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Animal rights organizations, in attempting to affect institutional change in industrial animal agriculture, face an institutional mountain. I show how these organizations, though contesting institutions which are highly reified, tacitly endorsed, and historically inertial, leverage emotional experiences and regulation to incrementally move this mountain. Using a grounded qualitative study of interview data from animal rights advocates and archival data generated by animal rights organizations, this study finds that animal rights organizations have encoded both response- and antecedent-focused emotion regulation into two distinct strategies used to garner support for their institutional change project: transgression mining and seed planting. Furthermore, this study expounds upon the role of moral emotional experiences in the individual-level process by which persons alternate into support for animal rights organizations and their goals, here labeled autodidactic frame alignment. Drawing on Goffman’s backstage/frontstage distinction, this study illustrates how emotion’s role in institutional change efforts varies across both
level of analysis and areas of interactive life. In doing so, this research adds empirical weight to and extends recent theoretical work expounding upon the emotionally-charged nature of the lived experience of institutions.
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I. INTRODUCTION

For assuredly, I say to you, whoever says to this mountain, ‘Be removed and be cast into the sea,’ and does not doubt in his heart, but believes that those things he says will be done, he will have whatever he says (Mark 11:23, New King James Version).

Animal rights organizations face the predicament of moving an institutional mountain. Paleontological evidence indicates the institutionalized domestication and consumption of animals dates back to at least 10,000 B.C.E. (Lawrie & Ledward, 2006). However, while the cultural precedent for animal farming and consumption might have been set over 12 millennia ago, contemporary meat production has little resemblance to any period in its history. In 2012, U.S.\(^1\) agribusiness organizations held over 157 million head of cattle, calves, and hogs in inventory whose marketing resulted in $90.7 billion in gross income. This included the slaughter of over 32 million cattle and calves and 113 million hogs to produce over 49 billion pounds of beef, veal, and pork. In the same year, over 8.8 billion chickens, turkeys, and ducks were slaughtered to produce over 46 billion pounds of poultry. The contrast with meat and poultry production just earlier in the century, however, is stark. In 1944, around 19 million cattle and calves and 84.5 million hogs were slaughtered to produce around 21 billion pounds of beef, veal, and pork, while in 1960 just over 1.7 billion chickens, turkeys, and ducks were slaughtered to produce

\(^1\) While accounting for only approximately 4.46 percent of the world’s population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012; World Bank, 2013), the U.S. is one of the largest producers (in 2012, 20.7 percent of the world’s beef and veal, 10 percent of pork, and 21.86 percent of poultry) and consumers (21.06 percent of beef and veal, 8.04 percent of pork, and 18.69 percent of poultry) of meat and poultry in the world (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2013).
just over 5 billion pounds of poultry. Annual per capita consumption of red meat and poultry in the U.S. has grown from 175.2 pounds in 1965 to 202.3 pounds in 2012, peaking at 221.6 pounds in 2007 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2013)\(^2\).

The production and consumption of red meat, pork, and poultry are inextricably woven into the fabric of Western social life. The institutions constituting the meat and poultry industries are characterized by a scope and degree of “taken-for-grantedness” (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Meyer & Rowan, 1977), or unreflexive acceptance as external facticity (Zucker, 1977), few others could be said to exhibit. Regardless, as is often the case with social hegemony, “institutionalization bears, if not the seeds of its own destruction, at least openings for substantial change” (DiMaggio, 1991: 287): large-scale agribusiness has bred its dialectical resistance. Animal rights organizations (AROs) are a subset of the broad category of social movement organizations (SMOs) whose members direct a significant portion of their organizationally relevant efforts at deinstitutionalizing or disrupting those institutions (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Oliver, 1992). While these often semi-formal organizations lack strict chains of command whereby the rank-and-file are compelled to enact certain bureaucratic processes and perspectives as a function of maintaining their livelihood, they do comprise a grouping of individuals directed or advised – though not commanded – by a centralized authority to use certain material tactics and enact certain ideologies toward intra-organizationally coherent goals (c.f., McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1986). When persons deviate from the directions offered by the organization’s upper echelons in legally, reputationally, or otherwise materially damaging ways, they are often

\(^2\) Earliest data available used for historical meat and poultry production statistics.
disavowed as members (e.g., Elsbach & Sutton, 1992), evincing boundary management techniques common to more formal organizations.

Animal rights activism, which has existed since roughly the beginning of the 1970s, is largely motivated by the philosophical presupposition of equality between animal and human species. As elaborated by Peter Singer in *Animal Liberation* (1975)\(^3\), animal rights activism centers around the assumption that one species’ physical or psychological suffering cannot be considered inherently more or less significant than any other species’ suffering, and therefore humans should strive to minimize the suffering of animal species in the same way they strive to minimize the suffering of fellow humans.

Until recently, the majority of sociologically minded organizational scholars might have examined AROs’ efforts in primarily macro terms. Prior to the last two decades, the two groups of scholars most interested in illuminating processes of social change, institutional and social movement scholars, would have likely focused their studies on communities of organizations (Greenwood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby, 2008; McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Scott, 2008) responding to changes in the macro-structural elements of the society they are embedded in: precipitating ecological jolts and political opportunities (e.g., Gamson, 1975; Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002; Tilly, 1978).

Subsequent to several authors’ calls for the incorporation of individual-level analysis into studies of institutional change (Barley, 2008; Hallett, 2010; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006; Powell & Colyvas, 2008), more attention has been paid to the “inhabitants” of institutional orders. Studies in this vein of research generally show how persons leverage their “social skills” (Fligstein, 1997, 2001) and positioning within a

\(^3\) Singer’s classic is often referred to as “the Bible” of the animal rights movement, and has served as the rallying manifesto for many animal rights activists for nearly four decades.
field (Battilana, 2006; Maguire, Hardy, & Lawrence, 2004) to affect desired changes in dominant institutional orders. However, these studies, much as the institutional and social movement theories generally, have largely ignored one component crucial to a person’s desire and ability to catalyze change in institutions: emotion (Creed, Hudson, Okhuysen, & Smith-Crowe, 2014; Scott, 2008; Voronov & Vince, 2012). While we could never fully understand institutional stability or change in absence of properly theorized emotions, the omission becomes even more egregious when considering the institutional change projects of persons such as ARO volunteers, who, driven by their emotional commitment to the well-being of animals and who rely on the emotions of others to garner support for their movement, persist against immense cultural odds in disrupting the institutionalized domestication and consumption of animals.

Consideration of ARO volunteers raises two questions unanswered by previous research on institutional change: what is the role of emotion in motivating persons to engage in institutional change projects aimed at disrupting historically inertial, deeply engrained, and pervasively reified institutions? Also, how do organizations attempt to strategically leverage emotions in achieving their goals? More generally, how and why do actors attempt to move an institutional mountain?

This dissertation pulls emotion analytically front-and-center in pursuit of answers to these questions. I suggest ARO activists reveal the “backstage” (Goffman, 1959) of the meat and poultry industries—institutionalized practices of questionable normative moral value hidden from consumers’ collective view—to potential supporters with the hope of eliciting a strong, negative emotional reaction. These negative emotions—for example, anger and disgust over the inhumane treatment of animals by factory farms and
slaughterhouses, shame over supporting the meat and poultry industries through consumption—become the vehicle for the alignment of activist and supporter framings, or “‘schemata of interpretation’ that enable persons ‘to locate, perceive, identify, and label’ occurrences within their life space and the world at large” (Goffman, 1974: 21, cited in Snow et al., 1986: 464). In essence, I suggest ARO activists leverage supporters’ emotions in attempting to align their interpretations of the meat and poultry industries’ hidden practices. Once aligned, targets of activism will be more likely to lend support to an ARO’s primary institutional project—the disruption of the institutions comprised of those backstage practices. I also examine how frames, constructed preliminarily by AROs as they train activists to solicit support for the movement, are manipulated by activists in response to the emotional tenor of real-time interactions with potential supporters. That is, ARO activists may alter framings of the backstage events during an interaction with a potential supporter if they initially fail to evoke the emotions which facilitate frame alignment.

The primary aims of this study are to: (1) provide an empirical investigation of emotion’s role in the institutional change projects of SMO activists, in the process highlighting the relationship between social emotions and social cognitions as it relates to the enactment of institutions, and (2) to theoretically and empirically incorporate emotion into our collective understanding of SMO framing processes. Toward the former aim, institutional researchers have yet to give systematic empirical attention to emotion in the enactment of institutions. In focusing explicitly on the social emotions underpinning institutional change projects, this dissertation will provide the first such study. Toward the latter aim of integrating the framing perspective with emotion, SMO framing
researchers—and to a slightly lesser extent, SMO researchers generally (Jasper, 2011)—have all but ignored emotions in their investigations of the cognitive schemas SMOs develop and attempt to disseminate. In empirically examining frame alignment as a function of emotional resonance, I provide an illustration of what to this point has been a largely tacit view emergent in the SMO literature: that emotions and cognitions are inextricably tied parallel ways of processing one’s social world.

The following sections will give a brief overview of this dissertation’s theoretical framework, which will draw primarily from organizational neo-institutionalism and social movement theory. This introduction will conclude with a discussion of the expected theoretical and practical contributions of this dissertation.

**Theoretical Framework**

Neo-institutional theory in organization studies finds its foundation in several seminal articles published in the late 1970s and early 1980s (i.e., DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Meyer & Scott, 1983; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983; Zucker, 1977). These contributions generally suggest organizations are embedded in organizational fields, or communities of “organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983: 148), and that within these fields organizations are subject to higher order pressures from social institutions, or “supraorganizational patterns of activity through which humans conduct their material life in time and space, and symbolic systems through which they categorize that activity and infuse it with meaning” (Friedland & Alford, 1991: 232), which critically affect organizational decision making.
and ultimately performance. While later authors would recognize the error in suggesting organizational performance, “technical rationality” (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), or economic utility maximization are distinct from other socially constituted organizational imperatives (e.g., Friedland & Alford, 1991; Granovetter, 1985; Lounsbury, 2008; Powell, 1991), these canonical works provide the basis for much work looking to systematically analyze the effects of organizations’ social embeddedness rather than relegating them to the error term as econometric models had done previously (Granovetter, 1985; Greenwood et al., 2008).

Research framed by institutional theory since these seminal contributions has been largely macro in orientation, with the majority of scholars focusing primarily on how institutional processes play out at the field level. However, in response to calls for explication of the micro-sociological processes which undergird the macro institutional environment (Hallett, 2010; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006; Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2009; Powell & Colyvas, 2008), a growing body of literature has begun to focus primarily on the individual level of analysis. These micro-oriented studies have examined the enactments antecedent both institutional stability (e.g., Dacin, Munir, & Tracey, 2010; Hallett, 2010; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006) and change (e.g., Alvarez, Mazza, Pedersen, & Svejenova, 2005; Creed, DeJordy, & Lok, 2010; Lok, 2010; Reay, Golden-Biddle, & GermAnn, 2006; Seo & Creed, 2002; Smets, Morris, & Greenwood, 2012), focusing on topics such as identity work or construction (e.g., Chreim, Williams, & Hinings, 2007; Creed et al., 2010; Creed, Scully, & Austin, 2002; Gutierrez, Howard-Grenville, & Scully, 2010; Lok, 2010; Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003; Reay, Golden-Biddle, & GermAnn, 2006), sensemaking (e.g., Weber & Glynn, 2006; Jay, 2013), and
practices (e.g., Alvarez et al., 2005; Kellogg, 2011), among others. This relatively small body of literature obviously does not represent a comprehensive examination of the interaction between the institutional environment and the persons which both constitute and are constituted by it, but one gap in researchers’ collective understanding of the individual level of analysis has been singled out as particularly salient: emotion. Emotion as it relates to persons’ cognitions and enactments of institutions is currently underspecified and almost completely unexplored, receiving scant theoretical attention (i.e., Creed et al., 2014; Jarvis, in press; Scott, 2008; Voronov & Vince, 2012) and only tangential empirical treatments.

Social movement theorists generally focus on certain groups’ intentional efforts to alter the social structure of a society (Gamson, 1975; McCarthy & Zald, 1977), along with associated efforts to accrue and maintain resources and participants through offering strategic framings of salient social issues (Benford & Snow, 2000; Snow & Benford, 1988, 1992; Snow et al., 1986). For SMOs, frames consist of “(1) a diagnosis of some event or aspect of social life as problematic and in need of alteration; (2) a proposed solution to the diagnosed problem that specifies what needs to be done; and (3) a call to arms or rationale for engaging in ameliorative or corrective action” (Snow & Benford, 1988: 199). Within broad societal movements in which many SMOs may take part, frames may vary in scope, either “functioning as a kind of master algorithm that colors and constrains the orientations and activities” of all SMOs in a movement (Benford & Snow, 2000: 618)—what social movement scholars call “master frames” (Snow &

---

4 Several contributions have peripherally examined emotion in rhetorical appeals (i.e., the Aristotelian argument “pathos,” from the Greek for “suffering” or “experience”) aimed at legitimating practices, values, beliefs, or prior actions (c.f., Brown, Ainsworth, & Grant, 2012; Erkama & Vaara, 2010; Green, 2004).
Benford, 1992)—or “limited to the interests of a particular group” within a movement (Benford & Snow, 2000: 618). Depending on the background of the audience and the specific member or group offering a frame, frames will vary according to their resonance, or the extent to which they “strike a responsive chord or resonate within the targets of mobilization” (Snow & Benford, 1988: 198), and consequently the likelihood they will inspire action in those targets.

Snow et al. (1986) propose four processes by which frames of potential supporters and SMOs become aligned, or when conjunction occurs between the parties’ respective interpretive frameworks. These include: (1) frame bridging, or “the linkage of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem” (1986: 467), (2) amplification, or “the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem or set of events” (1986: 469), (3) extension, or when an SMO “extend[s] the boundaries of its primary [interpretive] framework so as to encompass interests or points of view that are incidental to its primary objectives but of considerable salience to its potential adherents” (1986: 472), and (4) transformation, or when frames are transformed due to the extent to which they appear antithetical to “conventional lifestyles or rituals and extant interpretive frames” of mobilization targets (1986: 473). Although these frame alignment processes are conceptually distinct, very few have tried to distinguish them empirically. Taken as a whole, SMO framing research is primarily concerned with the content of frames—that is, outlining different frames utilized in different movements—rather than the processes by which frame alignment is achieved, which has received mostly peripheral attention from social movement scholars. This bias has led to the relative neglect of everyday, “on-the-
ground” interactions between social movement activists and potential supporters, i.e., as social movement scholars have been primarily concerned with describing the content of frames, they have overlooked the everyday processes by which those frames diffuse through a base of supporters.

Early social movement research in the 1960s shares much in common with organization studies (McAdam & Scott, 2005) as, similar to the neo-institutionalists to come later in the 1970s, social movement theorists drew heavily from the work of the “old institutionalists” led by Philip Selznick (1949, 1957). Indeed, proponents of the “resource mobilization” perspective in social movement theory generally suggest that some degree of organization is necessary to start and sustain movements, stressing the role of hierarchical power, political power, and leadership in acquiring resources and support in organizations (McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Zald & McCarthy, 1987).

Unsurprisingly given commonalities in source material (McAdam & Scott, 2005), there is considerable communication between contemporary institutional and social movement theorists. Schneiberg and Soule suggest institutionalization is the product of “constitutional struggles—conflicts evoked by social movements over the fundamental character of social, political, and industrial order” (2005: 122). That is, institutional dynamics are the product of social movements with varying degrees of organization attempting to “de-institutionalize existing beliefs, norms, and values” to be replaced with new beliefs, norms, and values (e.g., Davis & Anderson, 2008; Rao, Morrill, & Zald, 2000) more in line with the “preference structure” of the social movement (den Hond & de Bakker, 2007: 905). Thus, SMOs are key actors in the assembly of new and resistance to dominant institutional arrangements (Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008).
Important to this dissertation is the development of emotions in social movement research. Social movement researchers have articulated the role of emotions generally in catalyzing and sustaining movements and also isolated specific emotions as causal mechanisms (Goodwin, Jasper, & Polletta, 2000; Jasper, 2011: 285). For example, emotions such as love and pride are byproducts of the sense of collective identity movements generate (Jasper, 1998; Polletta & Jasper, 2001), while the same emotions, when characterizing a person’s membership in social groups competing with a movement, can cause the person to depart (Goodwin, 1997). Emotions are not only used to maintain movement participation, but are also used to recruit new members. The negative emotions associated with moral shock are used to focus potential members’ attention on inequitable areas of social life and radicalize their opinions of what they observe (Benford, 1997; Berbrier, 1998; Berns, 2009; Jasper, 2011). However, as with the institutional literature, social movement researchers utilizing the framing perspective have yet to systematically integrate emotion in their conceptualizations of SMOs’ framing processes.

**Expected Contributions**

I draw primarily on organizational neo-institutionalism and secondarily on social movement theorizing to address the above research questions. These perspectives are two of the most directly related to actors’ attempts to change social structure in the social sciences, and in that I suggest ARO activists attempt to disrupt the highly institutionalized practices and meanings constituting the meat and poultry industry through offering frames of agribusiness’s “backstage” activities, they are particularly apt here. Given the epistemological bases of both perspectives—rooted in the rejection and
eventual abandonment of rational actor models of human behavior which elide individual motivations to action outside of economic utility maximization—these perspectives help us understand what drives the behaviors of activists who, in general, do not stand to benefit in any economically material way from their activism. Broadly, this research is expected to aid the scholarly community in understanding what role emotions play in motivating individuals to engage social change projects, a role which is currently poorly specified in both the organizational neo-institutional and social movement literatures.

**Contributions to Theory**

This study will make two contributions to organizational neo-institutional theory by: (1) empirically examining the role of emotion in institutional change projects, and (2) suggesting frame alignment via backstage revelations as a cognitive process which underpins institutional enactment and contestation. This study will also make two contributions to social movement theorizing by: (1) conceptually and empirically distinguishing two frame alignment processes, and (2) integrating emotion into the SMO framing perspective.

Recent calls for the incorporation of emotion into our understanding of institutional enactment (i.e., Scott, 2008; Voronov & Vince, 2012) have highlighted the need to consider the affective dimension of institutional enactment. Without proper research attention to emotion, researchers cannot map the entirety of the gamut of motivations persons may have to deviate from or adhere to institutional prescriptions and proscriptions. Additionally, at the organizational level, institutional theorists have yet to reckon with the way in which organizations leverage emotional experiences to pursue certain institutional dynamics, a salient gap given how pervasive appeals to emotion are
on the part of SMOs, regulatory agencies, and for-profit organizations in garnering cultural support for certain practices, values, and beliefs. This dissertation provides an initial step in empirically examining how emotions are leveraged by ARO activists as a technique to increase support for an institutional change project. Given the degree of institutionalization of the meat and poultry industry, AROs specifically provide an excellent empirical setting to test the effects of emotional appeals on behalf of activists. Strong emotional appeals are likely to be necessitated to shift mobilization targets’ highly taken-for-granted beliefs about how their food is prepared. Examining emotions as utilized by ARO activism also provides the opportunity to study their relationship with an interpersonal cognitive process underpinning AROs’ institutional change efforts: frame alignment. By focusing on both social cognitions and social emotions, this study provides a distinct contribution from previous institutional work. This study also provides a unique application of the Goffmanesque backstage construct by applying it to the field level of analysis. That is, this study does not draw on the social interactionist roots of the frontstage/backstage distinction, but translates them to the institutional level, suggesting that whole fields of organizations, rather than just individual personas, may have backstages.

While a small body of literature utilizing the frame alignment processes as analytical categories has accumulated, the processes are rarely the focal point of systematic analysis. They are usually taken as emergent characteristics of inductive case studies, and not coincidentally, multiple framing processes are rarely studied simultaneously. This dissertation takes up the task of studying multiple framing processes with the goal of distinguishing them as analytically and empirically distinct constructs.
and capturing the empirical complexity inherent to SMOs’ attempts to garner support. Also, much like neo-institutional theory, social movement scholars examining framing have predominantly utilized cognitive perspectives which gloss emotional and interpretational issues (Snow et al., 1986), likely as a result from the widespread attitude that “the immediate impetus to collective action remains a cognitive one” (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1988: 713). However, several have suggested studying emotions as a productive avenue for advancing research on SMO framing processes (e.g., Benford, 1997; Berbrier, 1998) given the integral nature of emotion in SMOs’ efforts to align their own frames with that of potential supporters. Emotion’s role in SMO framing processes remains underspecified, as the scant empirical attention paid to this topic (i.e., Berbrier, 1998; Berns, 2009) does not discuss how emotion is utilized in any specific frame alignment process. This study redresses this gap through analyzing emotion as a catalyst of specific frame alignment processes and clearly thus clearly illustrating the role of emotions in the success of social movements.

**Contributions to Practice**

This dissertation will make three contributions to practice within both business organizations and SMOs by: (1) illustrating the efficacy of provoking emotions in frame alignment processes, (2) illuminating “on-the-ground” interactions between members of organizations and potential supporters, and (3) illustrating the efficacy of revealing “backstage” events in soliciting support for an organization’s practices, beliefs, and values.

As mentioned above, social movement researchers have yet to explicitly connect mobilization targets’ experienced emotions to specific frame alignment processes.
Empirically examining emotions in relation to specific frame alignment processes will elucidate how powerful a tool emotion is in accruing support for movements. SMO administration could potentially use this information in training front-line activists in tapping into targets’ emotions as they frame issues. As activists become more adept at eliciting specific emotions, their interactions with potential supporters will generally become more successful in terms of procuring material support for the movement, advancing the SMO’s goals. This research may also inform SMOs as to what emotions are ineffective in recruiting support, giving insight into why previous interactions with potential supporters rather than just insight into how to better navigate future interactions.

Furthermore, such frame alignment has relevance to business organizations as well. For profit businesses must induce frame alignment through persuading existing and potential stakeholders such as customers, clients, shareholders, and regulators that certain products, services, or modes of production are appropriate. These organizations might profitably take direction from the findings of this dissertation in refining their efforts directed at managing relations with these stakeholders. Additionally, managers of business organizations might profit from a more complete understanding of the motivations advocates have for endeavoring to alter industrial practices. Consideration of the emotional aspect of SMO advocacy might lead organizations to offer products or services which more effectively tap into advocates’ desires to ameliorate social inequality, as can been seen in the meat and poultry industries with, for example, the proliferation of cage-free eggs and humanely raised beef, among other products.

Second, having a more in-depth knowledge of how members of organizations extend and transform frames during real-time interactions with potential supporters, as
opposed to knowledge of how frames are extended and transformed over years or decades, may guide managers toward preparing the ‘rank-and-file’ responsible for interacting with clients, customers, or potential supporters of social movements with multiple framings in the hope of increasing their readiness to counter various mobilization targets with various extant meaning-structures. ‘Rank-and-file’ equipped with multiple framings, or with the rhetorical ability to manipulate framings in real time to better accommodate the beliefs and values of a diverse group of potential supporters, will again generally be more effective in eliciting support for the movement. This knowledge might also illuminate causes of unsuccessful interactions with potential supporters rather than just drivers of success in prospective interactions.

Finally, the results of this study will also guide management in the efficacy of revealing “backstage” activities of opposing movements or organizations. That is, findings may suggest that revelation of the backstage is an expedient method to elicit emotions aiding frame alignment processes. However, it is not clear right now what exactly the relationship between backstage revelations and success in recruiting support for an organization is. For example, it is possible that revealing aspects of a field’s backstage deemed to grizzly or morally distasteful may have the effect of encouraging the potential supporter to prematurely end the conversation without committing to support the movement. The results of this study will aid in placing boundary conditions around the successful use of backstage revelations in garnering support for an organization’s practices, beliefs, and values.

**Structure of the Dissertation**

This dissertation will proceed with a review of relevant research in three bodies of
literature: (1) organizational neo-institutionalism, (2) social movement theorizing, and (3) backstage/frontstage interactions. I will then outline the methods of the study, detailing the methodological approach and the data sources analyzed. Afterdetailing the methods, I will articulate the major findings of the study regarding the multilevel process by which organizations strategically leverage emotional experiences and expressions to catalyze frame alignment, helping catalyze institutional change. Finally, I will offer a short discussion of the findings along with major contributions to theory and practice, limitations, and future research directions.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I will review the literatures on organizational neo-institutionalism, SMOs, and the Goffmanesque dramaturgical “backstage” metaphor. In the first section, I will cover the foundations and development of organizational neo-institutionalism, research on agentic action and institutional change, and finally the microfoundations of institutional orders. In the second section, I will cover the foundations of the SMO concept, research on SMO framing, the interaction of organizational neo-institutionalism and SMO theorizing, and finally the uses of emotions in SMO theorizing. I will conclude with a brief review of the very small body of “backstage/frontstage” literature germane to this dissertation.

Organizational Neo-Institutionalism

Foundations and Development

Institutions may be defined as “supraorganizational patterns of activity through which humans conduct their material life in time and space, and symbolic systems through which they categorize that activity and infuse it with meaning” (Friedland & Alford, 1991: 232). Contemporary organizational neo-institutionalism finds its earliest theoretical foundations in 20th century institutional economists (Scott, 2008; Stinchcombe, 1997). These institutional economists—most notably Thorstein Veblen—suggested that economic decisions were much more influenced by habit and convention than rational calculation of individual utility (Scott, 2008: 3). By the mid-20th century, so-called “old institutionalists” (Selznick, 1949, 1957) had refocused attention from
“atomized” (Granovetter, 1985) economic individuals to organizations as collectives which were “distinguishable from both broader social institutions, on the one hand, and the behavior of individuals, on the other hand” (Scott, 2008: 17). Old institutionalism was “straightforwardly political” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991: 12) in its analysis of organizations’ departure from instrumentally rational decision making—vested interests resulting from the political dealings of organizations’ leadership were posited as the primary cause of the organizational inertia which undermined performance.

Early neo-institutionalists, contra old institutionalism and the other dominant perspectives of the time—contingency theory and Parsons’ and Selznick’s structural-functionalism (Hirsch & Lounsbury, 1997; Scott, 2008: 42)—departed from this focus on intra-organizational political behavior in favor of explanations centered on “interorganizational influences, conformity, and persuasiveness of cultural accounts” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991: 13). For the neo-institutionalists of the late 1970s and early 1980s, these explanations required abstracting the focal level of analysis to the field, or communities of “organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983: 148). Although “fields” of organizations were not always labeled or defined in exactly the same terms (e.g., “societal sectors”; Scott & Meyer, 1983), the key insight of early organizational neo-institutional studies remained principally the same: higher order institutional forces, bounded roughly by the set of related actors a focal organization is embedded in, exert social influence which critically affects decision making within the organization (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977).
These higher order forces were said to manifest as institutionalized myths, which specified in a rule-like way, beyond the discretion of any one organization, how an organization was to pursue technical efficiency (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). As a consequence of pervasive myths within a field, Meyer and Rowan suggested organizations may ceremonially adopt practices signaling compliance with myths, which would be effectively decoupled from more efficient core operations, although there is little evidence to date regarding when or to what degree organizations will decouple in this fashion (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996). Not adopting these myths was said to leave an organization open to claims of negligence, irrationality, and unnecessity (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). DiMaggio and Powell’s highly influential paper built on Meyer and Rowan’s theorizing by suggesting the aggregate effect of pervasive myths in highly structured fields is to lessen diversity. That is, organizations will undergo isomorphism, or “a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions” (1983: 149). DiMaggio and Powell outlined three forms of isomorphism: (1) mimetic, when organizations model themselves after other organizations they perceive to be successful due to uncertain environmental conditions (1983: 151), (2) coercive, when organizations are pressured by other organizations on which they are dependent to conform to certain myths (1983: 150), and (3) normative, or isomorphism driven by professionalization of an occupational field (1983: 152).

