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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the United States has witnessed a sweeping change in the public discourse pertaining to violence against women (Rentschler 2014; Phipps et al. 2017; Whittier 2016). While the movement to end violence against women has a rich history spanning over the course of several decades in the United States, more recently, activists and survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault have worked to effectively put gender-based violence on the national agenda (Armstrong and Mahone 2016). By way of the broader mass media, a new wave of activists and anti-violence organizations have worked to alter public perceptions of their grievances, and ultimately shape public attitudes and cultural understandings of domestic violence and sexual assault more broadly. From Slutwalks, which are an embodied type of protest that addresses the victim blaming and slut shaming of sexual assault survivors (Reger 2014) to the growing phenomenon of #MeToo, a hashtag used on social media to demonstrate the widespread prevalence of sexual assault and harassment experienced by women, this new wave of activism has helped to challenge prevailing notions of violence against women and gained a national platform by way of mass media.

My dissertation seeks to understand the factors that shape whether social movements—specifically, the violence against women movement—receive mass media coverage, as well as the factors that account for the quantity and quality of coverage they receive. Given that mass media are one of the most dominant and frequently used resources for understanding social issues (Gamson 1992), the media play a crucial role in shaping public attitudes and perceptions. Although social movements have increasingly targeted the mass media in their effort to achieve their desired outcomes (Andrews and Caren 2010; Rohlinger 2014), there remains a dearth of
research when it comes to scholarly understanding of the factors that shape not only whether social movements receive mass media coverage, but the amount and type of coverage they garner. My dissertation fills this dearth by drawing on mass media coverage of eight anti-violence-against-women organizations (AVAWOs) over a five-year time period spanning from 2011 to 2015 to empirically assess the influence that movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on whether anti-violence groups received mass media coverage, as well as the variation in the quantity and quality of coverage they received.

Incorporating three types of mass media (e.g., broadcast, print, and digital), I examined the social movement organizational and broad environmental factors that shape media coverage of anti-violence organizations by way of three overarching research questions: 1) What social movement organizational factors account for the quantity and quality of mass media coverage of AVAWOs? 2) What broad environmental factors account for the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage of AVAWOs? And 3) how do social movement organizational factors and broad environmental factors interact to influence both the quantity and quality of mass media attention that AVAWOs receive?

To answer these questions, I conducted a content analysis of mass media news items to construct two original datasets to quantitatively determine the factors that account for variation in the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received. The first dataset is a stratified random sample of mass media news items (N=300) that mentioned at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women (i.e., domestic violence, sexual assault, violence against women, and intimate partner violence). This data set was utilized to assess variation in the presence of coverage for AVAWOs. The second dataset is comprised of the population of mass media news items (N=412) that mentioned at least one of the eight
AVAWOs included in my analysis. This data set was utilized to assess variation in the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received. By drawing on these two datasets in light of the three overarching research questions outlined above, this research contributes to the literature on social movements, mass media, and cultural change and provides greater scholarly understanding of how social movement organizations are able to shape mass media discourse.

In the pages below, I introduce Chapter II with an overview of the relevant literature on social movements, mass media, and cultural change. I start by examining the existing literature on social movement outcomes, with an emphasis on cultural outcomes and the three dimensions of culture that can be influence by social movements (i.e., social-psychological cultural outcomes, symbolic cultural outcomes, and the development of new collective identities as a distinct cultural outcome). After introducing the three existing types of cultural outcomes, I expand upon the notion of mass media coverage as a distinct fourth type of cultural outcome and provide an overview of how previous scholars have operationalized mass media in terms of presence of coverage, quantity of coverage, and quality of coverage social movements. I next provide an overview of the movement organizational factors that influence mass media coverage of social movements, with a specific focus on the role that organizational identity, resources, and media tactics play, as well as the influence that broad environmental factors have including the presence of political and discursive media opportunities. I conclude this chapter by presenting my overarching research questions and hypotheses that guide this dissertation (see Appendix J for PowerPoint slides that provide an overview of my research).

In Chapter III, I provide a detailed overview of my research design, data collection, and methodological approach. In this chapter, I introduce the specific period of analysis and the eight
anti-violence organizations included in my research. I also describe the larger data collection procedures and how I constructed two separate datasets to assess the factors that influence the presence of coverage, as well as the quantity and quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received. I conclude this chapter with my analytic strategy and a description of the regression analyses I conduct in the three separate analysis chapters.

Chapter IV, V, and VI are analysis chapters that empirically examine the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that account for variation in the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received. In Chapter IV, I draw on the stratified random sample of mass media news items that mentioned at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women to assess the broad environmental factors that influence the presence of coverage for the eight AVAWOs included in my analysis. Due to sampling constraints, half of the cases included in the stratified random sample had missing values when it came to the movement organizational measures, thus this chapter focused solely on the influence of broad environmental factors.

In Chapter V, I draw on the population of mass media news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs included in my analysis to assess the influence that movement organizational factors and broad environmental factors had on the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received.

In Chapter VI, I draw on the population of mass media news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs. However, I examine the simultaneous influence that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the quantity and quality of coverage that AVAWOs received, as well as the potential moderating effect that the broader political and
discursive media structure had on the relationship between movement organizational characteristics and quantity and quality of coverage that AAWOs received.

The last and final chapter, Chapter VII, concludes with a general discussion of my findings, while also drawing connections to existing literature. This chapter ties back to the larger study of social movements and cultural outcomes, and ultimately lends support to the notion that mass media coverage is a distinct type of cultural outcome (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Ryan et al. 2005). Unlike the majority of previous scholarship that has only examined the factors that account for the presence or absence of coverage for social movements (Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010), this chapter concludes that the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence groups receive is dependent on both movement organizational and broad environmental factors. More specifically, the influence of these two types of factors is contingent on which measure of mass media coverage is being examined (e.g., length of coverage, tone of coverage, etc.). This finding from my research does not necessarily support previous research (Barker-Plummer 2002; Rohlinger 2002, 2004; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010) that has shown that the scope of organizational identity, number of resources, and use of media tactics accounts for variation in the mass media coverage that social movements received; rather, my research shows that the influence of movement organizational factors varies depending on the type of quantity and quality of mass media coverage measure being analyzed. Additionally, my findings show that the broad environmental context—specifically, the presence of political and discursive media opportunities—has a moderating effect on the relationship between movement organizational factors and the quantity and quality of coverage anti-violence groups received. This moderating effect is a distinct contribution of my research given that a large majority of previous research that has examined the relationship
between mass media and social movements (Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010) has not assessed the influence that the broader environment has on the relationship between movement characteristics and mass media coverage. Taking into account previous literature, this chapter concludes with an overview of the larger implications of this research as well as the limitations associated with my dissertation more broadly.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL OVERVIEW OF MOVEMENT OUTCOMES AND THE MASS MEDIA

Outcomes of Social Movement Activism

Within the field of social movements, scholars have begun to pay increasing attention to the outcomes and consequences of social movement organizations (Giugni 1998, 2008; Earl 2004). While some scholars attribute the dearth in social movement outcomes to the foundations of social movement research—which stressed breakdown and collective behavior theories that viewed movements as dysfunctional and irrational, and thus void of the ability to influence the political sphere—others argue that the lack of attention to movement outcomes is simply due to scholarly oversight (Giugni 1998, 2008). While research on movement outcomes is somewhat limited in scope, scholars whose work is guided by resource mobilization or political opportunity theories have increasingly examined the effects that movement organizations can have on policy and other state-centered outcomes (Amenta et al. 1992; Andrews 2001; McCammon et al. 2001; Soule and Olzak 2004). Although the literature on social movement outcomes has grown exponentially since Gamson (1975) first noted the importance of measuring movement consequences, the subfield remains limited in scope, especially when it comes to examining outcomes that reside outside of the political environment (Giugni 1998, 2008; Earl 2004; Armstrong and Bernstein 2008).

In order to better understand the outcomes associated with social movements, it is helpful to first define what encompasses a social movement. I define social movements as a group of individuals who are organized—either formally or informally—in an effort to collectively pursue or resist social change. Among social movement scholars, researchers often focus on social movement organizations (SMOs), which are formal organizations that identify their goals with
the mission of social movements in an attempt to achieve social change (McCarthy and Zald 1977). Social movement scholars interested in the outcomes of movement activism have identified an array of consequences associated with the actions of SMOs that tends to focus on three primary outcomes: 1) political, 2) biographical, and 3) cultural consequences. While scholars have also investigated movements’ impacts on economic markets and institutions (King and Soule 2007; King 2008; King and Pearce 2010), as well as the influence that movements have in terms of other broader social movement organizations (Meyer and Whittier 1994; Whittier 1995; Whittier 2004), social movement scholarship has largely centered on political, biographical, and cultural outcomes (Guigni 2008). I review these literatures in the following discussion.

**Political Outcomes**

Political outcomes have largely dominated the study of movement outcomes, with scholars focusing on the effect that movements have on the political environment (Giugni 1998). Amenta and his colleagues (2009: 142) define social movements striving to achieve political outcomes as movements seeking “to effect social transformations through the state by mobilizing regular citizens for sustained political action.” Unlike the goals of mobilizing constituents or fostering new collective identities, political outcomes are external to the social movement organization—that is, movements seek to persuade and influence key political players such as legislators, bureaucrats, and judges (Amenta et al. 2009). Scholars who focus on political outcomes investigate the conditions under which movements influence the political elite and draw on a variety of frameworks to examine this process, including political process and resource mobilization theory. In short, scholars who investigate political outcomes tend to focus
on actors’ ability to alter social and public policy, with a specific emphasis on “whether, when, and how movements influence the policy process and its outcomes” (Giugni 2008: 1583).

**Biographical Outcomes**

While political outcomes are state-centered and focus on movements’ ability to influence the larger political structure, biographical consequences of social movements focus on individual actors and the effects that movement activism has on one’s life course (McAdam 1989; Giugni 2004). Scholars who investigate the biographical outcomes of movements have shown that engagement in social activism has a strong effect on the political and personal lives of activists. McAdam (1989) found that individual participation in the 1964 Freedom Summer had an impact on both participants and non-participants. Specifically, McAdam found that participants in Freedom Summer were not only more likely to remain politically active relative to non-participants, but their activism fostered aggregate-level social and political change. He argues that participants in Freedom Summer spearheaded the civil rights movements of the 1960s, and their activism is ultimately connected to the broader cultural shift associated with the Baby Boomer generation. Ultimately, scholars who investigate the biographical consequences of movements stress the importance that involvement in social activism can have on both the individual and broader society in terms of shaping social attitudes.

**Cultural Outcomes**

One of the emerging concepts within the field of social movement research is the role of cultural outcomes. While cultural outcomes of social movements have received the least amount of scholarly attention, scholars argue that movements’ ability to alter their broader cultural environments often produce the “deepest and lasting impact” (Giugni 2008: 1591). Part of this
dearth in scholarly research can be attributed to the fact that cultural outcomes of social movements are notoriously hard to define (Earl 2000, 2004; Giugni 2008). With respect to investigating the cultural consequences of social movements, Earl (2004) argues that the broader field lacks consensus in terms of defining cultural outcomes, especially in relation to cultural change. The lack of unanimity among movement scholars can be attributed to two underlying factors. First, as noted by Earl (2004), most social movement scholars who investigate the consequences of movement activism have largely overlooked cultural factors. As stated above, the majority of previous research has focused primarily on state-centered outcomes, with a specific emphasis on political outcomes such as legislative change or the development of new social policy (McAdam 1996; Armstrong and Bernstein 2008; Guigini 2008). The focus on state-centered outcomes has resulted from the underlying assumption that social change is achieved through the direct and indirect pressure that movement actors place on key civil and political decision makers (Earl 2004).

Second, the lack of attention devoted to cultural outcomes can be attributed to the conceptualization of culture itself. As noted by Earl (2004), cultural change has meant many things to different scholars throughout the history of social movement research. For example, some social movement scholars view cultural change as the impact that movements have in terms of shifting public attitudes and beliefs (Gamson and Modigliani 1989), while others view culture from a symbolic standpoint, focusing on the role that movements have in terms of influencing cultural products that serve as a barometer of public attitudes (Issac 2009). The lack of uniformity among movement scholars regarding what comprises culture has limited this particular subfield of social movement scholarship.
Identifying Cultural Outcomes

Social movement scholars who focus on cultural outcomes investigate the role that movements have in terms of influencing the larger cultural contexts in which actors are embedded. Broadly speaking, the previous body of literature focuses on three dimensions of culture that can be influenced by movement organizations (Earl 2004; Guigni 2008; Jasper 2014). These three dimensions include: 1) viewing culture as a social-psychological phenomenon, in which culture is embodied by individual values and beliefs; 2) identifying culture as products and practices in which culture is defined by signals and meanings; and 3) viewing culture as distinct and shared worldviews that are embodied by sub-cultures or distinct collective identities (Hart 1996).

Social-Psychological Cultural Outcomes

The first of these three dimensions of culture is the idea that culture is a social-psychological phenomenon—that is, culture is viewed as a set of “values, beliefs, and motivations characterizing individuals” (Hart 1996: 88). According to this perspective, culture is understood as individual attitudes and opinions, which can be captured through public opinion polls in order to assess whether individuals’ viewpoints on particular movement related issues have changed (Earl 2004). Some social movement researchers (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; d’Anjou and Van Male 1998) approach the study of culture from this perspective, arguing that social movements’ ability to strategically alter public opinion illustrates the influence that movement organizations have on the broader cultural context.

Given that this perspective of cultural outcomes focuses largely on shifts in attitudes, movement scholars have relied on public opinion data to assess the influence that social movements have in terms of altering social and cultural attitudes. As noted by Giugni (1998),
social movements express themselves through a myriad of tactics, including forms of direct action such as public demonstrations, protests, and riots. Movements also deploy frames in order to amplify their message to the general public and such activities may, in turn, influence public opinion. While movements’ ultimate goal may be to seek political and/or legal change, it is pertinent that they first achieve public support to have their causes acknowledged and legitimated by the political elite (Giugni 1998).

Although movement scholars have acknowledged the association between social movements and public opinion, they have often failed to empirically demonstrate the influence that movements have when it comes to shaping public attitudes. One of the few movement scholars to examine public opinion as a distinct movement outcome is Paul Burstein (1985). Burstein investigates how and to what extent the civil rights movement influenced public support around employment equality, and ultimately, the passage of the 1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act. Specifically, he focuses on the intervening role that public support had on the relationship between social movement organizations and congressional change. For example, in the case of the civil rights movement, Burstein (1985) demonstrates that Congress adopted equal employment legislation as a result of social change that was “manifested in public opinion, crystallized in the civil rights and women’s movement, and transformed into public policy by political leaders” (125).

Drawing on public opinion poll data collected from two nationally representative sources (i.e., Roper Public Opinion Research Center [ROPER] and General Social Survey [GSS]), as well as Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) legislation and equal pay laws, Burstein empirically investigates broader public attitudes related to social inequality and EEO legislation. His findings demonstrate that when EEO bills were first introduced in 1942, there was little
congressional and public support for them. As the civil rights movement began to take form and public non-violent demonstrations occurred, public attitudes began to shift, with nearly 87% of citizens supporting issues related to equal employment opportunities for blacks and whites by 1966—compared to only 42% in 1944.

In conjunction with the shift in public opinion, Burstein found that congressional support for EEO legislation, and the adoption of EEO and equal pay laws, was strongly associated with public attitudes about the treatment of racial minorities. More specifically, Burstein shows that the 1964 passage of the first piece of EEO legislation (i.e., Civil Rights Act) occurred at the height of the civil rights movement. For example, in 1963, the NAACP and the Student Nonviolence Coordinating Committee (SNCC) were actively working to coordinated non-violent demonstrations led by the influential Dr. Martin Luther King. This ultimately culminated in the March on Washington, in which nearly 200,000 people gathered at the Lincoln Memorial to listen to Dr. King’s famous “I Have a Dream” speech. According to Burstein, it was these types of civil rights protests in the early 1960s that were responsible for an era of increased public awareness about racial inequality, and ultimately, the legal recognition of equal employment opportunities for racial, gender, and religious minorities. Overall, Burstein (1985) argues that the protest actions of the civil rights movement increased public awareness around race, causing a shift in the publics’ perceptions of race and equal opportunities. Congress then responded to this increased public awareness around inequality, and adopted several forms of EEO legislation, including the 1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act.

