

UNDERSTANDING THE INFLUENCE OF NEWSPAPER COVERAGE OF PROTEST  
ON SOCIAL MOVEMENT SUCCESS: A NEW APPLICATION OF THE POLITICAL  
MEDIATION MODEL

By

JESSICA A. MAHONE

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2013

© 2013 Jessica A. Mahone

To Mom, Dad, Ashley, Lara, and Jayden with love

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This document represents not just my own efforts but the support, dedication, and guidance of many, many people. I first want to thank my chair, Dr. Cory Armstrong, for her guidance and encouragement throughout the past two years. Cory became my advisor following the death of my initial advisor, but despite those sad circumstances, I feel nothing but gratitude for the opportunity to be mentored by her. Her confidence in me helped me overcome my own self-doubt, and I truly could not have asked for a better advisor, no matter what the circumstance.

I also want to thank Dr. Spiro Kiouisis for his role in my development as a scholar and for his contributions as a member of my committee. From my assignments in his persuasion class through my final defense, he has been kind, encouraging, and supportive, and his talent for giving constructive criticism without any negativity made this process much less intimidating. I am particularly grateful for his sense of humor, which has made getting to work with him a tremendous pleasure.

I would like to thank Dr. Churchill Roberts for being on my committee as well, especially for his strong point of view and his suggestions for improvement. His documentary and social change class inspired me to consider research in the area of social justice, and his vast knowledge of the civil rights movement was a great asset to my dissertation.

I also want to thank Dr. Alin Ceobanu for serving as my external member. If not for Dr. Ceobanu's political sociology course, I would not have found the theoretical framework I used in my dissertation, so I'm very thankful that he granted me permission to take the course. His insights into social movements were crucial to the success of my dissertation, and his enthusiasm about my topic is greatly appreciated.

I also thank my family for their unwavering love and support and for never once complaining when I've missed a holiday, birthday, or family gathering while in pursuit of this degree. I am especially grateful to my parents, Jesse and Deborah, for never denying me any opportunity to indulge my curiosity and for instilling in me a love of knowledge.

I am thankful to my coders, Shelli Weinstein and Cassie Vangellow, for their work and for sacrificing valuable free time to help me achieve my goal. They both have very bright futures ahead of them.

I also want to thank Dr. Stephen Marshall, Dr. Leslie McCallister, and Dr. Kelly Dorgan from East Tennessee State University. All three of them have been among my biggest supporters during my Ph.D., and I am proud to be joining their ranks.

I want to thank the many friends I've made throughout my graduate education, who have made this experience a bit less daunting and even fun. I am thankful to Mandy Miles, Dr. Eisa Al Nashmi, Megan Duncan, Jason Cain, Erica Kight, Dr. Sabrina Habib Williams, and Anthony Palomba for their friendship and for being such wonderful colleagues during my doctoral program. I also want to thank Dr. Angela Barlow, Wil Massey, and Casey White, my friends from ETSU, for sticking by me and seeing me through the three years since I graduated.

Finally, I want to thank a number of other friends who have provided comfort, humor, and respite over the past five years, especially my friends Dr. Frank Sensenbrenner, Matt Hoeck, and Tori Davis. I am very fortunate to have all of you in my corner.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
LIST OF TABLES.....	8
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	9
ABSTRACT .....	10
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	12
Media And Social Movements .....	14
Media Framing .....	15
Agenda Setting.....	16
Sociological Approaches to Social Movements .....	18
The Political Mediation Model.....	18
Methods Used.....	20
Significance Of Study.....	22
2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	25
Conceptualizing Social Movements And Protest .....	25
Approaches to Studying Social Movements.....	27
Social Movement Framing.....	28
New Social Movement Theory.....	29
Resource Mobilization Theory .....	30
Political Process Perspective .....	32
The Political Mediation Model of Social Movement Outcomes .....	34
Conceptualizing Social Movement Outcomes And Success .....	35
Media Processes And Social Movements.....	38
The Protest Paradigm .....	40
Media Framing And Social Movements .....	42
Framing Effects .....	44
Agenda Setting And Social Movements .....	46
Framing Vs. Agenda Setting.....	49
Using The Political Mediation Model to Bridge News Coverage to Movement Outcomes .....	50
The LGBT Rights Movement And “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” .....	52
The Women’s Rights Movement And The Equal Rights Amendment .....	55
The Disability Rights Movement And The Americans With Disabilities Act .....	57
People For The Ethical Treatment Of Animals .....	59
Research Questions And Hypotheses .....	60

News Coverage Of Protest.....	60
Activists' Attitudes Towards The Role of News Media In Social Movement Success.....	63
3 METHODS.....	66
Content Analysis Of News Coverage Of Social Movements.....	66
Sampling.....	67
Dependent Variable: Social Movement Success.....	69
Coding Instrument.....	72
Coder Training.....	75
Intercoder Reliability.....	75
Coding Procedures.....	77
Survey Of Activists' Attitudes Towards The Role Of Media In Movement Outcomes.....	77
Sampling.....	78
Survey Variables.....	79
4 RESULTS.....	86
Content Analysis Of Newspaper Coverage Of DADT, ADA, ERA, And PETA.....	86
Descriptive Statistics.....	86
Hypotheses And Research Questions.....	86
Survey Results.....	93
5 DISCUSSION.....	102
How News Coverage of Protest Influences Social Movement Success.....	102
Activist Perceptions Of The Role Of News Media In Social Movement Success..	110
Measuring Social Movement Success.....	112
Theoretical Implications.....	115
Implications For The Political Mediation Model.....	115
Implications For Framing And Social Movements.....	117
Implications For Agenda Setting And Social Movements.....	118
The Value Of The Negative Case.....	119
Limitations.....	120
Practical Implications For Movements And Media.....	123
Directions For Future Research.....	124
APPENDIX	
A CODEBOOK.....	129
B SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	133
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	138
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	148

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
2-1 Conceptualization of social movement and protest. ....	65
3-1 Peak year of individual movements .....	83
3-2 Movement rankings on individual success measures.....	83
3-3 Social movement success scores.....	83
3-4 Krippendorff's alpha coefficients for content analysis variables. ....	84
3-5 Characteristics of survey respondents.....	85
4-1 Descriptive statistics of content analysis sample.....	97
4-2 Summary of ANOVAs of mean total paragraphs.....	97
4-3 Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of article about protest. ....	98
4-4 Summary of ANOVAs of headline tone. ....	98
4-5 Summary of ANOVAs of article tone. ....	98
4-6 Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of movement source mentions.....	99
4-7 Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of official source mentions. ....	99
4-8 Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of quoted movement sources.....	99
4-9 Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of quoted official sources. ....	100
4-10 News coverage factors contributing to social movement success with PETA. .	100
4-11 News coverage factors contributing to social movement success without PETA .....	100
4-12 Mean credibility scores of OutServe, AAPD, NOW, and PETA members. ....	101
4-13 Mean credibility scores by membership segment.....	101
4-14 Activist perception that news media helps their movement. ....	101
4-15 Belief that news media help movement by organization.....	101

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act, 1990 law barring discrimination against people with disabilities in most public places
DADT	“Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” term used in reference to U.S. policy towards LGBT individuals in military service from 1993-2011
ERA	Equal Rights Amendment, amendment guaranteeing equal rights between men and women in all facets of social life which passed Congress in 1972 but failed to be ratified by the states
NOW	National Organization for Women, women’s rights group founded in 1966
PETA	People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, animal rights and welfare group founded in 1980 and based in the United States

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School  
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

UNDERSTANDING THE INFLUENCE OF NEWSPAPER COVERAGE OF PROTEST  
ON SOCIAL MOVEMENT SUCCESS: A NEW APPLICATION OF THE POLITICAL  
MEDIATION MODEL

By

Jessica A. Mahone

August 2013

Chair: Cory L. Armstrong  
Major: Mass Communication

Although considerable research has been conducted on the content of news coverage of social movements, no research has yet demonstrated the relationship of this coverage to social movement outcomes. This study used a model of social movements from political sociology, the political mediation model, to examine the relationship between newspaper coverage of protests related to the repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” the Equal Rights Amendment, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and the success of those movements. This study also used a newly developed measurement of social movement success incorporating proxy measures of recognition, policy gains, and polity membership to create a scale of social movement success.

Prior research indicated that positive tone of coverage, use of movement representatives as sources, and focus on conventional protest activities such as lobbying would be associated with social movement success. The results of a content analysis of 215 news articles about the movement to repeal “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” the women’s rights movement, the disability rights movement, and PETA indicate that focus

on lobbying and the degree of focus on protest activities in news coverage are the most important news coverage factors in social movement success. Further, despite the focus of previous research on framing in news coverage of protest, the tone of coverage was found to have limited influence on social movement success while the use of movement and official sources were counter to predictions. Limitations, theoretical and methodological implications for future research, and practical considerations for media practitioners and social movements in light of these findings are also discussed.

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

The term “social movement” can bring to mind images of marchers and protestors with banners, sometimes police confrontation, and sometimes even violence. The term likewise coincides with notions of social change and justice. Social movements are an important and visible part of the American political landscape with potential consequences for political and social institutions and processes, and just as they differ in issues and targets, movements differ in how successful they are in achieving their goals. Two examples, the movement behind the end to the ban on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals in the United States military and the movement behind the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), are useful in demonstrating the similar tactics and different outcomes of social movements.

The movement in support of allowing homosexual individuals to serve openly in the military began as part of the larger lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) movement that emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Herek, 2012), starting with Leonard Matlovich’s unsuccessful 1975 challenge to his dismissal for his sexual orientation (“Matlovich settles: Money, but no job”, 1981). During the course of its struggle, the movement faced two significant setbacks following Matlovich’s case. First, under a directive from President Ronald Reagan, the Department of Defense issued a policy stating that homosexuality is incompatible with service in the United States military in 1982, effectively banning LGBT individuals from the military. Second, legislation to overturn the ban on LGBT individuals in the military failed in Congress in 1992, and in response, a compromise deal was made between President Bill Clinton and Congressional leadership in 1993. The compromise measure was called *Don’t Ask,*

*Don't Tell, Don't Pursue* (DADT), and under the measure, service members could not be asked to disclose their sexual orientation, but they also could not disclose it themselves. In addition, sexual activity with a member of the same sex remained grounds for discharge. The policy was controversial but had significant support among members of the public. However, following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, opposition to DADT began to grow following the revelation that several Arabic linguists had been discharged due to their sexual orientation (Herek, 2012). This opposition was supported by significant protest activity, frequently in the form of demonstrations led by military personnel who had been discharged for being homosexual ("Activists detained while challenging 'don't ask, don't tell'", 2006; "Choi, five vets arrested against in White House DADT protest", 2010; McMillan, 2007; Melzer, 2005; Roehr, 2009; Zeller, 2006). The process to repeal DADT began in 2010. Following a Pentagon investigation into the impact of the repeal of DADT on the readiness of the armed forces, both chambers of Congress passed a repeal of DADT in December 2010. President Barack Obama signed the repeal into law December 22, 2010, and DADT was officially repealed on September 20, 2011 (The history of 'don't ask, don't tell', 2010; USD(P&R), 2011).

Similar to the movement behind the repeal of DADT, the movement behind the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) was part of a larger movement. The ERA, then called the "Lucretia Mott Amendment," was written by the National Women's Party in 1921 and introduced in Congress in 1923 (Francis, 2012). However, the ERA was opposed by most women's organizations until the 1960s on the grounds that the amendment could threaten protective legislation for women (Sklar & Dublin, 2012). During the 1960s and 1970s, the ERA gained the support of a broad coalition of women's rights groups, and in

1972, the amendment passed the House and Senate with a ratification deadline of June 30, 1979, extended to 1982 by Congress in 1978. As part of their strategy to win the support of the legislatures of those three states, women's groups joined together to found ERAmerica, a coalition dedicated solely to advocacy for ratification of the ERA. ERAmerica organized demonstrations in state capitals, starting in Springfield, Illinois, in May 1976. By 1980, 35 states had ratified the ERA, leaving only three remaining for the amendment to achieve the number required for ratification (Slavin, 1995).

Demonstrations in favor of the movement continued, including marches of nearly 100,000 participants in Washington DC in July 1978 and of approximately 90,000 participants in Chicago on Mother's Day 1980 (Gibson, 2011). However, despite this show of support, the ERA was not ratified by the 1982 deadline and has been unsuccessfully re-introduced in every session of Congress ever since (Francis, 2012).

### **Media And Social Movements**

The movements behind the end of the ban on LGBT military service and behind the ERA were both part of larger movements, had visible protest support, and won support from prominent politicians. However, LGBT discrimination is no longer U.S. military policy while the ERA has never been ratified and has yet to be voted on when re-introduced in Congress in every session since 1982. While any number of factors may account for this difference, a key component of social movement success is attracting popular support for the movement and its cause, and one of the most important factors in attracting support emphasized by social movement and mass communication scholars both is media discourse surrounding movements.

Media discourse surrounding social movements has been a significant focus of research in both mass communication and sociology. Research on social movements

within sociology has largely focused on the content of news coverage of social movements while research in mass communication has focused on both the content of news coverage of social movements and the effects of coverage on individual attitudes towards social movements. While research in both disciplines has found news coverage to be generally negative towards social movements (Boykoff, 2006; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Brasted, 2005a; Brasted, Protest in the media, 2005b; Cancian & Ross, 1981; McCarthy, McPhail, & Smith, 1996; McLeod D., 2007; McLeod & Detenber, 1999) (McLeod & Hertog, 1992; Shoemaker, 1984), and research in mass communication has found this to influence attitudes towards movements (Arpan, Baker, Lee, Jung, Lorusso, & Smith, 2006; Arpan & Tuzankan, 2008; McLeod & Detenber, 1999), the implications of news media for social movement outcomes have not been addressed by literature in either discipline. Two media processes in particular are relevant to understanding the relationship between media and social movement outcomes: framing and agenda setting.

### **Media Framing**

Media framing has been a substantial focus of research into social movements in both sociology and mass communication. Sociological approaches to framing and social movements have frequently emphasized how social movements frame their messages and how they are able to get their frames into news media (Benford, 1997; Benford & Snow, 2000; Cress & Snow, 2000; Ryan, Carragee, & Meinhofer, 2001; Snow & Benford, 1988). Mass communication approaches to framing and social movements have primarily emphasized how news media frame protest (Boykoff, 2006; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, Devanathan, Stein, & McLeod, 2004; Brasted, 2005a; Brasted, 2005b; Cancian & Ross, 1981; McCarthy, McPhail, & Smith, 1996;

McLeod, 2007; Shoemaker, 1984), developing and examining a phenomenon called the “protest paradigm” (Chan & Lee, 1984; DiCicco, 2010). In turn, mass communication research has examined the influence of news framing of protest on individual attitudes towards social movements (Arpan, Baker, Lee, Jung, Lorusso, & Smith, 2006; Arpan & Tuzunkan, 2011; Detenber, Gotlieb, McLeod, & Malinkina, 2007; McLeod, 1995; Shoemaker, 1982), known as framing effects, and participation in protest (Boyle & Schmierbach, 2009).

Together, these processes would lead to the prediction that movements receiving more frequent coverage, more prominent coverage, and more positive coverage would be more successful. However, research into the protest paradigm indicates that coverage of social movements becomes more negative as coverage becomes more frequent (Ashley & Olson, 1998; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, McLeod, & Stein, 2005; DiCicco, 2010). Therefore, the expectation is that frequency of coverage and valence of coverage of social movements would, on their own, be associated with more successful outcomes for social movements, but frequency would moderate the effects of valence, and valence would moderate the effects of frequency as interactive effects. So, the question is raised as to which is more important to social movement outcomes: frequency of coverage or valence of coverage.

### **Agenda Setting**

The basic premise of agenda-setting theory is that the topics that are prominent in media become the topics deemed most important by members of the public (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Over the past 40 years, agenda setting has been adapted to address intermedia agenda setting effects, which are those that occur when issues prominent in one media become prominent in another (Ragas & Kioussis, 2010), as well

as to incorporate framing into the theory, a concept called second-level agenda setting (Ghanem, 1997). However, for purposes of understanding the relationship between media and social movements, framing and agenda setting will be considered as separate though related processes for two reasons. First, the body of research into agenda setting and social movements is very limited and so very little is known about the nature of agenda setting processes related to social movements, certainly not enough to assume that framing is a secondary process to agenda setting. Second, the considerable body of research pertaining to media framing and social movements (Ashley & Olson, 1998; Boykoff, 2006; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, Devanathan, Stein, & McLeod, 2004; Brasted, 2005a; Brasted, 2005b; Cancian & Ross, 1981; McCarthy, McPhail, & Smith, 1996; McLeod, 2007; Shoemaker, 1984) suggests that framing occurs regardless of whether or not a movement or its issue is a part of the public agenda.

Further, the emphasis on the marginalization of social movements in research on media framing of social movements (Ashley & Olson, 1998; Boykoff, 2006; Brasted, 2005b; Dardis, 2006; McLeod D., 2007; Shoemaker, 1984) and research into the effects of such coverage on individual attitudes towards movements (Detenber, Gotlieb, McLeod, & Malinkina, 2007; McLeod & Detenber, 1999; Shoemaker, 1982) suggest that framing of social movements potentially could influence the agenda setting process. Social movement research has only begun to address agenda-setting processes within the last two to three years, and results indicate that the agenda-setting process is rather complex for social movements. While it is important for movements to garner the attention of media and the public, they additionally require the attention of political elites

(Smidt, 2012; Walgrave & Vliegenthart, 2012) in order to achieve their goals. However, on the basic premise that media attention gains an issue public attention, it would be expected that movements receiving more frequent coverage would be more successful.

### **Sociological Approaches to Social Movements**

Sociologists have proposed a number of perspectives for examining social movements, leading to some fragmentation among social movement scholars. The major contemporary theoretical perspectives are the collective action, resource mobilization, political process, collective identity, social movement framing, and cognitive balance perspectives (Opp, 2009). Of these, three are relevant to this project. The first, resource mobilization, approaches media as a tool available to social movements in pursuit of their goals (Opp, 2009). The second, social movement framing, is related to resource mobilization. The social movement framing perspective is related to media framing but largely emphasizes how movements frame their issues and messages although this perspective is also concerned with the extent to which the framing used by social movements appears in media discourse (Benford & Snow, 2000). The primary distinction between the media framing perspective and the social movement framing perspective is who is responsible for supplying the frames, media or social movements. The third is the political process perspective. This approach emphasizes the importance of political context, called the political opportunity structure, for the emergence of social movements (Tarrow, 1998). All these approaches, to some extent, seek to address the question of why some movements succeed while others fail.

### **The Political Mediation Model**

An adaptation of the political process model, the political mediation model addresses social movement outcomes as the result of the interaction between social

movement strategy and conventional political institutions (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Amenta E., Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010). Whereas the political process model approaches the political opportunity structure as a set of pre-existing conditions that allow movements to emerge, the political mediation model approaches the political opportunity structure as a set of conventional political institutions that movements must move through to have effect. Giugni (1998) conceptualized the political opportunity structure as having two components: state structure and the system of alliances and oppositions. Media fall within the latter component and can be said to be an ally of a social movement, albeit not necessarily intentionally, when news coverage is favorable towards the movement and can be said to be an obstacle to a social movement when news coverage is not favorable towards the movement.

The political mediation model provides the strongest framework for bridging media discourse with the outcomes of social movements by approaching media as part of the political environment with which movements interact. First, the model was designed specifically to address the political outcomes of social movements (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992). Second, the model addresses movement outcomes as arising from the interactions between the extra-institutional activities of social movements and the activities of existing social and political institutions (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992). Third, the model approaches outcomes beyond the scope of mere success or failure, and as the model has evolved, it has allowed for the consideration of a wider spectrum of outcomes including unintentional outcomes (Amenta E., Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010). Finally, the model is adaptable to the study of the influence of a variety of social and political institutions on the outcomes of social

movements (Amenta, Caren, & Olasky, 2005). Despite the model's adaptability, application of the political mediation model has largely been reserved for consideration of the influence of state structures on the specific policy outcomes of social movements. The influence of media processes on the outcomes of social movements has not been addressed using the political mediation model despite calls for consideration of the role of media discourse in social movement outcomes by Amenta and colleagues (Amenta, Caren, & Olasky, 2005; Amenta E., Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010).

### **Methods Used**

To explore the role of media discourse in social movement outcomes, a content analysis of news coverage of four social movements was used to assess the characteristics of news coverage as related to the outcomes achieved by the movements. The movements selected are People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) movement, the disability rights movement, and the movement that led to the inclusion of LGBT individuals in military service through first the introduction and then the eventual repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT). These four movements were selected according to the outcome achieved by each movement and its correspondence to the goals of the movement and because they may be, more or less, considered "concluded" or in the case of PETA, as being stalled for a significant period of time. The term "concluded" is being used loosely here because movements may continue even after achieving certain goals, but in terms of the specific issues addressed by each, they may be considered as having reached an end. In addition, all have sought policy as a solution to the problems they address. Each corresponds to a different outcome and degree of success with PETA being the least successful and achieving no clear policy outcomes of the four movements and the

movement in support of LGBT military service being the most successful and achieving the highest policy outcome.

In addition to influencing participation (Boyle & Schmierbach, 2009) and movement strategies (Ryan, Carragee, & Schwerner, 1998), news coverage of social movements may influence continued activist participation. Rauch (2010) found that social movement activists are concerned about the influence of media on non-activists, often called the third-person effect, and that this serves as a motivation for activists' use of alternative media. However, Rauch (2010) did not address activists' beliefs about the role of news coverage in their movement. So, in addition to identifying the role of news coverage in the outcomes of social movements, this project also seeks to understand how activists perceive the role of news media in the success of their movements through a survey of a snowball sample of activists in organizations associated with the movements above.

In order to address these questions, this project also sets out to conceptualize social movements, protest, and social movement outcomes in such a way that they are meaningful across theoretical traditions and disciplines. Definitions of social movements are largely dependent on their development within specific theoretical traditions, a situation that has produced a great deal of fragmentation and difficulty for scholars of social movements (Opp, 2009). Similarly, what constitutes protest has been dependent on theoretical tradition, sometimes very broadly defined and other times very narrowly defined, making it difficult to compare findings among traditions (Opp, 2009). To address both these problems, Opp's (2009) definitions of social movements and protest are being used and adapted to this study. Finally, multiple definitions of social

movement outcomes have been offered through the years, starting with Gamson (1990). Most scholars agree that success and failure are dissatisfying as categories of outcomes because they are broad and do not describe specific results of social movements (Giugni, 1998). However, subsequent definitions have focused primarily on strict categorizations of target and official response, usually policy, that do not reflect the goals of movements (Giugni, 1998). To answer the challenge this poses, this study uses Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan's (1992) three-category conceptualization of social movement outcomes as they relate to the goals of the four movements named above, allowing for an understanding of the influence of news coverage in the outcomes and success of the four movements.

### **Significance Of Study**

The first contribution of this study lies in the fact that it moves beyond the question of how media influence the mobilization and participation of individuals to the larger question of if and how media influence the ability of social movements to affect change on the issues they address. Much of the literature on the content of news coverage of social movements assumes a negative influence, and on the basis of literature about the influence of news coverage on mobilization, that would seem a reasonable assumption. However, there has been no systematic study of the relationship between media and social movement outcomes. Further, while providing perhaps the strongest evidence for expecting a relationship between media and social movement outcomes, the process of social change requires more than the mobilization of individuals. A systematic test of the basic relationship between media and social movement outcomes would provide direction for exploring other aspects of the process of social change in relation to media processes.

