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ABSTRACT

Our research examines how social movement organizations strategically frame their commercial activities. We present findings from a seven-year case study of a Sicilian anti-racket social movement organization that attempts to eradicate the practice of extortion payments to the Mafia by providing local tourism services. We bridge strategic and interactional theories of frame development to show the process by which a social movement organization entering in a new industry can develop frames that resonate with both industry actors and activists. Our findings show that original anti-racket social movement frames were modified through a process of strategic frame brokerage that incorporated, through interaction, the distributed interpretations of tourists, tourism service providers, and anti-racket activists. As a result of this process, original social movement frames were retained, transformed, or managed through selective referral. We discuss implications for research on strategic and interactional perspectives on framing, social enterprise, and commercialization as a “mobilizing technology” for social movements.
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Walking around Palermo, the capital of Sicily, it is not uncommon to meet groups of international students and other tourists wearing the brightly colored t-shirts of Addiopizzo Travel (AT), a Sicilian social movement organization. AT is a tour operator founded in 2009 to advance the goals of the local anti-racket movement, which seeks to end the payment of protection money (called *pizzo*), a longstanding Mafia extortion scheme that historically involved over ninety percent of Sicilian businesses (Santino, 2010). AT tours tell the stories and history of the movement while bringing tourists to visit and support local businesses, such as hotels and restaurants, that defy the *pizzo*, thereby mobilizing tourists to support the movement’s fight against the Mafia.

In recent years, AT has achieved significant commercial success and simultaneously received praise from anti-racket movement activists. At its founding, however, AT struggled to attract even those tourists and tourism service partners who demonstrated an interest in responsible tourism. Tourists perceived AT’s communication, which relied heavily on the impassioned rhetoric of the anti-racket movement, as confusing, off-putting, and even threatening. “We were activists, so we thought and communicated as activists. We did not know about the market.” (AT Entrepreneur#1). In response, AT considered adapting its products and communication to meet tourists’ expectations, but anti-racket activists saw such potential changes as superficial and divergent from the movement’s values. So, AT’s founders asked themselves, “We must have an entrepreneurial approach and be customer-oriented, but how can we meet the demands of the market without betraying the anti-racket movement?” (AT Entrepreneur#4)

Social movements influence markets via contentious tactics that target specific businesses (McDonnell, King, & Soule, 2015; van Dyke, Soule, & Taylor, 2004), as well as entire industries (Hiatt, Sine, & Tolbert, 2009; King & Pearce, 2010). Movements also indirectly support preferred products and markets through cultural entrepreneurship (Weber,
Heinze, & DeSoucey, 2008), and institutional support (Sine & Lee, 2009). Yet some social movement organizations intervene in markets by directly selling goods or services that enact movement ideology (Akemu, Whiteman, & Kennedy, 2016). For instance, anti-poverty activists founded the fair-trade organization Cafédirect, which sells coffee grown by farmers in the developing world, thus creating an alternative supply chain that operates according to anti-poverty principles (Davies, Doherty, & Knox, 2010). Similarly, evangelical activists have provided lodging and recreation services (Zald & Denton, 1963), grange activists have entered insurance (Schneiberg, King, & Smith, 2008), and environmental activists have entered fields such as banking (Almandoz, Lee, & Marquis, 2017) and construction (Henn & Hoffman, 2013). Rather than influence markets through conventional, external tactics, these social movement organizations directly join and participate in the market system.

A central challenge faced by social movement organizations that engage in commercial activity is the presence of interpretive pressures associated with different supporter groups. These social movement organizations operate at a nexus of interpretations: to gain broad support, their commercial activities must resonate with supporters influenced both by the prevailing schema of the social movements from which they emanate (Benford & Snow, 2000) and the commercial industries (Lounsbury, Ventresca, & Hirsch, 2003) into which they enter. As these activities are both ideological and commercial in nature, they may be unfamiliar to supporters and misaligned with these schema, resulting in incomplete or contested interpretations. Social movement organizations may address interpretive conflict or confusion by engaging in strategic framing that selectively highlights certain aspects and meanings of their activities (Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1986; Benford & Snow, 2000), yet little is known about how social movement organizations frame their commercial activities to resonate simultaneously with industry and social movement supporters. In this
paper, therefore, we ask: *how does a social movement organization entering an existing industry frame its commercial activities?*

We explored this question through a case study of AT and the framing of its commercial activities, drawing on interviews, observations, and archives from 2009 to 2016. Our results suggest that to frame their commercial activities to resonate with both industry actors and social movement activists, leaders of a social movement organization need to lead a strategic frame brokerage process consisting of interactions through which meanings are shared among movement activists and industry actors. We find that AT followed a process of strategic frame brokerage in which it transposed frames from the social movement, then engaged in interactive search and validation that assessed their resonance with multiple supporter groups and identified opportunities for frame transformation. Based on our observations, we identified three framing strategies resulting from frame brokerage: some frames were retained, others transformed, and still others used for selective referral for education and mobilization by other parts of the movement. The frames resulting from these strategies were then operationalized in the development of new commercial activities.

Overall, our paper sheds light on the process by which mutually resonant frames may be developed by social movement organizations for their commercial activities. We thereby contribute to research in three specific areas. First, our work advances a new process model of strategic frame brokerage that combines both strategic (Snow et al, 1986) and interactional (Gray, Purdy, & Ansari, 2015) mechanisms of frame development. While previous research has described frame development as either a “top-down” process dependent on the agency of strategic framing actors (e.g. Snow et al. 1986) or a “bottom-up” emergent, interactional process (Gray, Purdy, & Ansari, 2015), our model of frame brokerage is characterized by an interplay of these perspectives. In our model, social movement organizations strategically broker the social construction of frames that occurs through the distributed interpretations and
interactions of supporter groups. We thus answer calls for research that incorporates interactional mechanisms in the study of strategic framing (Oliver & Johnston, 2000; Polletta & Kai Ho, 2006).

Second, our findings contribute to the literature on social enterprise (Battilana & Lee, 2014) by demonstrating the importance of interactive and interpretive processes for social enterprises that align their goals with a broader social movement. While previous work has defined social enterprises’ social missions according to higher-level institutional logics (Pache & Santos, 2013), our study suggests that these ideals are socially constructed through interaction with broader collective action efforts and their associated frames. An interpretive perspective thus has important implications for issues such as mission drift (Battilana, Sengul, Pache, & Model, 2015) which may be forestalled by ex ante, interactive framing involving interaction with multiple supporter groups. We thus respond to repeated calls for research that makes use of social movement concepts to gain insight into the functioning of social enterprises (Dacin, Dacin & Tracey 2011; York, Hargrave & Pacheco, 2016).

Third and finally, our research sheds new light upon direct engagement in commercial activity as a “mobilizing technology” for social movement organizations (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004). While the social movement literature has generally emphasized the mobilization of social movement support on an ideological basis (Snow & Benford, 1988), our study illustrates how interpretive processes may enable use of commerce to mobilize supporters to advance movement goals. Our findings also provide insight into how the nature of mobilization realized via commercial transactions may differ from mobilization for activities within the traditional social movement repertoire. We discuss the potential of commercial transactions to mobilize unconventional bases of movement support, as well as the consequences of commercialization for social movement organizations and activism in general.
THEORETICAL CONTEXT

Strategic and Interactional Framing Processes in Social Movement Organizations

A social movement organization is a “complex, or formal, organization which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement… and attempts to implement those goals” (McCarthy & Zald, 1977: 1218). Pursuit of movement goals typically relies on mobilization of tangible and intangible resources, such as people, money, and legitimacy, from external supporters (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004). Early studies of social movement organizations explained resource mobilization as resulting from the structure of incentives that accrue to supporters when a movement’s goals are realized (Jenkins, 1983; see also Olson, 1965). The nature of mobilizing incentives may differ among groups of supporters. For instance, a movement might simultaneously gain the support of an aggrieved group that will materially benefit from realization of the movement’s goals (Morris, 1981) while other “conscience constituents” may be mobilized by ideological alignment with the movement (McCarthy & Zald, 1977).

Beginning in the 1980s, researchers shifted attention to interpretive processes underlying mobilization, and specifically the interpretive frames by which potential supporters make sense of social movement organizations and their activities (Snow et al., 1986). Frames are “schemata of interpretation” (Goffman, 1974) that draw potential supporters’ attention towards certain elements of situations (Williams & Benford, 2000), hence “demarcating and punctuating” these elements as meaningful (Polletta & Kai Ho, 2006). Effective frames satisfy multiple functions in the psychology of mobilization, or core “framing tasks,” each associated with a stage of the interpretive process: diagnosis of a social problem and its causes; prognosis of possible solutions, including actions and tactics by which these solutions might be achieved; and motivation to act to bring about these solutions.
Achievement of complex social movement goals frequently requires broad support, and movements therefore require “collective action frames” capable of mobilizing a diverse coalition of supporters (Snow & Benford, 1988; Cornelissen & Werner, 2014).

A central concern of framing research is the process by which collective action frames develop (Snow et al., 1986). Previous studies of this process have followed two main perspectives: strategic (Snow et al., 1986; Snow & Benford, 1992) and interactional (Goffman, 1974; Gray et al., 2015). Strategic framing theorists emphasize the agency of social movement organizations and their leaders (Snow & Benford, 1988; Oliver & Johnston, 2000) to deliberately frame their activities in ways that are likely to resonate with potential supporters and thus elicit support (Benford & Snow, 2000). To achieve resonance, strategic framing actors attempt to modify existing movement frames to fit the existing interpretive frameworks of desired supporters, through various “frame alignment” processes: strategic amplification of existing movement frames, extension of these frames to encompass supporter interests, linkage of these frames to the frames held by supporters, and the transformation of existing frames into novel frames (Snow et al., 1986). Some strategic framing researchers argue that mobilization success is significantly determined by the skill with which leaders of social movement organizations implement these processes (Fiss & Zajac, 2006; Snow et al., 1986).

While the strategic framing perspective is prevalent in framing research (see Cornelissen & Werner, 2014), scholars have also called for greater attention to the role of interaction in “bottom-up” processes of social construction, in contrast to the “top-down” perspective of strategic framing (Benford, 1997; Gray et al., 2015). The interactionist approach builds on symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1971) to portray frame development as resulting from repeated interaction among collective actors (Collins, 2004). While
acknowledging that existing frames shared among social movement organizations and potential supporters might accelerate the convergence of interpretations among different actors (Snow & Benford, 1992), interactionists view frames as likely to transform in the course of repeated interaction, via processes of keying and lamination (Goffman, 1974; Gray et al., 2015). Keying consists of reinterpretation of activities originally associated with existing collective frames, leading to the assignment of new meanings to these activities, which may be subsequently laminated to existing frames (Goffman, 1974), resulting in frame transformation (Snow & Benford, 1988). Changes in a social movement organization’s activities or supporters may also occasion new keyings and laminations, and thereby accelerate the processes by which collective action frames are transformed (Gray et al., 2015).

Framing scholars generally accept the importance of both strategic and interactional perspectives (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014), but enabling conditions for either process may not always exist. For instance, strategic framing depends on the ability of strategic framing actors to anticipate the interpretations of supporters (Snow et al., 1986), but these interpretations may not be evident to social movement organizations ex ante, particularly for novel or innovative activities that with features unfamiliar according to existing frames. Interactive frame development processes depend on repeated interactions among supporter groups (Gray et al., 2015), but social or structural separations may prevent such interactions from occurring. How strategic and interactive mechanisms might co-exist or complement each other under such circumstances, however, remains largely unexplained.

The Framing Challenge of Social Movement Organizations Engaged in Commercial Activities
Framing research has traditionally focused on organizations engaged in contentious tactics (Polletta & Kai Ho, 2006), but framing is also important for social movement organizations engaged directly in commercial activities (Akemu, Whiteman, & Kennedy, 2016; Sine & Lee, 2009). Social movement organizations engage in the direct sale of products or services that enact movement ideology as a means to broaden movement participation (Zald & Denton, 1963), but in doing so, they must reconcile how their activities are interpreted by the social movement and its activists, on the one hand, and industry actors, on the other. Such interpretive processes play a central role in the success or failure of a social movement’s foray into commerce (McInerny, 2014).

