Identifying and explaining framing strategies of low carbon lifestyle movement organisations

Milena Büchs[a,*], Clare Saunders[b], Rebecca Wallbridge[a], Graham Smith[c], Nicholas Bardsley[d]

[a] University of Southampton, Social Sciences, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom
[b] University of Exeter, Penryn Campus, Cornwall, TR10 9FE, United Kingdom
[c] University of Westminster, Wells Street, London W1T 3UW, United Kingdom
[d] University of Reading, Whiteknights, PO Box 237, Reading RG6 6AR, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Over the last decade we have seen the growth and development of low carbon lifestyle movement organisations, which seek to encourage members of the public to reduce their personal energy use and carbon emissions. As a first step to assess the transformational potential of such organisations, this paper examines the ways in which they frame their activities. This reveals an important challenge they face: in addressing the broader public, do they promote 'transformative' behaviours or do they limit themselves to encouraging 'easy changes' to maintain their appeal? We find evidence that many organisations within this movement avoid 'transformative' frames. The main reasons for this are organisers' perceptions that transformational frames lack resonance with broader audiences, as well as wider cultural contexts that caution against behavioural intervention. The analysis draws on interviews with key actors in the low carbon lifestyle movement and combines insights from the literatures on collective action framing and lifestyle movements.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The last decade has seen the emergence, development and growth of community-based organisations that seek to support members of the public to save energy and reduce personal carbon emissions. Prominent examples are the Transition Town movement, the Greening Campaign, Carbon Conversations, and Carbon Rationing Action Groups that were all founded between 2006 and 2008, in addition to a large number of local sustainability, climate change and energy-saving organisations. We use the term 'low carbon lifestyle movement organisations' (LCLMOs) to capture their characteristic approach. These organisations can be understood as part of a 'lifestyle movement' (LM) (Haenfler et al., 2012) because they seek to resolve climate change and foster social change primarily by influencing individuals' lifestyles. While the literature on lifestyle movements is in its infancy, examples include the "straight edge movement" (an alternative punk movement that refuses the use of drugs) (Haenfler, 2004a);

virginity pledgers (Bearman and Bruckner, 2001); slow food/slow living (Parkins and Craig, 2006); vegetarianism (Maurer, 2002) and voluntary simplicity (Alexander and Ussher, 2012; Elgin and Mitchell, 2003; Grigsby, 2004). Haenfler (2012: 2, 5) also mentions the "green living" movement and the lifestyle "wing" of the environmental movement as examples but so far they have not been analysed in more detail from an LM perspective.

The idea of LMs has emerged to distinguish resistance and/or social change embedded in individuals' lifestyles from the more familiar 'new social movements' (NSMs), which seek to foster social change through collective attempts to impact culture and/or policy. Although the distinction between LMs and NSMs is more blurred than posited by the originators of the concept (Haenfler et al., 2012), there remain important differences between the two. Whilst both NSMs and LMs seek to foster social change, they do so with slightly different orientations. Public collective action and the construction of collective identity are critical for NSMs, as part of their broader goals, which pose a fundamental challenge to the social order. Whereas NSMs seek to 'change the world', LMs seek to 'be the change'. LMs, therefore, focus more exclusively on individualised forms of action and lifestyle change and so public displays of collective action are more marginal and sometimes even eschewed (Haenfler et al., 2012: 8-9).

Jasper (2006) captures the distinction in terms of the 'Janus dilemma' faced by groups: many NSMs prioritise (and have been criticised for) 'reaching in' to service the interests of their members rather than aiming to affect broader lifestyle change 'beyond the activist ghetto' (Saunders et al., 2014). In contrast, the explicit purpose of LM organisations (LMOs) is to reach out to encourage lifestyle change across broader publics. As we will see later, for some LMOs this may involve addressing audiences that are at least sympathetic to their cause which has an element of 'reaching in' even though it does not go as far as only addressing those who are already fully 'converted'.

Numerous practitioners and academics have supported the view that community-based LCLMOs have potential to play an important role in encouraging the public to take up low carbon behaviours (e.g. Hargreaves et al., 2008, 2013; HM Government, 2010; Middlemiss, 2011; Middlemiss and Parrish, 2010; Nye and Burgess, 2008; Seyfang and Smith, 2007), especially in the context of a political deadlock on climate change (Hale, 2010). However, the ways in which community-based LCLMOs can most effectively contribute to carbon reduction have been debated. Two main positions can be identified. The first holds that these organisations have more potential to promote behaviour change to wider audiences than government-led action because they are considered more trustworthy and are better connected to local communities (DEFRA, 2008a; DEFRA, 2008b; Fudge and Peters, 2011: 801-2, 805; Hale, 2010: 256, 264; HM Government, 2010: 79). The second position sees community organisations' capacity for change in their potential for innovation as they often operate in societal 'niches' away from the 'mainstream' (Seyfang and Smith, 2007; Steward et al., 2009). One question is to what extent these two approaches are compatible: can LCLMOs move beyond niches and persuade 'mainstream' society to take up more radical low carbon behaviours? While Seyfang and Smith concede that it might be difficult for 'grassroots' initiatives to scale-up niche 'innovations', they remain optimistic that they can "eventually exert influence upon the mainstream" (2007: 597).

This raises the central question of this paper, namely, how do LCLMOs seek to persuade the wider public to make changes? Which behaviour changes do they promote and how do they motivate people to take them up? In other words, how do LCLMOs frame their attempts to interest people in personal carbon reduction? In this paper, we understand framing as an activity that movement organisers and adherents engage in when they attach meanings to and communicate aims and activities "in ways that are intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists" (Snow and Benford, 1988: 198).

Two contrasting positions on how LCLMOs might frame their activities can be identified. The *first* holds that people who are not yet converted to the cause of climate change are best motivated by highlighting non-environmental, often personal (read financial), benefits (e.g. DEFRA, 2008a: 48; Futerra, 2010). The *second* perspective has criticised this approach (e.g. Corner and Randall, 2011; Crompton et al., 2010; Evans et al., 2013), questioning whether "self-enhancing" motivations such as saving money or enhancing one's social status really are a solid basis for long-term action on climate change because they only work where and as long as such external incentives exist. Instead, advocates of the second approach argue that low carbon behaviours are more effectively and long-lastingly motivated by "self-transcending" values and that these values can be activated or strengthened through appropriate framing (Crompton et al., 2010: 34, 36-8, 47).