Until the late 1980s, most neo-institutional studies examined convergence of organizational forms within a field due to isomorphic pressures, often framed by Tolbert and Zucker’s (1983) two-stage model of diffusion. These studies focused excessively on
mimetic isomorphism to the exclusion of normative and coercive (Mizruchi & Fein, 1999) and yielded only mixed empirical results (Greenwood et al., 2008). More recent research has focused on the ways in which specific attendant practices, rather than wholesale organizational structures, might diffuse (e.g., Guler, Guillén, & Macpherson, 2002; Sherer & Lee, 2002; Westphal, Gulati, & Shortell, 1997), although diffusion studies have become more sporadic given the growing realization among organizational scholars that “institutional processes may be less homogeneous and less automatic than originally conceptualized” (Greenwood et al., 2008: 14), a realization which led to a shift in focus for much of the work framed by institutional theory. Specifically, many studies began to focus on either: (1) the processes by which organizations acquire, manage, and use legitimacy, (2) institutional agency and change, or (3) institutional microprocesses. Given that the analysis supporting this dissertation will concentrate primarily on data collected at the micro level and the empirical case is centered on organizations promoting institutional change, I will focus more extensively on the latter two foci, specifically research on agentic action and consequent institutional change and the microprocesses which underpin institutions.

**Agency and Institutional Change**

The study of institutional change logically must begin with the study of agency, or the “engagement by actors of different structural environments [i.e., institutions]…which…both reproduces and transforms those [institutions]” (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998: 970). Toward the end of the 1980s, institutional theorists began to recognize one of the most significant ambiguities of early institutional work (DiMaggio, 1988, 1991; Scott, 1987; Zucker, 1987): “If isomorphism obtains, how then are we to
explain the apparent variety of organizations that nonetheless co-exist within industries…?" (Fombrun, 1989: 439). The fact that organizations often offer divergent responses to ostensibly similar institutional pressures—what most scholars considered to be expressions of autonomous agency not determined by social structure—posed a challenge to researchers who had previously treated organizations as homogenous wholes responding mechanically and predictably to social forces (c.f., Greenwood et al., 2008; Kraatz & Zajac, 1996; Scott, 2008). Several studies turned inside institutional orders themselves; that is, rather than focusing on how institutional forces might coerce isomorphic organizational responses, authors began focusing on how organizations might strategically select which institutional prescriptions to comply with and which to defy (e.g., Beckert, 1999; Goodrick & Salancik, 1996; Neilson & Rao, 1987; Oliver, 1991). Others chose to study intraorganizational factors, positing the organization not as a homogenous whole, but rather as the site of constitutional struggles emanating from constituent members’ disparate understandings of social reality (e.g., Fligstein, 1985; Greenwood & Hinings, 1993), struggles which ultimately produce an organization’s ability to selectively adhere to field-level norms and myths. This work, however, failed to truly address the issue at the root of Fobrum’s question, an issue that has become known as the “paradox of embedded agency”—the tension created when considering whether actors, intraorganizational or organizational, can act agentically to change the very institutions which condition their agency (Battilana & D’Aunno, 2009; Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009; DiMaggio, 1988; Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006; Holm, 1995; Seo & Creed, 2002). That is, while positing actors who occasionally defy institutional prescriptions, authors suggested that the motivation for doing so was self-interest—often
interpreted as what early institutionalists would have labeled “technical rationality” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977)—conflicting with social imperatives, a view that effectively ignores the fact that all interests, including self-interests, technical rationality, economic utility maximization, etc., are institutionally given (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Granovetter, 1985; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Lounsbury, 2008; Powell, 1991).

Despite brief forays into the intraorganizational, institutional research generally remained more macro in orientation, searching out the field level conditions which might enable and constrain divergent organizational responses. Authors began to show awareness of institutional pluralism or complexity, defined as “the situation faced by an organization that operates within multiple institutional spheres” (Kraatz & Block, 2008: 243), throughout the 1990s (e.g., D’Aunno, Sutton, & Price, 1991; Heimer, 1999; Hung & Whittington, 1997; Kostova & Zaheer, 1999; Stone & Brush, 1996), which can be seen foreshadowed in Christine Oliver’s (1991) seminal article outlining strategic organizational responses to institutional pressures. Oliver, drawing on resource dependence theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), suggested that organizations are often subjected to “numerous and frequently incompatible demands from a variety of external actors” (1991: 147) upon which an organization may be dependent. Similarly, research focusing on pluralistic institutional influences in an organization’s environment tended to stress “multiple and often uncoordinated sources of legitimacy” (D’Aunno et al., 1991: 638; Meyer, Scott, & Strang, 1987).

Indeed, this view of the institutional environment seems to provide a necessary component of the answer to the paradox of embedded agency: actors’ agency may be
institutionally conditioned, but actors are necessarily exposed to an institutionally complex environment composed of multiple fragmented, hierarchically arranged, and often contradictory institutions (Clemens & Cook, 1999; Friedland & Alford, 1991; Goodrick & Reay, 2011; Greenwood, Díaz, Li, & Lorente, 2010; Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011; Heimer, 1999; Hoffman, 1999, 2001; Kostova & Roth, 2002; Kraatz & Block, 2008; Sewell, 1992). That is, several scholars have made clear that “agency” is characterized only by the illusion of autonomy from social structure—deviance from the prescriptions of one institution is simultaneous adherence to those of another. As Meyer and Jepperson noted, actors are “entrapped in standardized agency” (2000: 110). At the micro level, institutional change occurs as actors enact their “standardized agency,” which is the inexorable result of embeddedness in or exposure to multiple institutions inculcating multiple sets of practices, beliefs, and values which may be more or less mutually exclusive. As Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury suggested, “[i]nstitutional contradictions provide individuals and organizations with opportunities for agency and institutional change by exploiting these contradictions” (2012: 77). Every actor is inherently unique in terms of social positioning (Seo & Creed, 2002) and therefore also in terms of institutionally given interests which are expressed through an actor’s ability and desire to transpose institutionalized practices, values, and beliefs from one sphere of social life to another (Clemens & Cook, 1999; Sewell, 1992), consequently creating new or transforming existing institutions (e.g., Kraatz & Moore, 2002; Mutch, 2006).

The creation of “new” institutions, given its pervasiveness in institutional research, has become something of a colloquialism, but is also semantically misleading. As Zilber noted, choosing to study “a new structure/practice” within a field naturally results “in a somewhat artificial choice of a starting point.” “Whereas the specific social structures and practices leading to that point are usually explored and explained (new legislation, political change, etc.), the broader social, symbolic, and cultural origins of those very factors are commonly relegated to the background or totally ignored” (2006: 283; see also Helms, Oliver, & Webb, 2012, illustrating how “new” institutions are negotiated from old).
2007; Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2005; Walls & Hoffman, 2013). At the macro level, institutions change as their constituent communities contest, coalesce, and spin-off.

Researchers studying change in institutions have done so under several banners, to include institutional entrepreneurship (c.f., Battilana et al., 2009; Garud, Hardy, & Maguire, 2007; Hardy & Maguire, 2008; Pacheco, York, Dean, & Sarasvathy, 2010), institutional work (c.f., Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Lawrence et al., 2009), and institutional logics (c.f., Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; Thornton et al., 2012). While these perspectives all have “home” levels of analysis where they are the most analytically powerful (Friedland & Alford, 1991), each has contributed uniquely to the study of field level change and the individual-level enactments which constitute change. Therefore, I will not draw exclusively from any one perspective, but instead review studies grouped by their focal level of analysis in an attempt to trace the development of research on institutional change from macro to micro in orientation. Immediately below I begin by reviewing research focusing on macro-field level change.

The majority of research on institutional change throughout the 1990s and the first half of the 2000s was macro in orientation (see Table 1 for a review of studies done on institutional change).
### TABLE 1

**Review of Cited Studies on Institutional Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Primary Theoretical Perspective</th>
<th>Locus of Change Catalyst</th>
<th>Change Mechanism</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berman (2012)</td>
<td>Logics</td>
<td>Exogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>Actors within a field are said to experiment with practices associated with several logics. Changes in the environment of the academic services field shifted dominance among alternative logics and consequently allowed experimentation with alternative logics to gain traction and eventually become dominant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glynn &amp; Lounsbury (2005)</td>
<td>Logics</td>
<td>Exogenous to field</td>
<td>Jolt</td>
<td>The authors study critics’ reviews of the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra’s performances before and after the 1996 ASO strike and find that exogenous shocks such as the strike can be the catalyst for the blending of logics, in this case a market and aesthetic logic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodrick (2002)</td>
<td>General institutional change</td>
<td>Exogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>The author tracks changes in the institutional structure of the management discipline and suggests that change in organizational fields is inextricably tied to historical circumstances and the environment a field is embedded in. Diffusion of innovation within a field is suggested to be a function of the prestige of potential adopters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodrick &amp; Reay (2011)</td>
<td>Logics</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>Through a study of pharmacists’ professional work from 1852 to the present, the authors conclude that professional work within a field can be guided by a constellation of logics, and that these logics can play out relationships which are either competitive or facilitative/additive over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood &amp; Suddaby (2006)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Jolt</td>
<td>The authors examine the introduction of multidisciplinary practices in the field of professional business services to conclude that change in highly institutionalized fields may come from central actors given their varying network locations and levels of embeddedness within the orders constituting the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Does not include conceptual articles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Jolt</td>
<td>The authors examine the role of professional associations in pioneering a new organizational form—the multidisciplinary practice—and (re)introduce the concept of theorizing change to institutional theory. They find that professional associations play a large role in theorizing change for actors in a field and facilitating the diffusion of innovative forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haveman &amp; Rao (1997)</td>
<td>Logics</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>The authors study change in the early thrift industry and conclude that selection and adaptation processes are at play in the coevolution of organizational forms and institutional logics. The relationship between the two is conceptualized as recursive, logics influencing what forms manifest, and the process of manifestation in forms influencing logics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haveman &amp; Rao (2006)</td>
<td>Logics</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>A study of the automobile industry in the early 20th century reveals that hybrid organizations, which manifest multiple institutional logics simultaneously, are what lead to the slow, recursive coevolution of organizational forms and institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helms et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Logics</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>Through a study of the negotiation of and settlement on the ISO 26000, the authors find that logic pluralism within organizations is a catalyst for the creation and institutionalization of new practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman (1999, 2001)</td>
<td>General institutional change</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>The author examines the field organized around the issue of corporate environmentalism from 1960 to 1993 and concludes that competing institutions may exist within fields, driving field-level change in the regulative, normative, and cognitive aspects of institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holm (1995)</td>
<td>General institutional change</td>
<td>Exogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>Examines the rise and fall of the mandated sales organization form in the Norwegian fishing industry as an illustration of multiple institutions as interconnected, multilevel systems where the iterative interplay of the “practical” and “political” levels leads to change in institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraatz &amp; Moore (2002)</td>
<td>General institutional change</td>
<td>Exogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>Through a study of executive migration from one organizational field to another, the authors conclude that organizational leaders’ backgrounds are important determinants of the institutionalized practices and values of the organizations they lead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Institutional Change</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kraatz &amp; Zajac (1996)</td>
<td>General institutional change</td>
<td>Exogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>The authors study private liberal arts colleges from 1971 to 1986 and conclude that many of them changed in ways contradictory to institutional demands within the field, and that these changes were related to global and local technical environmental conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee &amp; Pennings (2002)</td>
<td>General institutional change</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>A study of Dutch professional services firms from 1925 through 1990 reveals that institutional change is affected by the interplay of selection of forms at the sector or field level and adoption of those forms at the level of the firm. Firm adoption is said to be dependent on various “diffusion filters.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquis &amp; Lounsbury (2007)</td>
<td>Logics/Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>The authors examined a case of logics competing as small, local banks manifesting one logic resisted acquisition by larger, national banks manifesting a different logic. Findings include that geography can bound logics and that institutional entrepreneurship can be mobilized to defend an institutional community or logic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mair et al. (2012)</td>
<td>General institutional change</td>
<td>Exogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>Through a study of a poverty alleviation organization in rural Bangladesh, the authors find that conflict and contradiction among “institutional bits and pieces” can lead to change in the institutional framework of markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martí &amp; Mair (2009)</td>
<td>Institutional work</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>Through a study of poverty alleviation in rural Bangladesh, the authors outline six strategies used by marginal or powerless actors in a field to change dominant institutional arrangements which benefit the powerful. Findings include that differently situated actors within a field are more or less likely to engage in institutional work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutch (2007)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>The author studies the organizational practices pioneered by Sir Andrew Barclay Walker, the “driving” force behind a highly successful company owning the pubs of Meyerside in the late 19th century. He concluded that Walker transferred managerial practices from outside the field to make the pubs, traditionally run by tenants, more formally organized and therefore successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakes et al. (1998)</td>
<td>General institutional change</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>The authors integrate the insights of Bourdieu to explain the naming and legitimating of new practices among provincial museums and cultural heritage sites in Alberta, Canada. Change involved redirecting work and changing producers’ identities through altering the capital valued in a field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rao et al. (2003) & Logics & Endogenous to field & Evolution & Through a study of changing approaches to cuisine in French gastronomy, the authors find that the legitimacy of activists, efforts to theorize change, changing practices by high status peers, and benefits to defectors of adopting new practices can catalyze change in logics.

Rao et al. (2005) & General institutional change & Endogenous to field & Evolution & Through a study of changing approaches to cuisine in French gastronomy, the authors find that “borrowing” from alternative institutional orders by high status actors increases the likelihood that lower status actors will also borrow from those categories, manipulating the institutionalized practices within a field.

Rao et al. (2000) & Entrepreneurship & Exogenous to field & Institutional contestation & The authors suggest social movements act as entrepreneurs within fields to legitimize new organizational forms. Social movements are said to take advantage of fragmented fields comprised of constituencies with diverse goals and overlapping jurisdictions.

Rao & Sivakumar (1999) & Entrepreneurship & Exogenous to field & Institutional contestation & Through a study of the diffusion of investor relations departments among Fortune 500 industrial firms from 1984 to 1994, the authors find that social movement activists may coerce organizations into complying with changes in institutionalized forms.

Reay et al. (2013) & General institutional change & Endogenous to field & Evolution & The authors take a micro-sociological perspective to explain how practices diffuse inter-organizationally. An examination of new practices within Canadian healthcare revealed that de-habitualization and re-habitualization at the individual-level underpin changes in higher order institutions.

Reay & Hinings (2005) & Logics & Exogenous to field & Institutional contestation & Through a study of a health-reform initiative in Alberta, Canada, the authors glean insights about how fields become reconstituted after institutional change. They found that change agents must consistently apply their power for institutional changes to take hold, as those defending old logics will likely stay entrenched.

Schneiberg (2005) & Logics & Endogenous to field & Evolution & The author examined institutional change in the American property insurance field and found that institutions generate conditions for change endogenously. Market failures, legitimacy crises, and new institutional models all converge to make institutional change more likely, and this change generally follows a “punctuated equilibrium” model of transformation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schneiberg (2007)</td>
<td>Logics</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>Through a study of change in the US economy during the first half of the 20th century, the author concludes that institutions become littered with floatsam and jetsam: the discarded elements of abandoned institutional projects, which are reorganized and utilized to promote new institutional projects directed at changing logics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smets &amp; Jarzabkowski (2013)</td>
<td>Institutional work/Logics</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>Through an inductive case study of a global law firm, the authors found that institutions are reconstructed in the everyday practices of their inhabitants as the pull from and rearrange elements of the constellations of logics in their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suddaby &amp; Greenwood (2005)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship/Logics</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>The authors conduct a study of the discursive struggles over the legitimacy of a new organizational form: multidisciplinary partnerships. They find that rhetoric can be used by entrepreneurs to expose and manipulate dominant and subordinate logics and create the impetus for institutional change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton (2002)</td>
<td>Logics</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>A study of the field of higher education publishing revealed a shift in the importance of certain logics as determinants of organizational structure. Throughout the second half of the 20th century, the field became increasingly more dominated by an editorial and market logic rather than the craft and professional logic which it had been previously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton &amp; Ocasio (1999)</td>
<td>Logics</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>In a study of higher education publishing, the authors found a shift in the dominant logics of the field manifested in varying determinants of executive succession. Under the market logic which the field came to be dominated by, succession was primarily determined by product markets and the market for corporate control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townley (2002)</td>
<td>General institutional change</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>The author uses a longitudinal case study of the institutionalization of certain business planning and performance measures in organizations, and finds that institutional contestation manifests in competing forms of rationality (substantive, practical, theoretical, and instrumental).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zietsma &amp; Lawrence (2010)</td>
<td>Institutional work</td>
<td>Endogenous to field</td>
<td>Institutional contestation</td>
<td>The authors use a longitudinal analysis of harvesting practices in the British Columbia coastal forest industry to glean insights on boundary work and practice work that actors perform to maintain and disrupt institutions. They find iterative cycles of boundary and practice work to underpin higher-order institutional change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zilber (2007)</th>
<th>Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Endogenous to field</th>
<th>Institutional contestation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using an analysis of an Israeli high-tech conference after the dot-com crash of 2000, the author suggests that institutions are transformed through the discourse of different constituencies, as each independent group retrospectively constructs narratives of past event which in turn create meaning for new practices, values, and beliefs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While this research often reflected older understandings of change as occurring endogenously within an institutional order or field, usually through the iterative interplay of evolving organizational forms and attendant practices and the field level institutions they constitute (e.g., Haveman & Rao, 1997, 2006; Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006; Lee & Pennings, 2002; Rao, Morrill, & Zald, 2000; Rao & Sivakumar, 1999; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005), several studies reflecting more contemporary understandings of institutional complexity placed greater emphasis on conflicting institutional regimes as the vehicle through which field level change occurs (e.g., Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005; Hinings, Greenwood, Reay, & Suddaby, 2004; Holm, 1995; Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007; Reay & Hinings, 2005; Scott et al., 2000; Thornton, 2002; Townley, 2002).

These studies often focus on ecological “jolts” or “shocks”—social upheaval, technological disruptions, competitive discontinuities, or regulatory changes (e.g., Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005; Greenwood et al., 2002; Schneiberg, 2005; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999) which “profoundly subvert old routines, vested interests or established ways of thinking” (Schneiberg, 2007: 50), although several have suggested the incorporation of “jolts” or “shocks” into models of institutional change may be misleading (Oakes, Townley, & Cooper, 1998; Schneiberg, 2007), as these are often simply the more salient moments of a much longer evolutionary process (e.g., Berman, 2012; Goodrick, 2002; Zietsma & Lawrence, 2010) when challengers to dominant institutional arrangements achieve a certain level of popular support, “official” endorsement, or regulatory recognition. For example, Greenwood and colleagues (2002), while tracking the institutionalization of multidisciplinary services among accounting firms, suggested that a “jolt” precipitated change, but fail to note exactly when this jolt occurred while
simultaneously discussing several events which might be considered candidates for the role. They also noted that multidisciplinary services were “occasionally” offered by large accounting firms even early on in the period studied, before the precipitating “jolts” (2002: 64). Glynn and Lounsbury, in a study of the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra, similarly suggest the “shock” of the 1996 musicians’ strike really only served to make “vivid the problem of increasing resource constraints” (2005: 1034) which predated the event.

Regardless of whether the label is misleading, scholars’ examination of jolts does have the effect of colorfully illustrating institutional pluralism through bringing points of friction between contesting institutional orders into clear focus. The “jolt” or “shock” must be interpreted and articulated as threatening to the hegemony of preexisting institutional arrangements by actors (Munir, 2005; Smets & Jarzabkowski, 2013; Zilber, 2007) who then offer theorizations of possible change (Munir, 2005; Greenwood et al., 2002; Reay et al., 2013; Strang & Meyer, 1993) which are pieced together from the existing cultural repertoire provided by the contesting institutional orders, a process Meyer and Rowan (1977) presciently dubbed “bricolage” from the French for “tinkering” (e.g., Rao et al., 2005; Schneiberg, 2007). This ongoing dialectical process often resembles an “institutional war” (Hoffman, 1999) where the vested interests and cognitive inertia of distinct institutional communities with discrepant practices, values, and beliefs wage a contentious cultural battle for social dominance. Hoffman (1999, 2001) showed how organizations in the U.S. chemical industry were bitterly vilified for their environmentally unfriendly practices, one industry commentator even going so far as to call executives from the largest chemical companies the “handmaidens of Satan”
(1999: 360). Change at the field level entailed hundreds of environmental legal cases filed in increasing numbers over several decades involving both environmental NGOs and chemical companies, but resulted in bricolage evident in the chemical industry’s new environmentally friendly stance and the environmental NGOs’ growing utilization of business partnerships. That is, change at the field level showed evidence of actors piecing together new institutional solutions from the practices and beliefs of other institutional orders with which they had contact. Mair, Martí, and Ventresca (2012), in their study of poverty alleviation in rural Bangladesh (see also Martí & Mair, 2009), also described vehement opposition from actors defending dominant institutions prescribing, for example, the exclusion of women from certain markets.

Several studies also illustrate the more banal side of institutional change, or the evolution of institutions without the dramatic friction of institutions at “war.” Goodrick and Reay (2011), for example, observed that institutions in the same environment might affect change, but without necessarily competing. Rather, they suggested institutions might have “cooperative” relationships whereby they mutually influence and reinforce each other. As they noted, rather than “competing to divide up the available ‘pie,’ the ‘pie’ itself may be expandable” (2011: 402). Other studies attest to the notion that institutional change does not necessarily entail “institutional war,” but simply the evolutionary blending of practices, values, and beliefs from two different institutional orders without significant contestation (e.g., Berman, 2012; Goodrick, 2002; Haveman & Rao, 1997).

**Institutional Microprocesses**

As the above review suggests, institutional research naturally listed toward more
macro analysis. While discussion of actors—individual, organizational, governmental, and even pan-national—abounded in institutional studies, research was biased toward a focus on the “external shocks that prompt change and on the voices that catalyze transformations” (Powell & Colyvas, 2008: 277), i.e., the events and actors retrospectively constructed by researchers as those having the most influence in the process of institutional change. Scholars’ tendentious reading of institutional processes implicitly reduced the vast majority of individual actors to what renowned ethnomethodologist Harold Garfinkel labeled “cultural dopes” (1967). Consequently, several authors over the last two and a half decades alluded to the need to incorporate more explicit analysis of the microfoundations of institutional analysis—the “everyday processes” at the individual level and the “less powerful members of organizations” (Powell & Colyvas, 2008: 277). Paul DiMaggio (1988, 1997; DiMaggio & Powell, 1991) has often asked for institutional researchers to “clarify the cognitive presuppositions behind their theories” (1997: 263), asserting that greater attention to cognitive processes of persons would allow for easier recognition of institutions’ true nature: fragmented across groups and problematically internalized and enacted at the level of the individual. Stinchcombe similarly warned that “if the guts of the causal process of institutional influence are left out of the model, then we successfully mathematize abstract empiricism, an empiricism without the complexity of real life” (1997: 6). Hallett and Ventresca went so far as to suggest “organizational sociology has been ‘decoupled’ from its foundations in social interactions: Passing references to micro sociology are a form of ‘myth and ceremony’ that create academic ‘legitimacy,’” and, as a result, “institutionalism became a-social at the micro level” (2006: 215, emphasis original).
Barley reminded scholars that micro-sociological approaches, specifically phenomenology and ethnomethodology, were integral components of the—in retrospect, somewhat quixotic—foundational statements of organizational neo-institutionalism (e.g., DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Zucker, 1977), but that “[s]ince these original manifestos,…institutionalists have devoted little attention to ethnomethodology, to social construction, or for that matter, to micro-sociology of any kind. As institutionalism spread, its micro-social concerns disappeared into the background” (2008: 492). He accosted academics to begin the task of institutional research at the “coalface,” that is, at the level of material practice and interaction7.

Micro-sociological approaches in organizational neo-institutionalism surfaced again primarily in the middle of the 2000s as a reaction to the challenges of the aforementioned researchers. Microprocesses research can be divided roughly into two categories: (1) in reaction to DiMaggio’s calls, studies of cognitive processes and (2) in response to calls to incorporate research at the “coalface,” studies of individual characteristics, most often conceptualized as psychological dispositions, which predict attempts to challenge or maintain institutional arrangements and the efficacy of those attempts.

With regard to cognitive processes, identity work, or people’s attempts to form, repair, maintain, strengthen, or revise the cognitive “constructions that are productive of a sense of coherence and distinctiveness” (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003: 1165; Watson, 2008), is the most widely studied within an institutional framework (e.g., Chreim et al.,

7 See also Roger Friedland’s (2009) echoing of Marx’s *Critique of Hegel’s ‘Philosophy of Right’* (1843/1977) in the form of a recommendation that institutional scholars begin analytically in the material and then proceed to the world of abstract meaning.
2007; Creed et al., 2010; Creed et al., 2002; Gutierrez et al., 2010; Lok, 2010; Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006; Rao et al., 2003), though Weickian sensemaking has also received some empirical (e.g., Brown & Jones, 2000; Delbridge & Edwards, 2013; Jay, 2013; Mair et al., 2012; Patriotta & Lanzara, 2006; Quack, 2007) and theoretical (e.g., Dorado, 2005; Jennings & Greenwood, 2003; Weber & Glynn, 2006; Weick, 2003; Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005) attention. Studies of cognitive processes undergirding institutional change generally posit a person’s need for coherence—either among his/her multiple social identities constructed around multiple institutional orders, as with identity work, or in the interpretation of life events, as with sensemaking—as the engine for the transposition of cultural elements from one order to another. A pluralistic and often contradictory institutional environment produces incoherence of varying degrees among institutionalized beliefs, values, and practices, and persons respond with cognitive processes aimed at ameliorating the incoherence which simultaneously engender material behavior disrupting some institutional orders while maintaining others. For example, Creed et al. (2010) showed how GLBT ministers simultaneously performed disruptive institutional work and identity work to reconcile identities derived from two institutional orders several perceived as prescribing mutually exclusive enactments and thus lacking coherence. That is, their attempts to bring coherence to their overall self-concepts simultaneously functioned to reframe institutional norms within their respective church communities. Gutierrez and colleagues’ (2010) study of Catholic churchgoers after the news of sexual abuse within the Archdiocese of Boston broke, found that de-identifying with an organization—cognitively and publicly distancing oneself from representatives of a specific institutional order—was a natural reaction to events which challenged or
contradicted the churchgoers’ preconceived notions of what it meant to be a member of the Catholic Church. Similarly, research on sensemaking suggests that equivocal organizational outcomes can spur sensemaking efforts which contribute to a shift in the institutions which constitute the organization (Jay, 2013). Other research suggests that certain interpretations, i.e., certain ways of making sense of equivocal events, can be institutionalized in organizations (Brown & Jones, 2000; Weber & Glynn, 2006). Once perceived coherence is achieved for a community, it may be reinforced through repeated enactment of elaborate performances or rituals which perpetuate certain institutional arrangements, as was found to be the case in Dacin et al.’s (2010) study of Cambridge dining rituals in support of the institutionalized British class system.