Critical to the framing of commercial activities are the existing frames that guide how social movement activists and industry actors interpret activities in their respective domains. Social movement activists interpret movement activities in terms of the existing frames used by the broader movement to compel collective action (Benford & Snow, 2000). By contrast, customers, partners, and other industry actors interpret commercial activities in terms of industry field frames, or “social structures of meanings and resources that underpin and stabilize practices and social organization” (Lounsbury et al., 2003). Industry field frames and collective action frames are likely to assign different meanings to a movement’s commercial activities due to their emergence from different commercial and collective contexts, respectively (Khaire & Wadhwani, 2010). Industry actors, accordingly, are likely to view a social movement organization’s commercial activities according to industry field frames that define accepted roles, normative and technical standards for products and services, and standards of evaluation, whereas activists are likely to view these according to collective action frames developed in the context of other social movement activities.

Social movement entrepreneurs are motivated to act strategically frame their activities to resonate with both supporters influenced both by the prevailing schema of the social
movements from which they emanate (Benford & Snow, 2000) and the commercial industries (Lounsbury, Ventresca, & Hirsch, 2003) into which they enter. Yet the commercial activities of social movement organizations may be unfamiliar to supporters and misaligned with these schema, resulting in incomplete or contested interpretations. Such initially ambiguous circumstances might require bottom-up, interactive frame development (Oliver & Johnston, 2000), but the emergence of frames through interaction between activists and industry actors is uncertain, particularly if consumption is episodic and not repeated. Social movement organizations engaged in strategic framing of their commercial activities therefore face the challenge, therefore, of strategically guiding the emergent, social construction of mutually-resonant frames.

**METHOD**

To answer our research question, we conducted an in-depth, longitudinal case study (Langley, 1999) of Addiopizzo Travel (AT), a social movement organization founded in 2009 by a group of anti-racket activists to support local anti-racket businesses. AT designed, sold and delivered tourism services in collaboration with other tour operators and travel agencies that exclusively patronized anti-racket businesses, thereby attempting to attract tourists to Sicily. By bringing tourists to visit and support these businesses, AT sought to create incentives for adoption of anti-racket policies and advancing the movement’s goal of eradicating Mafia racketeering. During its founding process, AT faced simultaneous pressures to adopt the frames of the anti-racket movement and the industry field frames of the responsible tourism industry. In the following sections, we briefly describe the characteristics of the movement from which AT emerged and the responsible tourism industry into which it entered. We then detail our research methodology.

**Empirical Context: The Anti-Racket Movement and Responsible Tourism Industry**
Criminal organizations worldwide practice racketeering and extortion to extract financial resources and control the territory where they operate (Misangyi, Weaver, & Elms, 2008). The Mafia, the most powerful and pervasive criminal organization in the Italian region of Sicily (Dia, 2005), has historically exercised its control through a system of extortion called *pizzo* (the Sicilian term for the practice of paying protection money) (Lodato, 2007). Few business owners resisted the *pizzo* prior to the emergence of a nascent anti-racket movement in Sicily in the early 1990s (Forno & Gunnarson, 2009). Yet initial efforts to draw attention to the *pizzo* and prosecute Mafia members failed, and in some cases whistleblowers suffered violent retaliation from Mafia agents (Santino, 2010). Such events reinforced the view among business owners that resistance to the *pizzo* was prohibitively dangerous. In the early 2000s, almost 90% of Sicilian entrepreneurs continued to pay it, resulting in reduced profitability and reinforcing Mafia control (Dia, 2005).

A more organized anti-racket social movement emerged in the early 2000s in Palermo, the Sicilian capital. The renewed movement mobilized a network of anti-racket entrepreneurs, business owners, and customers based on a rationale that organized mass resistance could protect local entrepreneurs against violence and give them confidence to resist Mafia pressure (Santino, 2010). In 2005, the movement introduced an anti-racket certification, called “Addiopizzo” (literally “goodbye protection money”): Sicilian firms and shopkeepers that obtained the Addiopizzo certification publicly committed to refusing to pay the *pizzo* and thus signaled their support for the movement. Simultaneously, anti-racket activists began to publicly call on civil society and consumers to challenge the *pizzo* by giving business to shops with Addiopizzo certification and also physically protecting them from Mafia retaliation (Santino, 2010). To mobilize these civil society and consumer supporters, the anti-racket movement framed its activities in terms of a strongly defined set of...
values—“desirable, trans-situational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in people’s lives” (Schwartz, 1996: 2; Vaccaro & Palazzo, 2015). These values used as frames are summarized in Table 1.

+++++++ Insert Table 1 around here ++++++++ 

The anti-racket movement’s value-based framing proved highly effective in mobilizing collective action among members of Sicilian society (Vaccaro & Palazzo, 2015), and the movement achieved early success in organizing resistance to the pizzo. At the end of 2006, one year after the introduction of the Addiopizzo certification, the movement had received public declarations of support of hundreds of activists, 12 nonprofit associations, 136 pizzo-free certified businesses, and 8,269 responsible consumers who explicitly declared their willingness to buy only from certified pizzo-free shops and firms. The movement grew quickly, and by 2009, it involved 419 businesses holding the anti-racket certification and could rely on thousands of activists, 18 associations, and 9,972 responsible consumers. It also received support and collaboration from the Sicilian police, the local chamber of commerce, schools, universities, and industry associations. Refusal to pay the pizzo was perceived as an increasingly viable option by Sicilian businesses due to broad support for Addiopizzo, particularly in Palermo (Santino, 2010).

Despite the high visibility and impact of their political organizing and certification, members of the anti-racket movement viewed its potential influence as limited by the local scope of its constituency of supporters. In 2009, a group of anti-racket activists launched AT as a new social movement organization with the specific objective of mobilizing the responsible tourism industry to support businesses in the anti-racket network and thus eradicate Mafia influence.

The responsible tourism industry. The responsible tourism industry is comprised of tourism companies—tour operators, travel agencies, hotels, B&Bs and restaurants—that
provide tourism services and initiatives that, while being enjoyable and pleasant, also aim at the protection and development of host communities and their cultural and environmental heritage (Stanford, 2008). Organized as a side event alongside the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, the Cape Town Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations issued a declaration defining such tourism as an attempt to create “better places for people to live in and better places for people to visit.” Now widely accepted as the founding document of the industry worldwide, this declaration defined responsible tourism as a field that would responsibly manage tourism’s economic, social, and environmental impacts, favoring positive and meaningful interactions between responsible tourists and local communities. The responsible tourism industry has grown significantly larger in recent decades (Lee, Jan, & Yang, 2013). As in other developed countries, in Italy it has developed as a branch of the traditional tourism industry, mainly focusing on initiatives, such as eco-tourism and community-based tourism, that prioritize cultural preservation and environmentalism (Del Chiappa, Grappi, & Romani, 2016).

**Data Collection**

To address our research question, we conducted a 7-year field study. We learned of plans for the creation of AT and began collecting data in July 2009, a few months before its official founding, and continued through September 2016. At different points in our study timeline (Patton, 2002), we conducted 73 semi-structured interviews of AT’s entrepreneurs, responsible tourism actors (tourists and tourism service providers such as travel agents, hoteliers, and restaurateurs), and anti-racket movement activists. We focused on these external actors because of their critical role in influencing AT communication strategy. Indeed activists were motivated by the social movement frames and pressed AT to communicate its activities coherently with the movement’s purposes of challenging the pizzo. Sharing the responsible tourism frames, customers and tourism service providers pressured
AT to present its initiatives as pleasant, enjoyable and impactful as required by this industry frames. We also engaged in 41 days of naturalistic observation of actors, events, and activities of AT and of the anti-racket movement. We supplemented our interview and observational data with data on the internal and external communications of AT (224 documents) and the anti-racket movement (443 documents), previous scholarly accounts of the anti-racket movement (15 documents), and reports produced by AT tourists (42 documents). Table 2 provides further detail on our data sources.

+++++++ Insert Table 2 around here +++++++

**Semi-structured interviews.** Our semi-structured interviews with AT entrepreneurs, responsible tourism industry actors, and anti-racket activists each lasted between one half-hour and two hours. When possible, interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. We interviewed all six AT entrepreneurs, including the three who founded the social movement organization and three who joined later, as well as five anti-racket activists not formally affiliated with AT. Finally, we conducted phone interviews with actors of the responsible tourism industry: five tourism service providers with longstanding partnerships with AT and seven tourists randomly selected from AT’s database.

Our interviews followed an initial protocol reflecting our research question (Alvesson, 2003) that we adapted to the characteristics of different informants and to the theoretical constructs that emerged over the course of our research. In our first stage of data collection, the protocol focused on investigating the main challenges AT faced in attempting to develop business activities that would simultaneously satisfy both responsible tourism and the anti-racket movement. The key role of responsible tourists, tourism service providers, and AT’s communications to these groups emerged at this stage, leading us to collect additional data focused on these themes. In particular, we noticed that tourists and tourism service providers had a common understanding and similar expectations about AT’s activities and that AT
communicated with both using the same strategy. We henceforth adapted our interview protocol to ask AT’s entrepreneurs to reflect and comment on i) how they communicated their activities to render them meaningful to tourists and tourism service providers, and ii) how and why they changed their communication over time. We also interviewed tourists, tourism service providers, and anti-racket activists to understand the expectations they had before working or traveling with AT and how they interacted with AT.

**Naturalistic observation.** We also collected observational data during key events of the anti-racket movement in Sicily and the evolution of AT. One of the authors participated periodically in anti-racket movement events and meetings in Sicily beginning in the early 2000s, and prior to the founding of AT, attended formal and informal meetings with the entrepreneurs who were discussing whether to establish the organization and its provisional strategy. After AT’s founding in 2009, two of the authors observed AT activities during board meetings, office hours, and tours. These observations provided us with a richer understanding of the context for the evolution of AT.

**Archival data.** To increase internal and external reliability of our analysis, we used data from archival sources such as records provided to us by AT, media articles, and snapshots of the AT website captured over time.

**Data Analysis**

Consistent with the tenets of grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), we analyzed the data following an inductive and interactive approach that included three recursive steps (Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013).

**Step 1: Empirical themes.** In the first step of data analysis, we performed open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990: 61) to identify key empirical themes that described how AT communicated its activities and interacted with external actors. In particular, we noticed that AT initially designed and communicated its tourism offerings to the responsible tourism...
industry (i.e. tourists and tourism service providers) relying extensively on some values used by the anti-racket social movement as frames—“security,” “dignity,” “denunciation,” and “community”. Table 3 shows how the anti-racket movement used these frames to mobilize support.

We further noticed that over time, certain of these original anti-racket values progressively disappeared from AT communication, while others—“environmentalism,” “sustainability,” and “beauty”—began to emerge. For instance, “security” was extensively used in AT’s early communication, between 2009 and 2010, and then disappeared. Instead, from 2013 onward, AT began using “sustainability” to explain to tourists the impact of the pizzo on local businesses and the role that AT and responsible tourists could have in addressing it.

Open coding of our data also enabled us to recognize that changes in framing appeared to be systematically related to interactions between AT and either responsible tourism industry actors or anti-racket movement activists. In these interactions, AT was responsive to observations regarding whether their present communications resonated with these two groups. However, at this stage of analysis it was still not clear how to make theoretical sense of our empirical themes and, more broadly, of AT’s communication strategy. Hence, we entered into a second stage of data analysis aimed at organizing the empirical themes we identified into more theoretically anchored conceptual categories. Our aim was to deepen our theoretical understanding of a) AT communication, and b) how and why it changed over time.

**Step 2a. Conceptual categories. Characterizing AT communication: using values as frames.** In this second stage of data analysis, we adopted a more abductive approach, moving back and forth between our data and research on framing in social movements (Snow & Benford, 1988; Gamson & Lasch, 1983) and, specifically, on frame analysis (e.g. Creed,
Frame analysis led us to recognize that some values that the social movement used to frame its activities—security, dignity, sustainability, beauty, environmentalism, denunciation, and community—were used also by AT as “frames”—that is, as unifying concepts that hold together and give coherence to a package of integrated idea elements that compose a text (Creed et al., 2002). To identify connections among different idea elements that characterized the texts AT produced, we followed the frame identification methodology introduced by Gamson and Lasch (1983) and further developed by Creed and colleagues (2002). Following this approach, we constructed a signature matrix to sort different idea elements into the following eight categories: metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions, visual images, roots, consequences, and appeals to principles (Gamson & Lasch, 1983). In this way, we realized that the aforementioned values could be coded as frames because each held together and gave meaning to different idea elements and associated categories that referred to the pizzo social problem. Table 4 shows the signature matrix for the values AT used as frames.

