Working Papers

Occupy Wall Street

The movement in its third anniversary

Daniel Blanche (dblanchet@uoc.edu)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Antonio Calleja-López (acallejalo@uoc.edu)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol (mfernandezar@uoc.edu)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Arnau Monterde (amonterde@uoc.edu)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Paper

Universitat Oberta
de Catalunya

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Table of contents

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Occupy Wall Street

The movement in its third anniversary

Daniel Blanche (dblanchet@uoc.edu)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Antonio Calleja-López (acallejalo@uoc.edu)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol (mfernandezar@uoc.edu)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Arnau Monterde (amonterde@uoc.edu)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Abstract

The emergence of networked social movements in 2011 has opened a new door in the social movements' literature. By adopting a technopolitical and situated approach, in this paper, we explore the case of the Occupy Wall Street movement three years after its formation in September 2011. Through an online survey and a nonprobabilistic sampling procedure, we pay special attention to the perceptions and opinions of the movement's participants. We distinguish seven thematic sections: the relationship with the movement, previous political participation and motivations, the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs), the emotions experienced, the evolution of the movement, its influence on institutional politics, and its impacts on several aspects of social life. The results show that the respondents (N=522) are overall adherent to the movement and that the majority participated at some point. Most think that the movement still exists in one way or another, and perceive its impact on several areas, institutions, behaviours, and ideas. We conclude by describing OWS as a case that adequately fits the concept of a networked social movement. Finally, we suggest further developments in the understanding of these movements by further applying the online survey designed for this study and complementing analyses via other research methods.

©Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Keywords

Occupy Wall Street, Networked social movements, Technopolitics, Information and communication technologies (ICTs), USA

©Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Introduction

In 2011, networked protests emerged in Tunisia, Egypt, Greece, Portugal, Spain and the US. A common feature was their innovative and performative connections of social media and urban spaces for collective action. The emergence of these movements and their strategic use of ICT (defined as the converging set of technologies that process information and communication by electronic means, including transmission and display [Castells, 1996; OECD, 2011]) constitute a key factor in the transformation of practices of contentious politics. A new public sphere may be emerging, connected to the spaces of autonomy (Castells, 2012) that movements create on the basis of the possibilities offered by the Internet. Labelled as "networked social movements" (Castells, 2012; Juris, 2004), there are numerous analyses of their relationship with digital practices and social media. In the conception of this study we follow a technopolitical approach (Toret et al., 2015) that takes into account the intensification and complexification of the technological mediation of collective action (Bennett & Segerberg 2012; Castells, 1996, 2009, 2012; Earl & Kimport, 2011) and situates social practices around digital communication technologies at the centre of the analysis (Couldry, 2012).

In this working paper we focus on the Occupy Wall Street (hereafter, OWS) movement in its third anniversary, which exhibits fundamental characteristics of the forms of collective action arising with the wave of networked social movements since 2011. OWS emerged in September 2011, with the consequences of the 2008 financial crisis still present in symptoms ranging from unemployment levels (8.6% at the time [Rampell, 2011]) to inequality indexes (Piketty, 2014), and a perception that those directly or indirectly responsible for the crisis were either left off-the-hook or even ended at key US economic institutions (Ferguson & Marrs, 2010). OWS operated through a multi-layered structure that connected offline interactions to mass and digital social media (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012; Gerbaudo, 2012). Born in digital networks with the call of the alternative magazine Adbusters, and the ensuing diffusion via social media, the movement evolved in relation to them. Due to its novelty and relevance, there is a need for a closer examination of OWS's relation to social media and technopolitical practices.

1. Background and conceptual framework.

It was on July 13th 2011, with the antecedents of Tunisia, Egypt or Spain and the growth of international networks (Castañeda, 2012; Tejerina, Perugorría, Benski, & Langman, 2013) when Adbusters launched its call to Occupy Wall Street. The call took place several months before the day of the action. A few hundreds attended the demonstration on September 17th (Pepitone, 2011), and only after different events and processes took place, in the following days and weeks, did the camp at Zucotti Park and the Occupy movement itself grow exponentially. Different episodes of police violence and the online/offline processes in

reaction to them, occurred during the last week of September and the first week of October, were crucial in the national and international growth of the movement (Gitlin, 2012). We believe networked emotions and the augmented events tied to them were crucial in the initial popularization of the protest, as it was the case of the 15M movement in Spain (Perugorría & Tejerina, 2013). This took place even though, as it happened in Spain, in its early days the movement received more attention in international than in national mainstream media[1].

Even with some moments of renewal, such as #OccupySandy (Feuer, 2012), the movement declined in the following years. In spite of that, the movement was able to influence public discourse and the media agenda, putting issues of inequality and social justice, or new formulas such as the opposition between the 1% and the 99%, at the centre of it, providing a frame in which the popularity of political figures such as Bernie Sanders became possible. Taking this into account, we believe relevant to examine OWS across time to understand some of its key features and its social and political impacts.

The unfolding of movements such as OWS leads us to reassess the study of social movements in the information and knowledge age. The proliferation and massive extension of technopolitical practices for the organization of collective action, the availability of open and distributed communication, the role of emotions in the main events as drivers of networked communication, the emergence of self-organizing forms at a large scale, or the hybridization of layers (physical and digital) in the movement's development are some of the factors that guide us towards new approaches in the study of social movements in the network society. In this sense, we aim at further developing the notion of networked movement (Monterde, 2015) as a concept that extends and includes most of the characteristics of these emerging social movements, which are articulated both by hyper-connected and complex dynamics. This development would enable new arguments for a better understanding of these movements, arguments that neither allude to technocentric ideas nor neglect the essential role of technologies in these movements. Such a novel and broader approach is captured in the term "technopolitics", which has been defined as the strategic and tactical use of digital tools in the organization and communication of collective action (Toret et al., 2015). These new conceptual developments in the intersections of social movements and information and communication technologies literatures pave the way for new directions in the analysis of social movements in the context of the current network society. Therefore, we adopt these new advancements in the examination of the OWS movement in the US.

2. Research goals.

In this study, we primarily approach OWS from the viewpoint of its participants. This provides extremely valuable information to understand how they conceive the movement. We believe that their experience and views are crucial for a better understanding of OWS. Having this said, our main goal is to look into the

---

[1] These processes have been narrated in different works such as Gitlin, 2012; Juris, 2012; or Graeber, 2013.

©Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

practices, evolution and impacts of the OWS movement from the perspective of its participants, in a transdisciplinary and situated manner. Furthermore, we define several specific goals that delve into greater detail on the experiences and perceptions of the OWS participants. First, to identify the degree of adherence of OWS participants to the movement. Second, to examine their previous political participation and motives to participate. Third, to identify the forms of participation and the technological means used in relation to the movement. Fourth, to explore the emotions experienced by participants regarding the movement. Fifth, to examine the perceived persistence or evolution of the movement through time. Sixth, to explore the influence of the movement on political elections. Finally, to look into the perceived effects of the movement on different domains and institutions in the social and political spheres. In the following section, we describe in greater detail the methodology applied in this study.

3. Methods.

Given the increasing pervasiveness of information and communication technologies in the US, and, especially, the intensive use of digital technologies by the OWS movement (which is a distinctive characteristic of networked social movements), we designed an online survey to collect the desired information. Accordingly, we deem this method to be adequate to reach our main target audience (participants in the movement), who are presumably frequent users of digital technologies or frequently exposed to digital contents. An encouraging precedent is the online survey conducted by Linares (2013) to investigate the 15M movement in Spain, who gathered 6,000 responses in a very short period (from May 14th to May 15th, 2013) thanks to the involvement of 15M participants. This experience demonstrated that it was possible to get a considerable amount of in-depth information on 15M participants through a non-randomized online survey.

Our survey relies on a similar strategy. We first involved several researchers and experienced activists in networked social movements in the United States and Canada in the design phase through several survey pilots. The goal was to include the perspective of the movement's participants, test the questionnaire and software repeatedly, and obtain their support in sharing the survey. Once the tools reached an optimal level, we released the survey through the main information channels and social network accounts of the movement. We circulated the survey through OWS key diffusion and communication networks, in which members of our research group are deeply involved in. By using some key OWS accounts in social network sites (SNS) we expected to generate a (network of) trust effect, therefore increasing the probabilities of a larger sample and completed questionnaires.

We are aware of the limitations of conducting an online survey based on a snowball sampling strategy, especially in terms of a lack of representativeness of the target population. In addition, the sampling procedure entails difficulties in terms of the replicability of the results, meaning that our data cannot offer full certainty of its robustness. In spite of these problems, we believe this strategy is adequate to collect a

UOC R&I
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers is a research monograph series promoted by the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers (2017)
ISSN 2462-7461
working-papers.uoc.edu

8

relatively high amount of data, in a standardized form, and to appeal, primarily, the OWS participants and supporters.

3.1. Data collection and processing.

The survey was conducted through an electronic questionnaire available on a web server. A self-selected, non-probabilistic sample was generated by making an open invitation to fill out the questionnaire through digital means, social network sites (SNS) among them. Three channels were used to disseminate the questionnaire: email, Twitter and Facebook. For each channel, an access link to the questionnaire was created, which allowed us to identify the source of the questionnaires filled (yet filled by unknown respondents). In addition, the questionnaire could be also accessed through the research group's website, Tecnopolítica.net. The questionnaires answered through this channel were homologated with those reached by email, since the main purpose was to classify responses according to the three channels of interest. In Twitter, we used the hashtag #OccupySurvey in every tweet along with the link to the questionnaire. Some of the key Twitter accounts that participated in the dissemination of the survey were @OccupyWallStNYC, @OccuWorld, @GlobalRevLive, @takethesquare, @potbanging, among some highly followed profiles.

The design of the questionnaire was a collaborative work between researchers involved in the project at the IN3-Open University of Catalonia and collaborators in the United States and Canada. The questionnaire was written in English as it is the predominant first language in the United States. The structure was based on the questionnaire used for the study of the 15M movement in Spain to enable comparability between the two surveys. Yet, the questions and phrasing of the original version were discussed jointly with our collaborators to deem if they were relevant and applicable to their national context. In this light, we wish to stress that the translation of the original survey entailed a situated adaptation, a version of the survey tailored in context. Therefore, a translation of this kind is not merely linguistic, but also contextual and socio-political. As a result, most questions were kept, some were adapted, and some were replaced by others that do not appear in the questionnaire used for the 15M movement. In addition, greater freedom of expression was provided to the respondents in the form of more open-ended questions and categories of response than in the survey applied to the 15M movement. In sum, although the application of a master version of the survey was essential to allow comparability between the two cases, the adaptation in context of the survey was equally ambitioned to achieve a greater understanding of the local case (see Annex 1 to read the final version).

Fieldwork was conducted between September 17th and October 22nd of 2014. A proprietary digital platform called Survey Manager (NetQuest) was used for data collection. The electronic questionnaire could be viewed in computers, smartphones and tablets, although it was better suited for the first two devices. The platform registered responses if the questionnaire was opened in one browser window or tab only. We received a total of 542 responses (87 from the questionnaire distributed by email and website, 95 from the one distributed through Twitter, and 360 from the one distributed through Facebook). Subsequently, we checked the quality of gathered data by analysing outliers, response patterns, and inconsistent answers (e.g., answering "stable job" along with "I have no income" as "Economic situation:"). Cases with failed system records and odd selection of answers in different questions were excluded from the sample. In addition, data entries of cases

UOC R&I
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers is a research monograph series promoted by the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers (2017)
ISSN 2462-7461
working-papers.uoc.edu

9

that submitted inconsistent answers in multiple choice questions were recoded as missing entry points. After data cleaning, the final sample size is of 522 observations. The database, the codebook, and the questionnaire are available under open license at http://tecnopolitica.net/content/OccupySurvey.

