

Protest-Case Analysis:
A Methodological Approach for the Study of
Grassroots Environmental Mobilizations

by
Maria Kousis

#570

May 1998

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION
WORKING PAPER SERIES

The Center for Research on Social Organization is a facility of the Department of Sociology, The University of Michigan. Its primary mission is to support the research of faculty and students in the department's Social Organization graduate program. CRSO Working Papers report current research and reflection by affiliates of the Center. To request copies of working papers, or for further information about Center activities, write us at 4501 LS&A Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48109, send e-mail to crso@umich.edu, or call (734) 764-7487.

Protest-Case Analysis:
A Methodological Approach for the Study of
Grassroots Environmental Mobilizations¹

Maria Kousis

Introduction

Protest-case analysis, unlike protest-event analysis, compiles information over five series of data: a) location, 2) events, 3) groups, 4) time, and 5) issue-claim linkages. This approach was devised for the study of the claim and action repertoires which antagonistic groups display in cases of environmental conflict at the local level throughout the duration of the conflict, as it is found in the selected printed media sources. The present paper describes how protest-case analysis was developed and applied in a project addressing grassroots environmental action and sustainable development in Southern Europe.

The first section presents the major methodology which utilized national media sources in order to locate and analyze these sources' population of cases concerning grassroots environmental actions in Greece, Spain, and Portugal. The second section briefly presents the supplementary methods that were

¹ The methodology was designed by the author and applied uniformly in the three countries. The feedback of the Spanish and Portuguese teams in particular, was essential for the success of the procedures. General guidelines were given on methodological approaches for the case studies as well, but there was more room for each team to act independently for these. I am grateful for all the valuable comments, assistance, and encouragement that were provided by Charles Tilly, Allan Schnaiberg, Joseph N. Lekakis, Dieter Rucht, Mario Diani, Doug McAdam, Sidney Tarrow, Johan Olivier, and Mark Beissinger. Yota Papageorgiou and Vassilis Dafermos provided technical assistance. A preliminary version of this paper was briefly presented at the International Workshop, «Protest Event Analysis: Methodology, Applications, Problems,» Wissenschaftszentrum, Berlin, June 12-14, 1995. Funding for this work was provided by the European Commission, DGXII for Science, Research and Development, contract no. EV5V-CT94-0393.

The enthusiasm, care, and laborious efforts of my partners, Susana Aguilar, and Teresa Fidelis-Nogueira, as well as all the research assistants, especially Ilse Borchard, Maria Aznar, Marta Sastre, in Spain, Sandra Bastos, I. Paiva, in Portugal, and Maria Lambrou, Katerina Lenakis, and Dora Matta, in Greece, made this work possible. E-mail address for correspondence <kousis@fortezza.lanr.uoc.gr>; postal address: Department of Sociology, University of Crete, Rethimno, 74100 Greece.

used to protest-case analysis via case studies in each country in order to avoid dependence on national newspapers and to deepen our understanding of the relevant issues.

Content Analysis: Identifying Grassroots Environmental Action Events and Cases

The Sources

The study of contentious grassroots events which are related to the environment and thus linked to the *sustainability* question can be approached using printed media sources. These sources should be carefully selected so as to provide continuity over the specified time period, steady interest in the units analyzed, the variance needed for analysis, and finally, be easily accessible (Rucht and Ohlemacher, 1992a). In order to fulfill the overall objectives of the project however these sources were supplemented by archival and other printed material, as well as by interviews for comparative purposes. For these reasons the following data sources were used:

1. National media: newspapers and ecology oriented magazines
2. 'Struggle' (Action) Committee Archives
3. Archives of local and nonlocal Agencies
4. Documents, Reports, etc.
5. In-depth Interviews with local and nonlocal key actors.

National coverage newspapers and ecology magazines were used as sources of information through protest case analysis in order to identify reported grassroots environmental action of local environmental conflicts that became visible via public protest events. For Greece and Spain one quality newspaper fulfilled the previously mentioned criteria of selection, while for Portugal the need to supplement *Jornal de Noticias* with a second, recent newspaper, *Publico*, arose given the limited coverage of the first². Once again, for both Greece and Spain, it was not possible to choose only one ecology magazine since none covered the twenty year period. Interestingly, for both countries the major ecology journal that ceased to operate after its establishment was immediately followed by a new major magazine which continued publishing until 1994. It should be noted however that in Greece, the first such journal appeared only in 1982, whereas in Spain in 1976. In Portugal the main ecology journal was established very late, i.e. in 1994, and thus, that is the only year examined. Table 1 shows which sections of these sources were read by the assistants, as well as the time periods covered.

² Even with two national newspapers Portugal showed considerably fewer cases for the twenty years than Greece or Spain.

Table 1. Printed Media Sources

I. Newspaper	Years Covered
1. <i>Eleftherotypia</i> (all sections) (including the Sunday edition)	1974-94
2. <i>El Pais</i> (including Sunday editions) National Coverage (all sections)	1976 -94
Madrid Edition:	1980*-94
<i>Valencia</i> Supplement	1986*-94
<i>Andalusia</i> Supplement	1986*-94
<i>Catalonia</i> Supplement	1986*-94
<i>Ciudades</i> Supplement	1990*-94
4. <i>Jornal de Noticias</i> (all sections) (including Sunday editions)	1974 -94
5. <i>Publico</i> (including Sunday editions)	1990*-94
II. <u>Environment-Periodical Press</u>	
1. <i>Ecology & Environment</i> (GR)	1982*-84
2. <i>New Ecology</i> (GR)	1984*-94
3. <i>Integral</i> (SP)	1976- 81
4. <i>Quercus</i> (SP)	1981*-94
5. <i>AAVV-Forum Ambiente</i> (PT)	1994*

* Starting year of edition/supplement
For *Catalonia*, years not read: 82-85.

Between July 1994 and July 1995 every issue of these sources was read by the assistants in the three countries, and the appropriate articles were located from the newspapers for the post-dictatorial periods, 1974 to 1994 for Greece and Portugal, and 1976-1994 for Spain. As a result, 2,900 articles are located for Greece, approximately 11,000 for Spain, and about 2,000 for Portugal. The majority of all articles (80%) come from the national newspapers, and the remaining from the ecology magazines .

Locating and 'Cleaning up'

In order to identify grassroots environmental action incidents, every issue of each of the above printed media (i.e. all pages other than those of the sports section of each daily issue) was examined by the assistants of that country. The assistants were instructed to locate all related articles, relying mostly but not only, on headlines. They were assisted by lists of examples indicating the types of mobilization

actors, and actions, the range of environmental issues, and the locality dimension to be found. In addition, the assistants were further instructed to locate all types of articles such as news, reports, background reports, photo-reports, announcements of grassroots environmental contentious incidents and commentaries, as well as documentaries.³ Finally, they had instructions to pick out and copy all articles which they were not sure of, or had any questions about. All the articles that were located were photocopied. The date of publication and the page number was recorded on each photocopy.

The unit of analysis is the contentious environmental event-case constituted by «collective incident/s in which approximately 5 or more persons from a specific geographic area and outside of the national government, express criticism, protest, or resistance making visible claims for their physical environment, and its likely impacts (e.g. on their health, or economic status), which if realized, would affect the interests of some person(s) or group(s) outside their own numbers during a given time period,» building on Tilly's (1978 and 1994) definitions. Under this definition, those mobilizing against a specific threat belong to a local setting, usually a community (village, town, urban neighborhood, etc.) or a set of communities (villages, island, a set of urban neighborhoods, etc.) be they urban or rural; they may mobilize once or more times. Such contentious gatherings include formal claim-making, petitions, meetings, demonstrations, boycotts, strikes, threats, collective violence, and other action forms. They are linked via a set of claims which even though they may change over time, are directly related to a specific source of contention and its related conflict parties. The present analysis of all cases of grassroots environmental action includes those best described by Tilly (1994) as "ad hoc social movements". These are the sustained challenges that take place at the local setting, usually a community, or sets of communities, over a given time period.