Several individual characteristics have been studied in relation to the propensity to act toward changing or defending institutional regimes. One of the most often studied is a person’s position within a field or features of that field (e.g., Alvarez et al., 2005; Battilana & Casciaro, 2012; Currie, Lockett, Finn, Martin, & Waring, 2012; Finn, Currie, & Martin, 2010; Kisfalvi & Maguire, 2011; Kraatz & Moore, 2002; Maguire & Hardy, 2009; Maguire et al., 2004; Reay et al., 2006). Research has yielded mixed predictions as to how positioning within a field might affect a person’s role in institutional change. Some suggest those occupying positions of importance are the most likely candidates to engage institutional change projects. Studies by these researchers suggest that certain subject positions within a network of actors allows for a person to more easily mobilize resources and support toward institutional change. For example, Maguire and colleagues (2004), in a study of HIV/AIDS advocacy, activists were better able to bridge diverse constituencies in pursuit of institutional change if they were HIV positive and
homosexual. The same logic has prompted some to study organizational elites in their capacity as institutional change agents (e.g., Kraatz & Moore, 2002; Mutch, 2007). Others seem to think incumbents to positions of importance, while retaining the means to achieve change, are likely to lack the desire to alter the social arrangements which produced their privileged position (e.g., Currie et al., 2012), and so suggest change is more likely to come from the “fringes” of a field or from marginalized actors (Battilana, 2006, 2011). Kisfalvi and Maguire (2011), for example, show how Rachel Carson, given her comfort with marginality and sense of duty, engaged an institutional change project in her writing of Silent Spring (1962), a major catalyst in the deinstitutionalization of DDT. Cascio and Luthans (2014) showed how political prisoners housed on South Africa’s Robben Island during Nelson Mandela’s tenure there continuously worked to change their institutionalized mistreatment.

Further answers when pursuing which individual actors are the most likely engage change in their institutional context may lie in other research devoted to examining idiosyncratic features of their immediate social context. Battilana and Casciaro (2012) found that those fields characterized by low “structural closure”—that is, actors within a field are not cohesive or are very fragmented—present individual change agents with the best opportunity of achieving institutional change. Focusing in on conditions even more local to individual change agents, Finn and colleagues discovered the “historical development of established working relationships” (2010: 1092) between team members to be integral to a person’s ability to attempt to change institutional structure, while Kellogg (2009) indicated the same of physical and virtual spaces which provide persons the ability to gain a sense of collective identity necessary for an institutional change.
project.

Other individual characteristics studied have to do with the psychological dispositions of those who engage institutional change projects. Some research concerns what Flixtstein labeled “social skill”: a person’s “ability to motivate cooperation in other actors by providing those actors with common meanings and identities in which actions can be undertaken and justified” (1997: 398; 2001; Zilber, 2002). Persons with requisite social skill have the ability to bridge often fragmented audiences (e.g., Dacin et al., 2010; Lok & DeRond, 2013; Maguire et al., 2004; Wijen & Ansari, 2007) under a common cause, often by making concessions to appease diverse interests (e.g., Rojas, 2010) and defending against attempts by defenders of dominant arrangements to fragment change agents further (e.g., Kellogg, 2012). Such persons have an ability to “envision unexpected or unusual approaches” (Tracey, Phillips, & Jarvis, 2011: 70) emanating not only from their intimate knowledge of the political resources available in the institutional arrangement they propose to change (e.g., Kellogg, 2011; Maguire & Hardy, 2009; Reay et al., 2006), but their exposure to other arrangements which inculcate contradictory practices, values, and beliefs (Delbridge & Edwards, 2013). Persons likely to engage in institutional change projects not only possess social skill, but positive psychological capital—feelings of efficacy of their own and their groups’ efforts (e.g., Cascio & Luthans, 2014).

**Emotion and Institutional Theory**

As is readily evident from inspection of the small but growing body of literature on the cognitions, psychological dispositions, social positioning, and social capital which drive the material practices and interactions constituting higher-order institutional
environments (Barley & Tolbert, 1997; Giddens, 1984), institutional researchers have only provided an initial mapping of the relevant individual level variables. Examination of emotion has only very recently become a priority to institutional theorists as authors began to realize the fundamental importance of affect in the enactment and experience of institutions, a striking omission given that, as Voronov and Vince recently suggested in their theoretical treatise incorporating emotion into the institutional work (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Lawrence et al., 2009) framework, excluding the systematic analysis of emotion may undercut the raison d'être of micro-sociological approaches to institutional studies:

[Although institutional scholars seek to distance themselves from the ‘rational choice’ conceptualization of human agency…the lack of emotional processes in institutional theory implicitly causes institutional theory to fall back on an essentially ‘cognitive miser’ (Fiske & Taylor, 1991) conceptualization of individuals…. [T]his view privileges the (boundedly) rational nature of human agency and underplays the emotional processes that are inherent in human relationships and that play important roles in shaping human behavior. (2012: 59)

Creed, DeJordy, and Lok reinforced the notion that an understanding of emotion is essential to an understanding of the lived experience of institutions:

The embodied nature of the experiences we describe and analyze suggests that institutional roles do not operate only as cognitive/normative structures in the form of behavioral assumptions, expectations, or norms. These ministers experienced their roles as a calling, both deeply meaningful and emotionally charged, that evoked feelings, images, and impulses that went far beyond a set of behavioral expectations. (2010: 1359)

Despite the absence of systematic analysis, emotion has been the subject of some indirect empirical attention from a variety of perspectives. In the studies of rhetoric mentioned above, emotion has been peripherally examined via the Aristotelian rhetorical argument “pathos,” from the Greek for “suffering” or “experience” (Brown et al., 2012; Erkama & Vaara, 2010; Green, 2004). Pathos arguments are said to be directed at
evoking emotion in an audience and primarily help establish pragmatic legitimacy, or the perception that whatever is being proposed via rhetorical argument will be somehow beneficial to the audience (Brown et al., 2012; Green, 2004; Suchman, 1995), though no specific emotions are theorized in relation to any specific institutional effect, only that emotionally charged arguments may imbue legitimacy where logically based arguments fail. Writing about institutional work, Cascio and Luthans (2014) suggested that feelings of hope, as a characteristic of those with positive psychological capital, were related to a person’s propensity to direct efforts at institutional change. Friedland and colleagues (Friedland, 2001, 2002, 2009, 2011; Friedland, Mohr, Roose, & Gardinali, 2014) have often drawn on love both as an example of an institutional logic (i.e., familial love) which highlights the conceptual flaws in Bourdieu’s theory of fields and as a base motivation toward compliance with institutional norms. Kisfalvi and Maguire similarly suggested Rachel Carson’s “strong emotional links to her mother and to the idyllic…moments spent with her, or by herself, in the Pennsylvania countryside” (2011: 160, emphasis original) provided her with the catalyst for her writing of Silent Spring.

Though emotion in the institutional literature is currently badly underspecified, negative emotions have been discussed as particularly important to the motivation to engage in institutional change projects. For example, Gutierrez et al. (2010) posited anger as the “emotional fuel” driving individual members of the Catholic Church to seek institutional change. Similarly, Hoffman (1999, 2001) illustrated how anger drove environmentalist NGOs’ attacks on large chemical companies, as manifested in trade magazine editorials expressing contempt for certain institutionalized practices. Maguire et al. found that AIDS activists were often “fueled by anger at what they perceived as
indifference, inaction, and ineptitude on the part of governments, research institutions, and pharmaceutical companies” (2004: 665). Thus, although not the focus of any systematic analysis, anger is usually theorized as influencing an actor’s readiness to engage institutional change projects.

In one of the only direct investigations of any specific emotion in connection with institutional effects, Creed, Hudson, Okhuysen, and Smith-Crowe (2014) examined shame as the “ubiquitous and constant” mechanism through which compliance with institutional norms is enforced and change in institutional regimes is achieved. In developing their analytical framework, they drew heavily from sociologist of emotions Thomas Scheff, who similarly posited shame as “the social emotion” (2000: 96, emphasis added; 1988, 1990), suggesting that all persons, consciously or preconsciously, are constantly in a state of pride or shame resulting from persistent monitoring for others’ approbation of their entire selves. According to Creed et al., behavior transgressing institutional norms elicits a person’s shame, which signals that valued social bonds rooted in an institutional community are in danger of breaking. Of course, members of an institutional community must not always rely on a person’s own appraisal of his or her alignment with institutional norms. A community may mobilize to actively shame those they feel transgress institutional norms, and therefore shame has both a disciplinary component—instilled in a person during socialization and felt as a result of self-monitoring—and a juridical component—utilized communally as a corrective and felt as a result of others’ imputations (Foucault, 1975). While their discussion initially seems to imply universal conformity to institutional norms and thus a somewhat clandestine reiteration of the “paradox of embedded agency,” Creed and colleagues, utilizing insights
from research on institutional plurality, also discuss how shame may catalyze change in institutional orders:

[P]ersons’ multiple memberships can result not only in contradictory prescriptions but also in potentially competing pulls toward valued social groups. As a consequence, managing memberships in multiple communities is potentially difficult because different communities give members different things about which they can experience felt shame (Sayer, 2005). In sum, not only can people experience painful competing pulls toward different communities (Scheff, 1990), people can also face situations where the institutional prescriptions of one social group conflict with the institutional prescriptions of another, such that what is seen as shameful in one group may be judged irrelevant or even praiseworthy in another. (2014: 286)

This terse body of literature leaves several questions to be answered. First, outside of Creed et al.’s work, institutional researchers have neglected to theorize specific emotions in connection with institutional processes. This omission is important given that, as becomes evident when considering extant treatments of shame, anger, love, hope, etc., different emotions are likely to have different impacts on institutional processes. Although awaiting empirical verification, Creed et al.’s framework begins to show the cracks in Voronov and Vince’s theoretical edifice, which postulates, at least implicitly, predictable forms of institutional work associated with various levels of a generalized “emotional investment” in an institutional regime, depending on the level of cognitive investment a person possesses. This truncates the complexity of the human emotional spectrum in a similar way to the research mentioned above which discusses emotion only peripherally (e.g., Brown et al., 2012; Green, 2004; Kisfalvi & Maguire, 2011), ironically while constructing a framework to respond to a lack of everyday social complexity in institutional studies.

Secondly, previous work does not meaningfully address the interrelatedness of individual cognition and emotion. Voronov and Vince, while illustrating how cognition
and emotion could and should be taken into account simultaneously, fail to devote significant effort to specifying how cognition and emotion might be related in a processual manner. It seems likely that heightened cognitive investment might follow causally from heightened emotional investment and vice versa, while cognitive divestment might be causally related to emotional divestment and vice versa.

Thirdly, empirical work focusing primarily on emotions in the institutional literature is extremely scarce. While Creed et al. and Voronov and Vince provide a promising analytical start, direct investigations of the emotions inherent in the inhabitants of institutions are sorely needed.

This dissertation seeks to remedy both of these gaps primarily via application of insights from research on SMOs. SMO theorists have done a slightly better, although incomplete, job of accounting for emotions in the social change projects of the activists which comprise the organizations they study (c.f., Jasper, 2011). This SMO literature will be reviewed below, with special attention paid to: (1) SMO micromobilization efforts via framing, (2) research utilizing a social movement and institutional framework simultaneously, and (3) the use of emotions in social movements.

Social Movement Organizations

Foundations and SMO Framing

Studies of the emergence and development of social movements, defined as semi-discreet sets of opinions and beliefs “which [represent] preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution in society” (McCarthy & Zald, 1977: 1217-18), can generally be placed into one of three categories: those focusing on those (1) political opportunities which enable and constrain movements, (2) mobilizing
structures which enable and constrain movements, or (3) framing processes mediating between opportunities and action by which meaning is constructed for members and non-members of movements (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996: 2). This dissertation and therefore this review will focus extensively on the third.

The foundations of SMO research, however, are generally attributed to studies categorized in the second foci and more specifically the seminal statements of the so-called “resource mobilization” perspective developed by John McCarthy and Mayer Zald throughout the 1970s (i.e., McCarthy & Zald, 1973, 1977), although the acronym SMO was first coined by Zald and Ash (1966) as part of their description of movement organization’s adaptation to various environments. Resource mobilization perspectives were introduced as a reaction to the dramatic social movements of the 1960s, which challenged dominant understandings of movement emergence that commonly “pointed to sudden increases in individual grievances generated by the ‘structural strains’ of rapid social change” as explanations for the formation of social movements (Jenkins, 1983: 528). Movement participation was viewed as rare and participants as “arrational if not outright irrational” (Jenkins, 1983: 528), with many even going so far as to posit movement participants that primarily organize around a shared pathological behavioral disorder (McCarthy & Zald, 2001: 535). Resource mobilization theorists countered with a conception of boundedly rational movement participants who were motivated by their “biographical circumstances, social supports, and immediate life situations” (McAdam,

It is notable that McCarthy and Zald’s perspective is one of several subsumed under the umbrella term “resource mobilization theory,” which also includes Tilly’s (1978) polity theory and Gamson’s (1975) theory of strategy. As the purpose of reviewing resource mobilization theory in this dissertation is just to trace the lineage of analytic focus on SMOs, these perspectives will be treated as synonymous here, but see Jenkins (1983) for a comprehensive review of the salient distinctions between them.
1988; McCarthy & Zald, 2001: 535), although their focus was rarely on these participants. Rather, resource mobilization scholars chose to focus on resource flows within and between SMOs, defined as complex or formal organizations which identify their goals with the preferences of a social movement (McCarthy & Zald, 1977: 1218), and their larger movement contexts: the social movement sector, or all social movements of any type within a given society, and social movement industries, or aggregates of SMOs promoting a particular cause. SMOs play a crucial role in that, if a movement is to succeed, resources such as money and labor must be aggregated and applied in a coordinated fashion. Resource aggregation of this kind “requires some minimal form of organization” (McCarthy & Zald, 1977: 1216)—“leadership, administrative structure, incentives for participation, and a means for acquiring [further] resources and support” (McAdam & Scott, 2005: 6)—hence resource mobilization theorists’ fascination with the operations of formal SMOs: they provide the vehicle by which resources are administered toward social change.

Framing research⁹, by contrast, has primarily focused on SMOs engaging in “meaning work—the struggle over the production of mobilizing and countermobilizing ideas and meanings” (Benford & Snow, 2000: 613) as a direct response to the glossing of individual ideologies in resource mobilization studies (Oliver & Johnston, 2000; Snow & Benford, 1988; Snow et al., 1986; Zald, 2000). That is, when SMOs frame, they “assign meaning to and interpret…relevant events and conditions in ways that are intended to

---

⁹ Framing research has propagated in several different disciplines, including cognitive psychology, linguistics analysis, communication studies, and political science (Benford & Snow, 2000; Dewulf et al., 2009). This review will focus exclusively on the analytic tradition emerging from Snow et al.’s (1986) seminal paper on frame alignment processes, as this has served as the basis for the majority of research on SMO’s use of framing both within sociology and organization studies.
mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists” (Snow & Benford, 1988: 198). Frames, therefore, are cognitive “schemata of interpretation” which allow their users to “locate, perceive, identify, and label a seemingly infinite number of concrete occurrences defined in its terms” (Goffman, 1974: 21). Framing has become a popular approach to SMO studies (Benford & Snow, 2000; Oliver & Johnston, 2000) because it facilitates the incorporation of interpersonal cognitive orientations into SMO research. In other words, whereas previous work on SMOs largely focused on macromobilization—the interaction of organizational efforts mobilize resources with political and institutional opportunities for social change—framing studies intrinsically highlight what Snow et al. label “micromobilization,” or “the range of interactive processes devised and employed by SMOs and their representative actors to mobilize or influence various target groups with respect to the pursuit of collective or common interests” (1986: 465).

SMO frames are said to have three principal components: (1) a diagnostic component, by which the SMO diagnoses “some event or aspect of social life as problematic and in need of alteration” and this problem’s cause; (2) a prognostic component, by which the SMO offers “a proposed solution to the diagnosed problem that specifies what needs to be done;” and (3) a motivational component, by which the SMO issues “a call to arms or rationale for engaging in ameliorative or corrective action” (Snow & Benford, 1988: 199). Multiple SMOs pursuing a certain cause or different constituencies within an SMO may have varying levels of agreement as to how issues should be framed. In attempting to recruit support for a movement, an SMO or set of SMOs may develop a series of diagnostic framings which outline more or less mutually
exclusive causes of a specific instance of inequity in some area of social life (e.g., Benford, 1993, 2007). To the extent that information about the problem is “hazy” (Futrell, 2003)—that is, information about cause-effect linkages is unclear or incomplete—the number of causes outlined by SMOs is likely to increase along with the likelihood that these causes will be mutually exclusive (Gerhards & Rucht, 1992; Hoffman, 2011). For example, Hoffman (2011) found that “information haze” surrounding shocking reports of climate change resulted in some pointing to “alarmists” fabricating scientific evidence as the cause of the problem, while others suggested the real cause was an actual human-generated shift in global climate. Although it is intuitively appealing to suggest that proposed solutions emerge seamlessly out of diagnosed problems (e.g., Gehards & Rucht, 1992; Messer & Bell, 2010; Nepstad, 1997; Perugorria & Tejerina, 2013)—as indeed they might for some SMOs for which membership is predicated on a common understanding of solutions to certain problems, such as with some Christian church groups who view Jesus Christ as the ultimate solution to every conceivable problem (e.g., Snow, Bany, Peria, & Stobaugh, 2010)—recent evidence suggests the diagnosis-prognosis relationship to be much more complicated for most movements (Benford & Snow, 2000). Noy (2009), for example, found that several organizations defined the problem of homelessness and its causes in the same way, but disagreed on the tactics needed to alleviate homelessness, and that these differences were attributed to variance in the groups’ access to material resources and political influence, while Futrell (2003) found that the same information haze which produces multiple competing definitions outlining multiple causes also produces multiple competing proposed solutions. The motivational component of frames can include references to the
efficacy of activism (e.g., Karagiannis, 2009; Tynkkynen, 2006) or appeals to mobilization targets’ “duties” and honor, which have been shown to motivate participation even when expected instrumentality of activism is low (e.g., Einwohner, 2003; Kowalchuck, 2005).

SMOs direct a significant portion of their efforts toward aligning the frames of mobilization targets with their own, or achieving a virtual “linkage of individual and SMO interpretive orientations, such that some set of individual interests, values and beliefs and SMO activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary” (Snow et al., 1986: 464). Snow et al. outline four processes by which target and SMO frames of certain issues may become aligned: (1) frame bridging, or “the linkage of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem” (1986: 467), (2) amplification, or “the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem or set of events” (1986: 469), (3) extension, or when an SMO “extend[es] the boundaries of its primary [interpretive] framework so as to encompass interests or points of view that are incidental to its primary objectives but of considerable salience to its potential adherents” (1986: 472), and (4) transformation, or when frames are transformed due to the extent to which they appear antithetical to “conventional lifestyles or rituals and extant interpretive frames” of mobilization targets (1986: 473).

While conceptually distinct, little research has attempted to extricate these processes empirically. The majority of authors who explicitly address frame alignment write about the process generally as the cognitive basis for micromobilization (e.g.,
Koopmans & Duyvendak, 1995; Martin, 2002; Phillips, 1998; Zuo & Benford, 1995), but fail to specify if any or all of the frame alignment processes played a role in the focal SMOs’ mobilization efforts. Notable exceptions include Cornfield and Fletcher’s study of the American Federation of Labor, an SMO they found to extend their framing of workers’ rights in reaction to “declining employer dependence on unions for labor-supply and increasing political opportunity” (1998: 1305), and Yukich’s (2013) study of New Sanctuary activists’ use of a “model movement strategy”—a form of frame transformation whereby activists attempted to shape mobilization targets’ expectations of immigrants through offering anecdotes of model immigrant citizens. Other studies provide terse hand-waving analyses of each individual frame alignment process (e.g., Benford, 1993; Park, 1998; White, 1999). However, given the cursory nature this exploration into the frame alignment processes as it exists, more research which attempts to empirically distinguish the individual processes is needed to determine whether they are useful categories for future empirical work to pursue or purely analytical categories which do not concretely manifest in the micromobilization techniques of SMOs.

This omission is compounded by the relatively recent neglect of everyday, face-to-face negotiation processes in micromobilization. As Benford suggested,

[F]rame alignment and construction processes are interactive processes. They may involve ongoing modifications to extant movement frames. We know little about these complex processes...[although] it is clear that reality construction entails emergent, dialectical processes that are fraught with conflict, hazards, and fragility. (1997: 422)

---

10 Several studies which discuss frame alignment suggest it not as the alignment between interpretive schemes of the SMO and an individual mobilization target, but as the alignment between the values, beliefs, and goals of the SMO and the broader culture, making it more akin to what Gamson (1992) labeled “cultural resonance,” and thus not germane to this paper (e.g., Cooter, 2006; Kubal, 1998; Pitchford, 2001; Swart, 1995).
Oliver and Johnston stressed that overlooking everyday interaction in framing research is a relatively new trend among researchers:

As imported into the study of social movements, frames have been treated as both fixed and emergent. Early insights into framing focused almost wholly on the interactive level of analysis…. Subsequent elaborations of the framing perspective moved to a more fixed conception of collective action frames, even though the most influential scholars of framing have consistently stressed emergent and processual aspects of framing [processes]…. [These processes] capture the emergent, contested, and socially constructed quality of cognitive frames as they are molded in interaction. (2000: 4)

This trend seems to have produced research which has privileged the content of frames over the processes by which SMOs achieve alignment with targeted individuals and groups, as evidenced by the dizzying array of purely descriptive studies aiming primarily to “identify the universe of specific frames,” resulting in “a rather long laundry list of types of frames” (Benford, 1997: 414). Haug (2013) provided a notable exception in his conceptual piece examining SMOs as a form of institutionalized meeting space where frames can emerge from a dialectical, face-to-face process of rhetorical contestation. While important to understanding the everyday realities of SMO framing, his study focuses more on the logistics of how frames become contested within an SMO, e.g., how the timing of meetings and organizational routine, among other factors, might affect the process by which “latent agreement is actualized” (2013: 716) and a dominant, firm level frame emerges. By contrast, no author has yet tried to examine how interactions between activists and mobilization targets rather than among intra-SMO activists might affect how frames emerge or specified if/how the framing processes play out at an interactional level. Neglecting this process undercuts the purpose for using a framing perspective in studies of SMOs by implicitly reducing an SMO’s frames to a strategy in response to cultural (rather than political) opportunities the ostensibly monolithic leadership
perceives in their environment, rather than a dynamic, emergent phenomenon that
changes in response to everyday interactions with the constituencies whose support an
SMO hopes to garner.

Organizational Neo-Institutionalism and Social Movements

Several scholars have taken advantage of the large degree of conceptual overlap
between the social movement and organizational neo-institutional theories of social
change by utilizing insights from both in the same study. Marc Schneiberg, one of these
scholars, has on different occasions (Schneiberg, 2013; Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008)
suggested that this research can generally be divided into two basic approaches: the first
conceptualizes movements and the SMOs which formalize their goals as “extra-
institutional forces” (Schneiberg, 2013: 655). These SMOs seek to assert their preference
structures on institutional regimes constituting discreet industries via attempts to affect
changes in the regulatory structure applicable to that industry (e.g., Hiatt, Sine, &
Tolbert, 2009; Lee, 2009; Sine & Lee, 2009; Wade, Swaminathan, & Saxon, 1998),
influencing the values and beliefs of the culture the industry is embedded in (e.g., Greve,
Posner, & Rao, 2006; Haveman, Rao, & Paruchuri, 2007), or direct appeals to the
organizations comprising an industry, which can come in the form of more “legitimate”
pragmatic rhetorical appeals (e.g., den Hond & de Bakker, 2007) or in the form of
disruptive protests, boycotts, or sabotage (e.g., Elsbach & Sutton, 1992; King, 2008; King
& Soule, 2007; Rojas, 2006). Studies taking this approach also often discuss how social
movements “till the ground” for the founding of organizations in new geographic or
cultural spaces by sparking or facilitating the diffusion of novel institutionalized
practices, values, and beliefs (e.g., Greve et al., 2006; Schneiberg, 2013; Schneiberg,
King, & Smith, 2008; Weber, Heinze, & DeSoucey, 2008). As alluded to above, the focus of neo-institutionalists in organization studies has historically been on communities of organizations under the umbrella of one definition or another; this approach demonstrates a clear distinction between SMOs and the organizations they attempt to influence.

The second approach entails a much more fluid conceptualization of social movements and SMOs as any “ideological actor that strives to maintain or gain the power to organize the archetypical possibilities of strategic agency in an institutional field” (Fligstein, 1996; Hensmans, 2003: 359). As such, SMOs are not viewed as necessarily “extra-institutional” or exogenous factors in the process of institutional change, but endogenous collective actors in a dialectical and political struggle for hegemony over institutionalized industry practices, values, and beliefs (Arjaliès, 2010; Hargrave & Van de Ven, 2006; King & Pearce, 2010). Scholars using this perspective often look at intra-organizational activism as an “internal” driver of institutional change within an industry (e.g., Briscoe & Safford, 2008; Davis & Thompson, 1994; Kellogg, 2012; Scully & Segal, 2002). For example, Lounsbury (2001) found that universities with student chapters of a nationwide environmental SMO were more likely to commit to recycling programs, altering the institutional landscape among higher education. Kellogg (2011) found employees of an elite teaching hospital to leverage cultural resources in pursuit of a collective identity and political resources to leverage real change in the institutionalized treatment of medical residents. Organizations are also said to provide members with the physical and social space necessary for cultural and political resources to be coordinated (Haug, 2013; Kellogg, 2012), facilitating collective action toward correcting perceived
inequities. Other researchers adopting this approach focus their attention on inter-organizational processes as they essentially equate social movements with institutional entrepreneurs pioneering new organizational forms (e.g., Rao, 1998; Rao et al., 2000) and group identities (e.g., Rao et al., 2003) against challenger SMOs attempting to occupy the same cultural space (Hensmans, 2003).