Regarding statistical techniques, in this working paper we conducted descriptive statistics: frequency tables, contingency tables, and chi-square tests for significant differences. All data analyses were carried out in the statistical package SPSS 23.

3.2. Basic characteristics of the sample.

In table 1 we can observe the basic socio-demographic features of the survey respondents. Bearing in mind the non-probabilistic nature of the sampling design, the distribution of these variables departs from the population distribution. The sample is predominantly male and highly educated. Males make up to 54% of the sample, females up to 43%, and a 3% self-describe according to other parameters. University graduates (71%) represent a vast majority, followed distantly by people with secondary (27%) and primary studies (1%). The average age of respondents is about 40 years old, and ages range from 15 to 84. However, respondents are typically young, wherein a quarter of them are 27 years old or younger and half are 35 years old or younger. Nearly all respondents are United States (75%), Europe (13%) and Canada (8%) born citizens, while most of the respondents also reside predominantly in these places (79% in the United States, and 9% in Europe and Canada each). Finally, respondents of the survey are overwhelmingly non-Hispanic white or Euro-Americans (83%), while Latinos or Hispanic Americans represent a 9%, native Americans or Alaskan natives a 4%, and black or Afro-Americans a 2%, among a few (although respondents could report belonging to more than one race or ethnical heritage). Compared to the 15M survey wherein racial or ethnical heritage was not asked, in this survey we deemed it as a relevant aspect to consider due to the social centrality of race in the American society[2].

Table 1. Basic socio-demographic characteristics of the sample (N=522)

	PERCENTAGE	YEARS
Male	54.2	
Female	42.7	
Self-describe	3.1	

[2] For a detailed distribution of these socio-demographic variables by participation and non-participation in OWS, see tables in Annex 2.

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Mean age		39.54
Standard deviation		15.19
Minimum-Maximum		15–84
Percentile 25		27
Percentile 50 (median)		35
Percentile 75		52
University studies	70.7	
Secondary studies	27.0	
Primary studies	1.3	
Don't know/No answer	1.0	
Place of birth		
US	75.3	
Europe	12.6	
Canada	7.5	
Asia	1.5	
Other American country	1.1	
Oceania	1.0	
Mexico	0.6	
Africa	0.4	
Place of residence		
US	78.5	
Europe	9.4	
Canada	9.0	
Oceania	1.1	
Other American country	0.8	
Asia	0.8	
Mexico	0.4	
Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American	83.3	
Latino or Hispanic American	5.8	
Native American or Alaskan Native	3.7	
Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American	1.9	
East Asian or Asian American	1.5	
Middle Eastern or Arab American	0.8	
South Asian or Indian American	0.4	
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.2	
Other	7.9	
Don't know/No answer	2.9	

Note. Categories sorted in descending order (except for "other" and "don't know/no answer"). Categories listed in racial or ethnical heritage are non-exclusive (its values do not add 100%).

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

4. Results.

The following structure of epigraphs mirrors that displayed in the paper on the 15M study (Monterde et al., 2017), and reflects the dimensions of interest in both surveys. We start with participation and degree of identification with OWS. We then focus on OWS participants by examining their previous political participation, the political and social issues that prompted them into participating, and the ways they participated in OWS. Subsequently, we identify the use of channels and electronic devices to access and spread information about OWS, as well as the use of social network sites during their participation in OWS. Next, we examine the emotions experienced by the respondents regarding OWS in its early days and in its form three years later. Next, we examine the perceived current status of OWS and its association with other political groups or processes. Then, we explore the perceived electoral effects of OWS as well as its association with electoral formations in the US. Finally, we focus on the perceived impact of OWS on ideas, behaviours, reputation and different aspects of society.

4.1. The OWS movement and me.

Starting with the proportion of respondents that participated in some way in OWS, table 2 shows that 74% did take part in one way or another, whereas 23% claimed not having participated, and 4% declared not knowing or did not answered the question. This amount of participation in the movement is comparable to that yielded in the 15M study (77%) (Monterde et al., 2016), which shows the relatively high appeal of the movement among respondents of the sample. In spite of a majority reporting having participated in OWS in some way, the amount of respondents that did not is significantly large, which may reflect a lack of interest in the movement or an opposite stance towards it. In the following sections, we will set comparisons between the distribution of OWS participants and "Others" (comprising self-reported non-participants and those who did not know or answer) across several dimensions of the survey (e.g., the use of information and communication technologies, the experience of emotions, the evolution of the movement, perceived electoral and social impacts), and we will further examine the nature and degree of involvement of the respondents that engaged with the protest movement.

Table 2. Participation in OWS (N=522)

	PERCENTAGE
Yes	73.6
No	22.6
Don't know/No answer	3.8

Note. Categories sorted in descending order (except for "don't know/no answer").

In table 3, we can observe how the distribution of the degree of identification with the OWS movement behaves among self-reported OWS participants and Others. A first look signals the high adherence to the movement among OWS participants, and that this high identification has remained constant in time (79%). However, the high adherence also among Others is remarkable (59%), which suggests that it is neither a lack of interest in the movement nor holding contrary views against it that prevented these respondents from participating in OWS. When taking into account the total proportion of respondents identifying with OWS, which represents nearly three quarters of the sample, it is clear that the majority of the sample sympathizes with the movement. In other words, and due to the sampling design, the survey reached mostly supporters of the OWS movement. Where OWS participants and Others depart from each other relates to having identified with the movement at some point in time. Whereas the second majority of OWS participants regard having identified themselves with the movement initially but not anymore (12%), the third majority among Others (16%) regard not having identified themselves with the movement at any point in time (the second majority, 17%, reported not knowing or did not answer the question). Although not necessarily representing contrary opinions towards OWS, the relatively small proportion of 16% of Others represents the opposition group of the sample regarding OWS. In addition, chi-square tests showed that there is a strong and significant association between the degree of identification with OWS and whether respondents participated or not in OWS.

Table 3. Degree of identification with Occupy Wall Street by participation in OWS* (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=384)	OTHERS (N=138)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=522)
I have and I do identify myself with Occupy	78.9	55.8	72.8
I have identified myself with Occupy but not anymore	12.2	1.4	9.4
I have not and I do not identify myself with Occupy	2.6	15.9	6.1
I did not identify myself with Occupy but now I do	2.6	9.4	4.4
Don't know/No answer	3.6	17.4	7.3

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values (except for "don't know/no answer"). Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.001.

13

4.2. Issues and political participation before OWS.

Focusing particularly on OWS participants, a first step was to compare the extent to which their social participation changed after the emergence of the OWS movement. We do not intend to make any causal claims with these data, but only to observe potential changes in group behaviour between two points in time. Table 4 displays the engagement of OWS participants in several associations or groups both prior to OWS's emergence in September 2011 and three years later, in September-October 2014. The overall trend of the data is that after the rise of OWS, the engagement in non-institutionalized political participation grew, contrary to the case of institutional politics which decreased. Participation in social movements, Internet related movements, and activist groups were, in that order, the highest prior to OWS; a ranking that remained three years after OWS's emergence and that grew distant from involvement in other types of groups (all three of them increasing between 12 and 14 percentage points). Conversely, participation in political parties, unions, churches and NGOs saw a decrease in time among OWS participants, a decrease particularly pronounced in political parties (over 12 percentage points less) and slight in NGOs (nearly minus 2 points). This suggests a possible permeating influence of the experience of participating in OWS in their interests and views.

Table 4. Participation of OWS participants before OWS's emergence in September 2011 and in September-October 2014 (%)

	BEFORE 15M (N=380)	MAY 2014 (N=381)
Social movements	56.1	70.1
Movements related to Internet and online activism	50.0	63.8
Solidarity, activist groups, alliance groups	46.6	58.8
Political parties	35.8	23.6
NGOs, non-profits, associations	35.3	33.6
Unions	21.6	18.6
Churches, charities	17.6	12.9
Others	16.1	15.2
None	10.5	6.3
Don't know/No answer	1.6	1.8

Note. *Non-exclusive categories.

In tables 5 and 6, OWS participants report the political groups, social movements, and issues, either national or international, which prompted them to participate in OWS. The case of Wikileaks, the international network Anonymous, and the wave of events known as the Arab Spring were reported, in that order, as the three most influential events for OWS participants. The wave of protests ignited by the 15M/Indignados social movement in Spain has been documented as influential for the emergence and organization of OWS (Castells, 2012), yet only 13% of OWS participants in this sample acknowledged it as an influential force.

⊜Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Also, a notable 20% of OWS participants declared not being influenced by either movements or organizations. Regarding the issues that led individuals to participate in OWS, these were reported to a much higher extent compared to influential movements or organizations. Economic inequality was reported by 91% of OWS participants as a problem boosting their involvement, followed by an 83% reporting a lack of democracy, 80% citing the economic crisis, 79% the financial institutions bail out, and 77% reporting corruption. In sum, what seems to have boosted most participation in OWS in this sample revolves political power, the economy, and their interrelation.

Table 5. Influences fostered participation in OWS (N=381) (%)

INFLUENCES	PERCENTAGE
Wikileaks	31.0
Anonymous	29.7
Arab Spring	29.4
Global Movement	23.4
Other	21.0
None	19.9
Food not bombs	13.9
15M/Indignados in Spain	13.4
MoveOn	13.1
IWW	8.4
End the Fed	8.4
Tea Party	7.1
Free software movement	6.8
Climate Camp	3.7
ISO	1.3
Don't know/No answer	6.6

Note. Categories sorted in descending order (except for "don't know/no answer"). Categories listed are non-exclusive. Column values do not add 100%.

Table 6. Issues that fostered participation in OWS (N=380) (%)

PROBLEMS	PERCENTAGE
Economic inequality	90.8
Lack of democracy	82.9
Economic crisis	79.7
Financial institutions bail out	78.9
Corruption	77.4
Environmental crisis	67.9
Social cuts	67.1
Unemployment/Underemployment	64.7
Student debt	59.7
Housing	52.9
Immigration and racism	49.7
Other motives	25.3
No particular motive	0.5
Don't know/No answer	0.0

Note. Categories sorted in descending order (except for "don't know/no answer"). Categories listed are non-exclusive. Column values do not add 100%.

Examining the actual activities or actions that OWS participants engaged in during their involvement, we can observe in table 7 that the most frequent ones occurred in an interchangeable manner between online and offline actions. The most typical form of participation was signing an online petition (80%), a relatively low intensity form of participation, then followed by participation in a demonstration (73%). Next was participation via online social networks (70%), followed by direct participation in an assembly (62%). Sending emails to politicians (59%) followed by an online/offline combination of participation via online social networks while being physically present at different actions (53%) were next among the most typical forms of participation in OWS. The relatively high degree of participation in active actions, such as attendance in demonstrations and assemblies (and to a lesser extent, engaging in community outreach and Town Hall meetings) suggests the high level of involvement of the sampled individuals who reported having participated in OWS. In addition, the list of forms of participation in OWS presented in the survey seems to be relatively exhaustive due to the relatively low proportion of OWS participants reporting having participated in the movement in another way (16%). Having examined the actual forms of participation in OWS, we now examine the use of technological devices, channels and platforms in relation to OWS in the following section.

Table 7. Activities engaged in during OWS participation (N=384)

FORMS OF PARTICIPATION	PERCENTAGE
Signing an online petition	79.7
In a demonstration (direct action, protest)	73.4
Via online social networks	70.3
In an assembly	62.0
Emailing politicians	58.9
In online social networks while attending events, camping ...	52.6
Doing community outreach	37.8
Making a poster	37.5
Writing a post on a blog	36.7
Participating in a cultural/artistic project or action	29.7
Contributing to a crowdfunding	28.1
Attending City Council or Town Hall meetings	26.3
Recording video / streaming	21.6
Participating in a flash mob	16.1
Other	15.6
Participating in a blockade	15.4
Made a newsletter or newspaper	12.5
Stopping an eviction	9.1
Shutting down a bank, port ...	8.3
Did not participate in any activity related to Occupy	0.5
Don't know/No answer	0.5

Note. Categories listed are non-exclusive. Column values do not add 100%.