Additionally, this study will provide an opportunity for protest and social movements to be incorporated more fully within the body of political communication research. The political mediation model is, at its core, about the relationship between institutional and extra-institutional political actors. This study addresses the specific relationship between the institutions of media and the extra-institutional forces of social movements. At the same time, it provides a basis to apply theoretical perspectives commonly reserved for institutional politics to the study of media and social movements.

This work also proposes a reconsideration of measuring social movement success and outcomes as defined in the political mediation model. In response to the limitations of defining social movement outcomes as either success or failure (Giugni, 1998), Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992) and Amenta, Dunleavy, and Bernstein (1994) developed three categories of social movement outcomes: recognition, policy gains, and full membership in the polity. These all represent at least partial successes for social movements and represent the possible policy responses movements may receive from leaders (Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein, 1994). While these categories are useful, this study adds an additional category to the model, non-response, to recognize that the failure of political leaders to respond to a movement is a possible outcome for movements and that the conditions that lead to non-response may differ from those that lead to any positive outcome and can offer insight into the relationship between media and social movements.

Additionally, the outcomes identified by Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992) have been used to create a scale that provides an objective but relative way of measuring social movement success. Using media saturation, roll call votes,

Congressional testimony, and public opinion as proxy measures of the outcomes discussed by Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992), this scale can be used to rank movements on each dimension of success and create a score for social movement success. Using this scale, non-recognition can be readily identified, and success is seen not only as multi-dimensional but also as dependent on multiple political actors, in keeping with the major argument of the political mediation model. This scale provides an important and useful tool for social movement scholars and represents a significant methodological advancement in the understanding of social movement success.

## CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Conceptualizing Social Movements And Protest**

Because this project relies on literature from two disciplines, mass communication and sociology, some conceptual clarity is required for the terms protest and social movement in order to understand specifically what this project is addressing. Definitions of protest and social movement vary according to perspective and author, but key features are shared across definitions that provide some guidance as to characteristics that a phenomenon must possess to be either a protest or a social movement. A good starting point is the most fundamental distinction between the two. Protest refers to an action while social movement refers to a group of people. However, the two are closely related (Opp, 2009).

For purposes of this project, Opp's (2009) definition of protest is used: "joint (i.e., collective) action of individuals aimed at achieving their goal or goals by influencing the decisions of a target" (p. 38). This definition is suitable for this project because it is broad enough to encompass the variety of tactics a movement may undertake in support of their cause. Activities need not be demonstrations, rallies, or marches, the terms most readily synonymous with "protest," and they need not be unconventional (Opp, 2009). Therefore, this definition also includes activities such as lobbying, petitions, boycotts, voter outreach, and even media campaigns, among others. Protest is the term used to describe all activities used to influence a target. However, while this definition is broad, it is narrow enough to exclude from consideration actions undertaken by individuals rather than groups, regardless of group affiliation (Opp, 2009). An individual may take action on their own to represent a group with which s/he is affiliated.

However, Opp's (2009) definitions exclude this type of activism from being considered protest because the action is not undertaken or necessarily endorsed by the collective group. In addition, for purposes of this project, the actions undertaken must be political in nature, an optional dimension provided by Opp (2009), meaning the remedies for the problem must lie in policy or state action. In addition, it is necessary to further limit protest as activities undertaken by groups outside of mainstream political parties and institutions. While protest may include conventional activities, the sponsors of these activities are extra-institutional, being outside mainstream political parties and institutions such as Congress (McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Tarrow, 1998).

Within the context of this project, social movement is defined as "a collectivity of actors who want to achieve their shared goal or goals by influencing decisions of a target" (Opp, 2009, p. 41). This term is synonymous with protest group, of which social movements may be considered a type, but use of the term social movement reflects the term currently used by social movement scholars to define such groups although movements may be considered a large and organized type of protest group (Opp, 2009). However, in this project, the term social movement is used to reflect the terminology used within the field of social movement research as an umbrella term encompassing protest groups (Opp, 2009).

The relationship between protest and social movement is important for understanding the relationship between news media and social movements. Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993) describe the relationship between news media and social movements as a "competitive symbiosis" (p. 116) taking the form of the following conversation: "'Send my message,' say the activists; 'Make me news,' say the

journalists” (p. 115). Movements depend on mass media to garner attention and support for their cause and to pressure their targets (Amenta, Caren, Olasky, & Stobaugh, 2009; Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993; Malinick, Tindall, & Diani, 2011; Snow & Benford, 1988) while news media value the attention that can come from contentious activities and events (Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993; Malinick, Tindall, & Diani, 2011). As a result, social movements primarily garner news coverage on the basis of their activities, from here on referred to as protest as noted above (Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993; Malinick, Tindall, & Diani, 2011). For this reason, a great deal of what is discussed in terms of media coverage of social movements within the context of this project is media coverage of protest. This conceptualization is summarized in Table 2-1.

### **Approaches to Studying Social Movements**

A number of perspectives for understanding social movement dynamics have been proposed within the field of sociology, each corresponding with specific characteristics that contribute to movement processes. Broadly, these perspectives encompass those addressing the conditions from which movements emerge, the role of social identity in movement cohesion and activity, the framing processes of social movements, the strategies and tactics of social movements, and the relationships between political institutions and social movements (Opp, 2009). Of the existing perspectives, three have considerable relevance to the relationship between media and social movement outcomes: the social movement framing perspective, resource mobilization theory, and the political process perspective (Benford & Snow, 1988; McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Opp, 2009; Tarrow, 1998). The model applied in this project, the political mediation model, belongs within the last body of literature. Each perspective will be discussed in turn, concluding with the political mediation model.

## **Social Movement Framing**

The social movement framing perspective emerged in the late 1980s with the work of Benford and Snow (1988). Their argument was that the key strategy of social movements was successfully setting the parameters for discourse surrounding their cause. Success in doing so would determine the extent to which movements were able to affect change on their selected issues. This argument has been forwarded throughout the past twenty-five years, but as noted by Benford and Snow (2000), there has been little systematic study of social movement framing.

The social movement framing perspective emphasizes the production of meaning in the attempt to influence policy (Benford & Snow, 2000; Snow & Benford, 1988; Tarrow, 1998). Social movements face two tasks in framing issues: diagnostic framing and prognostic framing (Benford & Snow, 2000; Opp, 2009). Diagnostic framing establishes a movement's definition of a problem and its cause, setting the stage for prognostic framing. Prognostic framing establishes a movement's solution to the problem (Benford & Snow, 2000). Within this framework, the success of social movements rests on their ability to convince the public as well as political elites of their definition of a problem and then to convince political elites in particular to adopt their solution to the problem.

Social movement framing must be distinguished from media framing although the two are very closely related. Social movement framing is the term used when referring to frames supplied by social movements (Benford & Snow, 1988; 2000; Snow & Benford, 1998) while media framing is the term used when referring to frames supplied in media coverage (Entman, 1993; Scheufele, 2000). Social movement framing scholars emphasize the importance of social movements advancing their definitions of issues.

This is where the role of media framing becomes important to social movements as they need for their frames to be adopted into media narratives about their movement (Tarrow, 1998). In this way, media are a tool for social movements in attracting attention to a problem as they see it.

### **New Social Movement Theory**

Between mid-1970s and mid-1990s, a number of perspectives emerged to explain social movements. Rooted in European social and political theory, these perspectives have collectively come to be known as new social movement theory. New social movement theory rejected as reductionist Marxist explanations for collective action. Specifically, theorists in the tradition of new social movement theory believed this reductionism devalued any form of protest other than proletarian revolution. Theorists in this tradition tend to examine the action of groups based in political ideology, culture, gender, race, and sexuality in order to understand social movements rather than groups centered on resource attainment or class (Buechler, 1995).

New social movement theory may be divided into two versions, political and cultural. Political new social movement theory is more state-oriented than cultural new social movement theory and focuses primarily on strategic questions and instrumental action as social movement goals with identity formation, grievance definition, and interest articulation as components of activism. Cultural new social movement theory is oriented towards “an information society whose administrative codes conceal forms of domination” (Buechler, 1995, p. 458). Because its focus is on social structure, cultural social movement theory is oriented towards everyday life and civil society. Identity and symbolic expression that challenge societal codes of domination are seen as the components of activism in this version of new social movement theory (Buechler, 1995).

Although new social movement theory is largely interested in identity, and three of the movements analyzed in this study are identity-based movements, this perspective defines action itself as an end and would offer more to an exploration of the communications activities of identity-based social movements than to the study of news coverage of social movements. Additionally, some new social movement theorists, particularly within cultural new social movement theory, eschew the idea that social movements should be political in nature because that suggests they are reinforcing conventional channels of political representation (Buechler, 1995). Given that the definition of protest being used in this study is inclusive of conventional political activities, this makes new social movement theory incompatible as a framework for understanding the influence of news coverage on social movement success (Opp, 2009).

### **Resource Mobilization Theory**

Resource mobilization theory addresses the “dynamics and tactics of social movement growth, decline, and change” (McCarthy & Zald, 1977, p. 1217) emphasizing social and political sources of social movement support and constraint, including media. Two strains of resource mobilization theory exist. The first, advocated by McCarthy and Zald (1977) explains social movements in primarily economic terms. Their argument is that the emergence and maintenance of social movements is a question of organizational integrity and access to and control over resources rather than grievances alone (McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Opp, 2009). The second, advocated by Tilly (1978) and McAdam (1982), explains social movements primarily as contention between movements and political institutions. The latter has come to be known as the political

process or contentious politics perspective, discussed below. This section focuses on the former.

Resource mobilization theory rests on the basic assertion that “[s]ociety provides the infrastructure which social movement industries and other industries utilize” (McCarthy & Zald, 1977, p. 1217). For this reason, social movements may not be understood solely on the basis of grievances or collective identity. They must be understood within the political and social contexts in which they operate. Resource mobilization theory defines social movements as “preference structures directed toward social change” (p. 1218), similar to political science’s interest aggregation. However, whereas political scientists are interested in existing party structures, resource mobilization scholars are interested with the “margins of the political system” (p. 1218). These definitions fit within the definition of social movements provided by Opp (2009) above. Resource mobilization perspectives are interested in how movements obtain and use the resources available to them within the social and political environment. One key resource for social movements is news media, and one of the core tasks for social movements is attracting media attention (McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993). Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993) describe this task as resting on an asymmetrical dependency in that movements rely much more on media for access to audiences than media rely on movements for content.

Because resource mobilization theory emphasizes media attention as a key resource for social movements, the implications of media coverage of for social movement outcomes is partly evident. Greater media attention represents a greater share of resources available to a movement, so the more successful a movement is in

gaining media attention, the more likely it would be expected to be successful. However, attracting media attention is dependent on a number of factors including organizational strength and integrity and the tactics of the movement. First, these factors may influence the frequency of news coverage a movement receives, with decentralized movements often having the greatest difficulty, as well as the characteristics of that coverage, again with more decentralized and less mainstream movements having the greatest difficulty (Carroll & Hackett, 2006). Second, the further outside mainstream political activities a movement's tactics are, the more likely a movement is to receive media attention. At the same time, the less mainstream a movement's tactics, the more likely news coverage of that movement will be negative (Armstrong & Boyle, 2011; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009). So, mobilization of media as a resource for social movements is a delicate task for social movements, but resource mobilization theory's emphasis on the organizational integrity of movements make it somewhat a poor fit for explaining the role of media in social movement outcomes because media coverage, though an external resource, would primarily be viewed as an effect of the movement's organization rather than itself a factor in movement outcomes. However, the theory does allow for some expectations regarding the role of news coverage of protest in the outcomes of social movements, specifically that increased media coverage of protest increases the likelihood that a movement will be successful.

### **Political Process Perspective**

A second strain of resource mobilization theory is the political process perspective of social movements. Political process models of social movements emphasize the importance of political context in the emergence and outcomes of social movements, particularly what are known as political opportunity structures. Political

opportunity structures consist of institutions that support existing norms and practices, and political opportunities are shifts in political order that make these institutions vulnerable as targets to challenge (McAdam, 1997; Tarrow, 1998; Tilly, 1994). For example, political parties and candidates may be more likely to respond to movements during elections because it may give them an advantage with a particular segment of the electorate. Within the context of this theoretical tradition, social movements are defined as “a sustained series of interactions between power holders and persons successfully claiming to speak on behalf of a constituency lacking formal representation in the course of which those persons make publicly visible demands for changes in the distribution or exercise of power, and back those demands with public demonstrations of support” (Tilly, 1994, p. 2). This description reflects the criteria provided by Opp’s (2009) definition of social movements in that it emphasizes collective action and the attempt to promote social and political changes through influence of a target.

Political process models have been primarily applied to understanding the emergence of social movements and used as a tool for cross-national contrasts and comparisons of social movements (Tarrow, 1998). This perspective primarily emphasizes the importance of state structures for social movements (Opp, 2009; Tarrow, 1998), but Giugni (1998) argues that the political opportunity structure has two components, state structure and the system of alliances and oppositions. State structure refers to the specific design and institutions of government. This includes the system of government and whether or not it is open, the composition of the legislature, the bureaucratic elements of government, and electoral systems and institutions. The system of alliances and oppositions consists primarily of institutions that are separate

from the state. This includes media but may also include religious institutions and social organizations and clubs. Certain institutions, particularly political parties, are part of the system of alliances and oppositions but have significant consequence for state structure because of their relationship to government (Giugni, 1998). The relationship between state structure and the system of alliances and oppositions makes the attracting allies critical to the ability to influence state structure and achieve their policy goals.

### **The Political Mediation Model of Social Movement Outcomes**

As an extension of the political process model, the political mediation model also addresses the relationship between political context and movement strategies, arguing that a movement's success is the result of its interaction with conventional political institutions. This model views political opportunity structures less as an entity that influences movements and more as a channel through which movements have influence. In other words, movements are mediated by the political structures through which they move, from which the model gets its name (Amenta, Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010; Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein, 1994). The model is designed specifically to address successful outcomes, which Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein (1994) define as any gains made by the movement even if the movement's goals are not met.

The earliest versions of the political mediation model (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein, 1994) defined three outcomes for social movements: recognition, policy gains, and polity membership. Recognition can be defined simply as the acknowledgment of the movement's claims by targets and outsiders. Recognition includes the adoption of the issue by a political party without any true gains for the movement, a process known as co-optation. Policy gains are a mid-

level outcome in which legislation or agency policy is designed to address movement claims either pre-emptively or as concessions to the movement, largely with the intent of quieting movements without initiating significant change. The final level, membership into the political structure, occurs when political actors routinely act in the interests of the movement and when resolution of the movement's claims removes its issue from the political agenda (Amenta, Caren, & Chiarello, 2010; Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992). More recently, Amenta, Caren, and Olasky (2005) have taken a different approach to outcomes than previous research using the political mediation model. In applying the political mediation model to old age policy in the United States, they assessed outcomes in terms of "moderate and radical influence" (p. 518) on policy rather than as categories of outcomes. In concluding their 2005 work, Amenta, Caren, and Olasky make note of the limitations of this model in its current form. First, the model excludes factors such as public opinion, movement framing of claims, and most relevant to the project at hand, media discourse surrounding the movement. Second, the authors express a need for further theorization and testing of the political mediation model in understanding the outcomes of social movements.

### **Conceptualizing Social Movement Outcomes And Success**

Defining the outcomes of social movements has proven a challenge for scholars (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Giugni, 1998). Early on, the primary definition of outcomes was the mere dichotomous categories of success or failure (Giugni, 1998), which, as discussed below, are results of a different nature from outcomes. To some, limiting social movement outcomes to success or failure seemed not to answer significant questions about the nature of the achievements of social movements (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Giugni, 1998). Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan

(1992) suggested moving away from this definition and proposed defining outcomes in terms of policy response from political institutions, using the four categories described above. However, their categorization does not include a designation for negative outcomes (Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein, 1994), those cases where political leaders do not respond to a movement's claims at all. Non-response is one of the possible answers political leaders may give to social movement demands. Therefore, the first revision to outcomes in the political mediation model is the inclusion of the negative case, recognizing that this is a possible response of political leaders to social movements and that the conditions leading to such a response may differ from those leading to the outcomes defined by Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992).

The second change to the political mediation model's consideration of outcomes is reconsidering its definition of success and failure. Giugni (1998) notes that social movement literature has largely considered success a dichotomous result. In other words, movements either succeed, or they fail. Unfortunately, this is very limiting because it would mean that, more likely than not, there are more failed movements than successful movements. To address the limitations of focusing solely on success or failure, scholars have largely focused instead on outcomes. Among the first was Gamson (1990), who defined success as two clusters of outcomes: acceptance of a movement as a valid spokesperson for legitimate interests and the gain of new advantages for the group. Using these two dimensions, four outcomes exist. The first is a full response in which a group is accepted as a spokesperson and achieve gains. The second is pre-emption in which a group makes gains but is not accepted as a spokesperson. The third is co-optation in which a group is accepted as a spokesperson

but does not make gains. The final outcome is collapse, in which a group disintegrates either during a challenge or in its aftermath. Giugni (1998) notes that while Gamson's is the best known outcome typology, most analyses have relied solely on the distinction between acceptance and advantage gains rather than the four-fold typology. However, despite this, Gamson (1990) has been influential in the subsequent conceptualization of social movement outcomes.

Like Gamson (1990), Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992) and Amenta, Dunleavy, and Bernstein (1994) attempt to overcome the limitations of studying social movement success or failure by focusing on movement outcomes and then specifically only on positive outcomes. Amenta, Dunleavy, and Bernstein (1994) even emphasize that a movement is successful when at least something is gained. Amenta, Dunleavy, and Bernstein (1994) attempt to work around this by terming it partial success but emphasize that it is success nonetheless. This seems to ignore that the movement failed to achieve its goals. This first disregards the agency of movements but also retains the standard dichotomous approach to measuring success. It is therefore proposed in this project to approach success in terms of movement goals and policy response, closer to the notion of partial success and full success hinted at by Amenta, Dunleavy, and Bernstein (1994) but recognizing that certain outcomes may be closer to the goals of social movements than others.

To do this, outcomes are measured against the goals of the movement as defined by the outcomes defined by Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan (1992) and success is defined as the degrees between the goals and the outcome. For example, a movement that seeks enactment of specific policy or legislation but fails to achieve more than

recognition would be less successful than a movement that seeks to gain recognition from power holders and receives recognition and nothing more. In this way, outcomes are recognized from the perspectives of targets and movements alike, and it will remain possible to examine the influence of news coverage on the specific policy-related outcomes of social movements while also examining the influence of news coverage on the success of movements. In addition, failure to make any gains is suggested for consideration as an outcome of social movements.

This re-conceptualization offers an improvement to existing conceptualizations of social movement outcomes by providing criteria for measuring the success of movements rather than relying on previous labels of dichotomous success or failure (Giugni, 1998). The re-conceptualization makes Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan's (1992) notions of all outcomes of partial success more concrete by tying their outcomes to the outcomes specifically sought by movements. Doing so strengthens the political mediation model as a tool for making comparisons across movements and for identifying movement and environmental factors contributing to specific social movement outcomes.

### **Media Processes And Social Movements**

Social movement outcomes are dependent on how movements interact with the political opportunity structure (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992). Media coverage can influence the political opportunities available to movements and influence their tactics (Ryan, Carragee, & Schwerner, 1998). Media coverage may also increase the vulnerability of targets of movements (King, 2008). Many authors have emphasized the importance of media coverage for social movement success (Amenta, Caren, Olasky, & Stobaugh, 2009; Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993; Malinick, Tindall, & Diani, 2011; Snow &

Benford, 1988). There is a sizeable body of literature on the content of news coverage of social movements (Armstrong & Boyle, 2011; Barker-Plummer, 2010; DiCicco, 2010; Boykoff, 2006; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, Devanathan, Stein, & McLeod, 2004; Boyle, McCluskey, McLeod & Stein, 2005; Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Cancian & Ross, 1981; Corbett, 1998; Dardis, 2006; Kensicki, 2001; Lind & Salo, 2002; McCarthy, McPhail, & Smith, 1996; McCluskey, Stein, Boyle, & McLeod, 2009; McLeod, 2007; McLeod & Hertog, 1992; Oliver & Maney, 2000; Shoemaker, 1984; Smith, McCarthy, McPhail, & Augustyn, 2001; Watkins, 2001) as well as literature on the effects of coverage on individual perceptions of social movements (Arpan, Baker, Lee, Jung, Lorusso, & Smith, 2006; Arpan & Tuzunkan, 2011; Detenber, Gottlieb, McLeod, & Malinkina, 2007; McLeod, 1995; McLeod & Detenber, 2007; Shoemaker, 1982) and on mobilization and participation (Boyle & Schmierbach, 2009). While this points to a general expectation that the relationship between media and movements holds significant consequences for movements, there are no studies to date that indicate how or even if news coverage influences movement outcomes.

Two media processes are particularly important to social movements: framing and agenda setting. These two processes are related, but as discussed in detail below, they are considered distinct from one another within the context of this project. Framing in the context of this project refers to the highlighting of certain aspects of protests and social movements over others (Entman, 1993). Framing effects refer to the influence of media framing of protests and social movements on individual perceptions and attitudes towards social movements and protest participation (Detenber, Gottlieb, McLeod, & Malinkina, 2007). Agenda setting is the process through which media emphasis of a

particular set of issues or topics leads the public to consider those issues or topics important (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). These processes represent the specific mechanisms through which news coverage of protest, as part of the political opportunity structure, influences the success and outcomes of social movements.

### **The Protest Paradigm**

Perhaps the most significant body of research about news coverage of social movements is that regarding the protest paradigm. First described by Chan and Lee (1984), the protest paradigm consists of the specific media framing devices and practices used by journalists in covering protests. The function of the protest paradigm is to “attribute different cause-and-effect relationships to civil protests and assign varying degrees of support to protestors” (p. 188). The protest paradigm is defined by three specific themes. The first theme gives support to official and government measures taken to suppress protests. It includes descriptive terms such as “timely” or “thought out” in reference to government actions. The second theme defines protests in a political perspective by attributing protests to external groups and political parties rather to existing political and social conditions. The third theme appeals to the importance of traditional morality and norms. Through these themes, news media act as agents of social control and work to preserve the status quo.

Research on the protest paradigm has found that in their capacity as agents of social control, news media tend to emphasize the spectacle of protest rather than any underlying issues or causes for the protest (Chan & Lee, 1984; Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Dardis, 2006; McLeod & Hertog, 1992). In turn, protest groups often appear more threatening to social and political systems than they are and are delegitimized by their portrayal (Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Chan & Lee, 1984; Dardis, 2006; DiCicco, 2010;

McLeod & Hertog, 1992). News coverage of protest marginalizes social movements and reinforces the existing political institutions and social order through a number of means beyond framing (Armstrong & Boyle, 2011; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Chan & Lee, 1984; Harlow & Johnson, 2011; McLeod & Hertog, 1992). When protests are covered, coverage may be located less prominently in media than conventional political groups and activities being more likely to be in the inside pages of newspapers or offered as human interest stories in television news (Shoemaker, 1984). Additionally, news coverage of protest may rely more heavily on official, police, and target sources than on movement sources (Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Dardis, 2006; Harlow & Johnson, 2011; McCluskey, Stein, Boyle, & McLeod, 2009), meaning that the movement's message is less likely to be presented in its own words than the message of police, government institutions, and the targets of protest. Public opinion surrounding a movement may be constructed through portrayals of protestors themselves, through an emphasis on official sources, an emphasis on the legal status of a protest, through bystander descriptions of events and protestors (Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Harlow & Johnson, 2011; McLeod & Hertog, 1992). Coverage of protests may portray movements as unpatriotic or emphasize their disruption to everyday activities, deeming them ineffective public nuisances (DiCicco, 2010). In relation to this, protestors themselves are often portrayed negatively, often as instigators, freaks, or the cause of civil unrest (Harlow & Johnson, 2011; McLeod & Hertog, 1992; Shoemaker, 1984). Such portrayals serve to make a distinction between protestors and the general public, essentially constructing an image of public opinion that does not include the concerns of social movements (McLeod & Hertog, 1992). In addition, movement's claims may be

marginalized the mere manner of presenting words used to describe a movement's goals, such as referring to the goal of the women's movement as "liberation," quotation marks included (Ashley & Olson, 1998).