What has not been the focus of much systematic attention, however, is micromobilization via framing. Several scholars utilizing an institutional and social movement perspective have discussed framing, but this discussion has centered on a conception of frames as functionally synonymous with the articulation of an institutional order’s organizing principles (e.g., Arjaliès, 2010; Fligstein & McAdam, 2011; Lounsbury, Ventresca, & Hirsch, 2003). That is, these studies utilize frames and framing primarily as vehicles for outlining the preference structures of SMOs—the practices, values, and beliefs collective actors hope to institutionalize within a given field or industry. This usage carries with it the same conceptual issues associated with the contemporary framing research reviewed above—that is, these studies privilege the content of frames rather than the processes of collective mobilization at the individual level framing as a construct was developed to address. Incorporating framing in its initial formulation will aid in moving both the institutional and social movement perspectives toward a contested, multilevel conceptualization scholars are beginning to regard as the most analytically and empirically accurate models of collective action toward social change (Schneiberg & Soule, 2005).

*Emotion and Social Movements*

Social movement scholars have come increasingly to recognize the importance of
human emotion to collective action. As Jasper recently suggested,

> Emotions are present in every phase and every aspect of [social movements].... They motivate individuals, are generated in crowds, are expressed rhetorically, and shape stated and unstated goals of social movements. Emotions can be means, they can be ends, and sometimes they can fuse the two. They can help or hinder mobilization efforts, ongoing strategies, and the success of social movements.... (2011: 286)

Prior to the last 25 years and in line with the assumptions of the dominant perspectives of the time—grievance theories and later the resource mobilization and political process perspectives—social movement theorists generally paid emotion “the wrong kind of attention” when not ignoring the topic altogether (Goodwin et al., 2000: 66), often tersely positing emotion as an antecedent to what was thought to be strictly irrational or arrational behavior (Jenkins, 1983): anger and fear inciting protest, feelings overriding cognitive faculties and consequently a person’s ability to make “rational” judgments based on self-interest (Goodwin et al., 2000, 2004). Today, however, unlike the comparatively small body of neo-institutionalist literature addressing the role of emotions, social movement researchers have at least tacitly incorporated a wide spectrum of positive and negative human emotions into their studies, producing a still-nascent but more robust understanding of emotions than can be found in the institutional literature (Goodwin & Jasper, 2006; Jasper, 2011). Emotions are conceptualized as having varying degrees of ephemerality (Goodwin et al., 2004; Jasper, 2006) and are said to play multiple roles within collective action against perceived inequity. For example, moral emotions—social emotions which find their experiential root in a person’s perception of moral transgression—such as shame, guilt, anger or outrage, and compassion (Scheff, 1988, 1990, 2000; Schieman, 2006; Turner & Stets, 2006). These emotions have been shown to be integral to transforming bystanders into supporters of movements or, when
felt to a greater extreme, members of SMOs (e.g., Jasper, 1997; Nepstad & Smith, 2001; Warren, 2010), which seems to be especially true of the animal rights movement (e.g., Jacobsson & Lindblom, 2013; Jasper & Poulsen, 1995; Mika, 2006; Wrenn, 2013). The positive emotions associated with successfully identifying with a collective working toward a socially positive goal—happiness, love, or hope—are an important component of maintaining participation in movements (e.g., Jasper, 1998; Melucci, 1995; Polletta & Jasper, 2001). Negative emotions directed at oppositional groups or members of a countermovement have also been shown to be important to holding a group together (e.g., Goodwin, 1997; Jasper, 2001).

Tangential or peripheral as some of the aforementioned treatments of emotions may be (Goodwin et al., 2004), this attention—the “right” kind of attention—stems from contemporary scholars’ understanding of emotion not as a biological factor skewing the ability to think rationally (Jasper, 1998), but, parallel with cognition, as another method for “evaluating and interacting with our worlds” (Jasper, 2011: 286). However, although these scholars have made great strides toward a conceptualization of social movements and SMOs as manifested by humans who are motivated by and make decisions with the inextricable tandem of heart and mind, emotions have yet to fully surface in the one place most would have expected them to surface first: research advancing the meso-level conceptualization of movements, to include—most importantly for this dissertation—the framing perspective. Over a decade and a half ago, Benford recognized the even then startling error in omitting emotion from the framing perspective, suggesting that those operating within the framing/constructionist perspective have not fared much better than their structuralist predecessors in elaborating the role of emotions in collective action. Instead, we continue to write as though our movement actors (when we actually acknowledge humans in our texts) are Spock-
like beings, devoid of passion and other human emotions. (1997: 419)

Excluding the efforts of a small number of scholars (e.g., Berbrier, 1998; Berns, 2009), emotions have remained largely absent from conceptions of framing until today (Goodwin et al., 2004; Jasper, 2011). As Jasper noted, “Virtually all the cultural models and concepts currently in use (e.g., frames, identities, narratives) are misspecified if they do not include explicit emotional causal mechanisms. Yet few of them do” (2011: 286).

This dissertation seeks to redress gaps in both the organizational neo-institutional and SMO literatures by conducting a systematic study of the emotions leveraged by ARO activists in face-to-face interactions with mobilization targets with the goal of achieving frame alignment. I suggest the primary mechanism ARO activists utilize to leverage these emotions is “backstage” revelation, or the act of illuminating institutionalized practices constituting the meat and poultry industries of questionable normative moral value hidden from consumers’ collective view. The “backstage/frontstage” metaphor is a seldom used but analytically valuable aspect of Erving Goffman’s dramaturgical method outlined in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959). Related to the concept of decoupling (MacLean & Benham, 2010; Meyer & Rowan, 1977)—that is, when organizations superficially adopt formal structures in compliance with field-level norms but avoid enacting the actual activities they entail—the backstage metaphor emphasizes the performative aspect of displays intended for audiences willing to participate in the “deception.” Whereas a study of decoupling would assume that the target of deceit is completely unaware an organization’s surface-level structures are not being practiced “behind the curtain,” Goffmanesque dramaturgical analysis assumes the audience has at the very least the knowledge that a backstage exists, and therefore this audience becomes
complicit and responsible for continuing the “play.” This distinction is important in the context of SMO activism, as it is likely the efficacy of appeals to mobilization targets would be affected by an activist’s ability not only to reveal knowledge of certain indiscretions, but point to the target’s complicity in keeping the indiscretions ostensibly hidden in the backstage.

Several of the studies from various disciplines that draw on the backstage/frontstage metaphor forgo explicitly defining or elaborating on the terms (e.g., Koffijberg, de Bruijn, & Priemus, 2012; Leppänen, 2008), but those which do often define the terms in not unexpectedly interactionist language. Frontstage behavior is a performance put on for those with whom a person has little trust, while in the backstage, the person can “relax; he can drop his front, forgo speaking his lines, and step out of character” (Goffman, 1959: 112). I suggest that certain field level practices, values, and beliefs can have an institutionalized backstage status. That is, within certain institutional communities, it may be taken-for-granted that certain practices, values, and beliefs of questionable normative moral value are to be hidden from those outside the community. Community boundaries are patrolled in more or less explicit ways to mitigate the chance knowledge of these practices, values, and beliefs will accidentally “leak” to outsiders.

Application of the backstage metaphor to examine institutionalized practices within a certain community or industry has some more or less explicit precedent. Hyland and Morse (1995), in a study of funeral parlors, found that directors at several different locations fostered impressions among grieving families regarding how bodies were treated, impressions that employees knowingly contradict when out of public view, where the tone is much less reverential towards the deceased and their grieving families.
Although not explicitly framing their study with it, Hudson and Okhuysen (2009), in their examination of men’s bathhouses, provided another illustration of the backstage metaphor manifesting among a set of organizations. In condemning environments, bathhouses hid their core operations from general audiences via the façade of more normatively accepted businesses: gyms. In both studies, the backstage is guarded by physical barriers designed to keep knowledge of normatively untoward behavior within the community. Other research shows the backstage metaphor to be particularly apt in the meat and poultry industries, where the “politics of sight” dictate that not only are industry outsiders or consumers to be excluded from intimate knowledge of the backstage, but that most slaughterhouse employees receive effectively the same treatment. An ethnographic study conducted by sociologist Timothy Pachirat (2011) revealed that boundaries around the “kill box”—the area where cattle were to be rendered unconscious or dead before the slaughter process was to continue—was heavily guarded by physical and social boundaries which prevented most employees from being exposed to the death and, very often, survival of cattle through the initial stages of the slaughter process, which involved the “beef”—a term Pachirat found to be intentionally utilized by slaughterhouse staff to mitigate against the possibility of viewing cattle as sentient beings—having his/her carotid artery and jugular severed and ears, tail, and hide removed while s/he was still conscious. These studies show how institutionalized practices, beliefs, and values—beliefs about how the dead should be treated, how cattle sent to slaughter are to be “processed,” and core business practices centered on the provision of physical and social space for homosexual sex, for example—are placed in the backstage by whole sets of organizations and carefully guarded against discovery by outsiders. In other words, these
practices, beliefs, and values gain an institutionalized, field level backstage designation.

**Conclusion**

In summary, the organizational neo-institutionalist and social movement perspectives have proven to have incredible utility in facilitating the discovery of factors which predict an actor’s decision to engage institutional change projects. From the institutionalist perspective, we glean that contradiction and contestation among field-level institutions are the genesis of actors’ actions directed at changing those very institutions, which manifests at the individual level as competing social identities, sensemaking processes, habitualized practices, and psychological dispositions—often held by one individual—and from the social movement perspective, we glean that political opportunities, mobilizing structures provided by SMOs, and cognitive schemata of interpretation all play a role in motivating change efforts.

However, in both literatures’ recent and nearly parallel migration to a greater focus on “cultural” factors predicting change efforts, discussion of one crucial factor has been omitted: emotion. While social movement scholars—primarily Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper—have begun to trace the outlines of how emotion motivates social change efforts, emotion has remained a largely peripheral feature of their research, and thus very little in the way of a systematic analysis of specific emotions has been offered. I seek to redress this gap through providing a study where specific emotions in their relationship with institutional change efforts of SMO activists are the central feature of the analysis. In doing so, I hope to provide a format and a springboard for other researchers to begin the surely long and arduous process of properly incorporating emotion into our collective conceptions of social change efforts.
III. METHODS

Given the exploratory nature of the study, qualitative methods were utilized to inductively build theory in the area of institutional microprocesses, specifically with regard to the role of emotions in recruiting support for the institutional change projects of SMOs via backstage revelations. Doing so will take incremental steps toward “emotionalizing” institutional theory (Voronov, 2014) while positing fields as “dramas” with carefully staged areas of access for participants and audience, i.e., the frontstage and the backstage. In doing so, this dissertation answers the following research questions, listed in order of the expected importance of the contribution each makes to institutional theorizing:

1. How do organizations attempt to strategically leverage emotion in the pursuit of changing highly institutionalized practices?
2. What is the role of emotion in motivating persons to engage in institutional change projects?

Context

An “extreme case” (Eisenhardt, 1989) of a movement and constituent set of SMOs where emotions would be a salient motivator of both activist and mobilization target behavior was identified, as extreme cases tend to amplify and highlight underlying cognitive and affective processes (Hudson, Okhuysen, & Creed, 2015). The animal rights movement is such a case (e.g., Jacobsson & Lindblom, 2013; Jasper & Poulsen, 1995; Mika, 2006; Wrenn, 2013). While emotions are inextricable from the recruiting process
of any movement, emotions are likely to play a very special role in the animal rights movement given that AROs are made up primarily of conscience constituents:

“supporters of an SMO who do not stand to benefit directly from its success in goal accomplishment” (McCarthy & Zald, 1977: 1222). Members and supporters of AROs do not directly benefit in any tangible or readily observable way from achieving better treatment of animals in the meat and poultry industries, providing a context in which the self-interested calculations of activists and potential supporters are almost completely irrelevant, but also where emotional reactions to the perceived abuse of farm animals is the most important driver of behavior. Importantly for this study, this implies that frame alignment processes, as the cognitive basis for the decision to support or participate in a social movement or SMO, are driven by emotion, illustrating what until now has been largely theoretical speculation on the part of social movement scholars: there exists no strict dualism between emotion and cognition. Studying specifically AROs and the interactions between ARO activists and potential supporters therefore highlights their relationship as inextricably tied and parallel ways of understanding the social world (Jasper, 2011).

Furthermore, studying AROs provides me the ability to directly trace SMO activism to changes in the higher order institutions constituting the meat and poultry industries. AROs’ activism often leads to changes in the regulatory structure of the meat and poultry industries, changes which are directly connected on activists’ ability to mobilize support at an individual level. For example, in 2002, over 500,000 Florida residents signed a ballot initiative petition to ban the use of gestation crates or stalls. A gestation crate
is a pen designed to encompass the sow’s static space requirements—that is, the space occupied by a sow when standing or lying on her sternum. Stalls are typically constructed of tubular metal frames with a feed trough and drinker at the front, and are about 2.2 [meters] long, 0.6 [meters] wide and 1.0 [meters] high…. Within the stall, the sow is unable to turn around and simple movements such as standing up or lying down may be difficult if the sow is large, because the dynamic space requirements needed to carry out these posture changes are greater than the static space requirements. Most stalls are situated within fully-enclosed, climate-controlled buildings with no bedding; slatted floors allowing urine and feces to pass through into a slurry pit under the floor. (USDA Agricultural Research Service, 2010)

According to the Animal Rights Foundation of Florida, while gestation crates are used when a sow is pregnant, female pigs are often continuously reimpregnated and as a result spend their entire four to five year lives in these stalls before being sent to slaughter.

The successful Florida initiative petition to ban gestation crates earned the measure a spot on the Florida ballot, and in November 2002, over 2.6 million Floridians (54.8 percent of the voting public that year) voted to amend the state constitution to “limit the cruel and inhumane confinement of pigs during pregnancy” (Florida Const. art. X, § 21). This amendment so radically changed the regulatory structure of sow farming in Florida, the only two hog farms utilizing gestation crates in the state shut down their operations in Florida after consultation with Florida’s Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services due to the financial burden upgrading their facilities to comply with the new amendment would have caused. Since 2002, similar initiatives with similar petitioning campaigns have led to state constitutional amendments banning inhumane animal confinement in two states: Arizona in 2006 and California in 2008. Two AROs—the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and Farm Sanctuary (FS)—were heavily involved in all three initiatives, both through providing campaign financing to temporary political action committees sponsoring the measures and, of more importance
to this study, organizing and training hundreds of volunteers to petition for the signatures needed to place the measures on their respective ballots, signatures which were gathered as a direct result of activists revealing aspects of industrialized pork production hidden from consumers’ collective view: the backstage. Cases like the 2002 Florida ballot initiative petition make the animal rights movement an excellent empirical context to study with regard to the workings of emotions in institutional change projects.

Data Collection

Four sources of data were collected and analyzed: semi-structured interviews with ARO activists, textual archival data, visual archival data, and participant observation\(^\text{11}\). 

Semi-Structured Interviews

I conducted 29 semi-structured interviews with 30 animal rights advocates\(^\text{12}\) between February and August of 2015. Twenty-four participants were female and six were male, ranging in age from their early twenties to their eighties. All interviews were conducted over the phone, audio recorded, and professionally transcribed. The average interview length was 45.17 minutes, yielding 321 pages of single-spaced text when transcribed. After transcription, interviews were member-checked (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013), whereby transcripts were emailed to their respective participants and checked for fidelity to their views and recollections of the interview. Interview participants were broken down into three categories of animal rights advocate: ‘rank-and-file’ advocates, administrators, and undercover investigators.

Rank-and-file advocates are those ARO members who participate in petition drives, demonstrations, protests, and leafleting. In doing so, they represent the on-the-

---

\(^{11}\) Data sources are listed in order of importance to answering research questions.  
\(^{12}\) Two interview participants – a husband and wife – requested to be interviewed in tandem.
ground, interactive front of their respective AROs, and thus are an excellent source of information regarding how interactions between advocates and those on the outside of the movement transpire, and, more importantly to this dissertation, what role emotion plays in AROs efforts toward recruiting material and cultural support for their institutional change project, if any. Rank-and-file animal rights advocates were identified by first contacting an ARO administrator with a large, national U.S. animal rights organization partially responsible for organizing the 2002 Florida ballot initiative described above. The administrator provided me with a list of the 100 most successful signature gatherers during the petition drive along with their contact information (i.e., emails and phone numbers). Given that thousands of volunteers who participated in the ballot initiative, it seemed logical that those appearing on the list would generally be the advocates most committed to the animal rights movement and most familiar with AROs’ strategies in recruiting support given that they had likely devoted the most time and effort to this particular initiative. Potential participants were first contacted by phone, after which a follow-up email was sent (see Appendix A for both telephone and email recruitment protocols). “Snowball” sampling was also used to expand the number of participants (Creswell, 2013). Nineteen rank-and-file volunteers responded to these solicitations with one unwilling to participate in an interview resulting in 17 interviews with 18 advocates. Each advocate identified himself or herself as a strong supporter of animal rights and as a member of several different AROs for anywhere from two years to several decades.

Administrators are those ARO members who coordinate the activities of the rank-and-file advocates as they participate in the ARO’s strategic initiatives, lobby legislators for regulations supporting desired institutional ends and against those which impede
those ends, and, most importantly here, construct and administer training for rank-and-file advocates as they interact with those outside the movement. Thus, as administrators are involved in carrying out and formulating AROs’ strategies, ARO administrators represent an excellent source of information regarding AROs’ strategic attempts to elicit institutional change. Administrators self-identified as such when they were contacted as part of the purposive and snowball sampling techniques described above, resulting in seven interviews with ARO administrators.

Undercover investigators are those ARO members purposed with gaining employment in industrial animal operations – usually concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) and slaughterhouses – with the objective of gathering footage of inhumane treatment of animals, unsanitary processing of animals, or unfair, unethical, or unsafe working conditions for employees. Except in those states where so-called “ag-gag” laws have been passed in state legislatures expressly forbidding such investigations, filming industrial animal operations is legal but emotionally turbulent for investigators, who fear being ‘blacklisted’ at animal operations should they be discovered as animal rights advocates and are forced to manage extreme dissonance between their participation in the abuse of animals and their identities as animal advocates. As these investigators gather the imagery AROs use to elicit emotional reactions from those outside the animal rights movement, they constitute an important source of data while outlining AROs’ strategic efforts to change institutions in the meat and poultry industries. In order to solicit investigators as interview participants, I first contacted the Director of Investigations at a U.S. ARO, who connected me with a retired investigator. Through
snowballing from the first investigator, interviews from five retired investigators\textsuperscript{13} were collected.

The interview protocol for all three categories of advocate was designed to elicit narratives regarding both their own alternations into supporters of and then advocates for AROs and also their organizationally-relevant attempts to get others to do the same (see Appendix B for the protocol). In the case of undercover investigators, interviews also focused on the emotional impact of their respective investigations along with AROs’ aims in collecting undercover footage. In all cases, Chell’s (2004) critical incident method was followed, whereby questions regarding the advocates’ general experiences in the animal rights movement were reinforced with questions asking participants to identify especially significant or memorable events. This method can help respondents recall events even in the distant past, and given that the most experienced participants identified as members of the animal rights movement for several decades, such an interview tactic was warranted here.

\textit{Textual Archival Data}

The websites of six large, national AROs headquartered in the U.S. were mined for texts relevant toward the AROs’ collective project of deinstitutionalizing inhumane practices in the meat and poultry industries. These organizations included Compassion Over Killing, Farm Sanctuary, the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), Mercy For Animals, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), and Vegan Outreach.

\textsuperscript{13} Given the nature of their work, investigators are almost universally concerned with maintaining anonymity – lest their identities be circulated to animal operations, precluding them from participating in further investigations. Thus I was told several times by retired investigators that it was very unlikely I would be able to solicit an active investigator to participate. This severely limited the number of willing participants among ARO investigators.
These organizations were chosen on two bases: (1) they are national U.S. AROs whose members direct a significant portion of their efforts toward institutional change in the meat and poultry industries, and (2) interview participants named them as the organizations they were members of or volunteered for most often. Collecting data from these organizations maximizes the likelihood of congruence between interview responses and archival data, and of capturing the meta-strategies of U.S. animal rights organizations as a field.

From these websites, any text which contained information germane to these organizations’ institutional change project aimed at the meat and poultry industries was collected, i.e., any text which attempted to recruit support from those outside the animal rights movement or directed advocates’ efforts in doing so. These included mission statements, descriptions of recent accomplishments, white papers on the effects of industrial animal operations on the animals or the environment, blog posts, e-newsletters, online magazines, leaflets or pamphlets, and training materials for new or nascent advocates, among other sources. These data cumulatively comprised 852 items averaging approximately 1.5 pages of single-spaced text.

**Visual Archival Data**

Visuals are an integral component of AROs’ strategy to affect institutional change in the meat and poultry industries as well as an important dimension of organizational life generally (c.f., Meyer, Höllerer, Jancsary, & van Leeuwen, 2013). As will be explored further below, imagery can simultaneously elicit emotional reactions on the part of those outside the animal rights movement and legitimate advocates’ rhetoric by anchoring discursive descriptions of the meat and poultry industries’ moral transgressions in footage.
which graphically illustrates them as such. In other words, visuals allow those outside the movement to peer into the backstage of the meat and poultry industries, behind the “curtain” constructed by animal agribusinesses to keep customers from experiencing the moral emotions which may cause them to reject animal products.

Given the role of visuals in AROs’ change project, 211 videos averaging 3 minutes and 40 seconds in length posted to the websites of the AROs mentioned above were collected. The majority of these videos were the product of undercover investigations exposing the backstage of the meat and poultry industries; footage taken by ARO investigators was edited and presented in short video format. The remainder of the videos included celebrity endorsements, dietary advice, recipes, and skits, all of which attempted to remove any stigma a given audience may attach to abstention from the meat and poultry industries and normalize a vegan or vegetarian diet.

**Participant Observation**

Three hours of participant observation at one Vegan Outreach leafleting event in June of 2015 (see Appendix C for the observation report) was taken. The purpose of this observation was to take notes on the interactions between animal rights advocates and those on the outside of the movement. This observation allowed insight into interactions between rank-and-file advocates and potential supporters in real time, insights which confirmed findings from the other data sources.

**Data Analysis**

Given the exploratory nature of this study, a ‘grounded’ approach (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glazer & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) was adopted whereby the “investigator seeks to systematically develop a theory that explains process, action, or
interaction on a topic” (Creswell, 2013: 86). The grounded approach rests on four fundamental tenets: “(1) minimizing preconceived ideas about the research problem and the data, (2) using simultaneous data collection and analysis to inform each other, (3) remaining open to varied explanations and/or understandings of the data, and (4) focusing data analysis to construct middle-range theories” (Charmaz, 2008: 155). In other words, grounded theory can best be described as a “frame for qualitative inquiry and guidelines for conducting it” (Charmaz, 2006: 14), i.e., a package of methodological assumptions springing from an inductive or emergent logic rather than a qualitative method in and of itself. Thus, the result of this grounded approach was a ‘middle-range’ theory in which has limited generalizability to other similar empirical settings (Charmaz, 2008), but should be interpreted primarily as an analytical representation of the focal empirical scenario.

Following a grounded theoretical approach, the constant comparative method was employed, which entails iterative interplay between collected data and consequent rounds of theorizing until data saturation, or the point at which data yield “diminishing returns,” when no new insights are being added to theorizing from data (Bowen, 2008: 140). This iterative interplay yielded findings in three nested categories: first-order codes derived from common statements and themes among all three data sources (interview, archival, and observation), theoretical categories which aggregate first-order codes along salient rhetorical dimensions, and a delimited grounded theory on the basis of common dimensions underlying theoretical categories (Pratt, 2009; Saldaña, 2012). First-order codes were gleaned using Charmaz’s (2006, 2008) “line-by-line” coding method, which differs from general qualitative coding in its emphasis on researcher interaction with data.
Whereas first-order codes in general qualitative coding are often purely descriptive, line-by-line coding produces first-order codes which already suggest interconnections between categories and themes within the data, easing the process of interpretation as the researcher attempts to transform first-order codes into theoretical categories. The primary benefit of utilizing line-by-line coding is that it “frees [the researcher] from becoming so immersed in…research participants’ world-views that you accept them without question” (Charmaz, 2006: 127). The entire coding process becomes a highly critical and reflexive activity such that the researcher minimizes the likelihood “assumptions inhering in…participants’ world-views” will simply be reproduced in a researcher’s analysis (Charmaz, 2006: 127).

With regard to textual archival data, rhetorical analysis was utilized. Out of the broad category of discursive approaches (Manning, 1979; Phillips & Hardy, 2002), this study specifically employed a rhetorical analysis, or the study of “discourse calculated to influence an audience toward some end” (Gill & Whedbee, 1997: 157). Several recent institutional studies have used or suggested rhetorical analysis (e.g., Brown et al., 2012; Erkama & Vaara, 2010; Green, 2004; Green, Li, & Nohria, 2009; Heracleous & Barrett, 2001; Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005), commonly asserting that suasion is the key discursive mechanism in institutional change, specifically when institutional change is prompted by persons’ or organizations’ advocacy efforts (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001), as is certainly the case with SMOs, whose framing of issues and events are fundamentally attempts to get mobilization targets to adopt a specific interpretive scheme (Snow et al., 1986). Pragmatically, rhetorical analysis provides the salient advantage of focusing on
manifestations of institutional forces which are empirically available to researchers.

Rhetorical arguments can easily be “measured as present or absent over time as practices
diffuse and change” (Green et al., 2009: 14) and are often directly traceable to the
institutional change they catalyze, as is often the case with ARO activism, as mentioned
above. Rhetorical analysis is therefore particularly appropriate in analyzing AROs
activism.

With regard to visual archival data, each video was sorted into theoretical
categories derived from analysis of the text data described earlier based on inferences
from the nature of the video (e.g., depicting animal abuse versus cooking a vegan dish)
and the accompanying text and/or audio (Saldaña, 2012) – in this sense treating visuals
much as one would treat a purely textual source – after which I followed Rose’s (2007)
proposed method for coding imagery. This involved describing the imagery in terms of
its modalities, to include (1) technological, or the technology which acts as a medium to
convey the image; and (2) compositional, or the “specific material qualities of an image”
(Rose, 2007: 13), such as its content, color, and use of space, among other characteristics.
This coding process allowed for many of the nuances of imagery deployed toward
institutional change to be isolated and examined independently.

Analysis was aided by NVivo 11 Pro qualitative data analysis software, which
allows for the researcher to easily sort statements by themes and higher order theoretical
categories manifesting in the data. NVivo 11 Pro also allows the researcher to import
online videos as data, sort sections of these videos by theme and theoretical category, and
take still frames from videos to be used as exemplars, facilitating the analysis of the
visual data described above. Following Pratt et al. (2006) and other recent inductive
qualitative work, Figure 1 (below) is the visual representation of my coding process, which moved from first-order codes comprised of commonly themed statements, to second-order theoretical categories derived from those statements, to third-order aggregate theoretical dimensions. Table 2 (below) details the data sources which provided the primary empirical support for each of the aggregate theoretical dimensions, while Table 3 (below) provides exemplars from the data for each aggregate theoretical dimension and theoretical category.

