

Massimiliano Andretta

Transnational activists: from shared ideas to collective identity. The Case of the first European Social Forum.

Paper presented at the conference on "Le mobilisation altermondialistes", Paris, 3-5 December, 2003.

First draft, not yet revised by native speaker.

Please do not quote without permission.

1. The "meaning work" of transnational social movements.

Although forms of contentious transnational actions against international institutions existed before (Gerhards, Rucht 1992, Rucht 1999), they often were transnational protest campaigns, that is, "thematically, socially and temporarily interconnected series of interactions that, from the viewpoint of the carriers of the campaign, are geared to a specific goal" (della Porta and Rucht 2002, 3). Today, by contrast, the movement against neoliberal globalization tries to interconnect different transnational protest campaigns, providing a shared master frame and structural mobilization potential units (SMOs, NGOs, National Associations, etc.), which interact periodically in transnational events (countermeetings, world and macroregional forums, and so on).

The basis of this "common view" has been built by what Snow and Benford have called "meaning work" (1992, 136), through which actors convince people to engage in a collective action. If "Every regime has a legitimating frame that provides the citizenry with a reason to be quiescent" (Gamson 1988, 219), social movements must produce "counter frames", which legitimize unconventional collective action: "People, William A. Gamson writes, act on the basis of some meaning system, and the definition of issues, actors, and events is a matter of constant contention. A central part of the symbolic struggle, then, is about the process of constructing specific meanings" (ibid.).

This happens "by identifying culpable agents, be they individuals or collective processes or structures" (Snow and Benford 1992, 137). In the case of the movement against globalization, this imputation of common causality has been socially built through what Sid Tarrow defined "frame condensation", through which different targets, perceived as causes of the problems, are "condensed" in one "super target" (2002): the neoliberal globalization, whose agents are International Governmental Organizations and multinational corporations (Andretta, della Porta, Mosca, Reiter 2003; Andretta 2003).

According to Sid. Tarrow the mechanisms that allow the formation of a transnational social movement possible are: the mechanism of *diffusion*, that is, "the transfer of information along established lines of interaction", and the mechanism of *brokerage*, that is, "the linking of two or more currently unconnected social sites" (2002). The transformation of the former mechanism into the latter is also due to the process of master-framing - that is, the building of a more general frame which bridges different sectorial frames (Snow and Benford 1992). Using Tarrow's terminology, I believe that "cognitive mechanisms", by altering the perception of people and organizations, are able to change "relational mechanisms", that is, the "connections among people, groups, and interpersonal networks", and thus to foster both organizations' and people's identification with a social movement. This is because through the "meaning work" social movements symbolically construct a collective subject (the working class, the people, the nation, environmentalists, women, etc.)¹; integrate the structural mobilization potential²; convince sympathizers to become involved in a collective action, and convince broader public opinion that the movement's claims are "just" and that the *status quo* is "unjust"³.

In order for a master-frame to be successful, therefore, it must resonate with the activists' ideas. Bert Klandermans (1992) has suggested that mesolevel symbolic construction - that is, the way in which

¹ For a famous analysis of the social construction of the working class see Thompson (1980); for a cultural foundation approach to the working class formation see Somers (1992) and Steinmetz (1992), for the discursive formation of "the people" see Hill (1981), and for the importance of symbolic construction in new social movements see Melucci (1996). Hunt, Benford and Snow (1994) provided a theoretical framework for the identity formation through framing process.

² Gerhards and Rucht call this function "cultural integration" (1992, 559).

³ Gamson claims that "collective action frames are *injustice* frames" (1992b, 68, original emphasis).

organizations build meaning – be analytically distinguished from microlevel symbolic construction, where the consciousness of individuals is raised.

In this paper I will focus only at the individual level. My aim is to see which kind of ideas activists share, if they do share ideas, and to what extent those ideas resonate with the anti-neoliberal masterframe.

By analyzing the data of 2.500 questionnaires administered to participants and the first European Social Forum, I will test "(t)he relationship between ideological factors – values, beliefs, meanings – and identification with social movements and participation in their activities" (Snow, Benford 1988, 197). The frame analysis, in fact, has gained a lot of attention at the theoretical level (Klandermans 1992, Snow et al. 1986, Snow and Benford 1988, 1992, 2000, Benford 1997, Hunt, Benford, Snow 1994, Gamson 1988, Oliver, Johnston 2000, Johnston 1995, 2002), which in turns stimulated some empirical research (amongst others Benford 1993, Gerhards, Rucht 1992, Marullo et al 1996, McCarthy 1994, Nepstad 1997, Weed 1997, Johnson 1997, Johnston, Aarelaid-Tart 2000). Nevertheless, "the question of how participation precipitates the enlargement of personal identity, or the correspondence between individual and collective identities, has not been satisfactorily answered by scholars investigating this linkage" (Benford, Snow 2000, 631, but see Hunt et al 1994, Hunt and Benford 1994).

In short, while social movements literature traditionally stressed the role of social conditions, of participation in collective action and of the organization in explaining the collective identity building and the identification with a movement, I will try to test the role of movements and individual ideas.

