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Abstract

A wide use of social media and the development of digital communication channels have changed the game in grassroots activism. Embracing those new ways of communication gives a way to new forms of activism and raises questions about media’s shifting role in the sphere of social movements and collective action. The general aim of this study was to map the role of media in the Let’s Do It! (LDI) movement that fights against illegal waste by organizing clean-up campaigns and by building awareness about the problem among the general public. The purpose was to find out what role media plays in the mobilization of clean-up actions; in communicating with the whole LDI movement and in sustaining the global network.

The research questions posed were: What communication channels are used, and how are they used by activists to reach general public and to engage the volunteers when organizing the local and the global clean-up campaigns in the LDI network? What is the value of the global Let’s Do It! network and how is global-local communication organized?

To find out about the use of communication channels and the purpose of the global network, a web-survey and in-depth interviews with global and local members of Let’s Do It! were conducted. The results show that different communication channels have a different role in the process of coordinating clean-up campaigns and in sustaining the network. Traditional media is important for gaining wider visibility; digital channels of communication, especially social networking platforms, are multifunctional with combining the internal and the external communication; and face-to-face meetings and interpersonal relationships are deemed crucial in forming strong ties and sustaining the network both globally and locally. The actual media use is also strongly influenced by the cultural context and the resources available for the local teams.

Keywords: Let’s Do It!, communication channels, communication campaigns, mobilization, external communication.
1. Introduction

1.1. Problem area and background

Social movements and people collaborating towards social change has been around for a while already, dating back as long as the anti-slavery campaigns. The role of media and the use of communication channels have evolved over time together with the movements. In the beginning, most of the communication was directed inward or distributed through underground sources. Later, the protest events became large spectacles with the whole world watching and the movement organizations like Greenpeace became good at strategic communication to win the public’s support. With the wide spread of the internet, new forms of activism and new opportunities appeared, the latter especially on the transnational level. Although transnational networks are not a new phenomenon (Keck and Sikkink 1998) the scale and the reach of large protests has changed. With several such protest events happening in the last decades, a scholarly discussion has emerged about the role of the new media in facilitating the coordination and mobilization for action and changing the game for social movements. As the media and digital communication technology plays a larger role in our everyday life, the question about its role in collective action and about the shifting role of other channels of communication is also raised.

A globalized world makes distant places interconnected and people increasingly develop a sense of place and identity through the local, national and global media. Such interconnectedness makes us more aware of the rest of the world and the environmental issues that happens globally also affects us locally.

This report studies how communication technology is used for mobilizing for collective action by the global citizen movement Let’s Do It! (LDI). LDI is a citizen initiative that targets the problem of illegal waste by organizing big national clean-up campaigns. It started in Estonia 2008 and after that spread to other countries and in 2012, a worldwide campaign “World Cleanup” was launched. At the time of writing, LDI has evolved into a global movement that aim to raise awareness about the root causes of waste by organizing clean-ups and other initiatives that support this objective. LDI is a network that currently connects 111 countries, or more specifically; local teams that organize clean-up campaigns in their home countries. The network also consists of a global core team that has a supportive role. This
study has an ambition to incorporate local campaigns, the global core team and to see if communication channels are used differently locally and globally in finding dedicated activists and in reaching the wider public.

The case of LDI was chosen for several reasons. Development of communication technologies have changed the game of collective action and there have appeared assumptions about the revolutionary characteristics of social media in what comes to grassroots activism, especially in the context of the Arab Spring and the Occupy movement (see Christensen 2011). There is also a question if online mobilization is sufficient for offline activism (Vissers et al. 2012; Enjolras, Steen-Johnsen and Wollebaek 2013) and how communication technologies have changed the nature of collective action (Bimber et al. 2005; Bennett and Segerberg 2012). As a lot of the studies about new media are concerned with the protest movements, there is a need to look into different kind of activism that is more sustained and tries to mobilize masses for other activities than protests. LDI is like Beck’s (2011) imagined cosmopolitan community that is produced by the world risk society, meaning people from different nations have to work together in order to fight the global problem of waste. Therefore, LDI offers a good opportunity to study a grassroots movement that unites many countries in one network that works toward one global aim but with local campaigns adapted to their own context and abilities.

**Waste issue**

As the case of this study is a civic movement that fights against illegal waste, it is appropriate to give some scope to waste production.

EU Waste Framework Directive gives an ambivalent definition of waste (quoted by Rootes 2009, p.818): ‘any substance or object . . . which the holder discards or intends or is required to discard’. Problem with waste is traditionally connected to consumer society but the issue now is rather in the composition of waste. New production technologies bring along new kind of waste, for example the explosive spread of smart phones rises the issue of e-waste and also the matter of industrial waste as different natural resources are needed for producing the equipment.

According to Eurostat (2010), in 2006, every person in EU produced in average 438 kg household waste. In total, households generated about 215 million tons of waste out of which
2.7 million tons was hazardous waste. The document also states that although households produce only 7% of all waste, a big part of it is landfilled and recycling rates are low in many countries (p. 61) which poses serious threats to the environment by air and water pollution as well as increases risks to public health and loss of space and natural resources.

Globally, 1.3 billion tons of solid waste is produced annually and the amount is expected to double by 2025. The production of waste differs according to region and income rate. Urban areas also produce more waste than non-urban (Hoornweg and Bhada-Tata, 2012).

Due to insufficient legislation there is also an issue of illegal dumping where waste is disposed of illegally, either sent to a country that has poor recycling laws or just dumped in the nature. Such problems are common in Eastern Europe and former Soviet Union countries (Stracansky 2010).

Besides being a problem of governance and economy, illegal dumping is also a matter of culture. For example, in Estonia bringing household and building waste to the forest has been a common practice for many years and the challenge is to change the attitudes of citizens.

**Environment and citizenship**

LDI is according to their webpage a citizen initiative. It unites people in assuming responsibility for taking care of their immediate surroundings and in being aware of the dangers of illegal waste in general.

Tackling environmental problems often requires civic engagement (Brulle 2010) and a public dialogue. But at the same time with the growing individuation, a kind of stakeholder citizenship has appeared where environmental issues are seen as a personal responsibility. Andy Scerri (2009) argues that the framing of environmental issues as personal responsibility brings along a paradox. People are led to believe that they are personally responsible for socially created problems. Instead of motivating people politically to engage in collective action, consumer choices are seen as enough to tackle some environmental issues. The rise of green consumerism is a challenge as it does not address the core problems of sustainability that are created socially, such as the production-consumption circle (Scerri 2009).
Smith and Pangsapa (2008) stress the need for redefining citizenship when it comes to environmental problems. Citizenship is much more than being a member of a nation state, it is also about identity and responsibility. The authors state the problem of clear distinction between the private and the public that hinders the understanding of how to make policies and actions more effective. There is a need for understanding that social and environmental issues go hand in hand and in order to create a change, civic engagement strategies and partnerships between institutions and citizens are needed (Smith and Pangsapa 2008). In other words, we need better cooperation between governments and the third sector. The citizens in their turn need to realize their own obligation towards society and the environment. Smith and Pangsapa (2008) describe ecological citizenship as one that integrates the public and the private sphere and takes the politics of obligation seriously (p. 9)

Dobson (2003) describes ecological citizenship as an example of citizenship that is characterized by the emphasis on non-reciprocal responsibilities rather than rights and that concentrates on virtue as being central to that citizenship. Aforementioned obligations extend through time and space – they are responsibilities towards future generations and constitute in the ecological footprint (Dobson 2003).

In sum, there is need for higher public participation to create social change and at the same time the society has become more individualized. The question raises how to connect individualized citizens into collective action towards an environmental change.

Environment, collective action and media

Media indeed can isolate people but at the same time computer mediated communication opens up new avenues for collective action. It could be said that the social capital that Putnam (2000) talks about, has moved from bowling alleys to the Internet. Digital media has a capacity to both enhance and reduce the power of collective action and those issues are brought up in the literature part of this study.

Bennett and Segerberg (2011) suggest that mobilization of individualized public needs personalized media communication. The authors find that a more personalized collective
action process maintains high levels of engagement, agenda focus, and network strength. As a comment to Bennet’s and Segerberg’s work, Della Porta (2014) suggests that with the use of various channels for organizing protests, there is a need to look deeper into ‘complex repertoires of means of communication’ (p. 271). Della Porta also stresses the need to study the conditions under which activists adopt certain means of communication. According to her, triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data would prove useful for deeper understanding of how different means of media are related with different steps in mobilization process (Della Porta 2014, p. 271). This study is an attempt to bring some knowledge into the area Della Porta suggests, studying the repertoires of means of communication in the LDI movement.

1.2. The aim of the study

The general aim of this study is to map the role of media in the Let’s Do It! movement that fights against illegal waste by organizing clean-up campaigns and by building awareness about the waste problem among the general public. The objective is to find out what role media plays in organizing the campaigns and in communicating with the whole LDI movement. The main focus is to describe the role of traditional media, new media and interpersonal relationships in mobilizing for clean-up actions and in sustaining the global network of LDI.

This study is motivated by two reoccurring arguments in the literature about social movements and media. Firstly, there is a body of research available about how communication and information technologies and specifically internet has influenced the way social movements operate, especially in the transnational arena (see for example de Donk (Ed.) 2004, Della Porta and Mosca 2005, Garrett 2006). Another claim by researchers is that a movement’s success does not rely on the technologies but instead on the way activists put them to use (see Bennett 2003, Bimber et. al 2005, Min and Kim 2012). The report uses mixed methods of web survey and in-depth interviews to find out which communication technologies are perceived important by the activists and how these tools are put to use when organizing local actions and when communicating on the global level.

LDI is a global network that consists of local teams from all over the world and of the global core team that has a supportive function. Localized actions have different resources,
opportunities and contexts and in order to understand the external communication tactics of local campaigns, one needs also to look at the role of global network in general. Therefore, the first research question of this study is more concerned with the external communication and the issue of reaching the wider audience and the second question is directed rather inward the movement, to find out in what ways global movement affects local efforts and what the role of media is in sustaining the local-global relationship.

The study is guided by following research questions:

1. What communication channels are used and how are they used by activists to reach the general public and to engage the volunteers when organizing the local and global clean-up campaigns in the LDI network?

2. What is the value of the global Let’s Do It! network and how is global-local communication organized?

1.3. Thesis structure

This thesis is divided into six chapters. The introductory chapter is followed by the background chapter (Chapter 2), which describes the Let’s Do It! movement and its development from a one-time local campaign to a global movement. Chapter 3 is dedicated to the literature review and brings up themes about the characteristics of collective action and campaigns, glocalization, media and activism, and also describes some previous studies about the media use and mobilization. The materials and methods of this study are discussed in Chapter 4 and the findings are presented and analyzed in Chapter 5. The final chapter presents the concluding remarks and states the limitations of this study and gives suggestions for future research on this topic.
2. Background

The previous chapter named the purpose of the research, specifying the aim which is to map the role of media in Let’s Do It! clean-up campaigns and to find out what communication channels are deemed important by the activists for mobilizing and for communicating the movement’s ideas. This chapter will give some background information about the Let’s Do It! movement: how it is built up and how it developed from a one time civic initiative in Estonia to the global movement it is now. Such an overview gives an example on how one movement diffuses from a local initiative to a global movement and shows the role of locality in a global movement and vice versa. In the age of globalization and with the spread of digital media it is important to understand how communication and cooperation between distant places is taking place and also how these contacts are created in the first place. This chapter also looks at the definition of social movement and discusses how LDI fits in that framework. Finally, a summary based on the secondary data about previous campaigns is made to find out what channels are used to spread awareness about clean-up campaigns and to inspire people to participate.

The background chapter is informed by the secondary data. The materials studied in this research are different instructions, reports, best practices, minutes of meetings, texts from the LDI website and some personal email communication with the former PR responsible. Most of the material comes from the LDI webpage. The collected secondary data has two purposes: firstly, to give a background overview of the movement and to inform how the movement has formed. Secondly, to give an overview of how local campaigns were organized in general and in more specific, how media was used for mobilizing. The collected data also helped to make a relevant survey and interview questions so that the information that already exists in the secondary data would not be asked again.

The list of secondary data used is presented in Appendix 1. All the data from the website was saved in separate files and the date of retrieving was added. The LDI website offers rich data about the communication efforts, for example in the form of promotional materials and media bank. Therefore, the website was also used as secondary data to inform the web survey question about communication material offered for local activists.
2.1. „Teeme ära“ campaign in 2008

“Teeme ära!” (“Let’s Do It!”) campaign was initiated by a few concerned citizens to target the illegal dumpsites in Estonian nature and to raise awareness of the waste problem among Estonian people. Followed by the state-wide waste-mapping and extensive PR and media campaign, on 5th of May 2008 around 50000 people gathered and picked up about 10000 tons of waste.

The initiative started with noticing the problem. Special software was created for mapping the waste in the forests in order to visualize the scope of the problem. The coordinating of the campaign involved the top experts of the field and the whole team of volunteers rose to about 600 people. The project was widely covered by the local and national media. A huge media campaign was launched to mobilize wider public and raise awareness about illegal dumping. According to the organizers of the “Teeme ära 2008” project, they organized the largest media campaign in the history of Estonia and they got it for free.

The coordinators had close cooperation with local municipalities and also companies, who contributed with necessary services, materials and manpower. Most of the project was financed through partnerships and not so much with money.

According to the report, in normal circumstances it would have taken 3 years and 22,5 million Euros to clean up the amount of illegal waste that “Teeme Ära 2008” campaign cleaned in one day with about 0,5 million Euros.

The clean-up campaign in Estonia has evolved into a day of civil actions that takes place each year on the first Saturday in May where people gather to do different activities to better their communities.

2.2. „World Cleanup 2012“

“World Cleanup 2012” was a global clean-up campaign that took place from 24th of March 2012 to 25th of September 2012. The video of “Teeme Ära 2008” cleanup was put on YouTube and it inspired some other countries to try the same. For example, in Slovenia, 13%
of the population gathered one day in 2010 to clean up illegal dumpsites. After that, global LDI movement was born and in 2012 a global campaign, “World Cleanup 2012” was launched. The campaign had a goal of involving 100 countries and millions of people in big national one day clean-up actions that are based on the model of Estonian action from 2008. By the end of the campaign, around 90 countries had joined and about 7 million people participated.

2.3. „Let’s Do It! World“

After the „World Cleanup 2012“ campaign, the assistance in coordinating local activities was still required and the decision was made to continue with Let’s Do It! until 2018 and the goals were made to involve 350 million people which is 5% of the worlds population. The model was also altered. Parallel to clean-up actions, the movement is also concerned with the root causes of the waste production and supports all kinds of activities that are connected to the aim of the clean world. Also the local teams have different ways of participating. There are those who already have accomplished local clean-up campaigns and joined the LDI network to support the global effort (Skräpplockardagarna in Sweden); different initiatives and organizations with the same aim sometimes join under the same umbrella of LDI (in the case of Kenya and Russia) or completely new teams are created (the Netherlands). Also, the level of participation is different, some countries have already organized huge country-wide clean-up and stopped, some are doing activities every year and some are still starting up their campaigns.

At the moment of writing, according to LDIW web-page (www.letsdoitworld.org), 111 countries have joined with the network and 9 million volunteers have taken part in 198 cleanups.

In the global LDI network, at the moment the core team in Estonia has a facilitating and supportive role by providing know-how, PR-kit, technical solutions (software for mapping the waste, e-mails) and managing the network, but the local organizers have free hands in making their own campaigns that suit to the local situation. The global level is funded by different foundations in Estonia and through partnerships with companies who offer their services for free. The minimum budget is 200000 Euros from which most of it goes towards salaries of some core team members and for covering travel expenses. The funding of the local clean-up
actions is up to every country. The most common is to form partnerships with companies, persons, municipalities or other associations.

LDI has also organized global and regional conferences to create a space for meeting, sharing experiences and inspiring each other. From the global movement, also a regional campaign has emerged. Let’s Do It! Mediterranean is a project that has the goal to join the surrounding countries for clean-up actions and to raise awareness about the waste issue around the Mediterranean Sea.

