that this local environmental group would seek to transform and extend its own interpretation of its struggle, to increase its visibility and motivate support for its cause; to that extent, *FânFest*, a music festival and one of the instruments in its protest repertoire, was an event principally aimed at bringing together participants as supporters of the campaign. As this initial research will show, the organizers' main goal was to mobilize a young audience while acknowledging the weak and transitory character of its engagement with the contentious issue and environmentalism, more generally. This was a qualitative change in the fabric of the movement's membership. However, this new solidarity was an opportunity to further legitimize and extend this protest and its appeal.

The organizers of *FânFest* that I interviewed emphasized the role of the Internet in the distribution of their call for participation at the festival. In 2007 they used the Internet as the principal instrument for reaching their audience. A question that I consequently aimed to explore was the role that the Internet played in creating a shared interpretation of participation at *FânFest*. If the Internet gives local environmental groups the opportunity to distribute their appeals far beyond their local constituencies, to what extent was it influencing the quality of engagement in this movement. What were the results of the negotiation of participation between the organizers and their expectations about the people who would attend *FânFest* on the one hand and the participants, their interpretations of the event and motivations to go to the festival, on the other? To this end I use some preliminary findings from a survey I conducted among the participants at the festival.

The next section provides a description of the research setting while aiming to qualify the "Save Rosia Montana" campaign as a social movement. In section three I review the main propositions in the literature on the use of *frames* for social movement mobilization (Snow et al., 1986; Tarrow, 1994). Consequently, data from interviews with four key informants from among the organizers are used to probe into their interpretations of participation at *FânFest*. I selected these four interviews from the larger sample of ten organizers whom I interviewed during my fieldwork. My option to use these interviews for the present paper was based on the roles that the interviewees played in the planning of the festival. To protect their anonymity I only use pseudonyms in this paper.

Xenia is one of the two campaign coordinators of "Alburnus Maior", the local NGO who initiated the opposition against the open-cast gold-mining project at Rosia Montana. She is one of the most experienced members of the team who organizes *FânFest*. She has had a decisive role in defining the

purpose and scope of the festival. Caden is another member of the coordination team. He is one of the most experienced green activists among the organizers but also a computer programmer and the Internet expert of the team. Finally, Odette is the public relations officer of *FânFest* and together with Warren they create and manage the content of the festival's website.

All those who were members of the festival's coordination team were activists in at least one organization. However, all interviewees surmised that their involvement in the *FânFest* team was based on a personal commitment to a common project which was run outside the institutional framework of their parent organizations. To that extent, each member's role in the team was negotiated based on their abilities and availability rather than on any formal agreements between organizations. "Alburnus Maior" who spearheads the "Save Rosia Montana" campaign was the only organization which was actively involved in the coordination of the event, principally for logistical and symbolic reasons.

As I describe in the next section, I came to regard "Alburnus Maior" as the central social movement organization in the environmental campaign this paper begins to analyze. Although this study does not go into a detailed discussion of the "Save Rosia Montana" campaign, in section two I acknowledge the debate about the status of local protests among social movements (Doherty, 2003). Starting from Tarrow's definition of a social movement (1994), I move to discuss the implications that *FânFest* had for mobilizing participation into this particular movement.

In section three I detail my initial analysis of framing participation at *FânFest* by the event's organizers and the role of the Internet in the distribution of their interpretation of participation and the selection of its audience. Consequently, in section four I look at how the participants perceived their presence at the festival and how effective the Internet was at mobilizing support for the "Save Rosia Montana" campaign. During the festival, I conducted a survey on an opportunity sample from the participants at *FânFest* 2007. The questionnaire I used was divided into four topic areas, 'participation at *FânFest*', 'activism', 'media usage' and 'socio-demographic characteristics'. I only used close-ended questions to glean factual data and opinions respondents had about the festival and their participation, their level of activism and engagement in conventional politics and their use of media and particularly the Internet for political ends. I distributed three hundred questionnaires during the three days of the festival. Two hundred and fifty were returned to me. The response rate of 84% was high for the distribution-face-to-face- and administration methods- self administered questionnaires (Weisberg et al, 1996:121) that I

decided to use. Finally, in the concluding paragraphs of this paper I review the main arguments and consider some directions for further research.