Summarizing the content of the paper, the following paragraph will provide an overview of how individual data have been gathered, and which kind of samples I use for the analysis. In Paragraph 3, I will analyze the individual schemas by cross-countries and cross-sectorial analysis, in order to test the "transnationality" of the movement. In the fourth paragraph, I will see to what extent the movement against neoliberal globalization, by providing a master-frame, has produced the individual identification with the movement as whole, and what other factors account for such a high identification. Paragraph 5 will provide the conclusions of the chapter by stressing the most important results of the empirical research and the (partial) relevance of such findings for theoretical matters.

2. Data collection.

I will use the data of the questionnaires which we administrated participants at the European Social Forum of Florence. We tried to maximize the degree of representativeness by applying the following procedure: first we collected information about what kind of workshops and which kind of organizations proposed every workshop of the ESF. Those data are still available in the ESF website (www.FSE-ESF.org). We than selected the workshops according to the type of proponent organizations (environmental organizations, religion-based organizations, pacifist and women organistaion, unions, leftist parties, and antagonists) and to the country of those organizations, especially focusing on Italian, French, Spanish, German, and English organizations. We sent about ten interviewers to the workshop selected and to the plenary sections. We also asked the interviewers to try to give as many questionnaires to male as they give to women, to aged people as they give to young people. The questionnaires were filled at the moment of the administration under the control of the interviewers.

At the end, 2,581 questionnaires have been filled. From the ESF full sample I excluded the Tuscans (863 participants) because they appeared very different from other participants in terms of socio-graphic dimensions (Gender, Age, Level of education, Social condition): most of the Tuscans in fact may be only sympathetic and curious, while people coming from other Italian regions and from other countries need to be strongly motivated to pay the costs of travel, accommodation and so on. I will refer to this sample whenever I test hypothesis without referring to the countries of origin. In this case, in fact, the number of Italian participants should not affect those relations because it is similar to the number of the other participants (933 Italians vs. 779 non Italians). Cross national comparison will be made between Italian, French, German, Spanish and English participants. In this case I will use an equilibrated sub-sample of 644 cases, by reducing the Italian sample with a stratified procedure to 150 cases, and by excluding participants coming from other countries. The

stratified procedure is based on socio-graphic variation analysis between the participants of the different countries. While education, age, and social condition (being a student) vary between all countries, the gender was equilibrated in every country except Italy (where men are predominant). Thus, when we reduced the Italian participants we equilibrated the gender.

2. Activists schemas and master frame resonance.

The movement against neoliberal globalization seems to have underlined that old and new social movements principles and frames may be part of the same world view: social justice and environmental justice, libertarian concerns and religious affairs may – the movement seems to tell us – work together for the building of "another world" (Andretta 2003).

If a collective identity process is really at work, however we should see whether the meaning work of mesomobilization actors succeeded in providing a meaning of the struggle which resonates with the meaning of activists and supporters.

In order to analyze individual schemas of the mobilization we asked participants what was, according to them, the main goal of the movement (open question). The answers have then been analyzed for the different dimensions mentioned by respondents to be grasped (see Appendix @@ for some examples).

After this operation I classified the different schemas touched by participants. Before the following quantitative analysis, therefore, an important part of this work has been the qualitative interpretation of individual texts.⁴

Participants at the ESF⁵ mostly referred to the diagnostic and prognostic elements of the master frame structure: only 2.3% of respondents referred to a mere "antiglobalization" schema.

Social justice. Well 38.2% of respondents referred to the social dimension of the problem by interpreting the movement as a struggle for social rights, workers rights and social justice. Especially mentioned was the problem of the unequal distribution of resources between the North and the South, underlining as a possible solution the poor country's debt dropping, along with a global diffusion and strengthening of social rights.

Ethics, values, solidarity. Participants often (25.9%) stressed the need for a moral changes of the human values, the need of ethic values which are consistent with a world where human relations of solidarity, human dignity and human cultures constitute the most important features.

Antineoliberalism. The antineoliberal schema as such has been touched by 17.9% of participants. They referred either to the diagnostic structure of the master-frame (mentioning the agents of neoliberalism such as WB, IMF, multinational corporations and so on) or the prognostic side of the frame, asking for the political control of the market at the global level, the taxation of financial transactions.

Mobilization. The idea that world problems can be solved only by the participation of "real" people through social movements mobilization, protest, struggle and civil society meetings is diffused among 21.2% of participants.

Making aware. 18.2% of respondents think that one of the main goal of the movement is making the participants and the public opinion aware about the gravity of the world problems that humanity is facing. The types of problems are often not specified, as they were obvious and then taken for granted.

Anticapitalism. Other respondents instead referred to a classic anticapitalist schema, by interpreting the movement's mobilization as against the "capital", which is in this phase "globalized", or by thinking that the movement goal is simply the revolution (17.2%).

Pacifism. 9.4% thinks that social movements' goal must be to establish peace as the normal tool for conflict solution on the long term and to stop the Iraqi war "now".

Ecology. The pure ecologist frame resonates with the idea of what social movement goal must be of 8.9% of participants. In this case participants stressed the need for nature or animal protection, or more likely for a "sustainable development".

⁴ I thank Maria Fabbri, Donatella Della Porta, and Lorenzo Mosca for their important help in this interpretative phase of the answers.

⁵ Participants who answered to this open question were 1,985.

Democratization. 7.8% of participants stressed the need for a democratization of both International Governmental Organizations, and dictatorial regimes.

