

APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 1: About your group

- Name of your group, including acronym or abbreviation.
- Location.
- Year your group was created/founded.
- Membership size.
- Principal category/group orientation: environmental; social justice and/or human rights; other, please specify.
- Specific social action agenda (e.g. anti-nuclear; religious/faith; civil rights; climate action; Indigenous Peoples; labour).
- What does your group specifically do?
- Coverage/extent of work: local/community based; state-wide/province-wide; national; international; online.
- Is your group a member of a network, alliance, or coalition? If yes, please specify.

Part 2: Effective campaign strategies

- Rate the effectiveness of the following strategies for accomplishing social change.
Scale: No experience; Very ineffective; Ineffective; Effective; Very effective.

- Education, information, awareness campaigns
- Non-violent direct action
- Both.
- Following on question above, what other approaches can you suggest in making social action campaigns effective? Please elaborate on your response.
- Rate the effectiveness of the following strategies for getting public support and engagement.
Scale: Scale: No experience; Very ineffective; Ineffective; Effective; Very effective.
 - Connecting campaigns with moral values.
 - Involving or engaging prominent people.
 - Extensive media coverage.
 - Presence of shocking incident or event that dramatically highlights a critical social problem.
 - Exposing the critical social problem in popular media.
 - Careful planning.
 - Affiliating in an alliance, network, or coalition.
 - Targeting campaigns towards existing social groups (e.g. faith groups, cultural groups, professional groups).
 - Engaging a public who share similar interests, faith, profession, age brackets, or community or area.
 - Engaging with friends, family, or relatives.
 - Engaging in joint activities even though they dare none of the above characteristics.
- Following on question above, what other strategies can you suggest in soliciting public support and engagement? Please elaborate on your response.
- Rate the importance of the following moral values in your campaigns.
Scale: No experience; Not important; Somewhat important; Important; Very important.
 - Nonviolence.
 - Social justice.
 - Right to security.
 - Intergenerational equity.
 - Conservation of biodiversity and ecological integrity.

- Basic human rights.
- Ecocentric rather than anthropocentric position.
- What other moral values can be invoked? Please elaborate on your response.
- In the absence of a critical social problem highlighted in the media, or exposed by a shocking incident, or supported by prominent people, what other strategies can you suggest?
- Outcomes from affiliating with a network or an alliance.
Scale: Strongly disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree.
 - Our group can create greater public impact since we are now part of a bigger group.
 - We feel we are now a stronger force.
 - We can combine our group's resources with that of other groups.
 - We feel we have lost part of our independence.
- What other outcomes have you experienced from being in a network, coalition or alliance? Please describe these sentiments.
- Challenges and barriers to effective campaigns?
 - Lack of funds and other resources.
 - Unsupportive media.
 - Absence of prominent persons in campaigns.
- What other challenges have you experienced? Please elaborate on your response.

Part 3: Ensuring public engagement

- Rate the effectiveness of the following modes of communication in ensuring public engagement as defined above.
Scale: No experience, Very ineffective; Ineffective; Effective; Very effective.
 - Face-to-face conversations.
 - Social media.
 - SMS or text messages.
 - All or combination of the above.
- What other communication strategies to ensure public engagement can you suggest? Please elaborate on your response.

APPENDIX B: NOTES ON THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT, STATISTICAL TREATMENT, AND REPORTING

The University of New South Wales' Built Environment Human Research Ethics Advisory Panel approved the research instrument on its meeting of 28 August 2014. The survey was administered between 28 August and 16 September 2014. The Boston University Charles River Campus Institutional Review Board, through its Protocol No. 4691X, approved the same survey instrument on 12 December 2017. It was administered between 13 December 2017 and 13 January 2018.

To assist the respondents with their choices, they were provided a range of choices through a four-level Likert scale, plus an option for 'no experience.' The scale does not have a 'neutral' option to reduce social desirability bias, or the tendency of the respondent to answer questions in a manner that will be viewed favourably by others. Study shows that social desirability bias is prone among scales with neutral options and arises from respondents' wanting 'to please the interviewer or appear helpful or not be seen to give what they perceive to be a socially unacceptable answer' (Garland 1991: 66–69).

To allow for free-flow of additional insights, the instrument also contains opportunities for respondents to voice an opinion, to expand on their answers, or even rebut the predetermined choices. The instrument was designed in this way to allow for some level of interaction. Another point to make about the scale is with regards to not using a Likert scale that contains large number of items, for example, seven,

nine, or ten choices. Although a large scale might capture a variety of responses and, therefore, might be more sensitive to nuanced positions, having a large number of choices can become too cumbersome to use and any additional benefits are cancelled by respondent fatigue (Ben-Nun 2008). Therefore, to safeguard reliability of response from plummeting, a shorter four-scale Likert scale, without a neutral option, was used.

To further minimise bias, no question was raised involving climate change or climate actions; rather, the topics revolved around broader issues that have universal application to social action regardless of campaign topic. By omitting climate change-related questions, the survey instrument allowed respondents, especially those who are neither environment nor climate-oriented, to express themselves freely without making any climate-related assumptions.

The statistics presented in this book generally represents verbal, not numerical, statements. To appreciate them as qualitative statements, similar items were clustered and the responses to these questions were compared and merged. Qualitative responses gathered from responses to follow-up questions have, thus, provided supplements that strengthened the statistical responses. Only when responses to these follow-up questions become broadly consistent with the medians and Interquartile Ranges (IQR) that confidence with the results is established. In case they are not, it might mean that the Likert-style statement did not function properly, for example, respondents may have been confused by the wording; therefore, those responses must be discarded from the dataset and are not reported. There was no such a case in this study.

Since the Likert items and scales produce ordinal data to measure non-numeric concepts and that can be ranked and tallied (Blaikie 2003; Hansen 2003), the statistical approach involves calculating the median as a measure of central tendency, not the mean as it would have been for a probability survey. Moreover, IQRs, not variances or standard deviations, are calculated as the measure of statistical dispersion (Clegg 1998). The interpretation is: the smaller the IQR, the more bunched up the data points around the median; by contrast, the higher the IQR, the more spread out the data points.

APPENDIX C: THE RESPONDENTS

The study intends to generate responses that are diverse in geography, focus of activities, membership size, and location of work to achieve rich, diversified responses. Except for the Caribbean and South American regions, all world regions have been represented in the 2014 survey. In a follow-up survey in 2017–2018, only groups from Australia, North America, and Turkey had participated. Majority of the responses in both surveys have come from Australia, Canada, and the USA ($N = 39$ or 87% in 2014 and $N = 7$ or 88% in 2017), indicating that the majority of our respondents work within social spaces in the context of industrialised societies.

Some may criticized the distribution of respondents and the response rate as imbalances. Indeed, only seven of the 39 invited participants opted to respond in our follow up survey. This should not be seen as a limitation. Indeed, the respondent size in a purposively sampled qualitative study—as the case in our surveys—need only be sufficient until the investigators have reached ‘the quality of information...rather than the number per se’ (Sandelowski 1995: 179). The responses collected for this work, despite their low quantities, appear to have given sufficient variability and richness for them to be considered useful for this book’s purposes.

In this study, thirty-four respondents or 72% categorise themselves as environmental groups (in 2017, there are six or 75% of them); two or 4% list their group as primarily oriented as a social justice or human rights

group (none in the 2017 cohort identified as such). Eleven or 23% list themselves as ‘other,’ including: three health-focused groups, two faith or religious groups, one education-focused group, and one petition-oriented group (there are two groups in this category in the 2017 survey). Table C.1 describes the participating social action groups, where our respondents emanate.