4.3. Uses of ICTs.

To start with, table 8 shows the distribution of the use of channels to get and/or spread information regarding OWS among OWS participants, Others, and the total sample. A first glance suggests that both OWS participants and Others made roughly the same use of social networking sites, television, and other channels in this regard. This is especially noticeable concerning social network sites (i.e., Facebook, Twitter, Google+, among a few), suggesting that both groups heavily accessed social network sites to get information about OWS (91% of OWS participants and 89% of Others). This becomes noteworthy in view of the significant difference between both groups regarding the use of digital media (82% of OWS participants and 62% of Others). So, on the one hand, both groups used the Internet to get information about OWS to a very similar extent (social network sites); and on the other, to a quite different extent (digital media). The use of word of mouth also shows to be largely different between both groups (78% of OWS participants, 54% of

Others); and to a lesser extent, the use of print media (41% of OWS participants, 27% of Others) also shows to be significantly different. Lastly, the use of radio also seems to have been different between both groups, reported by a 22% of OWS participants and by a 14% of Others of the sample.

An additional question was asked to non-participants in OWS (here addressed as "Others") on the use of social network sites to share information or opinions related to OWS. The result is that 79% of them reported doing so. Although the question does not describe if whether this group shared opinions in favour or against OWS, the high adherence to the movement shown in table 3 above gives hints that opinions were relatively more inclined towards the former.

Table 8. Use of channels to inform oneself and/or spread information about OWS by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=384)	OTHERS (N=138)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=522)
Social networking sites	91.4	89.1	90.8
Digital media (including websites)***	81.8	62.3	76.6
Word of mouth***	77.6	53.6	71.3
Print media**	40.9	26.8	37.2
Television	24.2	23.2	23.9
Radio*	21.6	13.8	19.5
Others	14.1	10.9	13.2
None***	0.3	4.3	1.3
Don't know/No answer	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Column values do not add 100%. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

Concerning the use of electronic devices to serve the same purposes, table 9 shows that there are significant differences between OWS participants and Others in the use of computers, either desktop (62% of OWS participants, 47% of Others) or laptop (79% of OWS participants, 69% of Others). Among these computers, the difference is larger in the case of the former. As for the rest of devices, there are no statistically significant differences between OWS participants and Others, as they use the same electronic devices to look for information about OWS to a very similar extent. The strongest difference between both groups lays on the non-usage of any electronic device, markedly higher for Others (6%) compared to OWS participants (1%).

18

ⓒDaniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Table 9. Use of electronic devices to inform oneself and/or spread information about OWS by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=384)	OTHERS (N=138)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=522)
Laptop*	78.6	68.8	76.1
Computer desktop**	62.0	47.1	58.0
Mobile phone	61.7	58.7	60.9
Tablet	22.9	21.7	22.6
Smart TV	2.6	0.7	2.1
Other	2.3	1.4	2.1
None***	0.8	5.8	2.1
Don't know/No answer	1.8	2.2	1.9

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values (except for "don't know/no answer"). Column values do not add 100%. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$.

We now focus on specific digital platforms or social network sites (SNS) used by OWS participants during their activities in the movement. As a reference point, nearly 70% of adult population in the US use at least one SNS, among which the most used are Facebook (68% of adults in the country), Instagram (28%), Pinterest (26%), LinkedIn (25%) and Twitter (21%) (Pew Research Center, 2017). In table 10 we observe that Facebook was by far the most widely used SNS among OWS participants, reported by a 91% of them. The following most used SNS or digital platforms are at quite a distance from Facebook, namely, the OccupyWallSt.org website (56%), websites in general (55%), Youtube (53%) and Twitter (49%). Next, there is a group of two SNS that were fairly used by OWS participants, namely, Ustream or Livestream (34%) and blogs in general (33%). From here on, there is a large list of other SNS or digital platforms that slowly decay in terms of usage which ends with WhatsApp (2%). In sum, the OWS participants in this sample used the most mainstream SNS in general (i.e., Facebook, Youtube, and Twitter), along with websites in general, and OccupyWallSt.org website in particular.

Interesting to know also is whether these SNS were first used by OWS participants during their involvement in the movement. Not surprisingly, neither Facebook nor Youtube were first used by OWS participants who used Facebook and Youtube in OWS (8% and 4% respectively), yet Twitter was reported being used for the first time by 39% of OWS Twitter users. The specialized websites InterOccupy.net and OccupyWallSt.org were reported to be first used in this context to a large extent (70% and 69% respectively). However, the SNS reporting the highest first use during OWS was Bambuser, reported by 83% of OWS Bambuser users during their participation. Likewise, Mumble (64%) and Ustream or Livestream (62%) were also among the debuting SNS with highest usage during OWS participation. In this light, participation in OWS entailed an opportunity to adopt new SNS and digital platforms, wherein Ustream/Livestream and Twitter stand out also for being two relatively highly used SNS among all OWS participants.

Table 10. Use and debut of social network sites (SNS) during OWS participation (N=383) (%)

	USE OF SNS	FIRST TIME USE OF SNS IN OWS
Facebook	90.6	8.1
OccupyWallSt.org	55.9	68.7
Websites	55.1	13.3
Youtube	53.3	3.9
Twitter	48.8	39.0
Ustream, Livestream	33.9	62.0
Blogs	32.9	6.4
Google Docs or other online shared documents	25.3	14.4
InterOccupy.net	23.8	70.3
Mailing lists	21.7	14.5
SMS	19.8	5.3
Forums	17.8	13.4
Skype, Google Talk, Google Voice	17.0	9.2
Reddit	15.4	24.1
Tumblr	12.8	20.4
Google+	11.5	13.6
Chat/IRC	10.2	21.1
Celly Loop	5.7	54.5
Instagram	5.7	4.5
Other	5.0	26.3
Webinars	5.0	21.1
Bambuser	4.7	83.3
Pads	4.4	35.3
Flickr	3.9	0.0
Mumble	3.7	64.3
WhatsApp	1.8	0.0
None	0.5	..
Don't know/No answer	0.5	..

Note. .. = Data not available. SNS=Social network sites. Categories sorted in descending order according to use of SNS values (except for "don't know/no answer"). The far right column represents the percentage of OWS participants who having used the corresponding social network site also reported having used it for the first time during their participation in OWS.

In a further question, OWS participants were asked about the frequency of use of such technologies after their participation in the movement (N=354). Results yield that most of them (57%) declared using these technologies with the same frequency as before their involvement in the movement, followed by a 23%

UOC R&I
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers is a research monograph series promoted by the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers (2017)
ISSN 2462-7461
working-papers.uoc.edu

20

declaring a higher use post-OWS, and a 14% declaring a lower use (7% of OWS participants did not answer the question). Therefore, in terms of influences in the more technological field, participation in OWS went hand-in-hand with the adoption of new digital platforms and SNS that were strongly related to media usage in OWS (e.g., InterOccupy.net, OccupyWallSt.org, Bambuser, Ustream or Livestream, Mumble, Twitter, Celly Loop). Although the experience of participating in OWS meant no difference regarding the frequency of SNS usage to a majority of them, SNS usage for nearly a quarter of OWS participants did increase (a section below analyses the impacts of OWS).

4.4. Emotions related to OWS.

To a great majority of the sample, the emergence of OWS meant a relevant emotional experience. Table 11 shows that 88% of the sample reported so. Although highly reported by both groups, OWS participants (94%) and Others (72%), the difference is significantly higher in the case of the former, distanced by 22 percentage points. Three years after the emergence of OWS (see table 12), it still remained as an emotionally relevant experience to most respondents (56%), yet decreasing considerably compared to the early days. The decline was especially noticeable among OWS participants (55%), whereas the decline was less pronounced among Others (59%), which is a somewhat remarkable figure in comparison to OWS participants.

Table 11. Emotional experience of OWS to respondents in its early days by participation in OWS* (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=363)	OTHERS (N=127)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=490)
Yes	93.7	73.2	88.4
No	6.3	26.8	11.6

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.001.

Table 12. Emotional experience of OWS to respondents in its current form (Sept.-Oct. 2014) by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=331)	OTHERS (N=109)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=440)
Yes	55.3	58.7	56.1
No	44.7	41.3	43.9

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values.

Going into greater detail, the following two tables show the particular emotions felt by the respondents both points in time[3]. Regarding the emotions felt in the early days of OWS (see table 13), a first majority reported feeling hope (88%); a second majority, empowerment (72%); and a third majority, joy (52%). In all these three emotions, OWS participants reported feeling them significantly more compared to the Others. Outrage was also an emotion felt significantly more among OWS participants than Others (32% and 15% respectively), and to a lesser extent, nostalgia (11% versus 3%), frustration (42% versus 31%), fear (18% versus 9%), and rage (15% versus 7%). It is worth to note not only how an absolute majority of OWS participants reported feeling hope, empowerment and joy, but also that an absolute majority of Others reported feeling hope and empowerment as well. This gives further evidence about the sympathy felt towards OWS in this latter group.

Table 13. Emotions felt regarding OWS at the time of the camps in 2011 by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=383)	OTHERS (N=136)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=519)
Hope***	90.9	79.4	87.9
Empowerment***	77.3	56.6	71.9
Joy***	58.5	33.1	51.8
Frustration*	42.0	30.9	39.1
Outrage (Indignation)***	32.4	14.7	27.7
Sadness	20.1	14.0	18.5
Fear*	17.5	8.8	15.2
Rage*	14.6	7.4	12.7
Nostalgia**	10.7	2.9	8.7
Disgust	9.4	8.1	9.1
Other*	7.6	1.5	6.0
Indifference	2.1	4.4	2.7
Don't know/No answer***	1.3	7.4	2.9

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$.

Three years later (see table 14), hope and empowerment remained as the most frequent emotions felt in relation to OWS among all the respondents (60% and 43% respectively). However, two things to remark: (a) it decreased notably compared to OWS' early days among both OWS participants and Others, and (b) the

---

[3] Originally, the survey included the emotion "Illusion" among the multiple choices available. However, we deemed the term was mistranslated from the emotion "Ilusión" in Spanish (meaning excitement). Therefore, we excluded this emotion for this paper.

most frequently reported emotions among OWS participants and Others were hope and empowerment in the case of the former, and hope and frustration in the case of the latter (with empowerment in a close third position). It is striking how arguably negative emotions like frustration and nostalgia are reported by both groups, climbing up to third and fourth position respectively in the total sample. At the same time, joy was experienced much less in both groups compared to OWS' early days. Nostalgia was also reported in a high degree, particularly among OWS participants. In all, three years after the emergence of OWS, both OWS participants and Others experienced a decrease in feelings of hope and empowerment and an increase in frustration, disappointment and nostalgia, although hope remained as the most reported emotion of all.

Table 14. Emotions felt regarding OWS in the present time (Sept.-Oct- 2014) by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=380)	OTHERS (N=138)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=518)
Hope	58.9	60.9	59.5
Empowerment*	45.5	34.1	42.5
Frustration	37.9	35.5	37.3
Disappointment*	37.6	26.1	34.6
Nostalgia***	33.2	11.6	27.4
Sadness	23.9	18.1	22.4
Joy	23.4	18.8	22.2
Outrage (Indignation)**	15.0	5.1	12.4
Indifference	8.9	13.0	10.0
Fear	8.4	7.2	8.1
Other**	7.9	1.4	6.2
Disgust	5.8	5.1	5.6
Rage	5.3	2.2	4.4
Don't know/No answer	4.2	5.1	4.4

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$.