Civil and Human Rights. The necessity that the movement focuses on the protection of human and civil rights is stressed by 7.5% of activists.

Women rights. Finally, only 1.1% of participants claimed that the movement's goal is or should be asking for more women rights.

The results are interesting enough, because, in contrast with what one may suspect if one thinks the contingent menace of war by US. Government to Iraqi regime, the peace frame is not more relevant than the others, and participants frame the problem of the war under other causes such as the neoliberal process and the capitalist system, and see social justice as the solution for war problems too. Second, they adopted frames which are relevant in the structure of the master frame: the cause is either the neoliberal globalization or the capitalist globalization; and the diagnosis is more social justice, more solidarity, more environmental justice, and more democracy. A first glance at the individual schemas therefore seem to confirm that the frame bridging operated within the master frame successfully resonates with activists perception of the political reality they want to change with mobilization.

But this is only one side of the truth, because 40.8% of the activists who answered to this question, referred to a single frame. The question is: why some participants of the FSE continue to represent the movement's goals by referring to only one frame type, while others coherently with the multiple identity of the movement for a globalization from below, bridge two or more frame types?

I tried to answer to this question according to the following plausible hypotheses: 1) People more educated may be more able in manipulating symbols, and then more able in articulating the answers according to more than one frame; at same time it seems that there is an impact of internet on the collective identity formation⁶ (Bennet 2003), according to this hypothesis, internet offers the possibility to communicate with different people of different ideas, and this may open closed identities toward different frames of the reality, which in turn may lead toward more complex and multiple collective and individual identities.

2) Otherwise, participants may have learned to contaminate their frames with other ones, by participating in different kind of collective activities: the overlapping membership may, in fact, undercut old cleavages, bridging different frames, and creating a new conflict (Diani 2000)⁷.

3) Participants may be more able to bridge different frames simply because they got more used to, by participating in previous mobilizations⁸.

Nevertheless, those hypotheses do not seem to be confirmed by our data: the binominal regression analysis predicting the "frame bridging" (dummy) did not generate good models of explanation: the adjusted R square of the last step of a stepwise/backward method is .01. Among all the explaining variables considered only the participation in previous movement activities is significant (at 0.1 level) (standardized beta is 1.75).

3.1. The network of the meanings: reconstructing the chaos.

Although some people who answered to this question referred to only one frame, it may be interesting to see what kind of bridge do participants which focused on two or more frames/dimensions.

If the "ecology of the mind" has been deconstructed for analytical purposes, it is useful to reconstruct the individual meaning, trying to individualize which frames participants bridge in their "view of the unjust world". First, I tried to see which frame bridges more, that is, if somebody refers to one frame what is the likelihood that he/she bridges it with at least another frame? Table 6 shows the correlations between every frame and the frame-bridging (dummies), the most bridging frames appear to be the social justice, the ecologist, the pacifist and the human rights ones. Second, I tried to see which frames bridge more together. I excluded the people who referred only to one frame from the correlations between all the individual frames, since I'm interested in noticing what

⁶ Indicators are the "degree of education" (three categories) and the frequency of internet use by the activists (0= never, 1= rarely; 3= sometimes; 4= regularly).

⁷ Indicator is the degree of overlapping membership (additive index of a list of organizations).

⁸ Indicator is the participation to previous activities of the movement (no=0; yes= 1).

kind of bridge the activists do, when they do bridge frames: e.g. if I correlate the anticapitalist frame with the antineoliberal one, I did not consider the activists which referred only to one of those frames. Besides, I don't show the correlations with both the "antiglobalization" and the "woman rights" frames, because the activists who referred to them are very few. Finally I only show significant correlations.

Through the results of these correlations we can reconstruct the discourse of the activists which operate a frame-bridge. The anticapitalist view is sometimes linked with a pacifist discourse, and in this case we find the typical Antimperalist view of the world, with USA at the center of an Empire where the capitalist forces impose their will with the war (tab. 6). Against this Empire the only mean people have is mobilization, the struggle against the system, the revolution and this is why anticapitalism and the need of mobilization are correlated.

The antineoliberalist frame is instead more isolated, since activists who focus on this dimension of the discourse do not bridge too much, except with the mobilization frame. It should be noticed, also, that the antineoliberalist frame is at the core of the diagnostic side of the master-frame: that explains also the correlation between this frame and the "mobilization" language. The Social Justice frame bridged especially with the ecologist, and the pacifist frame, but also, although less, with democratization. We can then conceive the social justice frame a kind of broker-frame, which mediates the connection between other important frames. In fact, if social justice is bridged with the ecologist, the pacifist frames, the ecologist frame is connected with the ethical view, and this is in turn bridged with the human rights frame.

Table.6. Individual frame bridging.