2.4. Defining the movement

Let’s Do It! defines itself as a civic movement. In order to understand the concept of movement, the characteristics of social movements, environmental movements and transnational advocacy networks are listed.

According to Snow et al. (2004, p. 8-10), there are various ways to define social movements, depending on what characteristics are emphasized. Characteristics they bring out are following:

- Collective or joint action. For example protests.

- Change oriented goals or claims. All definitions of social movements stress that movements are in the business of promoting or resisting social change and that is the reason for their existing. Movements are not in one mind when specifying the character of the change sought (Snow et al. 2004, p.8)

- Some extra- or non-institutional collective action. Della Porta and Diani (1999) argue that social movements are networks of interaction where the inclusion of formal organizations depends on circumstances. Social movements have participants rather than members and single organizations do not make up a movement (pp. 16, 17)
Some degree of organization. Sydney Tarrow (1998) distinguishes between three types of movement organization: social movements as formal organizations, the organization of collective action, and social movements as connective structures or networks (pp.123-4).

Some degree of temporal continuity. Social movement is rather a longer-lasting action than a discrete event. Those events can be a part of a movement and those involved feel linked by solidarity to other similar movements (della Porta and Diani 1999, p. 19).

Snow et al. (2004) offer a definition for social movement:

“collectivities acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional or organizational channels for the purpose of challenging or defending extant authority, whether it is institutionally or culturally based, in the group, organization, society, culture, or world order of which they are a part.” (Snow et al. 2004, p. 11).

Della Porta and Diani (1999) stress the political side when they define social movements as: “(1) informal networks, based (2) on shared beliefs and solidarity, which mobilize about (3) conflictual issues, through (4) the frequent use of various forms of protest” (p. 16). Repertoires of action would be for example marches, boycotts, occupations which can take the form of large mobilizations, causing material damage or bearing witness. Choosing a form of action is often a challenge as various audiences have different needs and actions deliver different messages (della Porta and Diani 1999).

Environmental movements have a similarity with social movements in what comes to temporal continuity and cooperation among different actors. According to Rootes (2004), environmental movements come about when environmental movement organizations and other actors are networked and come together in some sort of collective action. A single organization or a protest does not make up an environmental movement (p. 610). Rootes (2004) adds that environmental movements have become institutionalized and have moved on from protests to lobbying with governments and corporations. In that sense the movements have become somewhat invisible. Oftentimes, environmental movements are not only about environment, but also about social justice. For example, in former Soviet Union countries, environmental movements were a safe way to criticize the regime and they were connected to a change in larger political situation (see Hicks 2004; Manning 1998). Rootes (2004) brings out distinctive elements of environmental movements: intimate relationship to science,
practical claims to international solidarity, and ability to offer a critique of and an alternative to industrial capitalism (p. 634).

Another bottom-up form of collective action is what Keck and Sikkink (1998) call transnational advocacy networks. In that case, non-state actors interact with each other, with states and with international organizations in order to bring about chance in the practice of national sovereignty and to provide domestic actors allies outside the borders (p. 1). Such networks can be active in different areas, for example human rights, environment and women’s rights. Keck and Sikking give an example of successful advocacy campaign that helped to banish the practice of foot binding in China. At the core of such networks is information exchange and some main characteristics are values or principled ideas, the idea that individuals can make a difference, the creative use of information, and the use of sophisticated strategies to influence the decision-makers (p.2)

Garrett (2006) brings out a trend of ‘movement entrepreneurs’. These are individuals who act being motivated by individual grievances and they rely on their own skills in conducting the activities (p. 15).

LDI has some characteristics of social movements, like the presence of an informal network that works toward change oriented goals. It also has temporal continuity and it unites different actors for a common cause. What separates LDI from above defined social movements is that instead of protesting against something, they try to unite different parts of society to do something good for the environment together. As mentioned earlier, the movement grew from a citizen initiative, where a few concerned citizens acted on a grievance and used their expertise in order to reach the aims of the project. In that sense, LDI is entrepreneurial as Garrett (2006) put it. However, in order to sustain the global network, more organized effort is needed.

2.5. Role of media in earlier campaigns

A secondary data analysis was made to give guidance for creating the survey and in-depth interviews. Three campaigns were looked at based on the final reports available on the LDI website: Estonia 2008, Slovenia 2010 and Brazil 2011. Both Estonian and Slovenian
campaigns were highly successful in mobilizing the wider public to clean-up illegal waste. In Slovenia, 13% of the population came out on the day of the campaign. What was common with those campaigns was the professional planning of PR and media campaigns and the intense publicity in traditional media. Slovenia also organized promotional and professional events (round tables in local municipalities, eco-tours, a fashion show) to raise awareness and to mobilize. The campaign in Rio de Janeiro in 2011 had fewer participants. The team organized a promotional campaign with the help of an advertising agency. Digital media channels like websites, blogs and social media had the main responsibility to give information. The clean-up day had a low participation level and according to the report, a strike mobilized the media attention and the clean-up was not covered so much.

The secondary data shows that wide coverage on mass media is an effective way to mobilize the wider public. Good relationships with journalists are also important. The local newspapers have an important role in mobilizing locally. The reports show that in order to reach a wide audience and organize a huge country wide clean-up, all channels should be used efficiently and according to the Slovenian report, for engaging a large number of people, extra local approach should be taken by encouraging them to participate close to their homes.

This chapter covered the case of Let’s Do It! by describing its evolution from a local campaign to a global movement. The issue of defining the movement and some preliminary assumptions about the role of media in mobilizing for the campaigns were also covered. According to the secondary data, all communication channels need to be used efficiently to mobilize a large amount of people for clean-ups and the traditional media in the form of TV, radio and newspapers are still very important in reaching all the members of society. The next chapter reviews the literature in the areas of media and activism, campaigns and mobilization. An overview of previous studies in the area of grassroots mobilization and media is also done.
3. Literature review and theory

The objective of this chapter is to explore the role of media in the work of grassroots’ movements. The chapter is divided into four parts and is structured accordingly: the first part defines campaigns and describes the issue of choosing the right channels for effective communication. Also, different modes of mobilization and the issue of resources are brought up. The second part is about media and activism; it takes up traditional media and the new media. The third part lists some empirical studies that have been conducted in the framework of grassroots movements and their media use and about the mobilization for collective action. Finally, the notions of glocalization and global civil society are discussed.

3.1. Collective action and campaigns

3.1.1. Changes in collective action

Collective action is broadly defined as an action that is performed by individuals or groups in purpose of collective good (Bimber et al. 2005, Postmes and Brunstig 2002). There are various forms of collective action: it could be an interest group, military alliance, social movement, riots, rock concerts, gangs and so forth (Bimber et al. 2005; Snow et al. 2004). Bimber et al. (2005) describe two main characteristics of collective action based on traditional theory by Mancur Olson, published in 1965. According to that theory, the private and the public sphere are separate units that have well defined and rigid borders. The first characteristic is the issue of “free riding” according to which individuals decide if they take part of making collective good or just reap the benefits of others’ work. The second problem in crossing the borders between the private and the public is the reliance on formal organization in order to overcome communicative and organizational obstacles. The authors argue that with the development of communication technologies and especially of digital media, new forms of collective action have emerged and traditional theories should be revised. Bimber et al. (2005) therefore reframe collective action as a “set of communication processes involving the crossing of boundaries between public and private life” (p. 367). The authors conclude that information and communication technologies have drastically decreased the need for formal organizations in coordinating collective action and the spatial notion of the public sphere has lost some of its influence as the new public sphere is rather formed around common interests. In that sense, the new technologies make the barrier between the private and public sphere more easily crossable (Bimber el al. 2005).
Bennett and Segerberg (2012) take the analysis of collective action in contemporary environment to another level and propose two logics of connective action: logic of collective action and logic of connective action. The first logic has traditional character with high level of organizational resources and collective identity formation. The use of digital media aids the coordination process but does not change the core dynamics of the logic. The second, logic of connective action is based on personalized content sharing across media networks (p. 739). The main characteristic of such digitally networked actions is that the organization of action is more personalized even though the issues and grievances are the same as in traditional actions. In such cases, participation is based on rather personal expression than group identity. Formal organizations loose grip on individuals and group ties are replaced by weak tie social networks that coordinate themselves through social media (Ibid., p. 748). This kind of connective action, based on digital media, allows persons to find suitable ways to engage with issues on- and offline (Bennett and Segerberg 2012)

Bennett and Segerberg (2012) describe two main patterns for connective action. These logics of action may co-occur or have hybrid forms. The first pattern appears when action is coordinated behind the scenes by established organizations or networks. The organizations do not brand the action as theirs but instead use personalized messages. In the second case, technology platforms and application take the role of established organizations and the information is shared through social media, email lists and other online coordinating platforms (p. 756).

The authors conclude that such type of digitally networked actions have been larger, scaled up quicker and are more flexible in tracking moving political targets and in bridging issues. The logic of connective action has a dynamic of its own and the challenge is to understand when digitally networked action becomes chaotic and unproductive and when it becomes sustainable and logical (Bennett and Segerberg 2012, pp. 760-61).

3.1.2. Environmental communication and campaigns

Our knowledge about “the environment” comes from the media (Anderson 1997; Hansen 2009; Milstein 2009). According to Anders Hansen (2009), media influences how we see, perceive and value the environment on a personal level, but also in society in general. Earlier
environmental decision-making was based on science, now it is strongly influenced by the public opinion. Hansen adds that communication has become central for environmental issues and that environmental communication has become a significant field in media and communication research (Hansen 2009, p. 4). Therefore, in order to inform wider audiences about environmental issues and to influence them to take action, effective communication strategies are crucial. One option for environmental groups to increase the public awareness is to organize campaigns. Effective campaigns are capable to mobilize large amounts of participants, but at the same time it is resource demanding for the activists.

Cox (2010) defines advocacy campaigns as a strategic course of action, involving communication that is undertaken for specific purpose in which environmental groups act as intermediaries between science and the public, the media and lawmakers (p. 226). Advocacy campaigns pursue three communication tasks: create support, mobilize the support, and develop strategies to influence the decision makers (p. 226-232). Public communication campaigns on the other hand aim to inform, persuade or motivate behavior changes in a relatively well defined and large audience (Windahl, Signitzer and Olson 1992, p. 101). Such campaigns can deal with a wide area of issues like family planning, health behavior, traffic safety, or energy saving and have a specific target audience or the whole population. According to Bruhn Jensen (2002), media should be studied as planned means of communication and coordination and in that sense media acts like ‘vehicles of ‘campaigns’ to inform, persuade or mobilize a mass public’ (p. 147).

According to Keck and Sikkink (1998) campaigns are ‘processes of issue construction’ where activists identify a problem, specify a cause and propose a solution with the goal of producing procedural, substantive, and normative change in the problem area (p. 8).

The main features of a campaign are (Cox 2010, Windahl, Signitzer and Olson 1992):
1. A campaign is purposeful
2. Aimed at a large audience
3. Has a more or less specifically defined time limit
4. A campaign involves an organized set of communication activities.

Relying on earlier theories about communication campaigns, Windahl, Signitzer and Olson (1992) list factors that contribute to campaign success:
1. *The role of mass media* in creating awareness and stimulating participation. Behavioral change is unlikely.

2. *The role of interpersonal communication*, especially through peer groups and social networks it is important for creating and maintaining behavioral change.

3. *Characteristics of source or medium*. Is the source credible?

4. *Formative evaluation*. If campaign goals and messages fit with media habits, audience predispositions and availability of resources.

5. *Campaign appeals*. Campaigns should be specific rather than general in order to appeal to the values of individuals.


7. *Timeliness, compatibility and accessibility*. Messages should be adapted to the context: timely and culturally acceptable, channels available for the audience (p. 102).

The abovementioned factors show that grassroots activists have to consider both the message and the channel when organizing a communication campaign: what to communicate and how. As this study is more concerned with the issue of ‘how’, it is relevant to bring up the criteria for choosing the channels for communication. According to Hornik (referenced by Windahl, Signitzer and Olson 1992), the critical issue in channel effectiveness is its combined measure of reach (exposure) and effects (changes in behavior and knowledge). However, there are other criteria to keep in mind:

1. *Cost*.

2. *Managerial feasibility*. This refers to administrative practicality of either choosing a channel that is already available or easier to administer compared to some other option that might be more effective but requires additional resources.

3. *Sustainability*. Which channels are best sustained over time in terms of recurring costs, motivation of talent and/or volunteers and enthusiasm (pp. 152-53).

Hornik stresses that when planning the communication, situational conditions have to be taken into account. For example, although mass media is effective for raising awareness, there might be no funds for a campaign, so other alternatives have to be considered (Windahl, Signitzer and Olson 1992). Organizing successful campaigns to mobilize a large amount of people craves a range of resources from activists and careful strategic planning. The next part takes up the issues of resources and mobilization.
3.1.3. Resources and mobilization

According to Della Porta (2014), earlier social movement studies have been based on the assumption that the strength of the mobilization is influenced by the presence of ‘mobilizable resources’ for example in the form of certain social groups. Nowadays when people are not so much defined by their place in society, the strength of the mobilizing might be weakened as individualized citizens are less interested in the common good of the society (Della Porta 2014, p. 269, 270).

In order for grassroots movements to mobilize successfully for action, several types of resources are needed. Della Porta and Diani (1999) argue that the capacity of mobilization depends on available material and non-material resources and from the way social movements are able to use them (p. 8).

Edwards and McCarthy (2004) lists a number of resource types:

- **Moral resources.** These are legitimacy, solidary support, sympathetic support, celebrity. Such resources tend to originate outside social movement or social movement organization.

- **Cultural resources.** Knowledge related resources like tactical repertoires (how to do things), organizational templates, technical or strategic know-how.

- **Social-organizational resources.** Their main benefit is to gain access to other resources. It can be about recruiting volunteers through personal social networks or other connections.

- **Human resources.** Under this category belong labor, experience, skills, expertise and leadership. Also value-added components like experience, savvy, skills, expertise (human capital). Enhancement of the movement depends on how expertise fits the movement’s needs.

- **Material resources.** These kinds of resources are financial and physical capital; including money, property, office space, equipment and supplies (pp. 125-128).
Mobilization can shortly be defined as “the process by which candidates, parties, activists and groups induce other people to participate” (Enjolras, Steen-Johnsen and Wollebaek 2013, p. 894). Klandermans (2004) names mobilization as “the marketing mechanism of the social movement domain” and therefore the effectiveness of mobilization is connected to the effectiveness of (persuasive) communication, the influence of social networks, and the perceived costs and benefits of participation (p.361). A member of the public taking part in a collective action is sometimes a result of a lengthy process of mobilization (Ibid. p.369).

In case of social movement mobilization, one can talk about two kinds of mobilization, consensus mobilization and action mobilization (Klandermans 2004; Edwards and McCarthy 2004). Consensus mobilization is about raising awareness and making bystanders and opponents support the goals of the movement, action mobilization is about getting the supporters to take part in the action and possibly convince them to stay on as volunteers (Klandermans 2004). Action mobilization is constrained by the results of consensus mobilization (Ibid. p. 270). In other words, consensus mobilization is about convincing people to support the ideas of the movement and action mobilization is about convincing them to participate in the action. In the context of LDI, those who already know the dangers of illegal waste are possibly mobilized differently from those who are not conscious about the problem. In the latter case, in order to get those people out to pick trash, first they need to be convinced in the necessity of doing so.

There are also different forms of participation that play a role in the mobilization process. The main participation dimensions are time and effort. For example, giving money to charity and signing a petition crave a small amount of time and effort but actions like site occupation and being a member of coordinators are riskier and take more time (Klandermans 2004, p.360). It is easier to mobilize a large number of supporters for a one time activity than for an ongoing commitment like managing coordination of that activity (Edwards and McCarthy 2004, p. 141).