**Locating the Researcher**

It is important to acknowledge one important aspect of my own biography as it serves not only as one of the primary motivations to study the empirical context I have chosen, but also will necessarily inform the questions I ask of participants, what aspects of archival and observational data I think are salient, and my reading of the data. I have been a vegan since March of 2010 and an infrequent supporter of two large AROs—Farm Sanctuary and the Humane Society of the United States—via small monetary donations and signing online petitions. While I have never actively participated in any public demonstration or volunteer effort for any ARO, I am largely sympathetic to most causes championed by major AROs and agree with most of their philosophical assumptions about *whom*—as opposed to *what*—animals are, what role they currently play in social life, and what role they *should* play in social life.

I think this is important given that I am proposing to study emotions and their relationship with the acceptance of certain cognitive frameworks of interpretation that I myself have experienced and accepted, respectively, during my own transition from carnivore to herbivore. However, as I am not drawing conclusions about the moral
philosophical validity of the movement but rather the logistics of a social change project in a way I hope will be generalizable to the social change projects of other SMOs, I do not think my sympathies toward the content of the movement studied should materially influence my reading of the processes underlying activists’ motivation to engage and ability to recruit support for that movement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate Theoretical Dimension</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Archival-Text</th>
<th>Archival-Visual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transgression Mining</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Planting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodidactic Frame Alignment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deinstitutionalization</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3
Data Exemplars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate Theoretical Dimension</th>
<th>Theoretical Category</th>
<th>Exemplars from the Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transgression Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td>“COK’s brave undercover investigators are on an immensely important mission: to expose the truth about farmed animal abuse. They are our only eyes and ears into the secret and very dark world of factory farming, and they’re the animals’ only hope of shining a bright light on the hidden horrors they’re forced to endure everyday.” (Compassion Over Killing blog post, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Behind closed doors, animals are suffering on factory farms. Mercy For Animals’ brave undercover investigators risk everything to expose and end it.” (Mercy For Animals website, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Investigations are critical in fighting the systematic abuses in animal agribusiness, because their business model depends on keeping the public in the dark. … In addition to exposing the truth about the horrors farmed animals endure, undercover videos have led to the shuttering of facilities, animal rescues, and have fueled people to join the movement. For all of these reasons I knew I had to find the courage to do this” (former investigator quoted in Compassion Over Killing’s Compassionate Action magazine, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Transgression</td>
<td></td>
<td>“It was my first factory farming case. We had to pull crippled sows out of the barns and then hold them so someone could tie a chain around their necks and then hang them to death … and I’m thinking … ‘obviously, if I say ‘no,’ I won’t get the evidence and someone else will [have to] do it.’” (UNCI-26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“One of the main things that … people don’t really always understand [is] all the standard practices that go on at these farms and slaughterhouses – you know, castrating, debeaking, killing animals – these are all things that [investigators] need to do because that is part of the job … and if [you don’t] do them, you are fired, and that is really the only way we can collect evidence.” (UNCI-24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table continued from page 78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seed Planting</th>
<th>Emotion Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Certainly if you could save the animal’s life by taking the animal to a vet and helping the animal out, that would probably be the moral thing to do rather than just killing the animal right there … . But you can’t steal the animal, and you can’t blow your cover. … For me, I think the hard part was that I felt that I had done and not done so many things that I always felt that I had to do another case to make it up to the animals.” (UNCI-26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I mean, when I was in the barn, my personal experience as an investigator [was that] you are in ‘worker mode.’ So there are a lot of things that shock you, but it doesn’t quite register until you get home and you’re uploading your footage, reviewing what you’ve done that day and you sort of get the outsider perspective.” (UNCI-23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The emotional [regulation] is really the toughest part – being able to be in those conditions and not break down and cry and grab all the animals and run out. Of course you have the feeling that you want to do that, but obviously that wouldn’t help the situation.” (UNCI-25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You have to accept at some point as an investigator that you make a greater impact by [doing investigations]. … If you want to do [investigations], then you have to be able to desensitize yourself. … At the last job, I was killing maybe two hundred birds a day, and it just didn’t affect me in the way that original experience did.” (UNCI-27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Those who are successful in making the world a better place are students of human nature. They understand that each of us is born with a certain intrinsic nature, raised to follow specific beliefs, and taught to hold particular prejudices. Over time, we discover new ‘truths’ and abandon others, altering our attitudes, principles, and values.” (Ball, n.d.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s a transition, it’s … gradual. I was brought up as a meat eater, you had meat every day. And then … there was this [ARO] newsletter that was sent out …. And the statement kept coming up in the newsletter: when you know what goes on down at the slaughterhouse and you continue to eat meat and you do nothing about it, it’s called complicity. And I kept seeing that statement in different places.” (RF-05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[A] little bumper sticker got me started on the journey to discover all of the things that go on behind the scenes in the meat production industry …. So once your eyes are open and you see that, just walking in the grocery store and buying that piece of meat, you are directly contributing to all that horror that goes on behind closed doors.” (RF-09).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table continued from page 79

| Backstage Revelations | “One of the reasons for [advocacy] is to bring to light things that these different industries are trying to hide. What we’re doing is exposing the bad side, the down side, the dark side, the animal side.” (RF-15)

“I know several people who have contacted me once they’ve … found out a little bit more, and they’ve said, ‘Oh my gosh, I’ve participated in these things in the past. How could I have done that?’” (ADM-17)

“A picture says 1,000 words. It takes you there, it takes right there. It takes you into whatever is going on in that moment for that animal. And you can’t escape it.” (RF-08) |
| --- | --- |
| Alignment Processes | “You [have to] read people and their response to the issues that you bring up. You’ll be able to see where they are on the spectrum of what … issues they feel passionately about.” (ADM-22)

“Factory farms profit at the expense of animals and our environment. Their wealth and power influence government policies. We may not pay at the checkout line, but we pay when we visit the doctor for health problems directly correlated to factory farms’ callous operations and with our tax monies to subsidize the meat and dairy industries as well as clean up their toxic waste.” (PETA blog post, 2008)

“When Fremont [a marathon runner] was 69 he was diagnosed with colorectal cancer. Doctors warned him that without surgery, he’d have just three months left. Fremont did undergo surgery but also transformed his diet, eliminating meat, dairy, and eggs. He largely credits his diet change for shrinking the tumor and ultimately ridding himself of the cancer. Now, not only is he cancer free, he’s a world champion.” (Compassion Over Killing news item, 2014) |
| Emotion Regulation | “For people who might be new to the movement and might be still in a very angry stage, I think [ARO guidance on how to interact with those outside the movement] very helpful … because, in the beginning, when we are all kind of horrified …, we are desperate to get that information out to people …. You are mad at them when they don’t understand, and it’s easy to get frustrated and perhaps unleash some of that anger on them which turns out not to be effective.” (RF-14) |
Table continued from page 80

<p>| Autodidactic Frame Alignment | “I’ve been guided towards … being really friendly, being approachable, not angry or judgmental. … Just [don’t] take any negativity out on anybody passing by. You might be frustrated that somebody doesn’t want to sign your petition or has something not so nice to say to you, but just ignore it and move on to the next.” (RF-04) |
| Autodidactic Frame Alignment | “[The best approach] is usually really friendly, usually with a big silly grin on my face. … Rarely [would it be beneficial to interact] in a confrontational manner. I have to think [that] is the worst approach because people just put their defenses up a little bit more and they are generally not willing [to listen] if they are the person being targeted. … [Their] reaction is to defend themselves [and] whatever their beliefs or feelings might be.” (RF-17) |
| Biographical Anchoring | “I don’t think of making converts in [face-to-face interaction]. … I’ve never seen a conversion on the road to Damascus myself.” (RF-10). |
| Biographical Anchoring | “So it was something I didn’t think about. When I actually did [start thinking about animal rights], it was when I started learning … of the horrible, horrible way [animals] are treated … . So … it’s been a gradual thing.” (RF-05) |
| Biographical Anchoring | “This did not register with me until I was in my early 40s. I always had an affinity for animals, but societal upbringing, whatever. … How I got involved [in animal rights]? It was very gradual, I have to say.” (RF-06) |
| Biographical Anchoring | “[Seeing graphic images of abuse] just kind of blew my world apart. I think all of us as kids, most of us, we love animals, everyone – kids love animals. And that’s just kind of almost a given. When you’re a baby, some of your first things that you’re given as gifts are little animals, stuffed little animals and some little pictures of animals.” (ADM-21) |
| Biographical Anchoring | “Well, I grew up on a very tiny farm, so I had very close interaction with animals that I loved dearly. My first love of my life was probably my sheep Lolly, … but I wasn’t vegetarian, I wasn’t vegan. I really hadn’t heard a whole lot about that … . I was maybe about 12, [and] my mother served us lamb chops with mint jelly. … I looked out of the window, and there was Lolly, and I looked at my mother and I said, ‘Mom, how can we possibly eat lamb with Lolly right outside the window?’” (RF-08) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table continued from page 81</th>
<th>“I always had cats and dogs and took in every little bird I found, tried to nurse it back, everything. I was always a big animal lover. So once I made that [food-animal] connection, I had no choice but to go vegetarian, to live [in] alignment with my values. I valued the lives of animals.” (RF-09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Seeking</strong></td>
<td>“I originally became aware of animal rights and protection issues through a book that my sister gave me. It was called <em>67 Ways to Save the Animals</em>, and we had all grown up loving our pets, and that was kind of what I had envisioned [farming was like] when she gave me this book. It was my first introduction to factory farming, and I felt like I’d been punched in the stomach, I was just shocked and dismayed that this was not on the front page of the newspaper every single day. It was absolutely stunning to me that this kind of cruelty was so commonplace. So I started getting involved, I started learning more about the issues, trying to figure out if there are ways that I could get involved just to help animals more.” (ADM-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I picked up [an ARO flyer], saw the picture and read, and I was completely horrified! I had no idea this is the kind of thing that is happening. … I was the perfect person that you made these flyers for. I responded exactly how we want people to respond. And back then there was no website I could go to, there was only, you know, ‘for more information call this number.’ I got back to my little apartment and called the number. And I was like, ‘What the hell is this? What’s going on here?’ [Then] they sent me a pack of information.” (ADM-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“For a long time [I] was somewhat involved with some the main environmental work organizations. … And little by little, we read about living better with the earth.” (RF-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Emotions</strong></td>
<td>“When I found out about certain atrocities, I would get extremely upset, extremely. [When] I was home alone … I could scream if I wanted to, I could use profanity – which I don’t use outside – because it was so horrific that I had to express myself somehow. And … because of my fury I said, ‘I am going to do something about this.’” (RF-01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Extreme sorrow and sadness. Actual physical pain inside of you, you know, to see a creature be tortured like that. That’s what it is, it’s just overwhelming sadness and despair.” (RF-05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Well I think I am still sad. It was sadness, it was shock, it was horror, it was disbelief, and that carried me into the animal rights movement. … It weighs on me continuously how unbelievable screwed up we have become as a species.” (RF-08)
FIGURE 2
Multilevel Process Model of SMO Deinstitutionalization Efforts
IV. FINDINGS

As depicted in Figure 2 (above), my analysis suggested that, at the organizational level, AROs used two overarching strategies in attempting to recruit support for their institutional change project directed at the meat and poultry industries (i.e., transgression mining and seed planting). Second, at the individual level, if the AROs’ strategies were successful, individuals withdrew to their interactional backstage to evaluate the AROs’ message and, potentially, alternate their beliefs and practices in support of the advanced institutional change project (i.e., autodidactic frame alignment). In the case of AROs, these phenomena interacted to form a recursive process whereby successfully implemented transgression mining increased the efficacy of seed planting, which in turn had a greater likelihood of catalyzing autodidactic frame alignment. To the extent that autodidactic frame alignment is successful, more people choose to become advocates for AROs, allowing these organizations to more easily implement their strategies aimed at garnering further support. Additionally, to the extent that autodidactic frame alignment is successful, more people choose to support AROs, support which AROs leverage into changes at the field level in the meat and poultry industries.

Below I begin by unpacking transgression mining, seed planting, and autodidactic frame alignment for their analytical components, emphasizing the role of emotional expression and experience in the process by which AROs attempt to affect institutional change. After reviewing these three constructs, I conclude by expounding on how they interact to produce institutional change in the meat and poultry industries.
Transgression Mining

Transgression mining is the strategic search for practices and beliefs of questionable normative moral value hidden from audiences’ collective view with the intent of revealing them in support of an institutional change project. This construct draws on an expanded interpretation of Goffman’s backstage metaphor by suggesting that an entire field of organizations may have practices and beliefs which are obscured from general audiences. Indeed, the purpose of AROs transgression mining is to reveal the practices – and concomitant beliefs regarding farmed animals – of the meat and poultry industries which are carefully hidden from consumers’ view.

As attested by the Mercy For Animals website, this strategy is primarily carried out through undercover investigations, whereby ARO advocates gain employment at industrial animal operations – concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs)\textsuperscript{14} and slaughterhouses – with the objective of gathering footage of inhumane treatment of animals, unsanitary processing of animals, or unfair, unethical, or unsafe working conditions for employees:

On industrial farms and in slaughterhouses, farmed animals endure shocking abuse, out of sight and out of mind. But a team of MFA undercover investigators, wired with hidden cameras, is risking it all to pull back the curtains of these cruel and secretive industries, leading to landmark changes along the way. (Mercy For Animals, 2016)

\textsuperscript{14} The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines a CAFO as any facility where “animals have been, are, or will be stabled or confined and fed or maintained for a total of 45 days or more in any 12-month period, and crops, vegetation, forage growth, or post-harvest residues are not sustained in the normal growing season over any portion of the lot or facility” (EPA, 2016). Additionally, in order to be regulated as a CAFO, a facility must house a certain minimum number of animals (e.g., 200 or more mature dairy cattle, 750 or more swine weighing in excess of 55 pounds, 25,000 or more laying hens), utilize a “manned ditch or pipe that carries manure or wastewater to surface water; or the animals come into contact with surface water that passes through the area where they’re confined” (EPA, 2016). If a facility does not meet these requirements, it may still be regulated as a CAFO if it is deemed to be a “significant contributor of pollutants” (EPA, 2016).
Similar statements on the part of other AROs engaged in undercover investigations indicate their intentions not just to collect visual and audio evidence of abuse, but to leverage this evidence in their pursuit of institutional change in the meat and poultry industries. When transgressive practices are egregious enough to violate federal or state laws regulating the treatment of farmed animals during the slaughter process or the emission of pollutants as a result of the industrialized farming of animals – such as the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act or Clean Water Act – evidence is turned over to local, state, or federal authorities in an attempt to disrupt those practices. For example, one blog post detailed an undercover investigation of a calf slaughter plant. This investigation documented “egregious abuses including calves who are too sick or injured to walk being lifted by their tails, pulled by their ears, and shocked, hit, and sprayed with water in an effort to get them to kill floor” (Compassion Over Killing, 2014). The video evidence was turned over to the USDA, which immediately suspended the farm’s operations.

While much of the evidence transgression mining yields is turned over to legal authorities, it is also packaged into documentaries which are then disseminated to the public through news outlets, subscription cable channels, or the AROs’ websites with the goal of revealing the backstage of the meat and poultry industries to consumers. When directed at consumers, the revelation of transgressions is intended to marshal grassroots social support for legislative changes or formal sanctions against individual organizations – putting pressure on elected legislators and government agencies to respond to their constituencies’ demands – or simply to affect change in the choices of those individual consumers. For example, one ARO newsletter suggested that, “After a fire killed nearly
4,000 piglets in a North Carolina factory farm, the National Fire Protection Association should require similar facilities to have ceiling sprinklers” (HSUS, 2014). These appeals are often coupled with instructions on how to contact legislators or agencies who might be able to affect change in the meat and poultry industries’ practices. The process by which such appeals directed at individual consumers have their impact on higher order institutions in the meat and poultry industries will be discussed more comprehensively below.

When this kind of ‘whistleblowing’ results in the sanctioning or, at an extreme, closure of a facility, AROs will often laud it as a victory for animal rights, the environment, or workers. For example, one blog post summarized the accomplishments of Compassion Over Killing’s recent undercover investigations and touted their direct relationship with changes to the “status quo” in the meat and poultry industries:

Our investigations are challenging the status quo of agribusiness and creating change by prompting: federal authorities to temporarily shut down a dairy cow slaughterhouse, a chicken and duck hatchery to cease operations, chicken factory farm to shutter its doors, criminal cruelty charges being filed local authorities to impound animals and send them to sanctuaries, exposés on and lawsuits filed to challenge so-called humane animal care claims on retail marketing. (Compassion Over Killing, 2015)

Indeed, several interviews with investigators, rank-and-file advocates, and administrators (16 of 30) confirmed the notion that transgression mining is an integral component of AROs’ strategic challenges to the institutions governing industrialized animal farming.

As one investigator suggested:

… investigations sort of undergird all of the other activist stuff we do … because these conditions are … largely kept hidden from the public. … Every [undercover investigator] adds fuel to the fire in building a case against … factory farms. (UNCI-23)15

15 Interview responses will be associated with generic identifiers (e.g., UNCI-27) indicating a participant’s role within his/her ARO along with a number indicating the sequence in which participants were
Transgression mining, however, has not proliferated without resistance. In recent years, organizations owning industrial farming operations have become more aware of undercover investigations intended to reveal abuse of animals, workers, and the environment. Reflecting an institutionalized, field-level belief in the status of farmed animals, workers, and environmental resources as inputs to a production process – rather than sentient beings or realms with intrinsic value and rights to be protected – the primary reaction of these organizations has been to lobby state legislators to use the regulatory power of the state toward reinforcing the symbolic curtain drawn between industrial animal farming and consumers, i.e., preventing ARO advocates from exposing practices which many might consider abusive, allowing them to continue unhindered by widespread recognition and consequent stigmatization.

The primary mechanism for this reinforcement has been so-called ‘Ag-gag’ bills, which seek to criminalize video or audio recording on the premise of an industrial animal operation, misrepresenting oneself on an application for employment to an industrial animal operation, or impose strict fines on or, in some cases, criminalizing failure to turn over evidence gathered during an undercover investigation almost immediately (HSUS, 2014). These penalties seek to have a chilling effect on undercover investigations, although many of the bills imposing them have been successfully challenged on first-amendment (i.e., free speech) grounds, and either died in state legislatures or been struck down by state courts as unconstitutional. To date, Ag-gag bills have passed into law in 6 states (Alabama, Iowa, Utah, South Carolina, Missouri, and Arkansas) and been proposed

---

interviewed, which was arbitrary. ‘UNCI’ corresponds with an undercover investigator, ‘ADM’ with an administrator, and ‘RF’ with a rank-and-file member. Gendered references to quotes from interviewees will be random and not necessarily reflective of the participant’s actual gender.

Such dialectic counter-measures on the part of industrial animal operations have served to validate undercover investigations as not just a cathartic exercise for advocates seeking to reinforce their own beliefs, but an existential threat to the specific slate of institutionalized practices and beliefs regarding animals constituting contemporary industrial animal agriculture. As one investigator suggested, “the fact that they’re retaliating in this manner shows that we’re impacting them” (UNCI-24).

These reactions have also thrown into high relief the practices ARO advocates must exhibit in order to successfully gather evidence from the backstage of the meat and poultry industries. My analysis suggested that AROs’ transgression mining could be broken down into two mutually reinforcing behaviors on the part of undercover investigators: participation in transgression and emotion regulation (see Figure 3 below).
FIGURE 3

The Composite Behaviors of Transgression Mining
Participation in Transgression

As described above, industrial animal operations are becoming progressively more aware of undercover investigations and are taking precautions to guard against ARO efforts to expose the backstage of their industry. At many CAFOs and slaughterhouses, rank-and-file employees are instructed to be vigilant for signs that one of their coworkers may be an undercover animal advocate. If discovered as such, the advocate may be ‘blacklisted,’ i.e., have their identifying information circulated to other industrial animal operations in the area preventing them from obtaining employment at another facility.

Thus, for undercover investigators, maintaining cover while transgression mining has become more difficult in the past decade than it had been previously. An integral component of maintaining that cover is participating in practices investigators previously viewed as transgressive of moral norms, including industry standard practices such as beak-trimming female chicks without anesthesia, discarding male chicks in large bins to suffocate or starve, castrating piglets without anesthesia, and euthanizing piglets by hitting them against concrete floors, as well as putatively discouraged or illegal forms of abuse which are nonetheless common on industrialized farms (e.g., beating ‘downer’ or non-ambulatory animals, hanging cows or sows by forklifts). Participating in transgressions can also be conceptually extended to negative action, i.e., passively allowing for transgressive practices without intervening (e.g., not freeing intensively confined animals or attempting to stop coworkers from beating animals) with the purpose of maintaining cover. Taking part in these practices is a ubiquitous and necessary feature of transgression mining, as was attested by all undercover investigators interviewed:
Yeah, I think every investigator would [have to participate in cruelty]. It’s a tough world to be in … when you’re working there with these people, day in and day out, and you’re the only one not hitting the animals … it might stick out a little bit. … You have to do things that you disagree with in order to get footage out of [investigations] to help create change. (UNCI-25)

Participating in transgressive practices, therefore, assuages the concerns of fellow transgressors that they – or their organizations – might be exposed for violating normative moral standards for behavior or belief. This comfort emanates from an often preconscious assumption that an animal advocate would not be able to violate the central tenet of an identity derived from the animal rights movement – that of trying to prevent any physical or psychic harm to animals whenever possible – without some kinetic or (para)linguistic ‘tell’ that they are ARO advocates. All investigators supported the notion that, while necessary to gather evidence from the backstage of industrial animal operations, participating in transgressive practices was identity disconfirming to an extreme degree:

She picked up the second one and handed it to me and said, ‘Your turn.’ You know, the person I was for all the years leading up to that would never do such things under any circumstances. To keep the job … you have to quiet that part of yourself. (UNCI-23)

So my only options are that … I document what happens or I attack everyone on the farm. Those are my two options. There’s no other way to get [evidence of abuse]. … I’m so fucking sick of people that call me a hero …. I absolutely guarantee you, to the sows on that farm, I was no hero. (UNCI-26)

**Emotion Regulation**

Given the contradictions between the practices of ARO advocates while undercover and their previous self-conceptions as those representing and defending animals marginalized by industrial farming, undercover investigations take a large emotional toll on advocates. Investigators interviewed all reported feelings of anger,
indignation, and extreme sorrow at the inhumane treatment of the animals subject to the production processes of CAFOs and slaughterhouses. These emotions build up over the course of investigations which may last weeks or months as investigators are forced to manage their emotional states during working hours as a function of maintaining cover. Several (three of five investigators) reported that, as assignments ended, they would have unexpected ‘breakdowns,’ or uncontrollable affective outpourings as a direct result of not only witnessing the dire situation of farmed animals first-hand, but participating in their abuse:

I was in the field for almost four years, and I had just total emotional burnout. … One of the final [investigations], I was driving to [it] and I just pulled off the side of the road and started to break down crying. … I think I touched a little bit of hell and sometimes it comes out in spurts. … You bottle it all up when you’re there. It’s not just having to perform the job duties, it’s not just seeing the abuse, … sometimes [it’s] just walking on the factory farm [and] seeing the vastness of it, how many animals are just sitting there in gestation crates or battery cages, just the hopelessness in their eyes. … There [are] just so many things that kind of build up. (UNCI-24)

The intensity of felt emotions combined with the knowledge that effective investigations rely solely on their ability to maintain cover requires investigators to engage in emotion regulation, or the process “by which individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions” (Gross, 1998: 275; Gross, 2015). Scholars of emotion regulation have suggested that there exist two distinct forms of regulation: antecedent-focused regulation (i.e., ‘deep acting’), whereby a person seeks to modify characteristics of the situation or how they perceive a situation in order to change its emotional impact; and response-focused regulation (i.e., ‘surface acting’), whereby a person modifies their emotional display to be more congruent with what is situationally appropriate (Grandey, 2000;
Holman, Martinez-Iñigo, & Totterdell, 2008).

The interview data suggest undercover investigators primarily used antecedent-focused regulation as opposed to response-focused regulation. Investigators reported that, given the extreme nature of the inhumane practices surrounding them in industrial animal operations and their consequent extreme emotional reactions, masking felt emotions with neutral emotional displays was untenable over the course of an investigation (Jarvis, in press). One investigator reported being unable to control his emotions at the plight of a hen who had been beaten with a metal rod on his first investigation. He had started to cry while attempting to euthanize the bird by breaking the hen’s neck, something he had to do clandestinely, as the other employees were throwing birds with similar injuries into a pit to suffocate under other discarded birds, bleed out, or starve to death. Reflecting on the situation, he said, “I was luckily far away enough from my manager there that he didn’t see that I had started to cry. I was just getting so overwhelmed and felt so terrible that I was causing this animal so much pain” (UNCI-27).

Thus, simply changing outward emotional displays, given the intensity of their felt emotions, is not feasible for ARO advocates engaged in transgression mining. Rather, all interviewees indicated the importance of antecedent-focused regulation in their investigations. One advocate suggested that the efficacy of an investigation – and indeed the institutional project of AROs as a whole – hinges on investigators’ ability to ‘desensitize’ themselves during investigations:

You just have to accept … as an investigator … that someone has to record their stories so you can show it to the public. If you want to do that, you have to be able to desensitize yourself. … At my last job, I was killing maybe 200 birds a day, and it just didn’t affect me the way [it originally did]. (UNCI-24)

Another investigator reflected that she had, at least in part, reconstructed her identity
around her ability to successfully regulate her emotions in pursuit of changes in the institutionalized treatment of farmed animals:

What you want to do is … realize that you’re not hired because you’re empathetic to the animals, and you’re not going to go do this job because you’re compassionate. That’s not going to give you value any more as a person. The only thing that gives you value is your ability to stay calm when things are at their worst, and to endure the hardest things. (UNCI-26)

These statements revealed participation in transgressions and emotion regulation as the mutually interdependent and reinforcing behaviors through which AROs’ strategy of transgression mining was carried out. To maintain cover, those engaged in transgression mining must participate in transgressive behavior. Participating in such transgressions in support of an institutional change project can cause great distress, as the impetus to engage in transgression mining is an impassioned desire to alter exactly those aspects of the status quo perceived to be transgressive. Thus, participating in transgression requires antecedent-focused regulation, such that advocates alter the perceptual schema used to interpret their own participation in transgression as necessary evils to achieve a greater good. This form of ‘desensitization’ eases continued participation in transgression, allowing more evidence to be collected from the backstage of an industry or field.
FIGURE 4
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Seed planting encompasses SMOs’ rhetorical and behavioral strategies intended to catalyze a target actor’s self-directed frame alignment process\textsuperscript{16} in support of an institutional change project while avoiding emotion-laden conflict between an advocate and target. In the animal rights movement, seed planting primarily takes the form of face-to-face interactions between rank-and-file ARO advocates and mobilization targets, carried out during leafleting events, demonstrations, and protests. These interactions could be said to occur in the ‘frontstage,’ as the purpose of seed planting is to recruit (eventual) cultural and material support for AROs’ institutional change project from those with whom advocates have little or no familiarity. During these frontstage interactions, ARO advocates utilize both verbal rhetoric and rhetoric encoded in leaflets in encouraging potential supporters to consult AROs’ websites and their institutional change project on their own time, outside the view of unfamiliar advocates in front of whom mobilization targets are unlikely to make any significant decisions regarding their support for AROs or the meat and poultry industries. Thus, via rhetoric embedded in informational materials and websites, seed planting is also intended to occur in the backstage of a mobilization target’s interactional life.