Summing up this section, both OWS participants and Others experienced a similar pattern regarding their emotions towards OWS: in OWS' early days, OWS participants felt significantly more the aforementioned positive emotions; whereas three years later, both groups felt more or less to a same extent the aforementioned positive and (arguably) negative emotions.

ⓒDaniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

4.5. The evolution of OWS.

In regards to how respondents perceived the evolution of the movement three years after its emergence, the general impression was that both OWS participants and Others think of OWS in terms of an enduring existence (see table 15). A majority of OWS participants and Others perceived that OWS had evolved into other events, actions, projects or processes (81% and 55% respectively), most notable in the case of the former. In addition, both groups regarded the state of OWS as still relevant, slightly more pronounced among Others (64%) but not significantly different from OWS participants (61%). Interestingly, a relatively large proportion of members of both groups, and at practically the same level, perceived that OWS had diluted over time (27% each group). Contrary to the general trend, a minority in each group believed that OWS was over the moment the encampments ended, which is to say, in OWS' early days. In sum, most respondents in both groups perceived OWS as still being alive and relevant, that it had not perished or disappeared but rather transformed or evolved into other related forms.

Table 15. Agreement with statements on the evolution of OWS by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=381)	OTHERS (N=136)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=517)
Occupy has mutated into other events, actions, projects, or processes**	81.1	55.1	74.3
Occupy is still relevant	61.4	64.0	62.1
Occupy had a great impact at first but then disintegrated	27.3	27.2	27.3
Occupy ended when the encampments did	7.1	11.0	8.1
Don't know/No answer*	1.0	4.4	1.9

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Column values do not add 100%. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.001.

So, into what had OWS transformed specifically over time? One possible answer lays on the groups or processes the respondents associate with OWS (see table 16). Most OWS participants and Others regarded Strike Debt, Occupy Sandy and the Encampments as associated acts of OWS. Conversely, OWS participants associated May Day General Strike and InterOccupy to OWS to a relatively higher extent (43% and 41% respectively), whereas Others associated them to a much lesser degree (13%). Another difference between both groups is the significantly higher extent to which OWS participants associated the aforementioned groups or processes (also valid for the case of Free University) compared to the Others.

Table 16. Association of groups or processes with OWS by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=380)	OTHERS (N=135)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=515)
Strike Debt**	69.7	57.0	66.4
Occupy Sandy***	65.8	39.3	58.8
Encampments*	48.9	36.3	45.6
May Day General Strike***	42.9	13.3	35.1
InterOccupy***	41.3	13.3	34.0
Neighbourhood Assemblies	36.6	28.9	34.6
Free University*	35.3	24.4	32.4
Immigrant and Worker Justice	28.2	25.2	27.4
Research Justice	11.8	14.1	12.4
Other	7.6	4.4	6.8
None*	6.6	13.3	8.3
Don't know/No answer**	5.8	13.3	7.8

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values (except for "don't know/no answer"). Column values do not add 100%. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$.

Now, if there were significant differences found in the proportion of OWS participants and Others associating OWS to the groups or processes listed, these differences grew bigger in terms of participation in nearly every one of them. In table 17 we can observe that although both groups reported not having participated in any of these related groups or processes (dramatically high among Others [80%]), OWS participants show to have participated in nearly all these events to a much higher degree compared to Others. Even Free University, the last event showing this difference, was reported higher among OWS participants (12%) compared to Others (1%). To this point, it becomes clearer that although the Others seemed to generally sympathize with OWS, what makes the greatest difference is that most OWS participants were also active participants in other groups, processes and social movements of the like of OWS, in the past and the present. In other words, it becomes clearer that the sampled OWS participants reflect being part of the core of the OWS movement.

UOC R&I
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

25

Table 17. Participation in groups or processes associated with OWS by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=382)	OTHERS (N=138)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=520)
None***	30.4	79.7	43.5
May Day General Strike***	25.9	0.7	19.2
Strike Debt***	22.0	2.2	16.7
Encampments***	19.6	1.4	14.8
Neighbourhood Assemblies***	17.8	2.2	13.7
Occupy Sandy***	14.1	0.0	10.4
Immigrant and Worker Justice***	13.1	2.2	10.2
InterOccupy***	13.1	0.7	9.8
Free University***	11.8	1.4	9.0
Other	8.1	4.3	7.1
Research Justice	3.4	1.4	2.9
Don't know/No answer	9.7	7.2	9.0

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values (except for "don't know/no answer"). Column values do not add 100%. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

4.6. OWS and institutional politics.

In the field of institutional politics, we begin by examining the perceived effects of OWS on political elections. In table 18, we observe that most OWS participants and Others perceived an effect of OWS on political elections in the US, either at present or in the future. This perception was high even among Others (69%), although OWS participants perceived this significantly more (79%).

Table 18. Perceived actual effects of OWS on political elections in the US by participation in OWS* (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=299)	OTHERS (N=102)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=401)
	78.9	68.6	76.3

Note. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01.

Taking a specific case, both groups perceived to an even greater extent that OWS had an effect on the New York City mayoral election of 2013, which made Bill de Blasio the incumbent mayor (see table 19). Here, OWS participants believed so to a significantly greater extent (87%) compared to Others (73%), which shows that OWS is perceived as having real effects on society among the overall sample.

©Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Table 18. Perceived actual effects of OWS on the New York City mayoral election of Bill de Blasio** (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=210)	OTHERS (N=59)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=269)
	87.1	72.9	84.0

Note. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01.

As for political parties (see table 20), most of OWS participants (48%) and Others (40%) related OWS to the Green Party, followed by Socialist Alternative (36% and 37% respectively), and Independents' Party (32% and 28% respectively). A notable proportion in each group associated OWS with no party at all, which was somewhat more acknowledged among Others (30%) than among OWS participants (28%). Interestingly, OWS participants associated significantly more OWS to Ron Paul's Party (11% versus 4%), whereas Others associated significantly more OWS to the Democratic Party (21% versus 11%). However, the overall impression is that most people in both groups associated OWS to left-wing parties or to no party at all, and that both groups associated OWS to different American parties to a similar extent.

Table 20. Perceived association of electoral formations with OWS by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=378)	OTHERS (N=136)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=514)
Green Party	48.4	40.4	46.3
Socialist Alternative	35.7	36.8	36.0
Independent	31.7	27.9	30.7
No party	27.8	30.1	28.4
Working Families Party	21.7	17.6	20.6
Libertarian Party	12.7	8.8	11.7
Democratic Party**	10.8	21.3	13.6
Ron Paul's party*	10.3	3.7	8.6
None*	9.3	3.7	7.8
Other	8.2	8.1	8.2
Republican Party	0.5	0.0	0.4
Don't know/No answer	12.7	19.1	14.4

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values (except for "don't know/no answer"). Column values do not add 100%. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01.

Following on the previous idea, there seems to be a significant association between the reported political ideology of the respondents and whether they participated in OWS or otherwise. In table 21 we observe that most OWS participants and Others coincided in declaring themselves as socialists (26% of OWS participants and 29% of Others). It is also noteworthy that Others also defined themselves more as liberals (21%) and environmentalists (20%) compared to OWS participants, who identified themselves more with anarchism (20%), environmentalist (16%) and other ideologies (14%). In sum, OWS participants and Others have in common that both are mostly inclined to identify themselves with socialism and environmentalism, and depart regarding anarchism (higher among OWS participants) and liberalism (higher among Others). This gives further evidence that both groups are, with some differences, quite homogeneous regarding the issues presented in this survey.

Table 21. Identification with political ideology by participation in OWS* (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=362)	OTHERS (N=129)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=491)
Socialism	26.2	28.7	26.9
Anarchism	19.6	11.6	17.5
Environmentalism	15.5	20.2	16.7
Other	14.1	6.2	12.0
Feminism	8.8	6.2	8.1
Communism	5.0	3.1	4.5
Conservatism	0.8	2.3	1.2
Nationalism	0.3	0.8	0.4
Liberalism	9.7	20.9	12.6

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *$p < 0.01$.

4.7. OWS impacts.

Further examination of the impacts of OWS revolves, firstly, the perceived effects of OWS in a variety of social issues. Table 22 shows that among both OWS participants and Others predominated the belief that OWS has impacted perceptions of people, namely, of capitalism and economic justice. The belief that OWS has changed the perception of capitalism was reported significantly more among OWS participants than among Others (70% and 60% respectively), and so were the practices of social movements (60% versus 50%), the way respondents understand politics (45% versus 34%), and the respondents' vote intention (22% versus 13%). Yet, what marks the greatest difference between both groups is the respondents' forms of political participation, declared by 53% of OWS participants and 31% of Others. This is noteworthy in view of, as we have seen above (see table 4), a majority of OWS participants that had experience participating in social

movements before OWS. Perhaps OWS provided new ways to participate in social movements and to be politically involved (see table 6), as well as an opportunity to the introduction of new technologies used with political purposes (see table 9). In addition, in spite that Others did not report participating in OWS in any way, perhaps OWS provided the stimulus for nearly a third of them to engage in politics in a way that was different from their usual political participation repertoire. In sum, according to both groups, OWS seems to have affected mostly people's perceptions of the economic system, brought awareness of their empowerment potential, and, to differing degrees, the political participation of the respondents themselves.

Table 22. Perceived effects associated with OWS by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=383)	OTHERS (N=135)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=518)
The perception of capitalism*	69.5	59.3	66.8
The perception of or attention to economic justice	62.9	60.7	62.4
The practices of social movements*	59.8	49.6	57.1
My forms of political participation***	53.0	31.1	47.3
The ability of people to change things	49.3	47.4	48.8
My way of understanding politics*	44.9	34.1	42.1
The media agenda	42.6	35.6	40.7
What I consider intolerable in a society	38.9	38.5	38.8
The issues that interest me	35.2	32.6	34.6
What I consider desirable in a society	34.7	33.3	34.4
My vote intention*	22.2	13.3	19.9
Other**	5.7	0.0	4.2
Nothing	3.7	6.7	4.4
Don't know/No answer	3.1	3.7	3.3

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Column values do not add 100%. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

Moving on to the perceived effect of OWS on several and diverse areas of society, table 23 shows that a majority of OWS participants and Others believed that OWS has influenced democracy and the economy the most. Housing was perceived by OWS participants to have been influenced by OWS to a large extent (51%), while this perception was reported much less among Others (31%). Arts and culture was another area where both groups diverge significantly (44% of OWS participants compared to 32% of Others). Another notable divergence between both groups regards the perception that OWS had no influence at all on any of the listed areas. A 12% of Others believed that OWS had no influence, while this figure represented only 4% of OWS participants. Although overall, this belief was the lowest among all the areas listed, it is still interesting to note that this perception is one of the things that make these two groups different.

Table 23. Perceived influence of OWS on specific areas by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=380)	OTHERS (N=137)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=517)
Democracy	55.0	48.2	53.2
Economy	52.6	47.4	51.3
Housing**	50.5	31.4	45.5
Mass media	49.2	43.8	47.8
Transparency	48.9	41.6	47.0
Arts and culture*	44.2	32.1	41.0
Education	37.6	29.2	35.4
Health	27.4	19.0	25.1
Other	8.2	6.6	7.7
Nothing**	3.7	12.4	6.0
Don't know/No answer	11.3	11.7	11.4

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values (except for "don't know/no answer"). Column values do not add 100%. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.001$.

In terms of the image and reputation of different institutions, table 24 shows that there is a significant association between OWS participants and Others, and whether OWS exerted a positive or a negative effect on most of these institutions and actors. Chi-square tests suggest that this association is particularly strong regarding public institutions (congress, the police, among a few) and the role of the Internet in organizing protests. OWS participants reported that OWS affected negatively the reputation of powerful public institutions and positively the role of the Internet to organize protest to a very high extent (92% and 94%). While Others, although predominantly reporting both actors the same way, also perceived that OWS had not affected them at all (18% in the case of the former, and 13% the latter). This pattern repeated in the case of financial institutions and banks, political parties, and the media (in order of increasing predominance of "no effects" among Others); institutions which hold a significant, although less strong, association with being whether a declared OWS participant or part of the Others group. Conversely, although the majority of both groups perceived a positive effect of OWS on social movements and labour unions, no statistical association was found.