For example, we applied frame analysis to the following statement on the AT website advertising a tour in Corleone, a small village well known as the hometown of some Mafia bosses:

Surprising Corleone: Discover this picturesque village in the middle of Sicily…its green hills that stretch out as far as the eye can see and the warm hospitality of local people who fight the racketeers….The name of this village is sadly linked to Mafia violence. We invite you to discover the real Corleone, beyond clichés and stereotypes. The guided tour will show you the real beauty of Corleone: the anti-Mafia efforts of locals and its astonishing landscapes. (AT website, 2015)

Frame analysis enabled us to code beauty as the frame underling the idea elements contained in six categories presented in the aforementioned text. Beauty is the overarching concept holding together metaphors (astonishing landscapes), exemplars (locals who fight
against the Mafia), catchphrases (Corleone beyond clichés), roots (racketeers’ violence), consequences (Corleone trapped in a negative cliché), and depiction (the warm hospitality of local people who fight the Mafia) associated with the pizzo problem.

With frame analysis, we also realized that AT used the frames to i) characterize the pizzo as a problematic issue; ii) articulate a proposed solution to it; and iii) expose a rationale for engaging in corrective action. In other words, AT used categories and underlying frames to accomplish three framing tasks: i) **diagnostic framing**, “identification of a problem and the attribution of blame or causality” (Snow & Benford, 1988: 200); ii) **prognostic framing**, whose purpose is “not only to suggest solutions to the problem but also to identify strategies, tactics and targets” (Snow & Benford, 1988: 2001; and iii) **motivational framing**, “elaboration of a call to arms” (Snow & Benford, 1988: 202). In the example of the Corleone tour, the diagnostic framing is that the Mafia is creating a negative image of Corleone that obscures the beauty of the village. The prognostic framing is the support of local entrepreneurs who fight against the racketeers that causes this negative image. The motivational framing is that tourists can visit Corleone to discover the real beauty of the village.

**Step 2b. Conceptual categories. How and why AT changed its communication over time.** The comparison of our data with existing literature on strategic (Snow et al., 1986) and interactional (Gray et al., 2015) approaches to framing in social movements (Snow & Benford, 1988) led us to recognize that AT changed the frames it used in its communication following a process of search and validation that involved the engagement of responsible tourism actors—tourists and tourism service providers—and anti-racket activists. Through interaction with these different audiences, AT i) validated its frames’ resonance with industry actors and activists, and at times ii) searched for new frames that could more effectively resonate with its audiences. A frame’s resonance and consequent validation with tourists and tourism service providers such as tour operators, travel agencies, and hoteliers depended on
three mechanisms: i) narrative fidelity, the consistency of a frame with the dominant narrative and assumptions of a domain (Benford & Snow, 2000); ii) consistency with SMO’s activities, the congruence between a social movement organization’s claims and its actions (Benford & Snow, 2000); and iii) empirical credibility, the “apparent fit between the framings and the events in the world” (Benford & Snow, 2000: 620). With anti-racket activists, the resonance and validation of each frame depended on its perceived consistency with the social movement’s ideology.

Frame search followed two distinct but connected processes identified by previous interactionist research: keying (Goffman, 1974) and lamination (Gray et al., 2015). Keying is the process whereby “a given activity, one already meaningful in terms of primary frameworks, is transformed into something patterned on this activity but seen by participants to be something quite else” (Goffman, 1974: 43-44). Thus, keying may surface new meanings associated with a particular activity that diverge from the connotations of prevailing frames (Goffman, 1974). Given this definition, we identified keying when AT entrepreneurs involved tourists, tourism service providers and activists in a systematic process of reinterpretation of its activities that generated the emerge of new meanings associated with AT’s activities that were different than those intended by AT’s original frames. For instance, whereas visits to certified anti-racket businesses were originally framed by AT as meaningful because of the physical security they provided to these businesses, we identified keying when AT entrepreneurs, tourists, tourism service providers and activists interpreted systematically this same activity as meaningful because of the financial support they provided.

Lamination is the process of adding upon an original frame a new interpretation that has emerged through keying (Goffman, 1974; see also Gray et al, 2015), leading to frame transformation (Goffman, 1974: 82). We therefore identified lamination whenever AT layered a new interpretation of an activity that resulted from keying upon an original frame
related to that activity. For instance, referring to patronage of anti-racket businesses, AT performed lamination when it transformed security into sustainability, as the latter frame added the newly-keyed interpretation of financial support upon the meaning connoted by the original security frame, thus transforming it.

**Step 3: Aggregate dimensions and process model development.** Once a complete set of conceptual categories had been developed, we moved to more deliberate theorizing intended to aggregate categories in an empirically grounded model (Gioia et al., 2013) that explained the emergence of frames for AT’s activities and AT’s role in this process. We realized that AT first operationalized some frames they had transposed directly from the anti-racket movement. Then frames were revised through cycles of search and validation involving direct interaction e with actors of the anti-racket movement and the responsible tourism industry. As a result, AT retained some frames, transformed other frames and selectively referred to some other frames. Figure 1 shows the data structure.

+++++++ Insert Figure 1 around here ++++

**FINDINGS**

**The Founding of AT as a Responsible Tourism Travel Agency**

The anti-racket activists who founded AT envisioned it as an “extension in the business and tourism sector of the anti-racket movement” (AT Entrepreneur #3, interview) that would advance the goals of the movement by attracting tourists to Sicily and guiding them to support businesses that defied the pizzo. This would make defiance of the pizzo more appealing and create opportunities for anti-racket businesses within the responsible tourism industry:

Dear friends, you are all invited to the launch of AT: a new tour operator that organizes ethical tours to support those who say “No to the Mafia.” The idea is simple: [tourists] can become consumers who support pizzo-free businesses and in this way join the anti-racket
movement….This “pizzo-free” tourism initiative is another instrument to support anti-racket businesses. (AT inaugural press release, 2009)

AT believed that its offerings would appeal most strongly to tourists who were already predisposed to seek positive interactions with local communities. Therefore, it positioned itself as part of the responsible tourism industry:

We want to show that there is a Sicily that resists the Mafia… Our offering targets the responsible tourism sector: this is a growing market and we want to attract those responsible tourists who want something more than a relaxing holiday. (AT Entrepreneur #3, interview Italian TV-show, 2010)

To serve these customers, AT also attempted to partner with responsible tourism service providers—Sicilian restauranteurs and hoteliers, as well as other Italian and international travel agencies and tour operators—whom they expected to be attracted to AT’s social objectives and therefore have an interest in cooperation. One AT entrepreneur recalled:

A traditional tour operator would never work with us. The same for hotels and bed & breakfasts…We are not a traditional travel agency that simply sells products and services on behalf of a supplier. We are an outgrowth of the anti-racket movement. Our partners have to accept this and the idea that when they work with us it is not just about a commercial transaction, but also about trying to drive a change in society. (AT Entrepreneur#1, interview)

AT’s main tourism offerings were responsible tours of Sicily, conducted in collaboration with other anti-racket activists and businesses that defied the pizzo. Customers included both independent tourists and educational institutions seeking responsible tours. To explain their offerings to others, AT entrepreneurs initially transposed frames from the anti-racket movement – community, security, dignity, and denunciation – which had been developed and used successfully to mobilize participation in anti-racket movement activities.

AT discovered that these frames, applied to its tourism offerings, failed to resonate with potential tourists and tourism service providers. Tourists and tourism service providers instead interpreted AT’s offerings according to the alternative frames of the responsible tourism industry, which were disconnected from and sometimes inconsistent with anti-racket movement frames. This led AT entrepreneurs to engage in a process of strategic frame
brokerage that resulted in the development of new frames that resonated with industry
supporters while also remaining consistent with the ideology of the movement. The frame
brokerage process involved AT entrepreneurs, anti-racket movement activists, tourists and
tourism service providers, and led to three different framing strategies for the original,
transposed frames: first, AT retained the community frame as it was transposed from the
movement, second, it selectively referred to the original anti-racket denunciation frame; third,
AT transformed the original anti-racket frames of security and dignity into sustainability and
beauty, respectively.

By the end of 2015, six years after AT’s founding, this process of frame brokerage had
developed a stable set of frames that resonated with responsible tourists and tourism service
providers and therefore mobilized their support. The resulting frames also were perceived by
the anti-racket movement as consistent with movement ideology. AT was viewed as
commercially successful and was a point of reference in the responsible tourism industry,
“for all the tourists who want to contribute to the fight against racketeering while visiting
Palermo” (Lonely Planet Palermo, 2015: 136). Below we describe the process of frame
brokerage performed by AT.

**An Interactive Model of Strategic Frame Brokerage**

Our analysis shows that AT performed a process of frame brokerage that incorporated
industry actors and social movement activists. This process can be understood according to
the following stages: i) transposition and operationalization in commercial activities of the
original anti-racket frames, ii) validation of transposed frames, iii) (eventual) search for new
frames, iv) validation of new frames, and v) final frame operationalization.
**Transposition and operationalization of original anti-racket frames.** As long-time anti-racket activists, the AT entrepreneurs were themselves embedded in the anti-racket movement and initially used the frames of the movement to make sense of their initiatives and efforts. They therefore launched AT as an extension of the movement and transposed existing movement frames – particularly community, security, dignity and denunciation – to characterize their offerings:

As Sicilians and members of the movement, we want to make a contribution to the cultural change advanced by the social movement … When we launched AT, we thought we wanted to contribute to the growth of the anti-racket community, providing secure, pizzo-free opportunities to local entrepreneurs… we wanted to show the dignity of Sicilian people by showing that many of us work for a better Sicily and denounce extortions. (AT Entrepreneur #1, interview)

AT furthermore operationalized these frames to design their responsible tourism offerings.

For instance, in 2009-2010 AT designed offerings, building on the community frame, to enable tourists, tour operators, owners of restaurants, and B&Bs to actively participate in the Sicilian anti-racket community:

Last year [2010] we launched some events in the downtown of Palermo aimed at highlighting the achievements of our anti-racket activities … We involved tourists and many restaurants and shopkeepers we collaborate with. (AT Entrepreneur #2, interview)

During the same period, AT also applied the security frame in the design and communication of their tours. The anti-racket movement understood its role as providing physical security to businesses that defied the Mafia, and the first AT tours were intentionally designed to bring crowds of tourists to occupy the storefronts of these businesses, thus using tourists as a resource to replicate a common tactic of the movement:

If we know there is a business owner who is exposed to the Mafia, we try to be sure to organize our tours in such a way that we take tourists to their business… in this way, we try to contribute to guaranteeing the security of the entrepreneur. (AT Entrepreneur #4, interview)

Finally, AT designed tours to visit places that symbolized the dignity of locals who had publicly rebelled against the Mafia and reported extortions to the police, thus operationalizing the dignity and denunciation frames transposed from the anti-racket movement:
With our tours we show you the more authentic Sicily: a region of people who resist and hold their heads high against the Mafia … On the fourth day (The Capaci-Partinico-Cinisi tour) the tour stops in Caccamo [a village] to visit the local castle and have lunch in a pizzo-free restaurant to hear the story of the owners who denounced extortionists. (AT website: presentation of educational tours, 2010)

Validation of the original anti-racket frames. While applying the movement frames of community, security, dignity, and denunciation in its activities, AT validated them with its multiple audiences, testing whether they i) would resonate with tourists and tourism service providers (tour operators, hoteliers, and restauranteurs) and thus would favor their engagement in AT’s initiatives, and ii) were consistent with the ideology of the anti-racket movement. Only the community frame resonated with tourists and tourism service providers. By contrast, the security, dignity and denunciation frames resonated only partially with industry actors.