The unit of data collection is the mention of , and not the event itself. Once copies of all mentions were gathered they were collated into location files and then into cases comprised of events, using the above definition. This procedure will be discussed in the next section. The collated mentions were subsequently cleaned using several criteria. Cases were *included* if they involved:

1. Local groups of more than five persons (or their representative/s) mobilizing for local problems.
2. Local problems dealing with economic or health issues that relate to environmental issues, or just environmental issues.
3. Initiatives taken by local groups who are not directly involved in conventional politics but may collaborate with political parties.
4. Action forms ranging from the minimal (making general demands or public accusations) to the

³ Adopting the specific identification instructions of Rucht, Hocke and Ohlemacher (1992b) to coders from the Produt codebook (p.11).

maximal (violent episodes).

5. Local groups collaborating with various nonlocal groups on local problems.
6. Local groups collaborating with local authorities on local problems.
7. Local or/and national group/s mobilizing for national problems that affect them directly at the local level.

Simultaneously, cases were *excluded* using the following criteria, as shown in Table 2:

1. Absence of a contentious event, as specified in the range of action forms of the designed codebook. Any scientific meetings, social events, talks/lectures, seminars, exhibitions of photographs, various student activities, clean up campaigns, recycling campaigns, tree planting, or the establishment of ecological organizations that are not affiliated or related to any of the specified action forms are to be excluded.
2. Larger environmental organization initiatives for problems outside of their areas / which do not directly affect them, when there are no collaboration initiatives with the resident or local groups of that area.
3. Local government initiatives when there is no collaboration/support with/from local groups.
4. A group of less than five mobilizers (obviously, a case where there is one representative for at least five persons, is included).
5. Political party initiatives or initiatives taken by state agencies when there is no indication that there is collaboration with local groups.
6. Issues not related to the environment.

Table 2: Excluded Articles by Criteria and Country

Criteria	Country			Total
	GR	SP	PT	
1. Absence of a Contentious Event Related to various activities.	183	na	41	
2. Larger Environmental Social Mov't Organization Initiatives	19	na	6	
3. Local Government Initiatives	12	na	13	
4. Less than 5 mobilizers	9	na	26	
5. Political Party Initiatives	17	na	36	
6. Issues not related to the Environment	61	na	26	
Total	291	1374	148	1,813

Note: Minor corrections may be made to the final count of the Spanish data set which has not been finalized.

Data Organization: From Mentions to Event - Cases

The phases related to the selection, organization and coding of articles involved very frequent meetings and communications between the three teams.⁴ In the first phase, mentions were photocopied and carefully screened in order to see whether they met the criteria of inclusion. The selected mentions were subsequently organized into location files. Although in a large number of cases the location file might happen to also be the case file, the richer location files contained different cases. This led to careful readings of the complex location files until all the distinct cases were organized separately. For example, groups with different sets of claims may have mobilized in the same geographic area for the same source/activity, or groups with similar claims may have mobilized for different sources in specific locations of that area. The aim was to trace: a) actions, events, and issues inducing the mobilization for one group or set of groups that mobilized together over a given time period, with a given set of claims for a specific challenged group, b) any changes that may occur during the history of their mobilization process, c) the counterclaims made by the challenged groups, as well as d) the responses of the groups approached for assistance⁵.

The process of collating cases of grassroots environmental action had to be done in different phases, as more knowledge was gained by the coding teams on each specific case with sequential readings of the articles. The assistants formed lists of all the cases with very brief descriptions of each case in alphabetical and chronological orders; i.e. recording location, group, environmental claim, challenged group, action, date. The lists naturally needed repeated revisions since they were constructed following the process of case collation. Fortunately, the same assistants were employed during the different phases (locating, collating, coding of the articles) in the three countries, and could thus use the accumulated knowledge they acquired about their country's cases from consecutive readings of the articles.

This preparatory work was decisive and crucial. Given that our unit of analysis was the case, our articles had to be carefully organized so as to address five components: 1) specific location, 2) events, 3) group/formation, 4) time, and 5) issue-claim linkages. Consequently a case in this project is comprised by a group or set of groups of mobilizers from a given geographical area (e.g. municipality, village, island, region, etc.) who mobilize together during a given time period -even if there are periods of no action in between- with a specific set of claims on a source/activity, offenses, or/and impacts related to the environment (e.g. pollution/destruction of a wetland due to a specific source, of a specific

⁴ These meetings and communications were carried out on a daily, in the beginning, or at least weekly basis later on, depending on needs. In three of the four project meetings, most of the time was spent on establishing clear instructions and guidelines for the three teams. In these meetings the input of the main research assistants from the three countries, who worked with the data during the different phases, was most valuable.

set of sources or activities). Any changes in the claims are traceable on each code sheet. At the initial stage of the project the aim was to have the case as the unit of analysis but to work with the event as the unit of observation. Each event would be linked to its specific case and thus we would have more refined data showing us in detail the development and the specific features of one case over time. Unfortunately, although we designed and tested this, it was not possible to apply this new methodological approach given time and money constraints. Table 3 shows the number of articles, before and after their selection for and organization into cases, as well as the number of cases for each country.

Table 3: The Data, Gross and Net

Country	No. of all mentions, or articles collected	No of "out" articles	No of "in" articles	No of collated cases
GR	2,940	291	2,649	1,322
SP	10,874	1,374	9,500	2,336
PT	1,992	148	1,844	550
Total	15,032	1,813	13,993	4,208

Note: Minor corrections may be made to the final count which has not been completed for the Spanish data set.

Coding Environmental Claims

The literature addressing environmental conflict provided the starting point for building an inclusive range of ecosystem-related issues around which local contenders make their claims. A large part of this literature is comprised by case studies or general accounts from Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia, and Australia, and covers very different sets of 'ecological disorganization'⁶ problems given the wide variations in economic activities across the globe.

⁵ The claim and counterclaim repertoires were developed using as a basis Schnaiberg's (1994) thesis. Revisions extending these, as well as testing them were made given the different trials of the coding instrument across the three countries.

⁶ According to Schnaiberg and Gould (1994b, pp.8-19) 'ecological disorganization' is synonymous to environmental decay, destruction, or deterioration.

The rest of the literature, more representative of the US and European experiences, falls into two broad groups. The first group deals with communities exposed or expected to be exposed mainly to toxic waste, locally unwanted land uses (LULUs), or destructive industrial/energy/development production activities. Relevant mobilizations have been labeled *Not-in-my backyard/Not in our backyard*, NIMBY/NIOBY (Freudenberg, 1991), *ecopopulism* (Szasz, 1994), *environmental justice movements* (Bullard, 1993) *citizen-workers groups* (Gould et al, 1996), and *grassroots environmental groups* (Cable and Cable, 1995). The second group deals mainly with environmental social movement organizations (ESMOs), many of which focus on preservation and conservation issues in order to protect wildlife areas (Gould et al, 1996). While most ESMOs start at the local level, they usually extend their concerns over regional, national, international, and global scale environmental problems.

When studying environmental mobilizations, researchers of social movements identify several types of issues. Diani (1995) identifies traffic, industrial pollution, urban planning, buildings and monuments, nature protection, animal rights, and health. Rucht *et al* (1992b) code such issues into six categories: earth/ water/ air quality, protection against noise, healthy food stuffs, landscape conservation, animal protection, and miscellaneous. Other researchers use classifications such as the ozone hole, nuclear and toxic disposal accidents, soil erosion deforestation, species extinction, acid rain/pollution, global warming, animal protection, lack of or inadequate environmental policy, and others.

In order to draw a comprehensive and detailed picture of the range of environment-related issues and address the different sets of problems and related claims pertaining to each case study in our project, synthesis, clarification, and elaboration were required. To this end, when identifying ecosystem related issues which induce resistance, the various categories had to be suitable for comparative analysis. From the above literature as well as our tests on the coding instrument, we examined closely the claims around which environmental activists organized. This was a very essential focus for our project since we wanted to explore and comprehend the link between sustainable development and grassroots environmental action in a detailed and systematic manner. It appeared that activists could directly blame a source or activity that generates environmental offences, or they could just protest against ecosystem offences (e.g. air pollution in the city) without necessarily relating the problem directly to a specific environmental offender.