Most bridging frames	Pearson Correlations	N.
1.Anticapitalist	.06*	1412
2.Antineoliberalist	.19**	1412
3.Social justice	.27**	1412
4.Ethics	.25**	1412
5.Ecology	.28**	1412
6.Pax	.28**	1412
7.Human rights	.21**	1412
8.Democratization	.18**	1412
9.Mobilization	.18**	1412
10. Making Aware	.13**	1412
Most bridged frames		
Anticapitalist-mobilization	.16**	1212
Social Justice-Ecology	.14**	1343
Social Justice-Pax	.13**	1340
Ecology-Ethics	.13**	1301
Ecology-Human rights	.13**	1393
Pax-human rights	.13**	1390
Mobilization-Making Aware	.13**	1223
Antineoliberalism-Mobilization	.11**	1242
Anticapitalism-Pax	.10**	1299
Social Justice-Democratization	.09**	1329
Antineoliberalism-Pax	.08**	1329
Ethics-Making Aware	.08**	1214

** significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Lastly, if anticapitalism is associated with a vocabulary of "struggle", the ethical and the ecologist frames are associated with a different vocabulary which emphasizes the role of the movement for

making public opinion aware of the problem of the world. Thus, the activists bridge all the frames in a network of meanings, at the core of which there is the social justice frame, similarly to what can be found in the master-frame (Andretta 2003).

The apparent chaos of the definition of the reality has been transformed in an (apparent ?) order in the mind of the activists, through a patient negotiation of symbols.

3.2. A transnational movement or a transnational coalition?

If the meaning work of the mesomobilization actors resonate with individual activists, this does not necessarily mean that we are dealing with a real transnational social movement. On the contrary, one can easily argue that this may only be the result of the coalition of different sectors, and that participants adhere to mobilization only because their sectors mobilize, therefore each sector's participants adhere with their own sectorial frame. This case may be interpreted as a successful case of coalition, where individual sectors recruit their own micromobilization potential and connect them with each other to form a "block recruitment" (Obershall 1973, 117; Jenkins 1983, 62).

If the coalition was a real social movement, then the diffusion of new and similar ideas, values and frames should be found cross-nationally and cross-sectorially.

We can hypothesize two situations: a) activists adopt above all collective frames which belong to their organizational sectors, and then we are dealing with a coalition; b) the master-frame is diffused in different sectorial activists, and then we observe the minimal condition for a social movement to exist: shared ideas and values.

Another possibility is that individual schemas are not affected by their organizational sector, but by their country of origin. In this case we can either find that c) individuals interpret mobilization according to their countries' specific political cleavages and cultures; or d) individuals frame the mobilization according to the national specific social movements sector which adhere to the transnational collective action against neoliberal globalization (that is, again, national sectors influence individuals schemas). In the latter case, we should conceptualize the movements against globalization as a transnational coalition of nationally differentiated social movement sectors. In the next paragraph I will test hypothesis c, while in paragraph 3.4 hypotheses d, a, and b.

3.3. The cultural-territorial condition of master frame resonance.

Table 7 shows the percentage of people coming from different nations that adopt different frames. The most relevant differences are the far higher percentage of anticapitalists among UK participants, and the higher percentage of antineoliberals among French and German participants. Social Justice, which is at the core of the masterframe, is everywhere dominant except in UK. While pacifism is a little bit more concentrated in UK and Germany, the country of origin does not affect the diffusion of the remaining frames among participants.

Tab 7. ESF individuals schemas according to the country of origin (dummy variables: percentages of yes) (equilibrated sub-sample)

	Italy	France	Germany	Spain	UK	Total	Cramers'V ⁹
Anticapitalist	13.2	10.7	15.1	22.9	50.0	23.7	.37***
Antineoliberal	17.5	31.4	30.1	15.6	13.6	21.1	.19**
Social Justice	43.0	43.0	43.8	54.2	25.8	40.9	.19***
Ethics	21.1	39.7	23.3	32.3	26.5	28.9	.15*
Ecology	8.8	4.1	9.6	6.3	7.6	7.1	Ns.
Pacifism	6.1	4.1	15.1	9.4	15.2	9.7	.16*
Human rights	9.6	4.1	12.3	6.3	4.5	6.9	Ns.
Democratizatio	8.8	8.3	8.2	11.5	6.8	8.6	Ns.

⁹ Calculated for each cross-tabulation "countries" * "frame" (dummy).

n							
Mobilization	19.3	18.2	16.4	20.8	22.0	19.6	Ns.
Making aware	20.2	15.7	13.7	13.5	9.8	14.6	Ns.
Total	114	121	73	96	132	536	

*** significant at 0.001 level, ** significant at the 0.01 level, * significant at 0.05 level.

3.4. The organizational condition of the frames resonance.

Therefore, it seems that the diffusion of frames depends a little bit on the country of origin, but this is maybe a projection of the national social movement sector which in each country mobilizes with the antineoliberal globalization masterframe.

The prevalence of the radical anticapitalist *Globalise Resistance* (a network led by the trotskyst Socialist Workers Party) in UK, of the Antineoliberal ATTAC in France, where it was born¹⁰, and in Germany, where it is strong¹¹ seem to confirm this hypothesis.

The differences between the prevalent national sectors which mobilize within the antineoliberal umbrella is also confirmed by our data. If in Italy and in Spain, organized activists are members of different sectors of the movement, in France and Germany they adhere especially to the sector of Attac, while in UK the activists belong to the antagonist sector (table 8).

Besides, 45.1% participants did not belong to any organization of ESF. Although the amount of non-organized people seems higher in Italy, Spain and Germany, than in France, and (especially) in Great Britain, those data tell us that the movement succeeded in mobilizing supporters well beyond the Smos members.

Table 8. Affiliation sectors of ESF activists: Organized and non organized activists; according to the country.