2. The Campaign Chronicle: *FânFest* at Rosia Montana

2.1. The “Save Rosia Montana Campaign”: local opposition to a gold mine

Rosia Montana is a village in West-Central Romania where a proposed gold and silver mining project has faced local opposition from a section of the community which lives in the impact area of the planned mine. The mining company, Rosia Montana Gold Corporation, received its exploration and exploitation licenses in 1997 and has since been developing the project. The latter would use a total surface of 24,998 ha for the infrastructure of an open cast mine which would include four open pits and a tailings management facility (Rosia Montana Gold Corporation, 2006:6). To make room for the mine, the company plans to resettle or relocate 974 households (2006:7). The first relocations began in the second half of 2002 when the company launched its Resettlement and Relocation Action Plan (2006:17).

In 2000, several of the locals from Rosia Montana learnt that in the likelihood that the mining company would successfully complete the licensing procedures, they would face involuntary resettlement and relocation. To protest against the gold-mining project, these locals created “Alburnus Maior”, a non-governmental association “that comprises property owners from Rosia Montana... who refuse to relinquish their properties (Author’s interview with Xenia, 30.07.2007). They describe themselves as “the opposition to an open cast mining project which poses numerous and grave risks for the environment, the population, the archaeological patrimony, the economy at the national and cross-boundary levels” (Alburnus Maior, 2007).

In 2002, Xenia, an environmental journalist and campaigner, joined “Alburnus Maior” to help mobilize public support for the struggle of the locals who opposed the project. The awareness campaign “Alburnus Maior” initiated touched upon what the organization regarded as the problematic aspects of the proposed silver and gold mine. At the same time, the association started to challenge the legality of the licensing procedures for the project. The opposition subsequently grew into what has become the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign. The latter expanded to include a network of Romanian and

international organizations and is now presented as “the largest campaign...environmental and social movement in Romania”, as a participant in the research interviews surmised (Author’s interview with Odette, 14.08.2007). This coalition of national and international non-profit organizations includes, among its most prominent international members, Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth International, Bank Watch Canada, Mining Watch Canada².

“And in June 2002 Greenpeace came to Rosia Montana and took the campaign onboard. In terms of activism, Greenpeace is probably the most active international campaign organization that we have...and then within Romania, it’s a wide spectrum that has shifted over the years...they are all...thirty of them, thirty-five that have been with us from the very beginning and still are” (Xenia, 30.07.2007).

2.2. The local protest: tentative observations on a social movement

The “Save Rosia Montana” campaign started from a narrow interest of a section in the village community, to protect their property rights. As these locals took steps towards organizing and formalizing their opposition, their repertoire broadened both in terms of the interpretations afforded to their struggle and the means they used to protest against the mining development. This local group was, at the onset, a ‘not-in-my-backyard’ opposition whose legitimacy was challenged both from inside the community, by those who were in favor of the mine and the mining company itself and from outside it.

Gradually, as the organizational capacity of the opposition grew, topics of broader concern and general appeal to a wider, national and international audience were brought to the fore of the campaign. Consequently, the challenge to the gold mining project, although initially articulated mainly on legal and technical grounds, expanded to accommodate social and environmental justice issues and the protection of the cultural patrimony. Due to these developments, the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign may be regarded as a social movement.

Brian Doherty (2003) synthesized several arguments why local groups such as “Alburnus Maior” and their protests are generally not regarded as fitting the broad definition of social movements. He notes that “local environmental groups...do not usually have the characteristics expected of social

² ‘Cooperating Partners of Alburnus Maior’ available on <http://www.rosiamontana.org/>

movements; most are short lived, many never undertake protest action and may not see participation as an end in itself of their activity, and most do not seek far-reaching changes in society and politics” (2003:185). He adds, however, that instruments specific to the analysis of social movements remain highly relevant to this line of research because of the many adaptations that such groups may go through if their protest endures the test of time. Analyses of the ensuing culture and identity of such organizations, their members and the participants in their actions can thus be conducted in great detail using the tools from the social movements’ tradition (2003:185).

According to Tarrow (1994:101), an organization which aims to challenge the legitimacy and authority of its opponents and which at the same time generates “uncertainty” about its actions while “building solidarity” and support for its cause would be regarded as the subject of a social movement. “Alburnus Maior” could be researched as the central social movement organization in the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign. A social movement organization is an established group- by means of shared identities, practices, aims and outside recognition-that subsumes “its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a countermovement and attempts to implement those goals” (Zald and McCarthy, 1987:20). Finally, *FânFest* could be considered as one of the instruments in the protest repertoire of the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign which builds and extends solidarity with the local group and triggers uncertainty about this challenge, to the extent that the participants at the festival become active in other events and actions of this social movement.