The framing strategies adopted by LCLMOs (and LMs more broadly) are little understood. Therefore we draw on research that focuses on the framing strategies of social movement organisations (SMOs) (including NSMOs). This work acknowledges that

organisations seek to motivate and recruit supporters through the selection of accessible and convincing frames. It is usually assumed that SMOs adopt 'transformative' frames that challenge, often fundamentally, the social order (e.g. Benford and Snow, 2000; Melucci, 1996; Snow et al., 1986). This paper examines the extent to which LCLMOs are similarly able to adopt transformative frames and how this relates to the types of audiences they target. By 'transformative' or 'radical' we refer here to frames that highlight the urgency of climate change and support more far-reaching actions to reduce individuals' carbon footprints (for instance, giving up flying or moving to a vegan diet can be considered as more 'radical' than switching off lights when leaving the room). These frames and actions do not necessarily but may co-exist with those that challenge the system of global capitalism directly. Are LCLMOs limited in their framing choices because they target individual behaviour change on a broad basis rather than establishing and/or reinforcing a counter-cultural collective identity?

Our methodological approach to understanding framing strategies draws on interviews with organisers of LCLMOs (those who actively construct frames) alongside documentary and website analysis of the groups that provide additional evidence of the nature of those frames. In doing so, this paper provides a first analysis of the transformational potential of LCLMOs by examining the types of frames they adopt and their justifications for doing so. In the next section of the paper, we draw on the literature on collective action framing and lifestyle movements to present a framework for understanding differences and similarities in the framing strategies that LCLMOs adopt. We then provide details of the data and methods of analysis, and present and discuss our results.

2. Framing in social and lifestyle movements

To better understand the extent to which LCLMOs are willing or able to adopt 'transformative' frames to encourage low carbon behaviours and why, we find it useful to draw on the literature on "frame resonance" and "cultural resonance" within collective action framing to understand differences as well as similarities of framing strategies.

The perspective of collective action framing highlights that social movements are not simply "carriers of extant, preconfigured ideas and beliefs" (Snow, 2007: 384) but that framing approaches are generated through actual or imagined interactions between movement activists, participants, antagonists, etc. (ibid.). Snow and Benford (1988: 200-4) have identified three main framing tasks: activists need to identify the problem under consideration through "diagnostic framing"; identify solutions and strategies through "prognostic framing"; and provide a "rationale for action" through "motivational framing". Since all of the LCLMOs included in this study adopted similar diagnostic frames, seeking to mitigate climate change by reduction of personal carbon emissions, this paper focuses on organisations' prognostic and motivational framing. Which behaviour changes do LCLMOs promote as a solution to tackling climate change (prognostic framing) and how do they attempt to motivate people (motivational framing)?

We suggest here that it is useful to combine two aspects of the literature on framing strategies as developed within the social movement literature. The first represents the idea that framing as an activity is dialogical and that to be successful, frames need to resonate with the audiences they address (e.g. Benford and Snow, 2000; Boström, 2004; Pellow, 1999; Snow, 2007; Snow and Benford, 1988). The second argues that framing strategies will be influenced by "cultural repertoires" (Kubal, 1998; Williams, 1995, 2007; Williams and Kubal, 1999), defined as culturally acceptable ways of thinking, arguing and acting, that are available to framing

agents within specific social and historical contexts. These two aspects of framing are often discussed separately in the literature but we suggest that combining them facilitates robust comparison of framing activities across organisations with similar aims. We propose that different framing approaches across organisations are coupled with the different target audiences they address; whereas similarities are a result of cultural repertoires that enable but also delimit organisations' framing activities.

2.1. Framing as 'interactive' activity

Drawing on Goffman's (1975) work, collective action framing is typically conceptualised as an 'interactive' activity. 'Interaction' does not need to be direct but includes a more indirect 'orientation towards others' when organisations decide which frames and tactics they should adopt. For example, in an early paper on the topic, Snow et al. (1986: 464) argued that in order to successfully generate support, an "alignment" needs to take place to link "individual and SMO [social movement organisations] interpretive orientations, such that some set of individual interests, values and beliefs and SMO activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary". Later, Snow and Benford coined the term "frame resonance" which they defined as a measure of the extent to which movement frames resonate with "the targets of mobilization" (Snow and Benford, 1988: 213). Several studies examine how movement organisations employ frames to mobilise audiences, including lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transsexual (LGBT) (Jenness, 1995), white supremacy (McVeigh et al., 2004), feminist (Rupp and Taylor, 1999), anti-nuclear, animal rights, and environmental organisations (e.g. Benford, 1993a,b; Capek, 1993; Ingalsbee, 1996; Jasper and Poulsen, 1995; Taylor, 2000). The extant research indicates that specific frames are used to appeal to specifically targeted audiences, sometimes even within the same movement if they address, for instance, adversaries, the broader public, policy makers or the media (Boström, 2004; Pellow, 1999).

An important theme in this literature is whether frames that represent movements' beliefs and aims get 'watered down' in the process of appealing to audiences beyond core supporters. While research findings are mixed, there is evidence that frames can lose their edge when organisations try to reach out to wider audiences (Kubal, 1998: 544; Pellow, 1999: 676-8); that more radical frames alienate conservative audiences (Corner, 2013; Lybecker et al., 2013); and that they fail in affecting change in dominant representations of power structures in mainstream media outlets (Hopke, 2012). However, some studies argue that environmental organisations do not necessarily dilute their messages when they reach out to wider audiences and that 'transformative' frames *can* resonate with wider audiences (Boström, 2004: 82; Chilton et al., 2012; Merry, 2012); and Middlemiss (2011) found that participants in LCLMOs who were previously unengaged were more likely to adopt new, environmentally friendly behaviours even though the study does not provide insights into the frames that organisations used. However, based on the theory that framing is an interactive activity, we find it plausible that organisations may adopt less transformative frames if they seek to appeal to the broader public.

2.2. Framing and cultural repertoires

In another line of argument, Williams and colleagues (Williams, 1995, 2007; Williams and Kubal, 1999) suggest that SMOs' framing activities are not only influenced by what they perceive will appeal to their audiences but also by the "cultural repertoire" that is available within specific historical and social contexts. Williams and Kubal (1999) thus introduced the concept of "cultural resonance" which refers to the resonance of movement frames with and their contribution to the wider cultural context. The

existing, but limited, literature on cultural resonance and environmental organisations gives some indication of how cultural and political contexts can shape environmental justice (Agyeman, 2002; Davies, 2006) and ecological modernisation (Mol, 2000) frames.