Since the respondents’ groups are not strictly limited to one particular cause in their focus and work, the respondents were also asked to specify other causes that they are supporting. Forty-one (87%) state that they are also working on climate actions (2017 survey: four or 25%); twelve (26%) are also concerned with health issues (2017 survey: two or 13%); ten (21%) state that they are also focused on the youth sector; eight (17%) are also working on issues about indigenous peoples; seven (15%) are also working on anti-corruption issues; seven also campaign on anti-nuclear and civil rights issues (2017 survey: one for each cause or 6%); five (11%) state that the scope of their work also include anti-racism; three (6%) state that their groups are also working on animal rights; another three (6%) state that anti-globalisation issues are among their other concerns; another three (6%) state that they are also working on labour issues; two (4%) state that LGBT rights are also among their concerns; two (4%) state that direct democracy is a cause they are also working on; another two (4%) state that they work on either women’s or education issues. Other causes that the respondents work on include: children and women, decolonisation, environmental law, anti-fracking, livelihoods, parenting, population, refugees, and disability rights.

With regard to coverage and location, 35 respondents (74%) state that they are locally or community-based (2017 survey: three or 21%); twenty-seven (57%) state that they are working at the state or provincial and national levels (2017: 6 or 43%); sixteen (34%) have international reach (2017 survey: only one); and twenty-four (51%) state that they also maintain online presence (2017: two respondents or 14%).

All respondents are involved in education, information, and awareness campaigns through lectures, seminars, trainings, workshops, pamphlet distribution, etc. In addition to education campaigns; 31 or 66% also use non-violent direct action, civil resistance, or civil disobedience such as sit-ins, rallies, demonstrations, strikes, workplace occupations, and/or blockades; 36 or 77% are using both education and non-violent direct action.

Fourteen respondents (30%) state that they have less than 50 members (2017 survey: three or 38%); seven (15%) state that they have between

Table C.1 Social action groups of study respondents

| <i>Respondent's code</i> | <i>Description of their social action group</i> |
|--------------------------|---|
| <i>2014 Survey</i> | |
| SAE01 | This U.S.-based climate action group was formed in 2012. The group pushes for climate legislation and policy. It testifies in state legislature, organises petition drives, meets with political candidates, organises communities around their sovereign rights, holds rallies and demonstrations, risks arrest, and meets with industry leaders to discuss concerns. It has several statewide campaigns involving infrastructure resistance and divestment from fossil fuels for endowments and pension funds. It holds monthly meetings in its regional nodes within the state |
| SAE02 | This faith-based Australian group was formed in 2006. It puts up initiatives that promote environmental responsibility in diverse settings from worshipping to school and local communities. It does this through education, advocacy and expressions of ecotheology. The group's policy priorities include sustainability, energy, water and pollution |
| SAE03 | This faith-based Australian group was formed in 2007. It strives to make its operations more sustainable |
| SAE04 | This U.S.-based environmental group was formed in 2003. It helps individuals with specific environmental problems in their respective neighbourhoods. The group also has taken part in statewide environmental campaigns against fracking |
| SAE05 | This U.S.-based climate action group was formed in 2009. It connects youth environmental activists from across the US Pacific Northwest region to share campaign ideas, brainstorm new tactics, and conduct trainings and workshops |
| SAE06 | This U.S.-based group was formed in 1981. It educates doctors and medical students on the health effects of climate change to spur them to action. It is also involved in local climate change and public health adaptation planning efforts |
| SAE07 | This Hungary-based environmental group was formed in 1988. It primarily works on transport pollution issues, but is also involved with campaigns for greener and cleaner Budapest |
| SAE08 | This Australia-based climate action group was formed in 2006. It undertakes projects aimed at raising climate action awareness including the need for Australian sustainable energy transition |
| SAE09 | This Nepal-based group was formed in 2001. It conducts research-based education and advocacy campaigns, recommends public policy, and undertakes pilot implementation programs on issues related to sustainable energy use and environmental conservation |
| SAE10 | This Canada-based group was formed in 1989. It promotes environmental protection through reduction, reuse, and recycling |

(continued)

Table C.1 (continued)

| <i>Respondent's code</i> | <i>Description of their social action group</i> |
|--------------------------|---|
| SAE11 | This Australia-based climate action group was formed in 2007. It aims to increase its members and communities' climate change awareness and understanding |
| SAE12 | This Australia-based climate action group was formed in 2006. It aims to raise awareness on local, state, and national climate change issues, and environmental and trade exploitation. It was involved in a number of campaigns including surveys, film screenings, market stalls, lobbying a local council, etc. |
| SAE13 | This Australia-based group was founded in 2006. It researches and promotes information about domestic solar photovoltaic rooftop installations. It also lobbies its local council to be more proactively supportive of climate action |
| SAE14 | This US-based group was formed in 2010 to advocate for climate change education |
| SAE15 | This Gambia-based international group was formed in 1994. It works in partnership with local civic groups to support communities to realise their development aspirations. The group works on climate resilient techniques to enhance community livelihoods. It also works on issues about food and nutritional security, resilience to disasters, institutional capacity strengthening, peace building, and governance |
| SAE16 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2008. It provides assistance in teaching sustainability through free-access online learning activities that are linked to the national curriculum |
| SAE17 | This U.S.-based group was formed in 1996. It mobilises citizens against forest destruction and deforestation. It aims to raise awareness about the growing biomass industry. Among its current campaigns are mobilising support to oppose the destruction of the US Southern forests and working with European policy leaders to stop the growing European demand for biomass |
| SAE18 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2008. It engages local residents, businesses, and community groups in its area and surrounding districts to reduce water and energy consumption, minimise waste, and increase biodiversity |
| SAE19 | This Australia-based group was formed in 1996. It is a community legal centre providing free advice on environmental law issues including planning, climate change, environmental assessments, and threatened species protection |
| SAE20 | This Nepal-based group was formed in 2008. It provides capacity building programs for young graduates of natural sciences, researches biodiversity and climate change, appears in media to campaign on environmental awareness, and publishes a weekly newsletter on environmental issues in the Himalayas |

(continued)

Table C.1 (continued)

| <i>Respondent's code</i> | <i>Description of their social action group</i> |
|--------------------------|--|
| SAE21 | This Canada-based group was formed in 2007. It meets once a month for forums or film screenings on environmental issues. It advocates for citywide climate change preparedness. It has been conducting an annual environmental fair that attracts 600–800 people |
| SAE22 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2006. It provides support to its members on low carbon living, and how to lobby politicians on climate action |
| SAE23 | This Turkey-based group was formed in 2004. It works on biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resources management |
| SAE24 | This Australia based group was formed in 2006. It provides climate action information to its members and the local residents |
| SAE25 | This Canada-based group was formed in 2013. It lobbies local governments of cities and towns to pass laws that would require gasoline retailers to place climate change and air pollution labels on their gas pump nozzles |
| SAE26 | This US-based group was formed in 2010. Its primary work is concerned with clean water and air |
| SAE27 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2011. It develops strategies for triggering a fast build-up of community and governmental commitment to restoring a safe climate through an emergency speed economic mobilisation |
| SAE28 | This India-based group was formed in 1988. It works on local community action for the protection of the environment. The group covers rural areas and focuses on women, children, and the youth |
| SAE29 | This Canada-based group was formed in 1969. It works to protect and conserve British Columbia's wilderness, species and ecosystems within the context of global warming impacts |
| SAE30 | This US-based group was formed in 2011. It works to raise awareness about the Keystone pipeline on local, national and international levels |
| SAE31 | This Australia-based group was formed in 1988. It focuses its work on ecologically sustainable population, both nationally and internationally |
| SAE32 | This South Africa-based group was formed in 2011. It works to resist fracking activities through education and awareness campaigns |
| SAE33 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2007. It engages with the community and people in positions of influence to encourage them to take stronger climate action |
| SAE34 | This US-based group was formed in 2007. It works to empower the younger generation who are most at risk by the climate crisis to be heard by the generation with the most power to enact change. The group trains youth leaders to become spokespersons for their generation in boardrooms, classrooms, courtrooms, the media, Congress, and communities |