Validation of the original frames followed the diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing tasks articulated by Snow and Benford (1988). For instance, AT used community to diagnose the pizzo problem by suggesting that the lack of a strong community of people who rebelled against the Mafia was essential to its continued power:

The Mafia is stronger when people are left alone. They can intimidate or kill one entrepreneur, one activist, but they are powerless against a community because they can’t intimidate a mass of people.” (AT Entrepreneur #4, video during a tour, 2011)

AT also explained the consequences of Mafia defiance using the frame of denunciation, for instance by explaining that entrepreneurs who denounced extortionists to the police faced mortal danger from Mafia retaliation:

Tourists will be able to dine in a pizzeria owned by the brother of a man killed because of his stand against the Mafia (AT Entrepreneur #3, interview for the Guardian, 2009)

In the same period, AT also used the original anti-racket frames for prognosis of how AT’s activities advanced the goals of the movement. For example, AT used the security frame to explain to tourists that by physically occupying the businesses of local business-owners, they would amplify the impact of the anti-racket movement: 
We knew there was a bar owner the Mafia was intimidating and we decided to contribute to his security by modifying our Palermo tours to stop by his bar and have lunch there. We explained to our tourists that it was a way to help the entrepreneur because leaving him alone could have been dangerous. (AT Entrepreneur #2, interview)

Finally, AT extensively used the anti-racket frames to motivate the responsible tourists and tourism service providers to work with AT. AT promoted its tours as a way for tourists to become involved in the anti-racket community and discover the dignity of activists and entrepreneurs who had rebelled against Mafia extortionists:

Mafia-free tourism is a way for the responsible tourist to be involved in the fight against the Mafia. Even if you don’t live in Italy, by traveling with us, you can help the fight for an economy without corruption… We show the images of the real Sicilians who resist [the extortionists], and can hold their heads high. (AT website, 2010)

In 2011, AT entrepreneurs also interacted with activists, tourists, and tourism service providers to gauge their reactions to the frames transposed from the social movement. During early meetings, which were both formal and informal, activists expressed acceptance of AT frames, which they perceived as consistent with the movement’s ideology and its purpose of ending the pizzo:

One of the main issues for the movement is to grow, and AT is making its contribution through tourists… If you participate in AT tours, you really see that people get a sense of our community of entrepreneurs who fight against the racket and guarantee their protection. (Anti-racket Activist, interview)

However, AT received less favorable feedback from tourists, tour operators and business owners. Of the four frames transposed from the anti-racket movement, only the community frame resonated well with tourists and tourism service providers and thereby motivated them to travel and collaborate with AT. Community was effective for diagnostic framing of the pizzo problem because of its fidelity with the narrative (Benford & Snow, 2000) of the responsible tourism sector, which suggests that responsible tourists empower and strengthen local communities. Consequently, both Italian and foreign tourists came to view AT tours partly in terms of the anti-racket movement community frame, accepting that
in the Sicilian context, local prosperity required the existence of a strong anti-racket community:

We organized our first tour with AT back in 2009…During the year, we work to prepare the students for the trip: we discuss in class the role and the history of the Mafia in Sicilian society and in Italy. In this way when students go to Sicily they are well prepared, I would also say excited, to have the opportunity to really see the places and the people of the anti-racket movement. (Italian secondary school Professor, interview)

We contacted AT because we were looking for a different trip to Sicily, we wanted to know more about the locals fighting against the Mafia and to be engaged in their activities…with AT we discovered the importance of community, because when people are left alone they are more exposed to racketeers (German Tourists, interview).

The community frame was effective for prognostic purposes because tourism service providers saw it as consistent with AT’s activities (Benford & Snow, 2000) given that AT “could help the anti-racket community to grow by involving tourists” (Hotelier, interview).

Finally, community was also effective also for motivational framing because it was empirically credible (Benford & Snow, 2000) for tourists. Being largely shaped by industry field frames that required tourism to have positive local influence, tourists and service providers could visibly observe how their actions would advance the anti-racket community.

This recognition motivated them to engage with AT:

During the bus trip to the airport, the guide gave us the “AT community card.” It may seem irrational but I was touched. I felt a responsibility to be part of that network….When I went back home I spread the word to my relatives and friends: we are all responsible for fighting the Mafia. (Report of one Student to AT, 2011)

B&B and tour operators that work with us know they are not only involved in a commercial transaction but they enter in a network of players that want to drive a change in Sicily. This helps to develop better and long-term partnerships (AT Entrepreneur #2, interview)

Unlike the community frame, the security, dignity and denunciation frames generally failed to resonate with tourists and tourism service providers. To these actors, these frames and their associated meanings were unfamiliar and sometimes in conflict with their expectations. In contrast with the community frame, when used for diagnosis of the pizzo problem these frames lacked fidelity with the narrative of the responsible tourism sector. For
instance, the dignity frame was not meaningful to tourists and tour operators, who did not see
dignity as an important theme of responsible tourism:

Dignity for a Sicilian is something very important, but a tourist or a student doesn’t fully
understand its meaning. We always had to explain [dignity], but in this way it lost its power. (AT
Entrepreneur #2, interview)

The anti-racket movement frames of security, dignity and denunciation were also
viewed as inconsistent with AT’s activities when used for prognostic framing. These frames
had been effectively used in the past to explain the benefits of extended, deep anti-racket
movement campaigns that mobilized local businesses and citizens. But tourists questioned
whether tourism activities, which emphasized short-term interactions, pleasurable
experiences, and cultural exploration, were a good fit for achieving these goals. For example,
AT framed visits to businesses that defied the pizzo as ensuring the physical security of their
owners, but tourists and tourism service providers questioned whether tourism activities were
suited to this objective. One AT entrepreneur recalled:

The truth is we can’t pretend we guarantee the security of anybody…. Our tourists spend a few
days, one week maximum in Sicily. In order to guarantee security [of anti-racket businesses] we
would need to adopt the same strategy as the [anti-racket] movement: bring people outside and
inside the business and stay there all day long. (AT Entrepreneur #3, interview)

Third and finally, the security, dignity and denunciation frames were also ineffective
for motivational framing because tourists and tourism service providers perceived these
frames as lacking empirical credibility. From the perspective of the responsible tourism
industry, these frames conveyed sentiments of danger and fear that conflicted with their
expectation that responsible tourism should provide opportunities for enjoyable and positive
interactions with locals. The use of these frames thus decreased the motivation of both tour
operators and tourists to collaborate with AT. This mechanism is shown well by tourists’
resistance to the denunciation frame:

Honestly, I was a bit afraid to go to Sicily with AT. I did not want to end up in trouble with this
story of denouncing extortions: I called AT to request clarification before signing up for the tour.
(AT German Tourist, interview)
In sum, AT’s early interactions with tourists, B&Bs and tour operators revealed the failure of its framing strategy to directly transpose frames from the anti-racket movement. The community frame resonated sufficiently with industry actors to be retained, but activities framed in terms of security, dignity, and denunciation were viewed by responsible tourism industry actors as confusing and unappealing. This was clear to AT entrepreneurs:

Between 2010 and 2012, we contacted many potential partners and we went to these tourism and responsible tourism exhibitions in Italy and Europe to present our initiatives. Most were interested in our business, but then we always struggled to convert their overall interest into real collaborations. A German tour operator we work with told us the reason was that our image and communication was too aggressive and strong. We looked more like a group of activists than a travel agency. (AT Entrepreneur #1, interview)

This reaction of tourists, tour operators, and other tourism service providers led AT entrepreneurs to reflect on whether their vision of mobilizing the responsible tourism industry in support of the anti-racket movement was realistic:

We launched AT because we thought we could not constrain the fight against the Mafia to Sicily: we should involve new resources from outside. But as a tour operator we should offer something different to our partners and customers… we must find a way to address tourists’ expectations while at the same time achieving our own objectives. (AT Entrepreneur #1, interview)

By 2011, AT entrepreneurs began to consider whether the failure to attract responsible tourists might be due to a problem of interpretation, and began to consider modification of its framing strategy. One AT entrepreneur recalled:

We realized the social movement can, I would say must, stress the negative impacts of the Mafia and of the pizzo to wake up Sicilians… As a tour operator, we should be capable of finding a positive twist to add to the movement’s activities and message. This is the only way to appeal to tourists, tour operators and B&Bs … Community worked because responsible tourists, in a sense, were already looking for opportunities to join a community that is a driver of a positive change… But people already think Palermo is dangerous because of the Mafia. When we talk about security and denunciation, we risk reinforcing this idea, and we don’t want that, both because it could discourage tourists to come to visit Sicily and because it could reinforce the stereotype that Palermo is a dangerous city… one of our objectives is to refute stereotypes like this. (AT Entrepreneur #3).

New frame search through interaction with responsible tourism industry actors and following validation. Recognizing that its framing strategy would need to resonate with
industry actors, AT engaged them in the development of new frames. This interaction led AT entrepreneurs, tourists, tourism service providers to systematically re-interpret AT activities originally framed in terms of security as instrumental to the protection of the Sicilian natural environment. This process of reinterpretation, defined by Goffman as keying (Goffman, 1974; see also Gray et al., 2015), motivated AT entrepreneurs to laminate the new, emerging meaning of “environmental protection” upon the original security frame. To accommodate these laminated meanings, AT subsequently transformed the security frame into environmentalism, as we detail below.

By 2011, AT entrepreneurs recognized through interaction with tourists that the activities that they understood as providing physical security were being interpreted by tourists through the lens of environmental conservation. In particular, visits to anti-racket businesses was understood by tourists not only in terms of their contribution to the security of entrepreneurs, but according to their effect on the natural environment:

I remember we brought some German tourists to this famous pub here in Sicily that was one of the first to defy the pizzo. We explained to them that by going there we were supporting the business—you know, our story. Tourists listened and at the end they asked us why they had to eat with plastic dishes….They told us that of course it was remarkable that the owner had refused to pay protection money, that was certainly an ethical choice. But what about the environment? Why didn’t the owner use recyclable dishes? (AT Entrepreneur #2, interview)

AT similarly identified alternative interpretations of its activities through interaction with responsible tour operators and service providers, who suggested that AT activities originally framed as guaranteeing the security of racket entrepreneurs could also extend their social impact through waste management, reduction of water consumption and pollution, these being key expectations for any responsible tourism experience. An AT entrepreneur recalled:

We did not have experience in the responsible tourism sector so we started to participate in its events and meet other tour operators, talk with owners of B&B and entrepreneurs of the sector… they saw us as strange type of responsible tourism player that designed tours to protect
entrepreneurs but not the environment. But environmental issues are key components of responsible tourism and of what a tour operator is supposed to offer (AT Entrepreneur #1).

The systematic interaction with tourists and tourism service providers led AT entrepreneurs to start associating a new, environmentally-oriented interpretation to their visits to anti-racket businesses. One AT entrepreneur recalled:

When we bring tourists to local businesses we protect them … but in doing so we can also push them to embrace more environmentally-friendly initiatives. (AT Entrepreneur #3, interview)

By 2011, both industry actors and AT entrepreneurs had begun to interpret these AT activities according to their contribution to environmental protection. This keying motivated AT entrepreneurs to transform the original security frame into environmentalism, by *laminating* the meaning of “environmental protection” upon the original security frame:

The idea of the movement is to protect Sicilian entrepreneurs from the Mafia to make Sicily a better, Mafia free place. Protecting the environment is another way to protect Sicily and make it a better place … So we thought that the overall idea was the same: making Sicily a better place to live. (AT Entrepreneur #1, interview)

AT entrepreneurs immediately attempted to validate the resonance of the environmentalism frame with industry actors and activists. Similarly to the validation of the original anti-racket frames, AT used environmentalism for diagnosis, prognosis, and motivation when interacting with industry actors and anti-racket activists. As AT entrepreneurs expected, tourists and tourism service providers reacted positively.

Environmentalism was perceived as having *fidelity with the narrative* of the responsible tourism industry, so AT could effectively use this frame for diagnostic purposes, in this way:

When we visit some coasts that would be beautiful but are covered by rubbish, I explain that this is the responsibility of the Mafia… I also say that as they destroy our beautiful beaches with rubbish they also destroy our businesses asking them to pay the pizzo. I can see that people are shocked.” (AT Entrepreneur #2, interview)

Moreover, the environmentalism frame was perceived by the responsible tourism industry as *empirically credible*, and hence was effective for motivational framing. For instance, as a result of AT’s new environmental focus, schools contacted AT to participate in its tours,
perceiving an opportunity to “include AT environmental initiatives within their existing curricula.” (AT entrepreneur #3, interview, emphasis added)

Activists from the anti-racket movement, however, expressed dissatisfaction with AT’s increasing emphasis on environmentalism. In several meetings in late 2011, activists explicitly and openly questioned AT’s environmental framing of its activities, suggesting that it deviated from the social movement’s ideology and purpose. The following exchange occurred during one such meeting:

Activist #1: Don’t get me wrong, I also care about the environment, but is it what really characterizes our movement? …What’s the purpose of these bike tours: do we want to protect the environment or entrepreneurs?

AT entrepreneur #1: If we want to attract tourists to Sicily, we need to find a way to appeal to a new audience of tourists who do not really know what we do [as a social movement].