	Italy	France	Germany	Spain	UK	Total
Ecosolidarity sector ¹²	24.5	14.0	20.5	17.1	15.0	17.1
Attac- ant traditional left ¹³	37.4	57.0	69.2	28.6	3.3	33.0
Antagonist organizations	26.4	26.7	10.3	34.3	80.8	45.0
Non organized	11.3	2.3	0.0	20.0	0.8	4.8
N. of organized participants*	53	86	39	35	120	333
Non organized people	61.6	36.8	50.0	65.2	18.2	45.1
N.	90	53	42	75	27	287
Total valid cases**	143	139	81	110	147	620

* Only for organized participants, Cramer's V is .32, significant at 0.001 level.

** The Cramer's V of organized/non organized people and country of origin is .36. significant at 0.001 level.

Tab.9. Individuals schemas according to the sector of affiliation (column %, dummy cross-tabulations).

	Ecosolidarity sector	Attac- Institutional left sector	Anticapitalis t sector	Social Forums	Total sectors	Cr.'s V (a)	Non-organ.	Cr.'s V (b)
Anticapitalis	6.3	16.1	43.7	18.8	23.3	.36***	10.6	.17***

¹⁰ Attac France today can count on 30,000 members organized in 200 local groups (Ancelevici 2002, Kolb 2003).

¹¹ Attac Germany has an interesting story: when it was founded in 2001, only 400 people joined the organization as members, but in 2002 Attac-Germany reached close to 4,000 members and in November 2002, when the first European Social Forum took place, Attac-Germany with more than 10,000 members is one of the biggest Attac national branches in Europe (Kolb 2003).

¹² In this sector I put the solidarity and religious groups and the environmental movement organizations.

¹³ Attac + traditional leftist organizations, such as leftist parties and non radical unions.

t								
Antineoliber.	16.6	26.0	14.7	20.8	19.7	.13*	16.1	Ns.
Social Justice	31.9	40.5	27.7	27.1	33.2	.12*	42.6	.08**
Ethics	31.2	26.0	21.6	14.6	25.0	Ns.	27.7	Ns.
Ecology	12.5	6.2	4.3	12.5	7.5	.13**	10.4	Ns.
Pacifism	8.8	10.7	13.0	6.3	10.7	Ns.	8.5	Ns.
Human rights	10.6	3.3	7.4	8.3	6.8	.11*	8.3	Ns.
Democratiz.	8.8	9.1	4.3	8.3	7.3	Ns.	8.0	Ns.
Mobilization	25.0	22.7	26.3	27.1	25.0	Ns.	17.9	.08**
Making aware	24.4	16.1	9.1	27.1	16.4	.17***	20.8	.06*
Total	160	242	231	48	681	-----	672	-----

(a) Cramer's V of cross-tabulation between sectors and frames (dummies).

(b) Cramer's V of cross-tabulation between belonging to one sector of the movement (yes, No) and frames (dummies).

*** significant at 0.001 level, ** significant at the 0.01 level, * significant at 0.05 level.

We may anyway check more generally the relationship between sector affiliation and individual schemas. Table 9 shows that actually participants not always adopt only sectorial frames: anticapitalists stress much more than others an anticapitalist frame, and the institutional left (Attac, unions and leftist parties), adopt a little more than the others the antineoliberal frame, but also underlines the "old" social justice dimension of the mobilization. Yet, all frames are diffused in part of each sectors' participants, especially social justice is the most central frame in each sector, except the anticapitalist one. What's more is that the structure of the individual schemas of non organized people (people participating without organizational affiliation), is similar the ideas of organized individual, except the far less diffusion of the anticapitalist schema among the non organized participants.

4. The collective identification with the movement.

If shared ideas and values is a minimal condition for a social movement to exist, this does not seem to be self-sufficient. Another important implication of a collective identity is the identification of participants with a broader collectivity (Hewstone et al. 1982, Klandermans 1997). Participants may always share the same system of meanings but yet not feel part of the same subject, category, simply because they may not identify themselves with the movement, while exactly because "they identify with a particular group, individuals may willingly adopt the beliefs and norms that define the group" (Klandermans 1997: 5). If master-framing is an attempt to build an identity field, the success of such an attempt is to be empirically investigated and checked.

From the data it seems that participants share a quite high identification with movement as whole (77,2% identify "enough" or "much"), only a little more than with a specific sector of the movement (75%) and with a specific organization (66,7%). It is interesting that, coherently with the multiple and layered identity of this movement, the individual identification with the movement as a whole does not exclude a high identification with both a particular sector and a particular organization, and visa-versa.

But if we focus only on the highest score of identification with movement as a whole, we find about 33% of activists who identify with it "much". The question is "who are they"?

The "most identified activists" are found among the participants coming from UK, then Spain and France (table 10). The peculiarity of the movement in UK (essentially a Socialist Workers matter) may explain the higher identification of the English activists, because it is certainly easier to identify oneself with a movement which mostly overlaps with one's own organization. Actually if we exclude English participants from the analysis the differences between Italians and other countries' activists are not statistically relevant¹⁴.

¹⁴ The Cramer's V cross-tabulation between nations with the exclusion of English participants is not significant.

Table 10 High identification with the movement according to the activist nationality (equilibrated sub-sample).