(continued)

Table C.1 (continued)

| <i>Respondent's code</i> | <i>Description of their social action group</i> |
|--------------------------|---|
| SAE35 | This US-based group was formed in 2013. The group works online on a petition site that seeks signatures in which signers publicly acknowledge climate change as a threat to civilization and calls on the US Federal Government to instigate a World War 2 scale mobilization. The petition calls for a commitment to reach zero net carbon emissions by 2025 and to devote national resources to mitigate the damage to be caused by climate change in future decades |
| SAE36 | This US-based group was formed in 2012. It calls on Columbia University to divest its endowments from fossil fuel companies |
| SAE37 | This US-based group was formed in 2012. It holds forums, participates in demonstrations, and lobbies for change |
| SAE38 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2008. It works to inform the community about climate change science and relevant issues, lobby governments and representatives to take action, support renewable energy campaigns, support divestment from fossil fuels, and support activities that reduce the impact of anthropogenic climate change |
| SAE39 | This US-based group was formed in 2011. It calls on the University of California to divest its holdings from fossil fuel companies and reinvest these funds in sustainable alternatives |
| SAJ01 | This faith-based Australian group was formed in 2012. It works and dialogs with local communities and their leaders |
| SAO01 | This Canada-based group was formed in 1994. It works on issues around human health and the environment such as climate change and chemical pesticides |
| SAO02 | This US-based group was formed in 1998. It runs a blog and a petition site |
| SAO03 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2010. It has a variety of work including: (1) advocacy for state, national and international policy; (2) secondary research; (3) publishing; (4) communications, education and outreach; (5) community and health sector engagement; (6) developing a network of health service providers engaged in sustainability; (7) running events; (8) liaising with environmental campaigners; (9) online campaigns; (10) offering webinars |
| SAO04 | This US-based group was formed in 2010. It defends the teaching of science in public schools specifically on evolution and climate change |
| SAO05 | This US-based group was formed in 1981. It works on issues surrounding resilience, climate change mitigation, and adaptation. The group has also been working to: (1) eliminate nuclear weapons; (2) support clean, safe renewable energy; (3) eliminate coal and nuclear power; (4) address the health impacts of climate change and of coal and nuclear radioisotope exposure |

(continued)

Table C.1 (continued)

| <i>Respondent's code</i> | <i>Description of their social action group</i> |
|--------------------------|---|
| SAO06 | This Australia-based group was formed in 1957. It is involved in grassroots level organising working most particularly in anti-nuclear action |
| SAO07 | This UK-based group was formed in 1968. This faith-based international development agency works on long-term development and disaster relief |
| <i>2017 Survey</i> | |
| SAE40 | This U.S.-based group was formed in 2013. It works in the Berkshire |
| SAE41 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2011. It develops strategy for emergency speed restoration of a safe climate |
| SAE42 | This US-based group was formed in 2008. It educates, advocates and offers workshops, forums and conferences and community-based trainings on climate resiliency, nuclear disarmament advocacy, promotion of clean, safe, renewable energy and urging regulation of environmental toxins |
| SAE43 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2013. It connects investors with owners of commercial properties needing finance for solar installations |
| SAO08 | This Australia-based group was formed in 2010. It does advocacy, research, policy and communications to develop policy guidance on health and climate change for governments and other groups. This group participated in the 2014 survey and was coded as SAO03 |
| SAE44 | This Canada-based group was formed in 1985. It conducts public education at events and in schools |
| SAO09 | This US-based group was formed in 1981. It defends the integrity of science education |
| SAE45 | This Turkey-based group was formed in 2004. It works on biodiversity research, conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. This group participated in the 2014 survey and was coded as SAE23 |

51 and 100 members (2017 survey: two or 25%); five (11%) say that they have between 101 and 250 members (nil during the 2017 survey); two (4%) have between 251 and 500 members (2017 survey: two or 25%); six (13%) have membership size from 501 to 999; six others (13%) have membership size between 1,000 and 4,999; seven (15%) state that they have more than 5,000 members (2017 survey: one or 12%).

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, P., & Krueger, C. (1994). *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict: The Dynamics of People Power in the Twentieth Century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Adam, E. M. (2017). Intersectional coalitions: The paradoxes of rights-based movement building in LGBTQ and immigrant communities. *Law & Society Review, 51*, 132–167.
- Agyeman, J. (2008). Toward a ‘just’ sustainability? *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 22*, 751–756.
- Agyeman, J., Doppelt, B., Lynn, K., & Hatic, H. (2007). The climate-justice link: Communicating risk with low-income and minority audiences. In S. C. Moser & L. Dilling (Eds.), *Creating a Climate for Change: Communicating Climate Change and Facilitating Social Change* (pp. 119–138). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- American Psychological Association (APA). (2009). *Psychology and Global Climate Change: Addressing a Multi-Faceted Phenomenon and Set of Challenges: A Report by the Task Force on the Interface Between Psychology and Global Climate Change*. Washington, DC: APA.
- Anderson, K., & Nevins, J. (2016). Planting seeds so something bigger might emerge: The Paris Agreement and the fight against climate change. *Socialism and Democracy, 30*, 209–218.
- Andrews, K. T., Ganz, M., Baggetta, M., Han, H., & Lim, C. (2010). Leadership, membership, and voice: Civic association that work. *American Journal of Sociology, 115*, 1191–1242.
- Arabella Advisors. (2014). *Measuring the Global Fossil Fuel Divestment Movement*. <http://bit.ly/1rcDL6Q>.

- Assadourian, E. (2013). Building an enduring environmental movement. In E. Assadourian & T. Prugh (Project Directors), *State of the World 2013: Is Sustainability Still Possible?* (pp. 292–303). Washington, DC; Covelo, CA; and London, UK: Island Press.
- Australian Youth Climate Coalition (AYCC). (2013). *About AYCC*. <http://bit.ly/1pm8daW>.
- Bacon, W. (2013). *Climate Science in Australian Newspapers*. Sydney, Australia: The Australian Centre for Independent Journalism.
- Bacon, W., & Nash, C. (2012). Playing the media game: The relative (in)visibility of coal industry interests in media reporting of coal as a climate change issue in Australia. *Journalism Studies*, 13, 243–258.
- Barboza, T. (2014, September 22). L.A., Houston, Philadelphia mayors vow more action on climate change. *Los Angeles Times*. <http://lat.ms/1odyfOn>.
- Bertini, I. (2014, September 23). Church of Sweden completed fossil fuels divestment as movement doubles in one year. *Blue & Green Tomorrow*. <http://bit.ly/1wLlKyM>.
- Beveridge, R., & Kern, K. (2013). Energiewende in Germany: Background, developments and future challenges. *Renewable Energy Law Policy Review*, 4, 3–12.
- Billings, P. (2013, December 8). Protesters in Hodgman's sights. *The Examiner*. <http://bit.ly/1d5a931>.
- Blaikie, N. (2003). *Analysing quantitative data*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Bomberg, E., & McEwen, N. (2012). Mobilizing community energy. *Energy Policy*, 51, 435–444.
- Bond, J. (2001). The media and the movement: Looking back from the southern front. In B. Ward (Ed.), *Media, Culture, and the Modern African American Freedom Struggle* (pp. 16–40). Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Bostrom, A., Böhm, G., & O'Connor, R. E. (2013). Targeting and tailoring climate change communications. *WIREs Climate Change*, 4, 447–455.
- Boykoff, M. T., & Boykoff, J. M. (2004). Balance as bias: Global warming and the US prestige press. *Global Environmental Change*, 14, 125–136.
- Boykoff, M. T., & Goodman, M. K. (2009). Conspicuous redemption? Reflections on the promises and perils of the 'celebritization' of climate Change. *Geoforum*, 40, 395–406.
- Brown, L. R., & Betsill, M. (2008). *Plan B 3.0: Mobilizing to Save Civilization*. New York, London, UK, and Washington, DC: W. W. Norton.
- Bullekey, H., & Betsill, M. (2003). *Cities and Climate Change: Urban Sustainability and Global Governance*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Buys, L., Aird, R., Van Megen, K., Miller, E., & Sommerfeld, J. (2014). Perceptions of climate change and trust in information providers in rural Australia. *Public Understanding of Science*, 23, 170–188.
- C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group (C40). (2015). *C40 Cities*. <http://bit.ly/1ir0TJ5>.