Arguably, the main difference between the concepts of "frame resonance" and "cultural resonance" refers to the size and internal variability of the audience to which a frame seeks to appeal: relatively confined audiences with similar worldviews and interests (frame resonance) versus a wider public that includes supporters, bystanders and opponents (cultural resonance). As discussed above, the literature on frame resonance has more recently included examination of frames directed at audiences beyond close supporters. However, the distinction remains useful given that cultural resonance may explain similarities of framing activities even amongst organisations that try to appeal to slightly different audiences, as is the case among LCLMOs. Here, specific "cultural repertoires" might prove dominant across different local contexts.

2.3. Framing within lifestyle movements

The role of framing to mobilise support has not yet been studied in detail in the literature on LMs. Despite this, LM scholars have made relevant observations around target audiences and the ways in which messages are spread by LM participants. For example, Haenfler explains that in comparison to most social movements, LMs often do not have clearly defined target groups (or enemies) and as such "resistance" is often more general (2004a: 797). He refers to Gamson (1989: 357) who points out in relation to the AIDS activist movement that sometimes "the enemy is invisible, abstract, disembodied, ubiquitous" and argues that LMs "tend to target cultural codes and individual practices" (Haenfler et al., 2012: 7).

However, even without more specified audiences, LM activists still seek to spread messages or gain visibility as several examples in the literature illustrate, including the use of different forms of media (internet-based, flyers/brochures, letters to mainstream media outlets, distribution of vegan/vegetarian recipes, song lyrics); symbols (e.g. tattoos, t-shirt slogans, rings, bracelets); or the organisation of groups, events and campaigns (Bearman and Bruckner, 2001: 870, 900; Haenfler, 2004a: 793, 797; 2004b: 415, 425; Haenfler et al., 2012: 11). All such activities necessarily involve decisions about framing. Haenfler also discusses a typical tension that he observes within LMs between more active and passive styles of attempting to influence others: while he finds that some movement participants directly encouraged others to take up new behaviours (e.g. Haenfler, 2004b: 423-4), others were more hesitant to be so proactive, believing their own actions could set an example and thus inspire behaviour change in others (Grigsby, 2004: 9; Haenfler, 2004b: 424; Lorenzen, 2014: 464).

In applying ideas about frame resonance – that organisations seek to use frames which resonate with their target audiences to increase success – in the analysis of framing amongst LCLMOs, we will distinguish 'cautious framing' from 'transformational framing'. We do not suggest that these two approaches represent the whole spectrum of framing strategies; rather, they can broadly be understood as two ideal types within a much more differentiated spectrum. What we call 'transformational framing' is similar to the strategy of "frame transformation" identified by Snow et al. (1986) which involves efforts by movement organisations to change audiences' attitudes, values and identities to make them fit with the frames they promote. In contrast, 'cautious framing' can overlap with the other three framing strategies outlined by Snow et al. (1986). These strategies involve an adjustment of movement frames to audiences' attitudes, values and identities to make them

more compatible and garner further support in three ways: by connecting to compatible but previously unconnected frames (bridging), clarifying a frame so it matches frames that audiences already understand (amplification), and extending a frame to connect to worldviews already held by the audience (extension). Since we are mainly interested in the difference between transformational and cautious framing, we focus on that distinction in the analysis.

We expect that 'cautious' and 'transformational' framing will be influenced by the types of audiences that organisations target: organisations that tend to "reach out" to wider audiences can be expected to adopt more cautious frames because they need to find ways to connect to audiences that are not yet convinced of their aims. In contrast, we can expect that organisations that tend to "reach in" to core supporters are likely to adopt more transformational frames because they can be more confident that this will appeal to their audience. As set out in section 2.1, this hypothesis is better supported by evidence in the existing literature than the opposite proposition that framing is essentially independent from audiences. However, it is important to note here that there is no clear dichotomy between "reaching in" and "reaching out"—there can be gradual differences within each of these approaches and some organisations engage both in "reaching in" and "reaching out". We will illustrate this idea in the presentation and discussion of our results.

While we propose that the frame resonance perspective can explain some of the differences in framing strategies that organisations adopt, we also suggest that this perspective works well in combination with the 'cultural resonance' perspective set out above to help us understand similarities across LCLMO framing strategies, especially when compared to more traditional environmental organisations.

3. Data and methods

This paper draws on 69 interviews with organisers of 38 organisations which aimed to engage the public directly on low carbon living. In addition, we draw on 127 screenshots of these organisations' websites (i.e. usually including several screenshots per organisation), focusing on tabs such as "about us", "vision" or "what we do" that state organisations' aims and describe their activities. Only organisations that are part of a larger network are identified by name whilst stand-alone local organisations' names are anonymised to protect organisers' identities. The interviews were conducted in two phases, funded by two projects. The first was funded by the project "The Third Sector and the Environment" which was part of the ESRC Third Sector Research Centre and examined organisers' views on the third sector's role in promoting low carbon living. 34 interviews were conducted in this phase with organisers from 15 organisations across the UK, comprising Transition Towns, Carbon Rationing Action Groups, Sustrans, 10:10, Global Cool, Living Witness, Carbon Conversations and a number of local low carbon organisations. The second project was funded by the project "Community-Based Initiatives for Energy Saving" which was part of the RCUK Energy and Communities programme. Here we draw on 35 interviews with organisers of 23 local low carbon or energy saving projects in the UK, including Greening Groups, Transition Towns and Low Carbon Zones. The interviews focused on the types of activities undertaken, the way in which organisers framed these activities, which audiences they targeted and organisers' perception of how well the organisation was reaching its aims. We did not seek to achieve a representative sample of all environmental third sector organisations (for example, we did not include conservation or wildlife organisations) but a sample that included a comprehensive range of LCLMOs in terms of their activities as well as location (e.g. rural and urban, different regions, and socio-demographic context) (see Table 1 for an overview).

These semi-structured interviews were conducted by three different interviewers in separate phases of the projects, on the premises of the organisation or at other locations convenient to the organisers. All interviews were conducted face to face, apart from one phone interview. Interview transcriptions and website screenshots were coded and analysed by the lead author who developed a set of codes derived from our research interests, including "aims", "activities", "behaviour change", "framing", "recruitment", "who is involved", "perception of success", "transformational framing" and "cautious framing". Organisations were identified as having adopted "transformational framing" when they (a) openly framed their aims around carbon reduction; (b) motivated participants to reduce emissions by referring to environmental benefits (rather than money saving or other individual benefits), and (c) encouraged participants to take more 'radical' actions like reducing their meat consumption, car or air travel to reduce their emissions (instead of just taking "small and easy steps"). Organisations that did not fulfil these criteria were identified as those that had adopted "cautious" frames. Most of the organisations in the latter group did not fulfil any of the three criteria.