High identification with movement	Italy	France	Germany	Spain	UK	Total
Not at all/little	25.5	16.7	29.5	15.1	11.2	(18.8) 111
Enough	54.0	54.0	48.7	53.8	32.2	(48.0) 283
Much	20.4	29.4	21.8	31.1	56.6	(33.2) 196
Total	137	126	78	106	143	590

Statistical legend: Cramer's $V = .22$, significant at the 0.001 level.

If we want a better explanation of why people highly identify with the movement we should take into account other factors, including the role of the frames. Let's make the following hypotheses.

- 1) The new generation of activists, the very young ones, may identify more than the others, because their political activism coincides with the birth of the movement, while other activists may identify more with movements of the eighties, seventies and sixties. They also may be students more likely. Since students haven't a job yet they may be less interested in socio-economical identification and more attracted by the new and multiple collective identity they can find in this movement.
- 2) Another hypothesis focuses on the "organization": if the resource mobilization approach stresses the role of the "Leninist" "organization" (Tarrow 1994), while some activists may simply transfer their identification with the organization they belong to, toward the movement the organization decided to be part of, other activists may identify with movement because it expresses the multiple identity they need: since in the past they overlapped their membership in many types of "collectivity", a multiple collective identity may answer their "question" of a new and open kind of identification.
- 3) At the same time social movement literature stresses the importance of the mobilization experience, "once individuals become involved in an episode of collective action their view of the world may change dramatically. They acquire new collective identities as participants in collective action" (Klandermans 1997, 93).
- 4) A fourth model may include the role of cognitive-psychological factors: We can imagine that people who identify more with movement as whole are the ones who feel more attached to the whole world rather than feeling attached to a nation, a region, or a city: they are cosmopolite, as much as the movement is. They may also feel attached to Europe, since the European social forum calls for another Europe. What's more important is that we can test if people who bridge more frames are those who identify more.
- 5) Finally, there can be political reasons: the activists identify with movement because the movement appears to struggle against a neoliberal Europe, and they actually think the European Union is nothing but the Europeanization of globalization; they are also politically radical, because they want real changes in the world. Thus, they declare to trust social movements in general and they consider themselves as radical leftists.

I will test these hypotheses by applying a binominal logistic regression analysis which predicts the high identification with movement (High identification vs. low or little identification).

The logistic regression (tab. 11) shows that the socio-demographic model does not fit at all, while the second model tells us that belonging to one organization of the forum predicts a high identification with movement. The second model confirms in a way that the organizational channels count less and less in the collective identity building: people ask less and less to their organization what kind of the collectivity they have to identify with. Collective identities are always built via mobilization but if participation produces high identification, it has to be a significant participation in a symbolic protest like the Genoa one.

Among the cognitive psychological variables if the frame-bridging certainly matters, what matters more is the feeling of being attached to the world: one must be truly cosmopolitan if he/she identifies highly with a transnational social movement. Political considerations, however, seem to account more: the people who identify more are more radical and more used to trust social movements in general.

Tab.11. Why activists highly identify with the movement. Standardized coefficients (beta) and significance of binominal logistic regression analysis model.

	High identification with the movement	
	St. b	Sig.
Socio-demographic controls:		
Gender (Women)	---	ns
Level of education (three categories)	----	ns
Socio-demographic variables		
Age (three categories)	---	ns
Student (dummy)	---	ns
Organizational variables		
Belonging to one organization of the forum (dummy)	----	ns
Having an overlapping membership experience (additive)	---	ns
Participation variables		
Participation in previous manifestation (dummy)	----	ns
Participation at the anti-G8 manifestation (Genoa) (dummy)	1.945	*
Cognitive-Psychological variables		
Attached to World (4 degree of feeling attached)	3.560	***
Attached to Europe (4 degree of feeling attached)	Excluded	
Frame-bridging	2.878	**
Political variables		
EU strengthens neoliberal globalization (4 degree of agreement)	excluded	---
Trust in social movements (4 degree of trust)	7.147	***
Radical (dummy, extreme left=1)	3.025	**
Constant C	- 6,307	
Cox & Snell R Square	.28	
Adjusted R Square (Nagelkerke)	.37	

Sig. ***= 0.001; **= 0.01; *= 0.05. The variables were entered in the order of the table, and a stepwise backwards procedure was applied.

5. Framing process and transnational movements: toward a conclusion.

This paper is an attempt to provide a plausible explanation of the formation antineoliberal transnational movement based on the symbolic construction of the collective identity. The hypothesis that I tried to test is that movements built by interconnections between organizations

that differ on logic of action, type of identity and country of origin, must, if they want to succeed in mobilizing and creating a new collective identity, engage in a intensive activity of negotiation with the purpose of building collective frames of the contested situation which are shared by the individual and structural potential mobilization.

The empirical analysis confirmed that the master frame of the movement resonates with the system of meanings shared by most of the activists and supporters, as the schemas analysis of participants at the European Social Forum of Florence demonstrated. There are obvious differences between countries and between sectors in the way activists frame the protest against neoliberal globalization, but less than one may expect, and above all, those differences seem to depend more on the specific national sectors that mobilize under this master-frame. It seems that the sectors which decide to be part of this transnational movement vary among countries, and we need more systematic research in order to understand why.

This nevertheless, our findings suggest that, if the master frame bridging around the connection between social justice, ethics and environmental justice provided the symbolic umbrella under which "old" and "new" social movements issues and organizations can stay together, the individuals seem to reproduce the same connections.