- C40, UN Secretary General's Special Envoy for Cities and Climate Change, & Stockholm Environment Institute. (2014, September). *Advancing Climate Ambition: Cities as Partners in Global Climate Action*. <http://bit.ly/1yGBKXC>.
- C40, United Cities and Local Governments, & International Council for Local Governments. (n.d.). *The Compact of Mayors*. <http://bit.ly/1pFz9ni>.
- CAN International. (n.d.). About Us. <http://www.climate-network.org>.
- Carson, L. (2010, September 9). Growing up politically: Conducting a national conversation on climate change. *Australian Policy Online*. <http://bit.ly/ONNRaH>.
- Carson, L. (2011). Dilemmas, disasters and deliberative democracy: Getting the public back into policy. *Griffith Review Edition 32: Wicked Problems, Exquisite Dilemmas*, 32(Winter), 25–32.
- Center for Research on Environmental Decisions (CRED). (2009). *The Psychology of Climate Change Communication: A Guide for Scientists, Journalists, Educators, Political Aides, and the Interested Public*. New York, NY: CRED, Columbia University.
- Chandler, D. (2004). Building global civil society 'from below'? *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 33, 313–339.
- Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. J. (2011). *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2012). *Occupy*. New York: Zuccotti Park Press.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1993). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion* (2nd Rev. ed.). New York: Quill-William Morrow.
- Cinderby, S., Haq, G., Cambridge, H., & Lock, K. (2015). Building community resilience: Can everyone enjoy a good life? *Local Environment*, 21, 1252–1270.
- City Government of New York. (2014). *One City, Built to Last: Transforming New York City's Buildings for a Low-Carbon Future*. <http://on.nyc.gov/1pJQQRB>.
- City of Eugene. (2010). *A Community Climate and Energy Action Plan for Eugene*. <http://bit.ly/1vEpT6r>.
- City of Evanston. (2012, May 3). Evanston to Buy Its Own Energy, Save Residents Money and Help Achieve Climate Action Goals. <http://bit.ly/16Nw8aa>.
- City of Sydney. (2013). *City of Sydney Decentralised Energy Master Plan Renewable Energy 2012–2030*. <http://bit.ly/1f0DWx3>.
- Cleantechica. (2013). *Germany: 100% Renewable Energy and Beyond*. RenewEconomy. <http://bit.ly/12e7iT6>.
- Clegg, F. (1998). *Simple Statistics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Climate Action Tracker. (2015, November 13). *G20—All INDCs in, but Large Gap Remains*. Berlin, Germany: Climate Analytics and Ecofys; Potsdam, Germany: Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research; and Cologne, Germany: NewClimate Institute.

- Climate Reality Project. (n.d.). *Climate Reality Leadership Corps*. <http://bit.ly/1yU5wFv>.
- Collins, R. (2010). The contentious social interactionism of Charles Tilly. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73, 5–10.
- Cumbers, A., Routledge, P., & Nativel, C. (2008). The entangled geographies of global justice networks. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32, 183–201.
- Cvetkovich, G., & Löfstedt, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Social Trust and the Management of Risk: Advances in Social Science Theory and Research*. London, UK: Earthscan.
- Daly, H., & Farley, J. (2004). *Ecological Economics: Principles and Applications*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Dean Moore, K., & Nelson, M. P. (2013). Moving toward a global moral consensus on environmental action. In *State of the World 2013: Is Sustainability Still Possible?* Washington, DC, Covelo, and London, UK: Island Press.
- Delina, L. (2016). *Strategies for Rapid Climate Mitigation: Wartime Mobilisation as Model for Action?* Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Delina, L. (2018). Can energy democracy thrive in a non-democracy? *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 6, 5.
- Delina, L., & Diesendorf, M. (2013). Is wartime mobilisation a suitable policy model for rapid national climate mitigation? *Energy Policy*, 58, 371–380.
- Delina, L., Diesendorf, M., & Merson, J. (2014). Strengthening the climate action movement strategies from histories. *Carbon Management*, 5, 397–409.
- Della Porta, D. (2005). Multiple belongings, tolerant identities, and the construction of ‘another politics’: Between the European social forum and the local social fora. In D. Della Porta & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Della Porta, D., & Diani, M. (2006). *Social Movements: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Della Porta, D., Andretta, M., Mosca, L., & Reiter, H. (2006). *Globalization from Below*. London, UK: University of Minnesota Press.
- Democracy Now! (2014, September 21). *Special 3-Hour Broadcast of the People’s Climate March*. <http://bit.ly/1tHsEFF>.
- Diani, M. (1992). The concept of social movement. *The Sociological Review*, 40(1), 1–25.
- Diani, M. (1995). *Green Networks*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Diesendorf, M. (2009). *Climate Action: A Campaign Manual for Greenhouse Solutions*. Sydney, Australia: UNSW Press.
- Dietz, R., & O’Neill, D. (2013). *Enough Is Enough: Building a Sustainable Economy in a World of Finite Resources*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Dryzek, J. (2000). *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals Critics, Contestations*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Dryzek, J. (2009). Democratization as deliberative capacity building. *Comparative Political Studies*, *42*, 1379–1402.
- Dunlap, R. E., & McCright, A. M. (2011). Organized climate change denial. In J. S. Dryzek, R. B. Norgaard, & D. Schlosberg (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society* (pp. 144–160). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ereaut, G., & Segnit, N. (2006). *Warm words: How are we telling the climate story and can we tell it better?* London, UK: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Evans, J. P. (2011). Resilience, ecology and adaptation in the experimental city. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *36*, 360–376.
- Farrell, J. (2011). *Democratizing the Electricity System: A Vision for the 21st Century Grid*. <http://bit.ly/1eZrYH8>.
- Featherstone, D. (2005). Towards the relational construction of militant particularisms: On why the geographies of past struggles matter for resistance to neoliberal globalisation. *Antipode*, *37*, 250–271.
- Featherstone, D. (2008). *Resistance, Space and Political Identities: The Making of Counter-Global Networks*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Featherstone, H., Weitkamp, E., Ling, K., & Burnett, F. (2009). Defining issue-based publics for public engagement: Climate change as a case study. *Public Understanding of Science*, *18*, 94–101.
- Feldman, L., Maibach, E. W., Roser-Renouf, C., & Leiserowitz, A. (2011). Climate on cable: The nature and impact of global warming coverage on Fox News, CNN, and MSNBC. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, *17*, 3–32.
- Fernandez, R. M., & MacAdam, D. (1988). Social networks and social movements: Multiorganizational fields and recruitment to Mississippi Freedom Summer. *Sociological Forum*, *3*, 357–382.
- Fessenden-Raden, J., Fitchen, J. M., & Heath, J. S. (1987). Providing risk information in communities: Factors influencing what is heard and accepted. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, *12*, 94–101.
- Fisher, D. R. (1998). Rumoring theory and the internet: A framework for analysing the grass roots. *Social Science Computer Review*, *16*, 158–168.
- Fisher, D. R., Dow, D. M., & Ray, R. (2017). Intersectionality takes it to the streets: Mobilizing across diverse interests for the Women’s March. *Science Advances*, *3*, eaao1390.
- Fisher, D. R., & McInerney, P.-B. (2012). The limits of networks in social movement retention: On canvassers and their careers. *Mobilization: An International Journal*, *17*, 109–128.
- Floyd, D. L., Prentice-Dunn, S., & Rogers, R. W. (2000). A meta-analysis of research on protection motivation theory. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *30*, 407–429.