4. Findings

We first present findings on the ways in which LCLMOs' framing strategies differed. We argued above that organisations' framing strategies will be related to the types of audiences they focus on: organisations that seek to "reach out" to audiences who are not yet convinced of their main aims are likely to adopt more cautious frames while organisations who target audiences that are already more sympathetic to their aims are likely to adopt more transformational frames. Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 examine these links and provide evidence that framing strategies and the types of targeted audiences are related. In section 4.2 we turn to some of the similarities that we observed across organisations' framing strategies which, as we will argue, relate to more general cultural contexts within which these organisations currently operate.

4.1. Framing and types of audience

4.1.1. Cautious framing, broader audience

The first approach presented here is termed 'cautious framing' because even though organisations that adopt this frame aim at carbon reduction, they often choose not to communicate this clearly to participants in their prognostic and motivational frames, instead only encouraging 'easy' behaviour changes and highlighting financial or other individual benefits. Of the 38 LCLMOs, we allocated 34 to this group.

First, we examine prognostic frames which represent and communicate organisations' aims and the types of behaviour changes they encourage. For instance, the Low Carbon Zone project included in this study stated on its website that carbon reduction within its geographical area was one of its main objectives. This was also confirmed in an interview with one of the organisers:

> "[The Low Carbon Zone project is] about reducing the carbon footprint of an area" (O30-1).

When we asked later how this aim was framed in direct communication with participants in their projects, however, the organiser replied:

> "So although obviously the whole project is really predicated on carbon cutting, it's not being stated as the major aim" (O30-1).

Similarly, an organiser of an organisation which, according to its website, "supports communities across [region] to take action on climate change and move to low carbon living", stated:

"Our primary aim, I suppose, is reducing the carbon footprint of the town, however we would never say that to people" (O22-1).

Organisers in this group also tended to be cautious regarding the types and extent of behaviour change they were promoting. As illustrated in the next few quotes, many organisers stressed that they concentrated on encouraging "easy" changes and "little steps" or made it explicit that they refrained from encouraging people to do more 'radical' things. For example,:

"I think what we're trying to do is get people to take that first tiny little step and that may be that they just replace a low energy bulb or that they take a regular meter reading" (O25-1).
"For [location] Transition, it's just a case of doing (. . .) easy bits so (. . .) you're not saying to them 'oh . . . you have to have this and you have to do this' and it's just introducing them to little things (. . .) just something so small that people don't realise" (O6-1).
"Obviously there's a reluctance to change your lifestyle, it's a question of what you're asking people to do. If you're saying 'Right we want you to stop any international air travel' they're just going to find a reason why that doesn't apply to them. But if you say something a bit more reasonable like 'Change your energy supplier to a green one' they might be happy to do that if the energy was going to be cheaper. Or if you ask them to turn off a leaking tap, or change the light bulbs (. . .). So it's little things like that that people will take part in if it doesn't disrupt them too much" (O24-1).
"Living green doesn't have to mean growing dreadlocks and becoming an eco-warrior. At Global Cool we reckon a greener life is still a fun one. We promote . . . simple ways you can be greener without sacrificing the things you love" (O7, website).

It fits with this approach that whilst Global Cool 'gently' discourages flying in some of its entries, other web posts suggest that flying remains acceptable if combined with an 'eco holiday':
"We know life can be tough. Sometimes all you want to do is pack up your things and take a long vacation. Well what's stopping you? We've hunted high and low for the crème de la crème of eco-friendly hotels across the globe. So if you have to fly, make sure it's to one of these amazing places . . . " [here listing "Paradise Bay Eco Resort, Queensland, Australia" and "Wildbrook Retreat, India"] (O7, website).

Promoting 'little' and 'easy' steps often coincided with motivational framing that emphasised financial savings or other individual benefits:
"They've got to see what's in it for them at the end of the day and I think this is where it can be tricky (. . .) because you get a lot of committed key green people that want to save the planet, you know, want to tackle climate change, but actually that is not what resonates with the average person in the street and it's a massive turn-off. So we come into it very much from the save money on your bills [perspective] because I don't know anyone in the world that doesn't fancy saving a bit of money on their energy bills really" (O25-1).
"One of the things we learnt in the first year is that when you talk to people who are not into this, the climate bit's a real turn off. (. . .) We decided to go with saving money. I guess in order

Table 1
Interviews with organisers from LCLMOs.

Name or type of organisation Project 1	Code	Name or type of organisation Project 2	Code
10:10 (UK)	O1-1	Low Carbon Community Organisation (England)	O22-1
Carbon conversations (England)	**O2-1**	Sustainability Organisation, Energy Group (England)	O21-1
Carbon conversations (England)	**O2-2**	Sustainability Organisation, Energy Group (England)	O21-1
Carbon conversations (England)	**O2-3**	Local Climate Change Organisation (Scotland)	O20-1
Carbon conversations (UK); 16 Facilitators	**O2-(4-19)**	Climate Change and Energy Organisation (Wales)	O23-1
Energy saving organisation (England)	O3-1	Climate Change and Energy Organisation (Wales)	O23-2
Eco-congregation (England)	O4-1	Sustainability Organisation (wales)	O24-1
Renewable energy company	O5-1	Transition Town/energy Organisation (England)	O25-1
Transition town group (England)	O6-1	Greening Group (England)	O26-1
Transition town group (England)	O6-2	Greening Group (England)	O27-1
Global cool (UK)	O7-1	Greening Group (England)	O28-1
Groundwork (England)	O8-1	Greening Group (England)	O28-2
Living witness (England)	**O9-1**	Greening Group (England)	O29-1
BME Environment Group (England)	O10-1	Greening Group (England)	O29-2
Christian Environment Group (England)	O11-1	Low Carbon Zone (England)	O30-1
Local climate change organisation (England)	O12-1	Low Carbon Zone (England)	O30-2
Carbon rationing action group (England)	**O13-1**	Local Energy Saving Organisation (England)	O31-1
Sustrans (UK)	O14-1	**Christian Environment Group**	**O32-1**
WWF/common cause (UK)	O15-1	Transition Town Group (England)	O33-1
		Transition Town Group (England)	O33-2
		Transition Town Group (England)	O33-3
		Transition Town Group (England)	O34-1
		Local Climate Change Organisation (England)	O35-1
		Energy Saving Organisation (England)	O36-1
		Sustainability Organisation, Energy Group (England)	O37-1
		Sustainability Organisation, Energy Group (England)	O37-2
		Sustainability Organisation, Energy Group (England)	O37-3
		Sustainability Organisation, Energy Group (England)	O38-1
		Transition Town Group/Community Energy Project (England)	O39-1
		Local Climate Change Organisation (England)	O40-1
		Local Climate Change Organisation (England)	O40-2
		Local Climate Change Organisation (England)	O40-3
		Local Climate Change Organisation/Greening Group (England)	O41-1
		Greening Group (England)	O42-1
		Greening Group (England)	O42-2

Note: interviewees' names have been changed to protect their identities. The first two-digit number of the code refers to the organisation, the second number to the organiser. Organisations in bold have been identified as those that use transformational frames.

of priority, saving money, go green and reduce your emissions, in that order" (O29-2).