Table 24. "I think OWS has affected the reputation of..." by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS	OTHERS	TOTAL SAMPLE
Public institutions (Congress, police, ...)**	**(N=366)**	**(N=122)**	**(N=488)**
Negatively	92.3	80.3	89.3
Not at all	5.5	18.0	8.6
Positively	2.2	1.6	2.0
Political parties*	**(N=355)**	**(N=114)**	**(N=469)**
Negatively	87.0	73.7	83.8
Not at all	11.0	22.8	13.9
Positively	2.0	3.5	2.3
Unions	**(N=314)**	**(N=97)**	**(N=411)**
Negatively	6.4	11.3	7.5
Not at all	33.1	37.1	34.1
Positively	60.5	51.5	58.4
Social movements	**(N=314)**	**(N=97)**	**(N=411)**
Negatively	5.1	5.6	5.2
Not at all	5.4	11.2	6.9
Positively	89.5	83.2	87.9
Media*	**(N=344)**	**(N=114)**	**(N=458)**
Negatively	72.7	57.0	68.8
Not at all	21.5	35.1	24.9
Positively	5.8	7.9	6.3
Financial institutions and banks *	**(N=372)**	**(N=122)**	**(N=494)**
Negatively	93.0	82.0	90.3
Not at all	5.9	16.4	8.5
Positively	1.1	1.6	1.2
The Internet to organize protests**	**(N=361)**	**(N=128)**	**(N=489)**
Negatively	1.4	7.0	2.9
Not at all	5.0	13.3	7.2
Positively	93.6	79.7	90.0

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.01, **p < 0.001.

Following on the effects of OWS, we examine the perceived contribution of OWS to a social and political change (see table 25). We observe that there is a significant association between the varying degrees of such perception, and whether respondents participated in OWS or otherwise. Most OWS participants responded affirmatively to this question, while most of Others, although also responding affirmatively, introduced a nuanced response. Most Others reported a partially affirmative response to the question, which was also the

UOC R&I
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers is a research monograph series promoted by the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers (2017)
ISSN 2462-7461
working-papers.uoc.edu

31

second largest perception among OWS participants. In sum, although both groups largely perceived that OWS, in effect, contributes to a social and political change, some Others rejected this perception straightforwardly (8%).

Table 25. Contribution of Occupy Wall Street to a social and political change by participation in OWS* (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=379)	OTHERS (N=134)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=513)
Yes	48.8	37.3	45.8
Yes, in part	37.2	47.0	39.8
Yes, but only in the long term	11.1	7.5	10.1
No	2.9	8.2	4.3

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.01.

Lastly, after examining the respondents' perceptions of the possible effects OWS might have exerted over different things, we now present the respondents' behaviours after the emergence of OWS. An overview of table 26 suggests that what differentiates most OWS participants and Others in this respect is that once OWS emerged, the former engaged in activities that required a relatively higher level of involvement. OWS participants reported having attended protests for issues not affecting them directly (51%), more community events (32%), and City Council or Town Hall meetings (20%); while these behaviours were engaged by no more than 12% of Others. Conversely, most of Others engaged in activities involving a lower level of intensity (e.g., participation in local, state, or federal election [31%], shopping local or at farmer's market [38%]) or rather relatively passive behaviours (e.g., looking for information or news at different geographical levels). Relatively subtle changes also emerged among OWS participants, who after the emergence of OWS reported feeling greater sympathy with struggles abroad (55%); a change which was also the predominant one among Others (49%). Up to this point, it seems clear that declared OWS participants represent highly and historically engaged people in social movements, protest activities, and activism, activities that demand a high level of involvement; whereas Others seems to represent sympathizers and adherents of OWS, yet usually less involved in non-institutionalized forms of political participation and medium to low intensity level political behaviours.

Table 26. Activities or behaviours engaged in since the emergence of Occupy Wall Street by participation in OWS (%)

	15M PARTICIPANTS (N=377)	OTHERS (N=137)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=514)
Sympathize with struggles in countries other than my own	54.6	48.9	53.1
Attended protests for issues that do not affect me directly***	50.7	10.2	39.9
Sought out more foreign news	37.1	38.7	37.5
Started shopping local or at farmer's markets	37.1	38.0	37.4
Only purchase products from companies that are not part of the 1%, when possible	37.9	30.7	36.0
Sought out information on political ideologies different from my own	36.3	36.5	36.4
Attended more community events***	32.4	11.7	26.8
Sought out more local news	31.3	24.8	29.6
Participated in local, state, or federal election	30.8	31.4	30.9
Joined a credit union*	27.6	16.8	24.7
Sought out more national news	22.8	26.3	23.7
Attended City Council or Town Hall meetings***	19.9	4.4	15.8
Stopped voting*	13.0	5.8	11.1
Began a community group to address local issues and ordinances**	12.5	3.6	10.1
Not engaged in any new kind of activity or behaviour	7.2	8.0	7.4
Other	7.4	5.8	7.0
Don't know/No answer	5.6	6.6	5.8

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Column values do not add 100%. Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

5. Conclusions.

Recapitulating the results of the study, we would like to begin stressing the high proportion of self-reported participants in OWS: nearly three out of every four respondents declared having participated in the movement. In addition, nearly the same proportion identified themselves with it. This is an expected

©Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

outcome due to the methodological design of this study, which was focused mainly on sympathizers and participants in the movement. Regarding the latter, the results show that most of them increased their participation in non-institutionalized forms of political participation after OWS. Many of them were prompted into participation by the influence of internet-related activism and global social movements, as well as by issues of a predominantly economic (e.g., inequality, crisis, banks bailouts) and political (e.g., lack of democracy, corruption) kind. Also, a majority engaged in OWS through both online and offline forms of participation (i.e., sending emails, signing petitions, using social network sites, demonstrating, attending assemblies) or, more importantly, combining them in real time (i.e., using social network sites while attending assemblies).

An important block of questions in this study concerned the use of communication technologies in relation to OWS. The most widely used channels to access and share information about the movement were digital ones, as well as word of mouth, in contrast to mass media (print, television, radio), suggesting the central role of networks and decentralized communication systems to spread and be exposed to OWS information. As to the electronic devices used in this regard, computers (laptop or desktop) and mobile telephones were clearly the most widely used by respondents, which shows the predominance of relatively popular devices in contrast to others such as tablets or Smart TV. During their participation, OWS participants used the most popular social network sites (i.e., Facebook, Youtube, Twitter), along with websites in general and specialized websites in particular (i.e., OccupyWallSt.org). Interestingly, during their participation, some adopted new social network sites and digital platforms (e.g., Ustream/Livestream, Twitter).

The emotions experienced with regard to OWS were also a central aspect of this study: an overwhelming majority of respondents felt that OWS in its early days represented a relevant emotional experience to them, a proportion that declined notably when asking about their experience three years afterwards, even if still experienced by a majority. Feelings of hope and empowerment were the most frequently cited by respondents at both points in time, although feelings of disappointment, nostalgia and frustration clearly grew with time. For most of the sample, OWS was still relevant and alive in other forms, while a relatively small proportion believed OWS had disappeared after its early days.

An analysis that emerged throughout this study concerns the comparison between respondents that reported having participated in OWS and those who did not participate or did not answer. Both groups had no statistically significant differences on socio-demographical grounds (that is, they are similar in terms of age, sex composition, educational attainment, place of birth, place of residence, and racial or ethnical heritage). Although "Others" showed lower levels of sympathy, adherence, and involvement in OWS compared to OWS participants, it is clear that this group is relatively aligned with the movement: most of them identified themselves with OWS, regarded OWS as a relevant emotional experience, felt hopeful and empowered since OWS' emergence, perceived OWS as still relevant and alive, and perceived OWS as having an impact on several perceptions, behaviours, elections, institutions, and areas of social life. What apparently constitutes the fundamental difference between both groups is their level of political involvement, which is consistent with their self-ascription as non-participants in OWS.

The possibility of splitting the results based on participation or otherwise in the OWS movement allowed us to get a broader picture as well as a finer interpretation of what characterizes networked social movements. A

preliminary view of the results shows, for example, a hybridization of physical and digital participation. The differences in these patterns could be, perhaps, more related to the different degrees of involvement by OWS participants than to the conventional opposition between physical and digital participation. At the same time, we could observe the central role of digital technologies in the organization and communication of actions. Another relevant issue is the blurred borders of aggregated groups and collectivities around OWS. Many of them were largely identified with the movement, suggesting changes in the notion of identity and how this identity operates at higher levels, whether meso or macro (Monterde et al., 2015). Emotions are another crucial aspect: results reflect how mainly positive emotions are experienced during the protests in September 2011. We would be unable to understand these feelings during the protests if we neglect their networked dimension and the way in which the technologically structured contagion works (Toret et al., 2015). These initial and preliminary results suffice to continue and extend the task opened by Castells (2012) and other scholars in characterizing networked social movements, in this particular study, via quantitative techniques.

The technopolitical approach of this study contributed in defining the contents of each sections in which the survey is divided. The thematic blocks proved us useful to focus attention on several aspects of participation in OWS. Nonetheless, we wish to stress some aspects that could see improvements in future works. Firstly, in the set of questions related to the evolution of OWS, table 17 shows results on the actual participation of respondents in several groups or processes associated with OWS, a question which could be better placed in the section on forms of participation. The same applies to table 26 (activities or behaviours engaged in since OWS), which could be better grouped with a set of questions regarding forms of participation before, during, and after OWS. Secondly, we acknowledge that the set of questions about the impacts of OWS can be confusing. Tables 22 and 23 could be combined into one table only since they ask about the perceived effects of OWS on different issues and areas, which could seem redundant to the reader. Finally, in the section on elections, the first question in table 18 asks whether respondents perceived an effect of OWS on political elections in general in the US. We believe that the question may be better suited in an historical moment of expected elections sometime in the near future, as was the case of the study about the 15M social movement. Although a relevant question, the prospect of upcoming elections provides the potential for an enhanced context as well as richer and meaningful reflections of the respondents.

In methodological terms, online surveys have long concerned researchers regarding their capacity to accurately represent the population of interest. In this study, however, it became an excellent tool to query, analyse, and interpret an emergent social movement with relatively strong attachments to digital communication networks, as is the case of OWS. Firstly, by using the same key communication channels used in the movement, we were able to reach a sample that is closely related to the population of interest. And secondly, it allowed us to conduct separate analyses between self-reported OWS participants and the categorized rest of the sample ("Others"), enabling us to focus our analyses on the participants and their forms of engagement. The detailed examination of OWS participants across several sections provided us with greater insight of their practices, which is consistent with our situated approach in this study. In this sense, we deem the methodological approach adopted as appropriate. In addition, we strongly recommend comparing the data of the survey with other data sources based on qualitative analysis or network analysis.

To conclude, we wish to note that this working paper is an initial descriptive analysis of the survey. It is aimed to liberate the data and to contribute to the understanding of OWS three years after its emergence. In parallel, we are working on two similar studies: one related to the 15M movement in Spain, and another to the Journeys of June in Brazil. The present study and the Brazilian study are based on the 15M movement study, which has been adapted to the American and Brazilian contexts. Our next step is to carry out a comparative study of these movements in the near future. We also aim to establish the survey designed for these studies as a prototype for other networked social movements, in order to have a broader base for comparison and to better understand them.

Acknowledgments

Bibliographic references

BENNETT , W. L., & SEGERBERG, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 739-768.