This whole process produced a very high identification with the movement as whole, which hardly vary between countries. But not only frames matter. Obviously collective identity produces identification through different manners: we found for instance that participation in Genoa protest explains a higher identification with movement of the FSE activists, but there are also some political e cultural preconditions to meet: they must have a radical political position and they must feel cosmopolitan.

Bibliografia:

- Ancelovici, M., 2002, "Organizing Against Globalization: The Case of Attac in France", in *Politics & Society* 30, pp. 427-463.
- Andretta, M., della Porta, D., Mosca, L., Reiter, H., 2002, *Global, noglobal, newglobal. La protesta contro il G8 a Genova*, Laterza, Roma-Bari.
- Andretta, M., Mosca, L., 2003, *Il movimento per una globalizzazione dal basso: forze e debolezze di un'identità negoziata*, in D. della Porta e L. Mosca (a cura di), *Globalizzazione e movimenti sociali*, Manifestolibri, Roma, 21-47.
- Barlett, F.C. (1932), *Remembering*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1987), *Memorie di classe*, Torino, Einaudi, (Or. Ed., *Memories of Class*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD, 1982).
- Bello, W. (2001), "Present at the Creation: Focus and the March from Seattle to Porto Alegre", in *Annual Report*, pp. 3-9 (<http://www.focusweb.org/publications/Annual%20Report/annual%2020006.pdf>).
- Benford, R.D., 1993, "'You could be the hundredth monkey': collective action frames and vocabularies of motive within the nuclear disarmament movement", in *Sociological Quarterly* 34, pp. 195-216.
- Benford, R.D. (1997), "An Insider's Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective", in *Sociological Inquiry*, 67, pp. 409-430.
- Benford, R.D., Snow, D.A. (2000), "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment", in *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26.
- Bennet, W.L. (2003), "Communicating Global Activism: Strength and Vulnerabilities of Networked Politics", in *Information, Communication & Society*, forthcoming.
- Carroll, W.K., Ratner, R.S. (1996), "Master Framing and Cross-Movement Networking in Contemporary Social Movements", in *Sociological Quarterly* 37, pp. 601-625.
- Chiesa, G. (2001), *G8/Genova*, Einaudi, Torino.
- della Porta, D. (2003), "Ambiente e movimenti sociali globali", paper presented at the Conference *I Conflitti ambientali nella globalizzazione*, Firenze.
- della Porta, D., Kriesi, H., Rucht, D. (1999), *Social Moments in a Globalizing World*, London, Macmillan.
- della Porta, D., Rucht, D., 2002, *The Dynamics of Environmental Campaigns*, in in "Mobilization", 7, pp. 1-14.

- Gamson, W.A. (1988), "Political Discourse and Collective Action", B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi, S. Tarrow (eds.), *International Social Movement Research* 1, Greenwich, Conn., JAI, pp. 219-44.
- Gamson, W.A. (1992a), *Talking Politics*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, W.A. (1992b), "The Social Psychology of Collective Action", in A. D. Morris, C.M. Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, pp. 53-76.
- Gerhards, J., Rucht, D. (1992), "Mesomobilization: Organizing and Framing in Two Protest Campaigns in West Germany", in *American Journal of Sociology* 98, 555-595.
- Glasius, M., Kaldor, M. (2002), "The State of Global Civil Society Before and After September 11", in *Global Civil Society* edited by H.K. Anheier, M. Glasius and M. Kaldor, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 3-33.
- Goffman, E. (1974), *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of the Experience*, New York, Harper Colophon.
- Guidry, J.A., Kennedy, M.D., Zald, M.N. (2001), *Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power, and the Transnational Public Sphere*, Ann. Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Hardt, M., Negri, A., (2002), *Impero*, Rizzoli, Milano.
- Hewstone, M., Jaspars, J., Lalljee, M. (1982), "Social Representations, Social Attribution and Social Identity: The Intergroup Image of 'Public' and 'Comprehensive' Schoolboys", in *European Journal of Social Psychology* 12, pp. 241-269.
- Hunt, S., Benford R.D. (1994), "Identity Talk in the Peace and Justice Movement", in *Journal of Contemporary Ethnology* 22, pp. 488-517.
- Hunt, S., Benford, R.D., Snow D.A. (1994), "Identity Fields: Framing Processes and the Social Construction of Movement Identities", in E. Lara_a, H. Johnston, J. Gusfield (eds.), *New Social Movements*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
- Jenkins, J. C. (1983), "The Transformation of a Constituency into a Movement" in J. Freeman (ed.), *Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies*, New York, Longman, pp. 52-70.
- Johnson, V. (1997), "Operation Rescue, Vocabularies of Motive, and Tactical Action: a Study of Movement Framing in the Practice of Quasi-Nonviolence", in *Res. Social Movements, Conflict and Change* 20, pp. 103-50
- Johnston, H. (1995), "A Methodology for Frame Analysis: From Discourse to Cognitive Schemata", in H. Johnston, B. Klandermans, *Social Movements and Culture*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, pp. 217-246.
- Johnston, H. (2002), "Verification and Proof in Frame and Discourse Analysis", in B. Klandermans, S. Staggenborg (eds.), *Methods of Social Movement Research*, Minneapolis, London, University of Minnesota Press, pp. 62-91.
- Johnston, H., Aili Aarelaid-Tart, A. (2000), "Generations, Microcohorts and Long-Term Mobilization: The Estonian National Movement 1940-1991", in *Sociological Perspectives*, 43, pp. 671-698.
- Keck, M., Sicking, K. (1998), *Activists Beyond Borders. Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.
- Kim, J-O, Mueller C.W. (1978), *Introduction to Factor Analysis. What it is and How To Do It*, Berly Hills, London, Sage Publications.
- Klandermans, B. (1992), "The Social Construction of Protest and Multiorganizational Fields", in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. Morris and C. Mueller, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Klandermans, B. (1997), *The Social Psychology of Protest*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Kolb, F. (2003), "The Impact of Transnational Protest on Social Movement Organizations: Mass Media and the Making of the Attac Germany", paper presented at the conference "Transnational Processes and Social Movements", Bellagio, July 22-26.
- Kriesi, H., Koopmans, R., Duyvendak, J. W., Giugni, M. (1995), *New Social Movements in Western Europe*, Minneapolis-Londra, University of Minnesota Press.
- Marullo, S., Pagnucco, R., Smith, J., (1996), "Frame Changes and social movement contraction: U.S. Peace Movement Framing after the Cold War", in *Sociological Inquiry* 66, pp. 1-28.
- Marcon, G., Pianta, M. (2002), "Porto Alegre-Europa: i percorsi dei movimenti globali", in *Mappe di movimenti. Da Porto Alegre al Forum Sociale Europeo*, Trieste, Asterios Editore, pp. 5-33.
- McAdam, D. (1982), *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- McCarthy, J.D. (1994), "Activists, Authorities, and Media Framing of Drunk Driving", in E. Lara_a, H. Johnston, J. Gusfield (eds.), *New Social Movements*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press,