In order for movements to create a social change, Cammaerts (2007) lists six strategic challenges that were originally proposed by Doug McAdam and adds that different media impact in different ways on each of these strategic aims. First two challenges are about recruiting core activists and sustaining the organization. The other four are more outward
oriented: getting mass media attention; mobilizing beyond; overcoming social control and possible repression; and shaping state action (p. 272).

***

This section covered some issues about collective action and mobilization. Older theories about collective action stressed the important role of the formal organization in coordinating the activities. As collective action was seen as ‘a set of communication processes’ by Bimber et al. (2005), the development of communication technologies challenges the need of formal organizations and allows more flexible forms of coordination, going as far as the technology acting as an organizational infrastructure to connect distant individuals for the same cause by using personalized messages on social media platforms (Bennett and Segerberg 2012).

Illegal waste is a serious problem that affects individual people, the environment and societies. It is also a problem that is directly connected to people’s consumption behavior and that has not been given the same urgency by the media as climate change. To bring the problem to the public eye and to promote a behavior change, LDI needs to communicate strategically and social media based connective action (Bennett and Segerberg 2012) might not suffice. In the case where the public has to be convinced prior to their mobilizing, communication campaign is a relevant strategy. However, organizing campaigns is resource demanding and activists need to use available channels effectively. The new media opens some doors for the activists to reach their target audience more easily but the question remains if online communication is enough for the social change to happen offline.

As a further development for the abovementioned problem of mobilization online, the next chapter will discuss the role of media in grassroots activism. Although there is a body of research about how the new communication technologies have affected the collective action mobilization, the secondary data about LDIs earlier campaigns suggest that the mass media still have an important role in awareness building among the general public and the access to those channels is crucial for successful clean-up campaigns. Therefore the roles of both, traditional and new media are covered.
3.2. Media and activism

3.2.1. Traditional media and activism

Alison Anderson gives a brief historical overview of the movement-media relationship development in her book ‘Media, culture and the environment’ (1997). She says that the first movements in the early 19th century produced their own publicity and didn't use the benefit of the modern mass media. Anti-slavery campaigners and early evangelical associations published their own newsletters as mainstream newspaper had different agendas, like political propaganda and business news. Movements such as for workers’ rights in Britain depended on the publicity by underground radical press. Late 19th century, with the rise of mass-circulated newspapers, the communication strategies of protest organizations were transformed. It was not sufficient anymore to rely solely on their own publications and they had to try to get their message through to wider audience through mainstream mass-media. Television broadcasting gave a new power to protest movement. The symbolic power of mass demonstration captured the visual requirements of television news and communication between general public and the movement organizations’ leaders was increasingly relayed through the mass media. Social movements very early on developed media-conscious strategies and even created organizational roles for handling problems of communication (Anderson 1997, p. 81-83).

Transnational movements against neo-liberal globalization emerged during the 1990’s. They took the media adaptation of new social movements to another level with their professionalism in public relations. They attract media's attention through the staging of spectacular actions. Most of the communication takes place in the internet where they have also created alternative worldwide news services like Indymedia (Rucht 2004, p. 39-55).

Cammaerts (2007) argues that although the Internet provides for activists a low cost and accessible ways to mobilize for direct action, to distribute and share information, to organize internally and form coalitions with other groups, it should be seen as a part of a wider communication strategy that involves other media and ways to spread the message and reach the goals (p. 270). Getting positive attention in traditional media is important for reaching the wider public that are not yet convinced with movement ideas as the internet acts more like a
pull-medium, a channel for those who are already interested and informed and are looking for more information (Ibid. p. 270, 271).

Public awareness campaigns are an important way for activists to educate the public and to influence the elite. Visibility in mass media influences the public opinion and the attitude of decision makers and for gathering wider support, fine-tuned media strategies are crucial (Anderson 1997, p. 40). According to Edwards and McCarthy (2004), such “public education” campaigns are the most labor and capital intensive techniques for activists. The more resources that are available to the movement and the more it decides to invest, the more attention the movement gets. Nevertheless the outcomes of such mobilization are nonproprietary resources and cannot be obtained and kept by the movement (p. 140).

Rucht (2004) adds that such movements that are outwards oriented and mobilize in large numbers, need media visibility to survive. He says that if outward oriented movements fail to get visibility, they tend to shrink, fall apart or to radicalize (Rucht 2004, p. 32). Those who learn the rules of mass media have better chance to get attention as mass media has a different relationship with their audience. Its goal is to attract as many people as possible and no support of message is needed. Mass media is neither engaged in partisan struggle nor has a distinct opponent. It has clear measures of success (ratings, profit) and high selectivity in what gets published (Rucht 2004, p. 34). In other words, media has a different logic from the one of the movements and although both, movements and the media, struggle for attention and want to maximize their outreach, for the social movement, the content of message is the priority but for the media it is the opposite, the attention comes first, content of the message is not so important. Therefore, good relations with journalists are needed to get favorable coverage but as media has their own rules, movements do not have so much power over the message as they do on the internet. In that sense, the internet provides for grassroots activists an alternative information channel that gives control over the message and eliminates the filtering attribute that is common for mainstream media (Min and Kim 2012; Cammaerts 2007).

Garrett (2006) suggests that sometimes the absence of gatekeeping function is not the best solution as the removal of filters brings along the problem of information overload and the issue of trust. In latter case fabricated facts could be as common as well researched claims (p.22). Garrett adds that with the lowered cost for publication the competition for audience
increases and therefore activists may want to use digital media to gain access to other media outlets (Ibid.) “The passage from desktop to television screen”- journalists look for story ideas and information and crating pathways for information to flow from micro media to mass media (Bennett 2004). Della Porta (2006) is skeptical as media likes mainly stories about security issues and violence and the agenda of movements might get lost in cyberspace. According to Bennett (2005), it is easier for established organizations to reach mass media and the capacity to join public discussion is a goal for many activists (p. 220).

3.2.2. New media and activism

This section discusses the role of the new media in collective action. There are impressive amounts of studies about digital media and its impact on civic engagement. The new media has a capability to empower activists and at the same time it has some negative effects. The majority of scholars agree that information and communication technologies will not replace personal ties and that technology itself is not transformative but the way people put it to use (Wellman 2002; Bennett 2003a; Garrett 2006). Citizens and their willingness and capacity make the social change happen, not the media (Cammaerts 2007, p. 266).

It is important to start with the assumption that generalization about media and collective action is difficult as the media patterns and coverage varies from issue to issue and between different eras of collective action (Bennett 2003b). However, Bennett (2003b) brings out three generalizations that can be made about digital communication channels and social movements: firstly, they are needed for sustaining the networks by facilitating information exchange, helping to coordinate actions and to preserve knowledge about the common cause. Secondly, they facilitate the global scale of collective action. Finally, digital media lowers the cost of communication.

Going from generalizations to specifics, there is a number of functions that the Internet and other information and communication technologies have in the context of citizen engagement.

- Supports offline action. Organizing, mobilizing and transnationalization are done easier online (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010).
- *Creates new modes of action*. Van Laer and Van Aelst (2010) call these "internet-based" actions because these forms exist only because of the Internet. Examples of such actions are online petitions, email bombings, virtual sit-ins, hacktivism (p. 1148).

- ‘*Mesomobilization*’. Groups and organizations try to coordinate and integrate other groups to one collective action. (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010, p. 1154).

- Diffusing communication and mobilization efforts (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010, p. 1146) and overcoming barriers of space and time (Della Porta and Mosca 2005) *gives actions more transnational character*.

- *Strengthening of public sphere* by facilitating anti-hegemonic discussions (Cammaerts 2007, p. 270). Postmes and Brunsting (2002) add that less powerful groups have an opportunity to express their opinions without sanctions (p. 294).

- *Distribute and share alternative information* (Cammaerts 2007). Computer mediated communication gives direct contact with the public (Della Porta and Mosca 2005) and acts as mass communication medium to reach global audiences (Postmes and Brunsting 2002, p. 293). According to Della Porta and Mosca (2005) earlier social movements’ communication was self-made and inward oriented and now the border between internal and external communication is easily crossable and also facilitates both.

- Empowerment by having a *control over the messages and self-representation* (Cammaerts 2007, p 270)

- ‘Networking’ and *internal communication* between dispersed activists (Cammaerts 2007, p. 270). Della Porta and Mosca (2005) add the characteristics of cheap and fast to the internal communication through the Internet.

- Pull sympathizers from periphery to core (Cammaerts 2007, p. 277). That means that the already convinced have more chances to get involved in collective action. In that way *mobilization becomes easier* (Della Porta and Mosca 2005).

- Favors *flexible organizational models* (Della Porta and Mosca 2005). The need for formal organizations for coordinating an action becomes irrelevant and new groups and identities are more easily formed (Postmes and Brunsting 2002). Della Porta and Mosca (2005) argue that the movements appear in an organizational form of networks
and the Internet is not only technology but also a communication media and material infrastructure of such networks (p. 169).

Van Laer and Van Aelst (2010) stress that even though the new media has impacted the area of grassroots activism, Internet-based actions and tactics are not replacing traditional forms of action but rather complementing them. They also suggest that the Internet has not made social movements more powerful, with the power shift brought by globalization; digital communication channels help movements to keep up with the changes and operate more globally (p. 1164).

**Weak ties**

Wellman (2002) asserts that with growing use of personalized media we are witnessing the rise of networked individualism, meaning that people are switching between ties and networks and connect rather person-to-person as the physical place becomes less important. Networking competence and owning a supportive network (both online and offline) becomes an important resource. The downside of such networked individualism might be the loss of strong ties of community that provides a sense of belonging, but the gains are increased diversity of opportunity, wider scope for individual agency and self-identification (Wellman 2002, p. 5).

Such connection by interest, rather than place is called weak ties (Kavanaugh et al. 2005). That means that a person can belong to several social groups and those groups do not need to be bound to the person’s proximity. Kavanaugh et al. (2005) argue that the Internet increases the weak ties between different social groups and through the online knowledge sharing, such weak ties can be more efficient for collective action mobilization than strong ties and people who have multiple belongings act like bridges between the groups (p. 120, 121).

Postmes and Brunsting (2002) utter a paradox of the computer mediated communication: “how can a medium that isolates the individual inspire the collective?” (p. 294). Their explanation is that people internalize aspects of their social world and the created social identities are used even in isolation. The authors are quite optimistic about the weak ties that such isolated form of communication takes. They say that group ties are reinforced because the attention to individual differences in the group is reduced by anonymity and isolation.
Postmes and Brunsting (2002) argue that online communication can have the same norms and strong sense of identity and purpose that other contexts of interaction have.

In the context of collective action, Van Laer and Van Aelst (2010) are not so enthusiastic about the weak ties that internet-based activism creates. There is a problem of the permanent engagement as activists have become ‘users’ rather than ‘members’ by switching between the causes and moving on after supporting an action (p. 1163). Bennett and Segerberg (2012) also bring up the issue of commitment and sustainability to the network when it is easy to opt in and out of the movement (p. 773).

Cammaerts (2007) adds that the Internet is a non-intrusive medium where people can choose the level of involvement and balance the activities with the rest of their everyday life. According to Cammaerts, such online weak ties should be converted to strong ties and in that case the media is non-essential as the changing of people’s hearts and minds and the commitment to create the social change are equally important to good communication strategies (Cammaerts 2007, p. 282).

Lance Bennett (2005) offers the term ‘social technology’ which means applications of communication technologies where there is “social values inscribed in applications of technology”. Social technologies are about combining dense interpersonal communication both online and offline and that it is what makes social movements sustainable. Trust, credibility and commitment are rather achieved on an individual level than the collective and the success is achieved by the capacity to easily move between online and offline relationships (p. 203).

**Social media**

Related to Bennett’s (2005) social technologies, the rise of social media with its interactivity, multimodality and the capacity of spreading information have given another dimension to networked activism. Bennett and Segerberg (2011) argue that the centrality of communication and personalization of communication and messages has changed the logic of collective action. As described earlier in the chapter, they propose a new logic. The logic of connective action, where technology platforms and communication applications take the role of
coordinating organizations and the information travels through personal accounts and collective action becomes more like personal expression rather than sharing a collective identity (p. 742).

Recent wave of protests in Arab countries and also the ‘occupy’ movement has intensified the discussion about the role of social movement in mobilization for political action. Enjolras, Steen-Johnsen and Wollebaek (2013) and Anduiza, Cristancho and Sabucedo (2014) study how social media is used for mobilization and how it affects the offline participation. The studies look at two different demonstrations and in the first case of Rose Marches in Norway, the authors find that social media acts as an alternative mobilizing structure alongside other channels like mainstream media, organizational affiliations and personal contacts (Enjolras, Steen-Johnsen and Wollebaek 2013). In the case of 15M protests in Spain, Anduiza, Cristancho and Sabucedo (2014) tested the theory of connective action and found that traditional organizations and mainstream media indeed are no longer a necessary condition for mobilizing large amount of people for protests. Both of the aforementioned studies found a common characteristic that social media mobilize different kind of people as other channels do. Those who get activated through social media are often young people who are highly educated but have lower socioeconomic status (Enjolras, Steen-Johnsen and Wollebaek 2013) and are less organizationally embedded and are previously politically inactive (Anduiza, Cristancho and Sabucedo 2014).

Bennett and Segerberg (2012) studied two protest networks in the London G20 summit in 2009 and found that the network that provided more chances for personalized content and interactivity was more stable and had more participants. Some ways for personalizing are personalized message framing that allows the customization of issues and the opportunity for interactivity so that individual messages could be shared in the network. Such way of communication puts digital media in the center of conducting collective action and the mobilization capacity moves from organizations to individuals (p. 772). As a downside the authors mention the problem of commitment and that organizations lose control over the communication and action (p. 773). Bennett and Segerberg (2012) conclude that their study shows that successful collective action is possible without the emphasis of formal organization and mass media.
Castells (2007) calls this kind of personalized communication ‘mass self-communication’. It is mass communication as it reaches a global audience; it is multimodal, self-generated in content, self-directed in emission and self-selected by reception. The medium does not determine the content and effectiveness of its messages, rather it is about the diversity and the largely autonomous origin of most communication flows that construct and reconstruct global and local production of meaning in the public mind (p. 248). As media has become a place where power is decided, the mass self-communication movements can enter the space more easily (Castells 2007).

The studies about social media and mobilization bring out some affordances that differentiate social networking platforms from other online communication forms. Social media allows new forms of communication through the establishment of a social network structure and facilitating interaction within and between such networks (Enjolras, Steen-Johnsen and Wollebaek 2013, p. 891). Online social media also eases information diffusion and recruitment, changes organizational dynamics and encourages massive sharing of experience between loosely coupled individuals to bring about social change (Anduiza, Cristancho and Sabucedo 2014). Christensen (2011) adds that social media has made it possible to present alternative discourses, separate of those in power to local and global audiences. The author asserts that among all the techno-utopian (‘Twitter revolutions’) and –dystopian (‘slacktivism’) views on social media and mobilization, there is a need to address the question of balancing the relation between the affordances of social media and the materiality of the offline world (Christensen 2011).

Lindgren (2013) looks at Twitter use during protests in Libya and discusses about potentials and limitations of social media as a tool for activists. He analyses the expressions ‘Twitter revolution’ and ‘Facebook revolution’ and finds that such claims are too techno-deterministic (p. 217). Lindgren (2013) argues that social media was not a driving force for social change but instead the political situation in the country that made the revolution happen. The main problem with social media as a tool for activism and mobilization is the fact that such platforms are owned by corporations that can monitor or censor users or even block their usage. Another problem is the issue of “slacktivism” and the strength of engagement (p. 207). An example of slacktivism could be a sharing of a viral video in social media without further looking into the represented problem or doing anything else about it. However, social media provides a tool for people to promote their causes, organize actions and to distribute
alternative information that is not influenced by traditional media or governmental institutions. That means that people have an opportunity to use their own voice to talk about grievances and self-organize for collective actions (Lindgren 2013, p. 207, 218).

**Negative effects of the new media**

The Internet and other forms of personalized communication tools offer considerable opportunities for coordinating collective action across groups and national borders. However there are also some disempowering aspects that need to be considered when analyzing digital media as a universal tool for social movement mobilization.