Activist #2: This is true, but I still believe this message [of environmentalism] is completely disconnected from our purposes and goals. (Field note)

Both AT and anti-racket activists described these interactions as uncomfortable. Some activists began to question “the real objective of AT, whether they [AT] were just exploiting the movement for economic purposes or if they really wanted to remain true to [the movement’s] goals and values” (Anti-racket activist, interview). Negative feedback from activists caused AT entrepreneurs to again reconsider their role as an extension of the anti-racket movement. They determined that, while working to customize their offerings to the responsible tourism industry, to avoid further tensions they would also need to more explicitly connect their frames to the anti-racket movement’s ideology:

We started to adopt environmentalism because this is a key element of the responsible tourism market in which we compete…. But the truth is that we are a special case of responsible tourism because our priority is supporting anti-racket businesses. This is the purpose of the social movement, so it must be central in everything we do. (AT Entrepreneur #1, interview)

**New frame search through interaction with responsible tourism industry actors and anti-racket activists.** Following activists’ rejection of the environmental frame, in late 2011 AT modified its approach to frame development by proactively engaging both activists and
responsible tourism industry actors in frame search. One AT entrepreneur recalled:

Working full-time on the business we interacted with tourists and commercial partners on a daily basis to understand what they wanted…when we worked with Norwegian tourists for the first time we tried to figure out what they wanted, we designed the tour with them, we asked travel agencies …but we also made an effort to keep participating in the meetings of the movement, to be sure with our activities would remain coherent with the movement’s values and goals (AT Entrepreneur #2, interview)

This time, the keying process led by AT entrepreneurs generated a systematic and consensual re-interpretation (Goffman, 1997) among all three groups (AT entrepreneurs, responsible tourism actors and activists) of AT activities originally framed in terms of security and dignity. New meanings were laminated by AT entrepreneurs on its original frames, leading to frame transformation (Snow & Benford, 1988). In particular, re-interpretation of AT activities resulted in the transformation of security into “sustainability,” and in the transformation of the dignity frame into “beauty”. The failure of AT’s activities associated with the denunciation frame to accumulate new, shared meanings impeded its transformation and led AT to manage this frame through selective referral.

In 2012, while still using its original frames, AT entrepreneurs engaged tourists and tourism service providers in search of new frames. For example, AT noticed through interaction with tourists and tourism service providers that they interpreted tours originally framed in terms of security not only as relevant to environmental protection, but also in terms of the financial support they provided to anti-racket businesses. This new meaning was also consistent with tourists understanding of tours as experiences that would positively impact local communities through financial support:

When we arrived, we stopped at a pub whose owner refused to pay the pizzo. What can we do to help a brave entrepreneur like him? We can contribute by being sure to buy products and services from “clean” shops and businesses. (Letter of a high school student after a tour in Palermo, 2011)

Tourism service providers also viewed visits to anti-racket businesses as sources of revenues and financial support:
When I talk with new potential partners [hoteliers and owners of bed & breakfast], I always start the conversation by explaining they can work with us only if they have the anti-racket certification, which guarantees protection...but they immediately switch the discussion to the business opportunity we can generate for them...this is what they see and is what motivates most of them to contact us. (AT Entrepreneur #4, interview)

We identified a similar pattern in the case of the dignity frame: tourists and tourism service providers began to interpret tours framed in terms of dignity instead in terms that were more familiar to responsible tourism, such as the beautifulness and the aesthetic appeal of the region. While AT had designed and framed its tours as opportunities to visit places that symbolize the dignity of locals who had rebelled against the Mafia, tourists interpreted them more broadly as an opportunity to enjoy pleasant and meaningful visits to the beautiful Sicilian villages, countryside and seaside while also experiencing the efforts of local anti-racket entrepreneurs. In this way they assigned a meaning to AT activities that was more consistent with responsible tourism:

I met beautiful people and listened to amazing stories of people who resist the Mafia. But I also really enjoyed the cultural and “gastronomic” part of the tour: the visit to Monreale [a small town famous for its cathedral]. Sicily is all this together: brave people, beautiful landscape, and good food. (Report of one Student after a one-week tour with AT, 2011)

Regarding denunciation, tourists generally interpreted AT activities associated with denunciation, such as meetings with local entrepreneurs who had denounced racketeers, as demonstrations of honesty that contributed to drive a positive change in Sicily. This new honesty meaning assigned to AT’ activities originally framed in terms of denunciation was more consistent with the idea that responsible tourism would enable meaningful and positive connections with local communities:

Thanks to AT, we have discovered the stories of people who put their lives at risk to rebel against the Mafia and denounce extortionists….This experience has been fundamental to understanding that a deep sense of legality and honesty motivates anti-racket entrepreneurs who decide to denounce. (Report of one Student, 2011)

As had occurred with environmentalism, over time these interactions gradually resulted in the incorporation of these meanings into AT entrepreneurs’ own interpretations of
their activities. AT entrepreneurs started to see visits to anti-racket businesses in terms of the financial support they provided to honest, anti-racket entrepreneurs. They also began to change their interpretation of tours that they had originally associated with the dignity frame. They began to view them as pleasant and enjoyable opportunities to show that the beautiful, historical and cultural heritage of Sicily also includes anti-racket efforts of local communities. One AT entrepreneur recalled:

We came to understand that what distinguishes us from the movement and the value we can add is that we can give business opportunities to local entrepreneurs who resist the pizzo…we now control a quite big market share in the bed & breakfast segment, at least in Palermo, so we know we are an important source of revenue for them…this is possible because we show the most authentic Sicily, we show it is not only the Mafia. There are many people who fight against the Mafia because they love Sicily and its historical, cultural and environmental heritage. Our role is to give visibility to “this Sicily” (AT Entrepreneur #2).

As they started to develop new meanings through interaction with tourists and tourism service providers, AT entrepreneurs involved also anti-racket activists in the process of reinterpretation of their activities. In doing so, AT entrepreneurs hoped to avoid the antagonism that previously resulted from their earlier transformation of the security frame into environmentalism. Activists contributed to the reinterpretation of activities initially associated with security and dignity, while their resistance to the reinterpretation of denunciation motivated AT to stop engaging in interactions related to alternative interpretations of denunciation.

In formal and informal meetings with activists, in 2012 AT entrepreneurs described their activities originally framed in terms of security according to the meaning that had started to emerge in interaction with responsible tourism actors. They described the importance of visiting anti-racket businesses primarily in terms of the financial support AT could provide to entrepreneurs. AT further suggested that financial support was complementary to the provision of physical security in advancing the goals of the movement.
We give business opportunities to anti-racket entrepreneurs, in this way showing that [defiance of the pizzo] is economically advantageous. Initially there were some resistors within the movement but we addressed them showing that with our work we can scale the impact of the movement by providing a different type of support [beyond the physical protection guaranteed by the movement]. (AT Entrepreneur #4).

Following these interactions, also activists started to interpret AT visits to anti-racket entrepreneurs as instrumental to providing financial support and to see that this was related to the physical security provided by the movement. The following exchange during a meeting between AT and anti-racket activists shows this mechanism:

Activist #1: Security is a central, key element in what we do because we can’t ask people to be heroes and denounce without being sure they will be protected.

AT Entrepreneur #2: We [AT] cannot guarantee physical security, it is outside our capabilities. But we get [anti-racket businesses] money and we bring them tourists.

Activist #1: You are right…I think it is equally important. It is a different kind of security, but still security, no? (field note)

We found a similar pattern in the case of dignity. In 2012, AT began to describe to anti-racket activists how AT’s activities and tours provided tourists with broad exposure to Sicily’s cultural, historical, environmental heritage, and thus introduced the anti-racket movement as both an expression of the region’s dignified spirit and as a protector of this broader set of uniquely Sicilian beautiful qualities. Through this interaction, anti-racket activists also began to interpret AT tours as important for expressing the dignity and efforts of anti-racket activists and entrepreneurs in a more aesthetically appealing and pleasant way:

My idea is that AT should show that beyond the Mafia activities, there is much more here in Sicily: there are astonishing places, beaches and landscapes and people who fight the Mafia. Showing all of this is a way to show the “real” Sicily and not only the Mafia. (Anti-racket Activist, interview)

While activists participated in the keying of activities originally framed in terms of security and dignity, thus favoring the emergence of new shared meanings, they expressed concerns about “even thinking to modify” denunciation (note from a direct observation, 2012). In 2012, AT entrepreneurs attempted to explain how activities initially associated with
denunciation could advance a culture of honesty. However, activists viewed denunciation as so central to the anti-racket ideology that they interpreted its potential modification as a betrayal of the purpose of the movement. An activist recalled this resistance:

Speaking with [the AT entrepreneurs], I told them many times that denunciation is the pillar of this entire story [of the social movement], because by speaking about and supporting denunciation to the police we go against the Mafia culture, at its heart. (Anti-racket Activist, interview)

Upon observing the importance assigned by activists to denunciation, AT entrepreneurs halted the keying process of activities originally framed in terms of denunciation to avoid betrayal of the movement’s ideology:

We discussed this issue many times…and we all [social movement activists and AT entrepreneurs] agree that the core of the anti-racket movement is that, thanks to the movement’s efforts, now people know they can and must denounce extortionists [to the police]. If we lost this—if we didn’t support this with our activities—we would betray the core idea of the movement. This is a milestone for the movement: it exists, and we exist [as AT], to make it possible to denounce. (AT Entrepreneur #1, interview)

Feedback received from tourists, tourism service providers and activists about security, dignity and denunciation inspired AT entrepreneurs to redefine their framing strategy: transforming security into sustainability and dignity into beauty, and selectively referring to denunciation.

First, AT transformed the security frame into sustainability and the dignity frame into beauty. AT entrepreneurs applied these transformed frames to their activities originally framed in terms of security and dignity, believing that these new frames could laminate the new interpretations that had emerged through interaction with industry actors and activists together with the meanings of the original anti-racket frames. In the case of sustainability, by 2012 AT entrepreneurs came to view this frame as potentially effective for explaining how AT provided financial support to anti-racket entrepreneurs, while also accommodating meanings associated with the original security and environmentalism frames. Notably, the sustainability frame emerged during informal meetings with activists:
Talking about our initiatives, an activist told us that our efforts to organize environmentally-friendly initiatives in the context of anti-racket activities aimed at financially supporting anti-racket entrepreneurs had a name: sustainability. (AT Entrepreneur #4, interview)

In this way, AT entrepreneurs realized that they could transform security into sustainability because the latter frame could capture tourists’ interest in financially supporting local anti-racket businesses and protecting the environment, while also enabling a distinct role for AT in the social movement that was still clearly linked to the original anti-racket security frame:

The sustainability concept resonates with the kind of support we can guarantee to anti-racket business….It also resonates with our efforts to protect the natural environment, which for us is of central importance given that we play in the responsible tourism sector in which, we discovered, this issue is extremely important. (AT Entrepreneur #3, interview)

AT entrepreneurs also transformed dignity into beauty. They saw beauty as capturing the newly keyed interpretation of AT anti-racket activities as appealing and aesthetically pleasing while accommodating the lamination of these meanings upon the original dignity frame:

It became clear to us that what we can do through our business initiative is to give the tourist the opportunity to see Palermo and Sicily from a completely different perspective. Thanks to our contacts with anti-racket associations and activists, we can show what the traditional tourists would never see: the beautiful stories of the people who live in these beautiful places and fight against the oppression of the Mafia every day. (AT Entrepreneur #1, interview)

Second, AT entrepreneurs decided to manage the denunciation frame through selective referral. Since denunciation did not resonate with tourists and tourism service providers, but activists resisted changes to its meaning, in 2012 AT entrepreneurs decided to selectively refer to this frame, where selective referral took two forms: i) using denunciation only for diagnostic framing (but not for prognostic and motivational framing) and ii) putting tourists in contact with anti-racket activists to observe how other anti-racket movement activities enacted denunciation. In this way, AT entrepreneurs aimed to raise awareness about the denunciation frame:
We cannot ask [tourists and tourism service providers] to engage in denunciation, but without denunciation extortionists remain powerful, so we decided to say this in our tours and to always mention that the anti-racket movement takes care of denouncing extortionists. (AT Entrepreneur #4, interview)

**New frame validation.** In 2012-2013, following development of the selective referral approach to the original anti-racket denunciation frame, and the transformation of dignity and security to beauty and sustainability, AT validated their framing strategy with activists and responsible tourism actors. By using denunciation selectively for diagnostic framing (only) and introducing tourists to other anti-racket activists to observe denunciation activities, AT hoped to circumvent earlier challenges of *consistency* and *empirical credibility* that had limited the resonance of the denunciation frame, while also raising awareness of denunciation and its importance to the movement. AT fully adopted beauty and sustainability frames for diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing to mobilize support.