- Foderaro, L. W. (2014, September 21). Taking a call for climate change to the streets. *The New York Times*. <http://nyti.ms/1qkVZzy>.
- Foran, J. (2014). “¡Volveremos!/we will return”: The state of play for the global climate justice movement. *Interface*, 6, 454–477.
- Foxon, T. J. (2013). Transition pathways for a UK low carbon electricity future. *Energy Policy*, 52, 10–24.
- FrameWorks Institute. (2002). *Framing Public Issue*. Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.
- Fung, A. (2008). Democratizing the policy process. In R. Goodin, M. Rein, & M. Moran (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy* (pp. 669–688). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ganz, M. (2004). Why David sometimes wins: Strategic capacity in social movements. In D. M. Messick & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *The Psychology of Leadership: New Perspectives and Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Ganz, M. (2006a). Strategy, deliberation and meetings. In *Organizing Course Notes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School. <http://bit.ly/1Dx2ppv>.
- Ganz, M. (2006b). Mobilizing power: Analysis, strategy, deliberation. In *Organizing Course Notes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School. <http://bit.ly/1xcbrGW>.
- Ganz, M. (2010). *Why David Sometimes Wins: Leadership, Organization, and Strategy in the California Farm Worker Movement*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Garland, R. (1991). The mid-point on a rating scale: Is it desirable? *Marketing Bulletin*, 2, 66–70.
- Gifford, R. (2011). The dragons of inaction: Psychological barriers that limit climate change mitigation and adaptation. *American Psychology*, 66, 290–302.
- Gilding, P. (2011). *The Great Disruption: How the Climate Crisis Will Transform the Global Economy*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Giugni, M., & Grasso, M. T. (2015). Environmental movements in advanced industrial democracies: Heterogeneity, transformation and institutionalization. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 40, 337–361.
- Gleditsch, K. S., & Celestino, M. R. (2013). Fresh carnations or all thorn, no rose? Non-violent campaigns and transitions in autocracies. *Journal of Peace Research*, 50, 385–400.
- Go 100% Renewable Energy. (n.d.). *About Us*. <http://bit.ly/1umA6U1>.
- Gudynas, E. (2011). Buen Vivir: Germinando alternativas al desarrollo. *América Latina en movimiento*, 462, 1–20.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haas, T., & Sander, H. (2016). Shortcomings and perspectives of the German Energiewende. *Socialism and Democracy*, 30, 121–143.

- Haidt, J. (2007). The new synthesis on moral psychology. *Science*, 316, 998–1002.
- Hall, J. D. (2005). The long civil rights movement and the political uses of the past. *Journal of American History*, 91, 1233–1263.
- Hall, N., & Taplin, R. (2008). Room for climate advocates in a coal-focused economy? NGO influence on Australian climate policy. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 43, 359–379.
- Hall, N., Taplin, R., & Goldstein, W. (2010). Empowerment of individuals and realization of community agency: Applying action research to climate change responses in Australia. *Action Research*, 8, 71–91.
- Hannam, P. (2014, October 20). More Australian universities come under pressure to divest from fossil fuels. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. <http://bit.ly/1qLBZ13>.
- Hansen, J. P. (2003). CAN'T MISS—conquer any number task by making important statistics simple. Part 1. Types of variables, mean, median, variance and standard deviation. *Journal for Healthcare Quality*, 25, 19–24.
- Hess, D. J. (2018). Energy democracy and social movements: A multi-coalition perspective on the politics of sustainability transitions. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 40, 177–189.
- Hetherington, K. (1997). *Expressions of Identity*. London, UK: Sage.
- Hopkins, R. (2008). *The Transition Handbook: From Oil Dependency to Local Resilience*. Totnes, Devon, UK: Green Books.
- Houck, D. W., & Dixon, D. E. (Eds.). (2006). *Rhetoric, Religion and the Civil Rights Movement, 1954–1965*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2014). *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report of the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC*. The Core Writing Team, R. K. Pachauri & L. Meyer (Eds.). Switzerland: IPCC.
- IPCC Working Group III. (2014). *Summary for Policymakers in Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability* (Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC). Switzerland: IPCC.
- Isham, J., & Waage, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Ignition: What You Can Do to Fight Global Warming and Spark a Movement*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Islar, M., & Busch, H. (2016). “We are not in this to save the polar bears!”—The link between community renewable energy development and ecological citizenship. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 29, 303–319.
- Jasanoff, S. (2004). Science and citizenship: A new synergy. *Science and Public Policy*, 31, 90–94.
- Jasper, J. M., & Poulsen, J. D. (1995). Recruiting strangers and friends: Moral shocks and social networks in animal rights and antinuclear protests. *Social Problems*, 42, 493–512.
- Jenkins, J. C. (1985). *The Politics of Insurgency: The Farm Workers Movement in the 1960s*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Jenkins, K., McCauley, D., Heffron, R., Stephan, H., & Rehner, R. (2016). Energy justice: A conceptual review. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *11*, 174–182.
- Johnson T. (2014). *Sunday News Shows Ignore Historic Climate March*. Media Matters for America. <http://bit.ly/1wWLR27>.
- Jost, J. T., Napier, J. L., Thorisdottir, H., Gosling, S. D., Palfai, T. P., & Ostafin, B. (2007). Are needs to manage uncertainty and threat associated with political conservatism or ideological extremity? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*, 989–1007.
- Kahan, D. M., & Braman, D. (2008). The self-defensive cognition of self-defense. *American Criminal Law Review*, *45*, 1–65.
- Kahan, D. M., Jenkins-Smith, H., & Braman, D. (2011). Cultural cognition of scientific consensus. *Journal of Risk Research*, *14*, 147–174.
- Karagiannopoulos, V. (2012). The role of the internet in political struggles: Some conclusions from Iran and Egypt. *New Political Science*, *34*, 151–171.
- Kirby, A. (2008). *A UN Guide to Climate Neutrality*. Malta: United Nations Environment Programme and GRID-Arendal.
- Klandermans, B., & Oegema, D. (1987). Potentials, networks, motivations, and barriers: Steps towards participation in social movements. *American Sociological Review*, *52*, 519–531.
- Klein, N. (2014). *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. the Climate*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Krosnick, J. (2013). *Public Opinion on Global Warming in Texas: 2013*. Stanford, CA: Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2013). Does the American public support legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? *Daedalus, the Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Science*, *142*, 26–39.
- Kurzman, C. (1996). Structural opportunity and perceived opportunity in social movement theory: The Iranian Revolution of 1979. *American Sociological Review*, *61*, 153–170.
- Kurzman, C. (2012). The Arab Spring: Ideals of the Iranian Green Movement, methods of the Iranian Revolution. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, *44*, 162–165.
- Læssoe, J. (2007). Participation and sustainable development: The post-ecologist transformation of citizen involvement in Denmark. *Environmental Politics*, *16*, 231–250.
- Landy, D. (2015). Bringing the outside field interaction and transformation from below in political struggles. *Social Movement Studies*, *14*, 255–269.
- Largest Climate March in History—Your Pictures. (2014, September 22). *The Guardian*. <http://bit.ly/1uRQI94>.
- Leiserowitz, A., Maibach, E., & Roser-Renouf, C. (2009). *Global Warming's 'Six Americas' 2009: An Audience Segmentation Analysis*. New Haven, CT: Yale Project on Climate Change: School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University; Fairfax, VA: Center for Climate Change Communication and George Mason University.

