

“Constructing gender in urban safety activism: A qualitative study of on-line actions in Sweden”

Anna-Britt Coe\*

© by Coe, Anna-Britt

(\*)Anna-Britt Coe, PhD, Research Fellow  
Epidemiology and Global Health Unit  
Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine  
Umeå University  
901 87 Umeå, Sweden  
Telephone: +46 90 786 7964  
E-mail: [anna-britt.coe@umu.se](mailto:anna-britt.coe@umu.se)

Paper presented at the RC21 International Conference on “The Ideal City: between myth and reality. Representations, policies, contradictions and challenges for tomorrow's urban life” Urbino (Italy) 27-29 August 2015.  
<http://www.rc21.org/en/conferences/urbino2015/>

## **Introduction**

Across diverse disciplines, research shows that urban space, and specifically urban safety, is intricately linked to social divides created by gender, racial, class, sexuality and age hierarchies (Callanan and Rosenberger 2015, Cops and Pleysier 2011, Pain 2000, Spain 2014, Whitzman 2007). Less straightforward is whether and how city actors – government leaders, developers, media, activist groups and so forth – acknowledge and respond to these social divides as they develop measures to address urban safety. For example, city governments might address rape prevention by making changes to the physical environment (e.g. lighting) rather than by challenging power imbalances between different social. Activist groups are key actors in shaping urban safety measures and therefore in the construction and contestation of social divides.

Studies of activism on urban safety span an array of issues: random violence and victims' rights (Walgrave and Verhulst 2006, Stanbridge and Kenney 2009), sexual harassment and rape (Rentscheler 2014), hate crimes (McVeigh et al. 2003), urban restructuring and gentrification (Thörn 2012), and neighborhood marginalization (Ho 2012, O'Toole and Gale 2010, Sernhede 2011). This literature brings social divides to the fore in part by examining the composition of activist group membership, its homogeneity and heterogeneity. While movements against random violence are often comprised primarily of middle-class participants (Stanbridge and Kenney 2009), Walgrave and Verhulst (2006) found that the White Movement against random violence in Belgium successfully mobilized participants across social classes.

This literature further brings social divides to the fore by examining how these shape the actions, processes and arenas in which activist groups are involved. Rentscheler (2014) found that age and gender shaped the actions of young women to respond collectively to rape culture, making testimonials on social media their preferred tactic. In this sense, research on urban safety activism aligns with scholarship on gender and social movements: “gender is more than simply a characteristic of individual participants. Instead, movements, their activities and the arenas in which they operate are all gendered” (Einwohner et al. 2000:694). Verta Taylor's (1999) framework proposes that gender – and other primary forms of social relations – intersect with central features of social movements, including framing processes. Framing is the

meaning-making processes that activist groups engage in to define issues in order to mobilize collective action (Benford and Snow 2000: 613-4; Snow et al. 1986: 464).

In this paper, I examine the intersection of gender and other social hierarchies with the on-line framing process among citizen's groups mobilizing to urban safety in Sweden. I draw upon a qualitative study that aimed to clarify how on-line activism constructed urban safety as an issue. Specifically, I used Charmaz's (2013) constructivist approach to Grounded Theory to observe and analyze the on-line actions among two public Facebook groups. The findings captured the framing processes among the two groups. Whereas Safer City A mobilized in response to repeated incidents of rape of women by unidentified male perpetrators in a large municipality, Safer City B mobilized in response to multiple incidents of harassment of the general population by an identifiable group of delinquent immigrant youth in a small, densely-populated municipality. Safer City A explicitly addressed gender in its framing processes, whereas Safer City B explicitly addressed race but not gender in framing processes. Nonetheless, both groups privileged framing gender as differences between women and men: in Safer City A, women and men were constructed as two dichotomous groups with women as vulnerable and men as invincible. In contrast, in Safer City, ethnic Swedish women and men were distinguished from immigrant women and men. Gender framing was tied broader framing processes that distinguished between an immediate issue and advancing a long term vision.