In 2012, AT continued to use denunciation to diagnose the pizzo problem, explaining for instance “that extortionists are powerful because for many years victims haven’t denounced”. (AT Entrepreneur #1, interview). But rather than attempt to engage tourists directly in denunciation, AT referred tourists who expressed an interest in further engagement to the anti-racket movement, thereby creating opportunities for tourists to participate in denunciation activities outside of AT’s activities. AT thus retained the denunciation frame but referred to it only selectively:

We explain that denunciation is an important instrument to challenge the Mafia…and that denouncing extortionists is technically complex so the process is run by the social movement, and if they have any questions, [tourists and business owners] can contact them. (AT Entrepreneur #3, interview)

In the same period, AT entrepreneurs used beauty and sustainability for diagnostic, prognostic and motivational purposes. For instance, during tours they emphasized that “racketeers are parasites that have transformed Sicily from the most beautiful place in the world into the most awful place to live in” (Field note, AT entrepreneur’s speech during a
tour, 2012), thus using beauty to diagnose the pizzo problem. They also used these frames for prognosis, by elaborating the role AT and other tourism service providers could play to challenge the Mafia and the practice of pizzo:

Our “pizzo-free” booking service is a service we offer to our “pizzo-free” partners. With this service, we want to invest in building sustainable, ethical, and pizzo-free businesses in Sicily.

(Advertising for the launch of AT’s e-booking service, 2013)

Finally, AT entrepreneurs used beauty and sustainability to motivate tourists and tourism service providers to purchase tours from, and partner with, AT. The following example shows how they used beauty to accomplish motivational framing:

Discover the many beauties of Sicily, its artistic heritage, landscapes, and the enthusiasm of those who say “NO” to the Mafia. Traveling with us you will discover all this beauty and support the entrepreneurs and associations that rebel against the Mafia every day. (AT website, 2012: advertising for the Pizzo-Free Sicily tour)

AT’s audiences reacted positively to the new framing strategy proposed by AT. In 2013, selective referral to denunciation raised awareness among tourism service providers of the broader role of the anti-racket movement, beyond AT’s activities:

With AT the relationship is mainly business-oriented…they put me in contact with the anti-racket movement: I contacted them [anti-racket activists] and they clarified for me what denunciation means in practice. (Owner of an hotel in Palermo, interview)

And also among tourists:

AT Entrepreneur #4: Did you meet the activists yesterday?

Tourist: Yes, [my boyfriend and I] went there and spoke with a couple of them…they also explained to us what they do to support anti-racket businesses who report extortionists to the police…We stayed there all evening….It is amazing what they do. (Field note on AT tour)

Selective referral to denunciation also helped to resolve earlier concerns among activists that AT was behaving in ways that were inconsistent with movement ideology. They saw AT activities as “important because they give us the opportunity to talk about denunciation to people we would barely be in contact with otherwise” (Anti-racket Activist, interview).
Interaction with responsible tourism actors and activists validated that both beauty and sustainability resonated with both groups and thus mobilized their support. The beauty frame resonated with tourists and service providers because it supported their initial understanding of AT offerings according to a broad and aesthetic appreciation of Sicily, while also adding the anti-racket purposes of the social movement as an additional and new (from their perspective) element of a responsible tourism experience. Beauty was especially effective for diagnosing the pizzo problem to tourists, due to its *fidelity with the narrative* of responsible tourism. The pizzo problem thus added a new dimension to tourists’ understanding of the integrity of local communities’ historical, cultural and environmental heritage of local communities, a central narrative of the responsible tourism industry:

...beautiful seaside, countryside, the warm sun and the small, beautiful Corleone village: when you see all of this in Sicily you can’t help but ask yourself how one man can deprive another man of the chance to enjoy all this beauty… (Tourist’s message to AT, 2012)

Beauty was also used effectively for prognostic and motivational purposes. Tourists perceived activities explained using this frame as exciting and meaningful, in contrast to the connotations of danger and fear associated with the original dignity frame, thus adding a new meaning to AT activities that was more *empirically credible* for tourists and could therefore motivate their support of AT:

The travel has been a dip into the history, the beautiful countryside, and the extraordinary people of Sicily....We will bring with us the contagious desire to struggle together to build a pizzo-free economic system! (Tourist’s message to AT, 2012)

Similar to beauty, the sustainability frame resonated with tourists and service providers because it credibly laminated meanings associated with AT anti-racket efforts along with environmentalism. The sustainability frame was effective for framing the impacts of AT activities on the pizzo problem because it was *empirically credible*. Tourists were open to interpreting AT tours as sustainable, and were motivated to positively impact both the natural environment and the economic welfare of Sicily:
Thanks to Fabio, [an AT guide] we have understood that in Sicily, sustainability means not only protecting the environment but also supporting anti-racket businesses. (AT Tourist, interview)

AT’s transformation of dignity into beauty and of security into sustainability was also accepted by activists. Both of the newly constructed frames were perceived by activists as adding a new meaning to anti-racket activities while remaining consistent with the movement’s ideology. Activists saw beauty as representing the underlying meaning of dignity, but without its negative and frightening connotations:

This idea of beauty they have come out with is nothing more than the application of dignity to the Sicilian cultural and environmental heritage. Discussing and showing the beauties of Sicily is a way to associate Sicily and its people with something antithetical to the Mafia. This is [AT’s] way to give dignity back to Sicily. (Anti-racket Activist, interview)

Activists interpreted sustainability as scaling the impact of the original security frame by laminating financial support as an additional type of security guaranteed to anti-racket entrepreneurs:

At the beginning, I also asked myself whether this idea of sustainability was consistent with what we do as a social movement….As a social movement we work to guarantee the physical security of anti-racket entrepreneurs: The next stage is to guarantee their economic security. This is what [AT] does. (Anti-racket movement Activist, interview)

**Final operationalization of the frames constructed by AT.** The preceding phases of validation and search resulted in the retention of the community frame from the anti-racket movement, the selective referral of denunciation and the transformation of security into sustainability and dignity into beauty. After identifying and validating its frames, AT operationalized them by using them to design and launch new tour offerings and initiatives. While in the validation stage, AT entrepreneurs re-framed existing activities, in the operationalization stage they developed new activities guided by the frames of community, sustainability and beauty to gain industry actors’ support. AT also intentionally designed tours that put tourists and tourism service providers in contact with the anti-racket movement to raise awareness about denunciation through selective referral.
For instance, from 2012 onward, AT collaborated with anti-racket associations to exploit non-commercial mobilization opportunities for the movement at large, beyond AT’s activities, in this way operationalizing the community frame:

AT will participate in an event to celebrate the opening of the “Eco-Village,” a newly opened organic farmhouse managed by a social enterprise on one of the lands confiscated from the Mafia....We will be there. (AT advertising flyer, 16 Sep 2014)

Beginning in 2013, AT entrepreneurs also operationalized the sustainability and beauty frames that resulted from the transformation of security and dignity, respectively. It designed tours that focused on the sustainability frame, such as the “Sicily by bike” tour:

Sicily by bike: Cycle along coastlines, country roads devoid of traffic, trails which give way to stunning panoramas and cycle lanes engulfed in greenery, often following the tracks of abandoned railroads....All of the accommodations, from the agriturismi (Italian farms) to the hotels, are certified as Mafia-free....Discovering Sicily you will also support the fight of Sicilian entrepreneurs against the Mafia. (AT flier, 2014)

AT also designed tours that expressed the beauty frame by symbolically linking beautiful Sicilian places—villages, beaches, and monuments—with anti-racket initiatives, as exemplified by the Corleone tour, which AT created in 2014:

The “Corleone tour” is an extraordinary opportunity to visit a village that is now an icon of the anti-Mafia movement and to support the activities of the local anti-Mafia associations while experiencing the beauty of the Sicilian countryside. (AT web advertising, 2015)

Finally, AT operationalized denunciation through selective referral. For instance, AT entrepreneurs encouraged tourists to meet with local activists who had denounced extortionists, to create opportunities to expose tourists to denunciation without linking it directly to AT’s activities. One AT entrepreneur recalled:

During the tours in Palermo we try to stop to a bar which is behind the City Cathedral: some years ago the owner of this pub denounced the Pizzo to the police....We always close our tours at the “Focacceria San Francesco” because it is the first restaurant that denounced the Pizzo. When we stop there, we say owners of these places were among the firsts to denounce and that they are always available to speak with tourists. (AT Entrepreneur #1, interview)

This operationalization of community, sustainability, and beauty to mobilize the responsible tourism industry through commercial activities, and the selective use of
denunciation to raise awareness via referrals, enabled AT to gain support while keeping consistency with the movement’s ideology. Tourism service providers were motivated by other frames, such as sustainability, yet they were aware of the importance of denunciation:

They [AT] asked me to have the anti-racket certification and I know I have their support in case I need it [if a Mafia extortionist demands the pizzo], but that’s it. This is not the reason why I work with them; the reason is that since I have been working with them my revenues have increased significantly. (Tourism service provider, interview)

Moreover, the perception of membership in the anti-racket community and the possibility to have an impact on the sustainable development of Sicily pushed tourists to support the goals of the movement both within AT’s tours and outside of them:

We did this tour with AT, and at the end the guide gave us a small book listing all the pizzo-free shops, restaurants, hotels, and pubs, and we also bought the anti-racket t-shirts. Over the following days, we always took care to go to these “pizzo-free” businesses and we wore that shirt. This was our way of feeling we were actively contributing to the movement and being part of it. (Review of one Italian tourist posted on Tripadvisor.com, 2014)

The beauty frame also resonated with tourists and mobilized them because it conveyed the social movement enterprise’s anti-racket message while also addressing tourists’ demands for a relaxing visit to Sicily:

What’s better than visiting Palermo, and discovering its beauty and at the same learning more of the history of the anti-Mafia movement and of its heroes? (Review of one Italian tourists posted on Tripadvisor.com, 2014)

AT’s operationalization of its frames was also well accepted by anti-racket activists. They positively assessed the efforts of AT to use community, beauty and sustainability to show Sicily under a new, more positive perspective, in this way attracting tourists in the region while trying to advance the denunciation frame which was core to the anti-racket movement ideology:

AT’s position is clear—I understand it—they can’t be as proactive as [the anti-racket movement] in denouncing unethical behaviors because they have their business objectives. Their role is to show the beauty of Sicily and that this beauty lies in the activists and in the anti-racket entrepreneurs… doing this they support financially local entrepreneurs: something we can’t do but which is fundamental to challenging the Mafia…I also appreciate what they do to advance
denunciation, because it is at the core of everything we do. It is important that [AT] make their contribution. (Anti-racket Activist, interview)

In sum, by the end of 2015 tourists, tourism service providers and activists positively assessed AT activities and offering. The new framing strategy and frames operationalized by AT could now successfully mobilize industry actors support while maintaining perceived consistency with the anti-racket movement’s ideology, thus AT kept operationalizing them.

**DISCUSSION**

Social movement organizations face a distinctive challenge in framing their commercial activities to resonate with actors embedded in industry field frames (Lounsbury et al., 2003), while also maintaining consistency with movement ideology (Rao, 1998). Furthermore, how these supporter groups will interpret their commercial activities is often unknown *ex ante* and only revealed through interaction. Our findings suggest that mutually resonant frames may develop through a process of strategic frame brokerage that leads to three possible framing strategies. First, a social movement enterprise may *retain* a social movement frame that resonates well with industry field frames and successfully mobilizes industry actors, as we observed with the “community” frame. Second, when original social movement frames do not resonate with industry actors, a social movement organization may *transform* them to incorporate these actors’ interpretations of its commercial activities, as we observed in the transformation of “dignity” into “beauty,” and “security” into “sustainability”. Finally, when a frame does not resonate with industry actors, but is so central to movement ideology (Snow & Benford, 1988) that it cannot be transformed, the enterprise may *selectively refer* an original movement frame to other parts of the movement. As we observed with the denunciation frame, the social movement organization may thus avoid the direct use of frames that do not resonate with industry actors by enabling their enactment via interaction with other parts of the movement, and thereby maintain ideological consistency with the
movement. **Figure 2** shows the five phases of strategic frame brokerage – transposition of a social movement frame, validation of a transposed frame, frame search and transformation, validation of a transformed frame, and operationalization of a transformed frame.

**+++++ Insert Figure 2 about here +++**

In the first phase, the social movement organization transposes an existing social movement frame and applies it to commercial activities aimed at mobilizing support (Figure 2, left-most box).