The data suggest that ARO advocates carefully manage what appeals are made to persons during frontstage seed planning interactions – as well as the affective demeanor with which they are made. Animal products are woven deeply into the values and mores of society writ large, and dietary choices are especially personal given that food is often inextricably tied to the biographies of targets (e.g., holiday meals with loved ones,\textsuperscript{16} This self-directed process is explored in greater depth below, in the section labeled Autodidactic Frame Alignment.

\textsuperscript{16} This self-directed process is explored in greater depth below, in the section labeled Autodidactic Frame Alignment.
wedding receptions). Additionally, the nature of the abuse alleged by advocates is extreme. The data reflect advocates’ widespread recognition of these factors, and thus strategic seed planting is designed to accommodate the likely reluctance of mobilization targets to meaningfully reconsider their participation in the meat and poultry industries in real-time interactions, but also to minimize the likelihood of confrontations which perceived accusations of complicity in animal abuse might elicit. As an essay directed at new or nascent advocates suggested, “… at any given point, most of us believe our current opinions are ‘right’ – our convictions well founded, our actions justified. We each want to think we are, at heart, a good person” (Ball, n.d.). The desired outcome of seed planting, then, is simply to catalyze an often prolonged evolution of a target’s beliefs toward farmed animals.

Thus, “Effective advocates understand [the] evolution of people’s views, and, furthermore, recognize they can’t change anyone’s mind” (Ball, n.d.). Rank-and-file advocates and administrators reinforced the notion that successful frontstage seed planting resulted not in an ‘on-the-spot’ epiphany or a “conversion on the road to Damascus” (RF-10), but simply provided the necessary information to begin a conversion process in non-confrontational way:

I don’t want people to berate me or make me feel guilty, [and] I don’t want to do that to anybody else. [I’m] just a source of information. … I’m not going to make you feel bad for not making these changes and certainly for not making them immediately. (RF-03)

It’s not something that necessarily happens overnight. I know most people don’t go from huge carnivore to vegan overnight. It’s a process. But people start making those choices, … I think it makes people feel better about themselves and the choices they’re making. (ADM-29)

Strategic seed planting can be analytically decomposed into rhetorical (backstage
revelations and alignment processes) and behavioral (emotion regulation) components (see Figure 4 above).

**Backstage Revelations**

My analysis suggested that backstage revelation, or exposing transgressive practices and beliefs gleaned from transgression mining of an industry or field’s backstage to wider audiences in an attempt to garner support for an institutional change project, is the most important rhetorical strategy comprising an SMO’s seed planting activities. For AROs, backstage revelations are primarily mediated through visuals gathered from industrial animal operations by undercover investigators accompanied by text and audio.

In the frontstage, rank-and-file advocates commonly set up televisions playing documentaries comprised of clips compiled from undercover investigations while handing out leaflets and setting up poster boards with similar imagery. The video imagery, when effective, provides the greatest potential for moral shock (Jasper & Poulsen, 1995) to targets, depicting graphic and intentional abuses of farm animals and prompting targets to begin an emotionally-charged reconsideration of their own support for the meat and poultry industries. For example, a common video used at many Vegan Outreach leafleting and protest events depicts a close-up shot of a piglet being castrated without anesthesia. A video posted to the Mercy For Animals website documents abuse of dairy cows at a Burger King supplier, depicting videos of a cow being dragged behind a tractor by a chain placed around her neck, a cow struggling to move with her head trapped beneath a metal gate, an employee contorting one cow’s leg painfully out of position, and another cow being lifted off the ground by her head stuck in a metal grate.
(see Figure 5 below). The audio accompanying these videos is intentionally obtrusive for those passing by, often including, for example, shrill high volume screams of pain from cows or sows, or the near-deafening cumulative noise created by tens of thousands of laying hens clucking simultaneously in a crowded, concrete industrial hanger.

While the video imagery has the most potential to create moral shock in real time interactions between rank-and-file advocates and mobilization targets, the multiple technologies which host these images are mutually reinforcing and help increase the likelihood that seed planting activities will catalyze a target’s further sensemaking in the backstage of her interactional life (Rose, 2007). While the graphic nature or imagery and the high volume of audio make videos hard to ignore in real-time, they are spacially static: while targets might lend some of their attention to a video for the moment, this is unlikely to have a lasting impact once they leave the immediate area of the leafleters, protesters, or demonstrators. Hard-copies of leaflets and online resources (e.g., undercover documentaries, ARO white papers, online leaflets and magazines) utilizing similar visuals coupled text describing the extent of certain forms of abuse in the meat and poultry industries as well as its effects on both the environment and workers provide a portable primer which can travel with a target from the fronstage to the backstage, reminding him of the graphic imagery and sounds encountered in face-to-face interactions and, if successful, catalyzing greater interest in the animal rights movement and its institutional project. Thus, the ability of leaflets to traverse the ‘curtain’ with the target is integral to AROs’ strategic seed planting. The backstage’s importance to target alternations will be explored further below.

The composition of these visuals is also extremely important to their efficacy in
garnering support for AROs’ institutional project (Rose, 2007). As can be seen illustrated in Figure 5, most visuals of abuse are close-up frames which allow the audience to clearly distinguish any acts of abuse and resultant injuries, scars, or maladies (e.g., swollen udders on dairy cows caused by mastitis, pale eyes on laying hens caused from lack of access to sunlight). In cases where animals are being abused by industrial farm workers, close-up framings can also allow an audience access to the intent of the worker, who can often be seen exhibiting the bodily manifestations of frustration or anger, or – in the case of video coupled with audio – be heard laughing or joking with regard to the abused animal. Alternatively, fewer of these visuals utilize zoomed-out framings which pan over the expanses of industrial farming operations (see Figures 6 and 7 below for examples of both close-up and zoomed-out visuals found in Vegan Outreach’s Compassionate Choices leaflet and the Farm Sanctuary’s informational web page on the factory farming of pigs17, respectively). These framings emphasize not only the size of industrial animal operations, but the squalor and filth that farmed animals (and workers) are forced to endure in CAFOs and slaughterhouses, the lack of access to sunlight, and the claustrophic conditions within industrial farms. In combination, these compositional elements constitute a form of rhetoric whereby ARO authors attempt to convince mobilization targets of the egregious nature of farmed animal abuse as well as the enormous scope of industrial farming’s operations – and consequent suffering of farmed animals, employees, and the environment.

Reinforcing the notion that visuals are integral to both seed planting and AROs’ institutional project as a whole, many of the advocates indicated the importance of visuals

17 http://www.farmsanctuary.org/learn/factory-farming/pigs-used-for-pork/
in face-to-face interactions. One administrator suggested that visuals work to validate what could more easily be dismissed as propagandizing on the part of biased advocacy groups: “People need to see validation [of alleged cruelty], they need to do more than just hear it. … Otherwise it’s just a rumor” (ADM-17). A rank-and-file advocate confirmed that visuals are difficult to dismiss as the contrivances of ‘bleeding-heart’ liberals: “They simplify the issue. … You see an animal confined like that, biting on the cage bars, it immediately evokes some concern and sympathy” (RF-10). In other words, visceral images of abuse ground what would otherwise be purely abstract discourse in not only the material suffering of beings few would approve of, but also the affective experiences of the audience. These affective experiences, explored further below, are leveraged by advocates in the hopes of catalyzing sensemaking in a target’s backstage.
FIGURE 5
Exemplar of Backstage Revelations via Videographic Visuals\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{18} Originally published in: Mercy For Animals, \textit{Burger King cruelty: Video exposes horrific animal abuse at a Burger King dairy supplier}, retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IN_YcWOuVqk. Reproduced with permission from Mercy For Animals (see Appendix D).
FIGURE 6
Composition of Backstage Revelations via Visuals

Chickens raised for meat spend their lives packed in a massive warehouse. They have been bred to grow so fast that by the time they are one month old it hurts many of them to walk. Ammonia from waste is so concentrated it burns their eyes, skin, and lungs.

When chickens get sick, they can be clubbed on the head with a metal rod or left to suffer to death. At the slaughterhouse, they are electrically paralyzed before having their throats cut. If they avoid the blade—as many birds do—they will drown in a tank of scalding hot water.

---

FIGURE 7
Composition of Backstage Revelations via Visuals (continued)\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{itemize}
\item Shortly before piglets are born, sows are moved to “farrowing crates” where the piglets will be nursed. The crates, meant to separate the mother from the piglets to avoid crushing, are restrictive to the point that the mother pig can only stand and lie down — she cannot even turn around to see her piglets.
\item At only 17–20 days old, the piglets are taken away from their mothers and undergo a series of mutilations, including being castrated and having a portion of their tails removed without any sort of pain relief. The piglets spend the next 6 months of their lives confined to pens until they reach “market weight”; they are then trucked to slaughter.
\item Once piglets are weaned, their mothers are put back into the restrictive gestation crates and re-impregnated, and the cycle continues at an average of 2.4–2.5 litters per year until the sow is considered spent and is sent to slaughter herself.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{20} © 2016 Farm Sanctuary, Inc. Originally published in: Farm Sanctuary, \textit{Pork production on factory farms}, retrieved from http://www.farmsanctuary.org/learn/factory-farming/pigs-used-for-pork/. Reproduced with permission from Farm Sanctuary (see Appendix D).
Alignment Processes

Social movement scholars define alignment processes as the processes by which the interpretive orientations of SMOs and persons on the outside of social movements become aligned “such that some set of activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary” (Snow et al., 1986: 464). As with other SMOs, AROs utilize various rhetorical strategies to achieve alignment in interpretive orientations and, consequently, support for an institutional project. The data suggest that three of Snow et al.’s alignment processes characterized AROs’ rhetorical attempts to recruit support for their institutional project: amplification, extension, and bridging.

Amplification, defined as “the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem or set of events” (Snow et al., 1986: 469), manifested primarily in frontstage seed planting as rank-and-file advocates’ attempts to draw on and intensify targets’ already existing compassion for animals. Reflecting on his interactions with those outside the movement, one advocate suggested:

… I really believe that almost everybody comes from a place of compassion, and if you can just find that without threatening their lifestyle, that’s the important thing. When you go up and you just say, ‘You have to do something,’ well nobody is going to do that. When you say, “Well, I know you probably want to be a compassionate person. Could you just read this and see what’s going on?” [you’ll be successful]. … Changing [your] lifestyle is the hardest thing you can ever do. They grew up with it. (RF-09)

An administrator corroborated the notion that persons are generally compassionate toward animals by referring to her own experience on the outside of the animal rights movement:

It’s not like people are saying, ‘Yeah, yeah … kill a cow for those boots.’ … I mean, the way I’ve always said it is, listen, I didn’t know this stuff … before I became vegan and [got] into animal protection. … It was just normal and ‘that’s what I do.’ … But … I opened my eyes and realized, ‘Oh crap, this is not cool,’ I
felt like, ‘Okay, I just want to give others the opportunity to make that same decision that I made.’ (ADM-22)

Thus, ARO advocates to be engaged in frontstage seed planting activities are advised to approach their advocacy with an educational tack through providing perspectives and information on animals which tap into targets’ already existing sentiments regarding animals (e.g., I know you’re probably a compassionate person. Would you care to read about an issue you might care about as a compassionate person?) rather than with an accusatory tack, entailing implied allegations of complicity in the abuse of animals, the environment, or workers (e.g., “Do you know what you’re contributing to when you eat beef? You have to do something.”).

The data also indicated the importance of extension in successful seed planting, which happens when advocates “extend the boundaries of [an SMOs] primary [interpretive] framework so as to encompass interests or points of view that are incidental to its primary objectives but of considerable salience to its potential adherents” (1986: 472). While the primary concern for animal advocates was repeatedly emphasized as the wellbeing of farmed animals, analysis of interview and archival data suggested that incorporating concerns tangential or peripheral to the wellbeing of animals was integral to effective seed planting both in face-to-face interactions between advocates and targets, and in the ARO leaflets, pamphlets, and websites meant to be consulted by targets in their respective backstages. That is, even though advocates were unilaterally concerned primarily with animal welfare, they need to rhetorically incorporate interests in the environment, personal health, popular culture, athletics, and others into their appeals. Interviewees reinforced this notion, making multiple references to finding ‘common ground’ (ADM-22), finding where targets ‘are coming from’ (RF-03; RF-14) and what
they ‘are responding to’ (RF-01), and taking a ‘whatever sticks’ attitude (RF-16). An essay posted to Farm Sanctuary’s website similarly enjoins new or nascent advocates to “put the (vegan) shoe on the other foot” and answer, “what’s in it for me?”, i.e., tell targets how animal rights benefits them rather than only extolling the benefits of animal advocacy for the animals (Ginsberg, n.d.).

In the animal rights movement, extension manifests as strategic rhetorical appeals to the wellbeing of the environment or industrial farming workers, health of the target and her family, religious beliefs and values, or endorsements from celebrities, athletes, or cultural icons, all of which are meant to incorporate those targets who might not necessarily care about animal welfare, but may still support AROs and their institutional project based on other coinciding interests or values. For example, one rank-and-file advocate described her rhetorical extension in interacting with a targets concerned about the health of their children:

Because it affects their children, their children’s health and their health, things start to make a little bit more sense than when you say, ‘Oh, we’re hurting the poor little piggy or the poor little chicken.’ But if you say, ‘This impacts your child’s health,’ [targets are more likely to pay attention]. (RF-12)

An untitled Farm Sanctuary informational leaflet couples information about the deleterious effects of factory farming on animal welfare with descriptions of some similarly pernicious effects on the environment, while a leaflet titled The Compassionate Athlete extends via a testimonial offered by vegan bodybuilder Robert Cheeke, who reached the top of his sport:

According to the United Nations, animal agriculture generates 18 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions worldwide, including 9 percent of carbon dioxide emissions, 37 percent of methane emissions and 65 percent of nitrous oxide emissions. The Worldwatch Institute has suggested that these numbers are extremely conservative. (Farm Sanctuary, 2012)
I became a vegan when I was a skinny teenager. Over the next decade following a vegan diet, I gained 75 pounds and became a 2-time natural bodybuilding champion. Clearly, no meat was no problem for me. (Vegan Outreach, n.d.)

As in these examples, rhetorical extension incorporates diverse values, beliefs, and interests and attempts to discursively bind them by asserting that, when applied to the case of industrial animal farming, all these values, beliefs, and interests imply the same goal: abolition of the dangerous, intensive, inhumane, and otherwise abusive practices of production institutionalized in the meat and poultry industries.

Finally, AROs utilized rhetorical *bridging*, or SMOs’ attempts to link “two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem” (1986: 467). Bridging encompasses efforts to aggregate persons sharing “common grievances and attributional orientations, but who lack the organizational base for expressing their discontents and for acting in pursuit of their interests” (Snow et al., 1986: 467). In the animal rights movements, bridging manifested as AROs’ rhetoric directed toward convincing those sharing a concern for animal welfare that the ARO is the most appropriate and effective vehicle for changing the status quo in the meat and poultry industries. To this end, AROs’ contributions toward movement victories were detailed in ARO leaflets, magazines, blog posts, and newsletters. For example, in one blog post, a PETA advocated suggested that the failure of a New Mexico ag-gag bill was due primarily to PETA organized opposition:

Ding dong, the ‘ag-gag’ bill is dead! After hearing from hundreds of PETA supporters, New Mexico’s lawmakers let the state’s most recent ‘ag-gag’ bill, Senate Bill (S.B.) 221, die without even having a committee hearing on it. This is an important victory that will protect crucial eyewitness investigations, which reveal blatant, often illegal animal abuse on factory farms. (PETA, 2015)

A news item published on the HSUS website suggested that an HSUS-created hotline for
A hotline for reporting cruelty and neglect on factory farms, at livestock auctions and in slaughter houses will empower employees at those facilities who have witnessed cruelty or other unlawful acts. … The Humane Society of the United States, which launched the hotline …, offers whistleblowers a reward of up to $5,000 for information leading to the arrest and conviction of those who have committed acts of cruelty to farm animals. … Animal cruelty laws vary among states, but punching, kicking and other overt acts of violence are usually illegal. Denying adequate food, water, shelter and veterinary care to animals may lead to prosecution. Hotline callers will be assured anonymity if they desire it. ‘The bleak conditions endured by animals on factory farms are often made worse by overt violence and neglect,’ said Paul Shapiro, vice president of farm animal protection for The HSUS. ‘Pigs are often beaten. Chickens are stomped on. Lame cows are left for dead. We want whistleblowers to know that help is just a phone call away.’ (HSUS, 2014)

Similarly, other archival data directed at potential supporters of the animal rights movement suggested that AROs played an integral role in soliciting corporate commitments to more humanely sourced animal products, organizing fundraisers, walks, and other events to raise public awareness of the animal abuse, orchestrating undercover investigations, and lobbying for or against legislation bearing on farmed animals’ welfare. These sources often included appeals to the audience for active advocacy or donations to the ARO, drawing direct connections between this support and institutional change:

Please continue to spread the truth about how meat, milk, and eggs are produced, choose compassion, and make a donation to support our work to help end the suffering of animals on factory farms and build a kinder world for all of us. (Compassion Over Killing, 2012)

Thus, rhetorical bridging represents an ARO’s attempt to persuade potential supporters, should they donate their money, time, or more simply follow the prescriptions of the ARO, that they are not spending their resources on frivolous or wasteful initiatives, the ARO can accomplish collective goals more efficiently than can individuals working
without coordination, and that they are not being deceived or misled.

Emotion Regulation

Emotion regulation once again emerged as an important theme in the data regarding seed planting. The data suggest that rank-and-file advocates’ ability to regulate their emotions in frontstage seed planting activities significantly impacted the effectiveness of the rhetorical strategies – backstage revelations and alignment processes – of AROs. Advocates and archival sources converged on the notion that these rhetorical strategies would be unlikely to succeed if rank-and-file advocates let their own emotions regarding the treatment of farmed animals bleed through to their attempts to solicit support in real-time interactions while leafleting, demonstrating, or protesting. Thus, successful frontstage seed planting will have more efficacy to the extent that advocates engage in response-focused regulation such that they mask their felt negative emotions and display emotional neutrality or happiness in interaction with potential supporters, as attested by one ARO administrator:

The same principles apply whether it be knocking on doors asking for money, asking for a signature, asking [legislators] for a vote on a bill. … You have to be polite, you have to be friendly to everyone, whether they say no or yes or they’re rude or hostile, you have to be friendly. (ADM-21)

Several advocates (13 of 30) indicated that the ability to regulate the often extreme emotions which propelled them into the animal rights movement is a competency honed over time through many more-or-less successful interactions with those outside the movement:

When you first hear about these cruelties and this heinous abuse, … it’s a very, very common experience to get really angry. [But] not everyone’s at that same place, and so I recognize that more now than I did when I was first [started]. I’ve … digested it, I have calmed down a bit over the years and I’m ready to meet people where they are. (ADM-22)
An essay on effective activism posted to the Farm Sanctuary website corroborated the evolutionary nature of an advocate’s affective demeanor:

Try not to make your vegan advocacy a monologue—and especially not a ranting one. … When I first became a vegan …, I wanted to beat everyone into becoming a vegetarian or a vegan, to force them to share my horror and outrage. I am now convinced that this is not the most effective way to convince people to change their behavior. (Friedrich, n.d.)

As for why there was strong agreement that response-focused regulation was so integral to effective interactions with potential supporters, several advocates (12 of 30) called on the highly institutionalized status of the practices and beliefs comprising our diets as an explanation:

... Up to a certain point in your life, unless you’ve been educated in these things, you don’t think about it. … You have your pets and then you have your farm animals, and they are, of course, … different. That’s what they’re there for. So you grow up with these beliefs. (RF-05)

One essay also suggested that common cultural perceptions of ARO advocates may prime potential supporters to expect overly emotional or ‘irrational’ appeals:

Society’s stereotype of animal advocates and vegans is a significant roadblock to widespread change. … [U]nfortunately, the word [vegan] is often used as shorthand for someone young, fanatical, and antisocial. This caricature guarantees that veganism won’t be considered – let alone adopted – on a wide scale. … Regrettably, the ‘angry vegan’ image has some basis in reality. Not only have I known many obsessive, misanthropic vegans, I was one myself. My anger and self-righteousness gave many people a lifetime excuse to ignore the realities hidden behind their food choices. (Ball, n.d.)

As alluded to above, given their deeply taken-for-granted nature, animal products – especially food products derived from animals – can become intimately intertwined with a person’s biography and identity. As one rank-and-file advocate phrased it, “Making love and eating are the two most intimate things we do, and they affect us very viscerally. I think a lot of animal rights activists way underestimate the expectation they
are putting on society at large” (RF-18). Thus, when challenging the practices and beliefs inhering to the mode of production in which these animal products are brought to bear, advocates challenge not just an industry at the macro-level and an individual’s habitualized behavior at the micro-level, but, at an extreme, an integral part of a person’s identity.

The data suggest that, as individuals are more emotionally vulnerable when interacting with those they are less familiar with (Jarvis, in press), decisions to alternate away from an aspect of one’s life which is deeply personal and taken-for-granted are unlikely to occur during frontstage seed planting activities such as ARO leafleting, protesting, or demonstrating, where potential supporters are generally unfamiliar with advocates. Attempts to get potential supporters to ‘convert’ on-the-spot by forcing targets to share an advocate’s extreme despair or anger at the treatment of farmed animals is more likely to result in defensiveness, emotion-laden confrontations, and ultimately parties which are mutually steeled in their previous practices and beliefs. As a rank-and-file advocate reflecting on her own seed planting successes and failures suggested:

I know for me, I don’t want to be made to feel bad, I don’t want people to berate me, or make me feel guilty . . . . I don’t want to do that to anybody else. For me, I don’t cram anything down anybody’s throat. If I see that they’re open to it or they’re asking me questions, then I will just be a [source] of information. . . . I’m going to give you tons of information, but I’m not going to make you feel bad for not making these changes and certainly for not making them immediately. [It’s] a work in progress. (RF-03)

Further, emotion regulation enhances the likelihood potential supporters will be persuaded to adopt ARO interpretations and prescriptions by legitimating these framings of salient issues. Several advocates (14 of 30) suggested that expressions of emotion during frontstage seed planting activities make advocates easier to dismiss as an
‘extremist’ or ‘bleeding-heart liberals’:

They are easier to marginalize. … You can sort of message your position. ‘These are extremists, [these] are radicals, they don’t understand the issue, and they are driven purely from a place of emotion. … They don’t possess the facts and they aren’t reasonable. (ADM-28)

Conversely, rhetoric devoid of emotion works to assure potential supporters that AROs’ framing of the negative impacts of industrial animal farming are not hyperbole or fabrication, and that ARO prescriptions are proportionate, ‘rational’ responses to the problems inhering to industrial farming: “Find common ground, stay rational, know your subject well and present it well. And don’t blame. If you turn them off, then you are done” (RF-08).

Thus, not only does response-focused emotion regulation allow for discourse between advocates and potential supporters to occur by affectively-charged confrontation, it aids in validating the rhetorical content of AROs’ framings of industrialized animal farming, increasing the likelihood a potential supporter will meaningfully consider these framings while in his backstage.
FIGURE 8
The Composite Phenomena of Autodidactic Frame Alignment
Autodidactic Frame Alignment

*Autodidactic frame alignment* is the affectively charged, self-directed cognitive process whereby persons come to adopt an SMO’s interpretive orientation such that the SMO’s activities, goals, and ideology are perceived appropriate, right, or moral. Autodidactic frame alignment has two defining features: (1) it is SMO initiated, but primarily self-directed, and (2) it is most likely to occur in the backstage of a potential supporter’s interactive life. As expounded upon above, potential supporters are unlikely to make a significant and personal life decision – such as a major change in diet – ‘on-the-spot’ or in the presence of strangers among whom he feels emotionally vulnerable. Rather, persons retreat to their backstage, among those they feel psychologically secure, to (if ARO seed planting efforts have been successful) begin a primarily autonomous, more-or-less intentional evolution of their values, beliefs, and practices.

My analysis suggested that autodidactic frame alignment is composed of three mutually reinforcing individual-level phenomena by which persons ultimately cognitively align their framings with that of a given SMO: (1) information seeking behaviors, (2) biographical anchoring, and (3) the experience of moral emotions. Data indicated that these phenomena occurred in no particular order, but all advocates reported experiencing these phenomena at some point during their alternations into advocates.

**Information Seeking**

Information seeking encompasses a potential supporter’s efforts to better inform herself of the meat and poultry industries (i.e., their scope and scale, commonly utilized practices, and commonly held beliefs), AROs (i.e., their goals, methods or achieving those goals, underlying ideologies which guide goals and methods, and overall efficacy in
affecting change), and how she might participate in animal rights. Many interview participants indicated that seed planting activities, if successful, should “stick with” a potential supporter and provoke him to seek further information:

On some level … , they’ve now taken in this knowledge … . I think that once you see that image or you have that thought, it’s a little bit hard to shake the next time you eat … it’s hard to erase that out of your mind. (RF-14)

[You hope targets are] willing to take the time to stop and listen with an open mind and then indicate that they will follow up in some way, whether it’s seeking out more information or connecting with you again. But it’s not going to stop right there. (RF-04)

Indeed, many of the advocates, reflecting on their own alternations into the animal rights movement, suggested that their information seeking regarding the meat and poultry industries was sparked by the seed planting efforts of AROs. As one administrator recounted, “I picked up this flyer, ... saw the picture, and I was completely horrified. … I was blown away, and within a few years, I went vegetarian, and then a few years after that [I went] vegan” (ADM-21). One rank-and-file advocate reflected on how an animal advocate and chef’s culinary podcast encouraged her to ‘step-up’ her own commitment to the principles of animal rights:

I downloaded one or two different … podcasts, and … he just blew my mind. I had no idea of what was going on in the dairy industry, I had no idea about fish … and their intelligence and their suffering … . So … in 2008, I was like, ‘wow, I have only been doing this halfway, kind of still supporting something I am horrified by. (RF-14)

As can be seen illustrated above, most advocates remembered their adoption of a vegetarian or vegan diet as the biographical marker which demarcated the beginning of their animal advocacy. Several (12 of 30) acknowledged that this process can take years, and that discovering practices perceived to transgress moral norms provided the necessary motivation to continue searching for additional information regarding
industrial agriculture, its effects, and how they could contribute to its
deinstitutionalization:

It was really just spending time engrossing [myself] in all this educational
material. … For me going vegan was a long process. … I remember needing to
find things to help keep me motivated to pursue a full-fledged plant-based diet.
(ADM-07)

**Biographical Anchoring**

Biographical anchoring is the process by which individuals personalize an SMO’s
goals, methods, or ideologies by cognitively linking them to a personally experienced
biographical event of salience. All ARO advocates, reflecting on their alternations into
the animal rights movement, cited the development cognitive links between discoveries
about animal treatment in the meat and poultry industries to personal interactions with
animals as highly influential in motivating these alternations.