FânFest was originally a protest music festival. In 2007, its organizers designated it as “the space of environmental activism in Romania” (*FânFest*, June 2007). The initial rationale for incorporating an event of this kind in the anti-mining campaign was rooted in evaluations of the scope of public visibility afforded to it by the Romanian media, in 2004, the year of its first edition. An appreciation of the political economy of the media, and in particular the press, which featured the paid advertisements of the mining company but had only a limited editorial interest in the opposition to the proposed mining project, bore in it the seeds of the festival. Warren reminisced on the sense of urgency, in the campaign, to embrace new audiences and increase the scope of participation in the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign. “So then we said OK, ‘what can we do?’ And we thought of getting artists involved...The thing was that we had to reach young people somehow...and the festival was the best solution” (Warren, 14.07.2007). In the subsequent section, a set of theoretical propositions on framing-the interpretation of causes, means and actions- in social movements will be coupled with an emphasis

on the understanding that key informants from the *FânFest* organizing team had of the role this event played in the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign and the scope for participation.

3. Theoretical Discussion and Findings

3.1. Frame Alignment: Interpreting Participation

The preoccupation with frame alignment has been fueled by this study’s interest in recruitment planning by social movement organizations. The concept of *frame alignment* has been coined by Snow et al. (1986). It describes an interpretive process in which individuals and Social Movement Organizations (SMO) construct and understand issues, events, opportunities and risks “such that some set of individual interests, values and beliefs and SMO activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary” (1986:464). Interpretation of participation in a social movement is a dynamic process of negotiation which individuals, on the one hand, enter with some combination of calculations of costs and risks, socio-psychological predispositions- values, beliefs, emotions and evaluations. On the other hand, movements aim to align individual assessments of participation with their identity and action framework. “The underlying premise is that frame alignment, of one variety or another is a necessary condition for movement participation, whatever its nature or intensity, and that it is typically an interaction accomplishment” (1986:467). As Snow and his colleagues argue, there are four alignment processes that an SMO may embark on to galvanize participation: *frame bridging*, *frame extension*, *frame amplification* and *frame transformation*.

Frame bridging can serve to galvanize pre-existent dissatisfaction, and congruent interpretations of the environment, into an organized collective structure, to offer individuals “the organizational base for expressing their discontents and for acting in pursuit of their interest” (1986:467). *Bridging* may be effected through communication via public or private channels. The essential strategic task for organizations is to identify the disgruntled and disengaged and decide on the appropriate means to contact and persuade the latter. Focus on bridging has put the process of *micro-mobilization* under the limelight while students have tried to understand how congruent interpretations are transformed into participation capital, how individuals enter a movement structure (Snow et al, 1986:468), how membership may come to be negotiated (Bimber, 2003) and finally converted into action. *Frame extension* may, in some cases, be undertaken by an SMO prior to *bridging*, when participation can be facilitated by accommodating “interests or points of view that are incidental to its primary objectives

but of considerable salience to potential adherents” (1986:472). *Extension* would consequently be aimed at broadening the appeal to include new supporters and adherents. One avenue of investigation which Snow et al. believed could benefit from systematic observation was the concern with “the interaction processes involved...how SMOs and their constituents go about the business of persuading others, effecting switches in frame” to trigger engagement (1986:468).

Frame amplification may be described as a process of stimulating, activating and validating interpretations that could elicit participation. Essentially, *amplification* has to articulate possible interpretations which can be given to a context around an issue or event. The latter have to be congruent with relevant existing frames of members and participants which can galvanize action while inhibiting or eliminating other competing ones which hamper engagement (1986:469). Finally, *frame transformation* is a process through which those who were not sensitive to contested issues, were oblivious to their causes and/or did not share a movement’s interpretive frame of goals and means to achieve change- values and beliefs- are made cognizant about alternative interpretations which may spur engagement and action (1986:473-74). In the next paragraphs I look at how the organizers of *FânFest* framed the festival to promote it as an environmental event and how they transformed the frame of membership in the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign.

3. 2. “Mobilizing public awareness about Rosia Montana”

Reflecting on the preceding discussion on frame alignment, one may expect that participation at an environmentalist event would be based, to a significant extent, on existing congruent interpretations about its nature. A set of questions in the section on ‘mobilization and identity’, in the interview guide for the organizers, prompted them to think about the participants at the event. This open question did not try to induce the organizers to think about any specific characteristics but was rather designed with the hope that to answer it, they would rely on their acquired knowledge from the previous editions³.