While Burstein examined the role of the civil rights movement in terms of the relationship between public opinion and legislative change, Costain and Majstorovic (1994) have investigated the origins of women’s rights legislation by focusing on changes in public attitudes.
The two authors empirically assess four prevailing interpretations regarding the relationship between public opinion and legislative action, with a specific focus on the interplay between social movement organizations, public opinion, and legislative change.¹

To assess specifically the influence that movement organizations have when it comes to altering public opinion, Costain and Majstorovic (1994) focus on the relationship between congressional legislation and public opinion on women’s rights issues. Using *New York Times* event data, the authors coded and analyzed the abstracts of each article related to a specific women’s movement organization or women’s issue from 1950-1986. For each abstract, Costain and her colleague coded a variety of factors including whether the events positively or negatively depicted women’s rights; whether government actors, feminists, or anti-feminists initiated the event receiving media coverage; and whether the broader government or individual actors were the target of the protest action. To assess the impact that shifts in public opinion have on Congress, the authors measured legislative impact by drawing a sample of gendered-focused bills introduced to the U.S. Congress taken from the *U.S. Statutes at Large*. The authors coded the percentage of bills that were passed by Congress, which they argued captures the congressional agenda devoted to women’s legislation during each specific year.

To measure public opinion on women’s rights, Costain and Majstorovic (1994) utilized individual responses to the question, “would you vote for a qualified woman for President?” The question was first asked by Roper Public Opinion Research Center in 1937 and has been asked annually, making it one of the longest across-time measures of political prejudice towards

---

¹ These four prevailing interpretations include: 1) public opinion interpretation that sees a direct relationship between public opinion and legislative change, 2) an interpretation that views public opinion as filtering the impact of outside events on legislative action, 3) an elite behavior interpretation in which public opinion is affected by legislative elites, and lastly 4) a social movement interpretation in which legislation is the result of the interplay between social movements, public opinion, and media coverage.
women (Burstein 1985; Costain and Majstorovic 1994). The authors argue that this particular question captures public attitudes towards women as authority figures, and responses strongly correlate with separate measures that capture public acceptance of women in the workforce. To assess the influence that women’s organizations have when it comes to altering public attitudes, Costain and Majstorovic utilized multiple sources to construct a measure of changing membership in five different U.S. women’s organizations. Membership figures for all five organizations were taken from several academic sources, as well as the *Encyclopedia of Associations* (1951-1987), for the 37-year time frame.

These separate measures of social movement activity, public opinion, and congressional action allow Costain and Majstorovic to empirically investigate the influence that the U.S. women’s movement had on broader public opinion, as well as the passage of gendered-based civil rights legislation. Utilizing a factor analysis, the authors’ results illustrate the impact that both the organizational strength and protest actions organized by the women’s movement had a significant impact on shifts in public attitudes regarding gender, including public attitudes towards the introduction of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). Costain and Majstorovic’s findings show that the protest actions sponsored by women’s rights organizations led to a positive shift in public attitudes regarding gender equality, and ultimately put pressure on politicians and congressional members to pursue legislation such as the ERA in the early 1970s.

In short, Costain and Majstorovic (1994) demonstrate the unique political environment that
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2 The five organizations include: 1) League of Women Voters, 2) the American Association of University Women, 3) the National Federation of Business and Professional Women, 4) the National Organization for Women, and 5) the National Women’s Political Caucus.

social movement organizations create in terms of influencing public opinion and congressional legislation.

The work of both Burstein (1985) and Costain and Majstorovic (1994) illustrate the influence that social movement organizations have in terms of shifting public attitudes regarding social issues. While these scholars seek to empirically demonstrate the intervening effect that public opinion has on the relationship between social movement organizations and congressional change, more work is necessary in order to understand specifically how movements shape individual attitudes, including the influence that the mass media have in terms of amplifying the concerns articulated by social movement organizations.

Symbolic Cultural Outcomes

While social movement scholars (Burstein 1985; Gamson and Modigliani 1989; d’Anjou and Van Male 1998; Ryan et al. 2005) argue that changes in public opinion are important and provide researchers with a way to operationalization cultural outcomes, public opinion is not the only cultural consequence of social movements. Several scholars have examined culture from a more symbolic standpoint. This approach, as elaborated by Polletta (1999), stems from the view that culture is “a symbolic dimension of all structures, institutions, and practices” (66). From this perspective, cultural artifacts are imbued with meaning and are symbolic of specific beliefs and attitudes. The pattern of these artifacts, according to Polletta, is culture. This perspective is often associated with the “production of culture” and discussions of cultural products such as the visual arts or music. From this viewpoint, changes in symbols or artifacts—that is, the cultural products themselves—is understood as cultural change (Earl 2004).

To assess the ways in which social movement actors achieve symbolic forms of cultural change, scholars have focused on the creation of distinct cultural products (Futrell and Simi
Movement scholars have empirically investigated the influence social movements have on symbolic forms of culture by examining literature, music, and other products that serve as a barometer of public opinion and attitudes. For example, in his work on the American labor novel problem, Isaac (2009) adopts a symbolic cultural approach by examining labor novels from the 19th and 20th centuries. Using the novels as empirical evidence, Isaac examines the ways in which social movement activity is captured by the content of the novel, which he argues, influences the broader publics attitudes towards labor movements. Using annual-time series data for the United States from 1860 to 1919, Isaac examines the relationship between spikes in labor movement activity and the production of labor problem novels. Specifically, he gauges the trajectory of the American labor problem novel literary formation by assessing the number of new titles in the specific subgenre that appear annually. Of the 532 novels included in his sample, each novel contains one of the following literary elements: 1) labor strikes, 2) labor union activity, and/or 3) the labor problem in one form or another. Isaac’s findings highlight the underlying relationship between social movement activity and cultural outcomes, specifically demonstrating the ways in which social movements produce cultural change through shaping distinct cultural products.

New Collective Identities and Subcultures Cultural Outcomes

In addition to operationalizing culture as both a social-psychological and symbolic phenomenon, scholars have also measured cultural outcomes by focusing on the development of new communities and/or cultural identities (Hart 1996). This last and final dimension of culture frames culture as a shared “worldview” that aligns with the ways in which social scientists have traditionally understood culture (Earl 2004). From this standpoint, scholars focus on how social movement organizations challenge the broader social and cultural environment through the
development new collective identities based on the beliefs shared by a community of individuals. This understanding of culture acknowledges the importance of “large constellations of interconnected values and beliefs by focusing on the totality of those beliefs” (Earl 2004: 512). In turn, this cultural perspective argues that shifts in any particular value or belief is not possible without changes among communities or the development of an entirely new community of individuals (Staggenborg 1998).

In contrast to state-centered approaches of social movement outcomes, this third dimension of cultural change aligns with new social movement scholars’ emphasis on the relationship between social movements and the development of collective identities and subcultures. Polletta and Jasper (2001) adopt this type of cultural approach to movement outcomes, examining the development of collective identities in relation to social protest. The two scholars identify several key ways in which collective identities can take hold. These include the development of collective identities as constituents’ movement goals, as is the case with self-help movements (Taylor 1996), or the development of new identities—such as self-identifying with the broader white supremacy movement—that are the result from broader cultural backlash against individuals who do not embrace multiculturalism (Simi and Futrell 2010).

The development of new collective identities and group subcultures can take multiple forms and often emerge as a response to broader hegemonic discourses. For example, in the case of the white supremacy movement, individuals are often drawn to hate groups after interacting with white supremacists that share similar racist beliefs (Simi and Futrell 2010). Through the development of new mediated technologies, including the Internet, the modern white supremacy movement targets individuals who experience a sense of isolation from the broader cultural environment. Through their online interactions, potential constituents of the white supremacy
movement develop a sense of solidarity with fellow like-minded individuals who also harbor similar racist ideologies (Tsunokai and McGrath 2011).

To empirically assess how individuals come to adopt a racist ideology and become affiliated with the broader white supremacy movement, Futrell and his colleagues (2006) draw on ethnographic and documentary data collected on a variety of white supremacist activities and organizations between 1996 and 2004. The authors utilize participant observation data that was conducted in a multitude of settings, as well as in-depth interviews with nearly 60 white supremacists. The authors illustrate the crucial role that white supremacist online networks have when it comes to fostering a sense of collective identity and mobilizing new constituents. They specifically focus on white supremacists’ use of the Internet in developing a new sense of collective identity among potential constituents. According to the Futrell et al. (2006), the broader white supremacy movement is able to connect with new recruits through the use of the online networks; by providing potential recruits with virtual networks, the white supremacy movement spreads their racist ideology. Ultimately, Futrell and his colleagues find that some individuals who engage with online white supremacy networks develop relationships with white supremacy members, and often cross the virtual divide by attending white supremacist conferences and festivals. This work demonstrates the influence that movements and their technologies have when it comes to the development of new collective identities and expanding membership.

In contrast to the white supremacy movement’s ability to foster new collective identities, the radical lesbian feminist movement originally developed in resistance to mainstream liberal feminism. In their work on radical lesbian feminist identities, Taylor and Whittier (1992) examine the ways in which a mobilization of lesbian feminists fostered a culture where personal
politics were central, and the idea of lesbianism was a clear and distinct political stance. To foster a new sense of collective identity among members of the broader feminist movement, radical lesbian feminists emphasized the importance of consciousness raising, which encouraged women to engage in a “wide range of social and political actions that challenge the dominant system” (Taylor and Whittier 1992: 105).

To examine how radical lesbian feminist identities came to fruition, Taylor and Whittier draw on two main sources of data: 1) published primary materials, and 2) interviews with participants in lesbian feminist communities. In regards to the first type of data, Taylor and Whittier examine written sources including books, periodicals, and narratives by community members associated with the lesbian feminism, as well as newsletters, position papers, and other documents published by radical lesbian feminist organizations. In addition to the primary documents, the authors draw on a secondary data source by interviewing lesbian feminists who served as key informants about their community and the development of a collective identity among participants. Through their analysis, the authors demonstrate that the development of a new subculture and/or collective identity, such as radical lesbian feminism, is ultimately the result of deliberate forms of consciousness raising, which enabled radical feminists to influence the broader feminist community and encouraged at least some liberal feminists to question the ideological foundations of feminism more broadly.

**Mass Media Coverage as a Distinct Cultural Outcome**

Social movement scholars (Earl 2004; Giguni 2008) interested in cultural outcomes have identified three distinct cultural consequences of social movement activism: 1) a social-psychological phenomenon, in which culture is embodied by individual values, beliefs, and attitudes; 2) the production of new products and practices in which culture is defined by symbols
3) the development of distinct and shared worldviews that are embodied by
sub-cultures or distinct collective identities. Although scholars have provided a nuanced
understanding of the cultural consequences associated with social movement activism, they have
overlooked the ways in which the mass media coverage represent a distinct type of cultural
outcome. I argue that social movement organizations’ ability to influence mass media coverage
represents a fourth type of movement cultural outcome that is uniquely distinct from the three
outcomes highlighted above.

In my dissertation, I expand upon all three cultural consequences of social movement
activism noted above by defining culture as a distinct set of attitudes and beliefs (Gamson and
Modigliani 1989) shared among a collective group (Taylor and Whittier 1992; Polletta 1999) that
is embodied in cultural products (Issac 2009). This definition is similar to Swidler’s (1986: 273)
discussion of culture as a “toolkit,” in which she argues that culture consists of “symbols, stories,
rituals, and world-views” that individuals draw on to make sense of their social world. One such
cultural product that is embodied by my definition is the mass media, which highlights cultural
patterns in terms of how a collective groups’ attitudes and beliefs are organized around social
issues. Given that the mass media serve as the “master forum” (Gamson and Modigliani 1989), I
argue that shifts in media content are illustrative of broader changes in public attitudes and
beliefs. According to Gamson and Modigliani (1989), individuals are dependent on the mass
media to construct meaning and understand their social world. In short, I argue that the mass
media are a distinct cultural product that reinforces the public’s opinions about distinct social
issues (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Gamson 1989; Ryan et al. 2005).

While movement scholars have acknowledged the importance of the media in relation to
the success of social movement organizations (Rohlinger 2006; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews
and Caren 2010), there is an oversight among scholars in regards to media content and what shifts in media coverage represent in light of cultural outcomes. I argue that the changes in presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that movement groups receive can lead to a shift in public attitudes and cultural discourse, and ultimately, foster cultural change.

Defining the Mass Media

When it comes to investigating the relationship between social movements and mass media, it is crucial to first identify what encompasses mass media. Mass media consist of a set of diverse technologies that are intended to reach a large audience through mass communication (McQuail 2010). According to Wimmer and Dominick (2011), mass media refer to “any form of communication that simultaneously reaches a large number of people including, but not limited to radio, television, newspapers, magazines, billboards, films, recording, books, and the Internet” (2). Broadly speaking, there are three overarching forms that define mass media: 1) broadcast media, 2) print media, and 3) digital media (McQuail 2010). In regards to the first type of mass media, broadcast media consists of radio, music, film, and television media. Unlike broadcast media, print media consist of physical objects such as newspapers, books, magazines, billboards, signs, and placards that distribute information to the masses. The last form of media that comprises mass media are digital media, which consists of the Internet and other forms of mobile mass communication. In recent years, digital media have become increasingly common, as traditional forms of broadcast and print media have utilized the Internet to distribute news to the public (Salgado 2014).
Although mass media are often assumed to be synonymous with mainstream media, I argue that both mainstream and alternative media together comprise the broader mass media.\(^4\) This perspective differs from Rohlinger’s (2014) understanding of mass media, which she argues is comprised of three different types of media: 1) moderated media, 2) social media, and 3) direct media. In her work on the relationship between social movements and the media, Rohlinger draws on field theory perspectives (DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Bourdieu 1998, 2005), to examine how institutional dynamics affect the reputation and media opportunities of activist organizations, as well as their strategic choices. Rohlinger argues that the field of mass media is structured around two opposing forms of power—economic and cultural capital. While the exact forms of economic and cultural capital vary, when it comes to the mass media, she argues that economic capital is operationalized by circulations/ratings and advertising dollars, whereas cultural capital is represented by professional honors that result from peer recognition (Rohlinger 2014). Rohlinger argues that because the field of mass media is structured around two opposing forms of power, the specific location of movement organizations within the broader field determines the type of mass media activists strategically engage with.

In regards to the three types of media that encompass the mass media field (i.e., broadcast, print, and digital media), Rohlinger (2014: 5) defines moderated media as media that “uses a particular set of norms and practices to create a media product that (ideally) generates profits from consumer sales and advertising.” Direct media, on the other hand, is defined as

---

\(^4\) There is a distinct divide between what scholars identify as mainstream and alternative media. While mainstream media refers to “the mass media of television, radio, and newspapers that are privately or state-owned and controlled” (Salgado 2014: 278), alternative media are often harder to define. While there are varying definitions of alternative media, Salgado (2014) argues that there are several core characteristics of alternative media including the participatory modes of production and management, opposition to mainstream politics and culture (this can include both liberal left-wing and conservative right-wing media), as well as the non-commercial nature of media sources.
media “created by activists and associated with a movement group” (Rohlinger 2014: 5). Direct media, typically includes newsletters, pamphlets, websites, listservs, forums, videos and documentaries, as well as radio programming that is produced by a group of activists, whereas external media usually includes mainstream and alternative news outlets, radio stations, blogs, commercial documentaries (Rohlinger 2014). As noted by Rohlinger (2014), the distinction between direct and external media is important because while all movements may use mass media, not all groups choose to regularly engage in media over which they have little to no control.

In addition to both moderated and direct media, Rohlinger identifies a third type of media that comprises the broader mass media field. The third type, social media, according to Rohlinger, consists of outlets such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, Tumblr, and Youtube, as well as other platforms that provide movement activists with a way to directly communicate with constituents and reach out to potential new recruits. In contrast to moderate media, social media provides movement actors with a platform to bypass traditional forms of media and introduce their ideas to the broader public.

While Rohlinger identifies three types of media (i.e., direct media, moderated media, and social media), I use a simplified approach and argue that the field of mass media is comprised only of two main forms of media relative to social movements: 1) internal media and 2) external media. The first type of mass media, internal media, consists of media that are produced by social movement organizations. Internal media includes newsletters, pamphlets, websites, listservs, social media, op-eds, and other movement documents that are produced and distributed by individual activists and organizations. I argue that social movement organizations are able to
utilize types of internal media to strategically interact and shape external media, and ultimately, influence the type of events that the mass media view as “newsworthy.”

In contrast to internal media, external media includes media that is not produced and distributed by activists—that is, mass media that is independent of social movement organizations. What distinguishes external media from internal media is that social movement organizations and individual activists have no direct control over the content produced by various types of mass media (i.e., television, print, and digital media). When examining the ways in which social movement influence the mass media, scholars must investigate how activists influence external media sources that are distributed to a mass audience.

**Conceptualizing and Operationalizing Mass Media Coverage**

When it comes to the relationship between social movements and the mass media, scholars have increasingly come to view the media as playing a pivotal role in shaping whether social movement organizations are able to facilitate broader social change (Gamson and Wolfsfed 1993; Ryan et al. 2005; Andrews and Caren 2010; Rohlinger 2014). As noted by several scholars (Rohlinger 2002, 2006, 2014; Amenta et al. 2009; Sobieraj 2010), the mass media serve as a vehicle that can amplify the frames of movement organizations, while simultaneously shaping the public and political agenda by drawing attention to movements’ issues and beliefs. As noted by Gamson and Modigliani (1989), the mass media provide scholars with a discursive measure of social movement organizations cultural influence.