### **Framing Processes and Social Divides**

In social movement studies, the concept of framing is used to locate and clarify the meaning-making processes that activist groups undertake to socially construct circumstances and events for the purpose of mobilizing collective action (Benford and Snow 2000: 613-4; Snow et al. 1986: 464). Understood as the signifying work that activist groups do, framing practices are forms of interaction, negotiation, and communication (Coe 2011: 496). Scholars identify three sets of overlapping framing processes: discursive, strategic and contested (Benford and Snow 2000:623). In this paper, I draw upon discursive processes because these best capture the empirical findings of activists' on-line actions in public Facebook groups. Discursive processes refer to the "communications of movement members that occur in the context of, or in

relation to, movement activities” (Benford and Snow 2000:623). Framing processes consist of three core tasks: diagnostic framing, whereby activist groups define the problem; prognostic framing whereby they propose a solution to the problem; and motivational framing whereby they identify a rationale for participating in collective action (Snow and Benford, 1988: 199–204). I examine these tasks within the internal framing practices carried out by members of activist groups through their interaction, negotiation, and communication with one another, rather than their external framing practices developed with other actors (Coe 2011: 501). Finally, I examine how these framing practices and tasks are situated within broader political and cultural contexts consisting of stable and variable discursive structures, including hegemonic, radical, new, oppositional and/or procedural (Ferree 2003, McCammon et al. Coe 2011). As Ferree and Merrill (2000:456) explain “The framing process is a mechanism through which discourses, ideologies and frames are all connected”.

[The rest of this section needs to be refined in relation to the paper].

According to gender theory, gender is a constitutive element of the social order that functions on multiple levels to construct the relational positioning of the sexes (Connell 2004, West and Zimmerman 1987) and is accomplished simultaneously with other primary forms of social relations, namely class and race (West and Fenstermaker 1995). Gender and other social hierarchies intersect with framing processes (Taylor 1999). Taylor (1999:22) found that the post-partum support group movement in the U.S. framed women’s emotional distress as a critique of the gender division of labor that assigned women responsibility for childcare and rearing. Ferree (2003) compared abortion rights activism in the U.S. and Germany: the frame of individual privacy clearly tapped into hegemonic discourses in the U.S., yet it was linked to radical discourses in the German context. In contrast, the frame of women’s social protection tapped into hegemonic discourses in Germany but was marginalized as radical in the U.S. Ernst (2009) found that for U.S. welfare rights activists, the caregiving frame was more appealing in states with large white populations and relatively low income inequality because stay-at-home motherhood was a legitimate position for white women. In contrast, the caregiving frame was not appealing in states where welfare recipients were more likely to be associated with racially stigmatized groups and with high income inequality because stay-at-home motherhood was not seen as a legitimate

position for African American women. Emphasizing internal negotiation among members to determine goals and strategies, Checker (2004) found that African American environmental activists framed their internal differences in terms of class but that this was flexible and contingent, and the network was able to reframe their disagreements as a larger problem of racism. Adams and Roscigno (2005) show how US white supremacists groups used salient social problems – such as education, crime, and employment – to draw a causal link between white victimization by “systematic governmental, legal and society abuses” and political approaches such as affirmative action, liberalism and multiculturalism which threatened white status quo (772).

### **Social Divides in Existing Studies of Activism on Urban Safety**

[This section needs to be developed by relating key findings from existing studies of activism on urban safety in relation to the construction and contestation of social divides.] Existing research on activism around urban safety includes studies on: random violence and victims’ rights (Walgrave and Verhulst 2006, Stanbridge and Kenney 2009), sexual harassment and rape (Rentscheler 2014), hate crimes (McVeigh et al. 2003), urban restructuring and gentrification (Thörn 2012), and neighborhood marginalization (Ho 2012, O’Toole and Gale 2010, Serhede 2011).]