“I think there are all sorts [of participants]. To a smaller extent, people that are really interested in the environment.. to a larger extent, ahm, young people that go to a festival.. Ahm, but at the same time, I think that from among the young people who before used to simply come to the festival, there are now young people who go to a festival and are interested in the environment. And this I think has become an important thing about

³ The question was: ‘who do you think will attend FanFest this year?’

FânFest...the initial goal...to save Rosia Montana through a festival is not quite attained; precisely because of the many people who come are not necessarily concerned about this problem”. (Caden, 05.09.2007)

FânFest was accommodated in the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign as an *extension* which would sensitize an audience whose interests were balanced between on the one side, the concern for the environment and the local struggle at Rosia Montana, and the appetite for music and entertainment, on the other. As Caden asserted, in the preceding quote, and also Odette and Warren, in their interview, previously participants at *FânFest* had been, they noted, more interested in the entertainment. To that extent, participation at *FânFest*, these organizers hoped, would have been at this edition, on the one hand, an opportunity for the many to develop their limited awareness of campaign issues and other environmental topics discussed there, while banking on their taste for music. On the other hand, it would have been a chance to link concerns about environmental issues with on-going activist projects presented at the festival.

I would expect the kind of people, let’s say averaging between 18 and 24... who don’t go there because they’re fans of a band or because they follow ten groups at each festival or they’re crazy about I don’t know who’s music or they don’t generally like concerts a lot, you know. I hope that that kind of young people who, I don’t know, pay attention in school, they find out about something and they really want to get involved will come. I mean, they can think on their own and can go through a through process and realize why they are there; to realize that it’s absurd what that company wants to do there and ‘this is what I have to do, to go there and say no, I don’t want that’. And then there’s the public who I think will come because there will be a lot of youngsters that...come there mostly for the bands and for.. the concerts...I’m not saying that they’re not at all interested in the campaign, you know, maybe to some extent, ahm, they would go to a presentation, maybe to a movie on an environmental topic but that’s not the main purpose for their coming there...I hope there will be as many as possible from the first category (Warren, 14.08.2006).

Building on these anticipations, the organizers decided to actively pursue what they understood as a process of selective recruitment. This they grounded into a frame that *extended* the message of the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign, to include subject areas from the broader environmental movement

and to signal a widening of the cultural scope of the festival. Such an *extension* was coupled, on the one hand, with a deliberate effort to offer incentives-positive and negative- to future participants and thus influence their choice on attendance of the festival. On the other hand, a new definition of the festival would have also served the purpose of setting this event firmly into the context of an environmental movement.

Caden explained that the organizers felt the participants at *FânFest* were implicitly supporters of the campaign to save Rosia Montana. A deliberate decision had been taken to extend the frame on membership in the movement and transform the frame on participation. Membership was extended to those who attended the festival, who were loosely connected to the campaign, principally through their participation at *FânFest*. Participation was redefined in the process of transforming the music festival into an environmental event while preserving, to some extent, the broad appeal of the former among young people. These interpretations of the event were principally distributed to the youth through the Internet.

“...[participants] play a very important role through the fact that they come to *FânFest*; through the fact that they come there in spite of how difficult it is to get there... if it'd be in some city centre it would be a completely different thing. But the fact that somebody has to make such an effort to get there, I feel that they do support a movement, regardless of the thoughts they come with. You know, because they come there, they hear about Rosia Montana, they go back home and they tell others about Rosia Montana...because they hear about other environmental issues that are presented at *FânFest* and maybe they go back home and tell others. So, I think that information spreads widely through the participants at *FânFest* and at the same time, even though they might not be 100% aware, ahm, they make a statement because they are there. You know, they take a stance” (Caden, 05.09.2007).

3.3. Getting the message out: targeting and distribution

This study has thus far considered how the organizers of the festival framed this event, particularly in relation to their objective to encourage the participation of young people who were ready to develop their interest in environmental issues, broadly and learn more about the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign, specifically. To that extent, the Internet was instrumental in communicating this frame for participation and selecting the audience of the festival. The Internet was the preferred means of

communication for the *FânFest* coordination team. The predominant use of the Internet had an implicit impact on the selection of the audience which was consciously assumed by the organizers of the festival.