Portrayals of social movements may be influenced by the extent to which the group is outside the status quo and the extent to which groups use radical tactics, such as violence, in protests influences the portrayal of protest groups as deviant. A combination of both the deviance of groups from the status quo and the radicalness of the tactics used by the group has been conceptualized as a movement's "level of deviance" (Armstrong & Boyle, 2011; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, Devanathan, Stein, & McLeod, 2005; Boyle, McLeod, & Armstrong, 2012). A higher level of deviance often results in increased marginalization of the movement in news coverage (Armstrong & Boyle, 2011; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, McLeod, & Stein, 2005; Boyle, McCluskey, Devanathan, Stein, & McLeod, 2004; Boyle, McLeod, & Armstrong, 2012; Shoemaker, 1984). Most often, tactics are more important than the goals or position of a group in determining their treatment by media (Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McLeod, & Armstrong, 2012). However, goals may also be influential over the media treatment received by social movements (Kensicki, 2001; McCluskey, 2008).

### **Media Framing And Social Movements**

To begin, media framing will again be distinguished from social movement framing. Both have their roots in Goffman's (1974) *Frame Analysis* and emphasize the organization of social phenomena around specific details and aspects of those phenomena. The primary difference is the agent of framing with social movement framing referring to movements as the constructors of frames and media framing

referring to media, in this case news media, as the suppliers of frames. Social movement framing is a concern for purposes of this project only insofar as social movement frames may become media frames.

There is considerable debate about the definition of framing within the field of mass communication. A great deal of this debate depends on which approach the researcher takes: psychological or sociological. Psychological approaches to framing emphasize framing as a matter of information emphasizing perceived potential gains or losses to the individual while sociological approaches to framing emphasize the social construction of issues, events, individuals, and groups in the presentation of information (Entman, 1993). As might be expected, this project is rooted in the sociological approach to framing rather than the psychological approach although the latter is relevant to the understanding of framing effects.

The sociological approach to framing emphasizes the manner in which frames set the parameters for understanding issues, events, and people. Goffman (1974) referred to framing as a “definition of the situation” (p. 1), emphasizing that the definitions which guide individual lives are not ordinarily created by the individual but by the society which surrounds them. Individuals then use those definitions to interpret happenings in their own lives, sometimes successfully and sometimes unsuccessfully. He specifically branded these definitions as “social frameworks” (p. 22) that serve to subject actions to social appraisal. Social frameworks allow individuals to categorize the meanings and significance of events or people because they are rooted within a set of social customs and are based upon the extent to which these events and people are acting within accordance to those customs.

Entman (1993) defines framing as the increased salience of certain attributes of a subject over other attributes in such a way that interpretation of that subject may be influenced. Research into media framing of social movements has largely indicated that coverage of protests tends to highlight the tactics of protest groups over the issues addressed by them (Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Chan & Lee, 1984; Dardis, 2006; McLeod & Hertog, 1992). In addition, news coverage tends toward an emphasis on the deviance of groups, often by focusing on select individuals in a protest group, rather than the size or significance of the group (Dardis, 2006; McLeod & Hertog, 1992), and coverage often tends to rely more on the use of official and target sources than on the use of movement sources (Armstrong & Boyle, 2009; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McLeod, & Armstrong, 2012; Dardis, 2006; McLeod & Hertog, 1992).

### **Framing Effects**

In addition to the focus on the content of news coverage of protest, there has been some focus given to the effects of that coverage on perceptions of social movements and non-conventional political participation. In an experimental study, Shoemaker (1982) found that negative and ridiculing news coverage of non-mainstream political groups influences the perceived legitimacy of those groups among participants. Exposure to television news coverage that is one-sided in its portrayal of protestors and police through emphasis of protest violence increases individuals' critical perceptions of protestors (McLeod, 1995). The more supportive news coverage is of the status quo, research suggests that the more negatively television viewers will perceive protestors and the less effective they will perceive protest to be (McLeod & Detenber, 1999). Conflicting framing of protests through the use of photographs elicits less sympathy and support for protestors than peaceful framing of protests. Further, individuals exposed to

such photos are more likely to perceive protest as less effective than those exposed to peaceful photos (Arpan, Baker, Lee, Jung, Lorusso, & Smith, 2006). Additionally, while portrayals of deviance through photographs increase voluntary exposure to Web stories about social movements, photographic portrayals of activist deviance lowers positive perceptions of protestors and reduces attention and recall of the story (Arpan & Tuzankan, 2008).

Media coverage of social movements may also influence activists themselves. Ryan, Carragee, and Schwerner (1998) have identified news coverage as influential on the tactics used by social movements. Rauch's (2010) qualitative study of how activists perceive mainstream news media and average media audiences within the context of third-person effects indicates a strong distrust and dislike of mainstream news media among activists. Because news media tend to be critical of protest and therefore discourage protest participation, Boyle and Schmierbach (2009) tested the relationships between protest participation and media use and found that protest participants use alternative media more than non-participants, but there is no significant difference between participant and non-participant use of traditional media. They argue that this suggest that the content of mainstream news media, particularly online media, offers informative and incentive value to participants. However, they note that their findings suggest a limited role for the influence of mainstream television and newspaper media in that use of either neither helps nor hurts protest participation.

Collectively, the literature about the protest paradigm and framing effects suggests that more positive portrayals of protest will be associated with greater social movement success. However, one of the most significant findings with regards to the

protest paradigm is that more negative coverage of protest increases with increased frequency of coverage (Ashley & Olson, 1998; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, McLeod, & Stein, 2005; DiCicco, 2010). These conflicting findings complicate and challenge the claims within the social movement literature that media attention alone is vital to social movement success. It additionally complicates what can be expected with regards to the role of news coverage of protest in social movement outcomes. The literature above regarding framing and framing effects suggests that positive portrayals will be associated with greater movement success. However, this may be mitigated by increased frequency of coverage.

### **Agenda Setting And Social Movements**

Agenda setting has been one of— if not the— the dominant theories within political communication and news media research for the past 40 years. The basic premise of the theory is simple: Media emphasis of a set of issues makes those issues important to the public (McCarthy, Smith, & Zald, 1996; McCombs, 1997; 2004; 2005; McCombs & Shaw, 1972; Smidt, 2012; Walgrave & Aelst, 2006). This very simple statement further demonstrates why news coverage would be assumed important for social movement success: If a movement is to be successful, people need to know about the movement and its causes, and if people are going to know about a movement and its causes, movements need to attract media attention (Carroll & Hackett, 2006; McCarthy, Smith, & Zald, 1996).

However, there is very little literature regarding agenda setting processes and social movements. What research has addressed agenda setting has found the process to be very complex because social movements and their issues must become part of both multiple agendas (McCarthy, Smith, & Zald, 1996; Walgrave & Vliegenthart, 2012).

McCarthy, Smith, and Zald (1996) offered the first discussion of agenda setting processes in relation to social movements, laying out four competing agendas that potentially affect social movements' ability to influence policy: the media, public, electoral, and governmental agendas. The first three may be directly influenced by media while the fourth, the governmental agenda, is more likely to be influenced by direct lobbying on the part of organizations than by media. McCarthy, Smith, and Zald (1996) argue that social movements need to become a part of all four agendas, but because the four are interrelated and may even conflict, this is a complex and difficult process. The authors did not test for any agenda-setting effects either from movements to the four agendas named above nor among agendas although they examined common communications tactics undertaken by some of the best-known social movements and proposed an effect on the basis of agenda setting and framing theories.

The vast majority of the literature about agenda setting and social movements has focused on the ability of movement's to influence political agendas such as legislative agendas, party manifestos, and electoral platforms (Schumaker, 1975; Baumgartner & Jones, 1993; Walgrave & Vliegenthart, 2012), also called "agenda responsiveness" (Schumaker, 1975, p. 494). Only two studies have directly tested the agenda-setting influence of social movements with regards to news coverage. In examining coverage of gun control, Smidt (2012) found coverage of the Million Mom March in 2000 had a stronger association with the public agenda that year than coverage of multiple school shootings in the previous year or President Clinton's efforts to enact new gun control policy, demonstrating the power of social movements to influence the public agenda. Walgrave & Vliegenthart (2012) found that media attention

to protests in Belgium increased public attention to issues and in turn increased the attention given to those issues by political parties and the legislature. While these steps have been taken toward understanding agenda setting processes concerning social movements, the systematic study of agenda setting and social movements is largely neglected and consists primarily of untested conceptualizations of the phenomenon, leaving the specifics of agenda setting processes surrounding social movements are largely unknown.

Despite the lack of research into the ability of social movements to influence the public agenda, there is evidence that social movements can influence the media agenda. Walgrave and Vliegenthart's (2012) study of agenda-setting processes involving demonstrations in Belgium and Smidt's (2012) study of the agenda-setting effects of the Million Mom March on the issue of gun control both demonstrated that protest attracts media attention to causes and can in turn affect public and political agendas. However, most focus on the influence of movements on the media agenda is moving away from the influence of protest and to the intermedia agenda-setting effects in the online media environment. Intermedia agenda setting refers to the process through which the media agenda of one media outlet or medium is influenced by another (Roberts & McCombs, 1994; Ragas & Kioussis, 2010). This sort of effect has been found in studies regarding social movements and media agendas. For example, the YouTube videos of supporters and opponents of California's Proposition 8 ("Prop 8"), which banned same-sex marriage in that state, and found that YouTube videos influenced the coverage of Prop 8 in traditional media in 2009 although not in 2008 (Sayre, Bode, Shah, Wilcox, & Shah, 2010), the year the proposition passed. Merilainen

and Vos (2011) examined the ability of human rights organizations to influence online public agendas, essentially bypassing news media, and found that organizations influence public agendas without receiving media attention. However, media agendas are often also influenced in the process, allowing for potential agenda-setting effects offline.

### **Framing Vs. Agenda Setting**

Some scholars have argued for the incorporation of framing into agenda setting theory under the term “second-level agenda setting.” Their argument is that the transfer of the salience of news issues is accompanied or followed by a transfer in the salience of attributes describing those issues (Balmas & Sheafer, 2010; Ghanem, 1997; McCombs & Ghanem, 2001; McCombs, Llamas, Lopez-Escobar, & Rey, 1998). However, for purposes of this project, framing is being considered a separate process from agenda setting. Scheufele’s (2000) and Scheufele and Tewksbury’s (2007) arguments distinguishing framing from agenda setting are most relevant to this argument. Agenda setting as a media effect is largely a question of accessibility of information whereas framing is about interpretation of information. Agenda setting is an effect that occurs from repeated exposure to the same issue in media whereas framing is dependent on attention to media content.

Research into media framing of social movements suggests framing as a separate process from agenda setting and has taken the approach that framing is about the construction of discourse about a topic rather than the salience of specific attributes about it (Ashley & Olson, 1998; Boykoff, 2006; Brasted, 2005b; Dardis, 2006; McLeod D. , 2007; Shoemaker, 1984). Further, studies of the protest paradigm have found that negative coverage of protest emerges as coverage increases (Ashley & Olson, 1998;

Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, McLeod, & Stein, 2005; DiCicco, 2010), while framing effects research raises the possibility that framing might affect agenda-setting processes by influencing the importance individuals place on social movements and their issues (Detenber, Gotlieb, McLeod, & Malinkina, 2007; McLeod & Detenber, 1999; Shoemaker, 1982) by indicating that negative coverage of protest reduces the likelihood of protest participation and the importance individuals assign to a movement's issue.

Further research and conceptualization into this is necessary but lies outside of the scope of this project. However, this argument is being forwarded in support of distinguishing between framing and agenda setting in the study of news coverage of social movements. In addition, agenda setting is not being tested in this project but is offered, alongside resource mobilization theory, as a reason to expect that more frequent news coverage of protest will be associated with great success for social movements.

### **Using The Political Mediation Model to Bridge News Coverage to Movement Outcomes**

As discussed above, movement outcomes are re-conceptualized as the extent to which the outcome achieved-- recognition, policy gains, and polity membership (Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein, 1994; Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992)-- reflects the goals of the movement. Without detailing the measurement and assessment of this variable too greatly before explaining the methods used in this project, a generic example will allow for a basic understanding of the concept. Suppose movement A wants for its members a guarantee of equal wages regardless of race. This would be defined as a goal of polity membership because if met, it would mean that decisions of

the majority are in favor of the movement (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992).

Movement A targets legislators and the president, and their efforts elicit a statement in support of wage equality across races and even the introduction of legislation in Congress, but the bill fails to pass. This outcome would be defined as recognition but only as a partial success (Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein, 1994). In the re-conceptualization proposed, the outcome of recognition is two degrees from the goal of the movement. Likewise, if a bill granting some wage equality measures but not a guarantee of wage equality would be one degree from the goal of the movement, and somewhat obviously, if legislation or policy were produced that guarantees wage equality, the movement would have achieved full success.

News coverage of protest by four social movements is being analyzed in consideration of the role of news media in the outcomes of social movements: the movement behind the repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," the movement in support of the Equal Rights Amendment, the disability rights movement, and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. Each movement represents a different set of goals and tactics with a different outcome and level of success. Success here is understood as the extent to which the outcomes achieved by each movement reflect movement goals, measured as the level of recognition by Congress and media received by each movement; the extent of policy gains, measured by roll call votes, attained by each movement; and the degree of polity membership, measured as public opinion on the issues of each movement. The selection of these four movements tests the applicability of the political mediation model across issues and movements. In addition, each has generated

enough news coverage to allow for the consideration of the role of news coverage in their outcomes.

### **The LGBT Rights Movement And “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”**

The movement in support of allowing homosexual individuals to serve in the military began as part of the larger LGBT movement that emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Herek, 2012). The 1969 Stonewall riots are generally viewed as the start of the contemporary LGBT rights movement. The riots were a series of demonstrations by members of the gay community following a New York police raid on a gay bar at the Stonewall Inn (Carter, 2009). The Stonewall riots brought about a rapid growth of gay rights movements and led to strong organization of activists at the national level. Eventually, the gay rights movement began cooperating with lesbian feminist groups and transgender rights activists, and by the 1980s, the gay rights movement had expanded to become the contemporary LGBT movement (Eaklor, 2011).

The military was a key target by LGBT activists as early as the 1970s (Herek, 2012). Although homosexual individuals were unofficially banned from service in the American military starting with the Revolutionary War, and official policy regarding the discharge of homosexual service members was part of the Uniform Code of Military Justice signed by President Harry Truman in 1950, there were no major challenges to this policy until a Leonard Matlovich unsuccessfully challenged his dismissal under the ban in 1975 ("Matlovich settles: Money, but no job", 1981). In 1982, under a directive from President Ronald Reagan, the Department of Defense established a new policy stating that homosexuality is incompatible with service in the United States military. The new policy resulted in the discharge of approximately 17,000 men and women from the armed forces over the course of the 1980s (Herek, 2012).

Legislation to overturn the ban was introduced in Congress in 1992 while opposition to the policy began to increase. Shortly after taking office in 1993, President Bill Clinton requested that the Secretary of Defense draft a policy to end discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and to use the interim time period to resolve the practical matters that would accompany a new policy. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, many members of Congress, Republicans and other political opponents, and a large portion of the U.S. public all opposed the proposal. Following considerable public debate and a series of Congressional hearings, President Clinton and Georgia Senator Sam Nunn drafted a compromise policy called *Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue*, commonly known as *Don't Ask, Don't Tell* (DADT). Under the policy, military personnel could not be asked to disclose their sexual orientation and could not be discharged simply for being homosexual. However, sexual conduct with a member of the same sex still remained grounds for discharge. Congress passed most aspects of the policy in fall of 1993 (Herek, 2012).

Opposition to DADT and for the inclusion of LGBT individuals in the military began growing in 2000 following the murder of Barry Winchell by Calvin Glover at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, in 1999. Those opposed to DADT, including President Clinton and Vice President Al Gore, cited the case as evidence of the policy's failure to end discrimination and homophobia in the military. In 2000, Democratic presidential primary candidates Al Gore and Bill Bradley made repeal of DADT part of their campaign platforms. Republican candidates either affirmed their support for the policy or promised to return to the ban implemented in 1981. While these events were significant in the progression of challenges to DADT, the most vehement opposition to the policy and to

discrimination against the military service of LGBT individuals came after the attacks of September 11, 2001. The attacks created a significant need for military personnel, particularly military linguists fluent in Arabic. As a result, many objected when nine linguists, including six fluent in Arabic, were discharged in 2002 for being homosexual (Herek, 2012). In 2003, former president Clinton called for an end to DADT, the same policy he helped create. The Supreme Court along with several federal courts upheld DADT by ruling that the federal government could withhold funding from universities that used nondiscrimination policies to prohibit military recruiters on campus in 2006 (The history of 'don't ask, don't tell', 2010).

The most significant shifts towards inclusion of homosexual individuals in the military came in the late 2000s. In 2007, Democratic primary candidates Hillary Rodham Clinton, John Edwards, and Barack Obama all stated support for ending DADT. Eventual Democratic nominee and president Barack Obama promised a full repeal of the policy in his campaign. In May 2010, committees in both the house and senate approved amending the annual defense spending bill to lift the ban but not until the Department of Defense conducted a study to understand the effects of a repeal on the readiness of the military. The provision requiring the study passed the House but not the Senate, and in November of that year, the Department of Defense released a report concluding that homosexual service members did not pose a significant risk to the effectiveness of the military. The House of Representatives passed a repeal of DADT on December 15, and following a filibuster by Republican members, the Senate voted to repeal on December 18 (The history of 'don't ask, don't tell', 2010). President Obama signed the repeal into law December 22, and following the July 22 certification that the

armed forces were ready to implement the repeal, DADT was repealed on September 20, 2011 (USD(P&R), 2011).

As part of the larger LGBT rights movement, the movement in support of the military service of homosexual individuals was supported by significant protest activity, particularly in the late 2000s through 2010. The LGBT community included the military as a target of protest activity from the beginning of the movement (Herek, 2012), but protests specifically targeting the military first emerged in the early 1980s as military and political policy against homosexuality became more rigid ("Anita's West Point TV special draws protests", 1980). Protests frequently targeted military recruiters and ROTC presence on university campuses ("Anti-ROTC Activity at Madison", 1990; Bull, 1990; Davis, 2005; Oswald, 1986; Smith, 2002;). Protest activity in opposition to DADT began to increase in the late 2000s, led by military personnel who had been discharged after 9/11 despite prior service and skills ("Activists detained while challenging 'don't ask, don't tell'", 2006; "Choi, five vets arrested against in White House DADT protest", 2010; McMillan, 2007; Melzer, 2005; Roehr, 2009; Zeller, 2006;), and the process to repeal the policy began in 2010.

### **The Women's Rights Movement And The Equal Rights Amendment**

Similar to the movement that gained LGBT individuals the right to serve in the military, the movement behind the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) was a part of a larger movement. The ERA, then called the "Lucretia Mott Amendment," was first written by the National Women's Party in 1921 and introduced in Congress in 1923, following the 1920 passage of the 19<sup>th</sup> amendment that granted women in the United States the right to vote (Francis, 2012). However, the ERA was opposed by many women's organizations until the 1960s. Many of these organizations feared the

amendment would be a threat to protective legislation for women (Sklar & Dublin, 2012). In the 1960s and 1970s, however, the ERA gained the support of a broad coalition of women's rights groups. In 1972, the ERA passed the House and Senate with a deadline of 1979 to be ratified by three-fifths of the states, 38 states. In 1978, Congress extended the ratification deadline to June 30, 1982, Initially supported strongly by both political parties, Republicans withdrew their support for the amendment at their 1980 convention as part of a general conservative shift (Francis, 2012). By this point, only three more states were necessary for the amendment to be ratified, and activists intensified their efforts. However, the amendment failed to obtain ratifications from three more states, and the deadline to ratify passed on June 30, 1982. The ERA was re-introduced in Congress two weeks later and has been re-introduced in every session of Congress ever since (Francis, 2012).

Like the military service of homosexual individuals, protest played a significant role in the movement in support of the ERA, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s when the amendment had its strongest support among women's groups. A number of prominent women's organizations, including the League of Women Voters and the National Organization of Women (NOW), joined together to found ERAmerica, a coalition dedicated solely to advocate for the ratification of the amendment. Founded in 1976, after the amendment had passed Congress, ERAmerica's purpose was to push for ratification of the amendment by the states (Slavin, 1995). Part of ERAmerica's strategy, organized and promoted primarily by NOW, were demonstrations in the capitals and major cities of states that were resistant to ratifying the amendment. The first state ERA demonstration was May 1976 in Springfield, Illinois, and demonstrations

continued throughout the decade, culminating in a march of 90,000 participants in Chicago on Mother's Day 1980 (Gibson, 2011). At the same time, NOW was also organizing marches in Washington, DC, including a July 9, 1978, march of nearly 100,000 participants, and the deadline for ratification was extended by Congress shortly thereafter (Francis, 2012).

### **The Disability Rights Movement And The Americans With Disabilities Act**

Modeled on the examples of the civil rights and women's rights movement, the contemporary disability rights movement emerged in the 1960s. Prior to this, there had been a number of single-disability rights movements, particularly the disabled veterans' movement after the Second World War, but no cross-disability movement (Johnson, 1999). Although the disability rights movement that emerged has taken on multiple causes and confronted multiple targets, the center of disability rights advocacy since the emergence of a cross-disability rights movement has been on independent living for people with disabilities. The independent living movement, led by Edward Roberts, first emerged among wheelchair-using individuals in California in the late 1960s. The foundational ideology of this movement became the basis for the broader disability rights movement from the early 1970s forward: people with disabilities are experts about their conditions and what they need (Bagenstos, 2009). As such, the movement calls for disability no longer to be deemed a medical condition, for people with disabilities no longer to be institutionalized, and for the full social and political participation of all people regardless of ability (Johnson, 1999).

The key achievement of the disability rights movement is the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The ADA was enacted and signed into law in 1990 and prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability. Defining disability as "a physical or mental

impairment that substantially limits a major life activity,” the ADA leaves the definition of disability to determination on a case-by-case basis with the exceptions of substance abuse, visual impairment correctable by glasses or contact lenses, and conditions that can be controlled with medication (Rasky, 1989). The ADA was amended in 2008 in order to broaden the definition of disability to include those that are treated and controlled by medication and to set clear parameters for the determination of disability (Expansion in disability law?, 2008). Even after its implementation, the ADA still meets significant challenges from some in the business community (Expansion in disability law?, 2008; Malveaux, 2005). In addition, many states have laws on the books that can prevent those with intellectual disability and mental illness from voting (Leonard, 2012), and there have been challenges to laws allowing people with intellectual disabilities and mental illness the right to vote (Belluck, 2007; Leonard, 2012).