Thus, the ultimate aim was to develop an overall claim-making scheme within which environmental contentious actions could be described, analyzed, compared, and interpreted. It should be noted that in carving out such an approach for contemporary societies, the activities of powerful private and state producers deserve closer attention since they usually involve withdrawals from and additions to local ecosystems leading to drastic ecosystem disorganization. These ecosystem transforming activities create "exchange values" in the form of profits, but they also decrease the "use values" of ecosystems,

with negative economic, recreational, and health impacts to local populations (Schnaiberg, 1994). In addition to students of the environmental movement, environmental sociologists (e.g. Dunlap and Catton, 1979; Humphrey and Buttel, 1982; Schnaiberg, 1980) have pointed out convincingly the dynamic and critical interactions between society and environment. Under this general scheme, ecological intervention takes place when a group or individual actors through their control of a source or various activities, impinge upon environmental resources. This impingement in turn creates various combinations of ecosystem offenses which lead not only to environmental, but to societal impacts as well. The three components of this process evolve in the sequence (Kousis, 1997):

Source → Offense → Impact

- a) the ecosystem-disturbing source/s or (in) activity/ies, usually associated with a *social user*,
- b) the ecosystem offences produced by the source/s or (in) activity/ies
- c) the variety of impacts due to the ecosystem offenses produced by the source/s or (in) activity/ies controlled by the social user/s.

Looking at the first component, the relevant literature points to major groups of sources or (in) activities. Resource extraction in the form of uranium, gold, coal, oil, copper, or even water, have played a significant role in the 'ecological disorganization' for many areas around the globe (Moore 1994; Baker, 1989; Hyndman 1991; Connell and Howitt, 1991). Logging activities are especially prominent in rural regions of the developing world (Ekins, 1992) but also take place in western societies (Groome, 1994). Industrial agriculture withdraws from and at the same times adds to local ecosystems. Fishing and animal husbandry are also activities that may produce ecological disorganization.

Industrial sources or activities have been producing environmental stress in local environments via the additions they impose on them. Certain regions and communities have been severely imposed upon (Bullard, 1990). Waste disposal is especially serious. Toxic waste landfills hosted in an ecosystem are usually resisted by locals (Szasz, 1994; Regan and Legerton, 1990). Industrial or domestic waste disposal may not cause as much upheaval but are more abundant.

Energy production involves both the withdrawal of natural resources and the additions of the by-products to ecosystems. They range from nuclear to solar/wind power installations, including dams, and fossil fuel electricity generating plants (Kemp, 1990; Kousis, 1994; Juvik & Rodriguez, 1992). Other

sources or activities leading to ecosystem disorganization include military installations, large or small scale construction activities (such as airports, highways, and other infrastructural projects), tourism related, transport, storage, and communication activities. (In)activities leading to ecosystem disorganization include the lack of/ adequate / implemented environmental policies or laws.

Turning to the offenses component which are produced from the above sources/(in) activities, a careful overview of the literature especially comprising qualitative studies, indicates that another major area of concern embraces the ecosystem offenses which are produced by the previously mentioned sources or (in) activities. Overall, according to environment specialists, these offenses come in the form of noise, atmospheric, water (fresh and ocean), and land pollution, and destruction of natural ecosystems. Each of the above mentioned sources may produce one or more of these offenses. For example, industrial production processes have been creating intensive as well as extensive ecosystem disorganization, by the generation of atmospheric, water and land pollution. Depending on the quantity and type of pollution, the local ecosystem may well be affected negatively in irreversible ways (Kousis, 1998).

The offenses, in turn, lead to the third component of the process of ecological intervention, namely the various types of impacts which impose on local populations and their ecosystems. These make their appearance in the form of negative impacts including Aesthetics, Recreational, Cultural/Historical, Built-Environment, Political, Economic, Ecosystem, Psychological, Public Health and Life Endangering Impacts. One source or activity which produces a given set of ecosystem offenses may in turn induce one or more (more often multiple) impact types. Taking once again the industrial source/activity as an example, the pollution (ecosystem offense) produced in turn has led to local economic and public health impacts. Land values decrease, public health problems arise, risks of accidents may seriously threaten the local ecosystem, while water sources may be irreparably destroyed, threatening even further the survivability of the local population (Wernett and Nieves, 1992; Faber, 1992).

Creating the Codebook

While the cases were being collated, steps to improve the existing codebook started simultaneously, during early spring of 1995. As explained above, initially it was hoped that the unit of analysis would be each event - linked to its case - and thus the first versions of the codebook aimed to code information on events belonging to specific cases. Since a lot of time had to be spent on cleaning the articles and collating them into cases, a decision was finally made not to code for each contentious event of every case but to construct a codesheet for each case. Thus although in the beginning of the project we aimed to do a more refined coding of related/linked protest events that would allow us to trace all types of relations and changes through the years, time and resource limitations led us to decide to code the cases of these events which would provide more knowledge about the population than would a sample.

As a result of the above, the final instrument that has been used to code the data has been through more than 30 revisions. The first fifteen drafts of the codebook had as unit of analysis the contentious event whereas for the last fifteen drafts of the codebook the case was the unit of analysis. In both cases the different drafts of the codebook were tested in the three countries using many, very small samples of wide variation issues referring to protest event-cases or protest cases. Overall, more than 300 trials of the different versions of the codebooks were carried out. More specifically, from mid spring 1995 to November 1995 about 165 codebooks for protest events were tested; 85 in Greece, 40 in Spain and 30 in Portugal. From December 1995 to early February 1996 approximately 148 codebooks (of different versions) for cases were tried; 78 in Greece, 40 in Spain and 30 in Portugal. This preparatory work was extremely helpful in locating the range and type of coding categories that we needed in order to code our data. It proved especially valuable in identifying the environmental claim making themes (concerning the source/activities of environmental disorganization, the offenses produced , and the consequent impacts), the various actors involved, the types of responses and the variety of characteristics of the mobilizing groups.

The codebook designed for events, which were traceable to specific cases, is comprised of seven sections. The first section addresses questions about the coding process itself, providing basic information on coders, sources, as well as a brief description of the event. The second section refers to locality characteristics including information about population, urban-rural character as well as employment sector specification. In the third section information is coded on the characteristics of the mobilization, starting with questions on numbers and sources of local participating groups their gender, socio-economic and political affinity as well as occupational characteristics. Consequent questions relate to the type of nonlocal supporting groups and their types of support, as well as to the various features of the leader/s or committee of the mobilized groups such as gender, political position, and occupation. The last questions of this section concern the types of action forms taken and their duration.

The fourth section of the initial codebook consists of questions requesting the number of the case the event belongs to according to the list produced in each country, as well as the most central questions which refer to the causes of the mobilization. They are focused on the source of eco-disturbance, the mobilizers' perception of the source/s, their proposal of resolving the problem, their view of the antagonist interest groups, the ecosystems' offenses and impacts, as well as the way they decided upon them.

The fifth section addresses those groups which are involved but do not participate directly in the conflict along with their responses, whereas the sixth section is focused on the different challenged groups (state, private producers, et al) and their responses to the mobilized, as well as on the results of the mobilization. The final (seventh) section of this codebook concerns the relation of the event to public participation mechanisms/procedures.

Although this codebook for event-cases has been tried successfully on various samples across the three countries it has not been applied yet given time and funding constraints. However it formed the basis for the development of the instrument designed for the cases which was used to code the data at hand - 1,320 cases for Greece, 850 (of the 2,100) for Spain (almost all of the significant cases-by issue and size- were included) and 550 for Portugal.

The **codebook for cases** (see Appendix) is comprised of six sections as well. In the first section coder, source, article, and time information is sought. In addition, four questions address the relationship of the case at hand with other cases. Cases may be positively or negatively related to each other.⁷ The questions of the second section relate to locality characteristics, and address as well the rural-urban features of the area/s involved. The third section seeks information on number of participants, types of local and nonlocal participating and/or supporting groups, as well as types of action forms evident for the case as a whole.