### **Methodology**

This paper draws from a study that aimed to clarify how on-line activism constructed urban safety as an issue in Sweden.<sup>1</sup> Specific research questions included: How did activist groups engage in collective framing of urban safety? How did their framing explicitly or implicitly address gender hierarchies and/or other social hierarchies, such as race/class? These questions were critically examined in light of the Swedish context in which a hegemonic gender equality ideology emphasizes gender neutrality in public policies. Moreover, organizing around urban safety constitutes an urban grid in and of itself since it is considered a middle-class issue. To answer these questions, I used Charmaz’s (2013) constructivist approach to Grounded Theory to observe in-depth the actions among two citizens’ groups on Facebook.

I began the study by theoretically sampling on-line activism on urban safety in Swedish (Charmaz 2006; Hood 2007). This was carried out in three stages. In the first

stage, I mapped activism by groups and individuals on various digital media: websites, blogs, Twitter, Youtube, Facebook and Instagram. A pattern emerged that showed a distinction between professionalized non-governmental organizations<sup>ii</sup> and individuals on the one hand and ordinary groups and individuals on the other hand. Professionalized organizations and individuals developed actions on all types of digital media and were national in scope, whereas ordinary groups and individuals concentrated actions on Facebook and Instagram and were grassroots or local in scope. Because the former have long dominated civil society in the Swedish context, I focused this study on ordinary citizens' groups. In the second stage of theoretical sampling, I proceeded to map public Facebook groups. A pattern emerged that indicated four types of activism related to urban safety: *ensuring urban safety*, *showing support for rape victims*, *opposing sexual violence*, and *campaigning with a feminist orientation*. In the third stage, I selected two Facebook (FB) groups from the first type of activism because these groups mobilized around the issue of urban safety in broad terms.

After theoretical sampling, the next step was collecting rich data through ethnography. Charmaz (2006:21) describes ethnography as “recording the life of a particular group and thus entails sustained participation and observation in their milieu, community or social world”. After selecting the two FB groups, I returned to their respective sites and (re)read all of the posts on-line. Then, I copied posts from the two Facebook sites and imported them into a qualitative data software for coding. For Safer City A, all of the posts were used as the total amount of data was manageable, while for Safer City B, selected portions of the posts were used as the total amount was so large. Given the research questions above, I selected posts leading up to and following the only two points on Safer City B's FB timeline that explicitly addressed gender relations. One began with a brainstorming of ideas to improve urban safety and ended with was a discussion of women's experiences with sexual harassment (September and October 2014), and another began with a post celebrating International Women's Day and ended with a discussion of what urban safety meant to participants (March and April 2015).

I continued to use constant comparative methods to code the posts copied into the qualitative text software (Charmaz 2006; Hood 2007). Open coding involved studying every line of written data comparatively and labeling each line/segment with a word(s) that reflected ideas identified in the data. The gerund (“-ing”) form was used to code for

action (Charmaz 2006, 48-49). Open codes were sorted into clusters by grouping together those that related to one another, and each group was studied and named. In focused coding, these preliminary categories were used to re-examine all open codes, compare them with one another, and discard irrelevant codes. In theoretical coding, the connections between categories were examined and synthesized into a whole. Throughout the entire analysis, I wrote memos on emerging theoretical categories and I ended data collection when these were full or saturated (Charmaz 2006; Hood 2007). Finally, as presented in the next section, I re-constructed theory (Charmaz 2006).

### Ethical considerations

[This section needs to be revised and references inserted].