What organisations in this group had in common was that they sought to reach people who did not perceive themselves as 'green activists'. For example, an organiser from Global Cool explained that they are aiming to reach people who do not share 'typical' 'green' identities:

"So the starting point I guess is we try and reach people that have previously been unaffected by climate change campaigns (. . .) but specifically within that the segment of people typically motivated by success, status, wealth; and being good looking, and being cool and going on fine holidays and all those visible symbols of success" (O7-1).

Another typical statement comes from one of the Greening Campaign organisers:

"The idea of it is not to get the green people; I don't need the green people. What I need is the general – very general public who aren't really interested in this" (O26-1).

This suggests that there is a connection between the attempt to reach out to new audiences and the "cautious" framing approach that organisations in this group adopted.

4.1.2. Transformational framing, narrower audience

In our sample we could only identify four organisations – Carbon Conversations, Living Witness, a Carbon Rationing Action Group and a Christian environment group (O2, O13, O9, O32) – which adopted more transformational frames. When it comes to *prognostic* frames, these groups openly communicated their aim of carbon reduction and encouraged their participants to engage in more 'difficult' behaviour changes including a reduction of emissions from food such as dairy and meat consumption, car travel, flights and general consumption. They also emphasised environmental and ethical reasons in their motivational frames (this was also supported by O15, Common Cause, which did not directly engage members of the public).

The aim of Carbon Conversations as posted on their website provides an example of a more transformational prognostic frame: "Carbon Conversations Groups offer a supportive group experience that helps people halve their personal carbon footprint". As one of the facilitators put it, this does not only involve 'easy' change but "it is about changing your lifestyle and giving some important things up" (O2-5). Another Carbon Conversations organiser explained why they were also encouraging 'difficult' actions like reducing the number of flights:

"They [the participants] save three hundred kilograms [of CO_2] on the light bulbs and blow twelve tons on the flight, so in a way I think we're trying to create a context where you might be able to deal a little bit more deeply with some of the issues and hopefully produce more lasting change in people" (O2-3).

Similarly, an organiser from Living Witness, a Quaker-based climate change organisation, explained he encouraged participants to reduce emissions in the areas with the greatest carbon reduction potential:

"I would basically tell them where the majority of emissions came from and what the big elements of lifestyle are that contribute to them. (. . .) The essential message is that it's food, travel and housing, and within that it's meat and dairy, cars and planes and heating. (. . .) And I started actually being more direct about saying, 'actually, we really need to be going for these, you know, 70/80% personal reductions'" (O9-1).

Organisers in this group also used more radical motivational frames to encourage behaviour change. For instance, when asked whether 'money saving' featured in their framing activities, one of the organisers of the Christian environment group replied: "Not saving money really. Obviously that's a by-product, it's not what we focus on though" (O32-1).

The interview with an organiser from Carbon Conversations provides further insights as to why they rejected motivational framing that highlights individual benefits. The organiser agreed that many of the criticisms of 'traditional' environmental movement activists resonated, including the belief "that everybody wanted to eat muesli and grow a beard". She recognised the limitations of environmental campaigns that

"had spent thirty years giving people information and thinking that if you told them the shocking story everybody would just go, 'oh right, I see, yes, we've got to stop doing this' (. . .) but of course they don't" (O2-3).

But the organiser disagreed that the solution was to "sell" new lifestyles to people that suggested that "it's all about . . . fun, it's cool, you can do it, you don't have to be different from the person you are" (O2-3). In particular, she criticised an emphasis on money saving to motivate personal carbon reduction because of potential rebound effects (i.e. that money saved could then still be spent on high carbon activities) and that it would not consistently encourage emission reductions, mentioning the example of cheap flights:

"So a lot of things are sold on saving money, but also if you appeal to that money saving impulse in people, to be the canny consumer, what have you framed for, what have you set up? (. . .) The next time that person is looking for how they get up to Edinburgh, the flight's cheaper than the train (. . .) if you encourage somebody to see themselves as a money saver, then that's what they're going to do" (O2-3).

Instead, the organiser believed longer lasting change is more effectively motivated by

"trying to actually bring to the fore the values which everybody holds at some level (. . .), [around] concern for issues bigger than yourself, justice, equality and so on but if you (. . .) create activities that frame for those values you're more likely to get lasting change than if you're just trying to sell to people an existing position" (O2-3).

The audiences of more 'transformational' organisations differed both from those in the previous group as well as from more radical environmental organisations: while organisers of more 'transformational' organisations tended to focus on people who had at least a basic interest in the environment (thus 'reaching in' more than 'cautious' organisation), they also sought to reach beyond those who are already 'converted' by addressing people who had not yet taken any major personal action to reduce their emissions. For instance, talking about the groups they target, a Carbon Conversations organiser explained:

"Because the positive greens when you look at DEFRA's analysis say they might be prepared to do these things, but they haven't bloody done them. (. . .) So there's an audience who you might persuade to come in, and the other people are the concerned consumers, they're worried, they don't know what to do, they might be prepared to do some stuff, and the other group that I think are quite interesting who we do actually get showing up in the groups quite a bit are the waste watchers who will do certain things but not others" (O2-3).

They also explained that these three segments make up around 44% of the population (according to DEFRA's behaviour change framework), thus highlighting that they sought to reach beyond a minority group of core environmental activists.

An organiser from the Christian environment group also explained that they wished to engage more people who did not

already perceive themselves as environmentalists even though this remained a challenge:

> "Actually what you really need to do is Eco Teams with people who don't care, not Eco Teams with people who do because the chances are they're already making those changes. That's a challenge for us" (O32-1).

