MARÍA INCLÁN AND PAUL ALMEIDA

Urban Mobilization in Mexico: Non-Participants, Ritual Demonstrators, and Spontaneous Protestors

CIDE

Acknowledgements

Agradecimientos

Abstract

One division in the classification of popular contention is ritual demonstrations versus more spontaneous protests. Analysts of social movement participation in general have identified basic mechanisms for joining collective action such as ideological beliefs, social networks, collective identities, levels of cost/risk, and biographical availability. However, we know much less about participation in different types of protest demonstrations. In this study, we compare the dimensions associated with individual participation in commemorative demonstrations planned months in advance with participation in relatively spontaneous protest demonstrations. We employ an innovative survey sampling technique within five major demonstrations in Mexico City between 2011 and 2012, which included a sample of bystanders and passers-bye as a non-participant comparison group. Using a multi-dimensional approach of embedded activism, we find that protest participants maintain greater levels of ties to other activists, information access, expressions of solidarity, and past political experience than non-participants. Spontaneous protest participants in particular, appear to be more entrenched in the activist world than participants in ritual demonstrations.

Keywords: protest participation, ritual demonstrators, spontaneous protestors, embedded activism.

Resumen

Una forma de clasificar las manifestaciones populares es dividirlas entre movilizaciones rituales y "espontáneas". En general, los estudiosos de la participación en movimientos sociales han identificado mecanismos básicos para predecir la acción colectiva. Dichos mecanismos tienen que ver con las creencias ideológicas, redes sociales, identidades de grupo, análisis de costos y disponibilidad de los individuos para participar. Sin embargo, sabemos muy poco acerca de la participación en distintos tipos de eventos de protesta. En este estudio, comparamos las dimensiones asociadas con la participación individual en manifestaciones conmemorativas planeadas con meses de antelación contra manifestaciones de protesta relativamente espontaneas o reactivas. Utilizamos una técnica innovadora de muestreo mediante encuestas dentro de las cinco principales manifestaciones de la Ciudad de México entre los años 2011 y 2012; esta muestra incluye transeúntes y espectadores no participantes en la manifestación como grupo de control. Mediante un enfoque multidimensional de activismo incrustado, encontramos que los participantes en las protestas tienen mayores niveles de vinculación con otros activistas, acceso a la información, expresiones de solidaridad y de experiencia política pasada que los no participantes. En particular, los manifestantes en las protestas espontaneas parecen estar más arraigados en el mundo activista de las marchas que los participantes en protestas rituales.

Palabras clave: participación en protestas, manifestantes rituales, manifestantes espontáneos, activismo inmerso.

Introduction

Recently the literature on contentious politics, as well as public opinion, have contended that protest events can be differentiated between ritual demonstrations and more spontaneous protests (Klandermans 2012). A first distinction centers on the difference between their planned timing. While ritual demonstrations tend to be coordinated months in advance, relatively more spontaneous protests tend to react to new opportunities or threats in the political environment (Meyer 2014). A second difference refers to the themes that motivate each type of event. Ritual demonstrations tend to be annual commemorations of past struggles and gains, such as May Day rallies or LGBT Pride Parades. More spontaneous protests tend to revolve around current changes in the socioeconomic and political order, such as legislative decrees or sudden price hikes. A third distinction focuses on the type and mood of the events. Because ritual demonstrations tend to be commemorative events, they have become annual celebrations with festive crowds providing positive incentives for a wide audience to participate. Meanwhile, because more spontaneous protests are responding to sudden political or socioeconomic changes, they tend to be more contentious and confrontational events (Dodson 2011). Hence, ritual demonstrations would appear to have a lower threshold for individual participation because participants face minimum levels of risk and uncertainty. More spontaneous demonstrations tend to involve higher levels of risk and uncertainty, as less information is known beforehand on the likely unfolding of events and the outcome of the march (e.g., nature of the participants/organizers, violence, counter-protests, arrests) (Granovetter 1978). Also, coordinating a spontaneous demonstration raises interesting puzzles in terms of how individuals are motivated and linked into organizers to participate in such a short time horizon.

These assumptions, however, do not explain the extent to which mobilization channels to participate in more ritual-like demonstrations are similar to the incentives to join less planned protest events. We address this fundamental question of political participation with a unique data set of over 800 participants and non-participants in the context of five large street demonstrations in Mexico City between 2011 and 2012. Differentiating these two fundamental types of protest demonstrations will shed light on the mechanisms that bring individuals into collective action under different circumstances.

We examine differences in individual pathways to participate in protest between two distinct mobilization contexts: 1) three ritual type street marches planned months in advance, and 2) two relatively spontaneous street demonstrations over the last Mexican presidential electoral process. Specifically, we employ an embedded activist perspective of network, media diffusion, identity, and past political experience as motivations and channels for protest participation and compare these

dimensions with those of bystanders and passer-byes. Social movement scholarship has made great strides in the past two decades in the subfield of individual level participation in well-established and developed democracies. We know much less about these individual movement dynamics between participants and non-participants in other contexts (Viterna 2013). Our study provides a first approximation using random survey techniques within and around demonstrations.

In addition, the study provides an ideal case to empirically test protest participation related to urban movements in young democracies. Mexican civil society includes a wide diversity of social movement struggles, ranging from land access and agricultural debt to human rights, sexual diversity, and labor union conflicts (Cook 1996; Williams 2001; de la Dehesa 2010). Hence, within Mexico we find the types of social movement mobilization that occur in both developed stable democracies and developing ones. Such a country case provides a rich setting that may assist in explaining social movement participation dynamics in a variety of contexts beyond Mexico, especially protest participation in developing democracies and megacities.

Commemorative versus Spontaneous Demonstrations

Below we offer an analysis on individual correlates to participate across two major mobilization contexts: commemorative demonstrations and spontaneous protests. We include within our sample protest bystanders as an important group of non-participants that are geographically near the demonstration route but fail to join. Our theoretical overview examines the central mechanisms associated with differential protest participation. Using electoral-based protests as an example of more spontaneous demonstrations allow us to test whether the participants in this particular type of demonstration are mobilized by different networks, identities, political experience, and channels than the ones used for more ritual demonstrations.