I adapted ethical procedures commonly used for conducting field observation in public spaces where informing participants is not required. The first ethical consideration was to choose public Facebook groups because, following Facebook's stated policy, posts on these sites are considered public. The second ethical consideration was to inform the groups that I was conducting observations of their site for study. I sent such a letter to an administrator of both groups via the FB site. Nonetheless, because I was not a "friend" with them, these messages end up in an unobvious box. Therefore, I sought how to contact them via e-mail. The administrator of Safer City B had their work name on their Facebook page, and I used that to find their e-mail and we have been corresponding. I was unable to find an e-mail for the administrator of Safer City A. A third ethical question is how to handle quotes because it is possible for someone to search an exact quote on FB and find the group. For this reason, I have used direct quotes sparsely and altered them slightly to make them more difficult to find. (Carroll 2005, Moreno et al. 2013, Trevisan and Reilly 2014, Zimmer 2010)

### **Gender and Framing Urban Safety among Public Facebook Groups in Sweden**

The findings captured the framing processes carried out by the two FB groups to construct the issue of urban safety. While Safer City A mobilized in response to repeated incidents of rape of women by unidentified male perpetrators in a large municipality (approximately 150 000 inhabitants), Safer City B mobilized in response to multiple incidents of harassment of the general population by an identifiable group of

delinquent immigrant youth in a small, densely-populated municipality (approximately 30, 000 inhabitants). Safer City A explicitly addressed gender in its framing processes, whereas Safer City B explicitly addressed race but not gender in framing processes. Nonetheless, both groups privileged framing gender as differences between women and men: in Safer City A, women and men were constructed as two dichotomous groups with women as vulnerable and men as invincible. In contrast, in Safer City, ethnic Swedish women and men were distinguished from immigrant women and men.

Gender framing was tied to the groups' framing processes that distinguished between an immediate issue and advancing a long term vision. Safer City A began with both definitions, yet early on turned to emphasize an immediate issue and sidelined a long-term vision with little internal resistance. In contrast, Safer City B began emphasizing an immediate issue, yet was pushed internally to incorporate a long-term vision. This difference was clarified by the groups' motivational framing: Safer City A developed a rationale for action for addressing an immediate issue but not a long-term vision, whereas Safer City B did so for both an immediate issue and a long-term vision. These framing processes shaped both groups' ability to contest gender hierarchies and to sustain themselves.

#### Safer City A: Ensuring women's safety from unknown deviant men

Safer City A began its FB site in early 2010, grew to have over 5000 members and was active for about six months. Gender was explicit in the groups' framing processes because it sought to ensure women's safety from unknown male assailants. Its framing processes showed an initial concern for both addressing a practical issue of how the city was perceived at the time alongside advancing a utopic vision of how the city should and could be. Yet, early on, core members dispelled with the latter vision and concentrated on the former. This emphasis reinforced notions of gender difference where all women were similarly vulnerable and men similarly invincible. In addition, this emphasis hindered the group's ability to sustain itself because it closed down the possibility of doing more than address a practical issue.

According to Safer City A's long-term vision, the problem was defined as *women shouldn't need to be afraid*. See Table 1, second row. Ideally, women should be able to



move about how and when they please without being subjected to violence or threatened by harm.

Table 1. Safer City A’s Framing Processes

	<b>Problem Definition</b>	<b>Solution Definition</b>	<b>Rationale for Action</b>
<b><i>Addressing an immediate issue</i></b>	<i>facing the reality of the risk of rape</i>	<i>wanting to stop rape</i>	<i>doing something is better than nothing</i>
<b><i>Advancing a long-term vision</i></b>	<i>women shouldn’t need to be afraid</i>	<i>fostering a safe society and urban environment</i>	

Typical posts were: “Women will go safely all the time”, “I shall not have to go around with protective items”, and “Going out late is not inappropriate”. Although women’s freedom of movement was explicitly discussed, an underlying assumption was that no one should be restricted by fear regardless of their gender identity. The solution in Safer City A’s long-term vision was defined as *fostering a safe society and urban environment*. Members wanted to ensure urban safety by improving human relations as the following post illustrates: “If everyone is more humane, then we can all contribute to a safer society.” The solution proposed both the elimination of gender as an organizing category in society and the promotion of a more horizontal society overall. In this sense, this framing of the long-term vision as gender and social equality most clearly tapped into longstanding, dominant ideals in Swedish society. Nonetheless, this framing process was sidelined early one. One explanation for this is that the group did not develop a corresponding rationale for action to motivate participants to action around a long-term vision.