CASTAÑEDA, E. (2012). The indignados of Spain: A precedent to Occupy Wall Street. *Social Movement Studies*, 11(3-4), 309-319.

CASTELLS, M. (1996). *The information age: Economy, society and culture. The rise of the network society* (Vol. 1). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.

CASTELLS, M. (2009). *Communication power.* United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

CASTELLS, M. (2012). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity Press.

COULDRY, N. (2012). *Media, society, world: Social theory and digital media practice*. Cambridge, MA: Polity

EARL, J., & KIMPORT, K. (2011). *Digitally enabled social change: Activism in the internet age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

FEUER, A. (2012). Occupy Sandy: A movement moves to relief. *The New York Times*, 9.

FERGUSON, C. & MARRS, A. (2010). *Inside job* [Motion picture]. United States: Sony Pictures Classics.

GERBAUDO, P. (2012). *Tweets and the streets: Social media and contemporary activism*. London, United Kingdom: Pluto Press.

GITLIN, T. (2012). *Occupy nation: The roots, the spirit, and the promise of Occupy Wall Street*. New York, NY: Itbooks.

GRAEBER, D. (2013). *The democracy project: A history, a crisis, a movement*. New York, NY: Spiegel & Grau.

JURIS, J. S. (2004). Networked social movements: global movements for global justice. In M. Castells (Ed.), *The network society: A cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 341-362). Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

JURIS, J. S. (2012). Reflections on #Occupy Everywhere: Social media, public space, and emerging logics of aggregation. *American Ethnologist*, 39(2), 259-279.

LINARES, J. (2013*). El 15-M en España y los flujos de información: Medios, entornos y relatos. Del 9 de febrero al 19 de junio de 2011* [15M in Spain and information flows: Media, environments and stories. From February 9 to June 19, 2011] (Master's thesis). Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain.

MONTERDE, A., CALLEJA-LÓPEZ, A., BLANCHE, D. & FERNÁNDEZ-ARDÈVOL, M. (2017). 15M: The movement in its third anniversary. *UOC R&I Working Papers.*

OECD. (2011). *OECD guide to measuring the Information Society 2011*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. http://doi.org/10.1787/9789264113541-en

PEPITONE, J. (2011, September 17). Hundreds of protesters descend to "Occupy Wall Street". *CNN*. Retrieved from http://money.cnn.com/2011/09/17/technology/occupy_wall_street/

PERUGORRÍA, I., & TEJERINA, B. (2013). Politics of the encounter: Cognition, emotions, and networks in the Spanish 15M. *Current Sociology*, 61(4), 424–442. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113479743

PEW RESEARCH CENTER. (2017). *Social media fact sheet*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/social-media/

PIKETTY, T. (2014). *Capital in the 21st Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

RAMPELL, C. (2011, December 2). Jobless rate dips to lowest level in more than two years. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/03/business/economy/us-adds-120000-jobs-unemployment-drops-to-8-6.html

TEJERINA, B., PERUGORRÍA, I., BENSKI, T., & LANGMAN, L. (2013). From indignation to occupation: A new wave of global mobilization. *Current Sociology*, 61(4), 377-392.http://tecnopolitica.net/OWSsurvey2014_data

TORET, J., CALLEJA-LÓPEZ, A., MARÍN MIRÓ, Ó., ARAGÓN, P., AGUILERA, M., BARANDIARAN, X. E., … MONTERDE, A. (Ed.). (2015). *Tecnopolítica y 15M: La potencia de las multitudes conectadas. Un estudio sobre la gestación y explosión del 15M* [Technopolitics and 15M: The power of connected multitudes. A study on the emergence and explosión of 15M]. Barcelona, Spain: UOC Ediciones.

©Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Annex 1

#OccupySurvey Questionnaire

Legend
- SCQ: Single choice question
- MCQ: Multiple choice question
- SCQ PLUS: Single choice question with open option "Others"
- MCQ PLUS: Multiple choice question with open option "Others"
- MATRIX SCQ: Single choice question in matrix form
- NUMERIC: Numerical question
- TEXT: Open response question

General aspects

Title: #OccupySurvey
Subtitle:

Content

1 – COMMENT

This is a survey on Occupy in its third anniversary. The aim is to gather the opinions and perceptions you have about Occupy, regardless of the degree of knowledge or participation.

All responses are ANONYMOUS (we do not know who answers). The data you provide us with will be confidential. The survey results will be public and open.

The survey should take you about 15 minutes to answer it.

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

In case of comments or doubts, you can contact: civilsc@uoc.edu

WARNING! Please make sure you open the survey in one window or tab only.

The survey can be filled from any device, although we recommend using a big screen (12 inches or more) for better readability.

2 – PAGE BREAK

3 – COMMENT

To start with, some questions about you

4 – v_1 SQR
Phrasing   I am:
Codes
0   Male
1   Female
997   Self-describe: _____

5 – v_2 NUMERIC
Phrasing   I am: _____ years old

6 – v_3 SCQ
Phrasing   I was born in:
Codes
1   US
2   Canada
3   Mexico
4   Other American country
5   Europe
6   Africa

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

7   Asia
8   Oceania
999   Don't know/No answer

7 – v_4 SCQ
   Phrasing   I live in:
   Codes
   1   US
   2   Canada
   3   Mexico
   4   Other American country
   5   Europe
   6   Africa
   7   Asia
   8   Oceania
   999   Don't know/No answer

8 – PAGE BREAK

9 – v_5 NUMERIC
   Only shows if v_4 = 1
   Phrasing   Indicate your current postal/zip code: _____

10 – v_6_1 SCQ
   Only shows if v_4 = 4
   Phrasing   In which country do you live in?
   Codes
   1   Anguilla
   2   Antigua and Barbuda
   3   Argentina
   4   Aruba
   5   Bahamas
   6   Barbados
   7   Belize
   8   Bermudas

©Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

9	Bolivia
10	Brazil
11	British Virgin Islands
12	Cayman Islands
13	Chile
14	Clipperton Island
15	Colombia
16	Costa Rica
17	Cuba
18	Curaçao
19	Dominica
20	Dominican Republic
21	Dutch Caribbean
22	Ecuador
23	El Salvador
24	Falkland Islands
25	French Guiana
26	Greenland
27	Grenada
28	Guadeloupe
29	Guatemala
30	Guyana
31	Haiti
32	Honduras
33	Jamaica
34	Martinique
35	Montserrat
36	Navassa Island
37	Nicaragua
38	Panama
39	Paraguay
40	Peru
41	Puerto Rico
42	Saba
43	Saint Barthélemy
44	Saint Kitts and Nevis
45	Saint Lucia
46	Saint Martin
47	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
48	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
49	Sint Eustatius
50	Sint Maarten
51	South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
52	Surinam
53	Trinidad and Tobago
54	Turks and Caicos Islands
55	United States Virgin Islands
56	Uruguay
57	Venezuela
999	Don't know/No answer

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

11 – v_6_2 SCQ
Only shows if v_4 = 5
Phrasing   In which country do you live in?
Codes
1   Albania
2   Andorra
3   Armenia
4   Austria
5   Belarus
6   Belgium
7   Bosnia and Herzegovina
8   Bulgaria
9   Croatia
10   Cyprus
11   Czech Republic
12   Denmark
13   Estonia
14   Finland
15   France
16   Georgia
17   Germany
18   Greece
19   Hungary
20   Iceland
21   Ireland
22   Italy
23   Latvia
24   Liechtenstein
25   Lithuania
26   Luxembourg
27   Macedonia
28   Malta
29   Moldova
30   Monaco
31   Montenegro
32   Netherlands
33   Norway
34   Poland
35   Portugal
36   Romania
37   San Marino
38   Serbia
39   Slovakia
40   Slovenia
41   Spain
42   Sweden
43   Switzerland
44   Ukraine

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

45	United Kingdom
46	Vatican City
999	Don't know/No answer

12 – v_6_3 SCQ
Only shows if v_4 = 6
Phrasing   In which country do you live in?
Codes

1	Algeria
2	Angola
3	Benin
4	Botswana
5	Burkina Faso
6	Burundi
7	Cameroon
8	Cape Verde
9	Central African Republic
10	Chad
11	Comoros
12	Democratic Republic of the Congo
13	Djibouti
14	Egypt
15	Equatorial Guinea
16	Eritrea
17	Ethiopia
18	Gabon
19	Gambia
20	Ghana
21	Guinea
22	Guinea-Bissau
23	Ivory Coast
24	Kenya
25	Lesotho
26	Liberia
27	Libya
28	Madagascar
29	Malawi
30	Mali
31	Mauritania
32	Mauritius
33	Morocco
34	Mozambique
35	Namibia
36	Niger
37	Nigeria
38	Republic of Congo
39	Rwanda

40	Senegal
41	Sierra Leone
42	Somalia
43	South Africa
44	South Sudan
45	Sudan
46	Swaziland
47	Tanzania
48	Togo
49	Tunisia
50	Uganda
51	Zambia
52	Zimbabwe
999	Don't know/No answer

13 – v_6_4 SCQ
Only shows if v_4 = 7
Phrasing   In which country do you live in?
Codes

1	Afghanistan
2	Armenia
3	Azerbaijan
4	Bahrain
5	Bangladesh
6	Bhutan
7	Brunei
8	Cambodia
9	China
10	Cyprus
11	East Timor
12	Georgia
13	India
14	Indonesia
15	Iran
16	Iraq
17	Israel
18	Japan
19	Jordan
20	Kazakhstan
21	Kuwait
22	Kyrgyzstan
23	Laos
24	Lebanon
25	Malaysia
26	Maldives
27	Mongolia
28	Myanmar
29	Nepal

30	North Korea
31	Oman
32	Pakistan
33	Palestine
34	Philippines
35	Qatar
36	Russia
37	Saudi Arabia
38	Singapore
39	Sri Lanka
40	Syria
41	Tajikistan
42	Thailand
43	Turkey
44	Turkmenistan
45	United Arab Emirates
46	Uzbekistan
47	Vietnam
48	Yemen
999	Don't know/No answer

14 – v_6_5 SCQ
Only shows if v_4 = 8
Phrasing   In which country do you live in?
Codes

1	American Samoa
2	Australia
3	Christmas Island
4	Cocos Islands
5	Cook Islands
6	Coral Sea Islands
7	Federated States of Micronesia
8	Fiji
9	French Polynesia
10	Guam
11	Hawaii
12	Kiribati
13	Marshall Islands
14	Nauru
15	New Caledonia
16	New Zealand
17	Niue
18	Norfolk Island
19	Northern Mariana Islands
20	Palau
21	Papua
22	Papua New Guinea
23	Pitcairn Islands

24	Samoa
25	Solomon Islands
26	Tokelau
27	Tonga
28	Tuvalu
29	Vanuatu
30	Wake Island
31	Wallis and Futuna
32	West Papua
999	Don't know/No answer

15 – v_7 MCQ

Phrasing   Which of the following best represents your racial or ethnic heritage? (You can tick more than one)

Codes

1	Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American
2	East Asian or Asian American
3	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
4	Latino or Hispanic American
5	Middle Eastern or Arab American
6	Native American or Alaskan Native
7	Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American
8	South Asian or Indian American
9	Other
999	Don't know/No answer

16 – v_8 SCQ

Phrasing   What is the highest education level you have completed?