Commemorative events are ritual anniversaries of different social causes. As such, these events are anticipated, well-orchestrated festivals that tend to celebrate identities, traditional rights-struggles, public performances, and anniversaries that reinforce social solidarity (Collins 2001; Johnston 2009; Klandermans 2012). Ritual demonstrations offer many positive incentives to participate (e.g., reunite with old friends, share in a festive mood, take pride in past historical achievements). In contrast, spontaneous protests are reactive and more rapid responses to political, social, and economic changes. Hence, they are less anticipated activities. They also tend to be more contentious and less coordinated among organizers and participants. Identifying the varying levels that individuals embed themselves in activist networks and information channels for different types of events permits us to better understand participation in sudden upsurges in protests and differentiate it from routine-like demonstrations. Just as scholars have previously distinguished between the differential individual participation pathways between high risk and low risk activism (McAdam 1988; Erickson Nepstad and Smith 1999), we believe another fundamental distinction

between types of collective action and corresponding pathways is found between ceremonial and more spontaneous protest demonstrations. Presumably, participants in spontaneous protests would be more deeply entrenched in the activist world than participants in ritual protests as a means to overcome the barriers to collective action on short notice and conditions of uncertainty.

Theoretical Overview: A Multi-Dimensional Approach of Embedded Activism

We provide a synthetic theoretical framework to capture the multidimensional dynamics of individual participation in social movement-type activities called *embedded activism*. Such a synthesis combines approaches that emphasize network ties, mass/social media information flows, collective identities, and past protest experience. More specifically, we examine the influence of these multidimensional mobilizing mechanisms on the likelihood of participation in ritual and spontaneous street marches. Specific analytical attention is given to the depth of prior attachments and identity with the activist world among participants and groups of non-participants.

Social Networks: One of the major advances of social movement research in the past three decades resides in the recognition that general values and beliefs alone are usually not sufficient to explain variation in individual level participation. Earlier perspectives focused on dysfunctional psychological states of anomie, normative breakdown, and stress to explain the desire of individuals in a rapidly changing industrial society to join in acts of collective behavior (McAdam 1999). Between the 1970s and 2000s, scholars improved on these earlier statements in their empirical and conceptual work by introducing specific kinds of beliefs and structural conditions that more likely induce movement participation in more sophisticated multi-causal perspectives.[1] Bert Klandermans and Dirk Oemega (1987) and Bert Klandermans (1997) built on the beliefs literature by classifying the pool of sympathizers to a particular movement, and identified the additional sequence of steps that are necessary to move from the pool of sympathizers to actual protest participants. We extend these perspectives by incorporating another group of potential participants that fail to join in collective action – those individuals surrounding the actual demonstrations as bystanders and passer-byes.

Mediating between movement sympathetic beliefs and actual movement participation are social networks and organizations (Krinsky and Crossley 2014). Social networks of family, friends, neighborhood, and workplace (Dixon and Roscigno 2003) as well as community level organizations (voluntary associations, religious institutions, civic groups) act as important reference groups in pulling receptive individuals into activism or pressuring them into non-participation (Kitts 2000). Community level organizations also provide the opportunity for individuals to join a movement as a

---

[1] For example, Anthony M. Orum (1974) incorporated system legitimacy and feelings of injustice and political efficacy along with life stage into models of protest participation.

group or a block. David Snow, Louis A. Zurcher, and Sheldon Ekland-Olson (1980) demonstrated that potential movement participants are more likely to join collective action campaigns when they come into interaction with already participating activists. Doug McAdam's work (1988) on the voting rights movement in the Mississippi "Freedom Summer" campaign expanded on earlier network research by also finding connections to other participants and prior organizational ties as the strongest predictors to high risk/cost activism. Gould's (1995) historical study of the Paris Commune also demonstrated from archival arrest records that joining the resistance to the advancing German troops was based on national guard ties to neighborhoods. Taken together, social networks provide a micro-structural context for individuals to make decisions about social movement participation (McAdam 1988; Passy 2001).

Hence, we predict that individuals with pre-existing social network ties to other activists will be more likely to participate in both ritual and more spontaneous protest demonstrations. Spontaneous activists should have the most extensive network ties, since they are called to participate on short notice.

Identity-Based Perspectives: Recent participation scholarship has highlighted that networks and organizations provide largely structural explanations for protest participation. While an index or listing of an individual's social network ties may offer a compelling account on the probability in joining in collective action, it leaves a gap in explaining individual agency. Identity perspectives incorporate meaning into models of political participation. A counting of network ties and organizational memberships tells us little about the importance of these connections to an individual's sense of self, belongingness, and personal identity. People whose self-identity is strongly tied to a political movement should be especially motivated to participate in street demonstrations of the movement or issue in question. Indeed, David Snow and Doug McAdam (2000: 47) find that, "the existence of a movement provides an avenue for the individual to act in accordance with his or her personal identity."

Individuals are energized by group attachments and the collective sense of solidarity motivates future rounds of protest participation (Taylor, Kimport, Van Dyke and Andersen 2009). Also in a recent survey of the literature on individual level participation, Jacquelien van Stekelenburg and Bert Klandermans (2007: 163) contend that a number of protest participation studies consistently report an association between personal identification with the group mobilizing the demonstration and actual participation in collective action.

When individuals identify with specific networks and organizations as particularly salient to their everyday lives, they would be more likely to be moved into participating in both ritual and spontaneous collective action involving those organizations and networks along with issues and grievances that are more important to their identity (Stryker 2000). Commemorative demonstrations are often highly ritualized events and play a major role in reinforcing collective identities for particular subgroups (Collins 2004).

We expect those individuals that identify with the participants and organizations of specific ritual demonstrations would be especially likely to participate. Participants in

spontaneous protests would also maintain strong identities to organizations and other participants than non-participants in order to overcome the risks and uncertainties associated with less planned protest events.

Media Diffusion and Informational Flows: In addition to face-to-face social networks, and identities, different forms of mass and online social media may also motivate individuals to participate in demonstrations (Earl and Kimport 2011). Television and newspapers provide indirect diffusion mechanisms for potential participants by providing information about past and upcoming protest events over a wide audience and geographical space (Kolins Givan, Roberts, and Soule 2010). In addition, organizations mobilizing crowds into commemorative demonstrations tend to have more resources and time to advertise the events. However, research on urban rioting (Myers 2000) and nonviolent sit-ins by the African American civil rights movement (Andrews and Biggs 2006) highlight the critical role of newspaper coverage in the diffusion of protest activity once it is initiated.