One of the few movement scholars to examine how social movements influence mass media coverage, and ultimately shift public attitudes, is Charlotte Ryan and her colleagues (1991) who investigate the ways in which the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence (RICADV) altered media coverage and discourse around violence against women.
Through strengthening their internal and external media relationships, RICADV was able to increase their standing in the eyes of the mass media, which helped them strategically navigate the media market. As noted by Ryan et al. (2005), in order for social movement organizations to become routine sources for the media, activists and organizations must master the skills and resources needed for media appearances—that is, to sustain a working relationship with the media, movement organizations must invest in communication capacity building over time so that their interactions with the mass media enhance their broader political strategies.

Seeking to change media framing and the broader cultural discourse around domestic violence, RICADV’s media strategy was driven by two focal goals: 1) solidifying media standing and 2) expanding media opportunities. To empirically assess the changes in RICADV standing, Ryan and colleagues (2005) quantitatively measured shifts in RICADV’s rapid response capacity—that is, their ability to influence unplanned events. To operationalize RICADV’s rapid response capacity, the authors focused on critical discourse moments (Chilton 1987) and analyzed three comparable clusters of domestic violence related murders that occurred over a seven-year time period (1996-2002). Specifically, the authors focused on RICADV’s ability to influence the media’s language around domestic violence by encouraging reporters to adopt two changes in their journalistic practice: 1) labeling intimate partner violence as domestic violence and 2) downplaying sources that stressed the personal and private nature of domestic violence. Through their coverage in external media, RICADV was able to encourage journalists to draw on sources such as domestic violence advocates, survivors, and other experts that framed domestic violence and its prevention in a broader social context.

Drawing on weekly and daily newspapers, Ryan and colleagues (2005) show that RICADV became a routine source over the seven-year time period. By 2002, the authors show
that RICADV had established a solid communication infrastructure that facilitated their ability to become a routine media source. By achieving external media coverage, RICADV was also able to alter the media framing of domestic violence from a personal issue to a broader social issue that was analyzed in light of the broader cultural context. By the end of the sampling period, the authors found that there was a 16-fold increase in the labeling of violence against women as domestic violence in the mass media, and by 2002, domestic violence advocates and police officers were the two primary sources included in all journalistic coverage. In addition to increased standing and greater influence on media discourse, RICADV was able to transform comparable unforeseen events and critical discourse moments—like the three domestic violence murders that took place over the seven-year time period—into media opportunities and ultimately political opportunities that stressed the need for policy changes regarding violence against women.

The work of Ryan and her colleagues (2005) demonstrates the influence that social movement organizations have when it comes to changing cultural discourse and media framing around distinct issues. As demonstrated by Ryan et al. (2005), when it comes to cultivating an opinion on domestic violence, individuals’ perceptions are influenced by the mass media; not only does the mass media provide the broader public with information on social issues, but it played a critical role in terms of individuals cultivating an opinion on whether they believed violence against women was a social problem. Social movement organizations, such as RICADV, are able to influence media framing of domestic violence, which not only provides the public with a general understanding of violence against women, but also helps shape and alter public attitudes. In short, Ryan and colleagues (2005) work demonstrates the ways in which
social movement organizations are able to achieve cultural outcomes by shaping media coverage, which in turn, ultimately influences individuals’ attitudes and beliefs.

Given the importance of mass media in relation to social movement organizations, scholars have paid increasing attention to the various ways to measure the influence that movements have on mass media coverage. In the following section, I investigate the ways in which social movement organizations are able to influence the content and media framing of issues related to domestic violence and violence against women more broadly. When it comes to operationalizing the mass media coverage as a cultural outcome, I argue that movements’ influence on the media can be measured by examining three types of media coverage outcomes: 1) the absence of presence of media coverage, 2) the quantity of media coverage, and 3) the quality of media coverage.

**Presence or Absence of Media Coverage**

Several social movement scholars interested in the relationship between social movements and the media have conceptualized and measured media attention as whether movement organizations receive media coverage or not (McCarthy et al. 1996; Oliver and Myers 1999; Amenta et al. 2009). For example, Amenta and his colleagues (2009) examine the influence that social movement organizations have on the mass media by drawing on a sample of media articles from the *New York Times* for all national U.S. social movement organizations (SMOs) throughout the 20th Century. Starting with a list of SMOs drawn from the *Encyclopedia of Associations*, previous literature, and monographs on social movements, Amenta et al. identified 298,359 articles that mentioned 947 of the total 1,247 SMOs included in their sample. To operationalize media coverage, the authors employed a dichotomous measure that captured whether a social movement organization’s name was included in the article.
This binary measure of media coverage is also utilized by McCarthy, McPhail, and Smith (1996) who examine dimensions of selection bias in media coverage of demonstrations in Washington D.C. from 1982 to 1991. Like Amenta and his colleagues (2009), the authors draw on a sample of news articles from the *New York Times*, as well as the *Washington Post* since they focus on protest activity occurring in the Washington vicinity. To capture the influence of television news media, the authors also incorporate national news telecasts using data garnered from the *Vanderbilt Network News Index and Abstracts* to assess the national nightly news telecasts by *ABC*, *CBS*, and *NBC* throughout the nine-year time period. To assess the frequency of protest events occurring throughout Washington D.C., the authors gathered demonstration permit records from the National Park Service, United States Capitol Police, and the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia from 1982 to 1991. In terms of the analysis, McCarthy and his colleagues operationalize media coverage as the presence or absence of journalistic coverage for the documented protests that occurred throughout their time frame.

Although the work of Amenta and his colleagues (2009), like McCarthy et al. (1996), provide movement scholars with comprehensive overviews of the relationship between movements and the media, there are limitations associated with the authors’ operationalization of media coverage as simply the presence or absence of coverage. Simply taking into account whether movement organizations receive media attention overlooks more nuanced aspects of media coverage. While scholars have acknowledged the crucial role that media coverage plays in terms of a variety of movement outcomes (Gamson and Modeligni 1989; Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; McCurdy 2012; Wooters 2013), operationalizing media coverage as a binary variable fails to account for the amount of media attention devoted to the social movement organization (i.e.,
quantity of media coverage) and whether movements’ frames are included in the media coverage (i.e., quality of media coverage).

**Quantity of Media Coverage**

Movement scholars interested in the relationship between movements and mass media argue that coverage itself is not sufficient (Ferree et al. 2002; Vliegenthart et al. 2005; Rohlinger and Brown 2013; Rohlinger 2014). In addition to assessing the absence or presence of journalistic coverage of movements, scholars have also adopted a more nuanced approach to media coverage of social movements by taking into account the overall quantity of journalistic coverage when coverage is present. The quantity of media coverage refers to the actual amount of coverage devoted to a social movement organization—that is, the length of the article or news story, as well as the number of times the social movement is mentioned in the total coverage (Andrews and Caren 2010; Kiousis 2004). Communication and social movement scholars argue that the quantity of coverage is critical since it provides a measure of the importance that the mass media attribute to movements or protest events (Andrews and Caren 2010; Kiousis 2004; Vliegenthart et al. 2005). Previous scholarship has examined the quantity of media coverage by operationalizing two concepts related to media coverage: 1) the length of news coverage, and 2) the number of times a social movement organization is mentioned in media coverage.

**Length of News Coverage**

In their research on mass media coverage of environmental organizations in North Carolina, Andrews and Caren (2010), investigate the movement organizational characteristics that account for why some environmental organizations are more successful than others when it comes to gaining mass media coverage. To examine the organizational factors that account for
media coverage, Andrews and Caren combine two primary data sources: 1) organizational survey data from a representative sample of 187 local environmental organizations in North Carolina, and 2) complete media coverage of the 187 organizations in 11 major daily North Carolina newspapers from 2004 to 2005. Drawing on these two data sources, the authors construct a media prominence measure that assess four key dimensions: 1) the placement of each news article, 2) the length of each article (i.e., word count), 3) the inclusion of pictures or graphics, and 4) how often and when movement actors are mentioned in media coverage. In light with other communication and social movement scholars, Andrews and Caren argue that these characteristics of media prominence influence the likelihood that readers will pay attention to a newspaper article and its overall contents.

The second component of the Andrew and Caren’s prominence measure assesses the length of mass media coverage. To operationalize length of media coverage, the two authors measure the word count of each newspaper article that mentions the name of the 187 local environmental organizations included in their study. Using this count measure, Andrews and Caren incorporate the length of each newspaper article by taking the ratio of the article’s length to the average length of all articles included in their sample. With the measure, Andrews and Caren construct an equation that takes into account the placement, length, presence of photos, and direct mention of the name of each environmental organization to assess media prominence.

The work of Andrews and Caren aligns with previous movement scholars, who argue that the sheer length of space devoted to social movement organizations in mass media coverage signals
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to the public the “newsworthiness” or importance of the issues presented by movement actors (Koopmans and Statham 1999; Koopmans and Olzak 2004).

*Mention of Social Movement Organization*

In addition to measuring the amount of media attention allocated to social movement organizations, movement scholars have paid increasing attention to the number of times social movement organizations are mentioned in media coverage. In their research on media coverage and membership in several Dutch environmental movement organizations, Vliegenthart and his colleagues examine the relationship between membership in 138 environmental organizations and the amount of media coverage devoted to each organization. Drawing of a sample of 399,836 news articles from three Dutch newspapers including *NRC Handelsblad* (1991-2003), *Algemeen Dagblad* (1992-2003), and *de Volkskrant* (1995-2003), the authors examine news articles produced during a one-year time period for each of the three newspapers. They seek to examine the casual relationship between movement membership and media coverage by only including movement organizations that had publicly available membership figures that were no more than two years old. Using these two forms of data, the authors examine a possible two-way relationship between movement groups and media coverage: 1) assessing whether increased media coverage leads to greater membership, and 2) whether increased membership in environmental organizations result in more media attention.

To measure media coverage, the authors focus on the quantity of media coverage by counting the number of times the name of each 183 environmental organizations were mentioned in each individual news article. Using an electronic content analysis, Vliegenthart and his colleagues coded each of the articles included in the larger sample, with a specific focus on the number of times each movement organization is directly mentioned. Based on their analysis, the
authors conclude that increased levels of media coverage (i.e., number of times a SMO is acknowledge in media coverage) resulted in increased membership rates for the environmental organizations included in the analysis. Ultimately, the work of Vliegenhart et al. (2005) empirically demonstrates that the greater the quantity of media coverage, the more effective the mobilization strategies of movement organizations that seek to gain additional constituents. Although the work of Vliegenthart and his colleagues demonstrates the importance of the quality of media coverage, they fail to examine the impact that the quality of media coverage has on social movement organizations desired cultural outcomes.

**Quality of Media Coverage**

While scholars have acknowledged the importance of media attention in terms of presence/absence and quantity of coverage, social movement researchers have stressed that increased coverage alone does not fully account for the influence that movements have when it comes interacting with the mass media. Scholars (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Rohlinger 2002; Andrews and Caren 2010) interested in the relationship between movements and the media argue that the quality of media coverage—that is, the visibility of movement organizations in the mass media—greatly influences whether movements are able to achieve their desired outcomes. In addition to visibility, movement scholars have also noted that the ways in which journalists write about social movement organizations can greatly impact whether the public empathizes with their overarching goals (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Ferree et al. 2002; Rohlinger 2002, 2006; Andrews and Caren 2010). In the following discussion, I examine the quality of media coverage of social movement organizations by taking into account three factors: 1) the tone of
media coverage, 2) the standing of movement organizations in media coverage, and 3) the framing of movement organizations in media coverage.  

*Tone of Media Coverage*  
Within the field of communication studies, scholars consider whether the tone (or sometimes what is called “valence”) of media coverage is positive, negative, or neutral (D’Alessio and Allen 2000). As noted by Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993), the mass media do not simply report the news, but rather, construct the news by framing discussions of social movement organizations and activism in a positive or negative light. Given that the mass media set the context in which attitudes regarding social movement organizations are formed, scholars such as Kruse (2001) and Kiousis (2004) argue that the mass media’s tone in portraying movement organizations is critical.

For example, in her analysis of media framing of animal experimentation, Kruse (2001) assesses the tone of journalistic coverage of animal rights organizations. Specifically, Kruse investigates the frequency of positive and negative media frames regarding the U.S. animal rights movement, and whether coverage of the animal rights movement differs depending on the type of news media. To assess the relationship between the animal rights movement and media framing, Kruse draws on a sample of major news magazines and television networks. The print media included in her sample is comprised of 26 articles from *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report* drawn from the *Reader’s Guide to Periodical Literature* from 1984 to 1993. The broadcast media consist of all news segments concerning animal experimentation presented on the evening news broadcasts of three major U.S. television networks (i.e., ABC, CBS, and
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6 I originally proposed to also examine the placement of mass media news items as a measurement of quality of coverage. Given that placement of digital-only news items differs drastically relative to print and broadcast news items, I dropped placement as a measure of quality of coverage in my analysis.
NBC) drawn from the *Vanderbilt Television News Archives* from 1984 to 1993. In total, Kruse collected a total of 31 television news segments ranging in length from 10 seconds to nearly 5 minutes.

To empirically examine the tone of journalistic coverage of animal rights organizations, Kruse measured positive and negative coverage by investigating the ad hominen frames of the two types of media. Ad hominen frames, according to Kruse (2001: 73) are “those that focus on the individual or group making the claims,” and are identified as either positive or negative to indicate their implied support for, or opposition to social movement organizations’ mission. In terms of the tone used to discuss animal rights organizations, Kruse (2001: 73) identifies positive ad hominen frames as “conquered hero, minimizer, and martyr/victim,” whereas negative ad hominen frames include “terrorist/criminal, warped priorities, extremist, and agitator.”

Kiousis (2004) also examines the tone of media coverage. In addition to investigating both positive and negative tone, Kiousis takes into account the ways in which journalistic coverage projects a neutral tone. Using three kinds of tone, Kiousis operationalizes media tone by classifying all *New York Times* articles as positive, negative, or neutral. Trained coders were given a coder sheet that asked each individual whether, from the perspective of a typical newsreader, they would view the story as positive, negative, or neutral. In addition to assessing the tone of each individual article, the author also utilized three sets of indicators to add nuance to this tone measure. The first indicator gauged the total number of relevant stories per month that were positive, negative or neutral. The second indicator measured the number of front-page stories per month that were positive, neutral, or negative. The last and final indicator collapsed the number of positive and negative stories into a single measure that gauged the total number of stories—that is, the number of stories with a positive, negative, or neutral tone.
Standing of Media Coverage

In addition to assessing whether journalistic coverage of social movements depicts activists in a positive, negative, or neutral manner, social movement scholars have also taken into account the standing of movement organizations. The concept of standing refers to the extent to which social movement organizations have a voice in the media and are seen as a “regular media source whose interpretations are directly quoted” (Ferree et al. 2002: 13). Standing does not simply refer to receiving any form of media coverage; rather, standing refers to a group being treated as an “actor with a voice, not merely an object” discussed by others (Ferree et al. 2002: 13). While social movement organizations may receive media attention, coverage often only describes or criticizes the actions and goals of activists and does not provide them with the opportunity to provide their own interpretation or meanings to the events covered through direct quotes.

In terms of measuring the concept of standing, scholars (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Ferree et al. 2002) have operationalized standing as the number of times movement actors are quoted or paraphrased in the media. In previous research, movement scholars such as Ferree and her colleagues (2002) have assessed standing by the frequency of media coverage that movement organizations receive, regardless of the specific content. For example, in their comparison of abortion discourse in the United States and Germany, Ferree et al. operationalize standing as number of times abortion social movement organizations and individual activists are quote in German and U.S. newspapers. While standing does not always present movements with the opportunity to interject their preferred frame on a distinct subjective manner, the conceptual framework of standing stresses the broader opportunities the mass media provide in terms of movement groups making substantive comments about a specific issue or concern.
Even if movement actors achieve media standing, there is no guarantee that journalists will produce coverage that organizations desire; coverage, for instance, could still be negative. As noted by Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993), the movement-media relationship is characterized by a constant struggle over standing. Journalists serve as gatekeepers who are ultimately in charge of deciding whether movement actors are granted standing and determining who will be quoted. Receiving standing in the media is often a necessary condition before movement organizations are viewed as legitimate players by political elite and other individuals in power (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993). Below I discuss an additional measure, movement actors expressing movement frames in the mass media.

Framing of Media Coverage

In addition to measuring movements’ standing, scholars have also assessed the quality of media coverage by taking into account whether organizations’ preferred frames are amplified by the media. According to social movement scholars (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Ferree et al. 2002; Rohlinger 2002; Ryan et al. 2005), once movements have been granted standing, they are more successful when it comes to getting their messages across and having their preferred frames articulated by the mass media. Although movement organizations must typically first achieve media standing before they are able to have their frames amplified by the media, standing alone does not ensure that movement organizations’ preferred frames are included in journalistic coverage.