According to Safer City A’s immediate issue, the problem was defined as *facing the reality of the risk of rape*. See Table 1, first row. This reflected members’ perceptions of the city at the time. Due to repeated incidents of rape, members determined that it was unsafe for women to move about alone, especially at night. Members realized that they and people close to them were at risk in part because victims were similar to themselves and rapes could occur anywhere at any time (i.e. rape was not limited to a single

geographic area or time period), as the following posts illustrates: “It could have been me! The recent rape happened in a neighbor’s yard and the girl was just a little younger than me.” In addition, participants located a number of related problems that weakened their shared sense of safety in the urban setting: poor lighting, inadequate public transportation, limited police presence, cost of private transportation, and heightened media reporting of incidents.

The solution in Safer City A’s immediate issue was defined as *wanting to stop rape*, which consisted of two sub-categories: *doing night patrol* and *stopping rapists from acting*. The same three young men who started the FB group also led the group’s night patrol. Night patrol was the groups’ main solution as the following posts convey: “Now that people are organizing night patrol together, it is easier and better to join those who want to stop rape” and “You have made a great contribution by starting up night patrol to stop rape.” Night patrol is common in some Swedish cities and has existed for several decades, making it a readily available tactic and easily perceived by members as meaningful. The group developed this tactic both on-line and off-line. On the FB site, members discussed plans before going on night patrol and they shared stories of doing night patrol together afterwards. Off-line, they met up at a certain time each night and patrolled the streets together. Doing night patrol was intended produce a concrete outcome: stopping rapists from acting. Members perceived that if they were out on the streets, this would inhibit perpetrators from attempting rape. A key aspect was the perceptions of perpetrators as a small group of deviant men who were clearly distinct from normal, women-friendly, men. Rapists were characterized as “beasts”, “jerks”, “idiots”, “disgusting”, “sick”, and “crazy”. Nonetheless, the group prohibited posts that suggested racial stereotypes for example that rapists were either non-white or from a non-ethnic Swedish background.

The rationale for action in Safer City A’s immediate issue was defined as *doing something is better than nothing*, which consisted of two sub-categories: *being welcoming to all* and *having a serious image*. Core members motivated members to action by arguing that doing something was better than nothing. They repeatedly invited and encouraged all members to join night patrol and most members expressed interest in night patrol. However, despite wanting to contribute, not all members could participate in night patrol because of caretaking responsibilities, physical limitations (periodic

illness, permanent disability), night employment and so forth. Here emerged the group's key challenge. Given that night patrol was the group's only action, those who could not join had no other means to contribute to the group. On-line, members expressed their support for the initiative and night patrol as well as their appreciation for the volunteer efforts of night patrollers. Core members responded positively to this support, but became increasingly frustrated with the low turnout to night patrol. Finally, core members maintained a serious image by removing inappropriate posts and setting guidelines for behavior on night patrol. This serious tone was appreciated by members – especially compared to other FB groups – yet left little room for further discussion or debate about the issue of rape, its causes and consequences and what other more tactics the group could carry out to make it more inclusive.

Safe City A's framing of the immediate issue as gender differences tapped into discourses that are not dominant in the Swedish context (Are these ne, opposing the dominant gender neutrality?). Women were portrayed as different from men due to their vulnerability to physical and sexual harm, and men were portrayed as invincible. Differences among women were raised with regard to access to economic resources that could be used to reduce their vulnerability, such as taking a taxi rather than public transportation at night. Differences among men were acknowledged between normal men who help protect (vulnerable) women and the deviant perpetrators. It is this framing process that came to direct the group's actions early on.