Protests in support of disability rights began in 1977 in support of new regulations to enforce the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Similar to both the LGBT rights movement and the women’s rights movement, the disability rights movement had visible protest activity throughout the U.S. In 1977, disability rights advocates held demonstrations and sit-ins in Washington, DC, as well as the federal regions of major cities including New York, San Francisco, and Atlanta. The largest demonstrations were in Washington, DC, and San Francisco. These protests were significant because they represented the first collective action taken by the emerging disability rights movement (Barnartt & Scotch, 2001). Protests continued throughout the 1980s. A large number of these protests targeted public transit systems because overall, they represented the biggest block of opposition to disability rights legislation (Holmes, 1990). Disability rights protests in

favor of the ADA were also bolstered by the Deaf President Now protests at Gallaudet University in Washington, DC. Gallaudet, a federally chartered university for deaf students, was lead by a hearing president (Barnartt & Scotch, 2001;Yost, 1989). Deaf President Now protestors were joined on Capitol Hill and in marches throughout Washington by approximately 2,000 other disability rights protestors in support of both the appointment of a deaf president at Gallaudet and in support of the ADA and disability rights (Barnartt & Scotch, 2001).

### **People For The Ethical Treatment Of Animals**

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) was founded in 1980 by Ingrid Newkirk and Alan Pacheco in order to campaign for the release of 17 crab-eating macaques from the Institution of Behavioral Research in Silver Spring, Maryland (Carlson, 1991). PETA's slogan, "Animals are not ours to eat, wear, experiment on, or use for entertainment," (PETA website site) summarizes its goal of ending human use of animals for food, sport, clothing, and experimentation and would be defined as full polity membership, in this case for animals, within the political mediation model.

PETA had some success in seeing regulations for animal research changed although it has not met its goal of ending animal research (Carlson, 1991). Most of its efforts since the 1980s have focused on persuading the public to stop eating meat, wearing or carrying fur or leather goods, and stop supporting businesses that exploit animals for entertainment. PETA's website does not name any legislative initiatives or successes (PETA, 2012a) although the organization did demonstrate in favor of a tax on meat products in 2009 ("Top 10 PETA protests of the decade," n.d.). Even though PETA's efforts are focused primarily on changing consumer behavior, boycotts and demonstrations are a significant part of PETA's efforts (PETA, 2012). One of the

group's better-known tactics is splattering individuals wearing fur with red paint ("Top 10 PETA protests of the decade," n.d.). The organization is also well known for its use of nudity in protests and campaigns. On their website PETA states that the use of nudity in protest is expressly for purposes of attracting "free 'advertising' through media coverage" (PETA, 2012b, para. 1).

### **Research Questions And Hypotheses**

"The more radical and far-reaching the outcome, the more favorable conditions required and the more the movement may have to do to influence it" (Amenta, Caren, & Olasky, 2005, p. 522). Favorable conditions in terms of news coverage would include frequent coverage of the movement, coverage that is positive in its portrayals of the movement and its activists, that includes the movement's narrative through source use, and that is prominent in its location in news media. These are all expected to be associated with greater movement success.

### **News Coverage Of Protest**

Social movement literature emphasizes the importance of media for the success of movements (Amenta, Caren, Olasky, & Stobaugh, 2009; Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993; Malinick, Tindall, & Diani, 2011; Snow & Benford, 1988). While no studies have addressed this question specifically, a few have addressed Blanco (1997) has found that news coverage of social movements opens the agenda of political elites in terms of issues and solutions, and King (2008) found that media attention predicted corporate response to boycotts. Further, the basic premise of agenda-setting theory, that issues most salient in the media become most salient to the public (McCarthy, Smith, & Zald, 1996; McCombs, 1997; 2004; 2005; McCombs & Shaw, 1972; Smidt, 2012; Walgrave & Aelst, 2006), allows for the expectation that the more coverage a movement has

received, the more likely it is to be thought of as important by the public. However, studies which have indicated the significance of frequency of coverage for social movements (Blanco, 1997; King, 2008) did not examine other characteristics of coverage such as tone, and research into the protest paradigm has identified an association between frequency of coverage and tone of coverage, with more negative coverage emerging as the frequency of coverage increases (Ashley & Olson, 1998; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, McLeod, & Stein, 2005; DiCicco, 2010). It is therefore difficult to predict the specific influence frequency of coverage would have on the results of social movements. Therefore, the following question is raised:

RQ1: What is the relationship between the frequency of news coverage of social movements and the outcomes of social movements?

More positive portrayals of social movements have been found to elicit more positive perceptions of movements by individuals (Arpan & Tuzunkan, 2011; Detenber, Gottlieb, McLeod, & Malinkina, 2007; McLeod, 1995; McLeod & Detenber, 1999; Shoemaker, 1982). The terms “positive” and “negative” refer to the use of news frames, use of movement and official or target sources, the invocation or construction of public opinion, the legitimacy or illegitimacy of protest, and the characterization of activists in coverage of social movements. Coverage that could be termed “negative” would utilize riot, crime, or “carnival” frames, rely on official sources, invoke public opinion against the movement, portray protest as futile and illegitimate political participation, and characterize activists as radicals or as dangerous. Coverage that could be termed “positive” would use more debate frames, rely on movement sources, invoke public opinion in support of the movement, portray protests as legitimate political participation,

and characterize activists as average people (McLeod, 2007). Positive coverage of social movements is associated with more positive perceptions of social movements by individuals so it would be expected that the more positive the tone of coverage is towards a social movement, political targets would become more vulnerable and therefore more open to accommodating the demands of movements, so it is expected:

H1: Movements receiving more positive coverage will be more successful.

Journalists' choice of sources is an integral part of coverage of social movements. The extent to which movement sources are used in a story in relation to target or official sources is partly indicative of the extent to which a movement's narrative is part of coverage (Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; McCluskey, Stein, Boyle, & McLeod, 2009). Selection of sources from within the movement, particularly those in leadership roles, are important in providing balanced portrayals of movements, which in turn elicits greater support for movements (McLeod, 1995) so it is expected that:

H2: More frequent use of movement sources in coverage of social movements will be associated with greater movement success.

The basic argument of the protest paradigm is that news media act as agents of social control in order to uphold the status quo (Chan & Lee, 1984). News coverage of protest tends to focus on the spectacle of events rather than on underlying issues or grievances (Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Chan & Lee, 1984; Dardis, 2006; McLeod & Hertog, 1992), and in turn, social movements often appear as threatening to political systems in news coverage (Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Chan & Lee, 1984; Dardis, 2006; DiCicco, 2010; McLeod & Hertog, 1992). The tactics used by movement has been found to be more influential of treatment by news media than goals or group positions (Boyle

& Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McLeod, & Armstrong, 2012). More radical tactics result in greater marginalization by news media (Armstrong & Boyle, 2011; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, McLeod, & Stein, 2005; Boyle, McCluskey, Devanathan, Stein, & McLeod, 2004; Boyle, McLeod, & Armstrong, 2012; Shoemaker, 1984). Therefore, it is predicted:

H3: Greater focus on conventional activities in news coverage will be associated with greater movement success.

One of the primary arguments in this study is that the question of whether or not news coverage of protest influences the success of social movements. The general consensus, based on the amount of literature on news coverage of protests, is that it does. However, there are few factors to indicate what characteristics of coverage are most important in influencing social movements besides the role of tactics in influencing media treatment of movements (Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McLeod, & Armstrong, 2012). Therefore, the following question is posed:

RQ2: Which factors of news coverage of protest are most influential on social movement success?

### **Activists' Attitudes Towards The Role of News Media In Social Movement Success**

As discussed earlier, there is a body of literature devoted to the influence of news coverage of social movements on mobilization and attitudes towards social movements (Arpan & Tuzunkan, 2011; Detenber, Gottlieb, McLeod, & Malinkina, 2007; McLeod, 1995; McLeod & Detenber, 1999; Shoemaker, 1982). However, much of that work has emphasized this influence as it affects non-activists. In addition, literature addressing the influence of news coverage of social movements (Ryan, Carragee, & Schwerner,

1998) has exclusively addressed the effects of coverage on movement strategies, not activists' perceptions regarding whether or not news coverage is helpful or hindering for movement success. The closest such work was done by Rauch (2010) and addressed activists' perceptions of the influence of news coverage of movements on others, the third-person effect. Her findings indicate that activists strongly feel news media wrongly portray political issues, particularly those related to their movements, and this perception may lead to behaviors intended to counter what the influence of media. However, her study did not address specifically how activists perceive media as influencing their movement's success nor how this relates to their own participation in social movements. So, the following questions are raised:

RQ3: How do activists perceive the role of news coverage in the success of their movement?

RQ4: How do activists' perceptions of the role of news coverage in their movement's success influence their participation in the movement?

Table 2-1. Conceptualization of social movement and protest.

Term	Definition	Additional Criteria
Social movement	“[A] collectivity of actors who want to achieve their shared goal or goals by influencing decisions of a target” (Opp, 2009, p. 41)	Must seek policy-oriented solution to issue Must be outside existing political institutions such as political parties, PACs, and SuperPACs
Protest	“Joint (i.e., collective) action of individuals aimed at achieving their goal or goals by influencing the decisions of a target” (Opp, 2009, p. 38)	Must be endorsed by the group Must be a collective action rather than individual action Can include conventional activities such as lobbying, petitions, and media campaigns

## CHAPTER 3 METHODS

This project used two methods to test the hypotheses and answer the questions above. First, a content analysis of news coverage of the movements discussed in the introduction—People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, the Equal Rights Amendment movement, the disability rights movement, and the movement behind the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell— identified the characteristics associated with the outcomes and success of each movement. Second, a survey of social movement activists assessed perceptions of activists about the role of news coverage in the outcomes and success of their movement, the role of media in their motivations to participate in protest, their general attitudes toward media coverage of their movement, and their own definitions of movement success.

### **Content Analysis Of News Coverage Of Social Movements**

Content analysis is the systematic evaluation of the content of recorded communication (Neuendorf, 2002; Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 2005). This study was designed to meet the objectivity, systematization, and reliability standards of the frameworks put forward by Neuendorf (2002), Riffe, Lacy, and Fico (2005), and Lombard, Snyder-Duch, and Bracken (2002). Content analysis has been the most frequently applied method for studies of media and social movements over roughly the last thirty years (Armstrong & Boyle, 2011; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, Devanathan, Stein, & McLeod, 2004; Boyle, McCluskey, McLeod & Stein, 2005; Dardis, 2006; DiCicco, 2010; McLeod, 2007; McLeod & Hertog, 1992; Shoemaker, 1984). Some studies have used it to analyze marginalization devices in news coverage of protest (Dardis, 2006; McLeod & Hertog, 1992), source use in news coverage of social protest (Armstrong & Boyle,

2011; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009), and general framing of social protest (DiCicco, 2010; Harlow & Johnson, 2011; McLeod, 2007; Shoemaker, 1984).

## **Sampling**

To identify articles for analysis, the Proquest Historical Newspapers and Proquest National Newspaper Core database was employed to search for articles about the four movements discussed in the literature review. This database was selected because the ERA, after gaining the support of most women's groups, was passed by Congress in 1972 and is considered a key date in the modern women's movement (Sklar & Dublin). Because all four movements have traditionally been thought of as national movements, the sample analyzed was collected from the *Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, and the *Chicago Tribune* because Proquest provides access to all three databases from before 1970 through the current year, the time period of availability required by this project.

The databases were searched using the names of each movement plus terms such as "protest" and "demonstration." In addition to identifying the sample, the search also established the peak year of each movement using the same measure used by Amenta, Caren, and Olasky (2005) and Amenta, Caren, Olasky, and Snobaugh (2009) in assessing the frequency of media coverage of social movement organizations, the year of most frequent news coverage. The sample consisted of all articles from the peak year of the movement. To identify the peak year of the coverage, the advanced search option was selected in the ProQuest database, and the name of the policy supported by the movement was entered in the main search box. Additional search terms "protest," "march," "demonstration," "rally," "petition," "boycott," and "lobbying" were entered into additional search boxes.

The ProQuest database includes a tool that indicates the frequency of articles featuring these search terms and is customizable by decade, year, month, or week. In addition, it may be sorted by newspaper title. For example, to identify articles about the movement in support of the ERA, the words “Equal Rights Amendment” were entered into the main search box. The option to add the terms “protest,” “demonstration,” or “march” was selected by indicating that the search would be limited only to searches that included the words “Equal Rights Amendment” and one of the words “protest,” “demonstration,” or “march,” represented by the results as “(Equal Rights Amendment) AND (protest OR demonstration OR march). The results indicated that the decade with the most newspaper articles featuring this combination of terms was 1970-1979 with 2,079. This decade was selected in order to identify the year with the most articles. In this case, that was 1978 with 441 articles. To be certain this was the peak year of coverage, the decade with a similar number of articles was checked to be sure there was no individual year in that time period with more articles than 1978. In this case, no other year featured more articles, and most decades that produced results for the combination of search terms above showed fewer articles than for the year of 1978 alone. This procedure was repeated for the three remaining movements. Peak years of each movement are shown in Table 3-1 below.

Although Chan and Lee (1984) included opinion and editorial content in the sample of their study explicating the protest paradigm, editorials were excluded from this sample because framing and bias would be expected in opinion-based content. Wire service articles were also excluded from the sample in order to avoid duplicate copies of articles.

### **Dependent Variable: Social Movement Success**

In this study, the dependent variable is the success of each individual movement. To measure success, a multidimensional social movement success scale was created using proxy measures to correspond to each of the outcomes specified by Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992): recognition, policy gains, and membership in the polity. As defined by Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992), recognition is the extent to which the position of the movement is recognized as legitimate by others. To measure recognition, two measures were used. The first was the proportion of witnesses in congressional hearings from each movement. Data for this measure was obtained through the Congressional LexisNexis database. This specific measure of recognition represents the extent to which Congress recognized the arguments of each movement. A higher proportion of witnesses on behalf of a movement represents a higher degree of recognition by Congress. Working independently, both the researcher and another graduate student counted the number of movement and non-movement witnesses. Krippendorff's alpha for both movement and non-movement witnesses was 1. The second recognition measure, media saturation, was the proportion of articles about each movement that were front-page articles. These data were taken from the content analysis portion of this study.

Policy gains were measured as the proportion of votes on the legislative goals of each movement that were roll call votes. Roll call votes are considered the most important type of vote because each member's vote is recorded individually. Other types of congressional votes include voice votes, unanimous consent, and division votes (Mulvihill, 1997). Data for this measure were obtained through Congressional action reports from Thomas.gov. As with the measure of congressional witnesses, the

researcher asked another grad student to count the number of roll call votes, voice votes, unanimous consents, and division votes. Krippendorff's alpha was 1 for all.

Membership in the polity was measured as public opinion on the core issues of each movement. Data for this dimension were taken from the General Social Survey (GSS). For PETA, public opinion is based on the percentage of respondents who answered "strongly agree" and "agree" to the statement, "Animals have rights, too." For the ERA, public opinion is based on the percentage of respondents who answered "strongly favor" and "favor" to the question "Do you favor or oppose the equal rights amendment?" For the ADA, public opinion is based on the percentage of respondents who answered "strongly agree" and "agree" to the statement "The government should provide disability benefits to the mentally ill and disabled." For DADT, public opinion was based on the percentage of respondents answered "no" to the question, "Should gays be excluded from the draft?" For the ADA and DADT questions, the measures selected were the closest available on GSS to assessing support for disability rights and LGBT military service as no question directly asked about the ADA or the repeal of DADT. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to assess the internal consistency of these four dimensions of social movement success and was found to be .69, just under the standard reliability score of .70. The limitations of this will be addressed in the discussion chapter.

Following this, each movement was ranked on each dimension with the movement having the highest result for each measure receiving four points and the movement with the lowest result for each measure receiving one point. The disability rights movement was ranked highest for the proportion of witnesses at congressional

hearings on the ADA with a .571 proportion of witnesses, followed by the women's rights movement with a .44 proportion of witnesses in hearings about the ERA, the movement to repeal DADT with .125 of witnesses at congressional hearings, and PETA with no witnesses in congressional hearings. The disability rights movement was also ranked highest for media saturation with a .171 proportion of front page articles, followed by the women's rights movement with a .163 proportion of front page articles, followed by the movement to repeal DADT with a .068 proportion of front page articles, and PETA with a .036 proportion of front page articles. The movement to repeal DADT ranked highest for the proportion of votes on the issue that were roll call votes with all votes being roll call votes. This was followed by the women's rights movement with .791 of votes on the ERA being roll call votes, the disability rights movement with .560 of votes being roll call votes, and PETA with no roll call votes. The movement to repeal DADT ranked highest for public opinion with 82.5% of GSS respondents indicating objection to excluding gays from the draft, followed by the disability rights movement with 77.5% of GSS respondents stating support for disability services, the women's rights movement with 73.9% of GSS respondents stating support for the ERA, and PETA with only 29.9% of GSS respondents stating support for animals rights. All data for success measures were collected from the peak year of each movement with the exception of public opinion, which was based on the first GSS after the peak year. Table 3-2 shows each movement's ranking on each measure below.

After each movement was ranked on each success measure, the mean of all four ranks was taken to determine the final success score of each movement. Disability rights had the highest success score, 3.25, followed by the movement to repeal DADT

with a score of 3.00, the women's rights movement with a score of 2.75, and PETA with a score of 1.00. Table 3-3 below shows each movement's success score.

### **Coding Instrument**

Each article was assigned a case number and coded for the title of the newspaper, the date of the article, the name of the writer of the article, the movement covered, the type of action covered, and the size of the action or movement as reported in the article. The independent variables in this project are the characteristics of news coverage of the four aforementioned movements during the movement's peak year. The peak year of the movement is defined as the year in which the most news coverage was received by the movement (Amenta, Caren, & Olasky, 2005). The peak year was selected to overcome the challenge presented in measuring the frequency of coverage among movements of varying lengths. A movement that has only been in existence for 20 years will almost certainly have received more news coverage than a movement that has only been in existence for 10 years. Selecting the peak year of news coverage removes this obstacle. In addition, analysis of coverage from the peak year of a movement provides a picture of the movement when it was most visible to the public.

The characteristics of coverage analyzed in this project are the length of each article, the location of the article in each newspaper, the number of movement sources, the number of quotes from movement sources, the gender of movement sources, the gender of movement sources that were quoted, the number of official sources, the number of quotes from official sources, the gender of official sources, the gender of official sources that were quoted, the number of target sources, the number of target sources that were quoted, the gender of target sources, the gender of target sources

that were quoted, the tone of the headline, the tone of the article, and public opinion cues present in the article.

The length of each article was measured as the number of paragraphs. To measure source use, the number of movement and official sources were recorded. Movement sources are defined as spokespeople and participants of the movement. Official sources are defined as non-movement sources who are identified by a title. Official sources are elected officials, cabinet members, spokespeople for government agencies, and law enforcement personnel. In addition to counting the number of sources, the number of quotes from each movement and official sources were counted.

In addition, the presumed gender of sources was recorded for each category as well as for quoted sources, using the source's name as an indicator. This is a secondary measurement of movement representation in the coverage of the movement behind the ERA. The proportion of total sources and total quotes from the movement was used as a measurement of the extent to which the movement's narrative was a part of coverage with 0 representing the complete absence of the movement's narrative from coverage and 1 represent the movement's narrative being completely dominant in coverage.

The text of each headline is being recorded for descriptive purposes only, but headlines were coded for tone using the presence of frames and labels, mentions of success or failure, and characterizations of the group as positive or negative (Boyle, McLeod, & Armstrong, 2012; Harlow & Johnson, 2011). The tone of the text of the article itself will also be analyzed using similar criteria. To account for variations in the length of articles, the tone of the articles was assessed by the proportion of paragraphs which are negative, positive, or neutral. Paragraphs were each coded as 1) negative, 2)

neutral, or 3) positive and were be coded for the presence of frames (Boyle, McLeod, & Armstrong, 2012; Harlow & Johnson, 2011). Frames coded for in both the headline and article are injustice frames, sympathy frames, legitimizing frames, delegitimizing frames, spectacle frames, and contextual frames. Injustice, sympathy, legitimizing, and contextual frames are considered positive framing as they portray protestors and social movements as justified in their actions and deserving of sympathy and support. In addition, legitimizing and contextual frames focus on the issues of protest rather than the events of protest (Harlow & Johnson, 2011). Delegitimizing and spectacle frames are considered negative framing as they portray protestors as having an unjust cause, as taking unnecessary action, or as undertaking futile action. In addition, spectacle frames focus on the events of protest rather than the issues (Harlow & Johnson, 2011). Coders will enter the number of paragraphs featuring each frame.

To measure article tone, coders entered three different measurements: the number of negative paragraphs, the number of positive paragraphs, and the total number of paragraphs in the article. An article tone variable was created by subtracting the number of negative paragraphs from the number of positive paragraphs and dividing the result by the total number of paragraphs. These proportions were recoded to create a nine-point scale for article tone. On this scale, 1 represents a negative paragraph proportion between .76 and 1; 2 represents a negative paragraph proportion between .51 and .75; 3 represents a negative paragraph proportion between .26 and .50 4 represents a negative paragraph proportion between .01 and .25; 5 represents a neutral article tone; 6 represents a positive paragraph proportion between .01 and .25; 7 represents a positive paragraph proportion between .26 and .50; 8 represents a positive

paragraph proportion between .51 and .75, and 9 represents a positive paragraph proportion between .76 and 1.

### **Coder Training**

Two undergraduate students who had previously worked with the researcher agreed to work as coders for this project and were trained following the guidelines established by Lombard, Snyder-Duch, and Bracken (2002). For this project, where the sample consists of articles from the peak year of a movement, the training sample was drawn from the year before and the year after each movement's peak year so that articles are as similar to the sample as possible. Intercoder reliability for each variable was informally assessed during training, and the codebook was refined based on this first training session. Following these adjustments, the codebook was pilot tested using a second sample of articles from outside the sample. Intercoder reliability for each variable was again informally assessed following this pilot test. After Krippendorff's alpha reached .80 or greater for each variable in the pilot test, coders were instructed to proceed with the full sample. Just over one quarter, or 58 articles, of the final sample, was randomly selected for coding by both coders to calculate the intercoder reliability for the sample used in this project.

### **Intercoder Reliability**

Intercoder reliability is the measurement of the extent to which coders agree in their judgments about the characteristics of a recorded message and is key to content analysis. Without intercoder reliability, the analysis of messages is meaningless because it cannot be shown that the content measurements used by the researcher are valid. Krippendorff's alpha was calculated to determine the level of agreement among coders. Krippendorff's alpha was selected instead of other methods of calculating

intercoder reliability such as percent agreement, Holsti's method, Scott's pi, and Cohen's kappa. Krippendorff's alpha is preferable to percent agreement because Krippendorff's alpha accounts for chance agreement and is more conservative than Holsti's method (Lombard, Snyder-Duch, & Bracken, 2002). Krippendorff's alpha is also preferable to Scott's pi and Cohen's kappa because it can accommodate any number of coders and was designed for use with variables at the nominal through ratio levels.