Scholars interested in the relationship between movements and the media argue that studying movement frames appearing in the media is crucial, since the media reflect and contribute to the creation of a public discourse and broader social understandings. Framing is a social movement concept that acknowledges the role the mass media have in terms of shaping
cultural discourse. Frames themselves “assign meaning to and interpret relevant events and conditions in ways that are intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists” (Snow and Benford 1988: 198). Rather than just measuring the media standing of social movement organizations, the concept of framing assesses the ways in which collective actors themselves articulate their interpretations of specific social or political events, and the degree to which journalists incorporate these movement frames into their reporting. This perspective highlights the agency that activists can exert on the mass media.

In an effort to empirically assess how social movement frames are portrayed by the mass media, scholars have often investigated whether the preferred frames of movements are amplified by the mass media (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Ferree et al. 2002). Preferred framing refers to the “prominence of a movement organization’s frame in media discourse on the specific issue of concern” (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993: 121). Andrews and Caren (2010) measure preferred movement framing by assessing whether the mass media include movements’ perspectives and arguments without any distortion. Rohlinger (2002) investigates the relationship between media standing and preferred framing by focusing on the media strategies of the National Organization for Women (NOW) and Concerned Women for American (CWA) in the wake of three critical discourse moments based on U.S. Supreme Court cases. These two organizations are ideologically opposed on the abortion issue itself, but as Rohlinger notes, are comparable in terms of their general structure, organizational resources, and media standing more broadly.

To assess the preferred frames and media packages of the two organizations, Rohlinger analyzed articles pertaining to NOW Times and CWA publications from 1985-1992 and counted
how often abortion was mentioned in each publication in relation to broader organizational issues. From these data, Rohlinger derived two frames and twenty-four preferred packages used by NOW and CWA. To assess whether the two organizations were able to successfully have their preferred frames covered by journalists, Rohlinger conducted content analysis of mainstream media after each of the three Supreme Court decisions. Rohlinger’s findings indicate that NOW was able to have its preferred frames amplified—and hence, had greater influence on the mass media—due to its strategic and conscious engagement with the mass media and its greater standing relative to CWA. In sum, research in communications and social movements suggests the various ways in which social movements can receive mass media attention and how actors can incorporate their movement frames in media coverage.

**Movement Organizational Factors**

There is an array of movement organizational factors that are likely to influence the quantity and quality of mass media coverage. These factors include the organizational identity of social movement organizations, the resources that movement organizations possess, as well as media tactics employed by movement groups to gain media attention. By taking into account the organizational identity, resources, and tactics of social movement groups, scholars are able to account for the role that movement organizational factors have in shaping the media coverage of social movement groups.

*Organizational Identity*

Several social movement scholars (Carmin and Balser 2002; Rohlinger 2002; McCammon 2012) have empirically demonstrated the important role that collective identity has on movement organizations’ structures, tactics, and broader strategies. Carmin and Balser
argue that social movements “view the sociopolitical, cultural, and natural environments through different cognitive filters,” which influences the ways in which movements process understanding of how social change occurs. The notion of organizational identity, which McCammon (2012: 48) defines as a “group’s core political values and assumptions,” closely resembles collective identity—that is, the sense of “we-ness” and “shared definition of a group that derives from members’ common interests, experiences and solidarity” (Taylor and Whittier 1992: 105); however, I argue that organizational identity is associated with specific movement organizations rather than spanning across multiple groups, or even an entire movement, as collective identity theorists have previously demonstrated.

The organizational identity of social movement groups has broad implications since a movement group’s identity simultaneously reflects and shapes the behavior of its members and the collective identity it presents to others (Clemens 1993). Moreover, a movement’s organizational identity is reflected in mission statements, organizational documents, and public statements, which the broader public associates with a specific social movement. In addition to structuring the collective identity of members, the organizational identity of social movement groups can provide self-imposed boundaries for acceptable group actions (e.g., insider vs. outsider tactics), as well as structure the collective action framing and “repertoire of preferred messages” for movement organizations (Rohlinger 2002: 481).

One of the few scholars to examine the role that organizational identity has on mass media attention of movement groups is Rohlinger (2002), who empirically examines the organizational identities of the National Organization for Women (NOW) and Concerned Women for America (CWA). Rohlinger argues that organizational identity affects the prospects of movements gaining mainstream media attention. Specifically, she notes that organizations
with elaborate identities—that is, organizations that possess greater flexibility in terms of their language and ability to frame their issues of concern (Snow and Benford 1992)—are more likely to gain media coverage since they draw on broad and culturally resonate themes. In contrast to elaborate identities, movement organizations with restricted identities exhibit speech that is “rigidly organized and particularistic” and, in turn, are more predictable which often decreases the likelihood that a movement organization will receive mainstream mass media attention (Snow and Benford 1992: 139; Rohlinger 2002).

When it comes to issues related to abortion, Rohlinger (2002) demonstrates that the organizational identities of NOW and CWA shaped their framing of abortion, which influenced the amount and type of coverage the two organizations received. Whereas CWA frames the issue of abortion in terms of “morality,” arguing that citizens are obligated to uphold Christian values—including the sanctity of human life—NOW frames the issue of abortion in terms of “rights,” arguing that women have a constitutional right to abortion. Rohlinger discerns that CWA frame is restricted while the NOW frame is elaborated. Drawing on a sample of news articles from the *New York Times*, *Newsweek*, *Nation*, and *National Review* published in the wake of three critical discourse moments based on U.S. Supreme Court cases, Rohlinger finds that NOW’s elaborate identity and framing of abortion as a fundamental right resulted in greater media attention—nearly 50% of all news articles incorporated NOW’s rights frame in their coverage. Not only did NOW receive more mainstream media attention relative to CWA, but it also was more likely to have its preferred frames included in mass media coverage. Ultimately, Rohlinger’s (2002) research demonstrates the crucial role that organizational identity has on movement framing, which in turn, influences the type and amount of mass media attention organizations receive.
When it comes to garnering mass media attention, I argue that the organizational identity of a group influences the type and amount of media coverage they receive. Given that the origins of journalism emphasize objective reporting (Gans 1979; Gitlin 1980), and that journalists seek sources that will appeal to the broader public, I posit that organizations that embrace an elaborate identity and exhibit frames that appeal to the broader public will not only receive greater mass media attention, but the mass media attention they receive will include their preferred frames relative to their organizational counterparts who possess restrictive collective identities.

Organizational Resources

While the identity of a social movement organization plays a crucial role when it comes to attaining media coverage, scholars have also accounted for variation in media coverage by taking into account the resources that movement groups possess. Previous literature has identified a variety of organizational resources, including the size, finances, and location of movement groups, in an attempt to explain why some movement organizations are more successful when it comes to gaining mass media attention (Oliver and Meyer 1999; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010). By acknowledging the role that organizational resources play, movement scholars have often adopted a resource mobilization framework.

In contrast to theories of collective grievances, resource mobilization depends more upon “political, sociological, and economic theories than upon the social psychology of collective behavior” (McCarthy and Zald 1977: 1213). Originally seeking to provide a response to Olson’s (1965) “free rider” problem, which posits that few individuals will actively work towards obtaining the collective goods of social movement themselves, McCarthy and Zald (1977) introduce the theory of resource mobilization to examine the phenomenon of collective action by examining the resources that social movement organizations possess.
Adopting a more institutional approach to social movement organizations, resource mobilization emphasizes societal support and constraint by investigating the “variety of resources that must be mobilized, the linkages of social movements to other groups, the dependence of movements upon external support for success, and the tactics used by authorities to control or incorporate movements” (McCarthy and Zald 1997: 1213). This perspective allows scholars to analyze social movements in terms of organizational dynamics similar to other forms of institutional action. More specifically, resource mobilization theory views social movements as “normal, rational, institutionally rooted, political challenges by aggrieved groups” (Buechler 1993: 218). This framework often blurs the line between special-interest groups and social movement organizations; however, Buechler (1993) argues that while social movement organizations may have access to political elites, special interest groups have more routine and low-cost access to powerful decision-makers and overall greater influence.

In addition to viewing social movements as rational organizations, resource mobilization theory adopts a distinct perspective with regard to the type of resources that social movement organizations possess. As noted by several movement scholars (McCarthy and Zald 1977; Jenkins 1983; Buechler 1993), key resources such as knowledge, money, labor, solidarity, legitimacy, and support from powerful elites play a role in determining whether movements are able to successfully achieve their desired outcomes. Communications and movement scholars have also argued that the location of movement organizations shapes its ability to garner mass media attention. For example, Oliver and Meyer (1999) note that movement group’s geographical proximity of protest events to media outlets increase likelihood of media coverage, given that it is much easier for reporters to include movement groups in their daily routines and coverage if they are in the same geographical area.
Broadly speaking, movement resources can be divided into tangible and intangible resources (Jenkins 1983). Tangible resources include assets such as money, facilities, size, time, and means of communication, while intangible assets are those “human assists that form as the central basis for movements” and include both “specialized resources such as organizing and legal skills, and the unspecialized labor of supporters” (Jenkins 1983: 533). When it comes to achieving social change, the strategies and tactics pursued by social movement activists are often tied to their support base and the resources that the organization possesses.

Scholars interested in the relationship between movements and the media argue that organizational resources impact that type and amount of coverage that movement groups receive (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010). This perspective allows scholars to investigate what types of organizational resources are most important for movement groups that seek to gain media coverage. Adopting this approach, Amenta and his colleagues (2009) investigate why some social movement organization receive more coverage by the New York Times throughout the 20th Century. In accordance with a resource mobilization framework, Amenta et al. argue that movement organizations with the most extensive resources (e.g., number of members, longevity of movement, etc.) should receive the most extensive coverage. The authors emphasize that media coverage is determined by the size of social movement organizations since “newspapers tend to view their reporting as reflecting main tendencies in social trends” (Amenta et al. 2009: 638).

Drawing on a sample of New York Times articles that mentioned more than 1,200 individual social movement organizations from 34 different movement organization families, the authors examine the role of resources in predicting the likelihood that the mass media will cover the protest actions of social movement organizations. Amenta and his colleagues posit that the
greater number of members a movement organization has (as well as the number of organizations available for coverage), the greater the mass media coverage. In their analysis, the authors empirically illustrate the importance of movement resources, specifically the size of movements and the number of organizations included in a movement organization family. For example, the authors find that the AFL-CIO was the social movement organization that received the most media coverage during the span of the 20th Century—nearly three times as many mentions in the New York Times. The authors’ findings demonstrate that disparities in media coverage can often be explained in part by movement resources such as the number of members and social movements within a broader movement organization family.

Andrews and Caren (2010) echo this sentiment in their investigation of media coverage of environmental organizations in North Carolina. These authors seek to answer why some movement organizations are more successful than others when it comes to gaining media attention by focusing on organizational characteristics. To examine the factors that account for media coverage, Andrews and Caren combine two primary data sources: 1) organizational survey data from a representative sample of 187 local environmental organizations in North Carolina, and 2) complete media coverage of the 187 organizations in 11 major daily North Carolina newspapers from 2004 to 2005. The first data source allowed the authors to account for various organizational characteristics such as the longevity of organizations and number of staff, while the second source allowed the authors to assess when and what type of media coverage the organizations received.

In terms of the analyzing media coverage, Andrews and Caren conducted electronic newspaper searches for the 11 daily newspapers using NewsBank’s collection America’s Newspapers, which permits full-text online searches. For each of the 11 organizations, the
authors searched on the organization name (including all known variations) and distinguished between several types of media coverage including news stories, editorials, op-ed articles, letters to the editor, and other references to each organization. In total, the authors examined 2,095 newspaper articles and chose to include only news stories, editorials, and op-eds since they confer the organizations legitimacy in the eyes of the media.

Adopting a resource mobilization framework, movement scholars interested in the movement organizational factors that influence mass media coverage focus on several dimensions of organizations including the age of movement groups, the size of the staff, the number of the organization’s committees and its members, and organizational networks. In line with the work of previous scholars (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Amenta et al. 2009) who argue that the greater resources movement organizations possess, the greater likelihood that a movement organization will receive media coverage, Andrews and Caren (2010: 846) posit that “older organizations with greater staff, formal committees, networks, and members” will ultimately “gain a larger share of media attention.” Andrews and Caren measure organizational age as the number of years since founding and estimate the staff size of each organization by combining respondents’ report for the number of full time and part time staff. To operationalize organizations’ formal structure, Andrews and Caren measure the number of task committees, while they assess membership with estimates of individual members. Lastly, the authors measure organization’s networks by assessing whether the movement group is part of a local or national organization, and whether it is engaged in coalitions with any other environmental organizations.

Andrews and Caren (2010) find that movement groups that possess greater organizational resources achieve greater media coverage than their more grassroots counterparts. Not only do greater organizational resources help foster and maintain relationships with the mass media, but
the authors find that social movement groups are better able to signal the legitimacy of the organization and their broader claims to mass media organizations. The size of movements and the number of constituents associated with movement organizations continue to be key predictors when it comes to assessing the influence of organizational resources on media coverage. In accordance with Amenta and his colleagues (2009), Andrews and Caren (2010) find that membership “signals the broader interest and newsworthiness of a group’s claims and activities” (857). The work of Andrews and Caren, as well as Amenta et al. illustrate the crucial role that organizational resources have when it comes to accounting for why some movement groups are more successful in garnering mass media attention.

**Media Tactics**

Social movement organizations have adopted an array of tactics and strategies in an attempt to increase their media standing and overall ability to garner media attention. According to Rohlinger (2006: 538), these tactics include “issuing press releases, holding press conferences, and providing journalists with a steady stream of research and information about their issues, organizational activities, and goals.” Although these tactics are strategically employed in an attempt for movement organizations to portray themselves as a legitimate news source, movement groups must also remain innovative and utilize tactics that draw media attention to their organizations and cause (McCarthy et al. 1996).

Given that media coverage can account for whether organizations are able to achieve their desired goal, it is not surprising that movements have adopted an array of strategies in an attempt to control how they are portrayed by the mass media. For scholars interested in the relationship between movements and the media, public protests have provided ample opportunity to investigate the tactics associated with media coverage. In their investigation of the tactical
repertories of social movement organizations, Oliver and Myers (1999) examined the strategies that account for why some public protests receive greater media attention. The authors draw on police records (i.e., police logs and permits) from Madison, Wisconsin to develop their sampling frame of public collective events. Oliver and Myers compared their sample of police logs and permits to local newspaper coverage of protest events drawing on a sample of two daily newspapers. Using the LexisNexis database, the authors completed rigorous computerized searches for protest events using descriptors that appeared in the police records as keywords (i.e., actions, locations, and participating individuals or groups). Of the 121 events that received newspaper coverage, each article that specifically mentioned the protest event of interest was coded with a specific focus on the timely coverage of each event.

Oliver and Myers’ results demonstrate that the nature of the protest actions determines whether protest events receive media coverage, with dramatic protest receiving more coverage. According to the authors, there is a distinct contrast between conflictual and consensual protest events. For example, nearly 90% of all protest actions around conflictual issues received media coverage, whereas approximately 50% of events around consensual events achieved media attention. In addition to the nature of the protest issue, Oliver and Myers show that the size and strategic location of protest events shape media coverage. Protest events that occurred near downtown and around the state capital had a greater likelihood of gaining media attention. Additionally, the larger the size of the protest event—that is, the more movement activists engaged in marches and demonstrations—the greater the likelihood that the event received media coverage. The strategic location and number of activists engaged in protest action are just two examples of the tactics utilized by movement organizations that increase their media coverage.

7 The two local newspapers are 1) Capital Times and 2) Wisconsin State Journal.
Although movement scholars (McCarthy et al. 1996) have suggested that disruptive tactics better position movements to receive media attention, Oliver and Myers’ findings suggest that disorderly protests do not necessarily result in media coverage. By analyzing police permits and news media simultaneously, the authors find that unpermitted protests were less likely to receive coverage; furthermore, the number of police and nature of disruption was not associated with media attention. The assumption that disruptive actions result in media attention is based on a narrow interpretative of “newsworthiness.” According to Oliver and Myers, movement organizations that acquire the necessary permits and organize protests in centralized locations with a large number of constituents are viewed as newsworthy by the mass media, and in turn, are included as part of the media coverage.

While the broader literature has focused on the tactics of movement groups when it comes to garnering media attention, few scholars have empirically examined the media tactics that movement groups consciously employ in an attempt to gain media coverage. Media tactics, unlike conventional tactics employed by movement groups include all actions that “are intentionally designed to communicate a message to supporters, opponents, and/or broader publics through media venues” (Rohlinger 2006: 539). Unlike visible movement tactics such as protests and rallies, or conventional tactics like press releases and conferences, media tactics are strategically deployed with the goal of garnering media attention (Rohlinger 2006). Given the reach of modern mass media, as well as the power-dependency between movements and the media, scholars have outlined the media tactics that movements employ to increase their chances of garnering media attention.