Even more recently, scholars increasingly recognize the role of new social media technologies (activist web pages, Twitter, Facebook, Instagram) in providing information about upcoming protest events and motivating participation in more spontaneous demonstrations, such as protest events reacting to specific policy decisions (Almeida and Lichbach 2003; Carty 2010; Earl and Kimport 2011). Since routine annual demonstrations and street marches are planned in advance by specific groups with particular interests, participants in commemorative protests are more likely to receive information about protests in traditional mass media outlets, such as newspapers and television than newer social media. In contrast, spontaneous events are usually convoked by less organized groups. Therefore, the participants would rely more on newer social media to mobilize participants, as this would require less organizational resources and time. Moreover, because electoral-based protests tend to emerge as responses to specific events during electoral campaigns, they are the quintessential spontaneous protest demonstrations. More spontaneous events tend to enjoy media coverage after they have taken place and not much beforehand as ritual demonstrations. *Hence, we expect to observe participants in ritual demonstrations being convoked through more traditional media outlets and spontaneous protest participants being mobilized through newer media channels. We expect non-participants to be less aware of upcoming demonstrations from any source – including other people, traditional media, and online social media.*

Participation Tradition: We also take into account how habitual it is for some individuals to take part in political activities such as writing petitions, engaging in social, political, and economic campaigns, participating in community organizations, boycotting, striking, protesting and the like (Van Dyke, Dixon and Carlon 2007) – especially deeply embedded activists. Such past participation in organizations and collective action makes street protest a legitimate form of seeking social change for individuals. In contrast, one major barrier for non-participants and bystander publics preventing engagement in protest events resides in the unfamiliarity with demonstrations as a form of political expression. Street demonstrations are still largely

stigmatized in popular mass media accounts of protest events (Sobieraj 2011). The actual participation in protest and civic organizations allows individuals to become acquainted with alternate methods of seeking political influence beyond conventional participation such as voting in elections. Past political participation also provides a sense of personal efficacy through protest engagement, making future opportunities to join street demonstrations much more appealing than those without such experiences.

We expect to observe that participants in ritual and spontaneous demonstrations will tend to show more past protest participation than non-participants (Machado, Scartascni, and Tommasi 2011; Saunders et al. 2012; Bernhagen and Marsh 2007). Participants in more spontaneous protests will tend to have participated in all types of previous protest, with this previous political experience assisting in overcoming the collective action problem of creating social protest on short notice with heightened levels of uncertainty.

Theoretical Summary

In most democratic societies, there is a continuum of protest participation from non-participation to ritual demonstrations to more spontaneous protest events. An embedded activism perspective takes into account the multiple dimensions that vary among individuals in determining their likelihood to participate in demonstrations. Those individuals lacking interpersonal networks with activists, information about upcoming protests, a sense of solidarity with protesting groups, and past protest experience are unlikely to join street demonstrations (both ritual and spontaneous). Ritual demonstrations are less costly and risky than spontaneous protests. Organizers often obtain a legal permit in advance from officials to hold the event. Participants sympathetic and aware of the cause can be recruited to ceremonial demonstrations with modest levels of network ties, awareness, solidarity, and past experience. Ceremonial demonstrations are often rewarding for those that choose to participate offering positive incentives for individuals to join. Spontaneous events that have minimal advanced planning need to overcome the collective action problem of short-term recruitment under uncertain conditions. Individuals most likely to be drawn to such impromptu protests will already be tied to activist networks, maintain access to protest information, deeply indentify with the movement organizing the event, and maintain more past protest experience than other citizens. Spontaneous participants are more deeply enmeshed in activist networks than non-participants and ritual protest participants. We test these explanations below with an innovative study of participants and nonparticipants in street demonstrations in Mexico City.

Methods

Types of protests

Our survey data come from five different protest demonstrations that took place between 2011 and 2012 in Mexico City. These demonstrations were of two different types: ritual and spontaneous. According to Klandermans (2012), ritual events tend to take more the form of festivals or parades in which the movements' original demands are remembered, while accomplishments are celebrated, and new demands are presented. These events are well organized and usually count with an orchestrating stage, music and food. Our ritual events included commemorations of the 1968 students' movement, May Day, and the LGBT Pride parade. All of these events can be considered traditional festivals in Mexico City, as participants consider them as commemorations of past events and celebrations of movements' relative gains vis-à-vis the authorities. On the other hand, we consider spontaneous events those that are organized as immediate reactions to current issues, such as elections or the design and implementation of specific policy reforms (Meyer 2014). Our spontaneous events included two electoral-related demonstrations: a march against the 2012 presidential candidate of the Revolutionary Institutional Party (Partido Revolucionario Institucional, PRI), Enrique Peña Nieto and a post-electoral rally called by the losing candidate of the Party of the Democratic Revolution (Partido de la Revolución Democrática, PRD), Andrés Manuel López Obrador.

Standardized sampling technique

As part of the Protest Survey Project, fieldwork for this study uses the standardized survey sampling technique developed by Bert Klandermans, Jacquelien van Stekelenburg, Dunya van Troost, Anouk van Leeuwen, Stefaan Walgrave, Joris Verhulst, Jeroen van Laer, and Ruud Wouters (2010) for the research project titled "Caught in the Act of Protest: Contextualizing Contestation" (CCC). This survey method has a number of advantages over conventional research designs of political participation. Sampling and surveying protest participants during protest events reduces memory errors and false attribution usually present in protest participation or national surveys, which are conducted after the protest event has passed (Opp, Gern, and Voss 1995).

National population surveys lack information as to the type of protest in which respondents participated in the last year. Our survey allows us to report the type and the precise timing of the protest event. This allows for comparisons across different types of protests and mobilizing contexts (Walgrave and Rucht 2010). Surveying protest participants during demonstration events also increases the validity and reliability of their responses regarding their motivations to participate, their mobilization dynamics, and their opinions regarding the political context in which the

event is taking place. Moreover, the respondent's presence in the event guarantees that the subject actually participated in the protest. Because our surveyors record respondents' answers, potential errors of misunderstanding common in mail-in surveys are also diminished.

Potential selection bias was resolved by employing a team of "pointers" in charge of randomly sampling protest participants for surveyors to interview Klandermans et al 2010).[2] According to Klandermans et al (2010) counting with pointers is essential to increase the chances that they select protesters to be surveyed independently of their own inclination to approach them, as earlier tests showed them that interviewers would be much more inclined to select their own respondents based on how approachable they seem to them (Walgrave and Verhulst 2011). By pointing surveyors to randomly selected subjects of study, pointers also helped us to increase the likelihood that our sample was randomly selected from one of the section of the moving or standing demonstration and it is therefore representative of those protest participants (van Stekelenburg, Walgrave, Klandermans, and Verhulst 2012).