Recruitment strategies have developed in line with changes in the repertoire of conflict and the transformation of the social understructure on which collective identity has been grounded. Alberto Melucci has qualified these as *new* social movements as he set out a research agenda fundamentally concerned with identity processes and how movements organize protest (1996). Importantly, identity has been a research object considered in its historical context (Tarrow, 1994) and observed against the background of developments in the environment in which collective action has developed. To that extent, changes in the media landscape, with the advent of new technologies have allowed SMOs to “create an implicit structure out of proportion to their internal strength” (1994:143). This process has been explained using terms such as “decentralization” or “professionalization” (Tarrow, 1994); and it has been regarded as leading both to modifications in the fabric of organizations- definition, function, outreach- and in the makeup of membership. With the increase in the scope of information and communication and the concurrent decrease of costs for access and distribution, mobilization strategies have also conceded to this opportunity. Ultimately, expectations have been put forward that “information abundance makes possible flexible, scalable, network-style organizational structures” (Bimber, 2003:103) in which people engage in a transitory manner while negotiating their participation based on multiple, co-existing allegiances and eclectic commitments (Snow et al, 1980, Castells, 2007).

This study is not aimed, at this stage, at contributing to a long-standing conversation in social movement analysis which seems to be concluding with the resolution that “microstructural variables are of equal and perhaps greater importance than dispositional susceptibilities in the determination of differential recruitment” (Snow et al., 1980:798). Indeed, McAdam (2003), Tarrow (1994) and as these authors show, many other students of social movements who have researched the topic, concur with this assertion. Furthermore, there has recently been a renewed focus on structural conditions for participation information and communication technologies such as the Internet, but not limited to it, have developed.

The interviewees in my study qualified their choice for the distinct role that the Internet played in their work, referencing arguments on the low cost of access and use of this technology as a general favorable condition. Publishing autonomy, editorial control and media management were regarded as major

benefits in the scope of online communication. The organizers in charge of promoting the festival and also coordinating the relationship with the media described the medium as key for targeting and reaching specific audiences, managing and consolidating media partnerships, all in a timely fashion. The level of control on their public communication they could exercise with this technology seemed to be perhaps as relevant to its use as its low cost.

“...the truth is that there is this thing, that people say that the Internet, the groups, also the environmental ones but also various small groups of local action as well as the terrorists prosper because they can reach a lot of people with a click, you know; and it’s the same with *FânFest*” (Odette, 14.08.2007).

The organizers acknowledged the financial limitations they had to concede to when planning the event and subsequently promoting it. These constraints had been an established fact since the first edition of the festival and they had also been a common experience for the activist organizations involved in the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign. However, as Xenia explained, the Internet had become the principal means for accessing mainstream media which concurrently enabled them to also reaching an activist audience through its use. Therefore, the Internet, the organizers of *FânFest* surmised, compensated for the more limited access they had to mainstream media, on the one hand. On the other, the Internet was perceived as the most appropriate means for encouraging participation, of the youth, albeit in an environmental event.

“In the first years we would promote it like any other music festival. And maybe this wasn’t necessarily right because then people came to a music festival..and there were fewer activities on environmental protection than this year and probably people left as if they would from a music festival. This year, however, promotion through the media was much smaller- *the classical way* of promoting any music festival, posters, flyers, TV and radio commercials, ahm, telling friends” (Caden, 05.09.2007, emphasis added) .

3.4. Mobilization: the participants at FânFest

ICTs create new opportunities for participation- in the *network society* (Castells, 1997). Their use has been changing the scope and quality of social networks- extensive networks of weak ties

(Bennett, 2003). They have affected the mechanisms of organization and strategies for recruitment have conceded to a reality of multiple access and allegiances, increased frame competition and even the further dissolution of internal control over aims and action when organizations use the technology for collective and horizontal decision-making (2003:144). Bennett (2003), Bimber (2003) and also Castells (2007) suggest that these structural opportunities afford new post-bureaucratic, decentralized organizations which can muster only limited resources, the capacity to design “large and flexible coalitions” (2003:146). The latter have been instrumental in the adaptation of protest repertoires to changes in the movement environment- to address shifts of scale in space- triggered by global economic flows, global distribution of information, and the reconsideration of time- *timeless*-compressed or discontinuous *time* (Castells, 1997:125).

There appears to be an emerging agreement that CMC is instrumental in facilitating and maintaining low-cost, information rich, geographically-dispersed access to issue and event-based communities, epistemic and/or of practice. To that extent, Diani (2000) has argued that professional tenderers of causes with high public resonance are best positioned to build “virtual [social movement] communities” that require low levels of trust among participants and that have a common outlook on “issues...which are largely consensual” (2000:126), i.e. climate change. Diani was nevertheless more pessimistic about the potential to mobilize into movements that incur an increased level of risk, in which case ICTs are likely to be used as “virtual extensions” of offline face-to-face relationships that are the basis for *strong ties* (Haythornwaite, 2005: 127). Diani: “all in all, the most distinctive contribution of CMC to social movements so far seems to be of an instrumental rather than symbolic kind”. A fundamental question remains whether the technology will also become a platform for new social links, more so than just assisting mobilization of groups that already have “existing bonds and solidarities” (2000:126). The next section looks at who the participants at *FânFest* were and how environmentally aware and active they reported they were. It subsequently offers an initial appraisal of the role that Internet played in their mobilization