According to Rucht (2004) there are four distinct strategies that movement organizations adopt when it comes to interacting with the mass media: 1) abstention, 2) attack, 3) adaptation,
and 4) alternatives. The first strategy reflects the absence of any engagement with the mass media. As noted by Rucht, the phenomenon of abstention is often the result of negative experiences that movements have encountered with the mass media. Rohlinger (2014) elaborates on this media tactic, arguing that silence on behalf of movement organizations is a deliberate and strategic choice. In her investigation of abortion politics and the mass media, Rohlinger finds that organizations often abstain from media attention in an effort to portray themselves as a moderate voice in controversial debates. For example, the National Right to Life Committee refused to speak with mainstream media during pro-life activist Paul Hill’s execution for the death of an abortion provider. This strategic silence on behalf of the National Right to Life Committee served as an attempt to distance itself from the ideologies of radical pro-life activists (Rohlinger 2014). Ferree and her colleagues (2002) further elaborate on the use of strategic silence by movement organizations in their investigation of abortion politics in Germany and the United States. The authors’ findings demonstrate that both pro-choice and pro-life organizations refused to interact with the mass media often as a result of negative experiences with mainstream media.

While some movement organizations choose to remain silent when it comes to interacting with the media, Rucht (2004) argues that movements may choose a second strategy, the choice of attacking the mass media, which often consists of an “explicit critique of, and sometimes even violent action against, the mass media” (31). Activists and movement organizations who feel that they are overlooked by the mass media, or misrepresented, may choose to critically engage with the media by writing letters to editors, or only speaking to a rival media organization who they believe will better represent their issue of concerns. For example, in his investigation of HIV/AIDS and social movement activism, Gamson (1989) finds that organizations, specifically
ACT UP, were vocal with their critiques of the mass media portrayal of the AIDS epidemic during the late 1980s.

In addition to confronting and directly critiquing the mass media, Rucht identifies a third media strategy, which involves adapting movements’ interactions with the mass media to align with the media’s structure and norms. According to Rucht, this is often accomplished by employing public relations specialists who know how to interact with the mass media. This media strategy is often associated with more established and formalized organizations that possess the necessary resources to hire external personnel.

The last and final media strategy involves movement organizations that strategically develop their own internal media—that is, media produced exclusively by social movement organizations that bypasses mainstream media organizations—in an attempt to overcome the lack of interest and/or bias the media display. This is often achieved through the use of direct media, as well as social media produced by movement organizations. According to Rohlinger (2014), movements favor direct media—that is, social movement media over which social movement organizations have complete control, and sometimes even ownership over the medium and content—as a way to bypass mainstream mass media in an effort to directly interject their issues of concern into the broader public discourse. For example, movements may choose to solely engage in direct mediums via their own organizational websites, newsletters, pamphlets, blogs, and radio stations (Rohlinger 2014).

Of the four strategies outlined above, abstention and developing media alternatives to mainstream media result in inwardly directed activities of movement organizations, whereas attack and adaptation result in movement groups directly engaging with the mass media (Rucht 2004). It is important to further note that these four media strategies are not mutually exclusive;
rather in an increasingly media savvy environments movements are employing media strategies utilizing multiple tactics (Rucht 2004; McCurdy 2012; Rohlinger 2014). According to Rohlinger (2014), social movements are embracing a strategic action approach—that is, organizations are employing multiple media tactics simultaneously in an attempt to increase their ability to receive media coverage.

**Broad Environmental Factors**

In addition to the various movement organizational factors that influence mass media attention, the broad environmental context in which movement groups are embedded plays a crucial role in determining the presence or absence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage. While previous movement scholars (Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010; Rohlinger 2014) have examined the relationship between movement organizations and mass media coverage, they have not yet fully incorporated the broader environmental context into their theoretical explanations of how movement groups influence mass media coverage. By taking into account shifts in the political and discursive media environment, scholars are able to account for the role that broad environmental factors have in shaping the media coverage of movement groups (McCurdy 2012; Rohlinger 2014).

**Political Opportunities**

The notion that social movements do not exist in a social vacuum serves as the foundation for the political opportunity perspective, which posits that social movement success is ultimately dependent on the availability of political opportunities—that is, instances in which the existing political system is vulnerable to challenges posed by constituents, creating an opportunity for movement actors to alter the political landscape (McAdam 1996, 1999; Meyers
and Minkoff 2004). The core premise behind political opportunity perspective is that the political system provides opportunities and constraints that shape whether social movement organizations are successful in terms of achieving their desired outcomes. As noted by McAdam (1996), various shifts in the larger political context such as widespread demographic change, division among political elites, as well as the rise of political pluralism creates opportunities that allow movement actors to seek out the media and challenge previously held cultural beliefs.

From this perspective, movement scholars (Meyers and Minkoff 2004; Amenta et al. 2009) have argued that social movement organizations that possess ideological similar agendas as the political elite are more likely to receive media coverage than their ideologically divergent counterparts. For example, in their investigation of African American political mobilization and the presence of political opportunities, Meyers and Minkoff (2004) examine the relationship that the number of African Americans in Congress has on the civil rights movement and ability for civil rights groups to alter the political structure. With regard to the larger political context, scholars have noted that movement organizations are more likely to receive media coverage in light of major policy changes that favor movement organizations (Amenta and Young 1999). Given that political forces shape the mass media, shifts in the broader political environment influence the practices of the mass media, and ultimately, what issues are deemed “newsworthy” (Gamson and Wolsfeld 1993; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010).

---

8 Similar to political opportunities, legal opportunities are another broad environmental factor that shapes mass media coverage of movement organizations. Legal opportunities share the same underlying features as political opportunities, in the sense that they reflect instances in which the existing legal system is vulnerable to challenges posed by constituents, creating an opportunity for movement actors to alter the legal landscape (Hilson 2002). In my dissertation research, it is possible that I will take into account the role of litigation and legislation on shaping the mass media coverage of AVAWOs.

9 Similar to examining the relationship between African Americans in Congress and the availability of political opportunities for the civil rights movement, I argue that scholars can examine the relationship between the number of women in Congress and the availability of political opportunities for AVAWOs who are trying to achieve political change.
When it comes to the relationship between social movements and mass media coverage, the political opportunity perspective identifies several factors that account for why some movement organizations are more successful when it comes to shaping media coverage and altering public discourse. The broader political environment not only creates opportunities for movement groups to achieve media coverage, as is the case with presidential elections (Sobieraj 2010), but the larger political context directly shapes the tactics utilized by movement groups who hope to shape mass media discourse. For example, movement scholars including Rohlinger (2006, 2014) have empirically demonstrated that social movements choose media tactics as a direct response to broader political conditions that present movement organizations with varying opportunities and constraints.

When it comes to examining the relationship between the mass media, movement strategies and tactics, and the larger political context, Rohlinger (2006) argues that the media provide movement groups, who may not have access to political institutions or elites, with an opportunity to draw attention to their “issues or political agendas, expand policy debates, influence policy-makers, and mobilize a broader public to action” (538). To empirically examine the relationship between political opportunities and media strategies of movement organizations, Rohlinger (2006) investigates how political opportunities affect the tactics of two opposing abortion movement organizations: Planned Parenthood Federation of American (PPFA) and the National Right to Life Committee (NRLC). To examine how the broader political context influences the media strategies of PPFA and NRLC, Rohlinger draws on several data sources including the organizational newsletters of the two organizations from 1980 to 2000, interviews with past and present activists, as well as archival data. Rohlinger began her data analysis by
reading the three organizational newsletters produced by PPFA and one produced by NRLC. In addition to coding all of the organizational newsletters, Rohlinger supplemented these data with interviews and archival data.

Rohlinger’s (2006) results illustrate how political opportunities and their counterparts affect the media tactics movement organizations utilize. In times of political opportunities, Rohlinger finds that movement organizations choose to remain silent, which allows groups to distance themselves from public debates that may tarnish their political legitimacy in the eyes of the political elite. For example, the National Right to Life Committee chose to remain silent when questioned about Operation Rescues’ direct action tactics, which resulted in the death of the abortion provider by the pro-life activist Paul Hill. The deliberate choice to not engage with the mass media is influenced by the political context. By not discussing the very public and political execution of Paul Hill for the murder of an abortion provider, the NRLC attempted to distance themselves from the radical ideologies of pro-life activists and larger political debates around reproductive rights and abortion politics (Rohlinger 2006).

In addition to choosing to engage in strategic silence (Rohlinger 2014), Rohlinger (2006) demonstrates how shifts in the political structure can influence the trajectory of movement tactics in other ways. For example, although Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) remained silent on partial-birth abortion debates in the late 1990s, Rohlinger finds that PPFA began to publicly challenge the legal and moral principals that upheld the ban by the early 2000s. Rohlinger attributes this change in media strategies to the shift in the broader political structure.

---

10 The three organizational newsletters for PPFA include: 1) The Communicator, which focuses on the people, program and issues of Planned Parenthood; 2) The Insider, which focuses on news and information for Planned Parenthood affiliates; and 3) Clergy Voices, which is a newsletter that consists of Christian and Jewish clergy who support Planned Parenthood and counter religious opposition. The one organizational newsletter for NRLC include: 1) National Right to Life News, which consisted of the issues and challenges NRLC encountered.
More specifically, she argues that the election of Bill Clinton, a pro-choice president, allowed PPFA to distance itself from the public debate and focus on abortion access more generally. It was not until the political opportunity structure shifted with the election of George Bush, a pro-life president, that PPFA began to engage with the mass media in an attempt to amplify its perspective to directly challenged the legal arguments that served as the foundation to the partial-birth abortion ban. This example demonstrates that during political threats, as was the case with the partial-birth abortion ban, organizations such as PPFA strategically interact with the mass media in an attempt to amplify their issues of concern, while simultaneously working to advance their own political goals.

Although silence is a powerful media strategy, Rohlinger notes that silence is not always a viable option for social movement organizations. When individual activists or organizational allies engage in actions that spur public and political outrage, movements must react in order to not have their entire organization delegitimized. For example, when young pro-life activists turned to militant tactics after it became clear that Reagan was not seeking to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, individual activists began to engage in violent actions against abortion providers and clinics. As violent actions increased across the country, pro-choice organizations including PPFA began to publicly criticize the pro-life movement, calling for the federal government to begin an investigation regarding the clinic violence. In response, pro-life leaders publicly refused to denounce the violent incidents, which was interpreted as support for the violence direct action tactics. Given the threat to the legitimacy and creditability of the National Right to Life Committee, members publicly renounced violence as a feasible tactic by engaging with the mass media in an attempt to sway other pro-life organizations.
Drawing on the examples of both PPFA and NRLC, Rohlinger illustrates the ways in which movement organizations’ media tactics are influenced by the broader political context and access to political elites. With the broader political environment in mind, Rohlinger (2006) argues that movement organizations “carefully weigh the costs and benefits of their actions in both the political and media arenas” (555). As noted by Ferree and her colleagues (2002), as well as Ryan et al. (2005), achieving media standing is increasingly challenging in the media arena; as such, Rohlinger (2006) argues that movement organizations are often willing to remain silent on issues of concern and instead let elected officials or organizational allies directly interact with the mass media while they work behind the scenes to achieve specific political goals. The work of Rohlinger (2006) demonstrates the ways in which the broader political environment shapes the tactics and media strategies employed by movement organizations that seek to achieve mass media coverage.

Although Rohlinger (2006, 2014) examines the relationship between social movement organizations and the broader political context in which they are embedded, she does not take into account the array of movement organizational factors that shape media coverage of social movements. Expanding upon the work of Rohlinger and other movement scholars, I posit that political opportunities shape the mass media coverage of movement organizations in two distinct ways. First, political opportunities present a set of external circumstances, such as election cycles or a Democratic advantage in Congress, which may directly influence the media coverage of movements. Second, the influence of a movement’s organizational identity, resources, and tactics on media coverage of the movement group may be also influenced by a shift in the political context. That is, when a political opportunity exists, movement organizations may be
more capable of influencing mass media coverage; when a political opportunity does not exist, the movement organization may be less capable of influencing mass media coverage.

**Discursive Media Opportunities**

In addition to acknowledging that social movements’ ability to achieve their desired goals depends on the opportunities and constraints provided by the broader political structure, scholars (Gamson and Meyer 1996; Koopmans and Olzak 2004; Vliegenhart et al. 2005) have noted that political opportunities are subject to interpretation or framing before they can influence organizations’ decisions. This perspective posits that the mass media mediates the relationship between “political opportunity structures and collective action by interpreting and framing the political opportunity structure” (Vliegenhart et al. 2005: 396). Koopmans and Olzak (2004) identify the opportunities and constraints that become visible and affect organizational mobilization as discursive opportunities.

Although political perspective scholars have identified a multitude of political opportunities, all of which are characteristic of the formal political structures and its capacities, they have overlooked the role that other broader contextual social and cultural dynamics play in terms of impacting movement outcomes, as well as the factors that foster a receptive political environment (McCammon et al. 2001). These social and cultural factors work in conjunction with the broader political structure (McCammon et al. 2007). To understand broader cultural process, in particular, social movement scholars have investigated the role of cognition—that is, the “words we use, the beliefs we have about the world, the claims we make about how the world is, and the distinctions we draw between one thing and the other.” (Jasper 2014: 7). From this perspective, the idea of culture and ability for movements to foster cultural change is often dependent on the broader discursive structure in which movements are embedded.
The notion of culture as a distinct form of cognition often manifests itself through the phenomenon of movement framing. As noted by Snow and Benford (1988), the process of framing describes the ways in which collective actors articulate their interpretations of a specific social or political issue. This perspective highlights the agency that movement actors possess when they vocalize their concerns. These articulations are referred to as “collective action frames.” Among movement actors, collective action frames organize individual experiences in ways that are “intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystanders support, and to demobilize antagonists” (Snow and Benford 1988: 198). In terms of social movement organizations, collective action frames are identified as a set of action-oriented beliefs and meanings that serve as a vehicle to legitimate social movement actors and draw potential constituents to the movement organization.

McCammon and her colleagues (2007) argue that in order to more fully understand the ways in which certain social movement organizations achieve their desired outcomes, one must acknowledge not only the content of the frames articulated by movement actors, but the broader circumstances in which the framing takes place. A large component of successful framing on behalf of social movement actors is a result of aligning movement frames with the broader cultural context in which actors are embedded. The cultural opportunities and constraints that become publicly visible, and in turn influence mobilization, are known as discursive opportunity structures. In the case of social movements, collective actors must be able to incorporate or respond to critical discursive elements that comprise the larger political and cultural environment (McCammon et al. 2007). Discursive opportunity structures ultimately influence movement actors’ ability to recognize these strategic opportunities (Koopmans and Olzak 2004; McCammon et al. 2007).
Whereas political opportunity structures are founded on the notion that social movements’ ability to mobilize constituents is dependent on political opportunities that foster or hinder movement activism, such as electoral instability, government composition, and elite division (McAdam 1996), discursive opportunity theorists emphasize the importance of cultural and political ideas that are viewed as realistic and legitimate by the broader public (Koopmans and Statham 1999; Koopmans and Olzak 2004). In order for movements’ collective action frames to be received by their targeted audience, the frames must provide an understanding of the salient beliefs, values, and ideologies that comprise the broader cultural context (Gamson 1989). Discursive opportunity structures embody these broader cultural beliefs and attitudes, and as such, movement actors must seek to strategically define their frames in ways that will resonate with the beliefs and values held by their intended audience—that is, movement actors must articulate frames that possess cultural resonance (Snow and Benford 1988). The concept of cultural resonance illustrates the need for movements’ frames to align with society’s values and principles, which are reflected in the properties of the frame itself (Ferree 2003). In short, discursive opportunity structures serve as a useful tool for understanding which and when movement frames are the most receptive.

To empirically assess the relationship between discursive opportunity structures and movements’ strategic framing, McAmmon and her colleagues (2007) draw on a sample of U.S. women’s jury movements who united in an attempt to convince lawmakers to broaden jury laws and give women the opportunity to sit on juries. Drawing on a sample of 15 states, the authors utilize primary archival data for each state. McAmmon and her colleagues constructed a quantitative data set using a variety of manuscript collections, particularly those that focused on women’s organizations spearheading campaigns, as well as the personal papers of activists and
politicians at the time. The authors combined these primary data sources with local newspaper coverage, articles from women’s periodicals, legal and political documents, as well as a number of secondary sources.