Previous fieldwork experience has shown that face-to-face interaction with the respondent has a high response rate (Walgrave and Verhulst, 2011). Because all surveyed events lasted for over 5 hours, we were able to reach over 80% response rate as survey teams had time to randomly sample and survey other protest participants.[3] Surveyors kept track of the number of rejections and for every rejection they went back to their pointer to get assigned to another protest participant.

Protest non-participants were surveyed following the same sampling technique. Non- participants were bystanders and passer-byes along streets surrounding each demonstration event. Although non-participants may not have heard about a given demonstration in advance or approached by a movement recruiter (Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson 1980), once they become witnesses of a protest event as by-standers, they still face the decision to join the protest if they feel so inclined (Klandermans 1997). Moreover, the questionnaire applied to non-participants included most of the questions included for participants. These ways we were able to collect information about their motivations for their non-participation, as well as information as to whether or not they were asked to join the protest event and their political attitudes.

---

[2] In a moving demonstration (march), three pointers, each accompanied by a team of interviewers, are distributed to cover the front, the middle and the back of protesting group. To ensure a fair dispersion of questionnaires over the marching column, pointers count the rows of participants in the moving cortege, selecting every n^{th} row, to ensure that the same number of rows is skipped throughout the demonstration, so that the whole procession is covered (Klandermans et al 2010). During standing demonstrations (rallies) three pointers distribute interviewers around the square where the protest event is taking place. Hence, the crowd and space of a standing demonstration was always divided into three sampling areas. Pointers instructed their interviewers to survey from the outer circle in the direction of the centre of the square. As pointers walked toward the center of the square they need to count their steps and assign another surveyor every n-steps, increasing the number of steps as they approached the center. Pointers sent out interviewers to the left and the right of the 'line' he is following, and interviewers were spread more to the left and right at the edge of the crowd than in the centre. Pointer could also decide to start 'back-to-back' at the center of a square and spread themselves from the center to the periphery of the crowd of the crowd, diminishing the number of steps towards the periphery of the group. Finally, when the crowd was in a rectangular square or broad avenue pointers counted lines of protestors to assign surveyors similar to the method they followed during moving demonstrations (marches). The area was divided into three survey areas and each pointer went through the crowd counting lines of protestors and sent out interviewers to the left and the right of this middle line. They could start covering the crowd from the front to the back and from left to right or from the back of the front and from right to left.

[3] Rejection rates ranged from 2.6 to 53% with an average of 19.3%.

Data

Protest Participation: a dichotomous variable allows us to identify protest participants from non-participants for each protest event. We were able to collect full data on all the variables involved in this study for 640 protest participants and 183 no-participants.

Social Networks: in order to identify whether protest participants and no-participants were invited to take part in any given demonstration through personal connections, the questionnaire includes a question that asks respondents "which of the following people specifically asked you to take part in the demonstration?" Possible answers include: (1) no-one, (2) family, or friends (3) acquaintances, and (4) colleagues or fellow students. Each category was converted into a dichotomous variable. 'No one' was used as the base line against which all other categories were compared in the used logistic regression model and 'acquaintances' was left out of the model due to the very small numbers included in that category. Hence, only two categories were included in the model: (1) family and friends, (2) colleagues and fellow students.

Identity-Based Perspectives: in order to register the extent to which respondents identified with other protest participants and/or with the demonstration organizers, we use a survey question that specifically asked protest participants and no-participants alike how much did they identify themselves with the people participating in that protest event and with the organization organizing the event.[4] A five point scale was used to provide them with five possible answers for each case: 'not at all' = 0, 'not very much' = 1, 'somewhat' = 2, 'quite' = 3, and 'a lot' = 4.

Media Diffusion and Information Flows: we identified the most important source of information about the demonstration by using a question in the survey which asked protest participants and no-participants to state the most important source of information through which they got to know about the demonstration. Possible answers included four different categories: (1) conventional news media (radio, television, and newspapers), (2) online media and social networks, (3) personal connections (partners, family, friends, acquaintances, fellow students or co-workers, and fellow members of an organization or association, and (4) advertisement (flyers and posters) of an organization. Dichotomous variables were created of each of these options. Advertisements and information distributed by an organization was used as our base category against which all other three categories were compared to in our model.

Participation Tradition: in order to identify respondents' political participation, we used two questions in the Protest Survey questionnaire and constructed an index variable. The first question that we used asked respondents if in the last twelve months they were members of different listed civic organizations.[5] The

---

[4] The specific question read: "To what extent to you identify (a) with the other people present at the demonstration? (b) with any organization staging the demonstration?"

[5] The question reads: "Could you please tell me what other actions have you taken to promote or prevent a change in the last twelve months?" Possible answer include: (a) contacted a politician/local or national government official, (b) signed a

second question asks them about different their involvement in different political activities in the last twelve months.[6] After conducting a factor analysis both variables were combined in a normalized index from 0 to 1 to measure protest participants and no-participants' political participation.

Differentiated participation: in order to identify whether the factors mentioned before had different effects on protest participation in ritual vs. spontaneous demonstrations, we included a dichotomous variable that signals whether respondents were surveyed during such protest events. We coded arbitrarily spontaneous events with a '1' and ritual events with a '0'.

Education level: we identify survey respondents' level of education by employing the survey question which asked protest participants and no/-participants to indicate the highest level of education they completed or are currently completing. A seven-point scale was used for them to indicate whether they had no education ('0'), they completed elementary education ('1'), middle school ('2'), high school ('3'), college ('4'), or graduate school (masters '5', doctorate '6').

Social class: we register protest participants and no-participants social status by utilizing the survey question that asks respondents to indicate if they describe themselves as a member of the following:[7] lower class ('1'), working class ('2'), lower middle class ('3'), upper middle ('4'), upper class ('5'), or none ('0').

Age: respondents were asked to indicate the year in which they were born. This variable was used to compute their age.

Gender: in order to designate respondents' gender we use the survey question that asks respondents to indicate their gender ('1'=male, '0'=female).

---

[6] petition/public letter, (c) donated money to a political organization/group, (d) boycotted certain products, (e) worn or displayed a campaign badge/sticker, (f) joined a strike, (g) taken part in direct action (such as: blockage, occupation, civil disobedience), (h) used violent forms of action (against property or people).