Van Laer (2010) compares activists using internet and not using internet for an upcoming protest in Belgium and finds that the activists differ in several aspects: socio-demographically, motivationally, politically and organizationally. As a result he brings out some issues connected to online activism.

The main issue is that digital media reinforces social inequalities that are existing offline. Van Laer (2010) calls online activists ‘super-activists’: they are highly educated, experienced and have several engagements (p. 405). Those movements that have a louder voice get more attention and socially marginal groups might not be heard.

Another problem that was also brought up earlier is the strength of commitment in online activism. Van Laer (2010) argues that there are large amounts of studies about how digital media has impacted mobilization and coordination in collective action but there is also a need to study the media use on a micro-level; how activists use the tools to get information and to be mobilized. Della Porta and Mosca (2005) add that online activism could become low-cost but low-effect alternative to offline actions.

The internet use is also connected to personal backgrounds belonging to organizations and networks and motivation. People might have the access to technology and the skills, but no motivation to use it for civic engagement. Motivation on the other hand is not dependent on the technology (Van Laer 2010).
Diani (1999) argues that the internet makes existing bonds stronger, but he is skeptical if it can create brand new social ties where there were none:

“The potential to build “virtual communities” is higher among sympathizers of movement organizations who act mostly on a professional basis and on behalf of causes which have a vast resonance among the public opinion. By contrast, participatory movement organizations - usually the most radical - are more dependent upon direct, face-to-face interactions, and this is likely to result in “virtual extensions” when computer mediated communication is adopted.” (Diani 1999, p 13).

Wright (2004) describes a number of aspects that can hinder the effectiveness of Internet use for social movement activists. First, the relation between the time and energy invested in the 'virtual' world compared to the activity in the 'real' world. This can create situations in which 'information circulates endlessly between computers without being put back into a human context'.

Secondly, excessive use of the Internet can undermine traditional forms of interaction. He brings an example that Internet isolates activists in front of their monitors and keeps them off the streets and that many relationships made online will by their nature remain superficial.

Thirdly, there is a danger of information overload. When the amount of information grows, the noise can overshadow the message. There is two types of overload, one of excess volume and the one where information is chaotically organized that it becomes useless. Too much information can be confusing and paralyzing and can block taking an effective action. That also serves to strengthen the existing relations of power.

Fourthly, any discussion of global activism and the Internet raises questions about the distribution of resources between the North and the South.

Fifthly, there is the question of knowledge management in social movements and how to keep it alive through low period of activity.

Finally there is the question about the nature of information itself. Being informed implies relationships of trust and if trust can be established 'through the screen'. Enormous quantities of
information available online may blind activists to the knowledge and wisdom available from face-to-face encounters (p.81-89).

***

This section brought out both possibilities and limitations of the traditional and new media in grassroots activism to get a better understanding about the complexity of communication and mobilization for social change. However, as stated already in the beginning of this chapter, generalizations about movements and media are impossible, as in different contexts, communication technologies also give different effects (Garrett 2006, p. 24).

Although new media offers a considerable alternative for coordinating collective action by lowering the cost of communication; making the communication fast and global and by facilitating the coordinating of activities, traditional media is still important for influencing public opinion and decision makers. Also, visibility in mass media is crucial for the outward oriented movements to give trustworthiness for the cause and for helping to reach different segments of the audience compared to the Internet. Gatekeeping, sensationalism and limited access of traditional media are serious problems for movements and therefore professionalism in communication and good relationships with journalists are necessary which in turn craves resources not all activists have.

This chapter lists a number of opportunities that the internet provides for grassroots movements. At the same time there are some downsides to consider, for example the unequal access to technology, information overload, sustainability of the movements and the trustworthiness of information.

An important characteristic of the new media is that it creates weak tie networks by connecting individuals by interests rather than by place. Weak ties create new opportunities for collective action but the general opinion of scholars is that strong ties between the individuals are needed for greater commitment and the sustainability of the movement/action. Bennett (2005) proposed a suitable concept of ‘social technologies’ which refers to dense interpersonal relationships both online and offline to create better trust and sustainability in movements.
Social media platforms offer activists new opportunities to interact and to coordinate. Keeping in mind the context of this study, the mobilizing power of social media was covered. The studies found that depending on the situation, social media can act as an additional channel for mobilization or in some cases even as the main channel. The common aspect that emerged was that social media mobilizes different type of people compared to other channels: generally young people with lesser means who are usually not politically active. The personalized content and interactivity of the social media gives also more stability and more participants to movements and it also brings the mobilization from an organizational to an individual level. The problem with social media is however similar to the new media in general – the issue of commitment and sustainability.

The next section covers some studies made about movement’s media use and mobilization.

3.3. Previous studies about mobilization and movements’ use of media

As this study is mainly concerned with grassroots communication and mobilization, studies presented in this section are describing those issues. The section starts with a study about a campaign in the Let’s Do It! movement, gives a few examples of media use and then looks at mobilization. According to the studies, those mobilized through internet tend to come to the events alone and mobilization is medium specific: online mobilization is more effective for online action and offline mobilization impacts mostly offline events.

Cardoso, Boudreau, and Carvalho (2013) conducted a case study about “Let’s Do It! Portugal” and their trash-picking campaign organized by the citizens in 2009. The aim was to study the role of information and communication technologies throughout organizing a nationwide campaign that had an impact offline. The theoretical framework for the study was built up on the theories of collective action and online communities.

The research is still in progress but the preliminary results indicate that technologies had a different role in the different stages of organization. The authors identified four phases of organization (building structure, building support, scaling and formalizing) and found that
ICTs play different roles in different phases and that the technologies were connected to underlying logic of action that are described by Bennett and Segerberg (2011).

Min and Kim (2012) apply uses and gratification and niche theory to find out how issue advocacy groups choose media and communication technologies in their work. The results show that e-mails and websites were perceived to be superior to traditional media. Authors conclude that new media offers greater gratifications: cost-effectiveness, high interactivity and information spreading without filtering. At the same time they say that choice of media is important as different resources give different level of publicity and mobilizing possibilities increase with access to greater range of media technologies.

Laura Stein (2009) investigates how US-based social movement organizations use the web in their everyday work. According to Stein, studies mostly highlight the transnational uses of internet and neglect the aspect how social movement organizations actually use internet and utilize this communication media to produce results.

Stein offers a typology for social movement communication: it provides information, assists action and mobilization, promotes interaction and dialog, makes lateral linkages, serves as an outlet for creative expression, and promotes fundraising and resource generation (p. 752-53). Stein made a survey to study a number of social movement organization websites to check the usage of abovementioned typologies. The results showed that the majority of SMOs were not using their websites to the full potential. The reasons for not utilizing the potential of technology were according to the author connected to organizational goals, strategies and objectives, organizational resources and sharing resources with other organizations (p. 767).

Fisher and Boekkooi (2010) studied mobilizing through internet for domestic collective action. They conducted an oral survey with participants on the national day of climate action “Step it up”. The findings show that a large amount of people were mobilized through the Internet but the profile of those people was different from those who were mobilized through the personal or organizational networks. Participants who heard about the action through mediated channels were more likely to come to the event alone. The findings suggest that with the increasing role of the Internet in communication on the movement level and on the personal level, the collective action will also change. Internet mobilizes mostly isolated individuals who are not personally connected to other participants in the action and have
instead a high internal motivation. The authors suggest that mobilization through computer mediated channels has an effect to nature of participation itself and it remains to be seen if those who come to the events alone remain isolated or connect to the other participants and with a wider network.

Fisher and Boekkooi (2010) agree with the theory about the weak ties and with the assumption that the Internet facilitates new connections between people with similar interests and they add that the challenge is to integrate disconnected activists into a sustained movement. Therefore future research should concern if those people mobilized by Internet stay involved or get more involved or if it is just a one-time thing.

Vissers et al. (2012) made an experiment to compare the effects on participation in the cases of online and offline mobilization. The results show that the mobilization is medium-specific. That means web-based mobilization had an effect on online participation and face-to-face mobilization impacted off-line participation. The authors offer reasons for the effects being medium specific. Firstly there is the technical reason that online action requires less effort when a person is already online and receives the mobilization message. In other words, participation is just a mouse click away (p. 153). Offline participation requires more effort and that adds barriers for actual participation. Other reasons for medium-specific mobilization are the structural differences between the forms of participation which are connected to participants’ background, Internet skills and political identity. Vissers et al. (2012) also found that although web-based mobilization boosts Internet-based activism, it does not boost offline activism which also points to the risk that online mobilization only strengthens some forms of participation online and does not change the offline behavior. The authors suggest that such finding might be worrying for some as online forms of actions are considered less powerful and unsustainable (p. 164).

Nielsen (2011) challenges the important role of social media in mobilizing in his study of two congressional campaigns in USA. The study focuses on the internet tools used in mobilizing volunteers for the campaigns. The results show that mundane internet tools (email, search engines) were more integrated into mobilizing than emerging tools (social networking) and specialized tools (webpages). The author argues that the campaigns are not only on the web, but internet is in them too. He suggests that the internet has a mobilizing potential but we know little what tools are involved in actual mobilizing practices and what it means.
The presented studies in this section confirm the literature overview of the previous section on the growing importance of the new media and communication technologies in the work of grassroots movements. In addition to the previous finding that social media mobilizes mainly young previously politically inactive people, some other aspects of online mobilization emerged: internet mobilization brings together isolated individuals who tend to come to the events alone; online mobilization is medium specific in a sense that it is more efficient for online action; e-mails and websites are perceived superior to other modes of communication. On one side it is apparent that digital communication technologies play a crucial role in the coordination of collective action but on the other side, from the studies emerges a reoccurring question about how those technologies affect the commitment strength and movement sustainability. These are the issues that this study will discuss later in the findings as LDI is a movement that is planned to last for 5 years and communication is a vital part in holding the network together and finding new volunteers.

The next section gives an overview of the global aspect in grassroots activism. The digital media has made transnational coordinating easier and cheaper but at the same time locality is still important, especially what comes to environmental issues.

3.4. Glocalization of collective action

Globalization has made us more and more interconnected and the Internet has made the communication cheaper and faster which means that collective action beyond borders should be easier than before. Although Bimber et al. (2005) pointed out that the public sphere has shifted from a well-defined and spatial entity to a sphere of common values and ideas, locality and the national state still play an important role when it comes to civic activism. This section looks at the global-local relationship in grassroots activism and discusses the possibility for the global civil society and brings up the difference between local and global activists. In the context of this study, the role of glocalization is an important aspect to study as the global LDI movement grew out of one local initiative and within that global network the local activities still play a central role.
Roland Robertson (1995) has popularized the term glocalization. He discusses about the way which the local influences the global and vice versa: “Globalization as the compression of the world has involved and increasingly involves the creation and the incorporation of locality, processes which themselves largely shape in turn the compression of the world as a whole” (Robertson 1995, p. 40). Dobson (2003) is critical about the notion of globalization and insists on putting the asymmetry of globalization in the center of discussion. He argues that globalization enforces the master and slave relationship – a particular local (North) trying to enforce their interests globally.

Globalization and the development of information and communication technologies have brought up the discussion about the possibility of a global civil society. Smith and Wiest (2005) use Paul Wapner’s words to define global civil society, which broadly means that citizens organize themselves transnationally, outside the identity of their homeland by advancing shared agendas and coordinating political activities all over the world (p. 621). Smith and Wiest are skeptical about the global civil society being entirely global as in accessible to all the world’s citizens and that it represents the whole world (Ibid.). They conclude that although the rise of supranational institutions and growing global economy can lead to the decline of nation state, in reality the state still matters in what comes to giving individuals possibilities to be active transnationally (Smith and Wiest 2005, p.637). Castells (2008) describes trends that point towards a global civil society among which are the rise of NGOs that have global reach and goals, evolving of movements that aim to control the globalization and the rise of movements to influence public opinion. Castells stresses the global civil society’s dependence on media systems as through media one can influence the public’s mind and create change (Castells 2008, p. 90).

In the context of global activism, Cammaerts (2007) lists three types of transnationalization:

1. ‘Trans-international’ activism which is organized on transnational level and where the activists are dispersed internationally with the aim to bring local grassroots issues to the global level of governance. For example Transparency International.
2. ‘Trans-national’ activism with the examples of Indymedia, Greenpeace and Amnesty International, provides a transnational frame of reference but allows the local branches a relative independence. The local struggles link up with transnational agenda and vice versa.
3. ‘Glocal’ activism is more abstract form of transnationalization. In that case, transnational action-methods are imported, appropriated and adapted to the local contexts (p. 271).

With the evolution of communication technology, communities have become less dependent on the place. Wellman (2002) writes about transition from homogenous tight knit groups tied to the neighborhoods (“little boxes”) to networked individualism where people are connected to people with little regard to the place. In between are the “glocalized” networks, which are the combination of the aforementioned, where networks are sparsely-knit but in clusters and interaction goes from place-to-place. According to Wellman, globalization is a combination of intense local and extensive global interaction. Such transition makes it possible that communities are defined socially rather than spatially and they are about shared interests and not shared locality (Wellman 2002). Wellman (2002) adds that with networked individualism the proximity still matters although it is losing its dominance. Relationships are complex mixes of online and offline communication.

In the case of environmental movements, locality is still important and local campaigns prevail over transnational campaigns. According to Rootes (1999), people are aware of global problems but the most intense campaigning is still happening on the local level. Although such campaigns are place-specific, national media attention is crucial for gaining visibility. Therefore the effectiveness of local action is connected to the attention from outside. Rootes (1999) also argues that for the local activists, the main issue is about the defense of their habitat and as their identity is rooted in a sense of place, they refuse to become ‘rootless cosmopolitans’ (p.732). Besides the sense of the place, people are affected by the culture they come from, even when they try to think globally, in that sense thinking globally and acting locally becomes complicated (Rootes 2007, p. 304). Therefore ‘glocal’ activism (Cammaerts 2007) would work the best in campaigning for environmental issues.

The aforementioned remark about thinking globally and acting locally brings us back to the asymmetry of globalization and how it affects the environmental activism. Tomlinson (1999) refers to John Vidal who says that environmentalists are trying to embrace the local community action but as a whole, environmental movement has reinforced the globalist perspective where concern for the whole Earth equals with the concern about the lifestyle of the First World and the complex environmental problems are defined in global terms rather
than taking into account local culturally sensitive contexts. Therefore the idea of saving the planet might go to conflict with the interests of localism (Tomlinson 1999, pp 190-91).

This report is among other issues concerned with mobilizing volunteers to the local clean-up campaigns and also for the global coordination. Some authors have been interested in finding differences between local and transnational activists (for example Rootes 2007; Walgrave and Van Laer 2010). Rootes (2007) points out that global environmentalists are mostly middle-aged and highly educated (p. 291). Walgrave and Van Laer (2010) studied national and transnational activists participating on European and Belgian Social Forums in 2006 and found some more differences between them. After reviewing earlier studies they conclude some specifics that characterize transnational activism. Transnational activism requires higher commitment and the cost of participating is higher (p. 26). Activists are characterized by higher level of education, better connectedness and frequent travelling. Organizational embeddedness is according to Walgrave and Van Laer the main difference between local and transnational activists. Such embeddedness means that transnational activists are more connected to organizations: they get their information from there and they are mobilized through closed processes as opposed to national activists who mostly get their information from the mass media, friends and posters (Walgrave and Van Laer 2010, p. 34). Such results hint towards a professionalism of activism. Walgrave and Van Laer (2010) themselves conclude that “Transnational activism is simply national activism with more restrictions” (p. 37).

If Rootes (1999) argued that local activists refuse to become ‘rootless cosmopolitans’, then Tarrow (2005) talks instead about ‘rooted cosmopolitans’ (p. 237) who are needed for forming a transnational movement. Such people are ordinary citizens who have multiple belongings and flexible identities. They are rooted in local contexts but engage also transnationally and have a capacity to operate equally on both arenas (Tarrow 2005, p. 237-38).