Codes

1	No studies
2	Primary studies (grade school)
3	Secondary Studies (high school, professional schools)
4	University studies (diploma, bachelor, master, PhD...)
999	Don't know/No answer

19 – v_9 MCQ

Phrasing   What is your financial, job, or life situation? (You can tick more than one)

Codes

1	I have no income
2	I am in debt
3	Stable job
4	Unsteady work
5	Working without a contract

6	Permanent job
7	Temporary work
8	Working full time
9	Working part-time
10	Retired
11	Unemployed
12	Unpaid domestic work (caretaker, homemaker)
13	Student
14	Freelancer
15	Self-employed
16	Other
999	Don't know/No answer

20 – PAGE BREAK

21 – v_10 MCQ
Phrasing   Your house, apartment, or mobile home is: (You can tick more than one)
Codes

1	Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan
2	Owned by you or someone in this household without a mortgage or loan
3	Rented for cash rent
4	Occupied without payment of cash rent
5	I am homeless
6	Other
999	Don't know/No answer

22 – v_11 MATRIX SCQ
Phrasing   How do you consider your financial situation?
v_11   Assessment:
Codes

1	Very good
2	Good
3	Neither good nor bad
4	Bad
5	Very bad
999	Don't know/No answer

23 – v_12 MATRIX SCQ
Phrasing   Do you believe that...
v_12_1   Your economic situation will improve in the future?

©Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

v_12_2   The economic situation in general will improve?
Codes
0   No
1   Yes
999   Don't know/No answer

24 – PAGE BREAK

25 – COMMENT

Now, some questions on Occupy

26 – v_13 SCQ
Phrasing   Have you participated in Occupy in any way?
Codes
0   No
1   Yes
999   Don't know/No answer

27 – v_14 MCQ
Phrasing   How would you describe your level of identification with Occupy?
Codes
1   I have not and I do not identify myself with Occupy
2   I have identified myself with Occupy but not anymore
3   I did not identify myself with Occupy but now I do
4   I have and I do identify myself with Occupy
999   Don't know/No answer

28 – PAGE BREAK

29 – v_15 TEXT
Only shows if v_13 = 1
Phrasing   In what city/cities or town/s have you participated? (Maximum characters: 50)

30 – v_16 MCQ
Only shows if v_13 = 1
Phrasing   When have you participated in Occupy? (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   July-August 2011
2   September 2011
3   October 2011
4   November 2011
5   December 2011
6   January-June 2012
7   July-December 2012
8   January-December 2013
9   January 2014-Present
999   Don't know/No answer

31 – v_17 MCQ
Only shows if v_13 = 1
Phrasing   Before Occupy, you had participated in... (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   Movements related to Internet and online activism
2   Political parties
3   Unions
4   Social movements
5   NGOs, non-profits, associations
6   Solidarity, activist groups, alliance groups
7   Churches, charities
8   Others
9   None
999   Don't know/No answer

32 – v_18 MCQ
Only shows if v_13 = 1
Phrasing   Currently you participate in... (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   Movements related to Internet and online activism
2   Political parties
3   Unions
4   Social movements
5   NGOs, non-profits, associations
6   Solidarity, activist groups, alliance groups
7   Churches, charities
8   Others
9   None
999   Don't know/No answer

33 – v_19 MCQ
Only shows if v_13 = 1
Phrasing   Did any movement or organization influenced you to participate in Occupy? (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   Global Movement
2   Free software movement
3   Arab Spring
4   Food not bombs
5   15-M/Indignados in Spain
6   Climate Camp
7   MoveOn
8   IWW
9   Tea Party
10   ICFI
11   End the Fed
12   ISO
13   Wikileaks
14   Anonymous
15   None
999   Don't know/No answer

34 – PAGE BREAK

35 – v_20 MCQ PLUS
Only shows if v_13 = 1
Phrasing   Do you associate any of these movements with Occupy? (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   Open Source, free software and free culture movement (STOP SOPA-STOP PIPA, …)
2   Arab Spring
3   #Yosoy132 in Mexico
4   Occupy in the UK
5   Occupy Canada
6   15-M/Indignados in Spain
7   Gezi Park in Turkey
8   Passe livre in Brazil
9   Sintagma Square in Greece
10   Euromaidan in Ukraine
11   None
999   Don't know/No answer
0   (Open field) Other

51

36 – v_21 MCQ
Only shows if v_13 = 1
Phrasing   The problems that led you to participate in Occupy were... (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   Economic crisis
2   Corruption
3   Lack of democracy
4   Social cuts
5   Housing
6   Economic inequality
7   Unemployment/underemployment
8   Student debt
9   Environmental crisis
10   Financial institutions bail out
11   Immigration and racism
12   Other motives
13   No particular motive
999   Don't know/No answer

37 – v_22 MCQ
Only shows if v_13 = 1
Phrasing   In Occupy, you have participated... (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   In a demonstration (direct action, protest)
2   Camping in a square
3   In an assembly
4   Via online social networks
5   In online social networks while attending events, camping...
6   Recording video / streaming
7   Making a poster
8   Writing a post on a blog
9   Organizing an action
10   Stopping an eviction
11   Signing an online petition
12   Contributing to a crowdfunding
13   Emailing politicians
14   Participating in a cultural/artistic project or action
15   Participating in a blockade
16   Shutting down a bank, port...
17   Participating in a flash mob
18   Doing community outreach
19   Attending City Council or Town Hall meetings
20   Made a newsletter or newspaper
21   Other

UOC R&I
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers is a research monograph series promoted by the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Working Papers (2017)
ISSN 2462-7461
working-papers.uoc.edu

52

22   You did not participate in any activity related to Occupy
999   Don't know/No answer

38 – PAGE BREAK

39 – COMMENT
                Some questions on the use of media and digital technologies

40 – v_23 MCQ
    Phrasing   Have you used any of these channels to inform yourself and/or to spread information about Occupy? (You can tick more than one)
    Codes
    1   Television
    2   Radio
    3   Print media
    4   Digital media (including websites)
    5   Word of mouth
    6   Social networking sites
    7   Others
    8   None
    999   Don't know/No answer

41 – v_24 MCQ
    Phrasing   How did you first hear about Occupy? (You can tick more than one)
    Codes
    1   Television
    2   Radio
    3   Print media
    4   Digital media (including websites)
    5   Word of mouth
    6   Social networking sites
    7   Others
    8   None
    999   Don't know/No answer

42 – v_25 MCQ
    Phrasing   Have you used any of these devices with Internet access to get and/or spread information about Occupy? (You can tick more than one)

Codes
1   Mobile phone
2   Tablet
3   Laptop
4   Computer desktop
5   Smart TV
6   Other
7   None
999   Don't know/No answer

43 – v_26 MCQ
Only shows if v_13 = 1
Phrasing   For issues related to Occupy you have used... (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   Twitter
2   Facebook
3   YouTube
4   Reddit
5   WhatsApp
6   Mumble
7   Skype, Google Talk, Google Voice
8   Tumblr
9   Forums
10   Chat/IRC
11   Blogs
12   Websites
13   Flickr
14   Instagram
15   Bambuser
16   Ustream, Livestream
17   Mailing lists
18   Pads
19   Google Docs or other online shared documents
20   Google+
21   Webinars
22   SMS
23   Celly Loop
24   InterOccupy.net
25   OccupyWallSt.org
26   Other
27   None
999   Don't know/No answer

44 – v_27 SCQ
Only shows if v_13 = 0 OR 999

Phrasing   Have you shared information or opinions related to Occupy in online social networks?

Codes

0   No

1   Yes

999   Don't know/No answer

45 – PAGE BREAK

46 – v_28 MATRIX SCQ

Only shows if v_13 = 1 AND v_26 ≠ 27 AND v_26 ≠ 999

Phrasing   You told us that you have used some technologies in relation to Occupy.

V_28   Your frequency of use after Occupy is...

Codes

1   Lower

2   The same

3   Higher

999   Don't know/No answer

47 – v_29 MCQ

Only shows if v_13 = 1 AND v_26 ≠ 27 AND v_26 ≠ 999

Phrasing   Among the tools you have marked in the previous page, indicate whether you have started to use some of them because of Occupy (You can tick more than one):

Codes

1	Twitter	(Only shows if v_26 = 1)
2	Facebook	(Only shows if v_26 = 2)
3	YouTube	(Only shows if v_26 = 3)
4	Reddit	(Only shows if v_26 = 4)
5	WhatsApp	(Only shows if v_26 = 5)
6	Mumble	(Only shows if v_26 = 6)
7	Skype, Google Talk, Google Voice	(Only shows if v_26 = 7)
8	Tumblr	(Only shows if v_26 = 8)
9	Forums	(Only shows if v_26 = 9)
10	Chat/IRC	(Only shows if v_26 = 10)
11	Blogs	(Only shows if v_26 = 11)
12	Websites	(Only shows if v_26 = 12)
13	Flickr	(Only shows if v_26 = 13)
14	Instagram	(Only shows if v_26 = 14)
15	Bambuser	(Only shows if v_26 = 15)
16	Ustream, Livestream	(Only shows if v_26 = 16)
17	Mailing lists	(Only shows if v_26 = 17)
18	Pads	(Only shows if v_26 = 18)
19	Google Docs or other online shared documents	(Only shows if v_26 = 19)

20	Google+	(Only shows if v_26 = 20)
21	Webinars	(Only shows if v_26 = 21)
22	SMS	(Only shows if v_26 = 22)
23	Celly Loop	(Only shows if v_26 = 23)
24	InterOccupy.net	(Only shows if v_26 = 24)
25	OccupyWallSt.org	(Only shows if v_26 = 25)
26	Other	(Only shows if v_26 = 26)
27	None	
999	Don't know/No answer	

48 – PAGE BREAK

49 – COMMENT

<div align="center">A few questions on emotions in Occupy</div>

50 – v_30 SCQ

Phrasing   Were the early days of Occupy an important emotional experience for you?

Codes
0	No
1	Yes
999	Don't know/No answer

51 – v_31 SCQ

Phrasing   Is Occupy in its current form an important emotional experience for you?

Codes
0	No
1	Yes
999	Don't know/No answer

52 – v_32 MCQ

Phrasing   What emotions did you feel in relation to Occupy at the time of the camps in 2011? (You can tick more than one)

Codes
1	Joy
2	Disgust
3	Empowerment
4	Hope
5	Frustration

6	Illusion
7	Indifference
8	Indignation
9	Fear
10	Nostalgia
11	Rage
12	Sadness
13	Other
999	Don't know/No answer

53 – v_33 MCQ
      Phrasing   What emotions do you feel in relation to Occupy now? (You can tick more than one)
      Codes

1	Joy
2	Disgust
3	Disappointment
4	Empowerment
5	Hope
6	Frustration
7	Illusion
8	Indifference
9	Indignation
10	Fear
11	Nostalgia
12	Rage
13	Sadness
14	Other
999	Don't know/No answer

54 – PAGE BREAK

55 – COMMENT

On the evolution of Occupy

56 – v_34 MCQ
      Phrasing   From your experience, which of the following statements do you agree with? (You can tick more than one)
      Codes

1	Occupy had a great impact at first but then disintegrated
2	Occupy is still relevant

3   Occupy ended when the encampments did
4   Occupy has mutated into other events, actions, projects, or processes
999   Don't know/No answer

57 – v_35 MCQ PLUS
Phrasing   Do you associate any of these groups or processes with Occupy? (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   Strike Debt
2   Encampments
3   Occupy Sandy
4   Neighborhood Assemblies
5   InterOccupy
6   May Day General Strike
7   Immigrant and Worker Justice
8   Research Justice
9   Free University
10   None
999   Don't know/No answer
0   (Open field) Other

58 – v_36 MCQ PLUS
Phrasing   Have you participated in any of them? (You can tick more than one)
Codes
1   Strike Debt
2   Encampments
3   Occupy Sandy
4   Neighborhood Assemblies
5   InterOccupy
6   May Day General Strike
7   Immigrant and Worker Justice
8   Research Justice
9   Free University
10   None
999   Don't know/No answer
0   (Open field) Other

59 – PAGE BREAK

60 – COMMENT

Some questions on elections

61 – v_37 SCQ
    Phrasing   Do you think Occupy has had or will have an effect on political elections in the US?
    Codes
    0   No
    1   Yes
    999   Don't know/No answer