In the second phase, the social movement organization validates the resonance of the transposed frame (Figure 2, second box) through interaction with both industry actors and activists. The social movement organization uses frames to accomplish the basic diagnosis, prognosis and motivation for industry actors to participate in activities supporting the movement (Snow & Benford, 1988), then interacts with industry actors and social movement activists to assess the resonance of these frames in both contexts. When this reveals that the transposed frame resonates with audiences and can mobilize support — as was the case for the community frame in our study — the social movement organization retains the transposed frame and operationalizes it through the design of new business initiatives that enact this frame (Figure 2, bottom-right box).

If validation of the transposed frame fails, the social movement organization engages in further interaction with supporter groups in search of a new frame (Figure 2, center box). In this third phase of frame search, a frame may be transformed through interactive processes of keying and lamination (Goffman, 1974). The social movement organization engages industry actors and movement activists in a *keying* process by which activities associated with the original frame are reinterpreted, then transforms the original movement frame by *laminating* these keyed interpretations upon the original frame, thus transforming it (Snow & Benford, 1988). Once a frame is transformed and proven to resonate with both supporter
groups in a fourth phase of validation, the social movement organization moves to a fifth, final phase of operationalization (Figure 2, top-right box). In this phase, the social movement organization operationalizes it for the design of new business initiatives (as observed in AT’s operationalization of beauty and sustainability).

Finally, either industry actors or social movement activists may resist the re-keying of a frame and thereby obstruct its transformation, as was the case for the denunciation frame for AT. In this circumstance, the social movement organization selectively refers to the frame to characterize the social issue, and to enable interaction with other parts of the movement, but does not use it to frame its own activities (Figure 2, center-right box).

**CONTRIBUTIONS**

**Strategy and interaction in frame development**

Our findings combine the strategic framing perspective (Snow et al., 1986) with an interactional approach (Gray et al., 2015) to develop a model of strategic frame brokerage. New movement activities – such as commercial activities – are interpreted by multiple groups of supporters according to meanings that are not fully predictable and likely to be revealed only through interaction; as a result, *ex ante* strategic framing that aligns frames with supporter frames is difficult to accomplish. In our model, shared frames for new movement activities are socially constructed via interaction between supporter groups, yet social movement entrepreneurs occupy a strategic, central role as brokers of this interaction. Our study thus shows strategic and interactional framing not as alternative frame development processes, but as complementary elements of a single process.

Our work builds on previous research which has pointed to the distinctive challenges of finding shared meaning in new movement activities involving disparate groups of supporters (Rao, 1998), particularly when these groups are motivated, respectively, by commercial and non-commercial goals (Maguire, Hardy, & Lawrence, 2004; O’Mahony & Bechky, 2008). In
such settings, collective action frames that achieve mutual resonance are frequently “scavenger ideologies” that extend and combine elements of multiple existing interpretive systems (Mosse, 1985; Snow, 2004). Some studies taking a strategic framing approach have found that such integrative frames are developed through the ideational work of individual movement leaders. For instance, Martin Luther King developed a unique rhetoric and framing of the U.S. civil rights movement that wove together themes of Christianity, democratic ideology, and non-violence, as expounded by Gandhi (McAdam, 1996; see also Snow, 2004). Our work suggests that the integration of disparate interpretations may occur instead in micro-interactional mechanisms that have been documented by the interactionist literature (Goffman, 1974; Gray et al., 2015) but were previously absent from models of strategic framing.

Our model of frame brokerage contributes to research on frame development by suggesting a new, facilitative role for social movement entrepreneurs in framing processes where supporter groups have few, if any, direct interactions. Interactional accounts of the framing process are frequently derived from contexts characterized by thick and repeated interactions through which actors may directly observe each other and test new meanings and frames (Goffman, 1974; Collins, 2004). Yet collective meaning-making increasingly occurs in settings where supporter groups are geographically distributed (Orlikowski, 2002) and organized across multiple physical and virtual spaces (Perkmann & Spicer, 2014). Our findings suggest that in such settings, social movement entrepreneurs combine and cross-validate the interpretations of different supporter groups, thereby playing an important brokerage role.

Our model of frame brokerage also builds on previous models of frame development by showing how frames that bind together multiple meanings may enable expansion of the scope of collective action (Gray et al., 2015). Previous research has noted that multiple
groups may cooperate on shared activities despite viewing them through disparate frames (Donnellon, Gray, & Bougon, 1986; Zilber, 2002). We contribute the idea that the transformation of frames through brokerage can help bind meanings together in a form that is mutually resonant with, yet distinct from, existing fields: our findings suggest that through framing, commercial activities may be made meaningful both according to ideology and industry field frames, yet acquire an identity that is neither purely commercial nor purely ideological. In our findings, resulting frames were mutually resonant; however, we note that such framing might fail if the broader, transformed frames are viewed by supporters as diluted, and therefore fail to resonate. We did not observe such negative consequences in our study, but believe that understanding the potential limits of frames that contain multiple meanings as well as “delaminating” processes by which the meanings associated with frames might decay and become more specific, are important areas for future research.

**Framing, social movement organizations and social enterprise**

Our study also contributes to research on social enterprises that pursue a social mission while also engaging in commercial activity (Akemu et al., 2016; York, Hargrave & Pacheco, 2016). Institutional theorists characterize social enterprises as hybrid organizations (Battilana & Lee, 2014), a cognate organizational type that combines multiple institutional logics (Pache & Santos, 2013). Incomplete representation of both logics among members of hybrid organizations leads to complications in organizational practices (Besharov & Smith, 2014), and requiring resolution devices such as socialization in hybrid professional roles (Battilana & Dorado, 2010) and structures oriented to the resolution of tensions (Battilana et al., 2015).  

Our research contributes to understanding those social enterprises that are also social movement organizations, their social goals being identified with those of a broader social movement (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Social enterprises often struggle to
independently make significant progress on complex social problems, which frequently can be addressed only through collective action among many organizations (George, Howard-Grenville, Joshi, & Tihanyi, 2016). Working within a broader social movement may allow social enterprises to complement other movement activities, as we observed in our findings related to security: while other anti-racket organizations provided physical security, AT was uniquely positioned to also provide them financial security, and both were important to the advancement of anti-racket movement goals. However, as we observe in our findings related to denunciation, commitment to the direction and ideology of broader collective action also constrains the strategies and orientation of social enterprises.

Our study shows that a movement may influence social enterprises by participating in the social construction of their social purpose, or mission. Whereas other work has largely taken a social enterprise’ social purpose as defined according to higher-level institutional logics (Pache & Santos, 2013), we show how the framing of social purpose may be customized to appeal to and guide the interpretations of particular supporter groups. Our findings support the perspective that interpretation itself is a reflection of agency (Zilber, 2002), as supporter interpretations appeared to materially affect supporter mobilization. While previous social enterprise research has looked internally at how interaction may resolve tensions between organization members (Battilana et al., 2015), our work shows how external interaction between a social enterprise and groups of its supporters enables its social purpose to be negotiated and recast. Importantly, our work suggests that this process is distinct from symbolic management (Pache & Santos, 2013), as strategic frame brokerage not only manages outsiders’ interpretations, but also may influence the organization’s own interpretations of its activities.

An interpretive perspective also has implications for research on the displacement of organizational mission, or “mission drift” in social enterprises (Battilana & Dorado, 2010).
Mission drift is viewed as resulting from a failure to balance competing organizational goals and their associated activities, due to mismanagement or failed governance (Ebrahim, Battilana, & Mair, 2014). An interpretive perspective, however, suggests that mission drift may be anticipated and circumvented through *ex ante* interaction that reinterprets the purpose of the organization in the context of its commercial activities, thus reducing the likelihood that commercial activities will later be perceived as competing with social goals.

For instance, interaction revealed that activists perceived environmentalism goals as inconsistent with their own, setting in motion the development of a sustainability frame that was viewed by activists as consistent with movement ideology, and future conflict was thus likely avoided. This required a broadening of the original goals of the anti-racket movement that might be perceived as a form of mission drift, but was validated via interaction with activists.

Finally, our work also speaks to the specific challenge of managing “integrated” social enterprises in which both social and financial impact are viewed as emanating from the same activities, versus “differentiated” social enterprises in which these goals are pursued through separate activities (Ebrahim, et al., 2014). Some scholars have noted advantages of integrated social enterprises, suggesting that they will require fewer resource allocation dilemmas (Santos, Pache, & Birkholz, 2015) and as being less prone to mission drift (Ebrahim, et al., 2014). Yet the pursuit of multiple goals through integrated activities may complicate the development of clear and consistent meanings for those activities, and mission drift is possible even within an integrated hybrid (Battilana & Dorado, 2010). Whereas a differentiated hybrid might have been more easily allowed different frames for its commercial and pro-social activities, the “integrated” nature of AT’s activities, and therefore the need for different audiences to resonate with the same set of activities, made the frame development process necessary.
**Commercial transactions as a “mobilizing technology”**

Finally, our work advances our understanding of commercial transactions as a tactic by which social movement organizations advance movement goals. Social movement research has historically focused on protest tactics, targeting public institutions and regulatory processes. Yet social movements also increasingly seek to influence markets to achieve their goals, particularly when conventional, government targets are blocked (King & Pearce, 2010), recognizing the significant role of market actors in the distribution of resources and impact on issues of social justice. In recent years, greater attention has been paid to movements that mobilize supporters to target powerful private corporations through repertoire of protest tactics including product boycotts (King, 2008), shareholder resolutions (Davis & Thompson, 1994), and employee movements (Briscoe & Safford, 2008), as well as movements initiated by companies themselves (Walker & Rea, 2014). Still other work has seen social movements target entire industries (Lounsbury et al., 2003; Weber et al., 2008).

The sale of products and services provides an alternative “mobilizing technology” (Edwards & McCarthy 2004) alongside more conventional social movement repertoires. Direct participation in markets offers advantages over social movement tactics that attempt to influence businesses from the outside, including the ability to design new products and services and to directly select employees, customers, investors, and other stakeholders. Yet as our study demonstrates, social movement organizations entering commerce will experience certain drawbacks and constraints, including resource dependence on non-adherents of the movement. While our study suggests that the latter challenge may be partially addressed through strategic frame brokerage, building and operating a successful commercial operation is also likely to require other skills and repertoires different than those possessed by many activists (Tracey, Phillips, & Jarvis, 2011). Future research should
therefore consider other skills and strategies needed to successfully transition from collective action to commerce. Future research may also consider how direct commercial activity fits alongside other, specialized social movement organizations. In our study, other parts of the anti-racket movement were engaged simultaneously in contentious politics against established businesses, a pattern also shown in other cases of movement participation in commercial activity (Schneiberg, King, & Smith, 2008). Yet social movement organizations simultaneously compete for resources as they cooperate in the interest of their shared goals (Soule & King, 2008). Our study suggests that social movement organizations may coordinate with activists in interpretive processes, yet other forms of coordination among social movement organizations remains an important topic for future research. Also deserving of further research is the relationship between commercial and non-commercial forms of participation at the level of the resource provider: for example, would an individual’s participation in traditional forms of environmental activism increase or decrease her likelihood of also consuming environmentally-friendly products?

Finally, direct engagement in commercial activity also suggests a need to reconsider models of mobilization, which traditionally advance that the alignment of supporters with movement ideology is a necessary stepping stone to mobilization. McCarthy and Zald’s (1977) classic resource mobilization typology defines adherents as those actors who believe in the goals of a social movement, whether due to shared identity or shared ideology (Klandermans, 2004), and constituents as those who provide resources to the movement. In this view, ideological alignment is a natural precedent to mobilization: “at one level, the resource mobilization task is primarily that of converting adherents into constituents and maintaining constituent involvement…at another level the task may be seen as turning non-adherents into adherents” (McCarthy & Zald, 1977: 1221). Our findings suggest that mobilization via commercial activities may not always involve ideological adherence per
Through transformation of movement frames to incorporate the interpretations of industry actors, social movement organizations elide ideological alignment as a necessary condition for their mobilization. Because the benefits of participation via commerce mix ideological and material benefits, they can potentially mobilize a broader pool of supporters than other forms of support that place greater demands on supporters (Klandermans, 2004). Yet mobilization of consumers may also involve a different type of interpretation more resembling “marketing and resonating” than the “education and thinking” that typically underpins political support (Oliver & Johnston, 2000). Movements built on this sort of mobilization may consequently resemble more an ongoing flow of temporary constituents, rather than the durable coalitions commonly studied by social movement scholars.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Our paper has several limitations and boundary conditions worth noting. First, an important boundary condition is the existence of well-established interpretive frames within both the social movement and the commercial industry into which the social movement organization enters. In circumstances in which the schema of groups of supporters are weaker, interactional processes might be expected to give way to more heavy-handed strategic framing on the part of the social movement organization. Of particular interest, under such circumstances, social movement organizations might influence the frames of supporter groups. For instance, if a social movement organization were to enter a brand new market category, it might be able to shape this category, or alternatively, commercial activities within a relatively new social movement might meet less ideological resistance, and even shape the trajectory of the movement. We believe that both of these situations are interesting opportunities for further research.