The fourth and fifth sections of the codebook address the critical questions that were raised in this project. These questions relate to the actors involved in local environmental conflicts as well as their views and responses to the issues related to sustainable development.

Our work has tried to systematically code the process of ecological intervention. Here, in order to address the issues under study efficiently, the process of ecological intervention had to be precisely defined. One of the major sections of the codebook seeks information about: a) the social user/interest group/owner/producer, b) the source or (in)activity, c) the offences (e.g. atmospheric pollution), and d) the effects/impacts (e.g. socio-economic, public health, ecosystem, etc.).

The codebook for cases is designed to trace effectively and in detail the responses of different bodies approached as well as those of the variety of groups challenged by the mobilizers. It simultaneously allows the coder to make an assessment at the end about the 'achievements' of grassroots environmental mobilizers' resolutions on the basis of information provided by the articles. It is hoped that this data will contribute towards the study of responses or reactions to social movements.

The social user, owner, or interest groups category refers to the challenged person/s or group/s who intervene/s into an ecosystem with a specific set of interests; as seen in question 26. Such social user/s own/s or control/s a source or an activity (question 22) (e.g. an industry, a resource extraction unit, a military installation, a construction activity, waste disposal, or an energy installation), or, may even have direct control to environmental policymaking. According to the mobilizers such sources/activities are in specified ways responsible for ecosystem-disturbances. Students of natural resources maintain, that the offenses produced by such sources/activities, appear in the form of land pollution, noise and atmospheric pollution, fresh-water, coastal and marine pollution, as well as disorganization of an ecosystem (question 23). The view of the mobilizers on these offenses was also

coded (question 23b). As a consequence of the above the final component of the process of ecological intervention is focused on the impacts, as the mobilizers view them. These damages which are due to the offenses of the source, range from positive to life threatening and they include negative economic, ecosystem and public health impacts (see question 24).

In the fifth section of the codebook a wide range of assisting groups is provided and information has been collected on their responses. In the same section, once the challenged groups are identified, their responses are also recorded.

In the final section, the coder recorded the achieved resolutions of the mobilizers. In addition these are items pertaining to environmental impact statements (EIS) related to siting cases only. The aim of these items is to study the effects of EIS on the conflict and the mobilizations.

Supplementary Methods

Having identified the population of grassroots environmental action cases, we proceeded with the selection of case studies which according to the work program would increase our understanding of the problems under investigation.

Thus for the four important case studies of intense mobilizations that were carried out, syntheses of different supplementary methods were used to present, analyze and compare findings with those derived from protest-case analysis.

The first case study used struggle committee archives to study one case of a local mobilization against the siting of the biological treatment facility in northern Greece, i.e. that of *Kalamas* (Kousis, 1996). In contrast to the 84 articles that were found for this case using one major national newspaper and one magazine, the struggle committee's archives contained 182 articles from 21 national newspapers, and 541 articles from local or regional newspapers. They also included issues of a local newspaper ('Kalamas') established specifically for this particular case. Another set of valuable documents in the archives were minutes of meetings, incoming and outgoing correspondence, protest activity information, statements of support, etc. This material naturally contributes towards a deeper understanding of the case compared to the information from protest case analysis.

In the second case study a comparison was made between the cases identified in the national media data set and in a new set of archival material in the form of documents from local state and other agencies in *Iraklion*, Crete. This comparison of the two data sets reveals significant findings which are crucial to the methodology followed. Among them, it was found that the cases located in the national newspaper and environment magazine are approximately only 5% of the population of cases, given the large number of cases which were found in the archives of local agencies (Kousis, 1997).

7 We found such relationships in approximately 11% of all cases for the three countries.

In the third case study (Aguilar, 1996), in-depth interviews were carried out to enhance the understanding around the conflict over the declaration of a regional park in Madrid Spain. This method was valuable in understanding and coming closer to local and nonlocal key actors, especially if it is contrasted to the newspapers' account.

The fourth case study (Fidelis et al, 1996) combines article information from national as well as local newspapers to study the siting of a Toxic Waste Landfill in the Municipality of *Vagos* (PT) and to identify the groups which were subsequently interviewed. The data collected from the interviews contributed to a deeper understanding of the protests in *Vagos*, complementing in a significant way the information gathered from the newspapers.

REFERENCES

- Aguilar, S. 1996 'The Conflict Surrounding the Declaration of the Regional Park 'Cuenca Alta del Manzanares: A Spanish Case Study,' in M. Kousis (coordinator) «Grassroots Environmental Action and Sustainable Development in Southern Europe,» unpublished final report, project no. EV5V-CT94-0393 , DG XII, EC, Brussels.
- Baker, S. (1989) "Community Survival and Lignite Mining in Ireland," *The Ecologist*, 19:2 (63-67).
- Bullard, R. D. 1990. *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- _____ (ed) (1993) *Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots*, Boston: South End Press.
- Cable, S., and C. Cable (1995) *Environmental Problems, Grassroots Solutions: The Politics of Grassroots Environmental Conflict*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Connell, J. and R. Howitt, (1991) "Mining, Dispossession, and Development" in Connell, J. and R. Howitt (eds) *Mining and Indigenous Peoples in Australasia*, Sydney: Sydney University Press.
- Diani, M. (1995) *Green Networks: A Structural Analysis of the Italian Environmental Movement*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dunlap, R. and W. R. Catton (1979) «Environmental Sociology» *Annual Review of Sociology* 5:243-273.
- Ekins, P. (1992) *A New World Order: Grassroots Movements for Global Change*, London: Routledge.
- Faber, D. (1992) "Imperialism, Revolution, and the Ecological Crisis of Central America," *Latin American Perspectives* 19:1 (17-44).
- Fidelis-Nogueira, T., E. Figueiredo and S. Bastos 1996 'Siting a Toxic Waste Landfill in the Municipality of *Vagos*, Portugal: A Case Study Report,' in M. Kousis (coordinator) «Grassroots Environmental Action and Sustainable Development in Southern Europe,» unpublished final report, project no. EV5V-CT94-0393 , DG XII, EC, Brussels.
- Freudenberg, N. and Steinsapir, C. (1991) "Not in Our Backyards: The Grassroots Environmental Movement," *Society and Natural Resources*, 4(3): 235-245.
- Gould, K.A., A. Schnaiberg and A.S. Weinberg (1996) *Local Environmental Struggles: Citizen Activism in the Treadmill of Production* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Groome, H. (1991) "Conflicts causes by imbalances in forest policy and practice in the Basque Country," *Progress in Rural Policy and Planning*, Vol. 1 (140-151).
- Humphrey, C. R. and F. H. Buttell (1982) *Environment, Energy and Society*, Malabar, Florida: Krieger Publishing Co.
- Hyndman, D. (1991) "Zipping Down the fly on the OK Tedi Project" in Connell, J. and R. Howitt (eds) *Mining and Indigenous Peoples in Australasia*, Sydney: Sydney University Press.
- Juvik, S. and N. M. Rodriguez, 1992 "The State and Resource Management: Geothermal Development