Tomlinson (1999) offers a term ‘ethical glocalist’ to describe a transnational activist, suggesting that “cosmopolitans are ordinary people who need to experience the wider world touching their local life world and vice versa” (p. 198). He argues that cosmopolitan people need to be universalists and pluralists at the same time – citizens ability to make a change on a local level is dependent on their orientation towards the world and at the same time people
have this moral proximity which makes it hard to prioritize the concerns that are distant (Tomlinson 1999).

***

This section of the literature review raised the issues about globalization, glocalization and the possibility of global civil society. A global civil society in its purest form is hard to accomplish due to the inequalities and the still present importance of the national state. Still, transnational activism is happening and becoming more common. If glocalization refers to the globalization with a local touch, the same could be suggested to the global civil society as not everybody has the moral proximity to care about distant problems (Tomlinson 1999). An example would be a glocal civil society, a more flexible form of a global civil society where the dealing with global problems is adjusted to the local contexts. In that case, the shared agendas are dealt with inside the identity of the national state but in dialogue with the rest of the world. Linking local and global issues might require those cosmopolitan activists who can share their expertise and help to translate global risks to the local situations.

In conclusion, when talking about environmental activism, glocalization is an important factor to consider – a local isolated action might not have so much effect on desired social change than a global movement but the global success is also dependent on people acting locally.

Summary

The literature review of this study brought up an array of themes surrounding collective action and mobilization and the role of media in it. The goal of the study is to study one specific movement, the global Let’s Do It! movement, to find out what channels they use to mobilize volunteers and raise awareness about the risks of illegal waste. In order to understand the role of media in the LDI network, some other aspects were needed to consider too, like the importance of having access to appropriate resources, choosing the right channels for external communication and the role of some form of organization for coordinating the activities.

The literature chapter was built up accordingly: the first section covered the changing nature of collective action due to the development of communication technologies; aspects surrounding the coordination of actions in the form of resources and strategic communication. The second and the third section looked at the role of traditional media, the internet and the
social media in the collective action and mobilizing. From the literature appeared a challenge for the movements: all the channels are important for collective action mobilization but they reach different segments of the society. Mass media is useful for reaching a wider public and for creating awareness about issues; the internet is more effective for reaching people who are already agreeing with the goals of the movement and social media reaches a specific group of people which is oftentimes young people. For a wide-reaching social change like the LDI is after, all channels are needed to be put to use for the best outcome. This is a challenge for those local teams that have fewer resources. Further, another dilemma appeared: digital channels of communication offer new possibilities to coordinate and to unite isolated people for a shared cause which suggests that coordinating a collective action should have become easier and more effective. At the same time the contacts made online raise the issue of commitment and sustainability as it is easy to join and leave the movement compared to the situations where the contacts are based on personal offline relationships. This poses another challenge for the activists: how to motivate people online to take part in actions offline.

The LDI movement started from a local initiative and grew to a global network that is concentrated on helping to organize local clean-ups. Therefore the topics of glocalization and transnational activism were covered in the fourth section of this literature review. To be active on a global level requires more commitment from the activist and the ability to look further on from one’s own territory. Assisting local efforts globally is a potent way to boost the outcomes of the activities but certain sensitivity is required from transnational activists for understanding the local contexts and the needs of local people which can be very different of one’s own culture.

The following chapters discuss the specific case of Let’s Do It! movement and aims to find out what kind of communication channels are used in engaging people in voluntary environmental action.
4. Materials and methods

This chapter discusses the methods for collecting and analyzing the data and describes the material that was collected. The aim of the study is to find out what role media plays in organizing the campaigns and communicating with the whole LDI movement. The study is guided by following research questions: What communication channels are used and how are they used by activists to reach the general public and to engage the volunteers when organizing the local and global clean-up campaigns in the LDI network? What is the purpose of the global Let’s Do It! network and how is global-local communication organized?

The case of Let’s Do It! was chosen because it is a citizen initiative that has spread from one country to all over the world and its goals for clean world are actual and interesting. The LDI website has a rich amount of secondary data in the form of best practices and reports which give good background knowledge about the movement. The contact with a few members of the core team gave an access to the whole network for collecting the data.

To answer the research questions, the following methods were used: web survey and in-depth interviews. This chapter includes the motivation for chosen methods and an overview of how the data was collected.

4.1. Mixed methods

This study made use of mixed methods in order to answer the posed research questions. According to Bryman (2012), mixed methods research combines quantitative and qualitative research strategies in one study. He also states that mixed methods research has gained popularity in recent years. Initial arguments against mixed methods were that qualitative and quantitative strategies both carry fixed epistemological and ontological implications and in that sense the methods are rather incompatible than complementary. The current view sees both methods autonomous and that their epistemological assumptions can be fused and indeed complement each other. Creswell (2009) argues that mixed methods utilize the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative methods and that the problems addressed in social science are complex and mixed methods are more adequate in addressing them (p. 203). Bryman
(2012) adds that mixed methods are not superior to mono-method research. The employment of mixed methods requires necessary skills and the use should be well motivated and described (p. 649).

There are several ways to combine qualitative and quantitative research strategies in one study. For example, qualitative data can illustrate quantitative findings or the latter could provide a ground for sampling of qualitative interview respondents (Bryman 2012). Creswell (2009) lists six types of mixed method strategies. The strategies are: sequential explanatory design with emphasis on quantitative data, sequential explanatory design with emphasis on qualitative data, sequential transformative design, concurrent triangulation design, concurrent embedded design and concurrent transformative design. Aspects that influence those strategies are timing (if data is collected simultaneously or in phases), weighting (if both methods are equal or one of them is primary), mixing (if data is mixed or analyzed separately) and theorizing (if theories are made explicit or implicit).

As shown in Figure 1, this study uses elements from triangulation and embedded design. In the case of triangulation, the data is collected at the same time and then compared to find differences or convergence or both (Creswell 2009, p. 213). That way, two methods enhance each other and the results can be cross-checked for greater validity.

Figure 1. Embedded design of current study, visualization based on Creswell (2009).
In the embedded design, the data is also collected simultaneously but one method has a higher priority and guides the project, as the second method has a supportive role and it can address a different question than the primary method. This model is often used to gain broader perspectives than one method offers and also when the researcher uses different methods to study different groups or levels of the research problem. The limitations of this approach are the problem of transforming the data in a way that it can be integrated in the analysis phase and there may come up some discrepancies which need to be dealt with. Also the different priority of the methods results in unequal evidence (p. 214, 215).

As mentioned earlier, this study used both qualitative and quantitative methods in collecting data. Three types of data were collected and each type had a different role. From a qualitative dimension, secondary data and in-depth interviews, and from a quantitative dimension, a web-survey was administered. The role of web-survey and interview data is discussed later on. From the timing aspect, secondary data which had a sole purpose to give background information was collected and processed first, the survey and interviews were later made simultaneously. As earlier described about embedded design of mixed methods, this study prioritized the qualitative method of in-depth interviews. The sample reached local and global level of LDI network and the collected data was aimed to answer both research questions. As local campaigns in LDI are different in size, cultural context and resources available to organizers, any generalization based on interviews was deemed difficult. Therefore the quantitative survey helps to find out if there are communication channels that are perceived important by local teams the same way. So, the survey has a secondary priority and aids in answering the first research question about the local campaigns. The interviews give depth to quantitative data and help to understand it better by offering explanations.

4.1.1. Web survey

Creswell (2009) asserts that “Survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population. From sample results, the researcher generalizes or makes claims about the population”. (p. 145) There are several ways to fill in a survey. In the case of web-based survey, the respondents go to a webpage to answer the questions. Web surveys has some advantages over e-mail surveys. For example, attached e-mail surveys need computer literacy and those embedded in
the e-mail give fewer possibilities for good design. The main advantage of a web survey is that replies are logged and the dataset can be retrieved in the end. That eliminates the need for coding and there are fewer errors (Bryman 2012).

Bryman (2012) lists the advantages and disadvantages of the web survey: low cost, faster response, attractive formats, mixed administration, unrestricted compass (geographical limitations), fewer unanswered questions (compared to postal), better response to open questions, and better data accuracy. Weaknesses are low response rate, restriction to online populations, requires motivation, confidentiality and anonymity issues, multiple replies (one can answer few times) (pp. 676-77).

Other sampling issues are that people have more than one e-mail and that the sample is biased as computer users tend to be more educated and young. In the context of this study, aforementioned bias was not the issue as the sample was rather intended for describing the campaigns in different countries. The people who took part in the survey were representatives of their countries/campaigns and their demographical characteristics were not relevant for the survey. Problems with sampling in this case were rather motivation to respond and possibly the language barrier as respondents were from all over the world.

The survey method was chosen for this study as it provides a quick overview of the LDI organization and allows for quick identification of relationships between different communication channels and communication occasions.

The web survey (see Appendix II) was made by using the online survey tool Survey&Report, provided by Karlstad University. In total the survey consisted of 17 questions of which two questions were open ended. The questions were roughly divided into six categories:
- The scale of the campaign;
- What communication channels were used to find coordinators, partners and sponsors, and to reach the wider public;
- Professionalism of the campaign;
- Local media material creation and the use of provided global material locally;
- Perceived importance of communication channels in raising awareness, providing practical info and in mobilizing;

- Open question about challenges in mobilizing people in the context of respondent’s country.

No personal details were required besides the country that the respondent represented. As not all the countries that belong to LDI network have made a clean-up campaign, the questionnaire was adapted accordingly by directing those who answered “no” to making any campaigns to the last part of the survey where personal opinions about the importance of the communication channels were asked.

The web survey was open for 15 days and it was distributed in the network using the help of regional coordinators who contacted countries directly and the call was also published in the internal weekly newsletter. Two reminders were issued and some more personal approach adopted – the second round of reminders were sent to countries that had not yet answered and also the help of communication responsible for LDI Mediterranean was used to get more answers from Mediterranean region. Few respondents were also approached personally – those who were interviewed. In some cases it helped to get a reply, in one case it did not. The aim was to reach the representatives of all the 111 countries in the network. The response amount ended up with 38 replies and most of the answers came the first week. As the contact with the respondents was made through regional coordinators, it was not known how many countries exactly got the call for the survey. Therefore the response rate was difficult to estimate. Representatives from 26 countries replied which is 28.86% of all the countries connected to LDI.

Sample

According to the LDI webpage, the LDI network consists of 111 countries. Some of the countries in the network are more active, some are just contacts with potential for future campaigns and some have ceased to be active. The goal was to reach as many as possible from the whole network. For that reason, snowball sampling proved to be the most effective way to gather the responses. In snowball sampling, the researcher makes initial contact with people who are relevant to the research topic and uses these contacts to establish contacts with others (Bryman 2012, p. 202). In general, the snowball sampling is mostly used in qualitative
studies, as it is a non-probability sample and will not represent a population. In the case of this study, randomness of the sample was not the goal as the aim was to reach as many representatives of the countries as possible. Except for few cases, a direct contact with respondents was not made and to ensure the higher response rate, the help of regional coordinators was used. Regional coordinators have regular contact with the people from the countries assigned to them and the possibility to get answers for the survey was higher. In other words, in this case the snowballing occurred so that the first contact was made with the head of regional coordinators who forwarded the call for survey to regional coordinators who in turn contacted the countries they were responsible for. As it was not known how many coordinators from the 111 countries received the survey, the exact response rate was hard to estimate.

Despite the higher amount of answers, some problems occurred with not having control over the process of distributing the survey. The main problem was that some countries answered more than once. For example, Ukraine answered 6 times. Other instances were not so noteworthy. In the future, this problem could be minimized by giving more precise instructions and by being more explicit about whom should answer the survey (for example communication responsible of the teams) or by personalizing the surveys. The case of multiple answers changes the data somewhat, but it should not affect the validity crucially as the aim of the survey was to find out if there is a coherent use of communication channels in local campaigns across the network and not to generalize to other movements.

Of the 38 answers received, 26 different countries were represented. Those countries were: South Africa, Greece, Cyprus, Sweden, Russia, Ukraine, Estonia, Finland (Lapland), Cambodia, Singapore, Latvia, Colombia, Turkey, Hungary, Luxembourg, El Salvador, Argentina, Vermont (USA), Montenegro, Egypt, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kenya, Switzerland (West part), and Malta. There were some countries that answered more than once: Ukraine 6 times, Estonia 4 times, Russia 2 times, Bosnia and Herzegovina 2 times. In 2 cases, the country was not mentioned.

Most of the respondents had organized either a big national clean-up (18 cases, 62%) or one or several local clean-ups (9 cases, 31%). In two cases, a country had either not made a clean-up but was planning (1 case, 3.5%) or had not made the clean-up and was new to the network (1 case, 3.5%). The size of the clean-ups varied significantly. All the categories between
fewer than 500 and more than 100000 were represented. The distinction was following: campaigns with more than 100000 participants 5 cases (18.5%), participants between 50001 and 100000 were mentioned 2 times (7.4%), 10001 - 50000 was mentioned 6 times (22.2%), 5001 – 10000 in 3 cases (11.1%), 1001 – 5000 in 4 cases (14.9%), 501 – 1000 one time (3.7%) and under 500 participant campaigns were mentioned 6 (22.2%) times. The majority of local clean-up campaigns were with 500 participants or less with the exception of three cases where ranges between 1001 - 5000 and 5001 – 10000 were mentioned. Campaigns with less than 500 participants were organized in Russia, Finland (Lapland), Singapore, El Salvador, Argentina and Kenya. Countries that had big national campaigns with more than 100000 participants were: Sweden, Ukraine, Latvia, Hungary and Slovenia. Campaigns with up to 100000 participants were made by Estonia and Russia.

4.1.2. In-depth interviews

A qualitative inquiry gives a holistic account of the research problem – the researcher develops a complex picture of the study by involving multiple perspectives, identifying factors involved in the situation and reporting on the larger picture that emerges (Creswell 2009, p. 176). Qualitative methods concentrate on the meaning that participants hold about the issue and the researcher interprets what they see (Ibid.)

This study used semi-structured interviews for gathering some of the research data. Semi-structured interviews are flexible, they have a list of topics or questions in the form of an interview guide but the sequence of questions is not determined and there is also room for follow-up questions to arise. According to Thomas and Brubaker (2008, p. 174), interviews provide an “in-depth understanding of a respondent’s motives, pattern of reasoning and emotional reactions that is not possible with questionnaires”. In the purpose of this study, in-depth interviews give in the form of explanations and examples a deeper understanding of communication processes in LDI network and the uses of communication channels. Interviews also help to understand the context of the research problem. For example, if according to the survey a majority uses Facebook for external communication, then interviews give an insight of what functions of Facebook are used and for what purpose and how interviewees feel about its usefulness in the context of their situation.
A total 7 interviews were conducted. Because of the distance, the interviews were made over Skype and recorded with Skype recorder software that converted the files to mp3 format. In two cases the webcam was used, in two other cases there were some connection problems and the camera was not used and in one case the interviewee was called on the phone through Skype. The interviews lasted an average of one hour, with the shortest interview of 45 minutes and the longest with 1 hour and 15 minutes. As per request, two interviewees answered the questions over e-mail. That method saved some time with transcribing, but the answers were much shorter and some of the questions were not answered. Therefore the control over the successfulness of the interviews was not as well attained as with conversations (see also Bryman 2012). Some follow up questions were sent later and answers to those gave more detailed information.

The interview guide had in general around 25 questions that were divided in sections (see Appendix III for the interview guide). As the interviewees had different roles in the network, some questions had to be adapted accordingly. Therefore there was a section with task specific questions that had custom questions for the global part of the sample. All the local coordinators had the same questions and general questions about the network structure, volunteer specifics and view about the communication were the same for everybody. For the e-mail interviews, the questions were not changed. One of the respondents thought that the questionnaire was too long and some of the questions were unclear. The lesson learned here is that the interview guide for oral interviews is not always suitable for e-mail interviews and the questions should be adapted accordingly. In this case, e-mail interviews were not planned and they are analyzed the same way as the other interviews.