*Safer City B: Ensuring citizens' safety from known delinquent refugee youth*

Safer City B began its FB site in late summer 2014, has about 2000 members and remains active today. In contrast to Safer City A, gender was not explicit in the groups framing processes. Instead race/ethnicity was explicit because the group sought to ensure people's safety from known delinquent youth of non-white/non-Swedish origin. When gender was raised, emphasis was placed on gender differences through the lens of race/ethnicity. Safer City B's framing processes showed an initial concern for addressing an immediate issue of how the city was perceived at the time, yet rather quickly made room for advancing a long-term vision of how the city should and could be around the problem of integration of immigrants. The balance between different framing processes allowed for both more intense discussions of race/ethnicity in the

Swedish context and facilitated the group’s ability to sustain itself because it opened up the possibility of doing more than address a practical issue.

Table 2. Safer City B’s Framing Processes

	<b>Problem Definition</b>	<b>Solution Definition</b>	<b>Rationale for Action</b>
<i>Addressing an immediate issue</i>	<i>identifying delinquent immigrant youth as responsible</i>	<i>helping delinquent youth</i>	<i>keeping focused on delinquent youth</i>
<i>Advancing a long-term vision</i>	<i>failure of integration of immigrants</i>	<i>improving integration</i>	<i>openly debating integration</i>

According to Safer City B’s immediate issue, the problem was defined as *identifying delinquent youth as responsible*. As described on the FB site, some 25 youth of non-white/non-Swedish origin began to hang out in the city center in the summer and perpetrate incidents of petty crime. Members knew who the youth were, describing them as newly-arrived refugees and acknowledging that most of them were not criminals.

Threats and so forth are becoming more and more common. I know a lot of people who won’t go out in the evening, not even with their dogs. As long as there is a “gang”, threats will be more and more common, unfortunately.

By putting the word gang in quotation marks, the post above acknowledged that this was not a case of gang violence or organized crime. Nonetheless, divergent viewpoints emerged early on regarding the extent and seriousness of poor urban safety: whereas some depicted the town as overrun by crime, others cautioned against such exaggerations. As one post stated: “It is unpleasant to pass through the main square even in the middle of the day! What has happened to our fine little city?”

The solution to Safer City B’s immediate issue was defined as *helping delinquent youth*. Tactics included contacting and involving the youths’ parents, developing alternative activities for youth, and for those youth with deeper criminal involvement, collaborating with law enforcement. Members also met with municipal officials to

convince them to start a godparent system where newly-arrived refugee youth were to be paired with adults who had lived in Sweden for a long time. The implementation of tactics was led by a steering group consisting of both men and women, as well as both self-identified Swedish- and foreign-born persons, who had started the FB group.

The rationale for action in Safer City B's immediate issue was defined as *keeping focused on delinquent youth*. From the beginning, members used the FB site to comment on urban safety and crime unrelated to the delinquent youth as well as on the wider problem of integration of immigrants. Initiators, especially the steering committee, motivated members to action by arguing to keep focused on delinquent youth as this was an immediate situation that the group could help change. As one post conveyed: "Since joining the group, I've been frightened by comments, not the least about immigrants/refugees. I hope that the group's original goal takes over and it stops being derailed."

Despite its focus on delinquent youth, the group embraced a meaning of urban safety as highly subjective and recognized it as requiring complex and long-term measures. Thus, Safer City B developed a long-term vision that involved multiple issues, including the extent of crime in general, the sexual harassment of women and the influx of EU migrant beggars. All these issues were defined in terms of a single overarching problem facing their city: the *failure of integration of immigrants*. The term "immigrants" was used to distinguish certain groups by their race/ethnicity, in particular refugees from the Global South (Middle-East and Africa) as well as EU migrants from Romania. Again, divergent viewpoints emerged. The problem was defined either as stereotypes and discrimination on the part of dominant society preventing the integration of immigrants or as immigrants and immigration threatening a safe Swedish society. For example, the following post illustrates how the sexual harassment of women was defined as a problem of immigrants and immigration threatening safe Swedish society: "Young women are hunted by cars, followed on foot and harassed as they bicycle by those who fled to Sweden and were welcomed with open arms." Young women in this quote were categorized as Ethnic swedes while those who fled to Sweden as men refugees from the Global South. In contrast, the next post illustrates how the situation of the delinquent youth was defined as a problem of sweeping generalizations made by the dominant society preventing the integration of immigrants:

When I grew up, it was a local youth gang that fought with and harassed people in the city center, every weekend. You know who they were. Maybe you were one of them who participated? Please people, depicting a single group of people, recently-arrived refugees or not, as the big problem, doesn't help anyone.