Most advocates recalled a comparison of farmed animals to pets as a driving force
behind their advocacy (19 of 30). In describing her motivation to engage in undercover
investigations, one advocate recalled her relationship with her family dog, Scotty:

… I was bullied as a kid … for my entire childhood. I mean, I had a great family
upbringing, wonderful parents and all that, [but] you know how life is. … Yet we
had a family pet … [it] was this little cairn terrier named Scotty, and Scotty was
always my best friend. So even if everyone else was either a jerk to me or beat me
up or whatever, and then all of my so called friends would do nothing to stand up
for me, well, Scotty was always doing that, right? … As I [learned more industrial
animal agriculture], I realized that I most empathized with animals … because
they were the most defenseless. (UNCI-26)

Another undercover investigator cited his personal experience with animals on a friend’s
small farm:

I was looking for … satisfaction with my activism … but coupled obviously with
an emotional bond … with animals; growing up with dogs, spending time with
goose and ducks and cows at a friend’s farm … just getting to witness for myself
how intelligent and three dimensional animal personalities can be, it struck me as
Thus, for most ARO advocates, biographical anchoring functioned to break down institutionalized beliefs about the role of animals as products by cognitive parallels between the animals they had developed close personal relationships with and those subjected to industrial animal farming. Motivation to engage ARO advocacy emerged from this sensemaking whereby advocates came to feel that farmed animals are clearly not simply raw material yet to be synthesized into food or clothing, but were sentient beings sharing much of the same intelligence, social complexity, and affective capacity the animals they knew, loved, and would not imagine eating or wearing.

**Experiences of Moral Emotions**

The conceptual keystone of the package of individual-level phenomena defining autodidactic frame alignment is the experience of moral emotions. In cases where potential supporters alternate into actual supporters of an SMO, moral emotions, defined as “emotions that are lined to the interests or welfare either of society as a whole or at least of persons other than the judge or agent” (Haidt, 2003: 853), are elicited by information gleaned about an inequitable area of social life and the cognitive tethering of that information to personal biographical experiences. One administrator’s recollection of her alternation illustrates the inextricable nature of moral emotions, biographical anchoring, and information seeking:

> We had all grown up loving our pets and that was kind of what I had envisioned [farming was like]. When she gave me this book, … it was my first introduction to factory farming, and I felt like I’d been punched in the stomach. I was just shocked and dismayed that this was not on the front page of the newspaper every single day. It was absolutely stunning to me that this kind of cruelty was so commonplace. So I started getting involved, I started learning more. (ADM-22)

All participants reported similar experiences of moral shock, disgust, anger, and
compassion upon learning of farmed animals’ treatment in CAFOs and slaughterhouses:

I was shocked at the level of abuse. I was extremely sad, and my heart just broke for these animals. (ADM-21)

Disgust, shock, horror. It’s all of them. It touches my heart; it breaks my heart every time to this day. I’ve gotten … to the point where I just have to hit delete, delete, delete [on animal rights emails] for my own well-being. (RF-06)

Although they readily admit the actual process may have taken many years, most advocates (28 of 30) recalled emotion-laden ‘epiphanies’ which demarcated their identities before and after advocacy. One rank-and-file advocate described his epiphany while driving on the highway:

I got behind [a truck transporting chickens], and I could see the bird on the side, I could see their eyes looking out, I could see the feathers blowing off the truck, I could see wings or legs poking out, and I was horrified. I just pulled over on the side of the road and I lost it. I had a break down on the side of the road that had nothing to do with car mechanics. I just … had a meltdown. (RF-14)

Furthermore, many of the advocates interviewed linked the experience of these emotions directly to their desire to participate in animal advocacy: “When I [found] out about certain atrocities, I would get extremely upset. Extremely. … [I joined the animal rights movement] because I said, ‘I am going to do something about this’” (RF-01).

From these biographical narratives of advocates, we learn that the constituent phenomena of autodidactic frame alignment, while analytically distinguishable, play out empirically as mutually interdependent pillars supporting a person’s possible alternation into material or cognitive support for an SMO’s institutional project. Moral emotional experiences act as the centerpiece of this process, both catalyzed by and catalyzing information seeking and biographical anchoring, the confluence of which allows a person to break from institutionally defined convention regarding the role of farmed animals in our diets, environment, and economy.
Deinstitutionalization

As attested by the archival data, AROs’ efforts have indeed worked to move mountains – if only (relatively) small distances. In recent years, ARO advocacy has resulted in significant cultural changes, achieved regulatory or legal victories, and has garnered significant corporate commitments to modify both products and processes in accordance with the principles of the animal rights movement. In some small part, these achievements have worked to deinstitutionalize the practices and beliefs pervasive in the meat and poultry industries.

As evidence of the efficacy of the animal rights movement, AROs often gave evidence of latent cultural shifts to favoring a vegan/vegetarian diet or changing perceptions of farmed animals. For example, Compassion Over Killing reported statistics regarding its VegWeek Pledge Drive in the fall 2014 issue of its magazine, *Compassionate Action*: “6,400 people pledged to go veg for 7 days, 130,000+ meat-free meals were enjoyed throughout the week, 74 public figures, including federal, state, and local representatives, signed on.” Other AROs cited statistics which indicated shifts in consumer preferences, such as one PETA blog post stating,

Did Butterball know that more than 80 percent of Americans feel that it’s important that the animals they eat are ‘humanely’ raised? Or that 58 percent of consumers would pay an additional 10 percent or more for meat, poultry, eggs, or dairy products labeled ‘humanely raised’? (PETA, 2014)

A Compassion Over Killing news item cited similar statistics:

Research in the *Nutrition Business Journal* reveals that vegan eating is hitting the mainstream: Nearly half of consumers associate vegan food with healthy eating or weight loss (and 23% associate it with animal welfare concerns), 36% of Americans prefer dairy-free milk and veggie meats, 26% said they eat less meat now than they did 12 months ago, 19% view vegan food as better for the planted or more socially responsible. (Compassion Over Killing, 2015)
AROs also often touted corporate commitments to animal rights principles or corporate recognition of the vegan/vegetarian community as victories of their advocacy. According to the archival data, some of these commitments have included companies adopting vegan/vegetarian products, such as Subway, Target, Starbucks, Chipotle, Quorn, Ben & Jerry’s, Dunkin’ Donuts, Hellmann’s, among many others. Other data attested to corporations that had committed to eliminating inhumane practices from their supply chain or from their own industrial animal operations. For example, HSUS blog posts and news items reported several corporations pledging to eliminate the use of (or sourcing from farms which use) battery-cages for egg-laying hens, such as Post Holdings (December 2015), Taco Bell (November 2015), Rembrandt Foods (October 2015), McDonald’s (September 2015), Sodexo (February 2015), and Starbucks (December 2014), among others. Others pledged to eliminate the use of gestation crates, such as Walmart (May 2015), Panera (December 2014), Clemens Food Group (September 2014), Cargill (June 2014), Einstein Noah Restaurant Group (April 2014), Delhaize America (February 2014), Smithfield Foods (January 2014), and Tyson Foods (January 2014), among others. A handful of firms committed to strengthening systems for monitoring and reporting animal abuse on farms, such as Walmart (May 2015) and Einstein Noah Restaurant Group (April 2014).

AROs also cited legal victories or changes in the regulatory environment as evidence of institutional change in the meat and poultry industries, and often linked these victories directly to their own activism. For example, a 2015 news item from Compassion Over Killing suggested that as of January 1, 2015, millions of farmed animals being raised in California can no longer be intensively confined inside tiny barren cages or crates, as mandated by
law. Thanks to ‘Prop 2’ – a history-making ballot measure overwhelmingly passed by California voters in 2008 … -- egg-laying hens, pregnant pigs, and dairy calves raised for veal must be provided with enough space to lie down, stand up, fully extend their limbs, and freely turn around. This effectively bans gestation crates, veal crates, and tiny wire cages for egg-laying hens.

Another Compassion Over Killing news item relayed a legal settlement between Compassion Over Killing and Cal-Cruz Hatcheries, Inc. stemming from an undercover investigation:

The parties have issued a joint statement clarifying that this settlement resolves ‘all claims relating to an unfair business practices lawsuit based on alleged animal cruelty at the hatchery.’ Key points include: ‘Cal-Cruz Hatcheries is no longer in operation, closed a few months ago, and has therefore agreed to no longer own, keep possess, or have custody of any animal.’ Hatchery owner “Brian Collins has agreed that he will not be in any way legally responsible for the welfare of animals in a commercial setting for five years.’

Other archival data focused on industrial animal operations which had closed as a result of undercover investigations, fines levied against industrial animal operations, ‘right-to-farm’ (i.e., protection for farmers against nuisance suits filed by adjacent property owners for untoward smells or pollution caused by industrial farming operations) or ag-gag legislation defeated, and new laws restricting inhumane animal confinement or strengthening whistleblowing protections for animal advocates and employees alike.

The preceding section is not meant to imply there are many unambiguous causal relationships between ‘moving mountains’ of institutional convention and ARO advocacy (save for cases where advocacy results in regulatory changes which immediately change the institutional structure of a given state). However, it is clear from the testimonies of ARO advocates and from archival data that ARO advocacy is ‘moving the needle’ to some degree, and that these relatively small institutional changes – when put in the context of the wider social structure governing the meat and poultry industries and
society at large – at least in part emerge from the impassioned activism of those individuals deeply convinced of the principles of animal rights.
FIGURE 9

Full Multilevel Process Model of SMO Deinstitutionalization Efforts
V. DISCUSSION

Institutional scholars have only recently begun the project of exploring the individual-level affective experiences and processes which are integral to persons’ motivations for variously adhering to or deviating from institutional prescriptions and proscriptions (Creed et al., 2014; Jarvis, in press; Voronov & Vince, 2012). Among the many gaps in the nascent body of institutional literature more formally reckoning with emotion, standing out prominently is the absence of theorizing on how organizations leverage emotional displays and experiences in pursuit of institutional change. Additionally, research has been vague on the cognitive processes by which emotion actually works to encourage persons to devote time and energy to either maintaining or disrupting institutions.

Figure 9 (above) displays the full multilevel process model which begins to redress both of these salient gaps in the institutional literature. The model suggests that SMOs utilize two strategies – transgression mining and seed planting – in attempting to catalyze frame alignment with potential supporters. Transgression mining, which occurs in areas hidden from the view of general audiences, is more likely to succeed when SMO advocates both participate in transgressive behavior and regulate their emotions such that they ‘blend’ with others engaging in transgressive behavior, allowing advocates to garner evidence of transgressive behavior. To the extent that transgression mining is successful, those advocates engaged in seed planting will have more insight into transgressive behavior to reveal to potential supporters. That is, effective transgression mining is likely...
to increase the efficacy of seed planting, hence the arrow leading from transgression mining to seed planting.

Seed planting, whereby SMOs attempt to catalyze potential supporters’ self-led process of cognitive alignment with the SMO goals, methods, and ideologies, relies on two rhetorical strategies – backstage revelations and alignment processes – made more effective by rank-and-file advocates’ emotion regulation. That is, potential supporters are less likely to dismiss advocates’ efforts to rhetorically extend, bridge, or amplify the SMO’s frame in discourse if the advocate maintains emotional neutrality or a positive affective demeanor in spite of the generally negative moral emotions which propel persons into advocacy. Seed planting takes place in both the frontstage and the backstage of a potential supporter’s interactive life, i.e., both in face-to-face interaction between rank-and-file advocates and potential supporters, and via informational materials such as leaflets and websites which can be examined in the backstage.

To the extent seed planting is successful, potential supporters are more likely to engage the individual-level process of autodidactic frame alignment, or the self-led and usually autonomous backstage process whereby individuals adopt the interpretive orientation of an SMO. This process is comprised of three phenomena – information seeking behaviors, cognitive biographical anchoring, and the experience of moral emotions – which mutually reinforce one-another as an individual begins to reconsider his or her own interpretive frame and supplement (or replace) it with that of an SMO.

SMO scholars suggest that one of two outcomes may result from successful autodidactic frame alignment: (1) a person may become an adherent, or someone who ‘passively’ supports the SMO’s institutional project (e.g., adopting a vegetarian or vegan
diet in order to withdraw support from industrial animal farms), or (2) a person may become an advocate, or someone who more ‘actively’ supports the SMO’s institutional project via the provision of resources (e.g., money, volunteer hours). The former contributes to the deinstitutionalization of some set of perceived transgressive practices and beliefs directly the withholding of cultural support, while the latter contributes to the deinstitutionalization of transgressive practice and beliefs primarily via the SMOs which aggregate their resources and utilize them to implement their strategies of transgression mining and seed planting.

My study provides insight into these gaps in the institutional literature by examining AROs’ efforts to deinstitutionalize certain practices within the meat and poultry industries through recruiting material and cultural support from those on the outside of the animal rights movement, in the process highlighting the role emotion regulation and moral emotional experiences play in aiding AROs in incrementally achieving the goals of their institutional change project. In doing so, I build new theory, but also help tie together the organizational and individual levels of analysis left disparate in other work examining emotions within an institutional framework.

Theoretical Implications

This dissertation makes four primary theoretical contributions: (1) it suggests emotion is leveraged by organizations in attempting to achieve institutional change, (2) it explores the individual level cognitive process by which individuals alternate to support for an institutional change project, (3) it deploys Goffman’s (1959) backstage/frontstage distinction at both the organizational and individual levels, and (4) it empirically ties SMO frame alignment processes to emotion.
Organizations Leveraging Emotion

As mentioned above, no institutional research has formally reckoned with how organizations might draw on the emotional displays and experiences of their members to achieve institutional effects. Those institutional studies for which emotion is a peripheral feature of the analysis have largely suggested that organizations hope to engender emotional experiences which motivate the social support needed to alter institutional arrangements (e.g., Brown et al., 2012; Gutierrez et al., 2010; Hoffman, 1999, 2001; Maguire et al., 2004). Extending these tangential contributions, I found that, more than engendering emotion on the part of those the organization desires support from, organizational constituents may regulate their emotions in support of their organizations’ institutional change project. To wit, I found that both undercover investigators and rank-and-file advocates regulated their emotions in support of gleaning information from the backstage of the meat and poultry industries and interfacing with potential supporters of the ARO, respectively. AROs leveraged their members’ regulation of emotion to more effectively implement their strategies of transgression mining seed planting.

This study importantly draws institutional scholars’ attention to ways in which displays of emotion may be intentionally decoupled from the physiological experience of emotion, and lends empirical weight to Jarvis’ (in press) assertion that persons’ ability to effectively mask their own emotional states (response-focused regulation) or change the cognitive frameworks which imbue stimuli with emotional significance (antecedent-focused regulation) is a meaningful aspect of organizations’ attempts to catalyze certain institutional dynamics. In doing so, I take inspiration from emotion regulation scholars (c.f., Gross, 1998, 2015) who have long recognized that social dynamics importantly
influence and are influenced by persons’ ability to control their emotional states. This helps move institutional scholarship beyond the narrower conception of emotion as encompassing only the affective aspect of motivation – a perspective taken by the majority of the small body of literature on institutions and emotion – but as a package of both affective (i.e., emotional experience) and behavioral (i.e., emotional display) phenomena which interact to produce change and stability in higher-order institutions. Without taking into account persons’ ability to regulate their experiences and displays, researchers tend to fall back on an overly simplified picture of emotion as entirely out of a person’s conscious control, skewing rational decision making.

Emotion and the Cognitive Process Underpinning Institutional Change

In the past decade, studies examining the individual-level ‘inhabitants’ (Hallett, 2010; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006) of institutions have proliferated in response to calls for the ‘coalface’ work of exploring institutional microfoundations to begin (Barley, 2008; Powell & Colyvas, 2008). Much of this work has focused on various cognitive processes which underpin institutional stability or change, such as identity work or sensemaking (e.g., Creed et al., 2010; Jay, 2013; Lok, 2010; Mair et al., 2012; Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006). However, this research has yet to offer a well-specified model describing how emotion might interact with cognitive processes to produce institutional dynamics. This dissertation draws the concept of frame alignment from the SMO literature, and provides a model which suggest that, at the individual level, frame alignment occurs in the backstage of a person’s interactive life through biographical anchoring and information seeking. These cognitive/behavioral processes are laden with the experience of moral emotion, which both encourages and is caused and intensified by
information seeking and biographical anchoring.

This model not only directs theoretical attention to the role of emotion in motivating institutional action generally, but highlights how cognitive process are inextricably interwoven with emotion. In the case of AROs, this dissertation suggests that individual-level autodidactic frame alignment is comprised of both cognitive processes – information seeking and biographical anchoring – which both reinforce and are reinforced by the experience of moral emotions. The lack of a readily identifiable causal order to this process attests to the parallel nature of the affective and cognitive and mutually interdependent nature of sensemaking which influences persons’ practices, values, and beliefs. That is, following Voronov and Vince’s (2012) seminal paper, cognition and emotion are posited here as distinct but mutually interdependent modes of making sense of the nexus of institutional influences persons are embedded in.

Backstage/Frontstage and Institutional Change

My research also contributes to the institutional literature through illustrating how Goffman’s (1959) backstage/frontstage distinction can usefully be applied to both the organizational and individual levels of analysis. Although originally formulated as a way to describe the discrepant spheres of an individual’s interactive life, my study suggests that organizations may have backstages as well, or areas where practices, values, and beliefs of questionable normative moral value are enacted and intentionally hidden from an organization’s audiences who might otherwise stigmatize the organization if they were knowledgeable of these transgressions. In looking at the meat and poultry industries through the lens of Goffman’s frontstage/backstage metaphor, this study builds on existing institutional studies focusing on how organizations decouple their technical core
activities from what is presented to wider audiences (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996) by emphasizing the complicity of audiences in establishing the ‘curtain’ between what is seen and what is not. This study suggests that organizational audiences, as a function of maintaining the status quo in their own lives, may more-or-less intentionally ignore or disregard backstage practices, values, and beliefs. This finding adds to other research which compares organizations – and indeed entire fields – to dramatic plays in which actors on both sides of the curtain work to perpetuate institutionalized practices, values, and beliefs (e.g., Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009; Hyland & Morse, 1995).

This study also suggests that those organizations seeking to alter institutional arrangements which are highly taken-for-granted, historically intertial, and reified must rely on individual alternations which occur in an individual’s backstage to garner material and cultural support for their institutional project. As was found to be the case with AROs attempting to alter practices in the beliefs in industrial animal agriculture, organizational strategies were tailored around the belief that potential supporters would be unlikely to commit to a change as significant as one affecting their diets while in the presence of a stranger among whom they would feel emotionally vulnerable. Instead, animal advocates universally expressed the expectation that such changes would take much time and only among whom a person feels emotionally ‘safe,’ i.e., the backstage. Thus, while some small number of studies suggest that emotional experiences may catalyze institutional dynamics, this study contradicts the implied notion that emotions must be expressed to wider audiences to catalyze change (e.g., Hoffman, 1999, 2001; Maguire et al., 2004) by connecting the degree of institutionalization to the likely social location of emotional
experiences. In doing so, the findings here reaffirm previous work (e.g., Creed et al., 2010) which asserts that institutional hegemony can force emotional experiences into the backstage, and that, despite their marginalization in the dominant institutional order, in aggregate these experiences can still catalyze significant changes to the status quo.

**Emotion and SMO Framing**

This paper contributes to the SMO literature by empirically tying emotional strategies and experiences to the frame alignment process and providing theoretical detail to the process by which emotion interacts with frame alignment. Few studies have meaningfully considered the role of emotion in SMO framing (e.g., Berbrier, 1998; Berns, 2009), and the few that do fail to provide a detailed analysis of the processes by which emotion generates its effects on a person’s willingness to adopt an SMO’s interpretive orientation, methods, and ideologies as moral, right, appropriate, or rational – mirroring the framing literature’s general tendency to focus more on the content of frames than the analytical processes by which frames are deployed and rendered effective (c.f., Benford, 1997). This dissertation outlines biographical anchoring, information seeking, and moral emotional experiences as the separately necessary and collectively sufficient phenomena comprising persons’ alternations into accepting SMO framings.

**Practical Implications**

This dissertation also entails several implications for practice, specifically for SMOs, but more generally for any organization attempting to affect institutional dynamics. In particular, my study: (1) shows how provoking emotion is an integral part of garnering support for institutional projects, (2) clarifies the character of face-to-face interactions between rank-and-file advocates and potential supporters which are likely to
have efficacy in achieving frame alignment, and (3) illustrates the necessity of emotion regulation in change projects directed at highly institutionalized fields.

First, my study reinforces recent research in the SMO literature which suggests that social movements often rely heavily on the emotional experiences of potential supporters as recruiting mechanisms (c.f., Jasper, 2011), and that membership in an organization is in part defined by “a normative alignment among relevant … emotions” (Thomas, McGarty, & Mavor, 2009: 195). Specifically, I found that moral emotional experiences were universal among animal rights advocates, and these experiences played a significant role in propelling persons into constituency and eventually activism for AROs. For business organizations, this finding emphasizes the importance of aligning not just members’ cognitive schema of interpretation but also their emotional experiences about the organization and its guiding processes and ideologies. Working to achieve such alignment strengthens organizational cultures and unifies efforts towards a single set of goals, as illustrated in this case by AROs.

Additionally, specifying the operant emotions to be moral emotions in particular – emotions experienced in reaction to others’ afflicted by injustice or marginalization – may help organizations in formulating strategies to tap latent cultural support for their institutional projects. That is, inducing anger, horror, or disgust might be more powerful motivators if an organization focuses more of its efforts on defining a referent for these emotions (e.g., an inequitable area of social life; a regulatory agency blocking certain practices) rather than simply inducing these emotions. This distinction was a recurrent theme in the data; inducing emotion is a simple matter for animal rights advocates, as often persons outside the movement can feel threatened by the implications of animal
rights principles in their own diets and practices. However, for the advocate to be successful, anger must be directed in the ‘right’ places. Thus these findings suggest that the notion of emotion’s power in motivating action must be qualified by how organizations leverage these emotions vis-à-vis their objects.

Second, my study significantly clarifies the nature of successful face-to-face interactions between members of organizations and current or potential supporters. As I found through interviewing several rank-and-file ARO advocates and examining archival material intended as ‘instruction manuals’ for new advocates, attempting to elicit emotion in face-to-face interaction is unlikely to be successful. That is, the emotional vulnerability the potential supporter may be feeling is a significant influence on the likelihood she will align her interpretive framework with the organization. Thus, successful face-to-face interactions primarily involve ‘planting seeds’ which can be considered more meaningfully in areas of interactive life where the potential supporter feels less vulnerable. This finding may have a significant impact on how organizations, especially SMOs, train members for interactions with stakeholders. That is, another qualification to the notion of emotion’s power in motivating action is that emotional expression on the part of a customer, client, legislator, or potential supporter should not be expected in real time. Those experienced in the backstage are likely to have more efficacy in aligning the interpretive frameworks of a potential supporter and an organization.

Finally, this dissertation highlights the necessity of emotion regulation in institutional change efforts. With regard to AROs, I found antecedent-focused regulation to be essential in undercover investigators’ ability to mine information about transgressive practices, values, and beliefs from the backstage of the meat and poultry
industries, and I found response-focused regulation to facilitate the seed planting activities of rank-and-file advocates. This finding suggests that organizations might usefully codify instruction on the regulation of emotion when training new rank-and-file members whose duties are to include recruiting stakeholders to view practices or ideologies in organizationally beneficial ways.

Limitations and Future Research Opportunities

The primary limitation of this study is that it samples only animal rights advocates and derives archival data only from AROs to create inferences regarding the role of emotion SMO strategies and the process by which individuals alternate into support for an SMO. While appropriate given the grounded approach taken in this study and the middle-range theory that approach yielded (Charmaz, 2008), future research might attempt to validate the model proposed here through expanding its scope to multiple social movements and their constituent SMOs, in effect testing the generalizability of this dissertation’s model in multiple contexts. Such studies would be valuable given that various social movements may variously (de)emphasize the use of emotion or any given tactic taken here.

Additionally, because only animal advocates were asked about their alternations into support for AROs, it is not possible to directly trace such alternations to any of the factors outlined as composing autodidactic frame alignment. That is, unless a study sampled both those who immediately or eventually rejected AROs seed planting efforts and those who eventually accepted them, it would not be possible to say that information seeking, biographical anchoring, and moral emotional experiences cause frame alignment. Thus, while this dissertation found autodidactic frame alignment to occur, it
cannot suggest in a definitive way that its constituent phenomena differentiate those who eventually support an SMO from those who do not. Future researchers might profitably design studies to capture variance along eventual frame alignment so such inferences could be drawn.

Finally, another limitation of this dissertation is that it measures emotional experiences at the individual level through semi-structured interviews. Interviewing provides no way to validate that physiological emotional experiences have occurred, as the interviewer has only the respondents’ reports of emotional experiences to derive inferences from, reports which can potentially be biased by the social desirability of experiencing certain emotions and not experiencing others. Although I had no a priori or post hoc reason to believe the advocates did not experience the emotions they reported to feel – and indeed, the very fact that these persons were motivated to devote significant time and effort to AROs provides strong evidence to the contrary – this study cannot rule out social desirability as a confounding effect in the data. Future research might address this issue by designing studies more focused on the validation of physiological emotional experiences. To this end, researchers might employ experimental studies with physiological measures (c.f., Bitektine & Schilke, 2014; Heaphy & Dutton, 2008) or (auto)ethnographic studies (c.f., Creswell, 2013: 90; Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011) intended to allow a researcher to enter participants’ ‘backstage’ such that the latter would be feel less emotionally vulnerable around the researcher and more willing to report physiological emotional experiences.