This comparison suggests that there is a relationship between the framing approaches that LCLMOs adopt and the kinds of audiences to whom they seek to appeal. While organisations in both groups sought to reach beyond typical green activists, they focused on slightly different audiences. Organisations that addressed people who did not already have an interest in climate change, tended to adopt cautious frames whilst organisations who focused on people with a general interest in climate change but who did not know a lot about it and had not taken any significant action to reduce their carbon footprint tended to adopt more transformational frames. The next section draws out some of the reflections that organisers in both groups made about the cultural context in which they were operating and the barriers that this posed to their work.

4.2. Similarities across organisations: reflections on cultural barriers

As we noted earlier, movement organisations' framing activities are not only influenced by the audiences they target but also by the 'cultural repertoires' of specific societal contexts. Our research findings support this perspective as organisers across the cautious and transformational groups reflected in their interviews on more general, socio-cultural barriers to their work that influenced their framing approaches. The most prominent mutually reinforcing themes that emerged here were difficulties around behavioural intervention posed by liberal norms of non-intervention and personal freedom, the role of consumerism in society, and public perceptions of climate change and the 'traditional' environmental movement.

To make it easier to identify which group an organisation belongs to, the organisation codes behind quotes from organisations that used transformative frames (O2, O9, O13, O32) will be in bold.

First, many organisers felt uneasy in their role of promoting behaviour change. For example, an organiser of an LCLMO in a small town in Scotland stated that people "do not like to be told what to do" (O22-1). The following quote suggests that this might be related to a deeply entrenched commitment to a sphere of autonomy within Western culture:

> "Now, whatever you call behaviour [change], (. . .) not everybody likes this phrase because it's got an Orwellian flavour (. . .). The freeborn English person is very sensitive about other people messing around with their behaviour" (O40-3).

This explains why organisers from both 'cautious' and 'transformative' groups stated that if they try to encourage people to reduce their emissions, they are very careful not to come across as "preachy" or "pushy". The first two quotes below come from groups which we both identified as having adopted 'cautious' frames:

> "It's gently persuading people along, isn't it? Rather than pushing them" (O22-1)

> "Don't dictate to them. The minute you dictate or start telling people, they switch off. I think the best thing you can do is make it fun so that they're almost taking the information on board without thinking about it. That is the easiest way" (O26-1).

Organisers in the 'transformational' group shared the view that they needed to avoid being "pushy" or "preachy" or make people "feel guilty":

> "If you're into any sort of preaching or pushiness, you put people off. (. . .) Certainly as a facilitator trainer, I'm always saying, 'you've got to lighten up about this. If you're too pushy you just will create resistance and it's not going to engage people'" (**O2-2**).

> "We are not preachy about it. (. . . . .) Help people to change their own behaviour and decide what they want to do themselves, not say, you really should do this" (**O32-1**).

This suggests that assumptions about culturally embedded ideas of individual freedom and an aversion to behavioural intervention limit organisations' framing and activities, be they 'cautious' or 'transformative'.

Second, there is widespread concern amongst organisers as to how status and identity within consumer society act as a barrier to encourage people to reduce their emissions. Certain high consumption behaviours are "non-negotiable" (**O2-1**). A quote from a Carbon Conversations organiser expresses this idea most clearly:

> "And I think there is a middle class assumption that it is your absolute right to live in a nice house and to work in an interesting job. And if that means commuting several hundred miles from one to the other that's not negotiable. And there's elements of identity tied up in what you do, where you go for holidays, what you do for your weekends" (**O2-1**).

This perspective was also shared by organisations that used more 'cautious' framings:

> "We still have I think a mind-set where people are encouraged to consume more and more and more. And that's the dominating world view here" (O37-1).

Third, across all types of LCLMO, organisers shared the perception that climate change was an unpopular topic, either because people were still sceptical about the phenomenon or because it was too "depressing" (O40-1). This is reflected in the following quotes from organisations across the two groups:

> "So we always try and frame it in terms of money first (. . .) because we are very aware of the fact that (. . .) there are still good old fashioned climate change deniers, they still exist out here" (O23-2).

> "I think it's amazing how . . . the phrase 'climate change' . . . turns an internal switch off in lots of people's heads" (O40-3).

> "Often at the start of meetings (. . .) I'll ask people (. . .) if they can just identify a feeling about climate change (. . .) and often the words that come out are 'anxious', 'worried', 'depressed' and so on and underneath the surface these feelings are there" (**O2-3**).

Not only did LCLMOs struggle with climate change being a 'difficult' topic but also with the perception of how the wider public viewed environmentalists. Whether from organisations within the 'cautious' or 'transformational' camps, organisers often believed that their audiences viewed environmentalists as "odd" (O40-1), "alien" (O1-1), "left wing, tree hugging" (O30-2), "bunches of nerds" (i.e. move quotation marks from beginning of 'nerds' to beginning of 'bunches') (O35-1), "nutters" (O40-1), "people hanging off things" (**O32-1**), "lentil eaters; growing beards" (O33-1, **O32-1, O2-1**), or as leading a "hair shirt and open toed sandals existence" (O3-1). Therefore, organisers felt it was best to avoid frames that generated obvious associations with more radical environmentalism.

In summary, organisations in both groups were keen not to come across as "pushy" or "preachy" and distanced themselves

from the image of more traditional environmental groups. We argue that these commonalities across groups can be explained by the suspicion that exists in current cultural contexts regarding behavioural interventions more generally, the importance that is given to certain lifestyles to maintain social status, and generally prevailing negative perceptions of the topic of climate change and traditional environmentalism.

5. Discussion and conclusions

This paper is driven by an interest in the transformational potential of LCLMOs that (as an example of the broader group of LMs) focus on individual attitudinal and behavioural change and explicitly aim to reach beyond the 'already converted'. As a first step to address this question, the paper asks whether this movement can fulfil two potentially conflicting expectations: can it reach a wider public *and* encourage the take up of 'radical' low carbon behaviours?

Our approach to answering this question led us to adopt insights from literatures on frame resonance and cultural resonance, to examine whether the wider appeal that LCLMOs seek limits the transformational potential of the frames they employ. Our results confirm ideas from the frame resonance literature that framing is 'interactive' in character. A minority of LCLMOs in our sample that address audiences with a prior interest in climate change tend to adopt more 'transformational' frames compared to the majority of organisations that seek to appeal to people who have not engaged much with the topic before. The latter tend to employ more 'cautious' frames that promote 'easy' changes and motivate people by highlighting financial or other personal benefits. These findings challenge the argument made by some researchers that organisations maintain their critical and transformational 'edge' when they address audiences that do not already share core assumptions (Boström, 2004; Chilton et al., 2012).