To understand the ways in which discursive media opportunity structures function, McCammon and her colleagues identify three distinct aspects of discursive opportunities that can account for variation in social movement outcomes: 1) stability of a discursive opportunity, 2) resonance of a discursive opportunity, and 3) movement actors’ response to a discursive opportunity. According to McCammon et al., the first component that influences movement outcomes is the stability of discursive opportunity structures. In the same way that some political opportunity structures can be stable or volatile (Gamson and Meyer 1996), discursive opportunity structures can also be stable or mutable. Highly stable discursive opportunity structures, according to McCammon and colleagues (2007), are discourses that are long-lived and deeply embedded in the broader culture. Volatile discursive opportunity structures, on the other hand, are exemplified as salient discursive elements that are just emerging or only available for a short period of time (McCammon et al. 2007). Unlike their more stable counterparts, volatile discursive opportunities occur when there is shifting political and/or social circumstances that alter the political and social structure. Volatile discursive opportunity structures often are the result of emergent political opportunities (McAdam 1999; McCammon et al. 2007). As noted by McCammon and her colleagues (2007), it is possible that both stable and changing elements in the broader discursive environment occur simultaneously since the broader cultural environment is not comprised of one single discursive opportunity structure, but rather, is the result of multiple, often overlapping, discourses than range in terms of their stability and longevity.
In addition to the degree of stability of discursive opportunity structures, McCammon et al. (2007) identifies a second feature of discursive opportunity structures, which is the idea that the resonance of a discursive opportunity plays a crucial role in determining the outcomes of movement framing. As noted above, the concept of resonance in relation to framing refers to the credibility of a movements’ claim, as well as the validity of the frame in light of the broader cultural discourse (Benford and Snow 1988). Given that the broader cultural context is comprised of multiple, overlapping discourses, discursive opportunities themselves are inherently selective (Ferree 2003). This competitive environment can mean that some movements’ frames will resonate more than others with the broader cultural discourse. The likelihood that a movements’ collective action frame will resonate with the discursive field in which movement actors are embedded is dependent on movements’ ability to strategically utilize resonant frames that “tap into the vocabulary, underlying principles, and narratives of salient discourses in the broader cultural environment” (McCammon et al. 2007: 732). The level of resonance of movements’ frame is ultimately dependent on the discursive opportunity structure that can provide more receptive environment for some movement discourse.

The last and final factor that influences social movement organizations’ ability to influence mass media coverage is the ways in which movement actors respond to the discursive field itself. As noted by McCammon and her colleagues (2007), although discursive opportunity structures are contingent on the broader cultural context, the receptivity of the discursive field is actually contingent on movement actors who play an active role in determining how to respond to discursive opportunities. While movement actors may recognize the development of an opportunity within the broader discursive field, it does not necessarily entail that they will capitalize on it. According to McCammon et al. (2007), movement actors can strategically
present their collective action frame to “fit with the critical elements in the broader discursive context,” and, if they do so, in turn, they are more likely to be successful in achieving their desired outcomes (732).

Although McCammon and her colleagues (2007) focus on movements’ ability to capitalize on discursive opportunities and employ frames that are politically persuasive with the hope of altering the law, her theoretical framework can also be applied to broader cultural outcomes such as shaping mass media discourse. Given that the mass media are illustrative of the public’s attitudes and beliefs (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993), movement groups must be able to capitalize on what I call “discursive media opportunities.” Expanding on Chilton’s (1987: 7) concept of critical discursive moments, which he defines as “acts in discourses that contradict the rights or beliefs or values” of activists and movement organizations, I argue that discursive media opportunities represent specific events or social issues that challenge hegemonic cultural attitudes embedded and facilitated by the mass media. For movement groups who seek to gain mass media coverage, they must be able to recognize these discursive media opportunities and capitalize on the chance to interject their voice into this emerging discursive structure.

I posit that the broader discursive media structure shapes the mass media coverage of movement organizations in two distinct ways. First, discursive media structures present a set of external circumstances, such as the coverage of Title IX violations by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights, which may directly influence the media coverage of movements. Second, the influence of a movement’s organizational identity, resources, and tactics on media coverage of movement groups may also be influenced by a shift in the discursive media structure. That is, when a discursive media opportunity exists, movement
organizations may be more capable of influencing mass media coverage; when a discursive media opportunity does not exist, the movement organization may be less capable of influencing mass media coverage.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Previous research has examined the influence that movement organizational and broad environmental factors when accounting for why some social movement organizations are better able to achieve their desired outcomes. This research examines why AVAWOs are able to alter mass media discourse by simultaneously identifying movement organizational, as well as broad environmental factors that account for why some groups are more successful than others with regards to not only gaining mass media coverage but also receiving greater quantity and quality of mass media coverage. Through identifying the limitations in the existing literature on movement outcomes, as well as the relationship between social movements and the mass media, an opportunity emerges to contribute to scholarly understanding of how social movement organizations shape media discourse. More specifically, this research expands beyond past scholarship that has largely focused on factors, such as organizational resources, that account for presence or absence of coverage by empirically investigating the influence that both movement organizational and the broader political and discursive media environment have with regards to quantity and quality of media coverage that anti-violence organizations receive. With this in mind, my dissertation is guided by three overarching research questions and nine hypotheses:

1) What social movement organizational factors account for the quantity and quality of mass media coverage of anti-violence-against-women organizations (AVAWOs)? I identify three hypotheses:
**H1:** AVAWOs with broad organizational identities will receive greater overall quantity and quality of coverage relative to AVAWOs with focused organizational identities.

**H2:** AVAWOs with greater organizational resources will receive greater quantity and quality of coverage relative to AVAWOs with fewer organizational resources.

**H3:** AVAWOs that adopt media tactics will receive greater quantity and quality of coverage relative to AVAWOs that do not adopt media tactics.

2) What broad environmental factors account for the presence or absence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage of AVAWOs? I identify three hypotheses:

**H4:** The presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress will have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a Democratic advantage in Congress will result not only in greater odds of AVAWOs being included in coverage, but greater quantity and quality of coverage.

**H5:** The mention of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address will have a lagged effect, such that news item published in the year following mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address will result not only in greater odds of AVAWOs being included in coverage, but greater quantity and quality of coverage.

**H6:** The presence of discursive media opportunities will have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a greater frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women will result not only in greater odds of AVAWOs being included in coverage, but greater quantity and quality of coverage.

3) How do social movement organizational factors and broad environmental factors interact with one another to influence both the quantity and quality of mass media attention that AVAWOs receive? I identify three hypotheses:

**H7:** Political and discursive media opportunities will moderate the relationship between organizational identity and mass media coverage, such that AVAWOs that possess broad organizational identities will receive greater quantity and quality of coverage in the year following the presence of political opportunities and greater frequency of discursive media opportunities.

**H8:** Political and discursive media opportunities will moderate the relationship between organizational resources and mass media coverage, such that AVAWOs that possess greater organizational resources will receive greater quantity and quality of
coverage in the year following the presence of political opportunities and greater frequency of discursive media opportunities.

**H9:** Political and discursive media opportunities will moderate the relationship between the use of media tactics and mass media coverage, such that AWAWOs that employ media tactics will receive greater quantity and quality of coverage in the year following the presence of political opportunities and greater frequency of discursive media opportunities.

**Conclusion**

This chapter presented a detailed overview of the previous sociological literature that examines the relationship between social movements, mass media, and cultural change. I began with a review of social movement outcomes, then moved to an overview of cultural outcomes, followed by a discussion of the ways previous scholars have conceptualized mass media with regards to social movement organizations. I concluded the literature review with a discussion of the various movement organizational and broad environmental factors that previous scholars have argued influence not only the presence of media coverage, but the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that social movement organizations receive. This literature review was followed by my three research questions and the nine hypotheses that guide my dissertation. The next chapter explores the research design, data, and methods utilized to assess the ways in which anti-violence organizations strategically influence and alter the media discourse around violence against women.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN, DATA, AND METHODS

To empirically examine how social movement organizational and broad environmental factors influence the mass media coverage of movement groups, I drew on mass media coverage of anti-violence-against-women organizations (AVAWOs), with a focus on eight specific AAVWOs. In the following discussion, I describe my period of analysis, the eight AAVWOs included in my research, the data collection process, my independent and dependent variables, and lastly, my methodological approach that allowed me to assess the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that shape the presence, quantity, and quality of coverage anti-violence organizations received.

Period of Analysis

To capture the recent shift in the mass media discourse pertaining to violence against women, my period of analysis begins in January 2011 and extends until December 2015. This period was chosen for three reasons. First, the resurgence of the anti-violence-against-women movement has been tied to the publication of the “Dear Colleague Letter” by the United States Department of Education in 2011 (Heldman and Brown 2014). Second, this period captures the expansion of Title IX by Wendy Murphy, which spurred Annie Clark and Andrea Pino, both students at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, to file the first Title IX complaint with the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights (OCR) in 2013. This initial complaint resulted in the formal investigation of numerous colleges and universities across the country for Title IX violations (U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights 2014). Third, this period takes into account the founding of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault by President Barack Obama in 2014, as well as the successful passage of the
“Yes Means Yes” legislation by California and New York in 2014 and 2015, respectively. I therefore begin my study in 2011 and end it by continuing until 2015.\(^\text{11}\)

**Anti-Violence-Against-Women Organizations**

To empirically examine the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that shape mass media coverage of social movement organizations, I examined the media coverage of eight different anti-violence-against-women organizations (AVAWOs).\(^\text{12}\) The eight organizations included in my analysis focus on issues related to domestic violence and sexual assault, and concentrates efforts at the national level. These eight organizations include: 1) End Rape on Campus, 2) Know Your IX, 3) Students Active for Ending Rape, 4) Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, 5) National Network to End Domestic Violence, 6) National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 7) Futures without Violence, and 8) Break the Cycle.

I drew my sample of AVAWOs from the *Encyclopedia of Associations*, which is a comprehensive directory of more than 23,000 associations and non-profit organizations operating in the United States. From this list, I identified eight AVAWOs using three key criteria. First, I selected AVAWOs that operate at the national level, excluding anti-violence organizations that focus its efforts at the regional or local level. Second, I excluded all AVAWOs that solely provide social services for survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. These

\(^{11}\) Future analysis should extend this period of time until 2018 to capture the election of Donald Trump, the sexual harassment case levelled against Roger Ailes, the rise of #MeToo and other key events related to violence against women.

\(^{12}\) I originally identified 10 anti-violence against women organizations, but two of these organizations were eventually dropped from the analysis. Students Coalition Against Rape (SCAR) was excluded because there were only 5 news items that directly mentioned the AVAWO. NO MORE was excluded because its organizational structure differs relative to the other eight AVAWOs included in the analysis. More specifically, NO MORE is a coalition of leading advocacy groups, service providers, the U.S. Department of Justice, and major corporations who are committed to ending violence against women. Given that my dissertation focuses on the movement organizational factors that account for variation in the quantity and quality of coverage that AVAWOs received, it was crucial that all AVAWOs exhibited similar organizational structures.
types of AVAWOs often operate national domestic violence and sexual assault hotlines and focus its efforts on providing survivors with regional and local services such as housing and legal support. Third, I selected AVAWOs that have an established history of interacting with mass media organizations. To assess the previous media history of each AVAWO, I ran a search via Google News’ Archive using the names of AVAWOs that met the first two criteria to investigate the number of mass media news items that directly mentioned the name of each anti-violence organization. Anti-violence-against-women organizations that did not have an established media history were excluded from the sample. The following section describes in detail the eight different AVAWOs that met all three criteria and are included in my study.

*End Rape on Campus (EROC)*

End Rape on Campus (EROC), which was established in 2013 by Annie Clark and Andrea Pino. While enrolled at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, both Clark and Pino experienced separate incidences of sexual assault. It was not until the two women shared their stories with other female students that they realized the increasing number of sexual assaults taking place on UNC Chapel Hill’s campus (End Rape on Campus 2015). In an effort to address the increasing rates of sexual violence, Clark and Pino, along with two other women, jointly filed a Title IX complaint with the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR). The OCR is in charge of enforcing educational statutes, including Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. As part of its duties, the OCR evaluates, investigates and resolves complaints of sexual discrimination (U.S. Department of Education 2014).

Once Clark and Pino were informed that the ORC was going to open an investigation, they began mobilize and speak with other women across the country who were survivors of campus-based sexual violence. This dialogue was spurred by Clark and Pino’s strategic
engagement with mass media, which not only allowed the women to mobilize other survivors of sexual assault, but raise public awareness around the epidemic of college-based sexual violence. In 2013, Clark and Pino launched the anti-violence organization End Rape on Campus (EROC), which is a national survivor-run and student-driven organization that seeks to end sexual violence (End Rape on Campus 2015). Broadly speaking, the goals of EROC are to educate college students through its strategic engagement with the mass media about their rights to an education free from gender-based violence. Currently, EROC focuses on educating college women across the country about the merits of Title IX, assisting survivors of sexual violence in their complaints to the Department of Education OCR, and influencing mass media discourse around sexual assault and violence against women more broadly.

**Know Your IX (KYIX)**

The national survivor-run, anti-violence organization Know Your IX (KYIX) was co-founded in 2013 by Dana Bolger and Alexandra Brodsky. Bolger and Brodsky were college students at Amherst College and Yale University, respectively, when they were sexually assaulted on their campus. The two women came together through a close friend who introduced them to Title IX. Working together, Bolger and Brodsky founded Know Your IX, which strategically interacts with the mass media in order to educate college students in the United States about their rights under Title IX and sexual violence more broadly (Know Your IX 2015). KYIX focuses primarily on legal advocacy, with a focus on educational outreach around Title IX and federal and legislative reform.

In addition to mobilizing the law, KYIX is committed to challenging the notion that the anti-violence movement is a white, upper-middle class movement (Know Your IX 2015). Through engaging directly with journalists and media outlets, Bolger and Brodsky have created
a movement that seeks to alter the cultural landscape in relation to violence against women.

Similar to EROC, members of KYIX view the mass media as a crucial resource for disseminating their message and have published official guides for journalists who write about violence against women, specifically sexual violence on U.S. college campuses.

Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER)

Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER) originated as a student organization at Columbia University in 1999 with the goal of reforming the University’s sexual assault policy. At the time, Columbia University’s policy lacked key provisions to ensure appropriate and responsible handling of campus-based sexual violence, including educational programs, clear disciplinary procedures, and accurate statistics that represent the rate of sexual violence on their respective campus (Students Active for Ending Rape 2015). After a year-long campaign, which drew on a variety of tactics including student rallies and social media, SAFER made sexual assault policy reform a central issue on Columbia’s campus. As a result of the campaign, Columbia University adopted a comprehensive sexual assault policy and instituted a separate office devoted to sexual assault prevention and education (Students Active for Ending Rape 2015).

The success of SAFER’s campaign on Columbia’s campus led the group to establish a national student-led collective that seeks to provide educational assistance and outreach to students across the nation encountering issues of campus-based sexual violence. In 2000, SAFER became an official nonprofit organization and currently operates out of New York City. Broadly speaking, the goals of SAFER are to provide in-person workshops and training for student organizers across the country (Students Active For Ending Rape 2015). To facilitate these goals, representatives of SAFER are actively engaging with members of the mass media through
various media outlets. Currently, SAFER works with the mass media to bring awareness to the systemic problem of violence against women, specifically with regards to U.S. colleges and universities across the nation.

*Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN)*

The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN) is the nation’s largest anti-violence organization (Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network 2015). RAINN was founded in 1994 by Scott Berkowtiz and operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline through a partnership of 1,100 rape crisis centers across the United States. The mission of RAINN is to educate the public and provide resources for survivors of sexual violence. In addition to providing social services to survivors, RAINN also focuses on public policy initiatives and seeks to change federal and state legislative related to violence against women. RAINN is currently located in Washington D.C., and is a frequent resource for public policy makers who seek information on issues related to rape and sexual assault. As the nation’s largest anti-sexual violence organization, RAINN has developed a media strategy to ensure that it is included as part of the national discourse around violence against women.

*National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)*

The National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV) is one of the nation’s largest anti-domestic violence coalitions, which seeks to provide survivors of domestic violence with social and educational resources. Founded in 1995 and currently headquartered in Washington D.C., NNEDV has a network of state domestic violence coalitions and currently represents more than 2,000 member organizations nationwide (National Network to End Domestic Violence 2015). At the national level, NNEDV operates the U.S. National Domestic Violence Hotline,
which provides survivors of domestic violence with support and resources 24 hours a day. In addition to overseeing a domestic violence hotline, NNEDV also devotes its energy to public policy and making domestic violence a national priority. The organization has been involved with both federal and state domestic violence legislation and was a crucial organization in the reauthorization of the 1994 Violence Against Women Act. Similar to RAINN, NNEDV is a frequent resource for policy makers who focus on issues related to violence against women. As one of the nation’s foremost anti-domestic violence organizations, NNEDV has cultivated a media strategy that allows them to shape the larger cultural discourse around violence against women.

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) is one of the nation’s leading anti-violence organizations. Founded in 1978 and located in Washington D.C., NCADV grew out of the United States Commission on Civil Rights hearing on battered women (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence 2015). The mission of NCADV is to create a culture in which domestic violence is not tolerated and to foster a society that empowers both victims and survivors. Currently, NCADV focuses on several public policy initiatives that promote legislation to protect victims and survivors of domestic violence. In addition to collaborating with other anti-violence-against-women organizations on public policy initiatives, NCADV also provides direct support to survivors through a myriad of programs including the Cosmetic and Reconstructive Surgery Program, Remember My Name, as well as Hope & Power for Your Personal Finances (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence 2015). As one of the nation’s leading anti-violence-against-women organizations, NCADV often directly interacts with
members of the mass media to increase public awareness around issues related to domestic violence.

