

İztuzu Dayanışması [iztuzudayanisma] (2015, January 7). Hi, could you hack the website of akp businessman Ramazan Oruç, who wants to destroy the iztuzu beach? @RedHack_EN <http://www.oructravel.com/> Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/iztuzudayanisma/status/552611468508938240>

The sorts of direct interactions are pure samples in which collaborations bring active outputs. Indeed, Redhack hacked the website as a response to genuine request for support. In other cases, however, the logic of self-centered participation promoted by social media can represent a threat for political groups rather than an opportunity (Fenton & Barassi, 2011). The below tweet is a self-critical example of this argument:

Yusuf Kahraman [ysk5133] (2015, January 8) #İztuzuPlajınaSahipÇıkalım - If half of the retweeters had signed, the campaign would have already ended. @iztuzudayanisma <https://t.co/jEE6G8knnp> <http://t.co/Mb7HyH9g4u> Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/#!/ysk5133/status/553139555134898176>

The owner of this tweet, Yusuf Kahraman, was himself associated with the action-oriented economic competitiveness frame. As in his statement, the campaign attracted attention on Twitter, however, not many signed the online petition. Such forms of passive inclusion were commonly observed during this protest by nature of social media.

Findings from this research also indicate that the İztuzu protest was mainly stimulated by the injustice component, as its connotations were frequently noticed in the economic competitiveness frame. Even though the number of nodes linking to this frame was relatively low, economic competitiveness served as a common ground for the mobilization attempts during the protest.

SONUÇ

Both social movement theory and sociological studies of individual movements have largely ignored the problematic aspect of social movements concerned with delineating their boundaries (Rosenthal et al., 1985: 1050). Therefore, network analysis provides a unique methodological tool for systematically drawing the boundaries of a movement (Rosenthal et al., 1985: 1050). This is a useful tool for defining the participants in a movement, moreover identifying their linkages. Regarding the size of the İztuzu protest, the methodology adopted for this research revealed practical outcomes. However, it could be restructured to include offline connections between participants for the analysis of larger scale movements. Further research, particularly on the *processes* of mobilizing, could increase the understanding of how collective action for change is situated within the organization of a social movement.

This study was designed to bring together the methods of SNA and framing with the aim to suggest an experimental approach for the analysis of small scale movements. The framework of this paper was organized in line with this aim to review the existing literature on network analysis and framing, while applying the methods to a case study. However, the communicative experience on Twitter is also substantial. Twitter itself may not be directly associated with activating collective action, but it can be used to extend the movement network to bring in more actors. From a researcher's perspective it is also useful in observing the mobilization of a movement from a distance. Hence, the recent literature on the use of Twitter in protests may provide a solid background for the study of contemporary social movements. Another approach may be linking these protests to the culture of recent social movements in a specific context. Adopting this sort of an approach may also shed light on the grounds, which possibly lead to the modes of mobilization in future actions.

In social movements, it is important for participants to have an essential understanding of counter-hegemonic culture, along with organizing capabilities in order to achieve substantial outcomes. Today's movements are able scale up very rapidly, but generally lack the ability to shift tactically in order to weather transitions (Tüfekçi, 2014). This situation can be explained with regard to Gerhards and Rucht's longstanding hypothesis: "The larger the range of the problems covered by a frame, the larger the range of societal groups who can be addressed with the frame and the greater the mobilization capacity of the frame" (Gerhards & Rucht, 1992: 580). Frames with greater number of references combined with cross-movement networking

postulate larger protests by enabling the coalescence of members from diverse SMOs; however, this could also result in the abolition of the frame articulation processes, as the diversity of SMOs and the multiplicity of their grievances may cause frame disputes. Protests with narrowly defined objectives, as in the case of İztuzu, may be more likely to succeed if the relevant SMOs are involved. In the end, the İztuzu protest was not nurtured by the *social movement sector* (McCarthy & Zald, 1977) as a whole; instead it remained as a small-scale environmental protest. Limiting the scope of future studies on these sorts of protests to the existing literature on environmental justice could be useful, since not all the frames embrace the foundations of collective action.

The İztuzu protest can be identified with the former framework of actions taken against governmental policies.⁴ In this sense, recent protests against the construction of new nuclear installations in Akkuyu and Sinop, demonstrations against the establishment of a new power plant by the private Kolin Construction Company at Yırca, and even the Gezi protests can be appreciated as its predecessors. They were all initiated by environmental concerns, ultimately evolving to embrace other socio-political and economic aspects. Thus, the İztuzu protest can be regarded as an outcome of a continuing dialectic in the social movements parade of ‘new Turkey’, as it has references to the common rationale behind the recent movements. Within this context, there has been a rise in informal environmental radicalism against the recent energy policies of the ruling AKP government. However, the institutionalization of environmental political action still has yet to appear on the agenda.