The desired minimum level of intercoder reliability for this project is .80, the level generally considered acceptable for non-exploratory content analysis in mass communication research (Lombard, Snyder-Duch, & Bracken, 2002). All but one variable, sympathy frame, achieved a level of intercoder reliability in excess of .80, and most variables had intercoder reliability above .85. In discussions with the researcher, both coders indicated that the sympathy frame was difficult to identify in part because they expected the frame to elicit sympathy from them. One also stated that she did not see it as different from the injustice frame while the other stated she marked the sympathy frame whenever she encountered the injustice frame. The researcher clarified that the sympathy frame, unlike the injustice frame, did not simply present the size and scope of the problem or characterize it as unfair but specifically characterized it as unfortunate, and that one frame should not be coded simply on the basis of the presence of the other frame. She additionally emphasized that the sympathy frame was not dependent upon the degree to which coders felt sympathy for protestors. However, coders never came to agree on Table 3-4 presents intercoder reliability coefficients for each variable used in this analysis.

## **Coding Procedures**

Both coders were required to work independently of one another and to contact the researcher in the event questions arose. Each coder was given a timeline for coding to encourage the completion of the analysis in a timely manner. Following the completion of coding and the calculation of intercoder reliability for the full sample, the researcher resolved disagreements in coding by random selection, an option for incorporating the coding of reliability samples into the full sample (Lombard, Synder-Duch, & Bracken, 2002). Using random selection ensures that the analysis is not influenced by the biases of the researcher.

## **Survey Of Activists' Attitudes Towards The Role Of Media In Movement Outcomes**

To supplement the content analysis, a survey was conducted to identify activists' attitudes towards the role of news coverage in the outcomes of their movement. Survey is a research method where information requirements are specified, and data are collected from a selected sample of an identified population. The goal of a survey is to produce results that are generalizable to the population from which the sample was drawn (Alreck & Settle, 2004). This survey is designed according to the specifications of Alreck and Settle (2004), Walgrave and Verhulst (2011), and Presser et al. (2004). Survey was selected rather than personal interviews with activists in order to systematically uncover factors contributing to activists' attitudes towards interaction with news media in order to move towards an understanding of how these factors ultimately influence the role media plays in social movement success. The survey I assessed activists' attitudes towards media, willingness to interact with media as a source, media use habits, and beliefs regarding the influence of media on movement success or

failure. Literature on social movements emphasizes the importance of media coverage for movement success, but besides not testing relationships between news coverage and movement outcomes, this literature does not address whether or not those who participate in movements find news coverage useful or desirable for their movement.

### **Sampling**

To recruit participants, the researcher contacted leaders of OutServe, an advocacy organization for LGBT members of the U.S. armed forces; the American Association for People with Disabilities, a national organization for persons with disabilities; the National Organization of Women (NOW); and PETA to request permission to post a recruitment message on online message boards and Facebook pages. The recruitment message informed potential participants that the survey is designed to collect their opinions about the movement and its relationship with the media and that the survey is part of a dissertation study. As an incentive to participate, the researcher promoted a \$1-donation per completed survey to each organization. The survey was designed and distributed using the online survey software Qualtrics. No identifying information was collected from respondents.

Although a goal of 100 was set for survey responses, only 82 people responded to the survey. In addition, survey completion was just under half of this number with 40 completing the full survey. Most respondents did not complete questions past those about their involvement in their organization.

Of the 82 respondents, 56.8%, or 46, were from OutServe, 18.5%, or 15, were from the National Organization for Women, 13.6%, or 11, were from PETA, and 11.1%, or 9, were from the American Association for Persons with Disabilities. These numbers represent the relative assistance each organization gave the researcher in accessing

members for survey distribution. PETA only allowed the researcher access to message boards for college student activists and after a long delay following initial contact from the researcher. American Association for People with Disabilities permitted the researcher to post an invitation to the survey on their Facebook page but did not offer much additional assistance in distributing the survey. The researcher recruited NOW participants at the Florida state NOW convention as well as through the national organization's Facebook page and through Yahoo! groups. OutServe not only gave the researcher access to their Facebook page but actively distributed the survey to private Facebook groups and promoted the survey via Twitter. Because of the small size of the sample, the results of this survey are not generalizable and merely provide a point of departure for understanding activist perceptions of how media influences movement success.

Of the 40 who completed the survey and provided the information, 69.5% had been a member of their organization for more than one year with a mean of 7.16 years of membership. 84.2% were white, 55.3% were female, and 25% had a Bachelor's degree. The median age was 33. Table 3-5 shows a full summary of the characteristics of survey respondents.

### **Survey Variables**

The survey collected standard demographic information such as age, race, gender, level of education, political affiliation, and the organization with which they are associated. Respondents were asked to provide their age at their last birthday and indicate their race or ethnicity as white, African American, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, biracial, or other race. Those selecting "biracial" or "other" were asked to provide their ethnic or racial identity accordingly. Because one of

the groups selected for recruitment is a LGBT rights organization, the survey attempted to measure gender inclusively by asking respondents with which gender they identify by giving respondents the option of selection “male,” “female,” or “prefer not to answer.” Level of education was measured as highest level of education completed and designated as less than high school, high school diploma, Associate’s degree, Bachelor’s degree, Master’s degree, or doctoral or professional degree. Political affiliation was measured as both party affiliation and ideological designation. Party affiliation was simply measured as Republican, Democrat, other, and no affiliation. Those indicating “other” were asked to specify their affiliation. Ideological affiliation was measured on a five-point scale anchored by 1) very liberal to 5) very conservative.

Respondents were asked a series of questions about their participation in the movement and their beliefs about the movement’s goals. An open-ended question, “Why did you become active in this organization?,” allowed respondents to indicate their reasons for becoming active in their respective movement. Responses were coded and categorized by the researcher for analysis. A follow-up question asked respondents if any of the following motivated their activism: 1) information obtained in an educational setting, 2) information obtained through news media, 3) information obtained from the organization itself, 4) first-hand experience with the issue, 5) the experience of friends or family with the issue, or 6) other. Those selecting “other” were asked to specify other motivations. Respondents were asked to indicate how many years they have been part of the organization. Respondents were asked to provide one or two sentences to describe the goals of their movement. A follow-up question asked respondents why they do or do not believe their movement will be successful. Responses to this question were

coded and categorized by the researcher for analysis. Respondents were asked how likely they think it is that their organization will meet its goals using a five-point scale anchored with 1) very unlikely and 5) very likely. In cases where respondents indicate that it is very unlikely or unlikely that their organization will meet its goals, they were prompted to indicate what outcomes they believe their organization will achieve.

Respondents were also asked about their media use habits and their opinions towards media coverage of their movement. Media use was measured using a seventeen-item matrix where respondents indicate if they use a source never, less than once a month, once a month, once a week, or daily. Respondents were then asked a series of questions specifically about their attitudes towards news coverage of their organization. Respondents were asked how much they think news coverage helps their organization: none, very little, some, or a lot. They were asked if they have participated in any actions with their organization where news media have been present to report on the event. Respondents who indicated that they have been to such events were asked whether or not they agreed to be interviewed by any reporters present and then why they did or did not agree to be interviewed in an open-ended question. Responses were coded and categorized by the researcher.

Respondents who indicated that they did participate in an action where media were present were also asked if they watched, listened to, or read the news report, regardless of whether or not they were interviewed by a reporter and then were asked how fairly they feel their organization was represented: 1) not at all fairly, 2) unfairly, 3) neither fairly nor unfairly, 4) somewhat fairly, 5) very fairly represented. Those who indicated they were interviewed and watched, read, or listened to the report were asked

if they felt that they personally were fairly represented in the story on a five-point scale anchored by 1) not at all fairly and 5) very fairly represented. All respondents were asked how likely they would be to agree to be interviewed by a reporter for a story about their organization using a five-point scale anchored by 1) very unlikely and 5) very likely. Respondents were asked to indicate in an open-ended question why they would or would not be likely to be interviewed by a reporter, and answers to this question were coded and categorized for analysis by the researcher.

Table 3-1. Peak year of individual movements

Movement	Year	Number of Articles
PETA	2003	37
Women's Rights (ERA)	1978	441
Disability Rights (ADA)	1990	248
Repeal of DADT	2010	140

Table 3-2. Movement rankings on individual success measures

Movement	Congressional Witnesses (Rank)	Media Saturation (Rank)	Roll Call Votes (Rank)	Public Opinion (Rank)
DADT	.125 (2)	.068 (2)	1.00 (4)	.825 (4)
ADA	.571 (4)	.171 (4)	.560 (2)	.775 (3)
ERA	.440 (3)	.163 (3)	.791 (3)	.739 (2)
PETA	0 (1)	.036 (1)	0 (1)	.299 (1)

Table 3-3. Social movement success scores.

Movement	Success Score
DADT	3.00
ADA	3.25
ERA	2.75
PETA	1.00

Table 3-4. Krippendorff's alpha coefficients for content analysis variables.

Variable	Krippendorff's Alpha
Activity	0.874
Another Page	1
Author	0.868
Contextual Frame	0.863
Delegitimizing Frame	0.963
Female Movement Sources	0.921
Female Sources	0.952
Headline Frame	0.875
Headline Tone	0.817
Injustice Frame	0.857
Legitimizing Frame	0.932
Male Movement Sources	0.884
Male Quoted Movement Sources	0.874
Male Quoted Official Sources	0.868
Male Sources	0.906
Movement	0.977
Movement Graphs	1
Movement Sources	0.909
Negative Graphs	0.888
Newspaper	0.971
Number	1
Page	0.896
Politicizing Frame	0.874
Positive Graphs	0.92
Quoted Female Movement Sources	0.875
Quoted Female Official Sources	0.867
Quoted Movement Sources	0.878
Quoted Official Sources	0.855
Quoted Sources	0.88
Section	0.872
Spectacle Frame	0.9
Sympathy Frame	0.706
Total Graphs	0.941
Total Sources	0.89

n = 58

Table 3-5. Characteristics of survey respondents.

Characteristic	Participants (n = 40)
Movement	
OutServe	50% (20)
NOW	27.5% (11)
American Association for People with Disabilities	12.5% (5)
PETA	10% (4)
Gender	
Female	54.1% (21)
Male	43.2% (16)
Prefer not to say	2.7% (1)
Race	
White	83.8% (32)
Black	5.4% (2)
Hispanic	5.4% (2)
Other	5.4% (2)
Education	
High School	24.3% (9)
Associate's Degree	18.9% (7)
Bachelor's Degree	25% (10)
Master's Degree	16.2% (6)
Doctorate or Professional Degree	13.5% (5)
Median Age	33

## CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

### **Content Analysis Of Newspaper Coverage Of DADT, ADA, ERA, And PETA**

All data from the content analysis and survey were entered into SPSS for statistical analysis. Statistical analysis of the content analysis portion of this study consisted of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) and regression analysis.

Frequencies from survey data are used to answer the two research questions regarding activist attitudes towards media coverage of social movements. Because one objective of this project was to argue for the inclusion of negative cases in the analysis of social movement success, all results are presented with and without the inclusion of the negative case in this study, PETA.

#### **Descriptive Statistics**

In this study, four social movements were used to represent the four potential success described in the literature review. In total, 215 articles were sampled from the New York Times, Washington Post, and Chicago Tribune, approximately 24% of the sampling frame established from the peak years of each movement. Of these articles, 42.7%, or 91, were in the Washington Post, 40%, or 86, were about the ERA, and 45.6% appeared on an inside page of an inside section. Lobbying was the most frequently reported protest activity, account for 31.2%, or 67, articles while another 43, or 20%, of articles reported on demonstrations. The mean number of paragraphs per article was 16.95. Table 4-1 provides complete details of the content analysis sample.

#### **Hypotheses And Research Questions**

Research question one addressed the relationship between the frequency of news coverage of protest and the success of social movements. To control for the

influence of movements of different lengths of time, the number of articles published during the peak year of the movement was established as the measurement of frequency of coverage. Additionally, this served as the sampling frame.

The women's rights movement had the most articles, 441, during its peak year of coverage while PETA had the fewest, 37. The movement to repeal DADT had 140 articles during its peak year while the disability rights movement had 248 articles during its peak year. This indicates that the frequency of coverage of protest, measured as number of articles during the peak year of coverage, has a non-linear relationship with social movement success.

To further explore the relationship between how much coverage protest received and the success of the four social movements selected, the researcher collected data on two other measurements of coverage, total number of paragraphs per article and number of paragraphs specifically devoted to protest activities broadly defined. The results of analyses of variance (ANOVA) concerning each are discussed below, beginning with the number of paragraphs per article.

The first set of analyses compared the mean number of paragraphs per article about each movement. The results of a one-way ANOVA found no significant differences in the mean number of paragraphs in articles about DADT, ADA, ERA, and PETA [ $F(214, 3) = 2.075, p = .105$ ]. However, when PETA is removed from analysis, the results of a one-way ANOVA suggest differences are significant [ $F(186, 2) = 3.271, p = .040$ ], but post hoc analysis using the Bonferroni test indicates no specific differences between individual groups, with the mean difference between the mean

number of articles about ADA ( $M = 19.00$ ,  $SD = 11.73$ ) and ERA ( $M = 14.77$ ,  $SD = 10.88$ ) coming closest to significance ( $p = .077$ ). Tables 4-2 summarizes these results.

Because articles may not just differ in their number of paragraphs but the number of paragraphs focused specifically on protest activities undertaken by social movements, the researcher used the total number of paragraphs and the number of paragraphs specifically about protest to create a variable called “proportion of article about protest.” The mean proportion of article about protest was .298. The results of a one-way ANOVA found significant differences in the mean proportion of articles about protest [ $F(214, 3) = 9.684$ ,  $p < .001$ ]. Post-hoc analysis using the Bonferroni test determined that there were significant differences in the mean proportion of the article about protest between DADT articles ( $M = .186$ ,  $SD = .133$ ) and ERA articles as well as between ADA articles ( $M = .269$ ,  $SD = .215$ ) and ERA articles ( $M = .395$ ,  $SD = .277$ ). The mean proportion of DADT articles devoted to protest was approximately .21 less than the mean proportion of ERA articles devoted to protest ( $p < .001$ ), and the mean proportion of ADA articles devoted to protest was approximately .13 less than the mean proportion of ERA articles devoted to protest ( $p = .028$ ). When PETA is removed from analysis, these findings remain approximately the same with a change in the significance of the difference between ERA and ADA articles to .011. Table 4-3 summarizes these results. These results indicate an association between the frequency of coverage of protest and social movement success, specifically that more frequent coverage of protest is associated with lower social movement success.

H1 addressed the relationship between the tone of coverage and social movement success, predicting that more positive coverage would be associated with

better social movement success. Two variables measured the tone of coverage: headline tone and article tone. Analyses of headline tone will lead the discussion of these results, followed by analyses of article tone.

Mean headline tone was 1.98, indicating headline tone was essentially neutral in coverage of all four movements. Headline tone was most positive for ADA coverage ( $M = 2.12$ ,  $SD = .640$ ), followed by DADT coverage ( $M = 2.00$ ,  $SD = .415$ ), PETA coverage ( $M = 1.96$ ,  $SD = .344$ ), and ERA coverage ( $M = 1.91$ ,  $SD = .587$ ). The results of a one-way ANOVA indicate no significant differences between DADT, ADA, ERA, and PETA articles [ $F(211, 3) = 1.558$ ,  $p = .201$ ]. When PETA articles are filtered from analysis, there are still no significant differences in the headline tone among articles [ $F(185, 2) = 2.147$ ,  $p = .120$ ]. Table 4-4 summarizes these results.

Mean article tone was 4.8651, suggesting a very slight negative tone in coverage overall. Results indicate that coverage of PETA was most positive ( $M = 5.107$ ,  $SD = .916$ ), followed by DADT coverage ( $M = 4.983$ ,  $SD = .601$ ), ADA coverage ( $M = 4.976$ ,  $SD = .643$ ), and ERA coverage ( $M = 4.651$ ,  $SD = .967$ ). A one-way ANOVA indicates a significant difference in the article tone of DADT, ADA, ERA, and PETA articles [ $F(214, 3) = 3.470$ ,  $p = .017$ ]. However, post hoc analysis using the Bonferroni test does not indicate any significant differences between any two particular groups. In that test, only the mean difference of  $-.456$  between the tone of ERA and PETA approached significance ( $p = .065$ ). When PETA articles are filtered from analysis, a one-way ANOVA still indicates significant differences in article tone between DADT, ADA, and ERA articles [ $F(186, 2) = 3.939$ ,  $p = .021$ ]. Post hoc analysis using the Bonferroni test indicates that the mean difference of  $.332$  between DADT and ERA articles is significant

( $p = .045$ ). Taken collectively, the above results give some weak support to H1 but primarily only when the negative case, PETA, is excluded from the analysis. Table 4-5 summarizes the results of analyses of article tone.

H2 predicted that more frequent mentions of movement sources in coverage of protest would be associated with greater social movement success. In their analysis, coders counted the total number of sources mentioned, the number of movement sources mentioned, the number of official sources mentioned, the number of sources quoted, the number of movement sources quoted, and the number of official sources quoted. To test this hypothesis, two source mention variables were created using the numbers of sources, movement sources, and official sources. The first, movement source proportion, was created by dividing the number of movement sources by the number of total sources. The second, official source proportion, was created by dividing the number of official sources by the number of total sources. The mean proportion of mentions of sources from the movement was approximately .30 while the mean proportion of sources that were official was approximately .42. Generally speaking, news coverage of all four movements relied more on official sources rather than movement sources.

The results of a one-way ANOVA revealed no significant differences in the proportion of movement source mentions either with PETA articles [ $F(214, 3) = .763, p = .516$ ] or without PETA articles [ $F(185, 2) = 1.035, p = .357$ ] included in the analysis. A similar analysis of mentions of official sources found not significant differences in proportion of official source mentions either with PETA articles [ $F(214, 3) = 1.327, p =$

.266] or without PETA articles [ $F(186, 2) = 1.437, p = .240$ ]. Tables 4-6 and 4-7 summarize these results.

An additional measure of source use was the number of movement and official sources that were quoted. The number of movement sources, official sources, and total sources quoted were all counted. Proportional measures of movement and official sources quoted were created by dividing the number of quoted movement sources by the total number of quoted sources and by dividing the number of quoted official sources by the total number of quoted sources. The mean proportion of sources that were quoted was approximate .81, more than three-fourths of all sources. The mean proportion of quoted sources that were from the social movements was .31 while the proportion of quoted sources that were official was .30. Generally, the proportion of sources that were official and the proportion of sources that were from social movements were approximately equal.

The results of a one-way ANOVA found no significant differences in the proportion of quoted movement sources either with PETA articles [ $F(214, 3) = .687, p = .561$ ] or without PETA articles [ $F(186, 2) = .965, p = .383$ ]. However, the results of a one-way ANOVA found significant differences in the use of quoted official sources [ $F(214, 3) = 4.465, p = .005$ ]. Post-hoc analysis using the Bonferroni test found a significant difference in the mean proportions of quoted official sources in articles about PETA and DADT. The proportion of quoted sources who were official in PETA articles ( $M = .121, SD = .05$ ) was approximately .28 lower than the proportion of official sources in articles about DADT ( $M = .402, SD = .35$ ) ( $p = .004$ ). The results of the Bonferroni test also found that the mean proportions of quoted official sources in articles about PETA

and the ERA approached significance with the proportion of quoted official sources in articles about PETA being .21 lower than the proportion of official sources in articles about the ERA ( $M = .327$ ,  $SD = .389$ ) ( $p = .052$ ). A one-way ANOVA indicated no significant differences in the use of quoted official sources when PETA articles were excluded from the analysis. Tables 4-8 and 4-9 summarize the results of these analyses. Based on these results, H2 is not supported. Not only were no significant differences in the use of movement sources found, but the results of the analysis of quoted official source use is counter to the prediction.

H3 predicted that greater focus on conventional activities would be associated with greater social movement success while RQ2 asked which characteristics of news coverage are most influential on social movement success. To test H3 and answer RQ2, a set of regression models were built. The dependent variable in these models was the social movement success variable constructed using measures of movement testimony at congressional hearings, media saturation, roll call votes, and public opinion. The predictor variables entered into the model were the type of activity reported, the newspaper of publication, total number of paragraphs, proportion of paragraphs about protest, proportion of movement source mentions, proportion of movement quotes, headline tone, and article tone. As with previous hypotheses and research questions, the first model includes PETA articles in the analysis, and the second excludes PETA articles from the analysis.

When PETA articles are included in the analysis, the constant is 2.716, and the only significant predictor of social movement success is the type of activity reported. Articles focusing on lobbying as a movement's protest activity increased social

movement success .332 ( $p = .004$ ). This model explains 6.6% of variance in social movement success ( $R^2 = .066$ ). Table 4-10 shows the first model, with PETA included in the analysis.

When PETA articles are excluded from analysis, the constant is 2.744, and only the proportion of paragraphs focused on protest is a significant predictor of social movement success. Each one-percent increase in the proportion of paragraphs focused on protest decreases social movement success by .220 ( $p = .004$ ). This model explains 13.6% of variance in social movement success ( $R^2 = .136$ ). Table 4-11 shows the second model, with PETA excluded from the analysis.

Based on the above analyses, H3 is partially supported. In the first model, where PETA articles were included in the analysis, lobbying, a conventional protest activity, was found to be a predictor of social movement success. Additionally, the results of both the first and second models indicate that the type of activity and the amount of attention given protest in news coverage are the most important predictors of social movement success.

### **Survey Results**

RQ3 asked how attitudes toward media relate to participation in social movements. Respondents were asked to indicate how credible they find news media coverage about their organization using a matrix of eight statements on a five-point scale anchored at 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree). After reverse coding the statement for bias, a sum of all eight statements was used to create a credibility score between 8 and 40 points. Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .943. The mean credibility score was 22.62, indicating that respondents slightly feel that news media reports about their organization are not credible. When means are broken down according to

movement, OutServe members reported a mean credibility score of 25.81 (SD = 4.99), indicating they do not feel strongly that media reports about their organization are credible or not credible. Members of NOW reported the second highest mean credibility score, 20.30 (SD = 5.62), indicating that they feel media reports about their organization are not very credible. Members of American Association for People with Disabilities had a mean credibility score of 16.67 (SD = 6.66), and members of PETA had a mean credibility score of 14.00 (SD = 6.25), indicating they do not feel that media reports about their organizations are credible. This pattern indicates that social movement organization success may possibly influence activists' perceptions of media. However, it is important to remember that this is descriptive data only and does not provide statistical analysis to indicate the strength of these differences. Table 4-12 summarizes the mean credibility scores of each group.

To examine a little more closely how attitudes towards media are related to participation in a social movement, the number of years of membership were divided into five-year increments of one to five years, six to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, 21 to 25 years, 26 to 30 years, and 31 to 35 years. No respondents indicated membership of more than 35 years. Means were calculated for each group. Only one person indicated they have been a member of their organization for six to 10 years, and only one person indicated being a member of their organization for between 30 and 35 years, so no standard deviation is reported. Those who have been members of their organization for between one and five years had the highest mean credibility score, 24.30 (SD = 6.51), followed by those who have been a member of their organization between eleven and 16 years with a mean credibility score of 23.67 (AD = 3.21). Those

who have been a member of their organization between 21 and 25 years had a mean credibility score of 18.67 (SD = 8.62). The member who has been a member of his or her organization between six and 10 years had a credibility score of 17, and the member who has been a member of his or her organization between 30 and 35 years had a credibility score of 16. No members indicated membership between 16 and 20 years or 26 to 30 years. This indicates there may not be a direct relationship between social movement participation and attitudes towards media. However, this conclusion is limited by the small size of the sample and the distribution of members to between one and five years of membership. Table 4-13 summarizes the mean credibility scores by membership segment.