- in Hawaii," *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 3:4 (79-98).
- Kemp, R. (1990) "Why not in my backyard? A radical interpretation of public opposition to the deep disposal of radioactive waste in the United Kingdom," *Environment and Planning A*, 22 (1239-1258).
- Kousis, M. (1994) "Environment and the State in the EU Periphery: The Case of Greece", *Regional Politics and Policy* 4(1):118-135.
- _____(1996) 'Kalamas and Iraklion: Two Case studies from Greece,' in M. Kousis (coordinator) «Grassroots Environmental Action and Sustainable Development in Southern Europe,» unpublished final report , project no. EV5V-CT94-0393,DG XII, EC, Brussels.
- _____(1997a) "Grassroots Environmental Movements in Rural Greece: Effectiveness, Success and the Quest for Sustainable Development" in S. Baker, M. Kousis, D. Richardson, & S. Young (eds) *The Politics of Sustainable Development*, London: Routledge.
- _____(1997b) "Unraveling Environmental Claim-Making at the Roots: Evidence from a Southern European County," *Humanity and Society*, 21(3): 257-283.
- _____(1998) "Ecological Marginalization in Rural Areas: Actors, Impacts, Responses" *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38(1): 86-108.
- Moore, T. G. (1994) "Rural planning progress in a persistent problem area; the central Appalachian example," *Progress in Rural Policy and Planning*, 4:17-32.
- Regan, R. and M. Legerton (1990) "Economic Slavery or Hazardous Wastes? Robeson County's Economic Menu" in J. Gaventa, B.E. Smith and A. Willingham (eds) *Communities in Economic Crisis: Appalachia and the South*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press (146-157).
- Rucht D. and T. Ohlemacher, (1992a) «Protest Event Data: Collection, Uses and Perspectives,» in M. Diani and R. Eyerman (eds) *Studying Collective Action*, London: SAGE.
- Rucht, D., P. Hocke and T. Ohlemacher (1992b) "Documentation and Analysis of Protest Events in the Federal Republic of Germany (Prodat) Code Book, Wissenschaftszentrum, Berlin, June."
- Szasz, A. (1994) *Ecopopulism: Toxic Waste and the Movement of Environmental Justice*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schnaiberg, A.(1980) *The Environment: From Surplus to Scarcity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____(1994) "The Political Economy of Environmental Problems and Policies: Consciousness, Conflict, and Control Capacity," *Advances in Human Ecology*, 3: 23-64.
- _____, and K. Gould (1994b) *Environment and Society: The Enduring Conflict* New York: St. Martin's Press
- Tilly, C. (1978) *From Mobilization to Revolution*, Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- _____(1994) "Social Movements as Historically Specific Clusters of Political Performances, *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 38:1-30.
- Wernett, D. and L. Nieves (1992) Breathing Polluted Air: Minorities are Disproportionately Exposed. *EPA Journal*, 18 (1) pp. 16-17

CODEBOOK FOR CASES

I. BASIC INFORMATION

- Q0. Name of country 1. Greece 2. Spain 3. Portugal |__|
- Q1. Coder |__|V1
 1. Matta 2. Lenaki 3. Borchard 4. Sastre |__|V2
 5. Aznar 6. Bastos 7. Paiva 8. Other
- Q2. Date of Coding _____ (Day, Month, Year) |__|V3
- Q3. Select newspaper/s in which article/most articles is/are located: |__|V4
 0. Does not apply 3. Jornal de Noticias
 1. Eleftherotypia 4. Publico
 2. El Pais 5. Both Jornal de Noticias and Publico
- Q4. Select periodical in which article/s pertaining to this case is/ are located: |__|V5
 0. does not apply 2. Quercus
 1. Nea Oikologia 3. Forum Ambiente
- Q5. Date or time interval of publication/s |__|V6
 1. Single article cases: _____ (Day, Month, Year)
 2. More than 1 article cases: _____ (Day, Month, Year) 1st article |__|V6.1
 _____ (Day, Month, Year) last article |__|V6.2
- Q6. How many articles have been located for this case ? |__|V7
 (write no. of articles in the box)
- Q7. Case no. _____ (according to adjusted, final list in each country) |__|V8
- Q7a. Is this case **directly** related to any other one/s? |__|V8.1
 0. No specified information/No 1. Yes
- Q7b. **If Yes**, enter codes of other case/s |__|V8.2
|__|V8.3
|__|V8.4
- Q7c. Type: Grounds of relationship/s |__|V8.5
 1. Positive: **Similar** Source and Claims, **Different** Locality
 2. Negative: **Different** Claims on Same Source, **Common** Locality
 3. Both
 4. Other (specify) _____
- Q7d. **Brief Description:** In one sentence describe as precisely as possible the geographic location of the protest and the content of protest (against what/why?) (abbreviations only when full names are not available).

- Q8. What is the **starting date** of mobilization for this case? _____ (Day, Month, Year) |__|V9.1
- Q8a . What is the **duration** of this case? |__|V9.2
 0. No information 7. 9-12 months
 1. 1-3 days 8. 1-2 years
 2. 4-7 days 9. 2-4 years
 3. 8-15 days 10. 5-9 years
 4. 3-4 weeks 11. 10-15 years
 5. 1-3 months 12. 16-20 years
 6. 4-8 month 13. More than 20 years
- Q8b. Is the above a result of the coder's judgement or article information? |__|V9.3
 0. coder's judgement
 1. article information
 2. Both

II. LOCALITY CHARACTERISTICS (USE OF STATISTICAL SERVICE DATA)

Q9. Does this mobilization involve groups from one or multiple (more than one) municipalities/freguesias or villages?

- 1. One community
- 2. Multiple communities

|____|V10

Q10 Name of the **municipality**, or **village** for GR & SP; FOR PT **freguesia** (do not enter municipality). For cases involving participating groups from more than one , provide all the names appearing in articles. When applicable, place in parentheses the name of the neighborhood or quarter.

Enter the **number** of municipality/ies, &/or village/s, or freguesia/s in the V11 box |____|V11

Write the **name/s** of the municipality/freguesia/s or village/s *below* (not in boxV11.1) (String) |____|V11.1

Q11. If it/they belong/s to a **larger metropolitan area/s**, (Check Stat. Data for this)

Enter the **number** of metropolitan areas involved in the V12 box |____|V12

Write the **name/s** of the metropolitan areas below, and enter the *code in the box/es*, according to list

|____|V12.1

Q12 Name/s of the **eparhia** /no entry for SP /**municipality(PT)** in which municipality/ies/PT:freguesia, or village/s is/are located . *Write below*, not in box.

(string) |____|V13

Q13 Name of the **Nomos/Provincia/District(PT)** in which municipality/ies, freguesia/s, or village/s is/are located
 (Write name/s below. In the *box*, write the *code/s* according to the list provided by coordinator)

|____|V13.1

Q14 Name of the wider national division: **Peripheria/ Comunidad Autonomas /Regiao** in which municipality/ies, freguesia/s,or village/s is/are located (Write name/s below. In the *box*, write the *code/s* according to the list provided by coordinator)

|____|V14

Q15. **1981 Population** of Mobilizers' municipality/ies, freguesia/s, or village/s, according to National Statistical Service

|____|V15

Enter number *here*(not in box) _____ residents (for multiple, enter total population)

Q16 . **Type of 1981 population/s** (According to Statistical Service of each country)

Enter correct category *in box*

|____|V16

- 0. no information
- 1. urban
- 2. semi-urban
- 3. rural
- 4. mix (only for multiple communities, if appropriate)

III. MOBILIZATION CHARACTERISTICS OF CASE

Q17. What was the highest number of participants and supporters of mobilization activities ever mentioned in the article/s for this case? (Only the highest mentioned figure)

Write the number in the box _____ | V17

Q18. When specific information is not provided, or when information in article/s does not appear reliable, then estimate using the following categories

Write the number of the selected category in the box

- | | | |
|------------|---------------------|----------|
| 1. 5-25 | 5. 1,000-3,000 | |
| 2. 26-100 | 6. 3,001-6,000 | ____ V18 |
| 3. 101-500 | 7. 6,001-10,000 | |
| 4. 501-999 | 8. More than 10,000 | |

Q19 Local Participating Socio-economic/Political/ Cultural Groups

0. No spec. info./No 1. Yes

1. residents/citizens/neighbors, or/and their representatives or action committees [circle & enter] _____ | V19
If action committee exists provide its (latest) name
(_____)string _____ | V20
2. local government (mayor, council) _____ | V21
3. labor and trade unions, workers, or other occup. group _____ | V22
(specify: _____)
4. cooperatives (fishing, agricultural, tradesmen) [circle approp.name in () & then enter 1] _____ | V23
5. employers, private producers (spec: _____) _____ | V24
6. hunters, or other recreation related groups (spec: _____) _____ | V25
7. local activities clubs _____ | V26
(specify: _____)
8. local environmental groups or organizations _____ | V27
(name: _____)string _____ | V28
9. local physicians(doctors) _____ | V29
10. other local scientists, and professionals(spec: _____) _____ | V30
11. local courts (including judges) _____ | V31
12. parents/teachers assoc. groups _____ | V32
13. students/pupils _____ | V33
14. religious/church groups or leaders _____ | V34
15. women's groups _____ | V35
(specify: _____)
16. local representatives of political parties: _____ | V36
 - a. name _____)string _____ | V37
 - b. Party Affil: 1. Right 7. Green _____ | V38