At the same time we identify the adoption of similar tactics across all organisations that can be explained from a 'cultural resonance' perspective: findings point to common socio-cultural barriers for LCLMOs to achieve more far-reaching change. For instance, even organisations that have adopted more 'transformational' frames share a cautious orientation in not wishing to come across as judgemental, too 'preachy' or 'pushy' and they distanced themselves from images of more traditional environmental organisations. Organisers identified peoples' negative responses to climate change and environmentalism, deeply entrenched norms of non-intervention, as well as identities and status associated with consumerism, as limiting factors in the development and application of transformational frames and strategies.

Therefore, the LCLMOs in our study tend to differ from environmental NSMOs which, on the whole, have adopted more transformational frames. All the organisations in this study have in common that they target people who do not see themselves as environmental activists or who have not already adopted low carbon lifestyles. However, within this audience, there are still sub-groups that differ in how interested they are in climate change and personal carbon reduction. In that sense it can be argued that while some LCLMOs seek to "reach in" to more supportive audiences, all of them have a stronger focus on "reaching out" beyond typical environmentalists compared to environmental NSMOs. This and LCLMOs' focus on behavioural intervention rather than collective political action and identity can explain the different framing strategies of organisations in our study compared to more traditional environmental groups. This illustrates that the strategies of "reaching in"/"reaching out" are relative and not necessarily mutually exclusive while they still help us understand differences and similarities of organisations' framing strategies.

Despite our finding of predominantly "cautious" framing amongst LCLMOs, we do not mean to downplay the major efforts that low carbon community organisations make to raise awareness amongst the public and persuade them to cut their emissions. Their activities often support participants in maintaining or intensifying their endeavours to reduce emissions (Heiskanen et al., 2010; Howell, 2012; Middlemiss, 2011). As many of our interviewees highlighted, LCLMO activities can also have other positive side effects such as bringing people within and across communities together. However, organisers across the board expressed concern about the effectiveness of their activities in reaching out to wider audiences and in affecting change that reduces carbon emissions. The statement of a Greening Campaign organiser captures what many others communicated in the interviews: "We've created some positive change but it's really been at the margin" (O29-2). Some organisers explicitly stated that "the power of what the third sector can do has been overplayed" (O9-1) and that the "the speed of change will be insufficient" (O38-1) if it relies extensively on third sector action.

Therefore, our findings raise the critical question as to which framing strategies LCLMOs – and LMs more generally – should adopt to increase their potential effectiveness. Here we have a different version of Jasper's (2006) Janus dilemma: 'bring the frames to the public' by employing cautious frames that appeal intuitively to as wide a population as possible without confronting their (non-sustainable) worldviews and behaviours, or 'bring the public to the frames'. The latter essentially entails the more difficult nurturing of cultural change through more radical frames that provide more fertile ground for transitions in behaviours and wider social institutions. Advocates of optimising cautious frames see the changes they promote as a realistic 'first step', but this is unlikely to be successful in the long run because, first, such frames are likely to crowd out the more transformative frames required for a transition to a sustainable society and, second, they do not generate public demand for more radical policies.

If more transformational frames seem ineffective in terms of the number of people with which they currently resonate, the question shifts to one about the role that LCLMOs and other LM organisations can play in relation to wider cultural change. It is striking that central to the activities of most of the LCLMOs that we identified as being more comfortable with transformative frames is the practice of deliberation amongst participants: small groups that work together in confronting their own preconceptions, prejudices and emotions and support each other in adopting more radical pro-environmental behaviours (Büchs et al., 2015). The challenge for LCLMOs and LMs more generally is how to scale up this activity so that such deliberation is part of the broader public sphere: their transformational frames support a public discourse that encourages and provides motivation for more widespread public reflection and change. Small group work is comparatively easy when compared to this challenge of broader engagement. A strategy of broader deliberative engagement may end up breaking the distinction between lifestyle movement and new social movement: it may require the public construction of a collective low carbon identity that embodies and enables action in individual homes and lifestyles. Without more systematic confrontation in the public sphere of dominant frames that engender excessive consumption and disregard for environmental consequences, the current framing of action by LCLMOs – whether transformational or cautious – will have little material impact on long-term sustainability.

Acknowledgements

References

Agyeman, J., 2002. Constructing environmental (in) justice: transatlantic tales. Environ. Pol. 11, 31–53.

Bearman, P.S., Bruckner, H., 2001. Promising the future: virginity pledges and first intercourse. Am. J. Sociol. 106, 859–912.

Benford, R.D., 1993a. Frame disputes within the nuclear disarmament movement. Soc. Forces 71, 677–701.

Benford, R.D., 1993b. You could be the 100th monkey—collective action frames and vocabularies of motive within the nuclear disarmament movement. Sociol. Quart. 34, 195–216.

Benford, R.D., Snow, D.A., 2000. Framing processes and social movements: an overview and assessment. Annu. Rev. Sociol. 26, 611–639.

Boström, M., 2004. Cognitive practices and collective identities within a heterogeneous social movement: the Swedish environmental movement. Soc. Movement Studies 3, 73–88.

Büchs, M., Hinton, E., Smith, G., 2015. 'It helped me sort of face the end of the world': the role of emotions for third sector climate change engagement initiatives. Environ. Values 24 in press.

Capek, S.M., 1993. The environmental justice frame—a conceptual discussion and an application. Soc. Probl. 40, 5–24.

Chilton, P., Crompton, T., Kasser, T., Maio, G.R., Nolan, A., (2012) Communicating bigger-than-self problems to extrinsically-oriented audiences. Common Cause.

Corner, A., 2013. A New Conversation with the Centre-right about Climate Change: Values, Frames and Narratives. Climate Outreach & Information Network (COIN), Oxford.

Corner, A., Randall, A., 2011. Selling climate change? The limitations of social marketing as a strategy for climate change public engagement. Global Environ. Change 21, 1005–1014.

Crompton, T., Brewer, J., Chilton, P., Kasser, T., 2010. Common Cause. The case for working with our cultural values. Woking, WWF-UK.

Davies, A.R., 2006. Environmental justice as subtext or omission: examining discourses of anti-incineration campaigning in Ireland. Geoforum 37, 708–724.

DEFRA, 2008a. A Framework for Pro-environmental Behaviours. Report. DEFRA, London.

DEFRA, 2008b. Third Sector Strategy. DEFRA, London.