The solution to Safer City B's long-term vision was defined as *improving integration*. Members found common ground around the need to improve the integration of immigrants, despite divergent viewpoints within the group. Some held explicit anti-immigration or anti-Muslim sentiments: "If one is a little clearheaded then mass immigration is not a solution! This is a political question that should be solved not with more immigration but better integration." Meanwhile, others promoted mutual respect and understanding between different groups in society and proposed countering racism and discrimination: "If we want to create a safer City B, then all inhabitants should be free from discrimination based on age, gender, race, etc. And all people should stand by this principle."

The rationale for action in Safer City B's long-term vision was defined as *openly debating integration*. Initially, during the first month of the FB group, steering committee members attempted to limit posts about issues other than the situation with delinquent youth. It became increasingly clear that members were eager to address wider problems related to urban safety. Therefore, the steering committee announced its decision to open up the FB site to the discussion of these wider problems. Members were motivated to action on-line by the argument of the need for open debate about the failure of integration of immigrants. In contrast to the immediate issue with delinquent youth that involved off-line action, the group's long-term vision involved first and foremost creating an on-line space for discussion and finding common ground.

Safe City B's framing of both an immediate issue and a long-term vision as ethnic differences tapped into multi-cultural discourses that remained relatively new in the Swedish society since the 1970s, where long-standing discourses of assimilation (ethnic Swedifying) were dominant (Borevi 2011). Contained within the multi-cultural discourse opportunity structures, Safer City B's framing processes spanned between whether or not this was favorable. This was not surprising in the broader political context: in the elections of September 2014, Sweden's nationalist political party gained 13% of the vote campaign against multi-culturalism. The group's framing of gender

also tapped into this multi-cultural discourse, ethnic Swedish women and men were distinguished from immigrant women and men. The group's framing of open discussion of integration tapped in a procedural discourse opportunity (Coe 2011) that might have resulted from the elections. In Sweden, the issue of integration has become highly-polarized between racist and anti-racist projects. To encourage constructive debate about integration clearly proposes an alternative procedure. What is notable in both cases studied is that neither of their framing processes tap into a feminist discourse opportunity structure that would include mention or discussion of rape culture, this despite having been integrated into some of the public institutions' framing, including law enforcement.

### **Discussion**

Link back to the literature on activism on urban safety. How do the findings confirm and enhance what has already been found by other studies? How does framing combine with gender theory applied to this study enhance the broader study of activism on urban safety? What implications did groups' collective framing have for addressing urban safety?

### **References**

- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 611-39.
- Borevi, Karen. 2011. "From multi-culturalism to assimilation? Swedish integration policy from a European perspective." *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift* 113(1): 47-56.
- Callanan, Valerie and Jared S. Rosenberger. 2015. "Media, Gender and Fear of Crime." *Criminal Justice Review* 1-18.
- Carroll, Marnie Enos. 2005. "A Case in Studying Chat Rooms: Ethical and Methodological Concerns and Approaches for Enhancing Positive Research Outcomes." *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society* 3(1): 35-50.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2013. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London: Sage Publications.

Coe, Anna-Britt. 2011. "Pushing Back and Stretching: Frame Adjustments among Reproductive Rights Advocates in Peru." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 16(4):489-507.

Cops, Diederik and Stefaan Pleysier. 2011. "'Doing Gender' in Fear of Crime: The Impact of Gender Identity on Reported Levels of Fear and Crime in Adolescents and Young Adults." *British Journal of Criminology* 51:58-74.