2. Nationalist/Regionalist -Right	8. Mix of Leftist parties &/or Green parties
3. Centre	9. Mix of Right &/or Center parties
4. Socialist	10. Mix of Leftist, Right, Center parties &/or Green parties
5. Nationalist/regionalist- Left	11. Other(name) _____
6. Communist	
17. local politicians opposing their party's view _____ | V39
 - a. name _____ (string) _____ | V40
 - b. Party Affil: 1. Right 7. Green _____ | V41

2. Nationalist/Regionalist -Right	8. Mix of Leftist parties&/or Green parties
3. Centre	9. Mix of Right &/or Center parties
4. Socialist	10. Mix of Leftist, Right, Center parties &/or Green parties
5. Nationalist/regionalist- Left	11. Other(name) _____
6. Communist	
18. state affiliated local agencies _____ | V42
name: _____ | V43
19. local development associations _____ | V44
name: _____ | V45
20. local artists (actors, musicians,art specialists,etc.) _____ | V46
21. other (please, specify) _____ | V47

Q20 What type/s of action/s did the mobilizers take in this case? (Select all that apply for the whole duration of the case)

0. No spec. info./No 1. Yes

- 1. demanding/requesting/accusing/general claiming V48
- 2. procedural complaint to authority/government V49
(includes municipal council vote/decisions)
- 3. press conference/announcements/social events/debates/student actions V50
- 4. signatures/petition/public letter V51
- 5. court route (suits, appeals) V52
- 6. public referendum V53
- 7. demonstration/public protest assembly V54
- 8. occupation of public buildings/lands V55
- 9. strikes and closing of shops V56
- 10. activity/source blockage /encirclement V57
- 11. road blockades/sit-ins V58
- 12. Hunger strike V59
- 13. threat to use arms V60
- 14. damage to property V61
- 15. throwing things at responsables/Attack/riot V62
- 16. Unintended injuries V63
- 17. Intended injuries V64
- 18. death/s V65
- 19. other (please, specify) _____ V66

Q20a. Did any violence ever occur in this case?

0. no information; No 1. Yes V67

Q20b. If Yes, Was the police present when the violence occurred?

0. no information ; No 1. Yes V68

Q21. Nonlocal Participating or Supporting Groups or Persons (NPSGP), according to this case?

0. No specific information/No 1. Yes

- 1. Citizen Groups from adjacent areas (*spec.* _____) V69
- 2. Local governments from adjacent areas V70
spec. _____
- 3. Environmental groups or organizations V71
Name _____ (string) V72
- 4. Professionals (lawyers, doctors, Univ. professors, engineers, architects, etc.) [*circle*] V73
- 5. Labor and trade unions, workers, or other occup. groups V74
spec. _____
- 6. Church related persons /religious groups V75
- 7. Courts, Judges V76
- 8. Media (press, TV, radio) [*circle*] V77
- 9. Artists, musicians, actors, celebrities, et al V78
- 10. Political Party Representatives V79
 - a. Name: _____ (string) V80
 - b. Party Affil: 1. Right 7. Green V81
 - 2. Nationalist/Regionalist -Right 8. Mix of Leftist parties &/or Green parties
 - 3. Centre 9. Mix of Right &/or Center parties
 - 4. Socialist 10. Mix of Leftist, Right, Center parties &/or Green parties
 - 5. Nationalist/regionalist- Left 11. Other(name) _____
 - 6. Communist
- 11. Individual Politicians not presenting their party's view V82
 - a. Name _____ (string) V83
 - b. Party Affil: 1. Right 7. Green V84
 - 2. Nationalist/Regionalist -Right 8. Mix of Leftist parties &/or Green parties
 - 3. Centre 9. Mix of Right &/or Center parties
 - 4. Socialist 10. Mix of Leftist, Right, Center parties &/or Green
 - 5. Nationalist/regionalist- Left 11. Other(name) _____
 - 6. Communist
- 12. Associations, Clubs, Social Org's, etc V85
Spec. _____
- 13. Economic organizations, businesses V86

Name _____ | | V87
 14. State units/agencies _____ | | V88
 Name _____ | | V88.1
 15. other (please, specify _____) | | V89

IV. ENVIRONMENT-RELATED ISSUES

Q22. According to the mobilizers, which of the following source/s or in/activities led to the mobilization (Circle all appropriate ones and enter " 1" in the box next to each category) 0. No spec. Info;No 1. Yes

- 1. Wild life areas (*in nondeveloped and rural areas*)
 - 1.1 grazing, overgrazing | | V90
 - 1.2 hunting | | V91
 - 1.3 Forest: fires | | V92
 - 1.4 Forest: construction, | | V93
 - 1.5 Forest: Protected areas, etc. | | V94
 - 1.6 Forest: cutting wood | | V95
 - 1.7 Wetland: construction related | | V96
 - 1.8 Wetland: protected areas | | V97
 - 1.9 coastal /marine areas: construction related | | V98
 - 1.10 coastal /marine areas: Protected areas | | V99
 - 1.11 Miscellaneous (specify _____) | | V100
- 2.0 Agriculture
 - 2.1 infrastructure (dams, diversion of rivers, etc.) | | V101
 - 2.2 fertilizers, pesticides, hormones, etc | | V102
 - 2.3 Miscellaneous (specify _____) | | V103
- 3.0 Animal husbandry | | V104
- 4.0 Fishing; fishculture | | V105
- 5.0 Resource extraction
 - 5.1 ores (e.g. iron, copper, zinc, etc) | | V106
 - 5.2 water | | V107
 - 5.3 coal, lignite, petroleum, natural gas | | V108
 - 5.4 stone | | V109
 - 5.5 sand | | V110
 - 5.6 Miscellaneous (specify _____) | | V111
- 6.0 Tourism and recreational activities | | V112
- 7.0 Manufacturing activities
 - 7.1 Food and kindred products | | V113
 - 7.2 Tobacco | | V114
 - 7.3 Textiles | | V115
 - 7.4 Lumber & wood | | V116
 - 7.5 Furniture & fixtures | | V117
 - 7.6. Paper & allied products | | V118
 - 7.7. Printing & publishing | | V119
 - 7.8. Chemicals & allied products | | V120
 - 7.9. Petroleum & coal products | | V121
 - 7.10 Rubber & Plastics | | V122
 - 7.11 Leather & products | | V123