Evans, L., Maio, G.R., Corner, A., Hodgetts, C.J., Ahmed, S., Hahn, U., 2013. Self-interest and pro-environmental behaviour. Nat. Clim. Change 3, 122–125.

Fudge, S., Peters, M., 2011. Behaviour change in the UK climate debate: an assessment of responsibility, agency and political dimensions. Sustainability 3, 789–808.

Futerra, 2010. Sell the Sizzle. Futerra, London.

Gamson, J., 1989. Silence, death, and the invisible enemy—AIDS activism and social-movement newness. Soc. Probl. 36, 351–367.

Goffman, E., 1975. Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Grigsby, M., 2004. Buying Time and Getting By: The voluntary simplicity movement. State University of New York Press, Albany, NY.

Henfler, R., 2004a. Collective identity in the straight edge movement: how diffuse movements foster commitment, encourage individualized participation, and promote cultural change. Sociol. Quart. 45, 785–805.

Haenfler, R., 2004b. Rethinking subcultural resistance—core values of the straight edge movement. J. Contemporary Ethnogr. 33, 406–436.

Haenfler, R., Johnson, B., Jones, E., 2012. Lifestyle movements: exploring the intersection of lifestyle and social movements. Soc. Movement Studies 11 (1), 1–20.

Hale, S., 2010. The new politics of climate change: why we are failing and how we will succeed. Environ. Pol. 19, 255–275.

Hargreaves, T., Nye, M., Burgess, J., 2008. Social experiments in sustainable consumption: an evidence-based approach with potential for engaging low-income communities. Local Environ. 13, 743–758.

Hargreaves, T., Hielscher, S., Seyfang, G., Smith, A., 2013. Grassroots innovations in community energy: the role of intermediaries in niche development. Global Environ. Change 23, 868–880.

Heiskanen, E., Johnson, M., Robinson, S., Vadovics, E., Saastamoinen, M., 2010. Low-carbon communities as a context for individual behavioural change. Energy Pol. 38, 7586–7595.

HM Government, 2010. Shaping Our Future. The Joint Ministerial and Third Sector Task Force on Climate Change, the Environment and Sustainable Development. HM Government/Green Alliance, London.

Hopke, J.E., 2012. Water gives life: framing an environmental justice movement in the mainstream and alternative Salvadoran press. Environ. Commun. 6, 365–382.

Howell, R.A., 2012. Living with a carbon allowance: the experiences of carbon rationing action groups and implications for policy. Energy Pol. 41, 250–258.

Ingalsbee, T., 1996. Earth first! activism: ecological postmodern praxis in radical environmentalist identities. Sociol. Perspect. 39, 263–276.

Jasper, J.M., 2006. Motivation and emotion. In: Goodin, R.E., Tilly, C. (Eds.), Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 157–171.

Jasper, J.M., Poulsen, J.D., 1995. Recruiting stranger and friends—moral shocks and social networks in animals rights and anitnuclear protests. Soc. Probl. 42, 493–512.

Jenness, V., 1995. Social-movement growth, domain expansion, and framing processes—the gay/lesbian movement and violence against gays and lesbians as a social problem. Soc. Probl. 42, 145–170.

Kubal, T.J., 1998. The presentation of political self: cultural resonance and the construction of collective action frames. Sociol. Quart. 39, 539–554.

Lorenzen, J.A., 2014. Convincing people to go green: managing strategic action by minimising political talk. Environ. Pol. 23, 454–472.

Lybecker, D.L., McBeth, M.K., Kusko, E., 2013. Trash or treasure: recycling narratives and reducing political polarisation. Environ. Pol. 22, 312–332.

McVeigh, R., Myers, D.J., Sikkink, D., 2004. Corn, Klansmen, and Coolidge: structure and framing in social movements. Soc. Forces 83, 653–690.

Melucci, A., 1996. Challenging Codes. Collective Action in the Information Age. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Merry, M.K., 2012. Environmental groups' communication strategies in multiple media. Environ. Pol. 21, 49–69.

Middlemiss, L., 2011. The effects of community-based action for sustainability on participants' lifestyles. Local Environ. 16, 265–280.

Middlemiss, L., Parrish, B.D., 2010. Building capacity for low-carbon communities: the role of grassroots initiatives. Energy Pol. 38, 7559–7566.

Mol, A.P.J., 2000. The environmental movement in an era of ecological modernisation. Geoforum 31, 45–56.

Nye, M., Burgess, J., 2008. Promoting Durable Change in Household Waste and Energy Use Behaviour Report. University of East Anglia.

Pellow, D.N., 1999. Framing emerging environmental movement tactics: mobilizing consensus, demobilizing conflict. Sociol. Forum 14, 659–683.

Rupp, L.J., Taylor, V., 1999. Forging feminist identity in an international movement: a collective identity approach to twentieth-century feminism. Signs 24, 363–386.

Saunders, C., Buchs, M., Papafragkou, A., Wallbridge, R., Smith, G., 2014. Beyond the activist ghetto: A deductive blockmodeling approach to understanding the relationship between contact with environmental organisations and public attitudes and behaviour. Soc. Movement Studies 13, 158–177.

Seyfang, G., Smith, A., 2007. Grassroots innovations for sustainable development: towards a new research and policy agenda. Environ. Pol. 16, 584–603.

Snow, D.A., 2007. Framing processes, idology, and discursive fields. In: Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A., Kriesi, H. (Eds.), The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 380–412.

Snow, D.A., Benford, R.D., 1988. Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. In: Klandermans, B., Kriesi, H., Tarrow, S. (Eds.), International Social Movement Research. From Structure to Action: Comparing social movement research across cultures. Jai Press, Greenwich, Connecticut; London, England.

Snow, D.A., Worden, S.K., Rochford, E.B., Benford, R.D., 1986. Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. Am. Sociol. Rev. 51, 464–481.

Steward, F., Liff, S., Dunkelman, M., 2009. Mapping the Big Green Challenge. An analysis of 355 community proposals for low carbon innovation. Appleby and Brook Lyndhurst for NESTA.

Taylor, D.E., 2000. The rise of the environmental justice paradigm—injustice framing and the social construction of environmental discourses. Am. Behav. Sci. 43, 508–580.

Williams, R.H., 1995. Constructing the public good—social movements and cultural resources. Soc. Probl. 42, 124–144.

Williams, R.H., 2007. The cultural contexts of collective action. In: Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A., Kriesi, H. (Eds.), The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 91–115.

Williams, R.H., Kubal, T.J., 1999. Movement frames and the cultural environment—resonance, failure, and the boundaries of the legitimate research in social movements. Conflicts Change 21, 225–248.