From those respondents in my survey who disclosed their age, 91% were aged between 16 and 24. Also important to note is that 98% of the respondents who stated their level of education had reached at least ‘high-school level’ (eight or more years in school) while half of them were either undertaking or had received an undergraduate university degree. 79% of the participants in the survey stated they were either high-school or university students. Because of the ethical principles this study abides by, the sample did not include people who were less than 16 years of age. As I also had the role of survey

operator, I only recall two instances when I refused to offer a questionnaire to a person because (s)he was underage.

Table 1: Age of Respondents

		Age			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	16-24	221	87.7	90.6	90.6
	25-34	14	5.6	5.7	96.3
	35-44	7	2.8	2.9	99.2
	45-54	1	.4	.4	99.6
	over 55	1	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	244	96.8	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.2		
Total		252	100.0		

Approximately half of those interviewed in the survey stated that they had attended at least one previous edition of the festival (see Table 2). Respondents were consequently asked to rank three descriptions of *FânFest* in the order they believed was the most appropriate for the 2007 event. The three categories of this variable were ‘an environmental event’, ‘a political event’ and ‘a musical event’. From the respondents, 65% believed that *FânFest* was, first and foremost, an environmental event; 31% considered that it was principally a musical event and finally, only 4% of the participants deemed it to be primarily a political event.

Table 2: Participation at a previous edition of *FânFest*

		Have you attended a previous edition of FanFest?			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	127	50.4	50.8	50.8
	Yes	123	48.8	49.2	100.0
	Total	250	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		252	100.0		

Table 3: Description of the event

Description of FanFest: environmental event

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	most appropriate	160	63.5	64.8	64.8
	less appropriate	78	31.0	31.6	96.4
	least appropriate	9	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	247	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		252	100.0		

When asked whether they regarded their attendance of *FânFest*, among other things, due to their concern for the environment, almost half of the respondents from the sample considered that this was the case to a large or a very large extent. An almost equal proportion of the respondents, 45% stated that they participated at *FânFest* only ‘to some extent’ because they believed they were ‘a person concerned about the environment’. Finally, 6% stated their decision to attend FanFest was grounded ‘to a small extent’ or ‘not at all’ on the consideration that they were individuals concerned about the environment.

Table 4: Motivation to attend the festival (1)

Attend FanFest because you feel you are a person concerned about the enviroment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	to a very large extent	35	13.9	14.6	14.6
	to a large extent	82	32.5	34.2	48.8
	to some extent	108	42.9	45.0	93.8
	to a small extent	13	5.2	5.4	99.2
	not at all	2	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	240	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	12	4.8		
Total		252	100.0		

Respondents were subsequently asked to state the extent to which they agreed with several propositions which described hypothetical motivations that people will have had for attending *FânFest*. 64% of them reported that they ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ with the statement ‘I am here because I want to learn more about environmental protection’ while 21.5% neither agreed nor disagreed with it. However, two thirds of the respondents also stated that they ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ with the statement ‘I am here because I like some of the bands playing at this edition of *FânFest*’.

Table 5: Motivation to attend festival (2)

I am here because I want to learn more about environmental protection

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	74	29.4	30.5	30.5
	agree	82	32.5	33.7	64.2
	neither agree nor disagree	52	20.6	21.4	85.6
	disagree	27	10.7	11.1	96.7
	strongly disagree	3	1.2	1.2	97.9
	don't know/can't answer	5	2.0	2.1	100.0
	Total	243	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.6		
Total		252	100.0		

Table 6: Motivation to attend the festival (3)

I am here because I like some of the bands playing at FanFest.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	68	27.0	28.1	28.1
	agree	83	32.9	34.3	62.4
	neither agree nor disagree	50	19.8	20.7	83.1
	disagree	17	6.7	7.0	90.1
	strongly disagree	20	7.9	8.3	98.3
	don't know/can't answer	4	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	242	96.0	100.0	
Missing	System	10	4.0		
Total		252	100.0		

From the respondents, 38% reported that they were ‘associated’ or ‘supporters’ of ‘environmental organizations and/or campaigns’. One third of them claimed that they were ‘familiar with but not supportive of’ such movements and campaigns. Finally, 29% were ‘unfamiliar with’ environmental movements and/or campaigns. These preliminary findings would thus suggest that the organizers were successful in extending their agenda to elicit the participation of people who were not necessarily concerned about the environment but could be mobilized or made aware of issues and protests through their attendance of the event. Furthermore, 82% of the respondents also strongly agreed with the statement “I am here because I want to show the mining company that people oppose the mining project at Rosia Montana”.