62 – v_38 SCQ
    Phrasing   Do you think Occupy influenced the New York City mayoral election of de Blasio last November?
    Codes
    0   No
    1   Yes
    999   Don't know/No answer

63 – v_39 MCQ PLUS
    Phrasing   Which of the following electoral formations do you perceive as associated with Occupy (either in terms of values, people, etc.)? (You can tick more than one)
    Codes
    1   Democratic Party
    2   Republican Party
    3   Green Party
    4   Working Families Party
    5   Socialist Alternative
    6   Libertarian Party
    7   Ron Paul's party
    8   Independent
    9   No party
    10   None
    999   Don't know/No answer
    0   (Open field) Other

64 – v_40 SCQ
    Phrasing   What political ideology do you most identify with?
    Codes
    1   Anarchism
    2   Communism

3	Conservatism
4	Environmentalism
5	Feminism
6	Liberalism
7	Nationalism
8	Socialism
9	Other
999	Don't know/No answer

65 – PAGE BREAK

66 – COMMENT

Finally, on your perception of the effects of Occupy

67 – v_41 MCQ
Phrasing   You think Occupy has changed… (You can tick more than one)
Codes

1	The issues that interest you
2	The media agenda
3	Your way of understanding politics
4	The practices of social movements
5	Your vote intention
6	The ability of people to change things
7	Your forms of political participation
8	The perception of capitalism
9	The perception of or attention to economic justice
10	What you consider desirable in a society
11	What you consider intolerable in a society
12	Nothing
13	Other
999	Don't know/No answer

68 – v_42 MCQ
Phrasing   Since Occupy you have… (You can tick more than one)
Codes

1	Joined a credit union
2	Attended more community events
3	Started shopping local or at farmer's markets
4	Participated in local, state, or federal election
5	Stopped voting

6	Attended City Council or Town Hall meetings
7	Sought out more local news
8	Sought out more national news
9	Sought out more foreign news
10	Sought out information on political ideologies different from my own
11	Sympathize with struggles in countries other than my own
12	Began a community group to address local issues and ordinances
13	Attended protests for issues that do not affect me directly
14	Only purchase products from companies that are not part of the 1%, when possible
15	Other
16	Not engaged in any new kind of activity or behavior
999	Don't know/No answer

69 – v_43 TEXT
Phrasing Please complete the following statement: "I believe the greatest impact of Occupy was…" (Not mandatory to answer) (Maximum characters: 100)

70 – v_44 TEXT
Phrasing Please complete the following statement: "The biggest impact of Occupy in my life has been…" (Not mandatory to answer) (Maximum characters: 100)

71 – PAGE BREAK

72 – v_45 MATRIX SCQ
Phrasing You think Occupy has affected the reputation of…
v_45_1 Public Institutions (Congress, the police…)
v_45_2 Political parties
v_45_3 Unions
v_45_4 Social movements
v_45_5 Media
v_45_6 Financial institutions and banks
v_45_7 The Internet to organize protests
Codes
1 Negatively
2 Not at all
3 Positively
999 Don't know/No answer

73 – v_46 MCQ PLUS

Phrasing   ¿ You think Occupy has influenced the following areas... (You can tick more than one)

Codes

1	Housing
2	Transparency
3	Democracy
4	Education
5	Health
6	Mass media
7	Economy
8	Arts and culture
9	Nothing
999	Don't know/No answer
0	(Open field) Other

74 – v_47 SCQ

Phrasing   Do you believe Occupy contributes to a social and political change?

Codes

0	No
1	Yes
2	Yes, in part
3	Yes, but only in the long term
999	Don't know/No answer

75 – PAGE BREAK

76 – COMMENT

Now that you have completed the questionnaire, please send your responses by clicking on the "SUBMIT" button at the bottom.

We sincerely thank you for participating in the #OccupySurvey.

We remind you that this survey is an initiative of the Networks, Movements and Technopolitics research group linked to the IN3-Open University of Catalonia under the framework of the Balzan Project, and in collaboration with the @Datanalysis15M network.

All answers are ANONYMOUS (we do not know who answers). The data provided by you will be treated in a completely confidential manner.

62

©Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

The results of the survey will be shared to the public at the following webpage and in Twitter through the HT #OccupySurvey.

We invite you to spread this survey among your contacts.

Follow us at @Tecnopolitica and @Datanalysis15M.

In case of doubts, or if you want more information: civilsc@uoc.edu

Annex 2

Table 27. Basic socio-demographic characteristics split by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=384)	OTHERS (N=138)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=522)
Male	52.1	60.1	54.2
Female	44.5	37.7	42.7
Self-describe	3.4	2.2	3.1
Age (mean)	39.86	38.64	39.54
Age (standard deviation)	15.36	14.71	15.19
University	73.7	65.0	71.4
Secondary School	25.0	33.6	27.3
Primary studies	1.3	1.5	1.4
Place of birth			
US	77.1	70.3	75.3
Europe	12.0	14.5	12.6
Canada	6.8	9.4	7.5
Asia	1.6	1.4	1.5
Oceania	1.3	0.0	1.0
Other American country	0.8	2.2	1.1
Place of residence			
US	80.7	72.5	78.5
Europe	8.3	12.3	9.4
Canada	8.1	11.6	9.0
Oceania	1.6	0.0	1.1
Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American	84.3	80.3	83.3
Latino or Hispanic American	5.7	5.8	5.8
Native American or Alaskan Native	4.4	1.5	3.7
Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American	2.1	1.5	1.9
East Asian or Asian American	1.6	1.5	1.5
Middle Eastern or Arab American	0.8	0.7	0.8
South Asian or Indian American	0.3	0.7	0.4
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.3	0.0	0.2
Other	7.6	8.8	7.9
Don't know/No answer	2.9	2.9	2.9

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants values (except for "other" and "don't know/no answer" in racial or ethnical heritage). Categories listed in racial or ethnical heritage are non-exclusive (column values do not add 100%). No statistically significant associations were found after running chi-square tests (gender, education, place of birth, place of residence and racial or ethnical heritage) and ANOVA test (age).

Table 28. Economic and working situation split by participation in OWS (%)

	OWS PARTICIPANTS (N=383)	OTHERS (N=138)	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=521)
I'm in debt	36.3	28.3	34.2
Working full time	29.2	30.4	29.6
Working part time*	23.2	14.5	20.9
Student	20.1	21.7	20.5
Stable job	19.6	17.4	19.0
Self-employed	14.4	11.6	13.6
Permanent job	13.3	14.5	13.6
Freelancer	12.8	9.4	11.9
Unsteady job	11.5	5.8	10.0
Retired	10.2	8.7	9.8
Unemployed	9.7	5.8	8.6
Working without a contract*	7.8	2.2	6.3
I have no income	7.0	5.1	6.5
Temporary work	6.5	5.8	6.3
Unpaid domestic work (caretaker, homemaker)	6.5	5.8	6.3
Other	6.3	2.2	5.2
Don't know/No answer	0.3	0.7	0.4

Note. Categories sorted in descending order according to OWS participants' values. Categories listed are non-exclusive (column values do not add 100%). Chi-square tests ran to check statistically significant associations. *p < 0.05.

⊕Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Resumen

La aparición de movimientos sociales en red en 2011 ha abierto una nueva puerta en la literatura de movimientos sociales. Mediante la adopción de un enfoque tecnopolítico y situado, en este artículo, exploramos el caso del movimiento Occupy Wall Street tres años después de su formación en septiembre de 2011. Mediante una encuesta en línea y un procedimiento de muestreo no probabilístico, nos enfocamos especialmente en las percepciones y opiniones de los participantes en el movimiento. Distinguimos siete secciones temáticas: la relación con el movimiento, la participación política previa y las motivaciones, el uso de las tecnologías de la información y la comunicación (TICs), las emociones vividas, la evolución del movimiento, su influencia en la política institucional, y sus impactos en diferentes aspectos de la vida social. Los resultados muestran que los encuestados (N=522) son generalmente adherentes al movimiento y que la mayoría participó en algún momento. Además, la mayoría piensa que el movimiento sigue vivo bajo una forma u otra, y perciben sus impactos en diferentes áreas, instituciones, comportamientos, e ideas. Concluimos describiendo OWS como un caso que se ajusta adecuadamente al concepto de movimiento social en red. Finalmente, sugerimos pasos futuros en la comprensión de estos movimientos mediante la aplicación de la encuesta en línea diseñada para este estudio a la vez que complementando los análisis con otros métodos de investigación.

Palabras clave

Occupy Wall Street, Movimientos sociales en red, Tecnopolítica, Tecnologías de la información y la comunicación (TICs), EE.UU.

Resum

L'aparició de moviments socials en xarxa el 2011 ha obert una nova porta en la literatura de moviments socials. Mitjançant l'adopció d'un enfocament tecnopolític i situat, en aquest article, explorem el cas del moviment Occupy Wall Street tres anys després de la seva formació al setembre del 2011. A través d'un estudi en línia i un procediment de mostreig no probabilístic, ens hi enfoquem especialment en les percepcions i opinions dels participants del moviment. Fem disintció set seccions temàtiques: la relació amb el moviment, la participació política prèvia i les motivacions, l'ús de les tecnologies de la informació i la comunicació (TICs), les emocions viscudes, l'evolució del moviment, la seva influència en la política institucional, i els seus impactes en diferents aspectes de la vida social. Els resultats mostren que els enquestats (N=522) són generalment adherents al moviment i que la majoria va participar en algun moment. A més, la majoria pensa que el moviment encara és viu d'una forma o l'altra, i perceben els seus impactes en diferents àrees, institucions, comportaments, i idees. Concloem descrivint OWS com un cas que s'ajusta adequadament al concepte de moviment social en xarxa. Finalment, suggerim pasos futurs en la comprensió d'aquests moviments per mitjà de l'aplicació de l'enquesta en línia dissenyada per a aquest estudi alhora que complementant les anàlisis amb altres mètodes d'investigació.

Paraules clau

Occupy Wall Street, Moviments socials en xarxa, Tecnopolitica, Tecnologies de la informació i la comunicación (TICs), EUA

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Arnau Monterde

amonterde@uoc.edu
Communication Networks & Social Change Research Group (CNSC)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Arnau Monterde has a PhD in the Information and Knowledge Society at the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya. His research focuses on two main fields: the study of emerging social movements and their relationship with technology, and forms of political participation and network democracy.

More information about the author at: <http://tecnopolitica.net/ArnauMonterde>.

Antonio Calleja-López

acallejao@uoc.edu
Communication Networks & Social Change Research Group (CNSC)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Antonio Calleja-López is BA in Philosophy, MA in Political Science, Philosophy and Sociology, and PhD in Sociology at the University of Exeter. He works as a researcher at the Communication Networks & Social Change Research Group (CN&SC).

More information about the author at: <http://tecnopolitica.net/antonio-calleja-lopez>.

Daniel Blanche

dblanchet@uoc.edu
Communication Networks & Social Change Research Group (CNSC)
IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Daniel Blanche is BA in Communication, MA in Sociology, MA in Socio-Demography, and currently PhD candidate in Political and Social Sciences at the Universitat Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona, Spain. He is research assistant at the Communication Networks & Social Change Research Group (CN&SC).

More information about the author at: <http://www.communicationchange.net/en/daniel-blanche/>.

☺Daniel Blanche, Antonio Calleja-López, Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol & Arnau Monterde

Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol

mfernandezar@uoc.edu

Communication Networks & Social Change Research Group (CNSC)

IN3-Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Mireia Fernández-Ardèvol is interested in the impacts of mobile communication in our societies, and one of her areas of interest is their role in networked social movements. With a background on economics and econometrics, she holds a PhD from the University of Barcelona.

More information about the author at: <http://www.communicationchange.net/en/mireia-fernandez-ardevol/>.