Sample

Purposive sampling was used for gathering the data. That means the interviewees were not randomly selected but instead the selection was strategic, seeing to it that the participants were relevant to research goals and questions (Bryman 2012). With purposive sample it is important to ensure the variety in the sample but still that kind of sample does not allow generalizing to a population (Bryman 2012). As the research questions inquire communication tactics of both global and local level of LDI movement, the sample had to comprise suitable interviewees from both levels.
From the global core team, the head of PR and the head of regional coordinators were contacted. To get an insight to the regional level, the head of LDI Mediterranean was chosen as a participant in this study. In the case of local campaigns, the goal was to include various country and cultural contexts. For that reason, representatives from following countries were included: Netherlands as an example of a country where waste management is well regulated by the government; Kenya, where the waste issue is a big problem and not regulated by the government; and Russia that is kind of in-between of those aforementioned countries in what comes to waste management and the level of development and Russia is also a geographically large country which makes coordinating national campaigns challenging. Also the representative of El Salvador gave his consent to do the interview but with the problem of finding suitable mutual time, the interview was cancelled.

The contact information for interviewees was attained through the global core team with the help of the head of regional coordinators. She gave suggestions on which countries to contact and also the e-mail addresses of those people who were responsible for respective local campaigns. An e-mail with the request for interview was sent and all the persons that were contacted agreed to do the interview and no backup options were needed.

There were two interviews (both e-mail) from Russian representatives. That happened by chance when the primary respondent shared the interview questions in LDI Russia network and one more person answered them. Both of the interviews were added to the final analysis.

4.2. Validity and reliability

Validity and reliability are used in quantitative research to make sure that an indicator really measures the concept it is supposed to measure (validity) and if the measurement is consistent (reliability). In qualitative studies the issue of validity and reliability is equally important but it should be assimilated to the method with a change of meaning (Bryman 2012). Silverman (2011) points out that in qualitative research reliability refers to the stability of findings and validity is about truthfulness of findings.

According to Creswell (2009, p 109), there are several procedures to determine the reliability of the study. The main strategy is to document the research procedures as accurately as
possible. That includes setting up a research protocol, checking transcripts for mistakes and writing memos about the codes in order to avoid a shift in their meaning. Silverman (2011) adds the suggestion of detailed research strategy and data analysis description in the research report and he also points to paying attention to ‘theoretical transparency’, in which case the researcher makes the theoretical point of view explicit so that it guides the interpretation of results (p. 360-367).

Thomas and Brubaker (2008, p. 301) offer a definition for validity: “Research is valid to the extent that its outcomes convincingly answer the questions on which the study has focused”. Validity is about determining the accuracy of findings from the standpoint of the researcher, the participant or the reader’s. The terms to describe the validity in qualitative research are trustworthiness, authenticity and credibility (Creswell 2009, p. 191). Silverman (2011) warns for anecdotalism, where the researcher chooses the bits of data that support his/her arguments. In order to avoid such situation it is suggested to present contradictory cases and look into different perspectives of the same theme (Creswell 2009).

Another strategy to increase the validity is triangulation which means collecting different kind of data (qualitative and quantitative) and using different methods (observation and interviews) for cross-checking the results (Silverman 2011; Creswell 2009). Rich, thick descriptions in presenting the findings; self-reflection for clarifying the researcher’s bias; double-checking the findings with the participants; using peer debriefing and external auditor are also considered as effective procedures for increasing validity of the study (Creswell 2009, p. 191, 192).

In order to ensure the reliability of this study, thorough description of methods and data collection was included in the report. An interview guide was created for the interviews and the conversations were audio recorded in their entirety to ensure the accuracy of the information. Later, a careful transcription of the interviews was conducted. The data was collected by using mixed methods. Triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data, using different methods for collecting qualitative data (secondary data and interviews) and including several perspectives of the participants when sampling for the interviews increases the validity of the study. Also, the findings were described as detailed as possible so that the results could be more realistic and rich.
In case of the survey, a problem appeared with the sample when several people from one country answered the questionnaire. In order to minimize the influence of multiple answers, the excessive answers were removed from the first questions that were designed to describe the sample of respondents (size and scope of the clean-up events). The rest of the questions were more about attitudes and there the extra answers did not affect the results so much. As the survey was made to give an overview of the case study and not trying to generalize to other social movements, the results can still be considered as valid and relevant. In the case of qualitative research, generalizability is not a goal. According to Creswell (2009) qualitative studies are more about particularity and their value lies in descriptions and themes that are developed in the context of specific cases (p. 193).

4.3. Methods of analysis

Survey data was pre–coded by the survey tool. The results were exported into .pdf and excel files for analysis. As there occurred a problem with the sample when several answers from the same country were received (discussed under the validity and reliability section), the first part of the results was adapted accordingly. Later the results were analyzed according to the six themes mentioned earlier in the methods part. For writing up the results, Zwischenberger’s (2009) study about conference interpreters and their self-representation was used as a guide in conducting web-survey analysis.

For the interviews a generic form of analysis was conducted (Creswell 2009). After collecting the data, it was analyzed for themes and perspectives. When looking for themes, research questions, secondary data and survey results were kept in mind. Thematic analysis was made for some of the emerging themes. According to Bryman (2012), thematic analysis results in an index of central themes and subthemes that are later represented in a matrix. Themes and subthemes are recurring elements that come up in the repetitive reading of transcripts (p. 579).
5. Results and analysis

This chapter presents the findings of the materials that were discussed in the previous chapter and analyzes them. The aim of the study was to find out what communication channels were used to recruit coordinators and mobilize people for clean-up actions in the Let’s Do It! movement both on a local and global level. The study was conducted by the use of mixed methods: web survey and in-depth interviews.

The chapter is structured according to the research questions which are: what communication channels are used and how are they used by activists to reach the general public and to engage volunteers when organizing local and global clean-up campaigns in the LDI network? What is the value of the global Let’s Do It! network and how is the global-local communication organized?

The purpose of the web survey was to find out if there were common views on channel uses and to identify relationships between different communication channels and communication occasions. The aim of the in-depth interviews was to expand on the survey results and to get a better contextual understanding of the local campaigns – why and how are some channels used and what are the motivations behind it. Another objective of the interviews was to get the global perspective of the movement: how is the communication organized and what is the value of the core team.

5.1. What communication channels are used and how are they used by activists to reach the general public and to engage the volunteers when organizing the local and global clean-up campaigns in the LDI network?

This part of the analysis chapter aims to answer the first research question: What communication channels are used and how are they used by activists to reach the general public and to engage the volunteers when organizing the local and global clean-up campaigns in the LDI network? The chapter first gives an overview of the channels used for mobilizing
in the local campaigns and then discusses finding volunteers for the local initiatives and for
the global team. The aim of the perceived importance is to find out what the LDI people think
is the best channels for communicating internally and externally and see if there is a gap
between available resources and wished resources. The use of social media appeared to be
important and therefore a separate section was dedicated for the role of social media. The last
part covers the challenges both in the external communication and in convincing people to
participate in general.

5.1.1. The channels used for mobilizing

When mobilizing for collective action, good external communication strategies are needed
(Anderson 1997) and there are several ways for convincing people to participate. Klandermans (2004) distinguishes between consensus mobilization and action mobilization. In the first case, the potential activists need to be convinced first, and action mobilization is for those who already agree with movement goals. In the case of mesomobilization, groups and organizations try to coordinate and integrate other groups to one collective action. (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010, p. 1154). The web survey inquired about the communication channels used for mobilizing campaign coordinators (action mobilization), finding sponsors and partners (both consensus and action mobilization) and reaching the wider public (consensus mobilization). The survey asked about reaching the wider public instead of mobilizing. The reason is that it is complicated to talk about mobilizing the wider public as the amount of people that receive the message about the clean-up campaigns is possibly higher than of those who actually participate. Therefore the survey asked about channels used to spread the message to the wider public as the decision to participate is probably influenced by other factors too.

The results according to Table 1 show that aforementioned moments of external communication make use of different channels.
Table 1. Communication channels used in external communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Finding coordinators</th>
<th>Finding partners and sponsors</th>
<th>Reaching the wider public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contacts</td>
<td>33 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>22 (81,5%)</td>
<td>5 (18,5%)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>26 (96,7%)</td>
<td>2 (7,1%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>29 (96,7%)</td>
<td>1 (3,3%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>10 (47,6%)</td>
<td>11 (52,4%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local newspapers</td>
<td>13 (61,9%)</td>
<td>8 (38,1%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National newspapers</td>
<td>15 (65,2%)</td>
<td>8 (34,8%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>13 (59,1%)</td>
<td>9 (40,9%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>13 (56,5%)</td>
<td>10 (43,5%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looking for coordinators and partners, interpersonal communication channels like personal contacts, e-mail and phones are used a lot. This kind of communication is used less when communicating to the wider public. Social media are widely used both in finding coordinators and speaking to the public, less so when reaching out for the partners and sponsors. Campaign website is deemed important in every aspect of external communication. Mass media channels like local and national newspapers, TV and radio are widely used in mobilizing the public, not so much for finding partners and coordinators. The use of blogs is generally relatively low. However blogs are used more for mass communication.

When comparing the use of mass media channels in finding coordinators, it was mostly big national campaigns that made use of it. However, not all the big national campaigns used the mass media to recruit volunteers to their teams, 4 teams did not use local newspapers, 3 did not use national newspapers and in 2 cases TV was not used. Local campaigns made more use of mass media in reaching the wider public although it was mostly used by big national campaigns.

The results show that for action mobilization interpersonal communication channels prevailed and consensus mobilization made use of mass media channels. This coincides with Cammaerts’ (2007) argument that mass media acts like a push medium by reaching the wider public who are not yet convinced with the movement’s ideas.

It is noteworthy that the number of answers is higher when the use of a channel is higher. It could be interpreted that when the respondents did not answer, they found the channel unimportant (this survey had ‘yes’ and ‘no’ options instead of ‘tick all that apply’). For example, when asking about the use of personal contacts in finding coordinators and partners
and for reaching the wider public, the first two cases have 33 and 32 answers accordingly and with one exception they are ‘yes’. The use of personal contacts in reaching the wider public has 24 answers and six of them are ‘no’. Thus, the number of answers gives an overall trend of the channel importance although it cannot be considered as a certain finding as the respondents’ motivation to answer is unknown.

**Finding volunteers**

In LDI there are different opportunities to be engaged in activism that require different level of motivation. For example, one could be a full-time coordinator on a local or an international level or a one-time volunteer on a clean-up campaign. As previous survey results showed, reaching different target groups requires different approaches too. The interviews gave some extra information to the survey.

Findings show that there is no uniform way to get volunteers. Oftentimes, the members of LDI approach potential volunteers or they are approached by people who have heard about the movement and want to help out.

Finding more dedicated coordinators on the global level happened rather through a personal approach and through personal contacts. Those who wanted to help made themselves heard or they were approached through mutual acquaintances. In the PR group, previous experience was required and the head of PR made an ad with a specific profile and looked for volunteers in specific places (universities, trade unions). For her the professionalism of the volunteers was a substantial criterion:

“I required previous work experience. World cleanup is not possible any other way. Let’s Do It! is not the place where you contact CNN and this is the first thing you ever do.”

However, she adds that professionalism for her is more about experience and commitment and less about education:

“For me professionalism is not connected to a degree but to work experience and initiative.”

The head of LDIM found that one’s own personal networks work the best: to send e-mails to people you know and ask for contacts to those who could help. Finding persons for a
particular post needs a more strategic approach as factors like character and time have to be considered.

International events, for example youth exchanges and conferences, were mentioned as places where people have heard about the LDI movement and gotten inspired to do the same in their own countries. Approaching people in countries that had not yet joined the movement was also made through personal contacts. In such cases a prepared info-letter and ‘elevator speech’ and a YouTube video about the campaigns from 2008 were presented.

Facebook and other social networking platforms were mentioned several times both for contacting future coordinators and also as a channel where people have heard about the initiative. Effectiveness of the channel depends on the level of commitment people are willing to put in:

“For LDIM it (social media) hasn’t helped to get volunteers for the international cause but in each country it really helps because you can see photos of people and join in. If it’s local its possible just join in, when it’s international it takes a bit more time before people say ok I want to be involved in something internationally. You have to know someone who is part of the core team to feel like you want to help out across the different countries.” (Head of LDIM)

As the transnational activists needed a personal approach, person-to-person communication channels such as Skype, e-mail and Facebook prevailed. The head of LDIM brings up the best channel for motivating the new volunteers:

“If you can motivate someone over a Skype call to help to do the work in the project with you, it really holds up. Because an email works to get the contact to inform them but it doesn’t work so well to motivate the people”

On a local level, those who want to get more involved usually contacted the teams themselves. The message to the public was spread through different channels, both online channels and mass media. Besides messages in the media, teams were also created through the cooperation with different initiatives that have a similar aim or by connecting different organizations and institutions under one umbrella campaign. Some channels that interviewees
mentioned for spreading the word were: social networking sites, local internet forums, local newspapers, leaflets, face to face invitations, events, schools, community meetings, flyers, posters, mailing lists, website, magazines, and radio.

**Reaching the public**

The Netherlands representative offered an explanation why a mass media channel like newspapers is more effective in mobilizing the wider public:

“Facebook and Twitter was the most, but papers, written media were the best. Because people read it and then... If it is in the paper they know it’s important. In Facebook it’s just like an idea or a nice project, but if it’s in the paper, then it’s something bigger.”

Mass media coverage was considered important on a global level as well, but international media attention is harder to accomplish, due to lack of personal contact with the journalists and time-consuming partnership building.

Partnerships with local municipalities and companies were considered important by all interviewees, although in some cases it was stated unsuccessful (Russia and Netherlands). Cooperation was named as a best communication channel – when others talk good things about you it is more effective than to talk good things about yourself. Partnership with a governmental institution was also mentioned as a good source for resources (Kenya).

5.1.2. Perceived importance of communication channels

The optimal use of communication channels for spreading movements’ message and for action mobilization depends among other factors on the material and non-material resources the movement possesses (Della Porta and Diani 1999). In the situations where the organizers are not able to use the most effective channels they have to opt to the possibilities at hand. To find out which channels were considered as most effective, the web survey asked about the opinions of respondents about the importance of certain channels in awareness building, communicating practical information and in mobilizing. The results are visualized in Figure 2. Number 5 represents very important and number 1 not important.
Respondents evaluate social media as important in all aspects of external communication. Traditional media is perceived important for awareness building and mobilization, somewhat less for distributing practical information. Public events are assumed useful for awareness rising and mobilization and websites are good for forwarding practical information, less for...
awareness and mobilization. Personal contacts are deemed important in all aspects but to a lesser degree than for example social media. It was surprising to see how low perceived importance of blogs and printed materials were.

In the interview, the respondents were asked about ideal channels for communicating internally and externally. For the external communication, TV was mentioned the most. For internal communication, Skype, Facebook and face-to-face meeting were evaluated as the best channels. Table 2 gives a more detailed overview of the answers.

Table 2. Ideal communication channels internally and externally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of regional</td>
<td>Facebook, informal events</td>
<td>Visibility on big events like Olympics or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td>football events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of PR</td>
<td>Face-to-face, other place Skype or phone.</td>
<td>Depends on continent and culture context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of LDIM</td>
<td>E-mail and Skype. Especially Skype – being</td>
<td>TV across countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>able to see people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Facebook is ideal. It is quickest.</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>E-mail and Facebook</td>
<td>Young people FB and social media; public –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>national TV and radio, community meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia 1 (local)</td>
<td>Google groups and docs. Face-to-face for</td>
<td>Any available channel should be used. Requires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more committed. Skype calls, live LDI</td>
<td>well prepared and good quality content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conferences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia 2 (national)</td>
<td>Face-to-face is the best way, not virtual, not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by phone. Next phone calls, messages in social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>networks, e-mails, messages in groups in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social networks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both the survey and interview findings show that mass media is presumed as the best way to mobilize the public.