REFERENCES

- Akın, A., & Zıraman, E. (2015). Power Struggle in/around the Turkish Online Realm and Three forms of Opposition: Redhack, Alternative IS Association and Personal Resistances against YouTube Ban. *Global Media Journal Mediterranean Edition*, 10(1), 13–21.
- Barassi, V. (2013). Ethnographic Cartographies: Social Movements, Alternative Media and the Spaces of Networks. *Social Movement Studies*, 12(1), 48–62. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2012.650951>
- Benford, R. D. (1993). Frame Disputes within the Nuclear Disarmament Movement. *Social Forces*, 71(3), 677–701. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2579890>
- Benford, R. D. (1997). An Insider’s Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective. *Sociological Inquiry*, 67(4), 409–430. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1997.tb00445.x>
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611–639. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611>
- Benkler, Y. (2007). *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Brown, H. E. (2013). Race, Legality, and the Social Policy Consequences of Anti-Immigration Mobilization. *American Sociological Review*, 78(2), 290–314. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0003122413476712>
- Cable, S., & Shriver, T. (1995). Production and Extrapolation of Meaning in the Environmental Justice Movement. *Sociological Spectrum*, 15(4), 419–442. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02732173.1995.9982110>
- Čapek, S. M. (1993). The “Environmental Justice” Frame: A Conceptual Discussion and an Application. *Social Problems*, 40(1), 5–24. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3097023>

⁴ Findings supporting this argument can be traced back in certain tweets, which included references to Soma, Ermenek, Yırca, as well as Charlie Hebdo in France.

- Carroll, W. K., & Ratner, R. S. (1996). Master Framing and Cross-Movement Networking in Contemporary Social Movements. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 37(4), 601–625. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1996.tb01755.x>
- Chetty, K., Devadas, V., & Fleming, J. S. (2015). The Framing of Climate Change in New Zealand Newspapers from June 2009 to June 2010. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 45(1), 1–20. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2014.996234>
- Curtis, R. L., Jr., & Zurcher, L. A., Jr. (1973). Stable Resources of Protest Movements: The Multi-Organizational Field. *Social Forces*, 52(1), 53–61. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2576423>
- Diani, M. (1992). The Concept of Social Movement. *The Sociological Review*, 40(1), 1–25. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1992.tb02943.x>
- Diani, M. (1995). *Green Networks: A Structural Analysis of the Italian Environmental Movement*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Elmer, G. (2006). Re-tooling the Network Parsing the Links and Codes of the Web World. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 12(1), 9–19. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1354856506061549>
- Fenton, N., & Barassi, V. (2011). Alternative Media and Social Networking Sites: The Politics of Individuation and Political Participation. *The Communication Review*, 14(3), 179–196. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10714421.2011.597245>
- Gerhards, J., & Rucht, D. (1992). Mesomobilization Contexts: Organizing and Framing in Two Protest Campaigns in West Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(3), 555–595. <http://doi.org/10.1086/230049>
- Goffman, E. (1986). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360–1380. <http://doi.org/10.1086/225469>
- Haluza-DeLay, R., & Fernhout, H. (2011). Sustainability and Social Inclusion? Examining the Frames of Canadian English-Speaking Environmental Movement Organisations. *Local Environment*, 16(7), 727–745. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2011.594036>
- Klandermans, B. (1984). Mobilization and Participation: Social-Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory. *American Sociological Review*, 49(5), 583–600. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2095417>
- Klandermans, B., & Oegema, D. (1987). Potentials, Networks, Motivations, and Barriers: Steps towards Participation in Social Movements. *American Sociological Review*, 52(4), 519–531. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2095297>
- Krinsky, J., & Crossley, N. (2014). Social Movements and Social Networks: Introduction. *Social Movement Studies*, 13(1), 1–21. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2013.862787>
- Lofland, J. (1996). *Social Movement Organizations: Guide to Research on Insurgent Realities*. New York: Aldine Transaction.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1212–1241. <http://doi.org/10.1086/226464>

- Melucci, A. (1996). *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nisbet, M. C. (2009). Communicating Climate Change: Why Frames Matter for Public Engagement. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 51(2), 12-23. <http://doi.org/10.3200/ENVT.51.2.12-23>
- Oliver, P. E., & Johnston, H. (2005). What a Good Idea! Frames and Ideologies in Social Movement Research. In H. Johnston & J. A. Noakes (Eds.), *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective* (pp. 185-205). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Pellow, D. N. (1999). Framing Emerging Environmental Movement Tactics: Mobilizing Consensus, Demobilizing Conflict. *Sociological Forum*, 14(4), 659-683. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021604104463>
- Polletta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective Identity and Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27(1), 283-305. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.283>
- Porta, D. D., & Diani, M. (2006). *Social Movements: An Introduction* (2. edition). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rootes, C. A. (1997). Environmental Movements and Green Parties in Western and Eastern Europe. In M. Redclift & G. Woodgate (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Environmental Sociology* (pp. 319-348). Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing. Retrieved from <http://www.elgaronline.com/view/9781858984056.00032.xml>
- Rosenthal, N., Fingrutd, M., Ethier, M., Karant, R., & McDonald, D. (1985). Social Movements and Network Analysis: A Case Study of Nineteenth-Century Women's Reform in New York State. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(5), 1022-1054.
- Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1992). Master Frames and Cycles of Protest. In A. Morris & C. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory* (pp. 133-155). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Snow, D. A., Rochford, B. E., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation. *American Sociological Review*, 51(4), 464-481. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2095581>
- Taylor, D. E. (2000). The Rise of the Environmental Justice Paradigm Injustice Framing and the Social Construction of Environmental Discourses. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(4), 508-580. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0002764200043004003>
- Tilly, C. (1977). *Studying Social Movements/Studying Collective Action*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Tüfekçi, Z. (2014). Online Social Change: Easy to Organize, Hard to Win. Ted Talks. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/zeynep_tufekci_how_the_internet_has_made_social_change_easy_to_organize_hard_to_win