Table 7: Association, support or familiarity with environmental organizations and/or campaigns

Environmental organizations and/or campaigns

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	associated with	20	7.9	8.3	8.3
	supporter of	72	28.6	29.8	38.0
	familiar but not supportive	79	31.3	32.6	70.7
	unfamiliar	71	28.2	29.3	100.0
	Total	242	96.0	100.0	
Missing	System	10	4.0		
Total		252	100.0		

One of the objectives of this investigation was to learn how the participants used the information and communication technologies and particularly the Internet, to glean information on environmental and political issues and events. Respondents were consequently asked the question ‘where do you most often get your information from, when you want to find out about FanFest 2007?’ 81% designated the Internet as their primary source of information about the event, followed at a significant distance by ‘family and friends’ as a secondary source, with just 10%.

Table 8: Ranking- sources of information about FanFest

Information about FanFest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	television	10	4.0	4.1	4.1
	radio	3	1.2	1.2	5.3
	newspapers	6	2.4	2.5	7.8
	internet	196	77.8	80.7	88.5
	friends and family	25	9.9	10.3	98.8
	don't know/ can't answer	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	243	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.6		
Total		252	100.0		

When they considered the question, ‘in general, would you say that the Internet makes you more knowledgeable about environmental issues’, 45 % of them reported that to a large or a very large extent this was the case. 37% stated they believed that only to some extent the Internet had this effect on their

knowledge of environmental issues while 18% deemed the Internet would hardly play a role in their becoming familiar with environmental issues, if at all.

Table 9: Internet and knowledge about environmental issues

Internet makes you more knowledgeable about environmental issues

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	to a very large extent	37	14.7	15.6	15.6
	to a large extent	70	27.8	29.5	45.1
	to some extent	87	34.5	36.7	81.9
	to a small extent	27	10.7	11.4	93.2
	not at all	15	6.0	6.3	99.6
	don't know/ can't answer	1	.4	.4	100.0
Total		237	94.0	100.0	
Missing	System	15	6.0		
Total		252	100.0		

Interestingly, from the participants in this survey three quarters reported that they used the Internet as the primary source of information about the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign. Furthermore, 62% from those who gave a valid answer to the question ‘where do you most often get your information from when you want to find out about environmental campaigns’, claimed that the Internet was their principal source of information. However, only 26% of those who replied to the question ‘would you say that the Internet makes you more involved in activist events and campaigns’ stated that they believed so- 8.1% to a very large extent and 18.3% to a large extent. Contrary to that, 41% considered that the Internet made them more involved only to a small extent (25.5%), if at all (15.3%).

Table 10: Ranking- sources of information about "Save Rosia Montana" campaign

Information about "Save Rosia Montana" campaign

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	television	16	6.3	6.6	6.6
	radio	4	1.6	1.6	8.2
	newspapers	14	5.6	5.8	14.0
	internet	180	71.4	74.1	88.1
	friends and family	21	8.3	8.6	96.7
	don't know/can't answer	8	3.2	3.3	100.0
	Total	243	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.6		
Total		252	100.0		

Table 11: Ranking- sources of information about environmental campaigns

Information about environmental campaigns

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	television	41	16.3	17.1	17.1
	radio	2	.8	.8	17.9
	newspapers	10	4.0	4.2	22.1
	internet	149	59.1	62.1	84.2
	friends and family	16	6.3	6.7	90.8
	don't know/can't answer	22	8.7	9.2	100.0
	Total	240	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	12	4.8		
Total		252	100.0		

Overall, the results of the survey should generally be treated with caution if only because of some questions which this author had about the candidness of the responses while introducing them in the database. One such example would be the disclosure of the household income in the month prior to the event. Where possible, some questions were rephrased and included in the questionnaire more than one time. However, this analysis has not yet advanced to the point of reviewing this problematic.

4. Final Considerations

The purpose of this paper has largely been an exploratory one. These initial data will form the basis for a more detailed and sophisticated analysis in my PhD. project. To begin with, the present findings on recruitment strategies and the framing of participation will be the foundation for a discussion of both micro-structural and socio-psychological conditions for mobilization and action. Subsequently, collective identity and the links which underpin support and participation in social movements will be considered with a critical outlook on the role the Internet has been afforded in the case under study. Ultimately, findings will be used in a comparative project that will examine two distinct environmental movements.