RQ4 posed a question about activists' attitudes towards the role of news coverage in the success of their movement. A single question asked respondents how much they think news media coverage of their organization helps their organization achieve its goals. Almost half, 47.4%, of respondents indicated that they believe news coverage helps their organization "a lot" in achieving its goals; 28.9% indicate they believe news coverage helps their organization "some;" another 18.4% believe news coverage helps their organization "a little," and 5.3% of respondents believe news coverage doesn't help their organization at all. Table 4-14 summarizes these responses.

To further address this question, a cross tab was created to show how members of each organization felt about the role of media in their movement's success. Approximately two-thirds, 66.7%, of respondents from OutServe indicated they believe news media help their organization achieve its goals "a lot," with 19% indicating they

believe news media help their organization “some,” and 14.3% indicating they believe news media help their organization “a little.” No respondents from OutServe indicated they believe news media play no role in the success of their organization. Responses from members of the American Association for People with Disabilities were divided evenly with 33.3% of respondents indicating they believe media helps their organization none, “a little,” and “some.” No American Association for People with Disabilities respondents indicated they believe news media help their organization “a lot.” Among members of NOW, 40% indicated they believe news media help their organization achieve their goals “some,” 30% indicated they believe news media help “a little,” 20% indicate news media help their organization “a lot,” and 10% indicated news media do not help their organization at all. Equal numbers of PETA members, 50%, indicated that news media help their organization “a lot” and “some.” Table 4-15 summarizes these responses.

Table 4-1. Descriptive statistics of content analysis sample.

Characteristic	Percentage (Number of Articles)
Movement	
DADT	27.4% (59)
ADA	19.5% (42)
ERA	40% (86)
PETA	13% (28)
Newspaper	
New York Times	31.9% (68)
Washington Post	42.7% (91)
Chicago Tribune	25.4% (54)
Page Location	
Front	12.1% (26)
Section Front	7.9% (17)
Inside page of front section	34.1% (73)
Inside page of inside section	45.6% (98)
Type of protest activity	
Lobbying	31.2% (67)
Demonstration	20% (43)
Boycott	10.7% (23)
Fundraising	8.4% (18)
Media campaigns	7% (15)
Lawsuit	3.7% (8)
March	3.3% (7)
Petitions	0.5% (1)
Other	15.3% (33)
Mean number of paragraphs	16.95

Table 4-2. Summary of ANOVAs of mean total paragraphs.

	Mean (SD)			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
DADT	.186 (.133)	Movement (w/ PETA)	Between Groups	684.364	3	.529	9.684*
ADA	.269 (.215)		Within Groups	23200.073	211	.055	
			Total	23884.437	214		
ERA	.395 (.277)	Movement (w/o PETA)	Between Groups	643.795	2	.789	15.419*
PETA	.279 (.053)		Within Groups	18106.216	184	.051	
			Total	18750.011	186		

\*p = .105, \*\*p = .040

Table 4-3. Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of article about protest.

	Mean (SD)			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
DADT	.186 (.133)	Movement (w/ PETA)	Between Groups	1.586	3	.529	9.684*
ADA	.269 (.215)		Within Groups	11.517	211	.055	
			Total	13.103	214		
ERA	.395 (.277)	Movement (w/o PETA)	Between Groups	1.579	2	.789	15.419*
PETA	.279 (.053)		Within Groups	9.419	184	.051	
			Total	10.997	186		

\*p < .001

Table 4-4. Summary of ANOVAs of headline tone.

	Mean (SD)			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
DADT	2.00 (.415)	Movement (w/ PETA)	Between Groups	1.317	3	.439	1.558*
ADA	2.12 (.64)		Within Groups	58.608	208	.282	
			Total	59.925	211		
ERA	1.91 (.587)	Movement (w/o PETA)	Between Groups	1.306	2	.653	2.147**
PETA	1.98 (.555)		Within Groups	55.646	184	.304	
			Total	56.952	186		

\*p = .201; \*\*p = .120

Table 4-5. Summary of ANOVAs of article tone.

	Mean (SD)			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
DADT	4.98 (.601)	Movement (w/ PETA)	Between Groups	6.916	3	2.305	3.470*
ADA	4.98 (.643)		Within Groups	140.173	211	.282	
			Total	146.269	214		
ERA	4.65 (.967)	Movement (w/o PETA)	Between Groups	5.030	2	2.515	3.939**
PETA	4.83 (.811)		Within Groups	117.494	184	.639	
			Total	122.524	186		

\*p = .017; \*\*p = .021

Table 4-6. Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of movement source mentions.

	Mean (SD)			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
DADT	.264 (.275)	Movement (w/ PETA)	Between Groups	.254	3	.085	.763*
			Within Groups	23.426	211	.111	
ADA	.267 (.362)		Total	23.680	214		
ERA	.336 (.361)	Movement (w/o PETA)	Between Groups	.426	2	.117	1.035**
			Within Groups	20.869	184	.113	
PETA	.326 (.308)		Total	21.103	186		

\*p = .516; \*\*p = .357

Table 4-7. Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of official source mentions.

	Mean (SD)			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
DADT	.499 (.364)	Movement (w/ PETA)	Between Groups	.568	3	.189	1.327*
			Within Groups	30.078	211	.143	
ADA	.399 (.420)		Total	30.646	214		
ERA	.395 (.381)	Movement (w/o PETA)	Between Groups	.426	2	.213	1.437**
			Within Groups	27.279	184	.148	
PETA	.353 (.322)		Total	27.705	186		

\*p = .266; \*\*p = .240

Table 4-8. Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of quoted movement sources.

	Mean (SD)			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
DADT	.266 (.278)	Movement (w/ PETA)	Between Groups	.238	3	.079	.687*
			Within Groups	24.303	211	.115	
ADA	.278 (.377)		Total	24.450	214		
ERA	.34 (.367)	Movement (w/o PETA)	Between Groups	.228	2	.114	.965**
			Within Groups	21.767	184	.118	
PETA	.322 (.306)		Total	21.995	186		

\*p = .561; \*\*p = .383

Table 4-9. Summary of ANOVAs of proportion of quoted official sources.

	Mean (SD)			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
DADT	.403 (.350)	Movement (w/ PETA)	Between Groups	1.716	3	.572	4.465*
			Within Groups	27.034	211	.128	
ADA	.243 (.355)		Total	28.750	214		
ERA	.327 (.389)	Movement (w/o PETA)	Between Groups	.628	2	.314	2.301**
			Within Groups	25.131	184	.137	
PETA	.121 (.266)		Total	25.759	186		

\*p = .005; \*\*p = .103

Table 4-10. News coverage factors contributing to social movement success with PETA.

	B	S.E.B	$\beta$
Constant	2.716	.323	
Newspaper	.034	.094	.025
Activity*	.332	.102	.228
Total Paragraphs	-.002	.005	-.035
Protest Paragraph Proportion	-.046	.206	-.017
Headline Tone	.106	.090	.084
Article Tone	-.060	.056	-.074
Movement Source Proportion	.136	.388	.067
Movement Quote Proportion	-.157	.379	-.079

Notes:  $R^2 = .066$ ; \*p = .001

Table 4-11. News coverage factors contributing to social movement success without PETA

	B	S.E.B	$\beta$
Constant	2.744	.121	
Newspaper	.057	.035	.117
Activity	.067	.037	.131
Total Paragraphs	.002	.002	.074
Protest Paragraph Proportion*	-.220	.076	-.220
Headline Tone	.057	.032	.130
Article Tone	.014	.022	.045
Movement Source Proportion	.168	.136	.233
Movement Quote Proportion	-.177	.132	-.250

Notes:  $R^2 = .136$

Table 4-12. Mean credibility scores of OutServe, AAPD, NOW, and PETA members.

Organization	Mean Credibility (SD)
OutServe	25.81 (4.99)
American Association for People with Disabilities	20.30 (5.62)
NOW	16.67 (6.66)
PETA	14.00 (6.25)

Note: n = 40

Table 4-13. Mean credibility scores by membership segment.

Membership Segment	Mean Credibility (SD)
1 to 5 years	24.30 (6.51)
6 to 10 years	17.00
11 to 15 years	23.67 (3.21)
21 to 25 years	18.67 (8.62)
31 to 35 years	16.00

Note: n = 40

Table 4-14. Activist perception that news media helps their movement.

Level of Help	Responses
A lot	47.4%
Some	28.9%
A little	18.4%
None	5.3%

Note: n = 40

Table 4-15. Belief that news media help movement by organization.

Organization	None	A little	Some	A lot
OutServe	0	14.3% (3)	19% (4)	66.7% (14)
American Association for People with Disabilities	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	0
NOW	10% (1)	30% (3)	40% (4)	20% (2)
PETA	0	0	50% (2)	50% (2)

Note: n = 40

## CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

This study posed a basic question about the importance of news coverage of protest for social movement success given the extensive focus on news coverage of protest in both mass communication and sociology research. Using the political mediation model of social movement outcomes as a guide, this study assessed the influence of frequency of coverage, tone of coverage, source mentions and quotes, and type of activity reported on the success of PETA, the women's rights movement, the disability rights movement, and the movement to repeal DADT. Taken together, the results reported suggest that news coverage of protest has some influence on social movement success, especially the type of activity that is reported by news media and the amount of focus that is given protest in coverage. The following discussion will address the influence of news coverage of protest on the success of social movements, the role of activist perceptions of news media in social movement success, the measurement of social movement success used in this study, the theoretical implications of this study, the value of including non-successful movements in the study of social movements, the practical implications of this study for social movements, the limitations of this study, and directions for future research.

### **How News Coverage of Protest Influences Social Movement Success**

The results of the content analysis portion of this study suggest several ways news coverage of protest influences social movement success, most notably the types of protest activity reported and the amount of coverage specifically devoted to protest activity. While these two aspects of news coverage were found to hold the most significant consequences for social movement success, frequency of coverage, article

tone, and source use were also found to have an association with social movement success.

Research question one asked how frequency of coverage of protest related to social movement success. Measured by the number of articles during the peak year of coverage, the frequency of coverage appears to have a non-linear relationship with social movement success, with PETA having the lowest number of articles during its peak year, followed by the movement to repeal DADT, the disability rights movement, and the women's rights movement. However, results concerning the two other measures of frequency of coverage, total number of paragraphs and number of paragraphs specifically about protest, reveal a more complex picture regarding the influence of frequency of coverage of protest on social movement success.

When PETA articles were included in analysis, no significant differences in the mean number of paragraphs were found among coverage of protest in articles about the four movements sampled. Additionally, while analysis found significant difference in the length of articles among movements when PETA cases were removed from analysis, no differences among specific movements were found in post hoc analysis. This result indicates that article length has little association with social movement success.

However, while no specific differences were found between groups with regards to the mean number of paragraphs per article, there was an overall difference identified in the amount of space devoted to protest in articles about each movement. PETA, as the least successful of the four movements studied, would have been expected to have the highest proportion of article content devoted to coverage of protest. However, articles about the ERA had the highest proportion of content devoted to coverage of

protest, but the difference in proportions between ERA articles and PETA articles was not statistically significant while the differences between the proportion of articles devoted to protest between ERA articles and both DADT articles and ADA articles indicates an association between the amount of coverage given protest and social movement success. Specifically, the more content devoted specifically to protest in an article, the less successful a movement is.

This result reinforces prior research on the protest paradigm by indicating that focus on protest does in fact decrease social movement success. Prior research on the protest paradigm has argued that in its role as an agent of social control, news media focuses on events rather than issues (Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Chan & Lee, 1984; Dardis, 2006; McLeod & Hertog, 1992). In other words, this result indicates that the social control function of media with regards to social movements not only exists but is successful in doing so.

H1 predicted that more positive tone in coverage would be associated with greater social movement success. No significant differences in headline tone were found in analysis, indicating headline tone does not have much influence on social movement success. Most likely, this is due to the generally neutral tone of headlines about all four movements. However, this is a surprising finding given that headline tone is often an indicator of article tone (Boyle, McCluskey, Devanathan, Stein, & McLeod, 2004), and article tone in this study was slightly negative.

The results of analysis of article tone yield a slightly different picture. Overall, the tone of all articles was very slightly negative. However, once again, while articles about PETA would have been expected to have the most negative tone toward protestors,

articles about the ERA were most negative toward protestors. Additionally, the mean tone of DADT and ADA articles was the same. The only significant difference in mean article tone was between DADT and ERA articles, indicating a weak association between article tone and social movement success.

This result generally reinforces prior research on the protest paradigm. However, the tone toward protestors in ERA articles was more negative than the tone of articles about PETA, which indicates that although less successful movements may receive negative coverage, tone may be influenced by factors other than the social control function of news media. One possible factor to account for this finding may simply be that PETA is not taken as a serious threat to the status quo. If the purpose of the protest paradigm is to reduce the threat to social order posed by social movements (Chan & Lee, 1984), then movements not seen as a threat potentially receive less negative coverage because their likelihood of changing the status quo is not significant.

However, another and more likely explanation is that the women's rights movement posed a more significant threat to the status quo than the other three movements in part due to the ERA being a constitutional amendment with significant reach throughout social and political institutions but also in part due to it being a women's movement specifically. Although the ERA itself received significant media attention, this coverage frequently highlighted the contentious nature of women's equality (Barker-Plummer, 2010) as well as emphasized dissension within the movement and the appearance of protestors (Ashley & Olson, 1998). This likely was reflected in the tone of coverage as measured in the present study, which specifically assessed tone towards the movement and protestors themselves.

H2 predicted that greater mentions and quotes of movement sources would be associated with increased social movement success. This was not supported by the data here. First, mentions and quotes of movement sources were not found to be significantly different among the four movements studied, indicating that use of movement sources has little influence on social movement success. Second, while mentions of official sources were not significantly different among the four movements studied, there were significant differences in the use of quotes from official sources among the four movements. Specifically, counter to prediction, articles about PETA had the lowest use of quotes from official sources while articles about DADT had the highest use of quotes from official sources.

Source and quote use are indicators of whose definitions and narratives are dominant in coverage of protest (Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; McCluskey, Stein, Boyle, & McLeod, 2009). It was predicted that use of movement quotes would be associated with greater social movement success. However, that was the opposite of what was found. Instead, it appears that as a movement is more successful, the use of official quotes increases. While this appears to counter the protest paradigm, this finding reinforces and extends the protest paradigm.

Because the protest paradigm is rooted in the idea that news media act to reduce the threat of protest to the status quo, increased use of official quotes may be a practice that counteracts a movement's improved status. Official narratives may be less important when a movement is not a serious threat to the status quo, as in the case of PETA, but may become more important when a movement has been successful in

attaining its goals, as in the case of the movement to repeal DADT. In this way, this finding reinforces and extends understanding of the protest paradigm.

H3 predicted that increased focus on conventional protest activities would be associated with greater social movement success. This prediction was partially supported by the results of this study. Like other findings in this study, this result reinforces prior research about the protest paradigm. Focusing on conventional protest activities such as lobbying and petitions reinforces the importance of existing political and social institutions, particularly when associated with social movement success.

Further, the change in the importance of lobbying as a factor in social movement success when PETA articles were removed from analysis may also indicate the general importance of lobbying itself as a factor in social movement success. In contrast to the other three movements studied here, lobbying was not a commonly reported activity in coverage of PETA. In addition, PETA had no indicators of policymaking activities in the social movement success measure used in the study. This indicates that engaging in conventional protest activities, which may be seen as working within the system, are more beneficial to movements than non-conventional protest activities, which may be seen as working against the system. This may be related to the ability of movements to influence legislative agendas and indicates that agenda setting is a likely avenue of social movement success.

However, the importance of focus on conventional protest activities may also be the result of the broad definition of protest used in this study. Lobbying and petitions are not commonly considered protest. Much more often, the term protest brings to mind demonstrations, marches, and rallies, considered unconventional protest activities by

Opp (2009) and this is the definition often used in social movement and protest research (della Porta, 1999). However, even if this finding is partly the result of defining protest more broadly, the relationship between focus on conventional protest activities and social movement success suggests that perhaps some activities indicate more issue-oriented coverage while others indicate more event-oriented coverage, and in keeping with prior research on the protest paradigm, it would be expected that coverage that is more issue-oriented would increase social movement success.

RQ2 asked what were the most significant factors determining social movement success. The results indicate that the type of activity reported and the amount of focus on protest in news coverage are the most important predictors of social movement success. This is not necessarily a surprising finding in and of itself. Prior research has established the tendency of news coverage of protest to focus on events rather than issues (Chan & Lee, 1984; Brasted, 2005a; 2005b; Dardis, 2006; McLeod & Hertog, 1992), and it would be expected that if focus on protest activities generally decreases social movement success, focus on non-conventional activities would also decrease social movement success.

However, given the significant focus of research on the tone and framing of protest in news coverage (Boykoff, 2006; Boyle & Armstrong, 2009; Boyle, McCluskey, Devanathan, Stein, & McLeod, 2004; Brasted, 2005a; Brasted, 2005b; Cancian & Ross, 1981; McCarthy, McPhail, & Smith, 1996; McLeod, 2007; Shoemaker, 1984), it might have been expected that article tone would have played a more prominent role in social movement success. However, the results of this study indicate article tone has only a weak association with social movement success. This may be partially due to the fact

that coverage of the four movements studied was not particularly negative, or it may be that importance of framing and tone are not as important for the legislative and policy success of social movements as they are for individual perceptions and public support of movements.

In addition to these findings, a couple of observations were made that warrant additional discussion. First, the term “militant” was used almost exclusively in coverage of the ERA and ADA. As previously discussed coverage of the ERA was the most negative of any of the movements in this study, and this reflects previous findings about the coverage of women’s movements and issues in news media (Ashley & Olson, 1998; Barker-Plummer, 2010). However, it is less clear why this label was applied to the disability rights movement. One possibility is the status of the ADA as an unfunded government mandate.

As an unfunded mandate, the ADA places the costs of compliance on state and local governments as well as on private businesses. This led to significant opposition to the ADA from the business community in particular (Moss, Burris, Ullman, Johnsen, & Swanson, 2001). Hindman (2006) has found that local newspapers may reflect tensions about unfunded mandates in coverage of community conditions and conflict. It is possible coverage of the ADA reflected similar tensions nationally, particularly within the business community, and these tensions influenced coverage of the movement.

Second, *Chicago Tribune* coverage of the repeal of DADT frequently referred to LGBT rights groups as “the gays.” McLeod and Hertog (1992) identified methods for manufacturing public opinion about protest groups used by reporters. One method is presenting the concerns of the group as being outside social norms and not shared by

average citizens. Although the *AP Stylebook* (2010; 2012) recommends the use of the term “gay” in reference to men and women attracted to the same sex, the use of the term in this context excludes the possibility that straight people could share the opinion that DADT should be repealed. The phrase “the gays” distinguishes the concerns of LGBT rights groups from the concerns of average citizens and highlights them as outside existing social norms. Additionally, the gender of rights groups may influence news coverage of protest in part due to the implied violation of gender norms promoted by such groups (Ashley & Olson, 1998; Barker-Plummer, 2010). It is possible that the use of the phrase “the gays” reflects a similar bias among papers that use the phrase to refer to rights groups.

Third, countermovements were relatively prominent in coverage of the ERA and to some extent, coverage of the repeal of DADT. How coverage of countermovements influences coverage of social movements is outside the scope of this project, but as with the focus on lobbying in news coverage, attention given to countermovements may be related to adherence to the protest paradigm. It may be that when movements are particularly threatening to the status quo, coverage of countermovements presents the appearance of legitimate debate and legitimate opposition to the original social movements.

### **Activist Perceptions Of The Role Of News Media In Social Movement Success**

The survey portion of this study was intended to be a supplement to the content analysis. Unfortunately, the small sample size presents limitations to the conclusions that may be drawn from the findings. These limitations are discussed below. The primary purpose of this portion of the discussion is to discuss potential ways the

attitudes of activists towards news media may influence how news media covers protest.

An assumption of the protest paradigm is that news media are primarily responsible for the relationship between media and social movements. As a result, there has not been any research to date addressing how activist attitudes towards news media may account for some of the findings of research in this tradition. If activists hold primarily negative attitudes toward news media and are reluctant to interact with reporters and writers, this potentially would influence how they are covered.

RQ3 asked how attitudes toward media were related to participation in social movements. The purpose was to see if members of successful social movements held more positive attitudes towards news media. The findings indicate that those who are part of less successful social movements tend to find news media reports about their organization less credible than those who are members of more successful movements. However, no pattern was apparent when media credibility perceptions were examined according to length of membership indicating. Potentially, the influence of news coverage of protest on social movement success may be partly due to the willingness of members to engage with media while length of membership may not play a role in this relationship.

RQ4 asked specifically whether or not activists believe news media play a role in their success. As with the question regarding perceptions of media credibility, the purpose is to see if a more positive belief in the role of media contributes to social movement success. The findings indicate that activists overall believe media coverage is important to the success of their movement. However, when responses were broken

down according to movement, the pattern that emerged did not indicate the existence of a strong relationship between social movement success and belief that news coverage is important for social movement success. While members of OutServe, one of the more successful movements of those studied, overwhelmingly that they believe news media are important to their success, no members of American Association for People with Disabilities, the most successful movement of those studied, indicated that they believe news media are important to their success. Interestingly, but not necessarily surprisingly given their founder's statement that members have a duty to be "press sluts" (Specter, 2003), members of PETA had the second-highest proportion of respondents who believed that news media are important for the success of their movement. However, it should be restated that these findings are limited by the small sample size of the survey and merely suggest the potential for the relationship of these attitudes to the characteristics of news coverage of protest and the success of social movements.

### **Measuring Social Movement Success**

To address the shortcomings of previous measurements of social movement success, this research proposed, developed, and employed an entirely new measure of social movement success that incorporated proxy measures of the three outcomes designated by Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992). This measurement enhances the understanding of social movement success by conceptualizing success as multi-dimensional, relative, and able to be objectively measured. Previous conceptualizations and measurements of social movement success have largely been dichotomous (Giugni, 1998), leading to the abandonment of success as the result of a social movement in favor of outcomes (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992) or consequences (Amenta, Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010). The measurement developed and used here

reintroduces the concept of success to social movement research, offering an objective measurement of the concept and providing a scale that is adaptable and appropriate to multiple movements.

Specifically, this measurement assessed movements on success based on the outcomes proposed by Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992): recognition, policy gains, and polity membership. Four proxy measures were used to assess these three outcomes. Recognition, the extent to which movements are seen as acceptable voices on issues, was measured by the proportion of witnesses at congressional hearings who were representatives of the movement and by the proportion of articles that were front-page articles. Policy gains, the extent to which legislation, guidelines, or procedures are changed to the benefit of the movement, was measured by the proportion of votes on the ERA, ADA, repeal of DADT, and animal rights were roll call votes. Polity membership, or the extent to which decisions are routinely made in the favor of groups and the majority recognizes those rights, was measured by public opinion on issues relevant to each movement.

These measures create a scale of social movement success that reflects progress made towards movement goals. In this study, the disability rights movement was found to have the greatest success, closely followed by the movement to repeal DADT. The women's rights movement was found to have achieved less success on than the either the disability rights movement and the movement to repeal DADT while PETA was found to have by far the least success of any movement, failing to achieve success on policy gains and on the congressional testimony dimension of recognition.