- Leviston, Z., Price, J., Malkin, S., & McCrea, R. (2014). *Fourth Annual Survey of Australian Attitudes to Climate Change: Interim Report*. Canberra: CSIRO.
- Lorenzoni, I., Nicholson-Cole, S., & Whitmarsh, L. (2007). Barriers perceived to engaging with climate change among the UK public and their policy implications. *Global Environmental Change*, *17*, 445–459.
- Lovell, H., Hann, V., & Watson, P. (2018). Rural laboratories and experiments at the fringes: A case study of a smart grid on Bruny Island, Australia. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *36*, 146–155.
- MacLeod, J. (2012). *Civil Resistance in West Papua (Perlawanan tanpa kekerasan di Tanah Papua)*. Ph.D. thesis, School of Political Science and International Studies, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia.
- Mann, M. (1993). *The Sources of Social Power, Volume 2: The Rise of Classes and Nation-States, 1760–1914*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Manning, S., & Reinecke, J. (2016). A modular governance architecture in-the-making: How transnational standard-setters govern sustainability transitions. *Research Policy*, *45*, 618–633.
- Mansbridge, J., Bohman, J., Chambers, S., Christiano, T., Fung, A., et al. (2012). A systemic approach to deliberative democracy. In J. Parkinson & J. Mansbridge (Eds.), *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale* (pp. 1–26). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mark, J. (2013). Conversation: Naomi Klein. *Earth Island Journal* (Autumn). <http://bit.ly/18R9oZ2>.
- Markowitz, E. M., & Shariff, A. F. (2012). Climate change and moral judgment. *Nature Climate Change*, *2*, 243–247.
- Martin, B. (2010). Theory for activists. *Social Anarchism*, *44*, 22–41.
- Marx, G. T. (1967). Opiate or inspiration of civil rights militancy among Negroes? *American Sociological Review*, *32*, 64–72.
- Marx, S. M., Weber, E. U., Orlove, B. S., Leiserowitz, A., Krantz, D. H., Roncoli, C., et al. (2007). Communication and mental processes: Experiential and analytic processing of uncertain climate information. *Global Environmental Change*, *17*, 47–48.
- Maxmin, C. (2017, June 5). How Harvard Divestment Was Won. *The Nation*.
- McAdam, D. (1999). *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- McAdam, D. (2011). The US civil rights movement: Power from below and above, 1945–70. In A. Roberts & T. G. Ash (Eds.), *Civil Resistance and Power Politics: The Experience of Non-violent Action from Gandhi to the Present*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- McCauley, D., Rehner, R. W. M., & Pavlenko, M. (2015). Assessing the justice implications of energy infrastructural development in the Arctic. In R. J. Heffron & G. Little (Eds.), *Delivering Energy Law and Policy in the EU and US*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

- McKibben, B. (2012, July 19). Global warming's terrifying new math. *Rolling Stone*. <http://rol.st/LuRoru>.
- McKibben, B. (2013). Beyond baby steps: Analysing the cap-and-trade flop. *Grist*. <http://bit.ly/1dGK3sU>.
- McKibben, B. (2013, April 11). The fossil fuel resistance. *Rolling Stone*.
- McNamara, M. (2014, January 29). Criminalising activism a growing trend. *Echo Net Daily*. <http://bit.ly/100GuYE>.
- Melucci, A. (1989). *Nomads of the Present*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Melucci, A. (1996). *Challenging Codes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Millar, M. (2013, November 19). Harper government's extensive spying on anti-oil sands group revealed in FOIs. *Vancouver Observer*. <http://Bit.Ly/1ddnsqs>.
- Mirkinson, J. (2014, September 22). TV news misses yet another opportunity to cover climate change. *The Huffington Post*. <http://huff.to/1sUOqkX>.
- Monbiot, G. (2006). *Heat: How to Stop the Planet Burning*. London: Allen Lane.
- Mooney, C. (2011, May/June). The science of why we don't believe science. *Mother Jones*. <http://bit.ly/2Ez9egt>.
- Moore, K. D., & Nelson, M. P. (Eds.). (2010). *Moral Ground: Ethical Action for a Planet in Peril*. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press.
- Morris, C., & Jungjohann, A. (2016). *Energy Democracy: Germany's Energiewende to Renewables*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moser, S. C. (2007a). Communication strategies to mobilize the climate movement. In J. Isham & S. Waage (Eds.), *Ignition: What You Can Do to Fight Global Warming and Spark a Movement* (pp. 73–95). Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Moser, S. C. (2007b). In the long shadows of inaction: The quiet building of a climate protection movement in the United States. *Global Environmental Politics*, 7, 124–144.
- Moser, S. C. (2007c). More bad news: The risk of neglecting emotional responses to climate change information. In S. C. Moser & L. Dilling (Eds.), *Creating a Climate for Change: Communicating Climate Change and Facilitating Social Change* (pp. 64–80). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Moser, S. C. (2009). Costly knowledge—Unaffordable denial: The politics of public understanding and engagement on climate change. In M. T. Boykoff (Ed.), *The Politics of Climate Change: A Survey* (pp. 155–181). Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Moser, S. C., & Dilling, L. (Eds.). (2007). *Creating a climate for change: Communicating climate change and facilitating social change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Moyer, B. (1987). *The Movement Action Plan: A Strategic Framework Describing the Eight Stages of Successful Social Movements*. The Social Movement Empowerment Project. <http://bit.ly/1f9KI6p>.
- Moyer, B., McAllister, J., Finley, M. L., & Soifer, S. (2001). *Doing Democracy: The MAP Model for Organizing Social Movements*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.
- Mungiu-Pippidi, A., & Munteanu, I. (2009). Moldova's "Twitter revolution". *Journal of Democracy*, 20, 136–142.
- Murphy, G. (2005). Coalitions and the development of the global environmental movement: A double-edged sword. *Mobilization*, 10, 235–250.
- Nagda, B. R. A. (2006). Breaking barriers, crossing borders, building bridges: Communication processes in intergroup dialogues. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 553–576.
- National Research Council. (2002). *New Tools for Environmental Protection: Education, Information, and Voluntary Measures*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- National Science Foundation (NSF). (2009). *Science and Engineering Indicators 2006*. Arlington, VA: NSF.
- Nature (editorial). (2010). Climate of Fear. *Nature*, 464, 141.
- Nepstad, S. E. (2011). *Nonviolent Revolutions: Civil Resistance in the Late 20th Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- New Economics Foundation (NEF). (2008). *A Green New Deal: Joined-Up Policies to Solve the Triple Crunch of the Credit Crisis, Climate Change and High Oil Prices*. London, UK: NEF.
- Niemeyer, S., & Jennstål, J. (2018). *Scaling up deliberative effects—Applying lessons of minipublics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press Handbook of Deliberative Democracy, Oxford University Press.
- Nisbet, M. C. (2009). Communicating climate change: Why frames matter for public engagement. *Environment*, 51, 12–23.
- North, P. (2011). The politics of climate activism in the UK: A social movement analysis. *Environment and Planning A*, 43, 1581–1598.
- North, P., & Longhurst, N. (2013). Grassroots localization? The scalar potential of and limits of the 'transition' approach to climate change and resource constraint. *Urban Studies*, 50, 1423–1438.
- Nunes, R. (2009). What were you wrong about ten years ago? *Turbulence*, 5, 38–39.
- O'Neill, S. J., & Hulme, M. (2009). An iconic approach for representing climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 19, 402–410.
- O'Neill, S. J., & Nicholson-Cole, S. (2009). "Fear won't do it": Promoting positive engagement with climate change through visual and iconic representations. *Science Communication*, 30, 355–379.