[6] The question reads: "Could you please tell me if in the last twelve months you were a member of the following organizations. If you are a member of several organizations listed below, please only tell me in which of them you are most active." Possible answer include: (a) church/religious organization, (b) union/professional organization, (c) political party, (d) women's organization, (e) sport/cultural organization, (f) environmental organization, (g) LGBT organization, (h) community/neighbor organization, (i) charity organization, (j) peace-seeking organization, (k) anti-discrimination/pro-migrant organization, (l) human/civic rights organization, (m) other.

[7] The question reads: "People sometimes describe themselves as belonging to the working class, the middle class, or the upper or lower class. Would you describe yourself as belonging to the…?"

TABLE 1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS*

VARIABLE	MEAN NON-PARTICIPANTS (N=183)	MEAN PARTICIPANTS (N=640)	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Personal Mobilization:				
Family & friends	0.08 (0.28)	0.11 (0.32)	0	1
Colleagues	0.04 (0.21)	0.19 (0.39)	0	1
Not Asked	0.64 (0.48)	0.54 (0.50)	0	1
Identity-based Mobilization:				
Identification w/participants	1.58 (1.47)	3.15 (1.06)	0	4
Identification w/organizers	0.98 (1.40)	2.38 (1.49)	0	4
Mobilizing Channels:				
Conventional media	0.19 (0.39)	0.14 (0.34)	0	1
Internet media	0.16 (0.37)	0.40 (0.49)	0	1
Other people	0.27 (0.45)	0.44 (0.50)	0	1
Past Political Participation:				
Past Political Participation	0.18 (0.18)	0.45 (0.27)	0	1
Sociodemographic controls:				
Level of Education	3.23 (1.07)	3.45 (1.04)	0	6
Class Status (self-identified)	1.81 (0.97)	2.36 (1.01)	0	5
Age	37.80 (14.73)	36.70 (14.21)	16	83
Gender	0.43	0.66	0	1

Standard Deviations are in parentheses

Participants versus Nonparticipants: Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics differentiating the means of non-participant bystanders from protest participants in ritual and spontaneous demonstrations. In terms of personal networks, bystanders reported fewer connections to other activists. Non-participants also identified much less with other participants and organizers of the demonstration. Interestingly, more bystanders reported learning about the march from conventional media sources such as radio, television, and newspapers than participants. However, participants reported hearing about the upcoming demonstration from online social

media and other people at much higher levels than non-participants. Protest participants also had much more past political experience than bystanders.

Table 1 also shows that bystanders and passer-byes around demonstrations are not social isolates with no previous awareness of the protest events. A portion of the non-participant population sampled maintained a minimal level of knowledge and information about the upcoming street demonstration, hence they have some mobilization potential (Klandermans 1997). Nonetheless, bystanders are not as deeply embedded in already existing web of activist ties, knowledge, sympathies, and experience as the protest participants.

Models

Because the dependent variable is dichotomous (participation versus no participation), the most appropriate estimation method is logistic regression with clustered robust standard errors. Two models were run. Model 1 estimates protestors' participation in demonstrations. It includes a dichotomous variable that indicates whether respondents were surveyed during spontaneous demonstrations. This variable allows us to detect a possible statistical significant difference between both types of events.[8] Model 2 estimates protestors' participation in ritual demonstrations, while Model 3 does it for spontaneous demonstrations. Table 2 shows results for all models.

In order to test the statistical significance of predictors between Models 2 (ritual demonstrations) and 3 (spontaneous demonstrations), we ran Chow-Tests (Paternoster, Brame, Mazzerrolle, and Piquero 1998). Results are discussed in the next section. The results of the Chow-Test indicate a Chi-square of 19.24 with a probability of 0.083. Hence, we can reject the null hypothesis at a 90% confidence level (p-value <0.10). This means that our predicting factors had different effects for ritual and spontaneous protest events.

---

[8] Another model was run with dichotomous variables for each event to identify whether our mobilizing factors had different effects over the decision to take part in each demonstration. The LGBT pride march was the excluded comparison category. No significant effects appeared across different demonstrations.

Results

TABLE 2. MOBILIZATION FACTORS BETWEEN PROTEST PARTICIPANTS AND NO-PARTICIPANTS IN RITUAL AND SPONTANEOUS PROTESTS (WITH ROBUST STANDARD ERRORS, CLUSTERED BY PROTEST EVENT)

Explanatory Variables	Model 1 (All events)	Model 2 (Ritual events)	Model 3 (Spontaneous events)
Organizations and Networks:			
Family and friends	0.73 (0.63)	1.08 (0.88)	-0.65 (0.32) **
Colleagues and peers	1.56 (0.70) **	1.53 (0.78) **	-
Identity-based Mobilization:			
Id. w/participants	0.58 (0.06) ***	0.57 (0.07) ***	0.53 (0.05) ***
Id. w/organizers	0.07 (0.04) *	0.09 (0.07)	0.16 (0.20)
Mobilizing Channels:			
Conventional media	-0.54 (0.26) **	-0.60 (0.40)	-0.81 (0.75)
Internet media	0.89 (0.18) ***	0.99 (0.12) ***	0.61 (0.15) ***
Other people	0.71 (0.16)***	0.64 (0.12) ***	1.39 (0.22) ***
Mobilizing Political Participation:			
Past political part.	5.30 (0.88) ***	4.23 (0.61)***	8.32 (1.33) ***
Spontaneous events	0.01 (0.19)		
Socio-demographic controls			
Education	-0.28 (0.09) ***	-0.36 (0.08) ***	-0.06 (0.17)
Social status	0.48 (0.24) **	0.40 (0.35)	0.81 0.46) *
Age	- 0.02 (0.01) *	-0.03 (0.01) ***	0.001 (0.04)
Gender	0.71 (0.25) ***	0.84 (0.21) ***	0.61 (0.81)
	Num. obs.: 823 Pseudo R2: 0.4145	Num. obs.: 526 Pseudo R2: 0.3733	Num. obs.: 278 Pseudo R2: 0.5453 - omitted variable due to perfect prediction

*** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.10

TABLE 3. PREDICTED PROBABILITIES FOR PROTEST PARTICIPATION IN RITUAL AND SPONTANEOUS PROTESTS (WITH ROBUST STANDARD ERRORS, CLUSTERED BY PROTEST EVENT)