In contrast to previous conceptualizations, the major strength to this scale is that it conceptualizes social movement success as multi-dimensional. This reflects the argument of the political mediation model that social movement outcomes are dependent on interactions with multiple institutions within the political opportunity structure (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein; Amenta, Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010). Most previous conceptualizations of success have been dichotomous and uni-dimensional. Social movements either succeeded, or they failed (Giugni, 1998). These conceptualizations led to limitations on the study of social movement processes as scholars strived to focus on successful movements and led to a focus on outcomes (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein, 1994; Gamson, 1990) and consequences (Amenta, Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010) rather than success.

An additional strength of the scale of success used here is that it may accommodate any number of movements because success is measured in relative terms. This means that the scale could account for movements that achieve outcomes beyond stated goals. For example, if a movement desires only to raise awareness about an issue, a goal that would be labeled recognition, but achieves legislation that alleviates the grievance forwarded in raising awareness, an outcome labeled as a policy gain, this scale could easily account for that. This reflects the idea of social movement consequences conceptualized by Amenta, Caren, Chiarello, and Su (2010) but roots the measure in actual achievements of social movements.

Perhaps the greatest strength of this scale is that it offers an objective and genuine means of demonstrating that one social movement is more successful than

another. For example, without assessing these movements using the scale, it is difficult to state whether the movement to repeal DADT or the disability rights movement was more successful. Both were successful in achieving policy gains, but it is difficult to say that the policy gains of one were necessarily greater than the other. In this case, one might argue that the repeal of DADT was polity membership for LGBT members of the military while DADT itself represented a policy gain. However, all of these would be arbitrary distinctions in assessing how much success is represented by the outcomes of these movements. The scale developed and used here avoids the need to make such arbitrary distinctions and provides real measures that demonstrate quantitative and qualitative differences in the results of social movements.

### **Theoretical Implications**

#### **Implications For The Political Mediation Model**

This study was designed to connect news coverage of protest to the success of social movement using the political mediation model (Amenta, Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010; Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Amenta, Dunleavy, & Bernstein, 1994). This reflects Amenta, Caren, and Olasky's (2005) call for the incorporation of media discourse into the understanding of the political mediation of social movements. This study found that news coverage of protest has an influence on social movement outcomes, and the political mediation model seems useful for the study not only of successful social movements, as originally designed, but also of unsuccessful movements. However, the model needs greater development to understand precisely why or how news coverage influences social movement success.

First, through the measure of success used, the results here demonstrate the usefulness of the model for understanding unsuccessful movements as well as

successful ones. The model was originally designed to address successful outcomes in order to overcome the limitations previously presented by early conceptualizations of social movement success and failure (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Giugni, 1998). However, as argued, this ignores valuable information that may be learned from examining unsuccessful movements and comparing them to successful movements. By creating a measure of success based on the outcomes defined by Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan (1992), the success of these four social movements was connected to news coverage of protest, and differences in the interactions of the unsuccessful case of PETA and the more successful cases of the women's rights movement, the disability rights movement, and the movement to repeal DADT were identified. It would be expected that other differences exist between successful and unsuccessful movements, so it is suggested that the political mediation model be employed in future research of this nature.

Second, these results suggest that movements likely rely not only on interactions with the political opportunity structure but on interactions between individual components of the political opportunity as well. Giugni (1998) suggested that the political opportunity structure with which social movements must interact is comprised of two components, the state structure and the system of alliances and oppositions. The results here provide evidence that the two interact with each other although the direction of influence is not clear. The importance of emphasis on lobbying as a protest activity in news coverage of protest indicates that state structure may influence the system of alliances and oppositions, and via agenda setting, the public may also be influenced. The political mediation model might benefit from further development of the relationship

of these two components of the political opportunity structure in order to understand the relationship between news coverage of protest and social movement success more clearly.

### **Implications For Framing And Social Movements**

The relationship between media and social movements has been a fruitful area of research for quite some time. Particular attention has been given to the framing perspective. These results do not address framing directly although tone may be viewed as an extension or type of framing because it is assessed through the use of descriptors and labels of protestors and social movements. Given the very small role article tone plays in social movement success, this suggests that the focus on the framing of social movements might be reconsidered. The argument here is not that such research should be abandoned. However, the assumption behind much of this research has been that framing is important to social movement success, but the results of the present study suggest that perhaps framing plays a very limited role in social movement success.

Previous research has established that framing influences individual perceptions and support for social movements (Arpan, Baker, Lee, Jung, Lorusso, & Smith, 2006; Arpan & Tuzunkan, 2011; Detenber, Gotlieb, McLeod, & Malinkina, 2007; McLeod, 1995; Shoemaker, 1982), so it may be that framing is more important in the cultural practices emphasized by new social movement theory (Buechler, 1995). Framing may play an important role in eliciting support for social movements from individuals and in helping movements achieve success outside of traditional political channels while other processes may be more important in legislative and policy success emphasized by the political mediation model (Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Amenta, Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010). The results of the present study suggest that the type of activity

that is the focus of coverage and the amount of attention given to protest activity are the most important determinants of social movement success. The importance of type of activity in news coverage of protest points to the potential importance of agenda setting in the study of social movement success.

### **Implications For Agenda Setting And Social Movements**

While this study did not directly test agenda setting, the results do offer some implications for agenda setting processes in the context of social movements. First, the results of this study offer some support to the argument by McCarthy, Smith, and Zald (1996) that governmental agendas are more likely to be influenced by directly lobbying on the part of organizations than by news media. Reporting on lobbying was found to be one of the most significant factors of social movement success and was the most heavily reported protest activity. Merilainen and Vos (2011) have found that the attempts of organizations use online media to bypass news media in order to influence the online public agenda often affects media agendas and further influences the agendas of other segments of the public. Lobbying may have a similar effect. Although lobbying may not be designed to influence the media agenda, the media agenda may reflect the lobbying efforts of movements, and in turn, this may influence public agendas.

Second, this points to the potential influence of intermedia agenda setting in social movement processes, specifically the interplay of the four agendas discussed by McCarthy, Smith, and Zald (1996): media, public, electoral, and legislative agendas. The results here suggest a potential link between legislative and media agendas. However, there are probably a number of interactions among those four agendas. The peak year of coverage for three of the four movements studied here coincided with mid-

term Congressional elections. Barker-Plummer (2010) has found that the ERA was incorporated into coverage of the 1978 election, suggesting that the women's rights movement influenced the electoral agenda that year. Together, the relationship between social movement activities and legislative, as found in this study, and electoral agendas, as found by Barker-Plummer (2010) suggests there is likely a path of influence among these four agendas and that potentially media agendas are preceded by legislative and electoral agendas.

### **The Value Of The Negative Case**

In addition to examining the relationship between news coverage of protest and social movement success, this study sought to explore the value of analyzing negative cases of social movement success. In this case, the negative case was PETA, and all analyses were conducted with and without data from PETA coverage. Overall, it appears there are some differences in how news media report on unsuccessful social movements versus successful movements. Specifically, it appears that unsuccessful social movements are more likely to be the focus of coverage that is more neutral in tone, relies less on quotes from official sources, and focuses more on non-conventional activities than successful social movements.

In the analysis of article tone, results with PETA included in analysis indicated no significant difference in tone of coverage among the four movements studied, most likely because PETA coverage was more neutral than coverage of the other three movements, absorbing some of the variance in article tone. Differences in the use of official quotes in news coverage were only significant when PETA articles were included in analysis. Additionally, the type of activity reported is found to be a significant predictor of social movement success only when PETA articles are included in analysis, likely

because articles about PETA focused mainly on demonstrations, media campaigns, and fundraising rather than lobbying, which was the major focus of articles about the ADA and the repeal of DADT. Finally, protest paragraph proportion becomes significant when PETA articles are removed from analysis, likely because PETA articles had less focus on protest than other articles.

These differences in results not only suggest that research in social movements should incorporate unsuccessful movements into analysis because differences between successful and unsuccessful movements may yield important information about social movement success but also lend further support to the protest paradigm. Because PETA articles had the lowest proportion of official quotes, this lends further support to the notion that social movement success might influence coverage and might result in greater adherence to the protest paradigm among news media. The significance in type of activity reported as a predictor of social movement success only with the inclusion of PETA articles also lends support to the protest paradigm, as variance in the effect of type of activity reported dissipates without the inclusion of PETA, suggesting that the focus on non-conventional protest activities decreases as social movement success increases.

### **Limitations**

As with any research endeavor, there are limitations to the findings presented here. First, although the desire was to study the relationship between media and a range of social movements, three of the four movements were identity movements. While this does not necessarily mean the findings reported here do not have importance for the study of media and other social movements, it does limit the extent to which these findings can be generalized to non-identity social movements. Second, the papers

selected present significant limitations on the conclusions we may draw about news coverage of protest overall. By limiting coverage to just three newspapers due to database access, regional differences may influence some of the results. For example, the exclusion of papers from the west coast, most notably the *Los Angeles Times*, introduces the potential for regional biases. However, despite these limitations, the findings here do offer some indicators of news coverage of social movements generally, particularly in how larger news outlets may cover movements not picked up by smaller news outlets, and in turn, how that relates to the success of movements.

Additionally, use of an electronic database rather than microfilm or hard copies of the papers sampled presented some limitations on what characteristics can be analyzed, particularly with regards to the prominence of coverage. In particular, other topics of news featured in the papers, the remaining content on the same page, and the position of articles are not available using articles from an electronic database.

The use of electronic databases also limited the ability to incorporate the communication activities of movements into this study. Press releases, newsletters, pamphlets, and print ads would have provided valuable insight into how movements engage news media. However, databases containing these documents have no materials available prior to 1980, which would have eliminated those associated with the women's rights movement.

The scale used to measure social movement success has a Cronbach's alpha of only .69. This is below the accepted .70 and the preferred .80 in most social science literature. However, the reported coefficient may be accepted in this case because the research here, particularly the scale itself, is exploratory in nature. This is a very early

test of the relationship between news coverage of social movements and movement success, and this particular measure has not been used previously. Additionally, a lower Cronbach's alpha may be acceptable for smaller scales. In both these instances, a Cronbach's alpha between .60 and .70 may be acceptable (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006).

Further, due to time and resource constraints, this study was limited only to newspaper coverage of these four movements. Television coverage was not included in the analysis. However, this is not believed to be problematic in light of the findings of research on intermedia agenda setting. Studies of intermedia agenda setting have found that television news takes its cues on the salience of issues from the coverage of those issues in newspaper (Protess & McCombs, 1991; Reese & Danielian, 1989). Elite newspapers, particularly The New York Times and The Washington Post, play a particularly important role in influencing the agendas of television networks (Golan, 2006; Trumbo, 1995). Therefore, it would be reasonable to expect television coverage of these movements to reflect the coverage of these movements in these newspapers.

The results of the survey are far more limited than the results of the content analysis. This reflects the substantial difficulty that exists when sampling specific groups and organizations rather than drawing samples from the more general population. The researcher made multiple attempts to maximize the size of the survey sample, contacting each group repeatedly to gain access to members online. OutServe and NOW were most receptive to assisting. American Association for People with Disabilities did permit a survey link on their Facebook page while PETA refused to allow the survey to be posted to their Facebook page or circulated via email to members.

Eventually, PETA allowed the researcher access to a message board. In addition, she attempted to recruit respondents in person at a state NOW convention. Unfortunately, not enough respondents recruited from these efforts during the time allotted, and even fewer completed the survey.

The small size of the sample in the survey presents a number of disadvantages to the findings in this study. First, the findings are not generalizable to the organizations from which respondents were recruited nor to other organizations. Second, variability is a problem with samples this small because the addition or subtraction of only a handful of cases can change the results. Further, the results from the sample may deviate significantly from the broader population from which respondents were recruited. For these reasons, no statistical tests were performed using the survey data, only frequencies were reported, and results are not considered to be conclusive statements about the influence of activist attitudes towards news media on coverage and social movement success. With the limitations of this survey in mind, future research seeking to incorporate the perspectives of social movement participants would benefit from the use of personal interviews as a supplement or replacement for surveys. Interviews require a smaller sample size and do not require statistical analysis to draw conclusions.

### **Practical Implications For Movements And Media**

The results of this study have several practical implications for social movements. First, as evidenced by the small number of articles written about PETA during its peak year of coverage, it is evident that attracting media coverage should not be a goal of social movements in and of itself. However, as stated by founder Ingrid Newkirk herself, this is one of, if not the primary, goal of PETA (Specter, 2003).

However, the results here indicate that this does not enhance the success of social movements. Rather, actions that serve only to attract media attention serve either to reduce the success of the movement or fail to even attract attention in the first place. The much more effective strategy appears to be engaging in activities that simultaneously draw the attention of law- and policy-makers and media.

Second, lobbying drew the most media attention and had the greatest impact on social movement success. Movements appear to benefit most from engaging with lawmakers on their issues and draw the most attention from such activity. Although this does not mean other types of protest activity should be abandoned, the results here indicate that the emphasis of movements should be on working with lawmakers, as in the case of lobbying, rather than working against lawmakers, as in the case of demonstrations, rallies, or marches.

Third, the *AP Stylebook* (2012) needs to clarify use of the term “gay.” As noted above, in its coverage of the repeal of DADT, the *Chicago Tribune* frequently referred to the movement in favor of repealing DADT as “the gays.” This may be alleviated by providing clearer guidelines for the use of terms associated with the LGBT community, similar to the lengthy guidelines provided for references to individuals with disabilities (*AP Stylebook*, 2012). The suggestion here is not to ban any particular terms but to clarify if the term “gay” is meant to be used exclusively as an adjective, and if not, under which circumstances it is acceptable to be used as a noun.

### **Directions For Future Research**

The results of this study suggest several directions for future research. First, perhaps the most surprising finding in this study is the relative unimportance of the tone of news coverage in the success of social movements. As discussed above, this

suggests framing is more important for individual perceptions of protestors and activists than for institutional success. Future research should address other processes, in particular agenda setting. Such research should address the relationship between movement, media, public, legislative, and electoral agendas as they influence social movement success. The incorporation of agenda setting and agenda building in the study of social movements would be particularly beneficial to understanding the influence of lobbying and other more conventional protest activities on social movement success.

However, shifting the focus from framing to agenda setting should not mean that framing is abandoned in research on media and social movements. Future research should address the relationship between social movement framing of issues and the framing of those issues in news coverage and how this relationship influences social movement success. This study has examined the use of sources and quotes as representative of the inclusion of movement narratives and understanding in news coverage. However, the adoption of, or lack of, movement framing in news coverage represents another way movement narratives may be incorporated by news media. Additionally, research in this area could also examine the influence of movement framing on electoral and governmental agendas.

While the measurement of social movement success developed and used here provides a valuable tool to the study of social movements, it should be viewed as a preliminary measurement in need of further development. First, other conceptualizations of social movement success may be incorporated into the measure. Gamson's (1990) dimensions of success are proposed as a next step to increasing the robustness of the

measure in this study. Gamson (1990) argued that one of the strongest indicators of social movement success is the continued existence of a movement. Therefore, time is proposed as the next dimension to be used in further development of the scale of social movement success. Additionally, the measure developed and used in this study provides a means of identifying social movement failure, which should be distinguished from Gamson's (1990) conceptualization of social movement collapse. Collapse refers to the end of a movement and may occur at any point in a movement's history, even after a policy gain (Gamson, 1990). Collapse may not be incorporated as a dimension of success in this scale, but in future applications, the scale may be used to identify factors that contribute to the failure, decline, and collapse of social movements.

Second, this measure was used in this study primarily on identity movements. Although the movements in this study addressed a variety of issues, future research should use the scale of social movement success to study other types of movements including environmental, labor, and anti-poverty movements. However, there may be some limitations to the applicability of the scale to certain movements. For example, this scale may not be well-suited to movements that explicitly avoid engagement with existing political institutions. However, provided the proxy measures for each of these four dimensions are available for a movement, this scale is believed to be applicable and adaptable to any type of social movement.

Because this analysis only examined coverage for one year of each movement, future research should incorporate time and longevity into the analysis of news coverage of protest and of social movement success. Gamson (1990) has cited continued existence as a marker of social movement success. Specifically what effect

the longevity of a movement has on news coverage of protest, specifically the influence of social movement success on coverage, would be valuable in understanding the relationship between media and social movements. Because the political mediation model specifically seeks to highlight the relationship between political context and movement strategies, such research should incorporate how coverage of other news topics influences protest coverage and how this changes over time. Research in this area would be valuable to eventually understanding how social movement success influences news coverage, interactions with political institutions, and movements themselves.

Finally, future research on the influence of time and movement success on news coverage would be beneficial to revising the political mediation model itself. Currently, the model is linear. However, the relationship between social movements and the political environment may change as the result of increased social movement success. The results here suggest this is at least a possibility. First, the use of official quotes was highest among the most successful movements. This may reflect the protest paradigm, or it may demonstrate that a movement's issues have entered mainstream discourse. In either case, understanding the specific dynamics of this finding would indicate if social movement success can influence news coverage. Second, attitudes towards media potentially align with social movement success, and more positive attitudes towards media may influence the likelihood and frequency of activist interactions with news media, which would influence news coverage as well. If social movement success influences news coverage, success would likely influence the relationship between social movements and other institutions as well as the organizational strength and

capacity of movements. Therefore, future research should move forward with consideration for the revision of the political mediation model itself.

APPENDIX A  
CODEBOOK

Variables 1-6 and 7 are descriptive characteristics of the article. Variable 5 indicates which movement was covered in order to link coverage to outcomes and represents the dependent variable in the codebook.

1. Each article has been assigned a number for tracking purposes. Please enter the number given to this article.

Article number: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Please indicate the newspaper in which the article appeared.

Newspaper:

\_\_\_ *The New York Times*  
\_\_\_ *The Washington Post*  
\_\_\_ *The Chicago Tribune*

3. Please enter the date of the article in the following format: MMDDYYYY.  
Example: If an article were dated August 30, 2012, you would enter 08302012 for the date.

Date of article: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Please enter the name or names of the authors of the article.

Writer name(s): \_\_\_\_\_

5. Please indicate if this article is about the movement leading to the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT), the movement behind the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), the disability rights movement, or People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA).

Movement covered by article: (DV)

\_\_\_ DADT                      \_\_\_ ERA  
\_\_\_ Disability rights        \_\_\_ PETA

6. There are multiple activities movements can perform as protest. Please indicate the type of protest that is covered by the article:

\_\_\_ Demonstration: Large gathering of individuals in a public place in support of the position of the movement.

\_\_\_ March: Large gathering of individuals which move from one location to another in support of the position of the movement.

\_\_\_ Boycott: Refusal to support businesses by refusing to purchase products or services

\_\_\_ Lobbying: Meeting with members of Congress (House of Representatives and Senate) in support of legislation in support of the position of the movement.

\_\_\_ Petitions: Collection of signatures to show public support for the position of the movement.  
\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

7. If reported, please enter the number of participants. If no number is reported, leave blank. \_\_\_\_\_

8. Please indicate the section in which the article was located: (H3, H4, H5)

___ Front	___ International
___ National	___ Politics
___ Local	___ Features/Society/People
___ Opinion/Editorial	___ Magazine or supplement
___ Other (specify): _____	

9. Please indicate the page number of the article (Ex: A1, 1A, B1, 2A, B2, C3, 1C, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_ (H3, H4, H5)

10. Movement sources are protest participants who speak on behalf of the movement. They may be leaders of the movement or just participants. They will typically be designated with their name, followed by their affiliation with the movement. Examples: "Jessica Mahone, with the Free Hat movement"; "Jessica Mahone was one those marching with the Free Hat movement"; "Jessica Mahone with the Free Hat movement said she came because she supports giving people free head coverings to people who want them." Please count those who were quoted and those who were mentioned but not quoted.  
Number of movement sources named in story: \_\_\_\_\_ (H2)

11. Please indicate how many of the movement sources were female. Please use names and pronouns as an indicator of gender. If for some reason you are not certain about the gender of a source, please do not count them in this tally. Please count those who were quoted as well as though who were mentioned but not quoted.  
Number of female movement sources: \_\_\_\_\_ (H2)

12. Please indicate the number of movement sources quoted in the story. A quote will be indicated by the presence of quotation marks ("). Example: Jessica Mahone with the Free Hat movement said, "I came here to show my support for providing free head coverings to individuals who want or need them."  
Number of movement sources quoted: \_\_\_\_\_ (H2)

13. Please indicate how many of the movement sources quoted were female. Please use names as an indicator of gender. If you are not certain about the gender of a source, please do not count them in this tally.  
Number of female movement sources quoted: \_\_\_\_\_ (H2)

14. Please indicate how many target or official sources were featured in the story. Targets may include Congress, the White House, and government agencies such as the Department of Education or Department of Defense. Please do not count police officers towards this tally. Target sources will have words that designate the association of a source with the target organization. Examples: “Congressman John Doe said that Congress has no intent of passing legislation to provide free head covers to Americans.”; “Jane Roe, spokesperson for Congressman John Doe, said that Congress has no intent of passing legislation to provide free head coverings to Americans.”  
Number of target and official sources named in story: \_\_\_\_\_ (H2)

15. Please indicate how many of the target sources were female. Please use names as an indicator of gender. If you are not certain about the gender of a source, please do not count them in this tally. Please count those who were quoted as well as though who were mentioned but not quoted.  
Number of female target and official sources: \_\_\_\_\_ (H2)

16. Please indicate the number of target sources quoted in the story. A quote will be indicated by the presence of quotation marks (“”). Example: Congressman John Doe said, “Congress has no intent to pass legislation providing free head coverings to Americans.”  
Number of target and official sources quoted in story: \_\_\_\_\_ (H2)

17. Please indicate how many of the target sources quoted were female. Please use names as an indicator of gender. If you are not certain about the gender of a source, please do not count them in this tally.  
Number of female target and official sources quoted: \_\_\_\_\_ (H2)

18. Please enter the full text of the headline:

---

---

19. Frame of headline: (H1, H4)

Please indicate the presence of the following frames in the headline:

\_\_\_ Injustice frame: Emphasizes the moral outrage of protestors, the significance of the problem, or calls issue an injustice

\_\_\_ Sympathy frame: Characterizes protestors as underdogs deserving support or compassion

\_\_\_ Legitimizing frame: Emphasizes public support for protestors or recognizes protestors’ reasons for protest as legitimate

\_\_\_ Contextual frame: Emphasizes historical background of protest

- \_\_\_ Delegitimizing frame: Emphasizes lack of public support for protestors, discredits protestors' claims and actions, or characterizes protest as futile or pointless
- \_\_\_ Spectacle frame: Emphasizes number of protestors, violence, emotion, or deviance of protestors or protest
- \_\_\_ Politicizing frame: Connect group to a political organization or cause, usually extreme

20. Tone of headline: (H1, H4)

Please indicate if the headline is negative, neutral, or positive on the basis of descriptors used to describe protests or protestors.

- \_\_\_ 1. Negative (hooligans, deviants, corrupt, disruptive, emotional, irrational)
- \_\_\_ 2. Neutral or balanced
- \_\_\_ 3. Positive (fighting for democracy, freedom, stability, peaceful, orderly)

21. Frames of article: (H1, H4)

Please indicate the number of paragraphs featuring each of the following frames:

- \_\_\_ Injustice frame: Emphasizes the moral outrage of protestors, the significance of the problem, or calls issue an injustice
- \_\_\_ Sympathy frame: Characterizes protestors as underdogs deserving support or compassion
- \_\_\_ Legitimizing frame: Emphasizes public support for protestors or recognizes protestors' reasons for protest as legitimate
- \_\_\_ Delegitimizing frame: Emphasizes lack of public support for protestors, discredits protestors' claims and actions, or characterizes protest as futile or pointless
- \_\_\_ Spectacle frame: Emphasizes number of protestors, violence, emotion, or deviance of protestors or protest
- \_\_\_ Contextual frame: Emphasizes historical background of protest

22. Tone of article: (H1, H4)

Please indicate the number of articles using primarily negative, primarily neutral or balanced, or primarily positive descriptors of protestors or protest.