5.1.3. The use of social media

The survey results showed that social media is widely used channel in finding volunteers to the team and for reaching the wider public. It was also deemed important in all aspects of surveyed moments of external communication: awareness building, giving out practical information and mobilizing. According to Lindgren (2013), social movements use social media to promote their causes, organize actions and to distribute alternative information (p. 207). Bennett and Segerberg (2012) found in their study that networks that facilitate opportunities for interaction and personalized content were more stable and had larger amount of participants compared to network that were more closed. The results of the interviews confirm those findings but go into more detail about how social networking platforms, more specifically Facebook (FB) and other similar outlets are used in the LDI network. Coding of the interviews brought up three different areas that Facebook was utilized in: personal contact, internal communication in the groups/network, and external communication. Table 3 (p. 67) illustrates the Facebook usage by the interviewees. Most of the participants mentioned Facebook, in Russia there is another platform mostly used, vk.com. Reoccurring themes were among others facilitation of personal contacts across the borders, using FB for interaction, using group applications for internal communication and informing about events. Other social media platforms were also mentioned, but not so often as Facebook. the Global team acknowledged that Twitter was an unused resource but YouTube has been quite effective, with two viral videos.

It could be argued that a Facebook revolution does not so much occur in creating social change in societies but it is rather Facebook’s multifunctionality in connecting internal and external communication, offering different options for interaction (through chat and messaging) and providing a platform to share multimodal information that is strongly affecting the everyday work of grassroots activists.

The head of regional coordinators uses Facebook for interaction and for her it is a good way to be informed and contactable:
“It is the most effective way to keep your hand on the pulse and the let others know you are there.”

The function of being able to see who has read the messages was also praised as an advantage over e-mail, so that the coordinator can see who has received the communication and the feedback is more probable:

“Sometimes when I leave out an announcement on Facebook I know that they see it and they know I can see that they see it.” (Head of PR)

At the same time she stresses that the usefulness of Facebook depends on people. It works well with some, but to others, an e-mail or a phone call is better.

Facebook was considered a good tool for external communication and it was mostly used to post information about upcoming events and to share success stories. Another issue is how these posts are received. For example, there was a case in the Netherlands:

“We noticed that the Dutch people were not so interested in international clean-up. Ukraine had a clean-up last week and I put that on the FB page but not so many liked it but when I put a little boy cleaning up or a bird with plastic in his body then everybody were like, like, like.”

Also the local nature of information is important:

“It is very important that on the English FB page you don’t give information to Arabian or Russian or German teams. They want to get their information in their own language. We have countries whose FB pages have more likes than our international page which is totally normal in my view.” (Head of PR)
Table 3. The use of Facebook and other similar social networking platforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of regional coordinators</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More like a tool for interacting than for spreading information. I spend half of my workday on Facebook.</td>
<td>You can see if the receiver has received your information. People can like and comment. Feedback from there is much faster.</td>
<td>Could be more intensive and active.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Head of PR | When I see the person is online I can write to him directly through the chat. | Events on Facebook. Double info in other channels. Discussions in groups work better. | Find volunteers to the team. Local teams want to get their information in their own language. |

| Head of LDIM | Use anything that can keep the communication going through all kinds of channels. | To exchange information between core team and local teams. Mostly coordinators that post in it. | Website and FB are the most out there messages we have. |

| Netherlands | Keep contact with local teams in other countries. When it’s somebody’s birthday, you say happy birthday. | Facebook group to people who are internally involved is the easiest way. | Sometimes find volunteers. To inform public and ask them to take part. We have a FB page and we put all our stuff in there. |

| Kenya | Friendship level contacts with other teams in other countries. Not only to interact, also for business and motivation. | Posts on Facebook reach the team very fast. | Relevant communicating to young people. Highest mode of channel in getting volunteers. |

| Russia 1 (local) | Social networks are brilliant for cross-countries initiatives. | Groups and event… to share information, track the participants, and collect the contact information for future events. | Attract people to clean-up events. |

| Russia 2 (national) | | Vk.com main instrument. Weekly announcements about weekend events, posting reports and photos, requests for help. Helpful when moderated properly. | |
5.1.4. Challenges in communication and mobilization

Professionalism of the campaigns

72.7% of the respondents used either professional help in communication or had a communication specialist among the team members.

Figure 3 illustrates the optimal use of available channels. Even though professional help was used, the majority (72.7%) acknowledges that the communication channels were not used to their full potential. In 7 cases (21.2%) the teams made the best out of the channels and in 2 cases (6.1%) the channels were not used efficiently.

![Figure 3. The use of available communication channels.](image)

With the aim to find out what was lacking in the communication, an open ended question was asked: “What would you do differently in communicating your message to the public if you had a chance?” The answers were categorized according to emerging themes. Some answers included more than one category. Most popular themes that emerged were:

- More money/sponsors
- Better timing
- Better use of mass media channels
- Visibility on TV
- Better contact with newspapers/press
- More active on social media
- More outside ads
- Would not change a thing
- Well prepared content/planning
- Use more channels
- Events

And others: more dedicated people, engage relevant stakeholders, keep more in touch with companies and volunteers, sleep more.

The themes that were brought up the most were more money/sponsors which were mentioned in 3 cases. Examples include “If our finances would be secured we could do so much more” and “get bigger budget/sponsors to assist in using more channels and more frequently promoting a cleanup”. Better timing was brought up 4 times. For example, “The more time we have the more different channels we can use for communications” or “Taking in account the time, having a more organized schedule”. Also the use of TV as channel came up 4 times, either for advertising or engaging relevant stakeholders and opinion leaders. In four cases, the respondents would not have done anything differently.

From the answers it appears that the majority of the issues are public relations (contact with the press and mass media) and marketing (advertisement) related like access to mass media and ability to promote the event through different channels. Some reasons behind those issues that were brought up were connected to the lack of monetary resources and sponsors who could pay for the promotion. Another problem was the lack of dedicated people in the organizing team. Besides the promotional part, teams would also do differently in organizing the events: have well prepared content, plan better and have better focus. Also, time was a major issue, either the lack of it or the need for better use of it.

The head of PR adds that it is easy to spot the level of professionalism in the local campaigns. The bigger events tend to have more professional PR. In order to raise the level of professionalism among the local teams, the core team has produces different instructions, sample letters, designs for promotional materials, power point presentations and sample
articles. They also give consultations and most importantly motivate teams to recruit people with communication knowledge or to approach the media and marketing agencies for partnership.

The challenges in mobilizing

The first open question was about the challenges in getting the message out to the public. The second open question asked about the challenges in mobilizing the people keeping in mind the context of respondent’s country. Here the public relation and marketing issues were only mentioned a few times. On one occasion, the need for extensive promotion was brought up and on the second occasion gaining the full support of a national TV station was stated as a channel that the general public listens to.

The main challenge that came up repeatedly (8 cases) was motivating people. Motivation in turn could be connected to other issues that emerged: low awareness, low interest in clean-ups, low priority of waste issues (as there are other social and political problems in society like unemployment), volunteers want something in return and the general attitude of the public. People’s attitude was mentioned on five occasions. Examples include “The bad thing is that they’re expecting that someone else solves the waste problem”, “The general psychosis is that everything is bad, why should I do anything when we are paying companies to clean”, and “The biggest challenge is to overcome the general public’s urge to just complain about the problem and drive/push them into taking action for solving it”.

Besides motivating the general public, lack of different resources was also a difficulty that was mentioned on several occasions. The main issue was the lack of dedicated coordinators who could organize the clean-ups. Lack of money (for promotions and presents for volunteers) and lack of communication expertise were also reported.

Politics was also a problem that came up repeatedly in different contexts, for example in politicians trying to hijack the campaign or in the lack of political will which makes the access to government’s resources difficult.

Other challenges that were mentioned: too much information and competing events on the same day, involving adults and companies, uniting many small clean-ups into one big,
difficulties in arranging free poster places and supplying regional coordinators with necessary equipment, lack of time and knowledge about conducting a movement.

From the interviews with the local coordinators, a lack of human resources was a reoccurring challenge; too few dedicated and experienced people to delegate tasks to. Further, in the Netherlands a cultural challenge was brought up: countryside tends to be cleaner and people who live there do not see the purpose of a clean-up action. Kenyan representative counted a number of challenges, starting from the lack of access to the internet, unreliable electricity and people not owning mobiles. The low priority of the waste problem was also brought out as a major issue. Social problems as unemployment and poverty are more pressing and people do not feel motivated to come out and work for free when they have to worry about feeding their family. Furthermore, illiteracy, corrupted journalists and reaching the right target audience were also the challenges the Kenyan representative faced.

***

This section aimed to find out what communication channels were used in external communication of LDI campaigns and what channels were considered important for internal and external communication.

Surprisingly was the relatively low importance of blogs in spreading information and mobilizing. In the secondary data, the use of blogs were mentioned more than once and therefore added to the survey as a separate channel. Survey findings showed that in general it was not used or considered important enough. The findings revealed the importance of Skype in communicating. Skype and other similar programs with the possibility to make free video and conference calls as a tool for grassroots activism are worth a deeper look into as they are a cheap replacement for phone communication and the possibility to see the other person might contribute to forming stronger ties through the internet.

The findings reveal that challenges in organizing communication campaigns and mobilizing people are often not connected to the communication channels but are more complex in character. Environmental issues tend to have lower priority than social and political issues. Therefore the barrier between the private and the public is not crossed so willingly.
5.2. What is the value of the global Let’s Do It! network and how is global-local communication organized?

This chapter aims to answer the second research question of this study which is: What is the value of the global Let’s Do It! network and how is global-local communication organized? As the previous chapter dealt with external communication and mobilization this chapter concentrates on how the internal communication is organized in order to sustain the movement and to keep the activists motivated. The first part of this chapter looks at the local-global communication and the second part brings up the importance of strong ties and the value in organizing a global movement.

5.2.1. The Let’s Do It! network structure and the local-global communication

The LDI movement has evolved from a one-time clean-up action in Estonia through a one-time “World Clean Up” campaign to a sustained citizen movement that aims to engage 5% of the world’s population by the year 2018. According to the head PR manager, the global level of the movement, Let’s Do It! World, has elements of umbrella organization and is a central body with a core team but still cannot be called an organization. The core team consists of 7 members who are responsible for their own area of expertise and they all have their own project teams. All members of the core team are equal and they manage themselves how they see is best. The branches are: partnership relations and finance, IT-support, PR and communication, marketing and regional coordinators. The knowledge team has no leader at the moment and a policy team is on the making.

The countries in the network have their own teams and their structure is different country by country. As the work is on volunteer basis, the structure is not always fixed. In the sample of this study, all the initiatives had a different structure. The Netherlands had a core team of three persons that gave completely free hands for local communities to organize their events, as long as they were on the same date, 3rd Friday of September. In Kenya, the movement is still under construction and localized to Nairobi with different established initiatives cooperating to organize a clean-up. In Russia, the LDI initiative developed from a number of local initiatives to a national campaign that started using LDI logos.

The Russian coordinator (1) is happy with the flexibility of the team structure:
“I like the LDI structure - there is a flexible hierarchy of national- and regional-level coordinators who help other people with knowledge and resources for set of local events. The list of coordinators is frequently updated. It uses google groups and docs for effective knowledge sharing. If you would like to organize cleaning - you receive quite detailed and easy-to-follow guides. You most probably receive support of LDI national and regional sponsors for materials and equipment for events.”

The members themselves differentiate LDI from other more common forms of social movements:

“LDI is in that sense different from classical environmental organizations that we don’t point fingers towards anyone and we don’t protest against anyone. We are for something, for coming together and doing something together.” (The head of PR)

**Volunteer characteristics**

With the exception of two core team members, the majority of interviewees worked on a voluntary basis. The head PR manager and the Head of regional coordinators started receiving compensation just recently (November 2013), before that they were also working on a volunteer basis. All of the respondents have higher education. Some of them have previous task related work experience, some have learned by doing.

**The local-global communication**

The local-global relationship is the one of information exchange. The global core team assists with knowledge where necessary, the local initiatives provide feedback about their campaigns to the global level and from there it is distributed in the rest of network through newsletters and best practices to educate and inspire fellow activists.

According to the head of regional coordinators, the goals of the LDI in a wider perspective are hinted on yearly conferences, so the direction is up to all the members to decide. There are regular core team meetings and different departments have also regular meetings of their own.
The main information sharing goes through the regional coordinators who act as a link between the country and the core team. The head of the regional coordinators is overseeing the team of regional coordinators and reacts accordingly to the needs of the countries. Otherwise, the regional coordinators are responsible for the areas assigned to them.

The head of PR is responsible for managing the communication team, consulting the countries, developing the network, supporting and motivating the volunteers, organizing global level and Estonian media relationships. She is also participating in planning the campaigns and talking to the press when needed. The head of PR stresses that she does not do detailed communication in local countries although a big part of her time goes on consulting them.

Besides helping with the local campaigns, the main thing is to strive towards global media coverage. It is a challenge as there is no budget for marketing and getting direct contact with journalists is difficult. The main communication goal is to raise the capacities of the local team so that they could organize bigger events.

Communicating with people from different backgrounds from all over the world is not always easy. Some communication challenges were named by the global core team members. The head of the regional coordinators remarks the problem of understanding the local context: it is hard to know how the teams perceive the information sent to them and also to put in context the data sent from local activists. It is hard to control the trustworthiness of the information and in such situations a good personal relationship between the local activists and the regional coordinators is crucial as they help to put the information in the right context. The interviewee also states that one can use different communication tools, but it is not effective if the team does not know how to use it or does not understand its need.

The challenges of the PR responsible are the slow pace of receiving the information for press releases and the varying technological level in countries that also slows down the communication process. To solve this problem, communication workshops are made on conferences and an IT project that should make the reporting about the events easier is under construction.
5.2.2. The value of the global network

The main value of the global team is to support the local initiatives and provide necessary tools and knowledge to those who need it. Also help with solving problems by connecting countries with similar challenges. The head of regional coordinators summarizes the importance of LDI:

“I would say that the most valuable thing what LDI has created is the network and the know-how: bringing people together and finding necessary practices and support. To show teams that they are not the only ones who face particular problems and how some situations should be handled. How receptive one country is about these questions is of course different, they tend to think that their problems are extraordinary and nobody else has experienced similar challenges.”

The local coordinators were asked what kind of support they receive from the global team. The answers were connected both to practical help in the form of knowledge and also to more abstract as inspiration. The interviewees mentioned: inspiration and ideas about new formats of action; a resource on how different teams have planned their clean-ups and what kind of tools they used; design kit and human resource help by regional coordinators and PR people; informational materials and opportunities to participate in international LDI conferences and sharing the success and best practices. In one case it was mentioned that the openness in communication by current head of regional coordinators and PR responsible is inspiring and that the movement now is different from the 2012 World Cleanup campaign where mainly the model of Estonian clean-up was propagated and the support from the global team was less evident.

One of the interviewees from Russia brought up the importance of togetherness:

“It’s important to understand that we are not alone with our initiatives. We had a guest from El Salvador on our autumn event. It was quite exiting for people who came to cleaning as well as mass-media representatives.”

When asked about the importance of belonging to a global movement compared to just having local action, the answers were according: it gives a sense of belonging; gives a feeling that you are on the right way; gives collective energy; is a learning point both personally and for
the country. In two cases it was also mentioned that being part of a global networks helps when communicating with governance and companies.

The head of regional coordinators explains:

“And this is our strength that not one local initiative goes and asks for help from a company but an initiative that is a part of a huge global network. There is a big difference. In the eyes of partners it is a question of trust.”

Although LDI does not provide monetary help, the global team has created a number of media materials to aid the local teams in organizing their campaigns. Press releases and weekly newsletters are sent out internally to inform about the campaigns in different countries; logo types and promotional materials (flyers, T-shirts, poster designs, web banners etc.) have been created; pictures and videos are available for sharing and some special web solution have been made like thematic computer games and Facebook app to easily unlike the pages.

The survey asked what kind of common media materials provided by the global team were used by the local teams and what kinds of materials were made by themselves.