*Futures without Violence*

Futures without Violence has been actively working to promote policies and educational programs that empower individuals and organizations to end violence against women for the past 30 years (Futures without Violence 2015). With offices located in San Francisco, Washington D.C., and Boston, Futures without Violence works directly with medical, educational, and legal professionals to educate them about domestic violence and sexual assault. Led by Esta Soler, Futures without Violence was one of the driving forces behind the passage of the 1994 Violence Against Women Act (Futures without Violence 2015). In the past, Futures without Violence has collaborated with the Advertising Council to launch several Public Service Announcements related to violence against women (Futures without Violence 2015). As one of the nation’s leading public policy organizations for issues related to violence against women, Futures without Violence has cultivated a distinct media strategy when it comes to interacting with the mass media.

*Break the Cycle*

Break the Cycle is the nation’s leading anti-violence organization that focuses specifically on dating violence among young people between the ages of 12 and 24 (Break the Cycle 2015). The mission of Break the Cycle is to provide support and education young people about healthy dating relationship. Originally founded in 1996, Break the Cycle is currently located in Los Angeles and Washington D.C. Break the Cycle provides services for adolescent and young adults experiencing domestic violence (Break the Cycle 2015). Break the Cycle
advocates for policy and legislative changes to protect the rights and promote the health of young adults nationwide. As a member of the National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, Break the Cycle is part of a national coalition focused on developing effective public policy to address violence against women. In addition to focusing on federal legislation, Break the Cycle sponsors grassroots activism through various education programs including Love is Not Abuse, which works with local community members to implement teen dating violence education and polices throughout the community (Break the Cycle 2015). Break the Cycle often relies on the mass media to promote its educational programs and policies related to violence against women (Break the Cycle 2015).

**Data Collection**

To assess the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that shape mass media coverage of the eight AVAWOs included in my study, I employed a two-part data collection process. First, to empirically assess the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that each AVAWO received, I began by collecting mass media news items to construct two separate datasets. These news items were drawn from three types of mass media: 1) broadcast, 2) print, and 3) digital media. Drawing on these news items, I conducted a content analysis to assess for the presence, quantity, and quality of coverage and then used these codes to construct two datasets. The first dataset consisted of a stratified random sample of 300 news items that mention at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women (i.e., domestic violence, sexual assault, violence against women, and intimate partner violence) and allowed me to assess the presence or absence of coverage for the eight anti-violence
organizations included in my analysis. For this first dataset, it was the case that for some news items multiple AVAWOs were mentioned in the same news item. There were 17 news items in which there was more than one AVAWO mentioned, thus there were 317 separate cases that were included in my analysis that drew on this first dataset.

The second dataset consisted of the population of 412 mass media news items that mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs and allowed me to assess the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that the same eight anti-violence organizations received. While the population of news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs consisted of 412 individual news items, similar to the first dataset, it was also the case that for some news items multiple AVAWOs were mentioned in the same news item. For the second dataset, there were 115 news items in which there was more than one AVAWO mentioned. Thus, there were 527 separate cases—that is, unique combinations of each AVAWO and the individual news item—that were included in my analysis of this second dataset. I describe the construction of the two datasets in greater detail in the mass media news items section below.

Second, I gathered annual data on the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that shape the mass media coverage of each AVAWO spanning from 2011 to 2015. To capture the organizational factors, I conducted a content analysis of each anti-violence organization’s website and mission statement to assess the organizational identity, organizational resources, and media tactics of each AVAWO. To capture the broad environmental factors, I gathered data on the political opportunities, including the presence of elite competition and elite allies, as well as the presence of discursive media opportunities within my specific period of

---

13 Given that the stratified random sample (N=300) consisted of news items that mention at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women, it is possible that some news items from the population of news items that mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs (N=412) were included in the first dataset to assess the factors that account for variation in the presence or absence of coverage that anti-violence organizations received.
analysis by drawing on multiple sources. I describe the movement organizational and broad environmental measures and the sources in greater detail in the independent and dependent variables sections below.

In the following discussion, I provide an overview of my data collection procedures. I begin with a discussion of the three types of mass media included in my analysis, as well as the steps taken to gather the stratified random sample that mentions at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women and the population of news items that mention at least one of the eight AWAWS by name during my period of analysis. I then move to a discussion of my independent and dependent variables and provide an overview of the procedures utilized to gather data on the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that shape the mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received.

**Mass Media News Items**

Drawing on three types of mass media, I constructed two datasets that consisted of a stratified random sample of news items that mention at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women (N=300) and the population of news items that mention at least one of the eight AWAWS (N=412) included in my analysis. The first type of news media I gathered data from is broadcast media, which consisted of televised news programs on both network and cable news stations. The second type of mass media is print media, which consisted of both national newspapers and news magazines. The third and final type of media is digital media; unlike broadcast and print media, digital media is comprised of the Internet and other forms of mobile mass communication (McQuail 2012). Below I provide an overview of each type of mass media and discuss how I drew the stratified random sample and population of news items included in my analysis.
Broadcast Media

I examined news coverage from three networks and two cable news organizations. Historically, television news has been the most popular venue for U.S. news consumers.\textsuperscript{14} With the advent of the 24-hour cable news networks in the 1980s, television news came to play an increasingly important role in the media framing of social movement organizations (Ryan 1991). For my sample of broadcast media, I chose to include national news programs (e.g., ABC World News, NBC Nightly News, CBS Evening News) that air on the broadcast television networks \textit{American Broadcasting Company} (ABC), \textit{National Broadcasting Company} (NBC), and \textit{Columbia Broadcasting System} (CBS). In addition to national network television news, I also included cable news programs that air on the networks \textit{Fox News Channel} (FOX) and \textit{Cable News Network} (CNN).\textsuperscript{15} While mainstream national networks may tend to offer more balanced and inclusive coverage (Gans 1979; Gitlin 1980), the ideological leanings of cable network news, such as FOX being a more conservative network, may present different framing of issues related to violence against women (Rohlinger 2006).

To select the television news items from the national and cable networks, I utilized \textit{LexisNexis}, which has an extensive archive of television news transcripts. Drawing on this archive, I utilized two separate procedures to gather news items that comprised my two separate datasets. The first dataset consisted of a stratified random sample of mass media news items that mention at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women, which was utilized to assess the factors that account for variation in the presence or absence of coverage for the eight

\textsuperscript{14} The Pew Research Center’s annual 2010 Report, “State of the News Media,” noted that most Americans get their news from multiple sources, with television being the most common source.

\textsuperscript{15} LexisNexis does not have access to all broadcast networks. I selected these 5 broadcast networks because transcripts were available for news programs that included the name of one of the eight AVAWOs in my sample during my period of analysis.
anti-violence organizations included in my analysis. The second dataset consisted of the population of mass media news items that directly mention at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations to assess the factors that account for variation in the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that the same eight AVAWOs received.

With regards to the first dataset, to gather the stratified random sample of broadcast news items, I searched the archive of television news transcript available via LexisNexis using four key phrases as my search strings: 1) domestic violence, 2) sexual assault, 3) violence against women, and 4) intimate partner violence. Once I identified the sampling frame comprised of the total number of broadcast news items that mentioned at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women, I stratified the news items by whether they mentioned the name of one of the eight AVAWOs or not. I then used a random number generator to take a random sample of 50 news items from each strata—that is, 50 broadcast news items that did mention the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs and 50 broadcast news items that did not mention the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs.

As depicted in Table 1, there were 1,723 total mentions of at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women. Of these 1,723 mentions, there were 1,336 distinct broadcast news items (387 news items mentioned more than one of the four key phrases related to violence against women) and 50 news items that mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs (see Table 2). To construct the stratified random sample, I subtracted the 50 broadcast news items that mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs from the 1,336 distinct

---

16 These four key phrases were related to violence against women were gleaned from the Violence Against Women & Girls’ Resource Guide which provides a detailed overview of the terminology associated with violence against women. These four phrases were selected because they encompass an array of the ways in which journalists and news organizations discussion issues related to violence against women (http://www.vawgresourceguide.org/terminolgy)
broadcast news items that mentioned at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women, which resulted in 1,286 distinct broadcast news items that mention one of the four key phrases related to violence against women. Using a random number generator, I pulled a random sample of 50 broadcast news items from these 1,286 distinct broadcast news items.\textsuperscript{17} Since only 50 news items directly mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs, I included all 50 of these news items as part of the stratified random sample of broadcast news items. This resulted in a total of 100 broadcast news items being included in my stratified random sample.\textsuperscript{18} It is important to note that of the 300 news items that comprised the stratified random sample, 17 mentioned more than one AVAWO by name and thus were coded more than one time. As a result, the unit of analysis for the first dataset is the unique combination of the individual news item and whether it directly mentions the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs in each respective news item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Phrases</th>
<th>Broadcast Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Overall)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,723</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Distinct News Items)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,336</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17} I used the website random.org’s “True Random Number Generator” to identify my stratified random sample (https://www.random.org/).

\textsuperscript{18} Below I employed the same sampling procedure utilized for the broadcast news items to gather the stratified random sample for print and digital-only news items. This resulted in a total of 300 news items total in the stratified random sample, comprised of 100 broadcast, 100 print, and 100 digital-only news items. Half of these news items mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs, while the other half did not mention the name of any of the eight AVAWOs.
With regards to the second dataset, to gather the population of broadcast news items that directly mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs, I searched the same archive of television news transcripts available via LexisNexis using the name of each anti-violence group as my key search strings. Both the full name and acronym for each anti-violence organization (e.g., Know Your IX and KYIX) were utilized to search the archive of television news transcripts. As depicted in Table 2, there were 50 news items that comprised the population of broadcast mass media news items that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations during my period of analysis. It is important to note that of the 412 distinct news items that comprised the population, 115 items mentioned more than one of the eight AVAWOs by name and thus were coded more than one time. Thus, the unit of analysis for the second dataset—that is, the population of mass media news items—is the unique combination of individual news items and the direct mention of at least one of the eight AVAWOs in each respective news item. In the case of broadcast media, there were no instances in which more than one anti-violence organization was mentioned by name in the same broadcast news items, so the overall and distinct news item that mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs totals are both 50. As such, all 50 news items were included as part of the second dataset, which allowed me to assess variation in the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence groups received.
Table 2. Total Number of Mentions of At Least One of Eight AVAWOs for Broadcast Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-Violence-Against-Women Organizations</th>
<th>Broadcast Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End Rape on Campus (EROC)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Your IX (KYIX)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape, Abuse &amp; Incest National Network (RAINN)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures without Violence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break the Cycle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Overall)</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Distinct News Items)</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Print Media (Newspapers and News Magazines)


In addition to examining national daily newspapers, I also incorporated national news magazines as part of my print media sample. News magazines, unlike their daily newspaper

---

19 Newspapers were selected based on the top 25 daily newspapers produced by The Pew Research Center’s annual “State of the News Media” report (http://www.stateofthemedia.org/2013/newspapers-stabilizing-but-still-threatened/22-top-25-daily-newspapers/). I cross-referenced this list with the newspapers available via LexisNexis. LexisNexis does not have records of all newspapers, so my sample was limited to select news outlets. These seven newspapers were selected because they included mention of the eight AVAWOs and were available via LexisNexis.

20 I selected San Jose Mercury News because it not only included mention of the eight anti-violence organizations included in my sample, but it is the largest newspaper provider to the Bay Area outside of the San Francisco Chronicle (LexisNexis does not currently have historical records of the San Francisco Chronicle).
counterparts, have the advantage of publishing longer articles than traditional newspapers can usually accommodate. The variation in the size of articles devoted to coverage of social movement organizations has the potential to alter the quality and quantity of media coverage of specific issues of concern (Boyle and Hoeschen 2001). The news magazines included in my sample are those that are disseminated to a national audience and are published on a weekly and/or monthly basis.\textsuperscript{21} I chose to include \textit{Newsweek}, \textit{New York Magazine}, \textit{The Atlantic}, and \textit{The New Yorker}.

To access the national newspapers and news magazines, I utilized \textit{LexisNexis}, which has an extensive collection of all news articles published by the newspapers and news magazines. Only newspapers and news magazines that were available via \textit{LexisNexis} were included in my analysis. For all newspapers and news magazines, I chose to exclude all letters to the editor since they reflect the opinions of individuals not affiliated with mass media organizations. It is important to note that by only drawing on print news items available via \textit{LexisNexis}, I introduce potential bias in my sampling, since I am not including coverage from all mainstream print news outlets. It is possible that the print news outlets included via \textit{LexisNexis} may allocate greater coverage to the eight anti-violence organizations included in my sample, or may provide greater quantity and quality of coverage for the AVAWOs relative to the newspapers and news magazines not included in the print news archives available through \textit{LexisNexis}.

As was the case with the sample of broadcast news items, I drew on \textit{LexisNexis} and utilized the archive of newspapers and news magazines to further construct two datasets comprised of a stratified random sample of mass media news items related to violence against

\textsuperscript{21} The list of news magazines was determined based on the news magazines available via \textit{LexisNexis}. \textit{LexisNexis} does not have records of all news magazines, so my sample was limited to 11 total print news outlets. These four news magazines were selected because they included mention of the eight AVAWOs included in my analysis.
women and a population of mass media news items that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations included in my analysis. Again, the first dataset was utilized to assess the factors that account for variation in the presence or absence of mass media coverage that the eight anti-violence organizations received, while the second dataset was utilized to assess the factors that account for variation in the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that each of the eight AVAWOs received.

In terms of the first dataset, to add print news items to the stratified random sample of print news items, I began by searching the print news archives available via LexisNexis using the same four key phrases related to violence against women as my search strings that I utilized to gather broadcast news items. These four key phrases included: 1) domestic violence, 2) sexual assault, 3) violence against women, and 4) intimate partner violence. Once I had identified the sampling frame comprised of the total number of newspaper and news magazines that mentioned at least one of the four key phrases, I stratified the print news items by whether they included the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs. As depicted in Table 3, there were 1,226 total mentions of at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women. Of these 1,226 mentions (871 mentions from newspapers and 355 mentions from news magazines), there were 959 distinct print news items (267 news items mentioned more than one of the four key phrases related to violence against women). I stratified these 959 distinct print news items that mention at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women by whether they included the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs. As noted in Table 4, there were 138 distinct print news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs included in the analysis. To construct the stratified random sample, I subtracted the 138 print news items that mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs from the 959 distinct news items that mention at least
one of the four key phrases related to violence against women, which resulted in 821 print news items that mention at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women. Using a random number generator, I took a random sample of 50 news items from the 821 print news items that did not mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs and a random sample of 50 news items from the 138 print news items that did mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs. This resulted in a total of 100 print news items being included in my stratified random sample dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Phrases</th>
<th>Print Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Overall)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,226</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Distinct News Items)</strong></td>
<td><strong>959</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regards to the second dataset, to gather the population of print news items that directly mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs, I searched the same archive of newspaper and news magazines available via LexisNexis using the name of each anti-violence group as my key search strings. Again, as was the case with broadcast news items, both the full name and acronym for each anti-violence organization were utilized to search the archive of newspapers and news magazines. As depicted in Table 4, there were 138 distinct print news items (124 newspaper items and 14 news magazine items) that mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs during my period of analysis. Of these print news items, approximately 26 news items (21 newspaper items and 5 news magazine items) mentioned more than one of the eight AVAWOs by name and were coded more than once. Thus, as illustrated in Table 4, there were
138 distinct print news items that resulted in 164 cases in which one of the eight AVAWOs was mentioned directly by name during my period of analysis. These 164 print news item cases were included as part of the second dataset which allowed me to assess variation in the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence group received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-Violence-Against-Women Organizations</th>
<th>Print Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End Rape on Campus (EROC)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Your IX (KYIX)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape, Abuse &amp; Incest National Network (RAINN)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures without Violence</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break the Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Overall)</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Distinct News Items)</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Digital Media**

Unlike broadcast media and print media, digital media is comprised of the Internet and other forms of mobile mass communication (McQuail 2010). In recent years, digital media have become increasingly common, as traditional forms of broadcast and print media have utilized the Internet to distribute news to the broader public (Klinenberg 2005). While digital media traditionally includes websites associated with print or television news (e.g., CBS News, NBC News Digital, New York Times Digital, etc.), I included digital-only news outlets in my digital media sample to ensure that I did not include duplicate articles that have been published both in newspapers, news magazines, or broadcast sources and their online counterparts. Digital-only news outlets are those that are not tied to a major news media organization that distributes news
in multiple media formats (e.g., CNN and CNN.com). For my digital media sample, I focused on the top digital-only news sites, which include HuffingtonPost.com, BuzzFeed.com, Businessinsider.com, Jezebel.com, Slate.com, Salon.com, Vox.com, Gawker.com, TheDailyBeast.com, Politico.com, and Indiewire.com.22

To access the digital news items, I hired a computer programmer who created a coding syntax using Python. Python is a coding program similar to C++ or Java that allows programmers to essentially “scrape” information from online sources. Using Python, the computer programmer was able to download news items via Google News from the 11 digital-only sources noted above. Google News provides comprehensive up-to-date coverage from news sources across the globe and has an extensive archive that allows users to search news items dating back over 200 years (Weaver and Bimber 2008).