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|------|
| 7.12 Cement, clay, glass, lime, marble, &stone | <input type="checkbox"/> | V124 |
| 7.13 Metals | <input type="checkbox"/> | V125 |
| 7.14 Machinery & electrical equipment | <input type="checkbox"/> | V126 |
| 7.15 Transportation equipment | <input type="checkbox"/> | V127 |
| 7.16 Instruments | <input type="checkbox"/> | V128 |
| 7.17 Miscellaneous(specify _____) | <input type="checkbox"/> | V129 |
| 8.0 Weapons, military installations and activities(including nuclear,
military related source/activities) | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | V130 |
| 9.0 Transport, Storage and Communication activities | | |
| 9.1 land transport, traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> | V131 |
| 9.2 water transport | <input type="checkbox"/> | V132 |
| 9.3 air transport | <input type="checkbox"/> | V133 |
| 9.4 storage and communication | <input type="checkbox"/> | V134 |
| 10.0 Construction/ Infrastructure (<i>in developed areas</i> , other
than agriculture and energy) | | |
| 10.1 roads, highways, tunnels, bridges | <input type="checkbox"/> | V135 |
| 10.2 airport installations, extensions | <input type="checkbox"/> | V136 |
| 10.3 marine installations, extensions | <input type="checkbox"/> | V137 |
| 10.4 buildings, etc. | <input type="checkbox"/> | V138 |
| 10.5 parks,green areas, etc. | <input type="checkbox"/> | V139 |
| 10.6 lack of / improper regional or urban planning | <input type="checkbox"/> | V140 |
| 10.7 water supply related | <input type="checkbox"/> | V141 |
| 10.8 miscellaneous(specify _____) | <input type="checkbox"/> | V142 |
| 11.0 Waste Disposal and Treatment | | |
| 11.1 storage/treatment/disposal of nuclear waste | <input type="checkbox"/> | V143 |
| 11.2 untreated disposal of toxic/hazardous waste (toxic sludges, PCB's, dioxines,etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | V144 |
| 11.3 storage of <i>toxic/hazardous inustrial</i> waste | <input type="checkbox"/> | V145 |
| 11.4 incinerators for <i>toxic/hazardous industrial</i> waste | <input type="checkbox"/> | V146 |
| 11.5 micro-encapsulating plants for <i>toxic/hazardous industrial</i> waste | <input type="checkbox"/> | V147 |
| 11.6 chemical processing of <i>toxic/hazardous industrial</i> waste | <input type="checkbox"/> | V148 |
| 11.7 recycling of <i>toxic/hazardous industrial</i> waste | <input type="checkbox"/> | V149 |
| 11.8 untreated disposal of <i>nontoxic industrial</i> waste | <input type="checkbox"/> | V150 |
| 11.9 private, <i>nontoxic industrial</i> waste water treatment plants | <input type="checkbox"/> | V151 |
| 11.10 open municipal landfill; nonsanitary / free waste disposal | <input type="checkbox"/> | V152 |
| 11.11 nonexistent sewage systems; improper disposal of sewage | <input type="checkbox"/> | V153 |
| 11.12 problems with existing sewage system | <input type="checkbox"/> | V154 |
| 11.13 controlled/sanitary landfill | <input type="checkbox"/> | V155 |
| 11.14 municipal waste water treatment plants | <input type="checkbox"/> | V156 |
| 11.15 recycling plants for domestic solid wastes | <input type="checkbox"/> | V157 |
| 11.16 miscellaneous (specify _____) | <input type="checkbox"/> | V158 |
| 12.0 Energy Installations | | |
| 12.1 nuclear | <input type="checkbox"/> | V159 |
| 12.2 fossil fuels (coal, oil, natural gas) | <input type="checkbox"/> | V160 |
| 12.3 hightension power lines; radar | <input type="checkbox"/> | V161 |
| 12.4 hydroelectric | <input type="checkbox"/> | V162 |
| 12.5 geothermal | <input type="checkbox"/> | V163 |
| 12.6 trash to steam, biomass | <input type="checkbox"/> | V164 |
| 12.7 solar, wind | <input type="checkbox"/> | V165 |
| 13.0 Maintenance and Repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles and household goods | <input type="checkbox"/> | V166 |
| 14.0 Lack of Environmental Protection Laws / Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> | V167 |
| 15.0 Failure of Implementing Existing Laws / Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> | V168 |

- 16.0 Lack of Participation Opportunities in Decision Making concerning Environment V169
 17.0 Mistreatment of Animals V170
 18.0 Miscellaneous(specify _____) V171

Q22A. Which of the following best expresses the mobilizers' view of the above selected source or in/activities?

- | | | |
|--|------------|-------------------------------|
| | FIRST/ONLY | <input type="checkbox"/> V172 |
| | LAST | <input type="checkbox"/> V173 |
0. No information; does not apply
 1. Positive view of source/(in)activities
 2. No steady opinion about source; shifting or different opinion/s about source/activities
 3. It is not known whether source/activities are responsible for eco-disturbances
 4. Source/ activities are not responsible for eco-disturbances
 5. Source/ activities are partially responsible for eco-disturbances and protective steps should be taken
 6. Source/ activities are fully responsible for eco-disturbances but the jobs provided are needed
 7. Source/ activities are fully responsible for eco-disturbances and some protective steps should be taken
 8. Source/activities are fully responsible for eco-disturbances and should close/be permanently stopped/restore area/pay for damages
 9. Source/activities will be/are fully responsible for eco-disturbances and should not exist/put into operation

Q22B. Type of source/s V174

0. no specified information/does not apply
1. siting
2. exposure
3. in-between (some construction has been made)
4. Both 1 & 2
5. expansion of previous facilities
6. Mix/all

Q22C. What do the mobilizers propose as the resolution/s to the activity/source-created problem throughout this case? 0. No spec. Info;No 1. Yes

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 0. No information; do not know;does not apply | <input type="checkbox"/> V175 |
| 1. No change in/ continue the activities | <input type="checkbox"/> V176 |
| 2. Preservation/conservation/envir. management of a wild life/rural area [<i>circle</i>] | <input type="checkbox"/> V177 |
| 3. Preservation of a cultural heritage area (buildings and/or surroundings) | <input type="checkbox"/> V178 |
| 4. Green zones/spots in already developed areas | <input type="checkbox"/> V179 |
| 5. Compensations | <input type="checkbox"/> V180 |
| 6. Employment | <input type="checkbox"/> V181 |
| 7. Creation of environmental protection rules and regulations, laws/policy, or protected are[<i>circle</i>] | <input type="checkbox"/> V182 |
| 8. Implementation of regulatory rules, existing laws (e.g. fines to producers) | <input type="checkbox"/> V183 |
| 9. Proper regional and urban planning | <input type="checkbox"/> V184 |
| 10 Environmental Impact Assessment studies | <input type="checkbox"/> V185 |
| <i>Less polluting technologies</i> | |
| 11.1 main process related | <input type="checkbox"/> V186 |
| 11.2 nonmain process related :end of pipe; remedial action (patch solution) | <input type="checkbox"/> V187 |
| 12. Temporary shut downs | <input type="checkbox"/> V188 |
| 13. Removal/relocation | <input type="checkbox"/> V189 |
| 14. Removal and restoration of area (e.g. park, green area,etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> V190 |
| 15. Plans not actualizing / annulment of challenged group's location plans | <input type="checkbox"/> V191 |
| 16. Decrease in production activities | <input type="checkbox"/> V192 |
| 17. Permanent shut down of source; permanent stop of ongoing projects or eco-disturbing activities | <input type="checkbox"/> V193 |
| 18. Total restoration of affected area | <input type="checkbox"/> V194 |
| 19. Equal Say / Participation in Decision Making | <input type="checkbox"/> V195 |
| 20. Other _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> V196 |

Q23. Which of the following is/are identified as the eco-disturbing offense/s (e.g. pollution load) by the mobilizers in this case? 0. No spec. Info;No 1. Yes

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0. No information; unknown offense | <input type="checkbox"/> V197 |
| 1. Noise pollution | <input type="checkbox"/> V198 |

- 2. Atmospheric pollution (smog, etc.) | V199
- 3. Fresh Water related (rivers, lakes, underground) | V199
 - 3.1. water scarcity/shortage | V200
 - 3.2. water pollution or contamination | V201
 - 3.3. Miscellaneous (specify _____) | V202
- 4. Coastal pollution | V203
- 5. Sea/Ocean pollution (from oil spills, waste disposal, etc.) | V204
- 6. Land related
 - 6.1. soil pollution | V205
 - 6.2. soil erosion | V206
 - 6.3. Miscellaneous (specify _____) | V207
- 7. Destruction/disorganization (or its extension) of an ecosystem | V208
- 8. Other _____ | V209

Q23A. Is the above a result of the coder's judgement or article's information?

| V210

- 0. coder's judgement
- 1. article information
- 2. Both

Q23B. Which of the following best expresses the mobilizers' view of the above selected eco-disturbing offenses?