Conclusion

Through empirically exploring the role of emotion in institutional change in a
highly institutionalized context, my work illustrates the need for institutional scholars to begin more explicitly considering emotion at different levels of analysis. Consideration of AROs and their efforts to deinstitutionalize inhumane practices and beliefs in the meat and poultry industries throws the importance of both emotional experiences and the intentional regulation of emotion into high relief. This exploratory study represents the first step in illuminating the multi-level process by which emotion-laden organizational strategies interactive with individual cognitive and affective processes to foster institutional change. In particular, this study shows that even institutional ‘mountains’ can and are moved through the impassioned efforts of advocates and, importantly, their ability to control their extreme emotions in pursuit of the well-being of farmed animals.
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Recruitment Protocol

Moving Institutional Mountains: Animal Rights Organizations, Emotion, and Frame Alignment

Recruitment Protocols

Email

Hi [participant’s name],

I’m a doctoral candidate from the Department of Management Programs out of Florida Atlantic University’s College of Business working on my dissertation, and I’m contacting you to request your participation in an interview focusing on your role in as a(a) [undercover investigator ballot initiative petition volunteer] for [name of AR] organizations. The purpose of my dissertation is to analyze the role of emotions in animal rights organizations’ social change efforts.

I’ve been informed that you’ve participated in [undercover investigations/ballot initiatives to outlaw gestation crates/public demonstrations], and therefore I believe you can provide me with valuable insight. I’m requesting that you participate in a semi-structured interview to support the findings of this project, which will be written up in manuscript form for the purpose of publication in an academic journal. If you choose to participate, a pseudonym will be used in place of your name and organizational affiliation. Your interview may last anywhere from 45 minutes to an hour, depending on the amount of information you would like to share. Your participation is completely voluntary.

Please contact me at ljarvis4@fau.edu or (270) 312-5264 if you are interested in participating or have any further questions about my research project.

Best regards,

Lee Jarvis
Florida Atlantic University
College of Business
Department of Management Programs
ljarvis4@fau.edu
(270) 312-5264
Recruitment Protocol (Continued)

Telephone Script

Hello [subject’s name]. I’m a doctoral candidate from the Department of Management Programs out of Florida Atlantic University’s College of Business working on my dissertation, and I’m contacting you to request your participation in an interview focusing on your role in as a(n) [undercover investigator/ballot initiative petition volunteer] for [name of ARO]. The purpose of my dissertation is to analyze the role of emotions in animal rights organizations’ social change efforts.

I’ve been informed that you’ve participated in [undercover investigations/ballot initiatives to outlaw gestation crates/public demonstrations], and therefore I believe you can provide me with valuable insight. I’m requesting that you participate in a semi-structured interview to support the findings of this project, which will be written up in manuscript form for the purpose of publication in an academic journal. If you choose to participate, your interview would be conducted at your convenience, and you will be able to choose what, if any, identifying information would be associated with your responses should they appear in the final write-up of this project (e.g., you may choose to make your responses completely anonymous if you’d like). Your interview may last anywhere from 20 minutes to 3 hours, depending on the amount of information you would like to share. Your participation is completely voluntary.

Do you have any questions about this research project?

Would you be willing to participate in this research project?
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Investigators: Lee C. Jarvis, Doctoral Candidate & Elizabeth Goodrick, PhD

Interviewer: Lee C. Jarvis
Interviewee: ________________
Organizational Affiliation: ________________
Date: ________________
Time: ________________
Location: ________________

Topics Discussed: ____________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________

Sampling Leads: ____________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________

Verbal Consent Script (if telephone interview)

I am Lee Jarvis from Florida Atlantic University’s College of Business. I’m a doctoral candidate in management, and I am conducting my dissertation on animal rights organizations and the use of emotion in their social change efforts. The research will help me understand how animal rights organizations gather information about the meat and poultry industries and how that information is used in attempting to get people to support their causes.

The phone interview today should take between 45 minutes to 1 hour. Your participation is voluntary, and if you do not wish to participate, you may stop at any time.

If you choose to participate, a pseudonym will be used in place of your name along with your organizational affiliation and position with your organization if your responses appear in the final write-up of this study.

You will also have the option of: (1) allowing your responses to be audio-recorded and transcribed while notes are taken by the interviewer during the interview; or (2) allowing only notes to be taken by the interviewer during the interview. If you choose the first option, you may contact the investigators after the interview to
receive a copy of your interview transcript for review. You will also be able to make changes to your answers to make certain they accurately represent your views.

Digital copies of audio, interview transcriptions, and interview notes will be kept on the investigators’ password protected personal computers. Prior to the final write-up of this project, only dissertation committee and I will see your responses. The final write-up of this project is intended for publication in an academic journal. All anonymously provided data will be kept confidential, unless required by law.

Risks involved with participation include those associated with your indirect identification through your responses, and any threats to your reputation that may entail. Taking part in this interview is effectively your agreement to participate.

If you would like a copy of this letter for your records, please let me know and I will email, mail, or fax it to you. If you have any questions regarding the research, please contact me or my dissertation advisor, Dr. Elizabeth Goodrick, Department of Management Programs, (954) 236-1274 or goodrick@fau.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the Florida Atlantic University Division of Research at (561) 297-0777. Thank you again for your participation.

***Interviewer Marks the Subject’s Responses to the Following Questions***

Do you consent to participate in this interview?

___ subject consents  ___ subject does not consent

What recording methods do you consent to?

___ Audio-recording, transcription, and interviewer note-taking

___ Interviewer note-taking

Interview Questions:

1. Tell me your title, how long you’ve filled this position, and a brief description of what you do for your organization.
   a. Tell me about the projects you’ve been involved with for [participant’s ARO].
2. Give me a brief description of the meat and poultry industries.
   a. What role do you feel they play in our society?
   b. What role do you feel they should play in our society?
3. Tell me about what drew you to the animal rights movement.
   a. How did you become involved specifically with [participant’s ARO]?
4. Tell me about an average day [volunteering for organization, participating in public demonstration, taking undercover video/audio of slaughterhouses/factory farms].
   a. Tell me how you feel after an average day/particularly bad day/particularly good day.
5. Tell me about what you feel your participation in [ARO] has helped to achieve.
6. What do you think is the best approach to getting a potential supporter to actively support the movement in some way?
   a. Take a moment and see if you can think of an interaction with a potential supporter that went particularly well. If you can, tell me about the interaction. What did you say? How did they respond? Why do you think it went well? What were your feelings after this interaction?
   b. Take a moment and see if you can think of an interaction with a potential supporter that went poorly. If you can, tell me about the interaction. What did you say? How did they respond? Why do you think it went poorly? What were your feelings after this interaction?
   c. What are potential supporters’ usual reactions to your [advocacy/demonstrations/investigations]?
   d. Could you describe the ideal reaction you hope to elicit when you interact with someone unfamiliar with the movement?
   e. Could you describe the poorest reaction you don’t hope to elicit when you interact with someone unfamiliar with the movement?

7. How, if at all, has your opinion of the ‘best approach’ changed since you first joined the animal rights movement?
   a. Tell me a little about the experiences that led you to change your opinion, if they’re different from the experiences we’ve already discussed.

8. Is there anything else you’d like to tell me that might be useful to my overall project?
9. Are there any other [volunteers/demonstrations/undercover investigators] you could put me in contact with that might be useful to my project?

10. Could I contact you again if I have any follow-up questions?
11. How would you prefer I send you the transcript of this interview (email, mail, fax)?
Appendix C

Observation Report

Researcher: Lee Jarvis
Place: Miami Beach, FL, intersection of Lincoln Rd Mall and Meridian Ave
DateTime: Saturday, June 13th, 2015, 8 p.m. to 11 p.m.
Purpose: observe interactions between animal rights activists working on behalf of Vegan Outreach and general public

Empty storefront

ARO leafleters

Vegan Outreach booth

Outdoor seating and plants

[Image of a table with flyers and a TV screen]
During the process of interviewing activists working for animal rights organizations (AROs),
several suggested that it might be useful to observe the interactions surrounding a booth set up by
Vegan Outreach workers every Saturday night in Miami Beach. The booth is on Lincoln Place
Blvd, a street with a myriad of upscale retail and restaurant establishments. People walking
around are generally well-dressed people who seem to be in their 20s, but there are also a
significant number of middle aged people out for the night with their families.

The booth prominently features a television and DVD player powered by a car battery; what
DVD plays is chosen by the volunteers. This night, I’m told that the DVD is a relatively graphic
documentary informing those walking by of the animal abuse systemic to factory farms and
slaughterhouses. It shows video of pigs being tattooed with a large, spiked hammer like tool,
cows and pigs being bled to death while still alive, piglets being euthanized by workers via
swinging them from their hind legs and hitting them against metal tables or concrete floors (often
unsuccessfully, as one video showed piglets squealing in a large metal tub ostensibly meant for
the euthanized piglets), piglets being castrated without anesthetics, chickens being de-beaked
without anesthetics, and fish slowly suffocating after being taken out of water, among several
other images.

The booth also includes free pamphlets and literature on animal abuses in factory farms and
slaughterhouses, vegan cooking, and body-building while on a plant based diet, among other
topics. Several of the pamphlets are Spanish-language, I’m told as an effort to reach out to the
large Latino community in South Florida.

I arrive at the booth shortly after three volunteers (V1, V2, & V3) have set up the table and
begun handing out pamphlets. The volunteers are handing out pamphlets titled “Compassionate
Choices” – a brochure containing both positive imagery and negative imagery to humanize
animals and to reveal their plight, respectively, as well as information on a vegan diet and the
celebrities that support the animal rights movement – to people passing by. They hold out
pamphlets to almost every person passing; around a quarter of these people pass without
acknowledging the volunteers in any way, around a quarter politely decline the pamphlet, and
around half take a pamphlet but without much acknowledgement of the volunteer.

A very select few engage the volunteers in conversation. In the three hours I observed, I
witnessed four or five such instances (OC – I likely missed two or three more instances while
talking to the volunteers or watching them interact with others). Two of these were vegetarians
or vegans empathizing with the volunteers and expressing gratitude for their activism. Of the few
remaining, at least two were large, athletic men in their early 20s expressing interest in a vegan
diet but concerned about becoming ill, sickly, or lacking adequate protein if they made a major
change in eating. In each case, the volunteers presented them with a pamphlet titled “The
Compassionate Athlete: Athletes Tackle Questions about Plant-Based Eating.” This pamphlet is
very similar to “Compassionate Choices,” even using some of the same images, but contains
testimonials from athletes – professional football players, hockey players, bodybuilders, etc. –
rather than celebrities. Each of these interactions lasts for around five to eight minutes.

One of the athletic men is accompanied by a girl who is visibly disturbed by the documentary
playing on the TV. While the man talks to one of the volunteers about maintaining a plant based
Observation Report (continued)

diet, the girl fidgets, her face contorts, and eventually she begins to “hide” herself from the
documentary behind the man, who simply continued his conversation with the volunteer. While
conversing with the volunteer, he continues watching the documentary.

V2 explains to me that tonight is generally representative of most nights they leaflet in Miami
Beach. She suggested that, on any given night, they may have anywhere from 2 to 10 people stop
to ask questions about animal cruelty or a vegan diet. She goes on to tell me about her path to the
animal rights movement; she was a paralegal pursuing a law degree for some time before she
became frustrated with her ability to affect any change as a legal professional, and so started
volunteering more for organizations like Vegan Outreach.

Several people stop to watch the video, but neither take pamphlets nor interact with the
volunteers. Throughout my observation period, I witness around 10 instances of individuals or
groups stopping to watch the documentary for three to five minutes at a time. V2 and V3 explain
to me that there is a strong group effect at play in instances like this; if one person stops to watch
the documentary, people will sometimes coalesce around them. The more people there are, the
more likely it is that others will stop. Groups generally disperse when the first person voluntarily
leaves. I witness one such group form – around ten people stop to watch the documentary, one
couple or group at a time. The group dispersed rapidly after the first couple departed.

Of the individuals which stopped (around four), they all silently watched the video for around
five minutes before departing without interacting with the volunteers or taking any pamphlets. Of
the around five couples that stopped to watch, it was always the case that one stopped while the
other seemingly wanted to leave (OC – the other would often disinterestedly stare away from the
documentary, but if watching the documentary, their faces always betrayed much less emotion than their companions). In every case, the disinterested
companion would pull the interested companion away from the screen to continue on with their
night. One woman put her hand to her open mouth after letting out an audible “oh!” after which
she is quickly pulled away by her female companion. V1 tells me this is the most common
reaction to couples stopping to watch the documentary.

I ask V1 why they don’t walk up to those watching the documentary and offer them literature or
attempt to start a discussion with them. By way of explanation, she recounts the advice of long-
time Vegan Outreach leafleeter Brad King, who told her that the documentary communicated
more of the message of Vegan Outreach than any conversation ever could, and so volunteers
should never interrupt those watching the documentary. Indeed, I did not witness any volunteer
interrupt anyone actually watching the documentary, and most ended up walking away without
interacting with the volunteers.

I ask V1 about any negative reactions to the booth or the leafleting. She recounts people who will
get upset at the graphic nature of the documentary, suggesting that it isn’t suitable for children
and that such children are out with their parents on the weekend – oddly enough, the people who
have complained did not have children of their own. This complaint is relatively rare, V1
suggests that only around one or two such complaints will be voiced per year. She hadn’t had
anyone argue with her over actual animal rights principles while leafleting. She mentioned that
the most common “negative” response received were from young people “just being jerks.” She
told me about several instances, to include one young man writing "fuck you" on the email sign
up list to receive more information about Vegan Outreach and another who walked by and
unplugged the TV. I witness one young man shouting "oh shit!" at the documentary and then
immediately saying "nuh uh" to a volunteer reaching out a pamphlet to him (OC – the "oh shit"
was sarcastic and the "nuh/uh" was, for lack of a better term, "smart aleck-y").

(OC – it seems as though young people in general are more dismissive of the volunteers. I notice
that the younger and better dressed a person is, the more likely it is that they’ll either completely
ignore the volunteer or reject the pamphlet in an ostensibly dismissive way. For example, one
young lady in a dress and high heels laughed a dismissive "no" at a volunteer offering her a
pamphlet.)

I ask VI about her feelings after a night of leafleting, especially those which aren’t particularly
successful. She suggests that if she can make one person think about their dietary choices, she’s
made all of the difference she could hope to make, and she thinks she achieves that goal on
almost every night she’s been leafleting for Vegan Outreach.
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Copyright Permissions (Mercy For Animals)

Permission to Reproduce Copyrighted Material
2 messages

Lee Jarvis <ljarvis4@fau.edu>  Tue, May 24, 2016 at 4:33 PM
To: info@mercyforanimals.org

5/24/2016

Mercy For Animals

To whom it may concern:

My name is Lee Jarvis, and I am completing a doctoral dissertation at Florida Atlantic University, entitled “Moving Mountains: Animal Rights Organizations, Emotion, and Autodidactic Frame Alignment.” I kindly request your permission to reprint in my dissertation excerpts and pictures from your website and Youtube videos:

http://www.mercyforanimals.org/investigations

"Behind closed doors, animals are suffering on factory farms. Mercy For Animals' brave undercover investigators risk everything to expose and end it."

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IN_YcW0uVqk

(screenshots taken from this video are attached to this email)

My dissertation will be published through ProQuest Information and Learning Company (PQIL), and an electronic version will be archived in the digital collection at Florida Atlantic University. The requested permission extends to any future revisions of my dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages. These rights will in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your response to this email will also confirm that your company owns the copyright to the above described material.

If these conditions meet your approval, please respond to this email indicating your approval.

Sincerely,
Lee

Lee C. Jarvis
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Management Programs
College of Business
Florida Atlantic University
ljarvis4@fau.edu
ljarvis9@gmail.com

MFA copyright permissions pictures.docx
1567K
Mercy For Animals <info@mercyforanimals.org>

To: Lee Jarvis <ljarvis4@fau.edu>

Wed. May 25, 2016 at 11:18 AM

Dear Lee, Thank you for contacting Mercy For Animals. Please feel free to use any of our MFA original content, footage or photos. Please credit MFA when appropriate. To encourage the sharing of these materials far and wide, and to spread the truth about factory farms, we do not copyright them.

Thank you for all that you do for farmed animals.

Sincerely,

Tammy Borchert
Administrative and Merchandise Assistant
Mercy For Animals
www.MercyForAnimals.org

Your support saves lives! Please make your secure donation online today.

[Quoted text here]
Permission to Reproduce Copyrighted Material

Lee Jarvis <lj Jarvis4@fau.edu>
To: josie@vegan outreach.org

5/26/2016

Josie Moody
Office Manager
Vegan Outreach

Hi Josie,

My name is Lee Jarvis, and I am completing a doctoral dissertation at Florida Atlantic University, entitled “Moving Mountains: Animal Rights Organizations, Emotion, and Autodidactic Frame Alignment.” I kindly request your permission to reprint in my dissertation excerpts from the leaflets The Compassionate Athlete and Compassionate Choices:

http://vegan outreach.org/CA.pdf

“I became a vegan when I was a skinny teenager. Over the next decade following a vegan diet, I gained 75 pounds and became a 2-time natural bodybuilding champion. Clearly, no meat was no problem for me.”

http://www.vegan outreach.org/cc.pdf

(see attachment below for picture of text from Compassionate Choices to be reproduced in my dissertation)

My dissertation will be published through ProQuest Information and Learning Company (PQIL), and an electronic version will be archived in the digital collection at Florida Atlantic University. The requested permission extends to any future revisions of my dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages. These rights will in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your response to this email will also confirm that your company owns the copyright to the above described material.

If these conditions meet your approval, please respond to this email indicating your approval.

Sincerely,

Lee

Lee C. Jarvis
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Management Programs
College of Business
Florida Atlantic University
lj Jarvis4@fau.edu
lj Jarvis9@gmail.com

VO copyright permissions.docx
1151 K
Hi Lee,

Thanks for contacting us. You have our approval to use the materials you indicated in this email for your dissertation.

Please let me know if I can help you with anything else!

Best,

Josie

---

Josie Moody, Office Manager
josie@veganoutreach.org
Vegan Outreach | POB 1916 | Davis CA 95617 | www.VeganOutreach.org

---

Hi again Lee,

We don’t own the rights to any of the photos we use, but here are a couple sites of pictures that use a Creative Commons License (so that other people can use them):

https://www.flickr.com/photos/mercyforanimals/sets/

https://www.flickr.com/photos/farmsanctuary1/collections/7215760455468260

Best,

Josie

---

Josie Moody, Office Manager
josie@veganoutreach.org
Vegan Outreach | POB 1916 | Davis CA 95617 | www.VeganOutreach.org
Permission to Reproduce Copyrighted Material

Lee Jarvis <ljarvis4@fau.edu>
To: lmorris@farmsanctuary.org

5/25/2016

Lindsay Morris
Senior Communications and Marketing Manager
Farm Sanctuary

Hi Lindsay,

My name is Lee Jarvis, and I am completing a doctoral dissertation at Florida Atlantic University, entitled "Moving Mountains: Animal Rights Organizations, Emotion, and Autodidactic Frame Alignment." I kindly request your permission to reprint in my dissertation excerpts from the following web pages and brochures:

http://www.farmsanctuary.org/learn/factory-farming/pigs-used-for-pork/

(see the attachment for the screenshot to be reproduced in the manuscript)


"According to the United Nations, animal agriculture generates 18 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions worldwide, including 9 percent of carbon dioxide emissions, 37 percent of methane emissions and 65 percent of nitrous oxide emissions. The Worldwatch Institute has suggested that these numbers are extremely conservative."

My dissertation will be published through ProQuest Information and Learning Company (PQIL), and an electronic version will be archived in the digital collection at Florida Atlantic University. The requested permission extends to any future revisions of my dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages. These rights will in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your response to this email will also confirm that your company owns the copyright to the above described material.

If these conditions meet your approval, please respond to this email indicating your approval.

Sincerely,
Lee

Lee C. Jarvis
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Management Programs
College of Business
Florida Atlantic University
ljarvis4@fau.edu
ljarvis9@gmail.com
Hello, Lee. One question: Will you be using the photos as well?

Lindsay Morris
Senior Marketing & Communications Manager

281-714-0853

Connect with Farm Sanctuary:
Facebook | Twitter | YouTube | FarmSanctuary.org

From: ljarvis9@gmail.com [mailto:ljarvis9@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Lee Jarvis
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 1:11 PM
To: Lindsay Morris
Subject: Permission to Reproduce Copyrighted Material

Hi Lindsay,

Yes, I was planning on using the photos as well. Does Farm Sanctuary have the rights to those images?

Best,
Lee

[Quoted text hidden]
Lindsay Morris <lmorris@farmsanctuary.org>
To: Lee Jarvis <ljarvis4@fau.edu>

Thu, May 26, 2016 at 7:23 PM

Hello, Lee. I approve of the excerpt use, however, we do need for you to sign the attached to receive permission to use the pig photos.

Thank you.

Lindsay Morris
Senior Marketing & Communications Manager

281-714-0853

Connect with Farm Sanctuary:
Facebook | Twitter | YouTube | FarmSanctuary.org

From: ljarvis9@gmail.com [mailto:ljarvis9@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Lee Jarvis
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 1:11 PM
To: Lindsay Morris
Subject: Permission to Reproduce Copyrighted Material

5/26/2016

[Quoted text hidden]

Content License Agreement_ljarvis.docx
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Lee Jarvis <ljarvis4@fau.edu>
To: Lindsay Morris <lmorris@farmsanctuary.org>

Thu, May 26, 2016 at 7:30 PM

Hi Lindsay,

Attached is a scan of the last page of the agreement with my signature.

Thanks so much for your help!

Best,
Lee

[Quoted text hidden]

Jarvis photo permissions.pdf
287K
Content License Agreement

This Content License Agreement is entered into by and between Farm Sanctuary, Inc. (hereafter “Farm Sanctuary”), a Delaware not-for-profit corporation, and Licensee, who has requested permission from Farm Sanctuary to use certain of Farm Sanctuary’s photographs, videos, written content or other materials (collectively, the “Licensed Content”).

1. Licensed Content: Farm Sanctuary has agreed to grant Licensee permission to use the following particular Licensed Content pursuant to the terms of this Agreement:

- Shortly before piglets are born, sows are moved to “farrowing crates” where the piglets will be nursed. The crates, meant to separate the mother from the piglets to avoid crushing, are restrictive to the point that the mother pig can only stand and lie down — she cannot even turn around to see her piglets.

- At only 17–20 days old, the piglets are taken away from their mothers and undergo a series of mutilations, including being castrated and having a portion of their tails removed without any sort of pain relief. The piglets spend the next 6 months of their lives confined to pens until they reach “market weight”: they are then trucked to slaughter.
2. **License fee**: $ 0.00 (for non-commercial use).

Any fees due to Farm Sanctuary must be paid upon the execution of this Agreement. Any annual renewal fee for commercial use is due to Farm Sanctuary within two (2) weeks of the anniversary date of the execution of this Agreement by Licensee.

3. **Length of license**: Licensee may use the Licensed Content until such time as this Agreement is revoked by Farm Sanctuary. Farm Sanctuary reserves the right to revoke this License. For revocation caused by Licensee’s breach of this Agreement, Licensee is not entitled to any refund of any fees paid. For revocation for any other reason, Farm Sanctuary shall reimburse Licensee a pro-rata portion of the fee paid for annual use based on the date of revocation. Upon revocation, Licensee will cease to use Farm Sanctuary’s Licensed Content in any further printed publications (except that any content used in pre-existing printed materials may still be distributed by Licensee) and to remove any Licensed Content from websites and social media pages, if permission to post said Licensed Content has been granted based on this Agreement.

4. **Scope of license**: License may use the Licensed Content in the following manner: Content will be published through ProQuest Information and Learning Company (PQIL), and an electronic version will be archived in the digital collection at Florida Atlantic University. The requested permission extends to any future revisions of dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages.

5. **Alteration of Content**: Licensee shall make no alteration of Licensed Content other than cropping for technical quality, provided that the editorial integrity of the Licensed Content is not compromised.

6. **Transferability**: Licensee shall have no right to transfer or assign Licensee’s rights under this Agreement and shall have no right to sublicense the use of any of the Licensed Content.

7. **Exclusivity**: Farm Sanctuary reserve the right to grant other licensees the right to use the same Licensed Content. Thus, Licensee’s right to use the Licensed Content is non-exclusive.

8. **Credit**: Licensee must credit each individual Licensed Content item in the following manner immediately below the reproduction of each item:

   "© [insert year of production] Farm Sanctuary, Inc."

In addition if Licensed Content of any type is used in any audio visual production, credit shall be listed in the end credits of said production in an equal size and comparable placement to other such credits provided in said production and in the following format.

   "[Name of Content] [insert year of production] ©, supplied by Farm Sanctuary, Inc."
9. **Notice of Violations**: Licensee will immediately notify Farm Sanctuary if it becomes aware or suspects that any third party has gained access to the Licensed Materials through Licensee, is wrongfully using the Licensed Materials, or is violating any of Farm Sanctuary’s intellectual property rights, including but not limited to trademarks, trade names and copyrights.

10. **Miscellaneous Provisions**:

   10.1 **Reservation of Rights**: All rights which are not expressly granted by Farm Sanctuary to Licensee pursuant to this Agreement are specifically reserved by Farm Sanctuary. Except as expressly set forth in this Agreement, nothing contained herein shall be deemed to convey or transfer to Licensee any ownership interest, including copyright, in or to the Licensed Content.

   10.2 **Severability**: If one or more of the provisions contained in this Agreement is found to be invalid, illegal or unenforceable in any respect, the validity, legality and enforceability of the remaining provisions hereof shall not be affected thereby.

   10.3 **Waiver**: No action of Farm Sanctuary, other than an express written waiver, may be construed as a waiver of any provision of this Agreement. A delay on the part of Farm Sanctuary in the exercise of any rights or remedies provided herein or by law shall not operate as a waiver of such rights or remedies, and a single or partial exercise by Farm Sanctuary of any right or remedy will not preclude other or future exercise of that or any other right or remedy. A waiver of a right or remedy on one occasion will not be construed as a bar or waiver of rights or remedies on any other occasion.

   10.4 **Entire Agreement**: This Agreement contains the entire, complete, final and exclusive agreement between the Parties with respect to the subject matter of this Agreement, supersedes all prior written agreements and negotiations and oral understandings, if any, and may not be amended, supplemented or discharged, except by an instrument in writing signed by both parties. No agreement, statement or promise not contained in this Agreement shall be valid and binding.

   10.5 **Counterparts**: This Agreement may be executed in two or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same.

   10.6 **Captions**: Captions of the sections of this Agreement are for convenience and reference only. The words in the captions in no way explain, modify, amplify or interpret this Agreement.
10.7 **Governing Law**: This Agreement will be governed in all respects by the laws of the State of California, without reference to its laws relating to conflicts of law. Any disputes arising from or related to this Agreement or its enforceability, or the business relationship between the parties, may be brought only in the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

This Agreement is duly executed by each party’s representatives duly authorized:

**FARM SANCTUARY, INC.**

[Signature]

Drew L. Alexis  
General Counsel & Chief People Officer

**LICENSEE**

[Signature]

Date Signed: 5/26/16
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