78.8% (26 cases) answered yes to using the provided materials. Results show that the most used materials are promotional materials (90.9%), logo types (84%), videos (83.3%) and pictures (79.2%). Press releases (52.6%), newsletters (38.9%) and Facebook application (42.1%) are used less and computer games very little (35.7% and 14 answers).

31 (96.9%) out of 32 respondents have also made their own media materials. The most common ones mentioned are pictures (100%), press releases (96.8%), promo materials (96.6%) and videos (95.8%). Next in line are logo types (84.6%) and newsletters (84%). Special applications like computer games were not very commonly produced (3 times, 18.8%). Few had answered “If other, please specify” section: specific website, kyte and booklet summarizing past activities, T-shirts, all the above but more basic level, audio advertisements, hymn.
Both solutions, of using provided material and making their own, are used by the teams. In some cases like logo types, the use of provided and own production is done simultaneously. This could mean several things: provided logo is adapted to local campaign or that there are two logos in use. Low use of newsletters and press releases could be explained that they are mostly used for internal communication or that local press is not interested in the global clean-up events. Materials produced locally during the events (photos, videos, press releases) were the most common materials produced locally which is also natural. The results show that local teams use the promotional resources they are provided but also make an effort to produce custom material. More basic material was preferred and special solutions like games and Facebook applications were less popular.

From the survey and the interviews emerges that the basic value of the global network is that it provides resources to the local initiatives. It could be said that the LDI network helps out with all kinds of resources listed by McCarthy (2004). The moral resource is provided in the form of legitimacy and solidary support. Being a part of a worldwide initiative makes it easier to approach companies for fundraising and sharing the success and challenges with other countries build solidarity. The global team supplies cultural resources with sharing know-how and promotional materials and helps less experienced teams with their strategic campaign planning. The network itself acts partially as a social-organizational resource by allowing access to other resources and giving an opportunity to find new volunteers among the personal networks of current participants. The human resources and the lack of dedicated and experienced people were mentioned as an important limitation in coordinating the local initiatives. The global team relieves that limitation somewhat by giving professional advice in the matters of PR and IT. Oftentimes the volunteers to the global team are handpicked based on their expertise and experience. Acquiring of material resources is up to the local teams to themselves; however they do get advice on how to approach potential partners.

**The importance of interpersonal communication**

Having personal relationships with other members in the network was deemed important by all the interviewees. Interpersonal contacts are important on different aspects: in getting new volunteers, motivating and coordinating. Personal contact simplifies communication and collaboration and is crucial for sustaining the network.
On the local level, personal contacts with members from other countries were seen as inspirational and good for networking purposes, cross-countries initiatives, sharing ideas, motivation and resources.

The global coordinators found that communicating personally regularly is very important. For the PR manager, having personal contact with local teams brings more work and questions, but she also gets the information faster. LDIM coordinator finds friendships and informal communication valuable when organizing such global projects. According to him it makes formal collaboration easier. The interviewee from the Netherlands thought instead that friendships are not that important as she cannot be personal with everybody all the time.

The head of regional coordinators further stresses the vital importance of personal relationships between the global and the local level:

“If the regional coordinator disappears between the core team and the country then it is quite probable that this country disappears for us too. This personal relationship and trust is that strong as a rule. So this is very concretely a network that is built up on personal relationships.”

The contact with the distant members is mostly kept through e-mail, Facebook, Skype and other similar communication channels. As the findings in the Table 2 in the previous section showed, face to face interaction was deemed best in coordinating local initiatives and the everyday work of the global core team. Personal meetings are likewise vital in what comes to international relationships. For such occasion, the LDI movement is organizing conferences. The main conference is once a year in the beginning of the year and there are also regional conferences in European, Asian, American and African continents. The interviewees found the conferences good for networking, sharing ideas and experiences, getting answers to questions, motivation, and creating the team feeling. It was also mentioned several times that such meetings are good for sharing challenges as well as success stories.

The Kenyan representative finds conferences a good place to learn and to improve the local activities:
“It’s motivating and it’s a tool for improving your activities. For example I got a CD from the group in LDI Greece and I have been looking how they have been doing some of their activities and we have adopted some of the strategies they use there.”

The head of LDIM finds that the conferences are a unifying factor in LDI and without regular meetings the network would not exist:

“It really helps to build a team when you see them face-to-face, when we can talk and actually have fun together. Face to face contact is vital to keep an international network. It’s our lifeline and it’s the one thing we lack. And the thing we lack the most is money to be able to meet.”

This chapter aimed to answer the second research question: What is the value of the global Let’s Do It! network and how is global-local communication organized? The basic value of the global network was to provide the non-material resources to the local initiatives in the form of know how (shared best practices), expertise, templates, access to the other resources and solidary support. The value of the network was also perceived in more emotional way as a source for inspiration, feeling togetherness and being part of something big.

Although the communication on the global level is mostly done through digital communication channels which create weak ties, the results imply that strong ties and interpersonal relationships are crucial for sustaining the movement and also for making the activities more efficient. This coincides with Van Laer’s (2010) suggestion that the media is non-essential to motivating the activists. Furthermore, Bennett’s (2005) notion of social technologies applies in the case of the LDI movement: dense online interpersonal and real-life meetings are practiced in order to keep the network together and committed.
6. Conclusion

This chapter gives an overview of the main findings and states the limitations of the study and proposes perspectives for future studies. The general aim of this study was to map the role of media in the Let’s Do It! movement that fights against illegal waste by organizing clean-up campaigns and by building awareness about the problem of illegal waste among the general public. The purpose was to find out what role media plays in mobilizing for clean-up actions; in communicating with the whole LDI movement and in sustaining the global network.

The research questions posed were: What communication channels are used and how are they used by activists to reach the general public and to engage the volunteers when organizing the local and global clean-up campaigns in the LDI network? What is the value of the global Let’s Do It! network and how is global-local communication organized?

The contribution of this study is that it offers a deeper look into one global movement and contributes in a better understanding of how one global movement works: how the network is built up, how the communication is organized and what the importance of local contexts is. It also gives an idea on the role of different communication channels in coordinating a sustained global movement.

The results are presented according to the research questions.

What communication channels are used and how are they used by activists to reach the general public and to engage the volunteers when organizing the local and global clean-up campaigns in the LDI network?

The results show that different media had a different role in the process of coordinating clean-up campaigns and in sustaining the network. Traditional media was important for gaining wider visibility; digital channels of communication, especially social networking platforms, were multifunctional with combining internal and external communication; and face-to-face meetings were deemed crucial in forming strong ties and sustaining the network both globally and locally. The actual media use was also strongly influenced by the cultural context and the resources available for the local teams.
Literature and the analysis of secondary data show that in order to gain visibility and to mobilize beyond those who were already supporting the idea of clean-ups, traditional media channels were important. Local and national newspapers, TV and radio were used to reach the wider public and the respondents to the web-survey thought that mass media is important in raising awareness and for mobilizing, less so for communicating practical information about the campaign. Although traditional media was deemed to be important, the access to it was reported difficult.

Social media as an external communication tool got high ratings from the survey as an important channel. It revealed from the interviews that social media and Facebook (also other similar platforms) in particular had also other functions that LDI members used. The used area was divided into three categories: person-to-person interaction, internal group coordination and external communication.

Face-to-face communication was stressed as very important by the interviewees both in local and global teams. The yearly conferences were reported as crucial in knowledge exchange, motivation, creating a team feeling and sharing experiences. Personal relationships between global team and local coordinators were important in sustaining the network, increasing the speed and trustworthiness of the information.

Lack of resources (both material and human resources) was oftentimes behind problems in mobilizing. Another reason was people’s attitude and low motivation in participating.

*What is the value of the global Let’s Do It! network and how is global-local communication organized?*

The data revealed that the global network is valuable in providing non-material resources to the local initiatives so that teams with fewer resources have better chance in organizing a successful clean-up. Such resources come in the shape of know-how, network, instructions, and expertise. For creating a sustainable movement, chances for meeting and creating personal relationships are important.
The global team worked mainly with assisting the local teams with their campaigns but getting the attention from the global media was also important. The latter was evaluated as difficult with the reason being a lack of personal contact with the journalists.

6.1. The limitations of the study and future research

This study concentrated on the communication channels that were used in external communication and in mobilizing. Effective communication and grassroots mobilization has also other aspects that play crucial roles and looking only at the communication channels will not give a full understanding of the complex processes of mobilization. Some of those aspects were brought up, for example the access to resources and the willingness of volunteers to put their time and effort into the campaign. One has to also consider wider communication strategies like the framing of messages and using alternative channels that are not technology related, like opinion, leaders and known people giving their voice to promote the cause for raising the public’s trust for the event. Another limitation is that this study concentrated only on one citizen movement and the generalization of the results is problematic. But at the same time, generalizations about media and social movements are difficult as the contexts are different each time (Bennett 2003). A limiting aspect is also the fact that this study only concentrates on the coordinators’ point of view and therefore it is not possible to evaluate the effects of any of the channels.

With the limitations of this study in mind, there is a perspective for the future research. For example, to compare different global waste reduction initiatives for possible generalizations; to take a deeper look into communication strategies of the campaigns to get a more wholesome picture of the communication process; and study the effects of communication campaigns to see the usefulness of the communication tools.
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Appendix II. The web survey tool.

Dear member of the "Let's Do It!" family!

Thank you for taking your time to answer my survey. My name is Liisa Sõmersalu and I am a master student of Global Media Studies at Karlstad University in Sweden.

This survey aims to find out what communication channels are used in LDI network's local clean-up campaigns in order to mobilize volunteers and to raise awareness among the wider population.

No matter if your country has made a huge or a small clean-up, some other activity or is planning to do something for the first time, your answer is equally important and valuable.

The questionnaire should take about 10 minutes of your time and the responses are confidential. The survey will close on the 25th of April.

If you have any questions or if you are interested in the results, you can contact me at liisa@letsdoitworld.org.

Thank you,

Liisa Sõmersalu
Master student, Karlstad University
1. What kind of activity has your team organized?
   - Big national clean-up campaign(s)
   - One or several local clean-ups
   - No clean-up, but other awareness building/educational activities
   - None, but we are planning
   - None, I am new in Let's Do It!
   - If other, please specify ____________________

2. How many people took part of your most successful campaign?
   - More than 100000
   - Between 50001 – 100000
   - 10001 – 50000
   - 5001 – 10000
   - 1001 – 5000
   - 501 – 1000
   - Less than 500

3. What communication channels did you use for finding coordinators for your team?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Personal contacts
   - E-mail
   - Phone
   - Social media
   - Website
   - Blogs
   - Local newspapers
   - National newspapers
   - TV
   - Radio

4. What communication channels did you use for finding partners and sponsors?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Personal contacts
   - E-mail
   - Phone
   - Social media
   - Website
   - Blogs
   - Local newspapers
   - National newspapers
   - TV
   - Radio
5. What communication channels did you use for reaching wider public?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Did you get professional help for communication or have a communication specialist among team members?

☐ Yes
☐ No

7. How well do you think your campaign used available communication channels?

☐ We made the best out of all the channels
☐ Good, but not to their full potential
☐ I am not sure
☐ Not that efficiently
☐ Very badly

8. What would you do differently in communicating your message to the public if you had a chance?


9. Do you use media materials that are provided by the global team in your external communication?

☐ Yes
☐ No

10. If yes, what materials do you use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press releases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logo types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional materials available on the website (TV clips, posters, flyers, T-shirts etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


11. Have you made your own media materials?

- Yes
- No

12. If yes, then what kind of materials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press releases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logo types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(flyers, posters, banners, TV ads etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If other, specify ________________________________

13. How would you rate following communication tools as important in making people aware about waste issues? Please give your personal opinion. 1 star is not important, 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media (Facebook, Twitter etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional media (Newspapers, TV, radio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print material (flyers, posters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact (E-mail, phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. How would you rate following communication tools as important in communicating practical information about your campaign? Please give your personal opinion. 1 star is not important, 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media (Facebook, Twitter etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional media (Newspapers, TV, radio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print material (flyers, posters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact (E-mail, phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How would you rate following communication tools as important in getting people to participate in the clean-up? Please give your personal opinion. 1 star not important, 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media (Facebook, Twitter etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional media (Newspapers, TV, radio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print material (flyers, posters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact (E-mail, phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. In the context of your country and resources available for your team (material and knowledge), what are the challenges in mobilizing general public for a clean-up?

17. What country do you represent?
### Appendix III. The interview guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching themes</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Possible Probes (follow up questions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics of the network</strong></td>
<td>What is Let’s Do It! movement? What are the main goals?</td>
<td>Local: How is your campaign/movement called and what are the goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is the network built up? And the global core team?</td>
<td>Local: How is your team built up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer characteristics</strong></td>
<td>How long have you been active in LDI? How did you get engaged?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are your main tasks?</td>
<td>Do you have a formal training related to your tasks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are you doing it from your free time or is it a full-time thing?</td>
<td>Are you employed by LDI? Do you get a salary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have to manage people?</td>
<td>How many? How do you find volunteers to your team?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task specific questions</strong></td>
<td>See below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal views on communication</strong></td>
<td>How big role do personal contacts with teams from other countries play in sustaining the network? (Local: personal contact with team members from other countries)</td>
<td>How do you keep the contact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What communication challenges do you face in your everyday work in LDI?</td>
<td>What could be done to fix these problems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In your opinion, what are the best channels to communicate internally? And what would work best externally?</td>
<td>Has the way of communicating changed over time you have been active?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What channels do you actually use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you use social media in your communication?</td>
<td>How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much in your opinion has social media helped in creating discussion and recruiting new volunteers?</td>
<td>How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you make sure that local coordinators don’t give the “wrong” message/image?</td>
<td>Local: Team member won’t give the wrong image of the campaign.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDI has organized some conferences, both global ones and regional. Have you been part of any of them?</td>
<td>How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the importance of such meetings? For locals and for network as a whole?</td>
<td>How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extra comments

Is there anything else you would like to add that wasn’t brought up here now?

### Task specific questions

**Head of regional coordinators, global core team**

1. How is the work in your “department” organized?
2. How do you make the first contact with countries that haven’t yet joined the movement?
3. What other ways have countries found out about the movement?
4. How do you know what local teams are doing? What channels do you use to communicate with them?
5. What do you think could be done to improve the communication between the local and global level?
6. What kind of support do you offer local teams? Do you send any material help?

**Head PR coordinator, global core team**

1. How is the work in your “department” organized?

2. Besides helping local teams with their campaigns, do you also concentrate on raising awareness about LDI and its values on a global level (explain: Earth Hour style)? How?
3. Are you satisfied with the media attention the movement is getting on global level now? If not, what could be done to make it better?
4. Do you have made any communication goals for the network? What are they? How are you planning to reach them?
5. Do you use social media in your PR activities? How? How would you evaluate its usefulness as a communication channel in the context of your work? (I can ask those extra questions when I bring up social media in common questions)
6. What is the level of professionalism in the movement? If low, is it a problem for you?
7. Are you involved in local campaigns too? What are the main differences?

Head of Let’s Do It! Mediterranean, regional level

1. What are the tasks (is the function) of LDIM core team?
2. How do you find coordinators for local campaigns?
3. How is information exchange between the core team and local teams organized?
4. What kind of support do you offer for local teams?
5. What kind of support you get from the global team?
6. In the LDIM core team, do you also concentrate on spreading the awareness about LDIM goals among general public? If yes, how? If no, is it up to local teams to do it? Do you help them somehow?

Organizers of local campaigns (Netherlands, Kenya, Russia)

1. What is the situation with waste in your country? How is it regulated by government?
2. Do you know what people’s attitude towards the situation is?
3. How many clean-up actions have you organized? How did it go?
4. What kind of support you are getting from LDI global core team?
5. What kind of information you provide to them?
6. Do you also have a contact with local teams in other countries? How do you keep it?
7. In your opinion, what is the importance of being part of a global network compared to just having a local clean-up action?
8. What kind of communication channels did you use to inform the public and ask them to take part in the clean-up? Which channels worked the best in your view?