FIRST/ONLY | V211
 LAST | V212

- 0. No information; does not apply
- 1. There are no negative offenses
- 2. It is not certain that there are negative offenses
- 3. The negative offenses are not significant
- 4. The negative offenses are a necessary bad along with economic gain
- 5. The negative offenses need to be reduced; such future offenses should be avoided
- 6. The negative offenses should be eliminated
- 7. The negative offenses that are expected should be prevented
- 8. The negative offenses produced irreversible damages
- 9. Other _____

Q23C. Is the above a result of the coder's judgement or article's information?

| V213

- 0. coder's judgement
- 1. article information
- 2. Both

Q24. According to the mobilizers, which of the following is/are identified as the impacts (e.g. damage due to offenses) of the previously selected source/ activities in this case? 0. No spec. Info;No 1. Yes

- 0. does not apply | V214
- 1. Unknown impacts | V215
- 2. Positive impacts(specify _____) | V216
- 3. Negative Aesthetics impacts | V217
- 4. Negative Recreation impacts | V218
- 5. Negative Cultural /Historical impacts | V219
- 6. Negative Built-Environment impacts | V220
- 7. Negative Political impacts(including peace related,etc.) | V221
- 8. Negative Economic impacts
 - 8.1 property values | V222
 - 8.2 decreasing incomes (expected/realized) | V223
 - 8.3 threat to economic subsistence | V224
 - 8.4 plant, animal and crop destruction | V225
 - 8.5 Miscellaneous (specify _____) | V226
- 9. Negative Ecosystem impacts; destruction/disorganization of:

- 9.1 forest | | V227
- 9.2 wetland | | V228
- 9.3 land | | V229
- 9.4 whole island/s | | V230
- 9.5 fresh waters (lakes, rivers, underground) | | V231
- 9.6 coastal zones | | V232
- 9.7 marine ecosystems(sea, ocean related) | | V233
- 9.8 airshed/s | | V234
- 9.9 local ecosystem in general | | V235
- 9.10 threat to species; flora and fauna | | V236
- 9.11 green areas in the city | | V237
- 9.12 miscellaneous (specify _____) | | V238
- 10. Negative Psychological impacts | | V239
- 11. Negative Public Health impacts
 - 11.1 realized, few incidents | | V240
 - 11.2 expected; suspected | | V241
 - 11.3 realized, many incidents | | V242
- 12. Life itself is threatened/seriously endangered | | V243
- 13. Miscellaneous (specify _____) | | V244

Q24A. Is the above a result of the coder's judgement or article information? | | V245

0. coder's judgement
 1. article information
 2. Both

V. ASSISTING AND CHALLENGED GROUPS AND THEIR RESPONSES

Q25. In Table Q25 you are to circle those bodies that the mobilizers or their supporters approached, directly or indirectly, seeking help, intervention, assistance, or a chance to be heard (equal say). Simultaneously, you are to choose the type of response/s and enter its/their number in the appropriate box for the selected body/ies. If no bodies were approached circle the '0. No specified information' box.

Q25A. What is/are the name/s of the large environmental organization/s?(IN FULL) | | V269

_____ (string)

Q25A1. What is/are the name/s of the country/ies of origin of the above organization/s? | | V270

_____ (string)

Q25A2. Were there any coordinating actions, such as deliberate timing or other synchronization efforts, of the locals with the above organizations?
 0. No spec. Info 1. No 2. Yes | | V270.1

Q26. In Table Q26 you are to circle the owner/s, user/s or/and interest group/s of the previously chosen source / activities (Q 22) who is / are directly or indirectly challenged by the mobilizers (select all that apply). Simultaneously, you are to choose the type of response/s and enter its/their number in the appropriate box for each of the selected challenged groups.

Q26A. Is the above a result of the coder's judgement or article information? | | V290

0. coder's judgement
 1. article information
 2. Both

Q25 TABLE

	No specified information	Indifference	Strong Support to Source	Weak Support to Source	Source Not a Problem	Recognition of Mobilizers	Too costly to establish	Inevitable Develop't Effect	Too Costly to Control	Patience & Understanding	Employment Opportunities	Compensations	Procedural/Implement'n Aid	Did not keep Aid Promise	National Parliament	Promised Solution	Temporary Stop. of Source	Technical Aid	Legal Aid	Economic Aid	Organizational Aid	Publicity Aid	Partial Resolution	Total Resolution	Other	VAR	
BODY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24		
0. No specified information																										V246	
1. State-gov't, ministry, gov. party																											V247
2. Central State repr. at loc.level																											V248
3. Regional Govt/s (SP)																											V249
4. Local Govt/s																											V250
5. Sub-local govt(freguesia)(PT)																											V251
6. External Local Govt/s																											V252
7. Local Politicians																											V253
8. Non-governing Political Parties																											V254
9. National Parliament																											V255
10. Regional Parliament (SP)																											V256
11. Regional Court/s																											V257
12. Supreme Court/s																											V258
13. European Commission																											V259
14. European Court																											V260
15. European Parliament																											V261
16. Religious/Church grps/persons																											V262
17. Large Environmental Orgs																											V263
18. Scientists																											V264
19. Other Producer Organizations																											V265
20. Trade Associations/Coop's																											V266
21. Police																											V267
22. Other																											V268

Q26 TABLE

Type of Response

USER/OWNER/INTEREST GRP	Type of Response																						VAR	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21		22
0. No specified information																								V271
1. State-gov't, ministry, gov. party																								V272
2. Central State repr. at loc.level																								V273
3. Regional Govt/s (SP)																								V274
4. Local Govt/s																								V275
5. State Producers																								V276
6. Semipriv/semipublic producers																								V277
7. Priv.producers/employers/owner																								V278
8. Farmers																								V279
9. Fishermen																								V280
10. Shepherds																								V281
11. Hunters																								V282
12. Workers, Other Occup. Groups																								V283
13. Citizens																								V284
14. Trade Associations																								V285
15. Environmental Organizations																								V286
16. Political Parties of the Opposit.																								V287
17. Other Community/ies																								V288
18. Other (specify)																								V289

VI. RESULTS

Q27. Which of the following mobilizers' resolutions were achieved by the end?

	0. No spec. Info;No	1. Yes
0. No specified information	___	V291
1. No change in/ continue the activities (marked in Q22)	___	V292
2. Preservation/conservation/envir. management of a wild life/rural area [circle]	___	V293
3. Preservation of a cultural heritage area (buildings and/or surroundings)	___	V294
4. Green zones/spots in already developed areas	___	V295
5. Compensations	___	V296
6. Employment	___	V297
7. Creation of environmental protection rules and regulations, laws/policy, or protd area [circle]	___	V298
8. Implementation of regulatory rules, existing laws (e.g. fines to producers)	___	V299
9. Proper regional and urban planning	___	V300
10. Environmental Impact Assessment studies	___	V301
<i>Less polluting technologies</i>		
11.1 main process related	___	V302
11.2 nonmain process related :end of pipe; remedial action (patch solution)	___	V303
12. Temporary shut downs	___	V304
13. Removal/relocation	___	V305
14. Removal and restoration of area (e.g. park, green area, etc.)	___	V306
15. Plans not actualizing / annulment of challenged group's location plans	___	V307
16. Decrease in production activities	___	V308
17. Permanent shut down of source; permanent stop of ongoing projects or eco-disturbing activities	___	V309
18. Total restoration of affected area	___	V310
19. Equal Say / Participation in Decision Making	___	V311
20. Other _____	___	V312

FOR SITING CASES ONLY--APPLIES AFTER 1988

Q28. Does this case involve the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?

0.No information	1.No	2. Yes	___ V313
------------------	------	--------	-----------

Q28A. If Yes, how has the Environmental Impact Study affected the conflict?

0. No specified information	___ V314
-----------------------------	-----------

1. Intensified it due to negative/critical view of EIS
2. Aggravated it due to its confirmation of their fears
3. No change since EIS made no difference to the previous situation
4. Resolved it since EIS pressured authorities to take protective measures/actions
5. Other : _____

Q28B. Which of the following best describes the relationship between the total number of protests and the number of protests during the public participation procedures of the EIS?

0. No specified information	___ V315
1. The number of protests is higher before that procedure	
2. The number of protests is higher during the public participation procedure	
3. The number of protests is higher after the public participation procedure	
4. The number of protests is similar throughout the case	
5. Other _____	

Q29. COMMENTS