- Oettingen, G. (2015). *Rethinking Positive Thinking: Inside the New Science of Motivation*. New York: Penguin.
- Opp, K.-D., & Gern, C. (1993). Dissident groups, personal networks, and spontaneous cooperation: The East-German revolution of 1989. *American Sociological Review*, 58, 659–680.
- Orr, D. W. (2013). Governance in the long emergency. In E. Assadourian & T. Prugh (Eds.), *State of the World 2013: Is Sustainability Still Possible?* (pp. 279–291). Washington, DC; Covelo; and London, UK: Island Press.
- Oteman, M., Wiering, M., & Helderman, J.-K. (2014). The institutional space of community initiatives for renewable energy: A comparative case study of the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark. *Energy Sustainability and Society*, 4, 11.
- Parag, Y., Capstick, S., & Poortinga, W. (2011). Policy attribute framing: A comparison between three policy instruments for personal emissions reduction. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 30, 889–905.
- Parag, Y., & Janda, K. B. (2014). More than filler: Middle actors and socio-technical change in the energy system from the middle-out. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 3, 102–112.
- Parag, Y., Hamilton, J., White, V., & Hogan, B. (2014). Network approach for local and community governance of energy: The case of Oxfordshire. *Energy Policy*, 62, 1064–1077.
- Parliament of Victoria. (2013). *Summary Offences and Sentencing Amendment Bill 2013*. Victoria, Australia. <http://bit.ly/P8nAtd>.
- Parliament of Victoria. (2014). *Summary Offences and Sentencing Amendment Act 2014*. Victoria, Australia. <http://bit.ly/1rkMbvW>.
- Pearse, R. (2016). Moving targets: Carbon pricing, energy markets, and social movements in Australia. *Environmental Politics*, 25, 1079–1101.
- Pennicuik, S. (2014, March 11). *On the Summary Offences and Sentencing Amendment Bill 2013*. Website of the Victorian Greens. <http://bit.ly/1mA33x6>.
- People's Climate March. (2014). *Wrap Up*. <http://bit.ly/1qxNEZt>.
- Plumer, B. (2013, January 16). *Why Has Climate Legislation Failed?* An interview with Theda Skocpol. *The Washington Post*. <http://wapo.st/1jFMBUA>.
- Polleta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective identity and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 283–305.
- Rauschenbush, P. B. (2013, July 2). Fossil fuel divestment strategy passes at United Church of Christ Convention (UCC). *The Huffington Post*. <http://huff.to/1xVzYFC>.
- Renewables 100 Policy Institute. (2007). *What We Are*. <http://bit.ly/15AqFL8>.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 64, 652–667.
- Rosewarne, S., Goodman, J., & Pearse, R. (2014). *Climate Action Upsurge: The Ethnography of Climate Movement Politics*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire, UK, and New York: Routledge.

- Routledge, P. (2012). Translocal climate justice solidarities. In J. S. Dryzek, R. B. Norgaard, & D. Schlosberg (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ruskin, G. (2013). *Spooky Business: Corporate Espionage Against Nonprofit Organizations*. <http://bit.ly/1DGhUeQ>.
- Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health, 18*, 179–183.
- Saunders, C. (2008). Double-edged swords? Collective identity and solidarity in the environmental movement. *The British Journal of Sociology, 59*, 227–253.
- Saunders, C. (2009). It's not just structural: Social movements are not homogeneous responses to structural features, but networks shaped by organisational strategies and status. *Sociological Research Online, 14*, 1–16.
- Saunders, C. (2013). Insiders, thresholders, and outsiders in west European global justice networks: Network position and modes of coordination. *European Political Science Review, 2*, 167–189.
- Scheufele, D. A., Corley, E. A., Dunwoody, S., Hih, T. J., Hillback, A., & Guston, D. H. (2007). Scientists worry about some risks more than the public. *Nature Nanotechnology, 4*, 91–94.
- Schlosberg, D., & Dryzek, J. S. (2002). Digital democracy: Authentic or virtual? *Organization & Environment, 15*, 332–335.
- Schock, K. (2005). *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movement in Nondemocracies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schneider, F., Kallis, G., & Martinez-Alier, J. (2010). Crisis or opportunity? Economic degrowth for social equity and ecological sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 18*, 511–518.
- Schor, J. B. (2010). *Plenitude: The New Economics of True Wealth*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Segnit, N., & Ereaut, G. (2007). *Warm Words II: How the Climate Story Is Evolving and the Lessons We Can Learn for Encouraging Public Action*. London, UK: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Seyfang, G., Park, J. J., & Smith, A. (2013). A thousand flowers blooming? An examination of community energy in the UK. *Energy Policy, 61*, 977–989.
- Sharp, G. (1973a). *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: Part One, Power and Struggle*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.
- Sharp, G. (1973b). *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: Part Two, the Method of Nonviolent Action*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.
- Sharp, G. (2005). *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.
- Shirky, C. (2011). The political power of social media: Technology, the public sphere and political change. *Foreign Affairs, 90*, 28–41.
- Skocpol, T. (2013). *Naming the Problem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Symposium on the Politics of America's Fight Against Global Warming. <http://bit.ly/Pc8W3O>.