EXPLANATORY VARIABLES	MODEL 1 (ALL EVENTS)	MODEL 2 (RITUAL EVENTS)	MODEL 3 (SPONTANEOUS EVENTS)
Organizations and Networks:			
Family and friends	0.07 (0.06)	0.12 (0.09)	-0.04 (0.02) **
Colleagues and peers	0.15 (0.06) **	0.16 (0.07) **	-
Identity-based Mobilization:			
Id. w/participants	0.05 (0.006) ***	0.06 (0.001) ***	0.04 (0.001) ***
Id. w/organizers	0.007 (0.004) *	0.009 (0.007)	0.01 (0.01)
Mobilizing Channels:			
Conventional media	-0.05 (0.02) **	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.06)
Internet media	0.08 (0.02) ***	0.11 (0.02) ***	0.04 (0.007) ***
Other people	0.07 (0.01)***	0.07 (0.02) ***	0.10 (0.008) ***
Mobilizing Political Participation:			
Past political part.	0.51 (0.07) ***	0.45 (0.04)***	0.58 (0.05) ***
Spontaneous events	0.001 (0.02)		
Socio-demographic controls			
Education	-0.03 (0.009) ***	-0.04 (0.008) ***	-0.004 (0.01)
Social status	0.05 (0.02) **	0.04 (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)
Age	- 0.002 (0.001) *	-0.003 (0.001) **	0.00009 (0.003)
Gender	0.07 (0.02) ***	0.09 (0.02) ***	0.04 (0.06)
	Num. obs.: 823 Pseudo R2: 0.4145	Num. obs.: 526 Pseudo R2: 0.3733	Num. obs.: 278 Pseudo R2: 0.5453 - omitted variable due to perfect prediction

*** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.10

TABLE 4. MEAN COMPARSIONS OF RITUAL VERSUS SPONTANEOUS PROTEST PARTICIPANTS (T-TESTS)

VARIABLE	MEAN RITUAL PARTICIPANTS (N=400)	MEAN SPONTANEOUS PARTICIPANTS (N=240)	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Personal Mobilizing Mechanisms:				
Family & friends	0.14	0.07**	0	1
Colleagues	0.25	0.08***	0	1
Not Asked	0.45	0.70***	0	1
Identity-based Mobilization:				
Identification w/participants	2.91	3.53***	0	4
Identification w/organizers	2.09	2.88***	0	4
Mobilizing Channels:				
Conventional media	0.12	0.17*	0	1
Internet media	0.25	0.64***	0	1
Other people	0.55	0.27***	0	1
Mobilizing Political Participation:				
Past Political Participation	0.41	0.52***	0	1
Sociodemographic controls:				
Level of Education	3.40	3.55*	0	6
Class Status (self-identified)	2.36	2.35	0	5
Age	35.71	38.32**	16	83
Gender	0.69	0.63	0	1

*** $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.05$; * $p < 0.10$

Table 2 analyzes multivariate logistic regression models of individual participation in urban demonstrations in Mexico, including ritual and spontaneous protests. Table 3 presents the predicted probabilities of each of these correlated. In all urban demonstrations (Model 1), not distinguishing between protest type, individuals that were invited to participate by work colleagues and peers were more likely to

attend a demonstration than those that were not approached. However, mobilizing through colleagues and peers only increased the likelihood of taking part in a protest event by 15% (see Table 3). Participants in urban demonstrations were more likely to identify with other participants and organizations coordinating the demonstrations than non-participants. However, the real effects of these two predictors were rather slim. Having a shared identity with other participants only increased the likelihood of taking part by 5%, while a shared identity with the event organizers increased the probability of protesting in less than 1% (see Table 3). Activists in the urban demonstrations also learned about the demonstrations through the internet media and face-to-face interactions more than non-participants. Protest participants were 8% more likely to take part in a demonstration when they learned about it through social media and 7% more likely to participate when they learned about the event through other people. Non-participants heard more about the upcoming demonstrations via conventional medial of newspapers, radio, and television. However, the strongest predictor appeared to be the past political participation experiences of protest participants. Having taken part in other previous political activities increases the probability of taking part in a protest event – ritual or spontaneous – by 51% (see Table 3).

Models 2 and 3 distinguish between ceremonial and spontaneous demonstrations. Once again, previous political participation experiences appear as the strongest predictor of protest participation in ritual and more spontaneous events. Having previous experiences in political activities increases the chances of joining a ritual protest by 45% and spontaneous demonstration by 58%. In terms of pre-existing networks, spontaneous participants were 4% less likely to be contacted by family friends than nonparticipants (see Table 3). Participants in ritual demonstrations were 16% more likely to be invited by colleagues from work and school than non-participants. Both ritual and spontaneous protesters identified significantly more with other protest participants than bystanders and non-participants. However, their real effects were rather small. They fluctuated between 6 and 4 % respectively (see Table 3). Ceremonial and spontaneous protest participants were more likely to learn about the demonstration in question from online social media than non-participants – demonstrating the importance of online networks in urban popular mobilization in Mexico, and perhaps other world megacities. While learning about the upcoming demonstration through online social media increased protest participation in ritual demonstrations by 11%, it increased it by 4% in spontaneous protests (Table 3). Ritual and spontaneous demonstrators also were more likely to learn about the demonstration from face-to-face contact with other people than non-participants. Face-to-face contact increased the likelihood of taking part in a ritual demonstration by 7% and in a more spontaneous one by 10% (Table 3). Hence, both ritual and spontaneous participants were already connected online and to others with knowledge of the upcoming marches than non-participants.

In short, past political participation seems to significantly drive individuals to take part in both ritual and spontaneous demonstrations. Spontaneous protest participants follow a similar pattern to ritual participants, relying on their collective

identity and solidarity with other participants, links to online social media sources, and social interactions with people knowledgeable of upcoming demonstrations. Non-participants lack the knowledge of upcoming protest events as well as a sense of solidarity with those that engage in urban demonstrations.