Einwohner, Rachel L., Jocelyn A Hollander and Toska Olson. 2000. "Engendering Social Movements: Cultural Images and Movement Dynamics." *Gender & Society* 14(5):679-699.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 2003. "Resonance and Radicalism: Feminist Framing of the Abortion Debate of the United States and Germany." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(2): 304-44.

Ferree, Myra Marx and David A. Merrill. 2000. "Hot Movements, Cold Cognition: Thinking about Social Movements in Gendered Frames." *Contemporary Sociology* 29(3): 454-462.

Franceschet, Susan. 2004. "Explaining Social Movement Outcomes: Collective Action Frames and Strategic Choices in First- and Second-Wave Feminism in Chile." *Comparative Political Studies* 37: 499-530.

Hood, Jane C. 2007. Orthodoxy vs. power: The defining tools of grounded theory. In *The Sage handbook of grounded theory*, edited by Anthony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz. London: Sage Publications Ltd.



McCammon, Holly J., Courtney Sanders Muse, Harmony D. Newman, and Teresa M. Terrell. 2007. "Movement Framing and Discursive Opportunity Structures: The Political Success of the US Women's Jury Movements." *American Sociological Review* 72: 725-49.

Moreno, Megan A., Natalie Goniou, Peter Moreno and Douglas Diekema. 2013. "Ethics of Social Media Research: Common Concerns and Practical Considerations." *Cyberpsychology Behavior and Social Networking* 16(9): 708-713.

O'Toole, Therese and Richard Gale. 2010. "Contemporary grammars of political action among ethnic minority young activists." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 33(1): 126-143.

Pain, Rachel. 2000. "Place, social relations and the fear of crime: a review." *Progress in Human Geography* 24(3): 365-387.

Rentscheler, Carrie. 2014. "Rape Culture and the Feminist Politics of Social Media." *Girlhood Studies* 7(1): 65-82.

Sernhede, Ove. 2011. "School, Youth Culture and Territorial Stigmatization in Swedish Metropolitan Districts." *Young* 19(2): 159-180.

Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance and Participant Mobilization." *International Social Movement Research* 1: 197-218.

Spain, Daphne. 2014. "Gender and Urban Space." *Annual Review of Sociology* 40:581-598.

Stanbridge, Karen and J. Scott Kenney. 2009. "Emotions and the Campaign for Victim's Rights in Canada." *Canadian Review of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 473-509.

Taylor, Verta. 1999. "Gender and Social Movements: Gender Processes in Women's Self-Help Movements." *Gender & Society* 13(1): 8-33.

Thörn, Håkan. 2012. "In Between Social Engineering and Gentrification: Urban Restructuring, Social Movements and the Place of Politics of Open Space." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 34(2): 153-168.

Trevisan, Filippo and Paul Reilly. 2014. "Ethical dilemmas in research sensitive issues online: lessons from the study of British disability dissent networks." *Information, Communication & Society* 17(9):1131-1146.

Walgrave, Stefaan and Joris Verhulst. 2006. "Towards 'New Emotional Movements'? A Comparative Exploration into a Specific Movement Type." *Social Movement Studies* 5(3):275-304.

Whitzman, Carolyn. 2007. "Stuck at the front door: gender, fear of crime and the challenge of creating safer space." *Environment and Planning* 39: 2715-2732.

Zimmer, Michael. 2010. "'But the data is already public': on the ethics of research in Facebook." *Ethics Information Technology* 12: 313-325.

---

<sup>i</sup> The study is part of a larger research project "Fear and safety in policy and practice - overcoming paradoxes in public planning" that aims to investigate the analytical-practice-paradox within local planning practices and initiatives paradox that exists between two contrasting discourses on gender and fear in public space: the long-term project to equalize power relationships between women and men, and short-term measures to change the experiences of places and perceptions of fear.

<sup>ii</sup> In Sweden, non-profit organizations are often referred to as idealistic organization (ideella organisationer). It is important to note that national non-profits depend heavily on government funding, thereby blurring the boundary between civil society and state institutions.