FânFest was, in 2007, at its fourth edition. Its organizers were hoping that it was one of the key venues for environmental activism in Romania. They used this event as a soundboard for the central message of their campaign, to save Rosia Montana. As the frame in which they showcased this initial message extended, the festival developed into a progressively more environmental event where participants were invited to increase or consolidate their awareness of environmental issues and activist struggles. Finally, the already described transformation of the frame of membership in the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign was engendered by the need to legitimize and extend this protest and its appeal, to new audiences. From amongst the latter new activists and supporters would be recruited.

FânFest was a call for participation of the youth. The Internet was used as the key instrument for recruiting participants and it would appear that it enabled the organizers of the festival both to bring back former participants and to recruit new ones. Approximately half of the participants stated that they had attended a previous edition of the festival. It thus seems at this stage, that the Internet has helped build new links with a large, young audience which was not necessarily concerned about the environment or the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign. An explanation for this fact may lie in their socio-demographic characteristics. At the same time, two thirds of respondents in the survey stated that they were keen to learn more about environmental protection while at *FânFest*.

The initial results from the survey seem to indicate that the Internet was generally used, by the participants in the survey, to collect information about the “Save Rosia Montana” campaign, *FânFest* and also environmental issues. However, respondents indicated that they believed the Internet did not make them more active. These results have not yet been compared with findings on the aggregate level

of activism reported in the survey. Ultimately, a key question may still be whether the Internet and the weak ties it stimulates have a bearing on the type and level of active engagement in this and other social movements.

References:

- Alburnus Maior (2007) *Alburnus Maior- The Local NGO* [online] available from <<http://www.rosiamontana.org>> [20 Aug 2007]
- Bennett, L. (2003) "Communicating global activism". In *Information, Communication and Society*, 6 (2), 143-168
- Bimber, B. (2003) *Information and American Democracy: Technology in the Evolution of Political Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Caden (2007) Cluj-Napoca, Romania: Interview by author [5 Sept. 2007]
- Castells, M. (1997) *The Power of Identity*, 2nd vol. Malden, Massachusetts, Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers
- Castells, M. (2007) "Communication, Power and Counter-power in the Network Society". In *International Journal of Communication*, 1, 238-266
- Diani, M. (2000) "Social movement networks: virtual and real". In Frank Webster (ed) *Culture and Politics in the Information Age: a New Politics?* London, New York: Routledge
- Doherty, B. (2002) *Ideas and Actions in the Green Movement*. London and New York: Routledge
- FânFest (2007) *FânFest 24-25-26 August Verde* [online] available from <<http://www.fanfest.ro/2k7/index.php?lang=ro>> [15 June 2007]
- Haythornthwaite, C. (2005) "Social networks and Internet connectivity effects". In *Information, Communication and Society*, 8 (2), 125-147
- McAdam, D. (2003) "Beyond Structural Analysis: Toward a More Dynamic Understanding of Social Movements". In Diani, M. and McAdam, D. (eds.) *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press
- Melucci, A. (1996) *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Odette (2007) Cluj-Napoca, Romania: Interview by author [14 Aug 2007]

- Rosia Montana Gold Corporation (2006) *Non-Technical Summary of the Rosia Montana EIA Report* [online] available from <http://www.truestory.ro/raport/files/RMP_EIA_MAY_06/1%20-%20EIA%20Chapters/9%20Non-Technical%20Summary%20-%20Chapter%209/RMP_EIAch9_NonTechSummary_May06.pdf> [20 Sept 2007]
- Snow, D.A., Zurcher, L.A., Jr., Ekland-Olson, S. (1980) "Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment". In *American Sociological Review*, 45 (5), 787-801
- Snow, D.A., Burke Rochford, E., Jr., Worden, S.K., Benford, R.D. (1986) "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation". In *American Sociological Review*, 51 (4), 464-481
- Tarrow, S. (1994) *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Warren (2007) Cluj-Napoca, Romania: Interview by author [14 Aug 2007]
- Weisberg, H.F., Krosnick, J.A., Bowen, B.D. (1996) *An Introduction to Survey Research, Polling and Data Analysis* (3rd. Edition). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications
- Xenia (2007) Cluj-Napoca, Romania: Interview by author [30 July 2007]
- Zald, M.N., McCarthy, J.D. (1987) *Social Movements in an Organizational Society*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books