- \_\_\_ Negative (hooligans, deviants, corrupt, disruptive, emotional, irrational)
- \_\_\_ Neutral or balanced
- \_\_\_ Positive (fighting for democracy, freedom, stability, peaceful, orderly)

23. Please indicate the total number of paragraphs in the article: \_\_\_\_\_ (H1, H4)

APPENDIX B  
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographic data:

1. Please enter your age as of your most recent birthday. \_\_\_\_
2. Race/ethnicity- Please select one.
  - \_\_\_ White/Caucasian
  - \_\_\_ Black/African American
  - \_\_\_ Hispanic
  - \_\_\_ Asian
  - \_\_\_ Native American
  - \_\_\_ Pacific Islander
  - \_\_\_ Bi-racial/bi-ethnic (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
3. Gender- Please select the gender with which you identify.
  - \_\_\_ Female
  - \_\_\_ Male
  - \_\_\_ Prefer not to answer
4. Level of Education- Please indicate the highest level of education which you have completed.
  - \_\_\_ Less than high school
  - \_\_\_ High school diploma
  - \_\_\_ Associate's degree
  - \_\_\_ Bachelor's degree
  - \_\_\_ Master's degree
  - \_\_\_ Doctoral or professional degree
  - \_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Activism History:

5. This questionnaire has been distributed to a few separate movements and circulated among its members. Please indicate the movement with which you are most closely associated.
  - \_\_\_ OutServe
  - \_\_\_ American Association for People with Disabilities (AAPD)
  - \_\_\_ National Organization of Women (NOW)
  - \_\_\_ PETA

6. How long have you been an active member of this organization? Please enter the number of years. If you have only been an active member for less than a year, please enter 1. \_\_\_\_\_ (RQ3)

7. In what capacities have you been involved in this organization? (RQ3)

- National leadership
- State leadership
- Local leadership
- Membership
- Donations only
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

8. In one or two sentences, please describe the goal(s) of your organization:

---

---

---

---

9. In a sentence or two, please describe why you became active in this organization.

---

---

---

10. Have any of the following motivated your activism? (RQ3)

- Information obtained in an educational setting
- Information obtained through news media
- Information obtained from the organization itself
- Personal experience with the issue
- Others' experience with the issue
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

11. How much do you think news coverage of your organization helps in achieving those goals? (RQ2, RQ3)

- (1) None
- (2) Very little

- (3) Some
- (4) A great deal

12. Have you participated in any events with your organization that have been covered by news media? (RQ2, RQ3)

- Yes
- No
- Don't remember

13a. If yes, did you agree to be featured in the story in any way (interviewed, photographed, videotaped, etc.)? (RQ2, RQ3)

- Yes
- No
- Don't remember

13b. If yes, why did you agree to being featured in the story?

---

---

---

13c. Did you see, hear, or read the report? (RQ2, RQ3)

- Yes
- No
- Don't remember

13d. If so, and if you were featured in the story, how fairly did you feel you personally were represented by the story? (RQ2, RQ3)

- (1) Not at all fairly represented
- (2) Unfairly represented
- (3) Neither fairly nor unfairly represented
- (4) Fairly represented
- (5) Very fairly represented

13e. If so, how fairly did you feel your organization was represented by the story? (RQ2, RQ3)

- (1) Not at all fairly represented
- (2) Unfairly represented
- (3) Neither fairly nor unfairly represented

- \_\_\_ (4) Fairly represented
- \_\_\_ (5) Very fairly represented

13. Different people use a variety of different sources for information about news and public affairs. Listed below are several sources from which you gather news and public affairs information. Please indicate how much you use each source to obtain news and public affairs information generally, from never to several times per day.

	Never	Once or twice per year	Monthly	Weekly	Daily	Several times per day
Local TV						
National TV						
Cable TV						
PBS						
CSPAN						
Newspapers (print copy)						
News magazines						
Radio						
News websites						
Social networking sites (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)						
Blogs (Huffington Post, DailyKos)						
Search engines (Google, Bing)						
Speaking face-to-face with others						
Speaking with others online						

14. How frequently do you consume traditional media reports (newspaper, TV, or radio) about your organization? (RQ2, RQ3)

- (1) Never
- (2) Once or twice per year
- (3) Once per month
- (4) Once per week
- (5) Daily
- (6) Several times per day

15. How fairly do traditional media reports represent your organization? (RQ2, RQ3)

- (1) Not at all fairly
- (2) Unfairly
- (3) Neither fairly nor unfairly
- (4) Fairly
- (5) Very fairly

16. How frequently do you consume online media reports (blogs, web news such as *Huffington Post*, podcasts) about your organization? (RQ2, RQ3)

- (1) Never
- (2) Once or twice per year
- (3) Once per month
- (4) Once per week
- (5) Daily
- (6) Several times per day

17. How fairly do online media reports represent your organization? (RQ2, RQ3)

- (1) Not at all fairly
- (2) Unfairly
- (3) Neither fairly nor unfairly
- (4) Fairly
- (5) Very fairly

18. Do you have any other comments about your organization and its relationship with news media that you would like to share?

---

---

---

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- "Activists detained while challenging 'don't ask, don't tell'". (2006, May 11). *Gay Chicago Magazine*, 30 (19), p. 18.
- Alreck, P., & Settle, R. (2004). *The survey research handbook* (3rd Edition ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- "Anita's West Point TV special draws protests". (1980, May 29). *Advocate* (293), p. 8.
- "Anti-ROTC Activity at Madison". (1990, May 7). *New York Native* (368), p. 15.
- The Associated Press. (2010). *The Associated Press stylebook and briefing on media law*. 2010 ed. New York: Associated Press.
- The Associated Press. (2012). *The Associated Press stylebook and briefing on media law*. 2012 ed. New York: Associated Press.
- Amenta, E., Caren, N., Chiarello, E., & Su, Y. (2010). The political consequences of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 287-307.
- Amenta, E., Caren, N., & Olasky, S. (2005). Age for leisure? Political mediation and the impact of the pension movement on U.S. old-age policy. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 516-538.
- Amenta, E., Caren, N., Olasky, S.J., & Stobaugh, J.E. (2009). All the movements fit to print: Who, what, when, where, and why SMO families appeared in the New York Times in the twentieth century. *American Sociological Review*, 74(4), 636-656.
- Amenta, E., Carruthers, B., & Zylan, Y. (1992). A hero for the aged? The Townsend movement, the political mediation model, and U.S. old-age policy, 1934-1950. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98 (2), 308-339.
- Arpan, L., Baker, K., Lee, Y., Jung, T., Lorusso, L., & Smith, J. (2006). news coverage of social protests and the effects of photographs and prior attitudes. *Mass Communication & Society*, 9 (1), 1-20.
- Arpan, L., & Tuzunkan, F. (2011). Photographic depiction of normative deviance and informational utility as predictors of protest news exposure, related perceptions, and story comprehension. *Mass Communication & Society*, 14, 178-195.
- Ashley, L., & Olson, B. (1998). Constructing reality: Print media's framing of the women's movement, 1966 to 1986. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 75 (2), 263-277.
- Bagenstos, S. (2009). *Law and the contradictions of the disability rights movement*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

- Balmas, M., & Sheafer, T. (2010). Candidate image in election campaigns: Attribute agenda setting, affective priming, and voting intentions. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 22 (2), 204-229.
- Barker-Plummer, B. (2010). News and feminism: A historic dialog. *Journalism & Communication Monographs*, 12, 144-203.
- Barnartt, S., & Scotch, R. (2001). *Disability protests: Contentious politics*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Baumgartner, F.R., & Jones, B.D. (1993). *Agendas and instability in American politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Belluck, P. (2007, June 19). States face decisions on who is mentally fit to vote. *The New York Times*, p. A1.
- Benford, R., & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611-639.
- Blanco, V.S. (1997). The media politics of protest: Social movements, political and discursive power. *Mobilization*, 2(2), 185-205.
- Boykoff, J. (2006). Framing dissent: Mass-media coverage of the global justice movement. *New Political Science*, 28 (2), 201-228.
- Boyle, M., & Armstrong, C. (2009). Measuring level of deviance: Considering the distinct influence of goals and tactics on news treatment of abortion protests. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 17, 166-183.
- Boyle, M., McCluskey, M., Devanthan, N., Stein, S., & McLeod, D. (2004). The influence of level of deviance and protest type on coverage of social protest in Wisconsin from 1960 to 1999. *Mass Communication & Society*, 7 (1), 43-60.
- Boyle, M., McCluskey, M., McLeod, D., & Stein, S. (2005). Newspapers and protest: An examination of protest coverage from 1960 to 1999. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82 (3), 638-653.
- Boyle, M., McLeod, D., & Armstrong, C. (2012). Adherence to the protest paradigm: The influence of protest goals and tactics on news coverage in U.S. and international newspapers. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 17 (2), 127-144.
- Boyle, M., & Schmierbach, M. (2009). Media use and protest: The role of mainstream and alternative media use in predicting traditional and protest participation. *Communication Quarterly*, 57 (1), 43-60.
- Brasted, M. (2005a). Framing protest: The Chicago Tribune and the New York Times during the 1968 Democratic convention. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 13 (1), 1-25.

- Brasted, M. (2005b). Protest in the media. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, 17, 383-388.
- Bull, C. (1990, June 5). ROTC spawns protest fever among collegians. *Advocate* (552), p. 14.
- Cancian, F., & Ross, B. (1981). Mass media and the women's movement: 1900-1977. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17 (1), 9-26.
- Carlson, P. (1991, February 24). The great Silver Spring monkey case. *The Washington Post*, p. w.15.
- Carroll, W., & Hackett, R. (2006). Democratic media activism through the lens of social movement theory. *Media, Culture, & Society*, 28, 83-104.
- Carter, D. (2009, July/August). What made Stonewall different. *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide*, 16 (4), pp. 11-13.
- Chan, J.M., & Lee, Ch. (1984). Journalistic 'paradigms' of civil protests: A case study in Hong Kong. In Arno, A., & Dissanayake, W. (Eds.), *The news media in national and international conflict* (pp. 183-202). Boulder, CO, and London: Westview.
- "Choi, five vets arrested against in White House DADT protest". (2010, April 29). *Gay Chicago Magazine*, 34 (17), p. 18.
- Corbett, J.B. (1998). Media, bureaucracy, and the success of social protest: Newspaper coverage of environmental movement groups, *Mass Communication & Society*, 1(1/2), 41-61.
- Dardis, F. (2006). Marginalization devices in U.S. press coverage of Iraq war protest: A content analysis. *Mass Communication & Society*, 9 (2), 117-135.
- Davis, K. (2005, February 17). Students protest military at career fair. *Bay Area reporter*, 35 (7), p. 12.
- della Porta, D. (1999). Protest, protestors, and protest policiing: Public discourses in italy and Germany from the 1960s to the 1990s. In Giugni, M., McAdam, D., & Tilly, C. (Eds.). (pp. 66-96), *How social movements matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Detenber, B., Gotlieb, M., McLeod, D., & Malinkina, O. (2007). Frame intensity effects of television news stories about a high-visibility protest issue. *Mass Communication & Society*, 10 (4), 439-460.
- DiCicco, T. (2010). The public nuisance paradigm: Changes in mass media coverage of poltiical protest since the 1960s. *Journalism & Mass Communicaton Quarterly*, 87 (1), 135-153.

- Eaklor, V. (2011). Gay rights movement, U.S. *GLBTQ Social Sciences* , 101-105. Chicago, IL: GLBTQ, Inc.
- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm, *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Expansion in disability law? (2008, January 18). *The Kiplinger Letter* , 85 (3).
- Fico, F., & Cote, W. (1999). Fairness and balance in the structural characteristics of newspaper stories on the 1996 presidential election. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76(1), 124-137.
- Francis, R. (2012, September 9). *The history behind the equal rights amendment*. Retrieved September 20, 2012, from The equal rights amendment: <http://www.equalrightsamendment.org/era.htm>
- Gamson, W. (1990). *The strategy of social protest*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Gamson, W., & Wolfsfeld, G. (1993). Movements and media as interacting systems. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* , 528, 114-125.
- Ghanem, S. (1997). Filling in the tapestry; The second level of agenda setting. In M. McCombs, D. Shaw, & D. Weaver, *Communication and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers of agenda-setting theory*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gibson, M. (2011, August 12). A brief history of women's protests. *Time* .
- Giugni, M. (1998). Was it worth the effort? The outcomes and consequences of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 371-393.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Golan, G. (2006). Inter-media agenda setting and global news coverage: Assessing the influence of the *New York Times* on three network television evening news programs. *Journalism Studies*, 7 (2), 323-333.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Harlow, S., & Johnson, T.J. (2011). Overthrowing the protest paradigm? How *The New York Times*, Global Voices, and Twitter covered the Egyptian revolution, *International Journal of Communication*, 5, 1359-1374.
- Herek, G. (2012). *Lesbians and gay men in the U.S. military: Historical background*. Retrieved August 30, 2012, from Sexual orientation: Science, education, and policy: [http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/html/military\\_history.html](http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/html/military_history.html)

- The history of 'don't ask, don't tell'*. (2010, November 30). Retrieved September 18, 2012, from Washington Post: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/special/politics/dont-ask-dont-tell-timeline/>
- Holmes, S. (1990, March 14). Disabled protest and are arrested. *The New York Times* , p. B7.
- Johnson, R. (1999). Mobilizing the disabled. In J. Freeman, & V. Johnson, *Waves of protest: Social movements since the 1960s* (pp. 25-45). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Leonard, K. (2012, October 17). Keeping the 'mentally incompetent' from voting. *The Atlantic* .
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Bracken, C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human Communication Research* , 28 (4), 587-604.
- Kensicki, L.J. (2001). Deaf president now! Positive media framing of a social movement within a hegemonic political environment. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 25, 147-166.
- King, B. (2008). A political mediation model of corporate response to social movement activism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53 (3), 395-421.
- KRWG News and Partners. (2013, May 10). Heinrich co-sponsors resolution promoting Equal Rights Amendment. Retrieved May 10, 2013, from <http://www.krwg.org/post/heinrich-co-sponsors-resolution-promoting-equal-rights-amendment>
- Lind, R.A., & Salo, C. (2002). The framing of feminists and feminism in news and public affairs programs in U.S. electronic media. *Journal of Communication*, 52(1), 211-228.
- Malinick, T., Tindall, D., & Diani, M. (2011). Network centrality and social movement media coverage:A two-mode network analytic approach. *Social Networks* .
- Malveaux, J. (2005, November 18). Access for disabled remains elusive. *USA Today* , p. 13A.
- "Matlovich settles: Money, but no job". (1981, February 1). *Body Politic* (70), p. 17.
- McAdam, D. (1982). *Political process and the development of black insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCarthy, J., McPhail, C., & Smith, J. (1996). Images of protest: Dimensions of selection bias in media coverage of Washington demonstrations, 1982 and 1991. *American Sociological Review*, 61 (3), 478-499.

- McCarthy, J.D., Smith, J., & Zald, M.N. (1996). Accessing public, media, electoral, and governmental agendas. In McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D., & Zald, M.N. (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 291-311). Cambridge, UK, and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82 (6), 1212-1241.
- McCombs, M. (1997). Building consensus: The news media's agenda-setting roles. *Political Communication*, 14(4), 433-443.
- McCombs, M. (2004). *Setting the agenda: The mass media and public opinion*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- McCombs, M. (2005). A look at agenda-setting: Past, present, and future. *Journalism Studies*, 6(4), 543-557.
- McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176-187.
- McCombs, M., Llamas, J., Lopez-Escobar, E., & Rey, F. (1998). Candidate's images in Spanish elections: Second-level agenda-setting effects. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 74 (4), 703-717.
- McLeod, D. (1995). Communicating deviance: The effects of television news coverage of social protest. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 39, 4-19.
- McLeod, D. (2007). News coverage and social protest: How the media's protest paradigm exacerbates social conflict. *Journal of Dispute Resolution*, 185, 185-194.
- McLeod, D., & Detenber, B. (1999). Framing effects of television news coverage of social protest. *Journal of Communication*, 49 (3), 3-23.
- McLeod, D., & Hertog, J. (1992). The manufacture of 'public opinion' by reporters: Informal cues for public perceptions of protest groups. *Discourse & Society*, 3 (3), 259-275.
- McMillan, D. (2007, December 6). Don't ask, don't tell protests capture national attention. *San Francisco Bay Times*, p. 1.
- Melzer, E. (2005, October 28). Gays protest outside U.S. Naval Academy. *Washington Blade*, 36 (43), p. 14.
- Merilainen, N., & Vos, M. (2011). Human rights organizations and online agenda setting. *Corporate Communications; An International Journal*, 16(4), 293-310.

- Mulvihill, M.E. (1997, Feb. 20). House and senate rules of procedure: A comparison. The Dirksen Congressional Center. Retrieved May 26, 2013, from [http://www.congresslink.org/print\\_basics\\_rulesofprocedure.htm](http://www.congresslink.org/print_basics_rulesofprocedure.htm).
- Neuendorf, K. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Oliver, P., & Maney, G. (2000). Political processes and local newspaper coverage of protest events: From selection bias to triadic interactions. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106 (2), 464-505.
- O'Neill, T. (May 9, 2013). New path to ratify the ERA: Three-state strategy bill introduced. Retrieved May 10, 2013, from <http://www.now.org/issues/constitution/05102013newpathtoratifyera.html>
- Opp, K. (2009). *Theories of political protest and social movements: A multidisciplinary introduction, critique, and synthesis*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Oswald, J. (1986, April 21). Columbia gays protest military recruiters. *New York Native* (157), p. 11.
- PETA. (2012). *About PETA*. Retrieved October 20, 2012, from People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals: <http://www.peta.org/about/default.aspx>
- PETA. (2012). *Why does PETA sometimes use nudity in its campaigns?* Retrieved October 20, 2012, from People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals: <http://petacms.peta.org/about/faq/Why-does-PETA-sometimes-use-nudity-in-its-campaigns.aspx>
- Presser, S., Couper, M., Lessler, J., Martin, E., Martin, J., Rothgeb, J., et al. (2004). Methods for testing and evaluating survey questions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68 (1), 109-130.
- Protest, D., & McCombs, M. (1991). *Agenda setting: Readings on media, public opinion, and policymaking*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ragas, M., & Kiousis, S. (2010). Intermedia agenda-setting and political activism: MoveOn.org and the 2008 presidential election. *Mass Communication & Society*, 13 (5), 560-583.
- Rasky, S. (1989, August 14). Bill barring bias against disabled holds wide impact. *The New York Times*, p. A1.
- Rauch, J. (2010). Superiority and susceptibility: How activist audiences imagine the influence of mainstream news messages on self and others. *Discourse & Communication*, 4 (3), 263-277.
- Reese, S.D., & Danielian, L.C. (1989). Intermedia influence and the drug issue: Converging on cocaine. In Shoemaker, P.J. (Ed.), *Communication campaigns*

- about drugs: Government, media, and the public* (pp. 29-45). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. (2005). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research* (2nd Edition ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Roberts, M., & McCombs, M. (1994). Agenda setting and political advertising: Origins of the news agenda. *Political Communication*, 11, 249-262.
- Roehr, B. (2009, July 2). House Dems block DADT repeal vote as LGBTs march on White House. *Bay Area Reporter*, 39 (27), p. 9.
- Ryan, C., Carragee, K., & Schwerner, C. (1998). Media, movements, and the quest for social justice. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 26, 165-181.
- Sayre, B., Bode, L., Shah, D., Wilcox, D., & Shah, C. (2010). Agenda setting in a digital age: Tracing attention to California Proposition 8 in social media, online news, and conventional news. *Policy & Internet*, 2(2), 7-32.
- Scheufele, D. (2000). Agenda-setting, priming, and framing revisited: Another look at cognitive effects of political communication. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3 (2/3), 297-316.
- Scheufele, D., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 9-20.
- Schumaker, P.D. (1975). Policy responsiveness to protest-group demands, *The Journal of Politics*, 37, 488-521.
- Shoemaker, P. (1982). The perceived legitimacy of deviant political groups: Two experiments on media effects. *Communication Research*, 9 (2), 249-286.
- Shoemaker, P. (1984). Media treatment of deviant political groups. *Journalism Quarterly*, 61, 66-75.
- Sklar, K., & Dublin, T. (2012). Equal rights amendment. *Women and social movements in the United States, 1600-2000*. Alexander Street Press.
- Slavin, S. (1995). *U.S. women's interest groups: Institutional profiles*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Smidt, C. (2012). Not all news is the same: Protests, presidents, and the mass public agenda. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76 (1), 72-94.
- Smith, R. (2002, October 11). Georgetown law students, faculty protest campus military recruiters. *Washington Blade*, 33 (41), p. 6.

- Smith, J., McCarthy, J.D., McPhail, C., & Augustyn, B. (2001). From protest to agenda building: Description bias in media coverage of protest events in Washington, D.C. *Social Forces*, 79(4), 1397-1423.
- Snow, D., & Benford, R. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, 1, 197-217.
- Specter, M. (2003, Apr. 14). The extremist: The woman behind the most successful radical group in America. In *The New Yorker*, 52-67. Accessed May 14, 2013, from <http://www.michaelspecter.com/2003/04/the-extremist/>.
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (2nd ed. ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tewksbury, D., & Althaus, S.L. (2000). Differences in knowledge acquisition among readers of the paper and online versions of a national newspaper. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77(3), 457-479.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- "Top 10 PETA protests of the decade." (n.d.). UPI. Accessed October 16, 2012, from <http://www.upi.com>.
- Trumbo, C. (1995). Longitudinal modeling of public issues: An application of the agenda-setting process to the issue of global warming. *Journalism Monographs*
- USD(P&R). (2011). *Repeal of 'Don't ask, don't tell' (DADT): Quick reference guide*. Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments. Arlington, VA: Department of Defense.
- Walgrave, S., & Aelst, P.V. (2006). The contingency of the mass media's political agenda setting power: Toward a preliminary theory. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 88-109.
- Walgrave, S., & Verhulst, J. (2011). Selection and response bias in protest surveys. *Mobilization: An international journal*, 16 (1), 203-222.
- Walgrave, S., & Vliegenthart, R. (2012). The complex agenda-setting power of protest: Demonstrations, media, parliament, government, and legislation in Belgium, 1992-2000. *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 17 (2), 129-156.
- Watkins, S.C. (2001). Framing protest: News media frames of the million man march. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 18(1), 83-101.
- Yost, P. (1989, August 3). Accord set on disabled-worker bill; White House, senators endorse anti-discrimination legislation. *The Washington Post*, p. A6.

Zeller, S. (2006, April 17). Pentagon tunes into gay protests. *CQ Weekly*, 64 (16), p. 1009.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Jessica Mahone is a native of Elizabethton, TN. Prior to her doctoral studies at the University of Florida, Jessica earned Master of Arts degrees in professional communication and sociology from East Tennessee State University in 2009 and 2010, respectively and a Bachelor of Arts degree in religion with a minor in English from King University, formerly King College. Jessica was a recipient of the Board of Education summer fellowship, sponsored by the Office of Graduate Minority Programs at UF, in 2010. She received her Ph.D. in mass communication in August 2013.