Ritual versus Spontaneous Participants: Table 4 compares only the *participants* in the two types of demonstrations. We hypothesized that spontaneous protesters would be even more deeply embedded than ritual demonstrators in the activist world along multiple lines of networks, information, identity and past political experience. In terms of direct social ties to other participants, ceremonial protesters actually reported more attempts by friends, family and colleagues to invite them to the demonstration than spontaneous demonstrators. This may due to spontaneous protesters acting more in the role of leaders inviting others to protest events rather than being asked. Indeed, in a separate analysis not reported here, 47 % of spontaneous protesters invited someone else to the protest event while only 38% of ritual protesters attempted to recruit others to the demonstrations.[9]

Spontaneous demonstrators also reported significantly higher levels of identity with other participants and organizers of the protest events than ritual protest participants. This is consistent with the deeper levels of solidarity felt by those engaging in more risky and uncertain types of contentious events. In terms of knowledge of the upcoming demonstrations, spontaneous demonstrators learned of the events from conventional and Internet media sources, while ritual protest participants were more likely to be informed by face-to-face interactions with other persons. Nearly two-thirds of spontaneous protesters (64%) learned of the demonstration from online social media outlets such as Twitter and Facebook. Spontaneous demonstrators also reported substantially more past political experience giving them the confidence to participate in last minute protest events as a legitimate pathway to try and influence the political system. Ritual and Spontaneous demonstrators were similar along demographic lines, with spontaneous protesters on average tending to be slightly more educated and a couple of years older

---

[9] This difference was statistically significant at the $p < 0.10$.

Discussion and Conclusions

Participation in urban mobilization in Mexico tends to be a multi-dimensional process of connectedness, information knowledge, solidarity, and past experience. No-participants and bystanders in our study were less politically active and connected to other participants in both ritual and spontaneous demonstrations. Earlier work has shown this to be the case for no-participants that are *ideologically* close to the movement. This paper shows that bystanders and others in *geographic* proximity to the actual demonstrations were also less linked to movement participants through social ties.

This work has also demonstrated the importance of information flows before a demonstration takes place (Schock 2005). Not only ritual and spontaneous activists had more knowledge of upcoming protest events than non-participants, they also received more of this knowledge through new social media sites, such as Facebook and Twitter. Hence, a portion of the cyber activist community in urban Mexico appears to "spillover" into *actual* street demonstrations through the sharing of information of upcoming events (Meyer and Whittier 1994; Whittier 2004). Participants in both types of demonstrations also reported higher levels of identity with other participants than the bystanders on the streets. Hence, even if an onlooker may sympathize with a particular grievance or slogan of the protest march, her lack of connectedness and solidarity with the protesters inhibits joining the demonstration.

Finally, past participation proved crucial for citizens protesting in the present. The experience of engaging in civic organizations and earlier rounds of collective action assisted individuals in overcoming the barriers of apathy and popular notions of protest as a deviant behavior. Each protest event involves further engagement in a larger social movement in which individuals share strong attachments (Corrigall-Brown 2012).

Because spontaneous demonstrations draw from especially committed and embedded activists, it is more likely that ritual demonstrations could draw in bystanders since participation is less costly and often emotionally rewarding. In order to build bandwagon effects (Lichbach 1995) and enlarge the size of ceremonial street marches in real time with bystander publics, activists would likely need to target businesses, outdoor markets, and schools *near the march route* in advance with their social contacts and online social media connections. Future work should also explore other types of nonparticipants besides bystander publics in distinguishing between ritual and ceremonial demonstrations. Another promising population of near participants are those citizens with ideologically similar beliefs and sympathies of the participants (Klandermans 1997), but fail to participate in either ceremonial or spontaneous protests.

References

Almeida, Paul D. and Mark I. Lichbach. 2003. "To the Internet, from the Internet: Comparative Media Coverage of Transnational Protest." *Mobilization* 8 (3): 249-272.

Almeida, Paul D. 2005. "Multi-Sectoral Coalitions and Popular Movement Participation." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 26: 67-102.

Andrews, Kenneth and Michael Biggs. 2006. "The Dynamics of Protest Diffusion: Movement Organizations, Social Networks, and News Media in the 1960 Sit-Ins." *American Sociological Review* 71: 752-777.

Bernhagen, Patrick and Michael Marsh. 2007. "Voting and protesting: Explaining Citizen Participation in Old and New European Democracies." *Democratization* 14(1): 44-72.

Bunce, Valerie and Sharon Wolchik. 2011. *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Postcommunist Countries.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carty, Victoria. 2010. *Wired and Mobilizing: Social Movements, New Technology, and Electoral Politics.* New York: Routledge.

Collins, Randall. 2001. "Social Movements and the Focus of Emotional Attention." Pp. 27-44 in Passionate Politics, edited by Jeff Goodwin, James M. Jasper, and Francesca Polletta. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

---------. 2004. Interaction Ritual Chains. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cook, Maria Lorena. 1996. Organizing Dissent: Unions, the State, and the Democratic Teachers' Movement in Mexico. State College, PA: Penn State University Press.

Corrigall-Brown, Catherine. 2012. Patterns of Protest: Trajectories of Participation in Social Movements. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

De la Dehesa, Rafael. 2010. Queering the Public Sphere in Mexico and Brazil: Sexual Rights Movements in Emerging Democracies. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Dicken, Peter. 2011. *Global Shift: Mapping the Contours of the Global Economy.* New York: Guilford.

Dixon, Mark and Vincent Roscigno. J. 2003. "Status, Networks, and Social Movement Participation: The Case of Striking Workers." *American Journal of Sociology* 108: 1292-1327.

Dodson, Kyle. "The Movement Society in Comparative Perspective." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 16(4): 475-494.

Earl, Jennifer and Katrina Kimport. 2011. *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Einwohner, Rachel, Jo Reger and Daniel J. Myers, 2008. "Introduction: Identity Work, Sameness, and Difference in Social Movements." Pp. 1-17 in *Identity*

Work in Social Movements, edited by Jo Reger, Rachel Einwohner, and Daniel J. Myers. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Eisenstadt, Todd. 2011. *Politics, Identity, and Mexico's Indigenous Rights Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erickson Nepstad, Sharon and Christian Smith. 1999. "Rethinking Recruitment to High-Risk/Cost Activism: The Case of Nicaragua Exchange." *Mobilization* 4(1): 25-40.

Estrello, Luz and Massimo Mondonesi. 2012. "El #YoSoy132 y las elecciones en México. Instantáneas de una imposición anunciada y del movimiento que la desafió." *OSAL* 32: 219-242.

Gould, Roger V. 1995. *Insurgent Identities: Class, Community, and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Howard, Philip. 2010. *The Digital Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Information Technology and Political Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization. Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Johnston, Hank. 2009. "Cultural Analysis and Contentious Politics." Pp. 3-29 in *Culture, Social Movements, and Protest,* edited by Hank Johnston. Aldershot UK: Ashgate Publishers.