Moreover, engagement in commercial transactions is not likely to find success in all social movements, and the strategic frame brokerage between activists and industry actors
for the purposes of strategic framing are not a guarantee of success. Movements are likely to vary in the breadth and flexibility of the issues they address and their interpretations of these issues (Snow & Benford, 1988), and thus not every movement may be amenable to commercial transactions as a mobilizing tactic, irrespective of interpretive frames. We further note that frame brokerage is costly in terms of time and attention of social movement entrepreneurs and supporters and the benefits of mutually resonant frames may not outweigh these costs in all circumstances.

Contestation-based models of collective action form an important starting point for understanding how social movements shape market processes. The alternative tactic of direct participation in markets presents new opportunities, but also new material and symbolic entanglements at the nexus of movements and markets that organizational research is uniquely positioned to resolve. We are confident that further research along these lines will yield new, important insights for theory and practice.
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### TABLE 1

**Values the Anti-Racket Social Movement used to frame its activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-racket values</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dignity</td>
<td>Forno &amp; Gunnarson, 2009; Santino, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legality</td>
<td>Gunnarson, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Santino, 2010; Vaccaro &amp; Palazzo, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical consumption</td>
<td>Partridge, 2012; Forno &amp; Gunnarson, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor</td>
<td>Lodato, 2007; Vaccaro &amp; Palazzo, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Partridge, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>Santino, 2010; Vaccaro &amp; Palazzo, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Forno &amp; Gunnarson, 2009; Partridge, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Gunnarson, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denunciation</td>
<td>Santino, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>Partridge, 2012; Gunnarson, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

**Sources of Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of information</th>
<th>Use of information collected (between 2009 and 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addiopizzo Travel (AT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interviews with AT entrepreneurs</td>
<td>40 interviews  [a. Characterization of AT activities and objectives pursued over time]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal documents</td>
<td>56 documents  [b. Characterization of the frames used by AT to make sense of its activities with industry actors and anti-racket activists over time]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communication to media</td>
<td>51 documents  [c. Characterization of the interaction of AT with industry actors and anti-racket activists]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advertising</td>
<td>31 documents  [d. Characterization of visibility and impact achieved by AT over time]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Media coverage</td>
<td>86 documents  [e. Understanding of the rationale beyond the choice to retain, transform, and selectively refer frames]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Direct observation</td>
<td>41 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible tourism industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interviews with tourism players</td>
<td>11 interviews  [a. Characterization of the frames held by industry actors]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interviews with tourists</td>
<td>7 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tourists’ reports</td>
<td>42 documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anti-racket movement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interviews with activists</td>
<td>15 interviews  [a. Characterization of the ideology and goals of the social movement]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Books and scientific articles</td>
<td>15 documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communications of anti-racket movement</td>
<td>122 documents [b. Development of historical account of the evolution of the movement in Sicily and its impact]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Media coverage</td>
<td>321 documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c. Characterization of the strategies used by the movement to motivate entrepreneurs, consumers, and civil society to rebel against the Mafia]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d. Characterization of the frames held by anti-racket activists]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e. Characterization of the interactions of the anti-racket movement with AT]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f. Characterization of the reaction of the anti-racket movement to the framing strategy of AT]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 3

**Anti-Racket Movement Adoption of Security, Dignity, Community, and Denunciation to frame its activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Dignity</th>
<th>Denunciation</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security means guaranteeing the protection of those who resist the practice of paying protection money, of their families, and their business assets (Vaccaro &amp; Palazzo, 2015)</td>
<td>Dignity is the quality of being worthy of honor and respect for having the courage to rebel against the Mafia (Lodato, 2007; Santino, 2010)</td>
<td>Denunciation is defined and applied by the movement in terms of reporting extortionists to the police (Santino, 2010)</td>
<td>The movement works to build a network of entrepreneurs, consumers and activists that rebel against the Mafia and the practice of the pizzo (Anti-racket movement website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanks to the work of the movement, the police, and many institutions, anti-racket businesses can now defy the pizzo and report extortionists without risk of retaliation (Anti-racket movement, July 2013)</td>
<td>The citizens of Palermo now have the responsibility to take a stand against extortionists and get their dignity back (Press release, December 2016)</td>
<td>Denunciation is now possible: Next March 9-10 two associations of the movement will meet with locals to talk about the pizzo and explain how to denounce extortionists (Anti-racket movement press release march 2012)</td>
<td>Libero Grassi (one of the first entrepreneurs who reported an extortionist to the police) was killed because he was left alone (AT activists, on an Italian TV show)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For many years, a lack of security has been a good reason and sometimes a good excuse to refuse to report extortionists to the police. That’s why we work to guarantee the security of those who fight against the Mafia (Anti-racket activist, interview)</td>
<td>The anti-racket activists of Barcellona (a village) have recently organized a protest to prompt local entrepreneurs and business owners to join them in a journey of legality and dignity (Anti-racket press release, May 2009)</td>
<td>The Mafia myth is challenged because of the thousands of denunciations by local entrepreneurs. It is time to denounce. It is time to rebel against the Mafia: Now or, maybe, never (Anti-racket movement website, December 2016)</td>
<td>Everybody should take a stand against extortionists. We believe that the Mafia can be defied only if it is challenged by a large network that involves citizens, institutions, and professionals (Free professional associations, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of protection is one of the main reasons why businesses have always paid the pizzo (AT activists interview)</td>
<td>A population that pays the pizzo is a population without dignity (Anti-racket movement motto)</td>
<td>Business owners do not denounce because they are used to the racketeers: they seem normal to them (Anti-racket movement website, 2009)</td>
<td>Victims of extortion can’t defeat the Mafia if they are alone. They ask for our support (Anti-racket movement press-release, March 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To compel local supporters to guarantee the safety of people who denounce extortionists and of the anti-racket activists</td>
<td>To compel local entrepreneurs, citizens, activists, and consumers to rebel against the Mafia</td>
<td>To motivate entrepreneurs to find the courage to denounce the Mafia</td>
<td>To motivate activists, entrepreneurs, citizens, police, and consumers to communicate and collaborate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphors (rhetorical devices to highlight, by resemblance, some characteristics of the principal subject)</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Dignity</th>
<th>Denunciation</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Beauty</th>
<th>Environmentalism</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphorical representation of “heroes” as useless in the fight against Mafia</td>
<td>Anti-racket entrepreneurs who refuse to pay the pizzo can hold their head high</td>
<td>Denunciations are like breathing for the movement</td>
<td>The growing anti-racket family</td>
<td>Astonishing Sicilian landscapes and breathtaking countryside</td>
<td>Cycling as environmentally friendly transportation system</td>
<td>AT’s achievements as metaphor for the sustainability of the organizations involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplars (representative events/people of the past/present)</td>
<td>Show Sicilian markets where anti-racket entrepreneurs can safely run their businesses</td>
<td>Stories of people who accepted having to pay and became slaves of the Mafia without dignity</td>
<td>Meetings with people who denounced racketeers to the police</td>
<td>Stories of activists and entrepreneurs who collaborate to build a Mafia-free economy</td>
<td>Stories of anti-racket activists and entrepreneurs who protect(ed) Sicilian cultural, historical, and environmental heritage</td>
<td>Tours of organic farms holding the anti-racket certificate</td>
<td>Stories of financially sustainable and environmentally friendly Sicilian businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchphrases (slogans and statements summarizing the package)</td>
<td>“Refusing the pizzo should be a safe choice”</td>
<td>“An entire population who pays the pizzo is a population without dignity”</td>
<td>“Tourists can also play a role in denouncing the pizzo”</td>
<td>“The more we are, the stronger we are: join us!”</td>
<td>“Discover the real beauties of Sicily beyond clichés”</td>
<td>“Discover Sicily in an environmentally friendly way”</td>
<td>“We want to leave a better Sicily”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depictions (characterizations of subjects)</td>
<td>Activists and business owners who rebel against the pizzo are normal people</td>
<td>Anti-racket entrepreneurs are worthy of respect. Racketeers are not</td>
<td>Whistleblowers as good citizens</td>
<td>Tourists and tourism players as members of the anti-racket network</td>
<td>AT entrepreneurs love Sicily and want to show what it has to offer</td>
<td>Mafia racketeers are criminals destroying the Sicilian environment</td>
<td>AT and other anti-racket businesses as organizations that can thrive without paying the pizzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Images (icons and visual images that suggest the core of the frame)</td>
<td>Image of the anti-racket certification</td>
<td>Images of smiling and proud anti-racket activists</td>
<td>Images of whistleblowers on AT website</td>
<td>Images of groups of tourists and activists together</td>
<td>Images of activists and Sicilian landscapes</td>
<td>Images of cyclists</td>
<td>Images of AT entrepreneurs as successful and realized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots (explanation of the causes underlying the events)</td>
<td>Lack of security explains why Sicilian entrepreneurs pay the pizzo</td>
<td>Sicilians have accepted the pizzo as unavoidable</td>
<td>Racketeers are powerful because nobody reports them to the police</td>
<td>Racketeers are powerful because they protect the beauty of Sicily</td>
<td>AT and other anti-racket businesses as organizations that can thrive without paying the pizzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences (effects of different policies)</td>
<td>Protection enables entrepreneurs to defy racketeers</td>
<td>Accepting the pizzo implies losing self-esteem</td>
<td>Not reporting racketeers to police will override any effort to challenge the Mafia</td>
<td>A large and diversified network can defeat the Mafia</td>
<td>Racketeers have destroyed Sicilian beauty</td>
<td>Responsible tourists can protect the Sicilian environment</td>
<td>Tourists can guarantee the sustainability of anti-racket enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to principle (general precepts)</td>
<td>The goal is to protect anti-racket entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Give dignity back to Sicily</td>
<td>Extortionists should be reported to the police</td>
<td>The pizzo is not only a Sicilian issue</td>
<td>Beauty in all its forms must be protected</td>
<td>The environment must be protected</td>
<td>Businesses should be sustainable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4 Signature Matrix used to code frames**

**Data Structure**
Empirical themes

- New products and services that appeal to tourists
- New products and services that appeal to commercial partners
- New partnerships with responsible tourism industry actors
- New partnerships with organizations of the anti-racket movement
- Values used to characterize pizzo payments as problematic and explain why
- Values used to design activities to suggest solutions to the pizzo
- Values used to design activities that could appeal to responsible tourism sector actors and motivate them to engage in market transactions with AT
- AT entrepreneurs ask for industry actors’ feedback about clarity of communication strategy
- Industry actors prove to understand (or not) the values used by AT in its communication
- AT entrepreneurs ask for industry actors’ feedback about the consistency of AT offerings with their expectations
- Industry actors relay that the values used by AT to describe its activities are (not) consistent with their expectations
- AT entrepreneurs ask industry actors’ feedback about the consistency of AT communication with the enterprise’s practices
- Industry actors relay that the values used by AT to describe its activities are (not) consistent with its practices
- Activists assess the coherence of AT’s framing of its activities with the movement’s ideology
- AT, tourists and tourism service providers share ideas about AT activities in the context of market transactions
- AT and anti-racket activists share ideas about AT activities in the context of discussion about the movements’ purposes
- AT entrepreneurs make sense of how tourists, tourism service providers, and activists understand of AT activities
- AT identifies new frames that combine interpretations of tourists, tourism service providers and activists

Conceptual categories

- Product/service innovations to enact a frame
- Partnerships formation to enact a frame
- SMOs adoption of to mobilize support through:
  - Diagnostic framing
  - Prognostic framing
  - Motivational framing
- Industry actors’ assessment of a frame fidelity with the narrative of an industry
- Industry actors’ assessment of a frame consistency with SMO’s activities
- Industry actors’ assessment of a frame empirical credibility for industry actors
- Activists’ assessment of a frame consistency with social movement ideology
- Interactional keying of social movement organization activities
- Strategic lamination of a social movement organization’s frames

Aggregate dimensions

Operationalization
Validation
Search
Figure 2: Process of frame brokerage