- Slaughter, A.-M. (2005). *A New World Order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, N., & Leiserowitz, A. (2013). The role of emotion in global warming support and opposition. *Risk Analysis*, *34*, 937–948.
- Snow, D. A. (2013). Framing and social movements. In D. A. Snow, D. della Porta, B. Klandermans, & D. McAdam (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, *1*, 197–217.
- Snow, D. A., Zurcher, L. A., & Eklund-Olson, S. (1980). Social networks and social movements: A microstructural approach to differential recruitment. *American Sociological Review*, *45*, 787–801.
- Snow, D. A., Rochford, B., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, *51*, 464–481.
- Sovacool, B. K., & Dworkin, M. H. (2014). *Global Energy Justice: Principles Problems and Practices*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Stepanova, E. (2011). *The Role of Information Communication Technologies in the “Arab Spring”: Implications Beyond the Region*. Washington, DC: PONARS Eurasia, the George Washington University, and Elliott School of International Affairs. <http://bit.ly/1L9ceOg>.
- Stern, P. C. (2012). Psychology: Fear and hope in climate messages. *Nature Climate Change*, *2*, 572–573.
- Stirling, A. (2008). ‘Opening up’ and ‘closing down’: Power, participation and pluralism in the social appraisal of technology. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, *33*, 262–294.
- Stoknes, P. E. (2015). *What We Think About When We Try Not to Think About Global Warming*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea.
- Strathman, A., Gleicher, F., Boninger, D. S., & Edwards, C. S. (1994). The consideration of future consequences: Weighing immediate and distant outcomes of behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*, 742–752.
- Suarez, S. L. (2006). Mobile democracy: Text messages, voter turnout and the 2004 Spanish general election. *Representation*, *42*, 117–128.
- Sullivan, C. (2010, December 14). San Francisco eyes goal of 100% green power by 2020. *The New York Times*. <http://nyti.ms/P8KPU7>.
- Swim, J. K., Stern, P. C., Doherty, T. J., Clayton, S., Reser, J. P., Weber, E. U., et al. (2011). Psychology’s contributions to understanding and addressing global climate change. *American Psychologist*, *66*, 241–250.
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, S. (2005). *The New Transnational Activism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Thomas, T. (2013, December 19). A room full of eco-idiots. *The Daily Telegraph*. <http://bit.ly/1uJcBFk>.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Tilly, C. (1995). *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1754–1834*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tilly, C. (2002). *Stories, Identities and Political Change*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Tilly, C. (2006). *Regimes and Repertoires*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tilly, C. (2008). *Contentious Performances*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- UNFCCC. (2015). *Adoption of the Paris Agreement* (Report FCCC/CP/2015/L.9/Rev.1). <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cop21/eng/109r01.pdf>.
- United Nations. (1992). *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change* (FCCC/INFORMAL/84). <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/con-ukp/conveg.pdf>.
- United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). (2011). *Hot Cities: Battle-Ground for Climate Change*. Nairobi, Kenya: UN-Habitat.
- Vala, C. T., & O'Brien, K. J. (2007). Attraction without networks: Recruiting strangers to unregistered protestantism in China. *Mobilization*, 12, 79–94.
- Van der Schoor, T., & Scholtens, B. (2015). Power to the people: Local community initiatives and the transition to sustainable energy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 43, 666–675.
- Van der Schoor, T., Van Lente, H., Scholtens, B., & Peine, A. (2016). Challenging obduracy: How local communities transform the energy system. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 13, 94–105.
- Wagner, G., & Zeckhauser, R. J. (2012). Climate policy: Hard problem, soft thinking. *Climatic Change*, 110, 507–521.
- Wardekker, J. A., Petersena, A. C., & Sluijs, J. P. (2009). Ethics and public perception of climate change: Exploring the Christian voices in the US public debate. *Global Environmental Change*, 19, 512–521.
- Weber, T. (1997). *On the Salt March*. New Delhi, India: HarperCollins.
- Weber, E. U. (2006). Experience-based and description-based perceptions of long-term risk: Why global warming does not scare us (yet). *Climatic Change*, 77, 103–120.
- Weber, E. U. (2010). What shapes perceptions of climate change? *WIREs Climate Change*, 1, 332–342.
- Wolcott, J. (2007, May 1). Rush to judgment. *Vanity Fair*. <http://vnty.fr/1IJ80yE>.
- World Bank. (2012). *Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4 °C Warmer World Must Be Avoided*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Yagatch, W., Galli Robertson, A. M., & Fisher, D. R. (2018). How local environmental stewardship diversifies democracy. *Local Environment*, 23, 431–447.

INDEX

A

accountability, 61
alternative, 7, 9, 24, 46, 49, 50, 52,
77, 87
Anderson, Kevin, 85
Aquino, Ninoy, 33
Arab Spring, 77
Assadourian, Erik, 16
attitude, 9, 25, 38, 75, 87
Australia, 24, 35, 36, 39, 59, 70, 74,
75, 95
Australian Centre for Independent
Journalism, 75

B

backfire, 9
behaviour, 4, 5, 46, 48
belonging, 20, 25, 46

C

C40, 53
Canada, 16, 36, 70, 80, 95

Civil Rights Movement, 7
Climate Action Network, 70
Climate Leadership Corps, 37
Climate Reality Project, 37
coalition, 65–68, 70, 89–91
community, 3–6, 16, 19–23, 35–39,
46–48, 50–52, 54, 59, 61, 64,
76, 79, 81, 86, 87, 89, 90, 96
community energy, 48, 51, 86
consumption, 5, 6, 24, 49, 53, 66, 86
credibility, 37, 61

D

deliberation, 80, 81
democracy, 35, 36, 49, 65, 86, 96
Denmark, 16, 50
Diesendorf, Mark, 3, 6, 7, 22, 30, 31,
33, 36, 46, 47, 61, 62, 74
diversity, 7, 9, 22–24, 60, 61, 70, 80,
95
divestment, 22, 23, 52, 61, 66

E

Energiewende, 6
 energy efficiency, 21, 23, 24, 38, 48,
 51–53, 81
 energy transition, 23, 24, 31, 32,
 50–52, 64, 79
 equity, 34, 86, 90

F

Facebook, 77
 face-to-face conversations, 16, 17, 20,
 25, 79, 91
 fake news, 78
 frames, 17, 20, 25, 30, 31, 33, 37–40,
 48, 49, 74, 75, 87
 Freedom Summer, 18
 free riding, 60

G

Gandhi, 74
 Ganz, Marshall, 4, 6, 48, 79, 80
 Germany, 50, 64

I

identity, 7, 9, 16, 20, 21, 32, 46, 48,
 60, 68, 87
 India, 33
 Instagram, 77

J

justice, 8, 34, 35, 66, 86, 87, 89, 90,
 95

K

Keystone Pipeline, 3, 22
 Klein, Naomi, 69

Kyoto Protocol, 2

L

local, 3, 5, 16, 19, 20, 22–24, 32, 38,
 46, 48–52, 54, 60, 62, 68, 70,
 74, 81, 86, 88, 89, 96
 local government, 16, 51, 52

M

McKibben, Bill, 33, 69
 media, 4, 10, 22, 37, 38, 74–80, 87,
 90, 91
 micro-grid, 23
 morality, 7, 9, 20, 31–34, 36–40, 45,
 73, 90, 91
 multistakeholderism, 68

N

Nationally Determined Contributions,
 2
 network, 62, 64–67, 70, 89–91.
See also webbing
 non-humans, 34
 nonviolence, 3, 4, 36, 62, 77
 North, Peter, 5, 47
 nuclear energy, 16, 89, 96

O

Obamacare, 69

P

Paris Agreement, 1, 2, 85
 Parks, Rosa, 33
 People Power Revolution, 7, 33, 62,
 77
 People's Climate March, 3, 5, 62, 78

post growth economy, 86
 prefigurative activism, 5, 22, 23, 47,
 52, 64, 86, 87
 proximity, 22, 31, 39
 psychology, 9, 18, 30–33, 48

R

reduced work hours, 24
 reflexivity, 8, 9, 46, 78, 86–88
 relationships, 9, 18, 25, 49, 66, 68
 renewable electricity, 23
 renewable energy, 6, 23, 32, 50–52,
 79
 resilience, 19

S

Sami, 80
 scaling, 5, 10, 23, 51, 52, 81
 Sharp, Gene, 4, 5
 shocking events. *See* tipping point
 skilling, 37, 50
 Skocpol, Theda, 69
 social capital, 25, 78
 social media, 10, 76, 78, 81
 symbols, 30–33, 39, 48

T

tar sands, 36

Thailand, 78
 350.org, 3, 52, 62, 69
 Tilly, Charles, 7, 37
 tipping point, 9, 30, 87
 Transition Towns, 52
 Twitter, 77, 78

U

United Kingdom, 45, 51, 64, 68, 74
 United States Climate Action
 Partnership (USCAP), 68
 USCAP. *See* United States Climate
 Action Partnership

V

values, 9, 16, 19, 22, 25, 30, 32–37,
 39, 46, 47, 61, 67, 70, 90, 91
 vested interests, 22, 36, 62
 vision, 8, 9, 19, 47–49, 54, 87

W

webbing, 8, 9, 23, 47, 49, 60–62,
 65–68, 70, 81, 87
 Worldwatch Institute, 16
 WUNC, 7, 37