- pp. 133-67.
- Mosca, L. (2003), "Transnational Protest Activists and the Use of the Internet: Hypothesis and Evidences from a Research on the European Social Forum", Paper to be presented at the Conference on "Transnational Processes and Social Movements", Bellagio, July 22-26.
- Montagna, N. (2003), "Questioning while Walking. The Centri Sociali and the Forms of Conflict in the Globalized Society", paper presented at the Conference "Globalizzazione e conflitti", in Trento, Italy, June 5-6.
- Nepstad, S.E. (1997), "The Process of Cognitive Liberation: Cultural Synapses, Links and Frame Contradictions in US-Central America Peace Movement", in *Sociological Inquiry* 67: pp. 470-87.
- O'Brien, R., Goetz, A.M., Aart, J., Williams, M. (eds.) (2000), *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*, London/New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Obershall, A., (1973), *Social Conflict and Social Movements*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall.
- Oliver, P., Johnston, H. (2000), "What a Good Idea! Frames and Ideology in Social Movement Research", in *Mobilization* 5, pp. 50-65.
- Pianta, M. (2002a), "Parallel Summits: an Update", in *Global Civil Society* edited by H.K. Anheier, M. Glasius and M. Kaldor, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Pianta, M. (2002b), "I controvertici e gli eventi della società civile globale", in *Mappe di movimenti. Da Porto Alegre al Forum Sociale Europeo*, Trieste, Asterios Editore, pp. 35-51.
- Smith, J., Chatfield, Ch., Pagnucco, R. (1997), *Transnazional Movements in global Politics*, Syracuse, Syracuse University Press.
- Snow, D.A., Benford, R.D. (1988), "Ideology, Frame Resonance and Participant Mobilization", in B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi, S. Tarrow (eds.), *International Social Movement Research 1*, Greenwich, Conn., JAI, pp. 197-218.
- Snow, D.A., Benford, R.D. (1992), "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest", in A. Morris, C. Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press.
- Snow, D.A., Benford, R.D. (2000), "Mobilization Forum: Comments on Oliver and Johnston", in *Mobilization* 5, pp. 55-60.
- Snow, D.A., McAdam, D. (2000), "Identity Work Processes in the Context of Social Movements: Clarifying the Identity/Movement Nexus", in S. Stryker, T. Owens, R. White (eds.), *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, New York, Aldine de Gruyter.
- Snow, D.A., Rochford, E.B., Worden, S. K., Benford, R.D. (1986), "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation, in *American Sociological Review* 51, pp. 464-481.
- Somers, M.R. (1992), "Narrativity, Narrative identity, and Social action: Rethinking English Working Class Formation", in *Social Science History* 16, pp. 591-630.
- Steinmetz, G. (1992), "Reflection on the Role of Social Narratives in Working-Class Formation: Narrative Theory in the Social Sciences", in *Social Science History* 16, pp. 489-516.
- Tarrow, S. (2001), "Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics", in *Annual Review of Political Science* 4, pp. 1-20.
- Tarrow, S. (2002), "The New Transnational Contention: Organizations, Coalitions, Mechanisms", Paper presented to APSA Annual Meeting, Boston MA.
- Thompson, E.P. (1980), *The Making of the English Working Class*, London, Penguin Books (Or. Ed. 1963).
- Weed, F.J. (1997), "The Framing of Political Advocacy and Service Responses in the Crime Victim Rights Movement", in *Journal of Sociology of Social Welfare* 24, pp. 43-61.