Johnston, Hank, Enrique Laraña, and Joseph R. Gusfield. 1994. "Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements" Pp. 3-35 in *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kitts, James. 2000. "Mobilizing in Black Boxes: Social Networks and Participation in Social Movement Organizations." *Mobilization* 5 (2): 241-257.

Klandermans, Bert. 2012. "Between rituals and riots: The dynamics of street demonstrations." *Mobilization* 17 (3): 233-234.

----------. 1997. *The Social Psychology of Protest*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Klandermans, Bert, and Dirk Oegema. 1987. "Potentials, Networks, Motivations and Barriers: Steps Towards Participation in Social Movements." *American Sociological Review* 52: 519-31.

Klandermans, Bert, Jacquelien van Stekelenburg, Dunya van Troost, Anouk van Leeuwen, Stefaan Walgrave, Joris Verhulst, Jeroen van Laer, and Ruud Wouters. 2010. *Manual for Data Collection on Protest Demonstrations. Caught in the Act of Protest: Contextualizing Contestation (CCC). Version 3.0.* [www.protestsruvey.eu]

Kolins Givan, Rebecca, Kenneth Roberts, and Sarah Soule. 2010. "Introduction: The Dimensions of Diffusion." Pp. 1-15 in *The Diffusion of Social Movements*, edited by Rebecca Kolins Givan, Kenneth Roberts, and Sarah Soule. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krinsky, John and Nick Crossley. 2014. "Social Movements and Social Networks: Introduction." *Social Movement Studies* 13 (1): 1-21.

Lichbach, Mark. 1995. *The Rebel's Dilemma*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Machado, Fabiana, Carlos Scartascini and Mariano Tommasi. 2011. "Political Institutions and Street Protests in Latin America." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55(3): 340-365.

McAdam, Doug. 1988. *Freedom Summer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---------. 1999. 2nd ed. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McAdam, Doug and Sidney Tarrow. 2013. "Social Movements and Elections: Toward a Broader Understanding of the Political Context of Contention." Pp. 325-346 in *The Future of Social Movement Research: Dynamics, Mechanisms, and Processes*, edited by Jacquelien Stekelenburg, Conny Roggenband, and Bert Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Meyer, David S. 2014. *The Politics of Protest: Social Movements in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (2nd Ed.).

Meyer, David and Nancy Whittier. 1994. "Social Movement Spillover." *Social Problems* 41: 277-298.

Myers, Daniel J. 2000. "The Diffusion of Collective Violence: Infectiousness, Susceptibility, and Mass Media Networks." *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (1): 178-208

Opp, Karl-Dieter, Christiane Gern, and Peter Voss. 1995. *Origins of a spontaneous revolution: East Germany 1989*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Orum, Anthony M. 1974. "On Participation in Political Protest Movements." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 10: 181-207.

Passy, Florence. 2001. "Socialization, Connection, and the Structure/Agency Gap: A Specification of the Impact of Networks on Participation in Social Movements." *Mobilization* 6 (2): 173-192.

Passy, Florence and Gian-Andrea Monsch. 2014. "Do Social Networks Really Matter in Contentious Politics?" *Social Movement Studies* 13 (1): 22-47.

Paternoster, Raymond, Robert Brame, Paul Mazzerrolle, and Alex Piquero. 1998. "Using the Correct Statistical Test for the Equality of Regression Coefficients." *Criminology* 36(4): 859-866.

Saunders, Clare, Maria Grasso, Cristiana Olcese, Emily Rainsford, and Christopher Rootes. 2012. "Explaining Differential Protest Participation: Novices, Returners, Repeaters, and Stalwarts." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 17(3): 263-280.

Schock, Kurt. 2005. *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Nondemocracies*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Small, Mario Luis. 2009. *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Snow, David A., Louis A. Zurcher, and Sheldon Ekland-Olson. 1980. "Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment." *American Sociological Review* 45: 787-801.

Snow, David and Doug McAdam, 2000, "Identity Work Processes in the Context of Social Movements: Clarifying the Identity/Movement Nexus." Pp. 41-67 in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by Sheldon Stryker, Timothy J. Owens, and Robert W. White. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Sobieraj, Sarah. 2011. *Soundbitten: The Perils of Media-Centered Political Activism*. New York: New York University Press.

Stryker, Sheldon. 2000. "Identity Competition: Key to Differential Social Movement Participation?" Pp. 1-21 in *Self Identity and Social Movements,* edited by Sheldon Stryker, Timothy J. Owens and Robert W. Wright. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Taylor, Verta, Katrina Kimport, Nella Van Dyke and Ellen Andersen. 2009. "Culture and Mobilization: Tactical Repertoires, Same-Sex Weddings, and the Impact on Gay Activism," *American Sociological Review* 74 (6): 865-890.

Tilly, Charles and Lesley Wood. 2012. 3[rd]ed. *Social Movements, 1768-2012*. Boulder: Paradigm.

Van Dyke, Nella, Mark Dixon, and Helen Carlon. 2007. "Manufacturing Dissent: Labor

Revitalization, Union Summer, and Student Protest." *Social Forces* 88 (1): 193-214.

Van Stekelenburg, Jacquelien, Stefaan Walgrave, Bert Klandermans, and Joris Verhulst. 2012. "Contextualizing Contestation. Framework, Design, and Data." *Mobilization* 17(3): 249-262.

Van Stekelenburg, Jacquelien and Bert Klandermans. 2007. "Individuals in Movements: A Social Psychology of Contention." Pp.157-204 in *Handbook of Social Movements across Disciplines,* edited by Bert Klandermans and Conny Roggenband. New York: Springer.

Viterna, Jocelyn. 2013. *Women in War: The Micro-processes of Mobilization in El Salvador*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wada, Takeshi. 2014. "Who are the active and central actors in the 'rising civil society' in Mexico?" *Social Movement Studies* 13(1): 127-157.

Walgrave, Stefaan and Joris Verhulst. 2011. "Selection and Response Bias in Protest Surveys." *Mobilization* 16 (2): 203-222.

Williams, Heather. 2001. *Social Movements and Economic Transition: Markets and Distributive Conflict in Mexico*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whittier, Nancy. 2004. "The Consequences of Social Movements for Each Other" in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, eds., D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule and H. Kriesi. Oxford: Blackwell.