As was the case with broadcast and print media, the 11 digital only news outlets noted above were utilized to add to the two datasets. In terms of the first dataset, to gather the stratified random sample of digital news items utilized to assess the factors that account for variation in the presence of coverage for the eight anti-violence organizations, the computer programmer utilized the same four key phrases related to violence against women as search strings that were used for broadcast and print news items. Again, these four key phrases included: 1) domestic violence, 2) sexual assault, 3) violence against women, and 4) intimate partner violence.

Once the sampling frame of digital-only news items that mentioned at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women was identified, I stratified the digital news

---

22 The top digital-only news outlets were drawn from The Pew Research Center’s annual “State of the News Media” report on digital native news sites (http://www.journalism.org/media-indicators/digital-top-50-digital-native-news-sites-2015/). Drawing on data from ComScore (an Internet analytics company), the Pew Research Center examined approximately 400 digital-only news outlets, which they narrowed into a top 50 news websites list based on the number of unique visitors per month. I selected the top 11 digital-only websites that had the highest number of unique visitors per month and gathered all news items that directly mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AWAWOs included in my analysis.
items by whether they included in the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs or not. As depicted in Table 5, there were 7,427 total mentions of at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women. Of these 7,427 mentions, there were 6,278 distinct digital news items (1,149 news items mentioned more than one of the four key phrases related to violence against women). I stratified these 6,278 distinct digital news items that mentioned at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women by whether they included the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs or not. As noted in Table 6, there were 224 distinct digital news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs included in the analysis. To construct the stratified random sample, I subtracted the 224 distinct digital news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs from the 6,278 distinct digital news items that mentioned at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women, which resulted in 6,054 distinct digital news items that mentioned at least one of the four key phrases related to violence against women. Using the same random number generator I used for the stratified random sample of broadcast and print news items, I took a random sample of 50 digital news items from the 6,054 distinct digital news that did not mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs and a random sample of 50 digital news items from the 224 distinct print news items that did mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs. This resulted in a total of 100 digital news items being included in my stratified random sample.
Table 5. Total Number of Mentions of At Least One of Four Phrases Related to Violence Against Women for Digital Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Phrases</th>
<th>Digital Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>2,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>3,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women</td>
<td>1,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Overall)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,427</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Distinct News Items)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,278</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Total Number of Mentions of At Least One of Eight AVAWOs for Digital Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-Violence-Against-Women Organizations</th>
<th>Digital Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End Rape on Campus (EROC)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Your IX (KYIX)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape, Abuse &amp; Incest National Network (RAINN)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures without Violence</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break the Cycle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Overall)</strong></td>
<td><strong>313</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Distinct News Items)</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the second dataset, which captured the population of digital news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs, the same computer programmer wrote a Python script to capture all news items from the 11 digital-only outlets that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations in my analysis. Using Google News, the computer programmer scraped the archives of Google News and downloaded all news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs. As depicted in Table 6 above, there were 224 distinct digital-only news
items that mentioned the eight AVAWOs. Of these 224 news items, 89 included mention of more than one of the eight AVAWOs by name and were coded more than once. Thus, as illustrated in Table 6, there were 224 distinct digital news items that resulted in 313 cases in which one of the eight AVAWOs was mentioned directly by name during my period of analysis. These 313 digital news item cases were included as part of the second dataset—the population of news items—which, again, allowed me to assess the variation in the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received during my period of analysis.

**Independent Variables**

In the following section, I provide an overview of the procedures utilized to gather data for the independent and dependent variables included in the analysis. I begin with a discussion of my independent variables, which focused on the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that shape the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received. After providing an overview on how I operationalized all independent measures, I move on to a discussion of the three focal dependent variables that capture the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that each AVAWO received.

**Movement Organizational Factors**

A number of factors account for whether social movement groups are able to influence and shape mass media discourse. Research suggests that organizational aspects of social movement groups play a crucial role when it comes to the ways in which movement groups

---

23 The sample of 313 digital-only news items takes into account removing all irrelevant news items, letters to the editor, and blog posts. Irrelevant news items refer to news items that included the name of one of the eight AVAWOs but were not about the specific anti-violence organization. For example, several news items mentioned “Break the Cycle” but focused on issues of alcoholism or drug abuse and specifically referred to breaking the cycle of substance abuse. All news items that were not about the specific AVAWO were excluded from the analysis.
interact with the mass media. My independent variables take into account the movement organizational factors associated with mass media coverage and focus on three distinct factors: 1) organizational identity, 2) organizational resources, and 3) media tactics.

Organizational Identity

The first type of independent variable included in my analysis measures organizational identity, which refers to a “group’s core political values and assumptions” (McCammon 2012: 48). For each AVAWO included in my study, I assessed the scope of each groups’ identity in terms of its language and how it frames issues. In line with Rohlinger (2002), I argue that organizations with broad organizational identities are able to draw on culturally resonant themes in the larger discursive media structure, and as a result, increase the likelihood that its preferred frames are included in mass media coverage. To capture the organizational identity of each AVAWO included in my sample, I examined each anti-violence organization’s mission statement.

To capture the organizational identity of all eight AVAWOs, I utilized the Internet Archive, which is a nonprofit digital library that oversees the Wayback Machine. The Wayback Machine is a web archive that contains over 150 billion web captures.24 This service allows users to access archived versions of websites across time, with the “intent of capturing and archiving content” that would otherwise be lost when a website is changed or closed-down (Internet Archive 2016). Since my period of analysis extends from 2011 to 2015, I utilized the Wayback Machine to access the websites of each anti-violence organization. For each of the eight AVAWOs included in my analysis, I identified the first and last available web capture via the

24 The Wayback Machine can be accessed at http://archive.org/web/
From these web captures, I “scraped” the mission statement of each anti-violence organization, which allowed me to assess the scope of each groups’ organizational identity. Table 7 illustrates the earliest date I was able to gather data for each anti-violence organization via the Wayback Machine for my period of analysis stemming from 2011 to 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-Violence-Against-Women Organizations</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End Rape on Campus (EROC)</td>
<td>August 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Your IX (KYIX)</td>
<td>August 6, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER)</td>
<td>January 5, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape, Abuse &amp; Incest National Network (RAINN)</td>
<td>January 16, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)</td>
<td>January 7, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)</td>
<td>January 5, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures without Violence</td>
<td>January 24, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break the Cycle</td>
<td>January 16, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the eight AVAWOs, I coded the organizational mission statement and determined whether they possessed broad or focused organizational identities for each year during my period of analysis. To assess the scope of each anti-violence groups’ organizational identity, I examined the language each group employed with regards to discussions of violence against women. Anti-violence organizations were coded as possessing broad organizational identities if they discussed issues related to domestic violence and sexual assault more generally. For example, Futures without Violence and NCADV included mentions of its efforts to promote education, public policy, and social services to address the growing epidemic of sexual assault.

25 To ensure that I captured any shifts or changes in the mission statements of anti-violence organizations, I examined the mission statement available on each anti-violence groups’ organizational website for the first and last available date via Wayback Machine from 2011 to 2015. While mission statements did not change drastically, this ensured that I accounted for any potential variation in the scope of each AVAWOs organizational identity.
and domestic violence, respectively, whereas EROC and KYIX’s mission statements only included mentions of its efforts to promote education, public policy, and social services specifically related to campus-based sexual violence (see Appendix A which lists the mission statements for each anti-violence organization from 2011 to 2015). I measured broad organizational identity by assigning a value of “1” to anti-violence organizations that mentioned discussions of domestic violence and/or sexual assault more generally in its mission statements for each year between 2011 and 2015, and a value of “0” to anti-violence that mentioned discussions of campus-based sexual violence or sexual violence specifically within educational institutions. Table 8 provides an overview of the eight AVAWOs and outlines which anti-violence organizations were coded as possessing broad organizational identities. While some of the anti-violence organizations made changes to its mission statements during the period of analysis, these changes did not impact the scope of its organizational identity with regards to the framing of violence against women (see Appendix B which lists the years in which the mission statements changed for each anti-violence organization). For example, both Futures without Violence and Break the Cycle revised its mission statements in 2014, however, the updated mission statements still focused on its efforts to promote education, public policy, and social services aimed at addressing sexual assault and domestic violence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-Violence-Against-Women Organizations</th>
<th>Broad Organizational Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End Rape on Campus (EROC)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Your IX (KYIX)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape, Abuse &amp; Incest National Network (RAINN)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures without Violence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break the Cycle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Resources

The second type of movement organizational independent variable included in my analysis takes into account the resources that each AVAWO possessed. Social movement scholars (McCarthy and Zald 1977; Oliver and Meyer 1999; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010) have demonstrated that key resources, such as money, knowledge, size, and location of headquarters play a role in determining whether movements receive mass media attention. My organizational resource variable assessed five distinct characteristics of each AVAWO: 1) date that each AVAWO was established, 2) annual size of organizational staff, 3) annual number of organizational staff with professional and graduate degrees (e.g., JD, PhDs, etc.), 4) whether each AVAWO in a given year has a formal organizational board, and 5) location of the headquarters in a given year. Table 9 provides an overview of the eight AVAWOs included in my analysis and the five organizational resource measures that were utilized. This table represents the binary coding of each of the five organizational resources for the eight anti-violence organizations from 2011 to 2015, which I describe in greater detail below. As noted in Table 9, for two years during my period of analysis (i.e., 2011 and 2012) both End Rape on Campus (EROC) and Know Your IX (KYIX) did not exist, hence, NA represents that the specific organizational measure is not available for each respective AVAWO.

26 I originally proposed to also include annual budget as one of my organizational resource characteristic, but was unable to access IRS 990 forms for three of the anti-violence organizations included in my sample (i.e., EROC, KYIX, and SAFER). These three organizations were fiscally sponsored by NEO Philanthropy, and as part of this fiscal sponsorship, NEO Philanthropy files 990s on behalf of EROC, KYIX, and SAFER so there is no public record of their annual operating budget. Given that I did not have complete data for all eight AVAWOs, I removed this organizational resource measure from my analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Resource Measures</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Anti-Violence-Against-Women Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td>EROC  KYIX  SAFER  RAINN  NNEDV  NCADV  Futures Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        1       1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>EROC  KYIX  SAFER  RAINN  NNEDV  NCADV  Futures Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA       NA       0       0       1       0       1       0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA       NA       0       0       1       0       1       0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        1       0       0       1       0       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        1       0       0       1       0       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        1       0       0       1       0       1       0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td>EROC  KYIX  SAFER  RAINN  NNEDV  NCADV  Futures Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA       NA       0       0       1       0       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA       NA       0       0       1       0       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       0       0       1       0       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       0       0       1       0       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       0       0       1       0       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>EROC  KYIX  SAFER  RAINN  NNEDV  NCADV  Futures Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA       NA       1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA       NA       1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0.5     1       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters in DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>EROC  KYIX  SAFER  RAINN  NNEDV  NCADV  Futures Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA       NA       0       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA       NA       0       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       0       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       0       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>0        0       0       1       1       1       1       1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Organizational measures were captured by a binary measure with a value of “1” assigned to AVAWOs that possessed the organizational resource for the given year and a value of “0” assigned to AVAWOs that did not. Averages were utilized to calculate the binary measures for size of staff and professional degree (see Appendix C). NA represents that data for the organizational resource was unavailable for each respective anti-violence organization for the specific year.

To operationalize the first factor, date of origin, I identified the date that each anti-violence organization was founded via its organizational website. All anti-violence organizations that were established prior to my period of analysis (i.e., 2011) were assigned a value of “1” and all anti-violence organizations that were established during my period of analysis (i.e., 2011-2015) were assigned a value of “0.”

To operationalize the second factor, size of organizational staff, I assessed the annual number of staff associated with each anti-violence organization via its organizational website. Number of staff was defined as paid employees that were listed on the organization’s website and excluded all volunteer staff positions. As noted above, since my period of analysis stems from 2011 to 2015, I used the Wayback Machine to access the websites of each anti-violence organization for each year. For each of the eight AVAWOs included in my sample and for each year, I identified the first and last available web capture via the Wayback Machine from 2011 to 2015. If there were changes in the size of staff from the first to the last available web capture for each year of analysis, I performed an additional check and examined each AVAWO’s website at the beginning, the end, and the middle of each year (i.e., the month of June) for each year in the analysis. When there was variation in the annual number of staff for AVAWOs during a specific year, I took the average number of staff from the multiple measures (that is, the three measures) for that specific year. For example, RAINN went from 9 staff members in January of 2011 to 12 staff members in December of 2011. I also examined RAINN’s organizational website in June of 2011 to assess its number of staff, which was 11. From these three different points for 2011, I constructed an average number of organizational staff for RAINN for the year for the three
measures from the year 2011 which was 10.7. Using the procedure outlined above, I constructed an annual measure for the total number of staff for each of the eight AVAWOs included in my sample.

To incorporate staff size into my organizational resource index, I constructed a binary measure for annual size of staff by taking the mean number of staff for all eight AVAWOs during each year spanning from 2011 to 2015 (see above for my construction of the annual measure for each AVAWOs) and assigning a value of “1” to anti-violence organizations that had a greater than average number of staff and a value of “0” to anti-violence organizations that had less than the average number of staff (see Appendix C which provides an visual overview of how I constructed annual measures for size of staff for the eight AVAWOs for each year in the period of analysis, as well as how I utilized the annual average size of staff to construct binary measures for each AVAWOs).

The third organizational resource measure, the number of staff with professional and/or graduate degrees, was operationalized by first identifying the educational background of the staff for each of the eight AVAWOs. Number of staff with professional and/or graduate degrees was defined as any paid employee whose highest level of educational attainment extended beyond a four-year college degree. Using a similar procedure utilized to measure the annual number of staff for each AVAWO, I started by identifying the first and last web capture available via the Wayback Machine from 2011 to 2015. From these web captures, I examined the names and biographies of all staff associated with each AVAWO. For the majority of AVAWOs, they list the name and educational background of its staff members; however, when the educational background was not listed, I utilized LinkedIn.com to access the background of staff members to determine their highest level of education (Bail 2012).
If there were changes in the number of staff with graduate or professional degrees from the first to the last available web capture for each year of analysis, I performed an additional check. As was the case with the annual size of staff, when there was variation in the number of staff with professional degrees during a specific year within my period of analysis, I took the average number of staff with graduate degrees among the multiple within year measures and constructed an average for that specific year. For example, NNEDV had 9 staff members with graduate degrees in January of 2013, but had 10 staff members with graduate degrees in December of 2013. Again, drawing on the Wayback Machine, I examined NNEDV’s website in June of 2013 to assess the educational background of its staff which included 10 staff members who possessed graduate and/or professional degrees. From these three different points in time, I constructed an annual average number of staff with professional and/or graduate degrees for NNEDV for the year 2011 which was 9.7.

Employing this same procedure, I constructed an annual measure for the number of staff with graduate and/or professional degrees for each of the eight AVAWOs included in my sample. Again, to construct the organizational resource index, I constructed a binary measure for annual average number of staff with graduate and/or professional degrees by taking the annual mean number of staff with higher educational degrees for each of the eight AVAWOs spanning from 2011 to 2015 and assigning a value of “1” to anti-violence organizations that had a greater than average number of staff with graduate and/or professional degrees and a value of “0” to anti-violence organizations who had less than average number of staff with graduate and/or professional degrees (see Appendix C which provides an visual overview of how I constructed annual measures for number of staff with graduate and/or professional degrees for the eight AVAWOs for each year in the period of analysis, as well as how I utilized the annual average
number of staff with graduate and/or professional degrees to construct binary measures for each AWAWOs).

To measure the fourth organizational resource, I examined each anti-violence organization’s website to see whether they had a formal board. A formal board was defined as a designated group of individuals listed on each anti-violence groups’ website under the title of board. To assess the presence of a formal board for each of the eight anti-violence organizations, I identified the first and last available web capture for each AWAWO’s organizational website via the Wayback Machine from 2011 to 2015. From these web captures, I identified whether there was a formal board for each anti-violence group, which was often listed under the “about us” section of each AWAWOs website. As was the case with size of staff and number of staff with professional and/or graduate degrees, when there was variation in the presence of a formal board between the first and last web capture for each anti-violence organization for a given year, I performed an additional check and examined each anti-violence group website in the middle of the year using the Wayback Machine. For example, KYIX did not have a formal board in January of 2015, but did have a board established in December of 2015. Using the Wayback Machine, I examined KYIX’s organizational website for June 2015 and found that they did have a formal board established. Using the procedure outlined above, then, I operationalized the presence of an organizational board as a binary measure by assigning anti-violence organizations a value of “1” when they had a formal board and anti-violence organizations a value of “0” when they did not have a formal board. When there were changes in the presence of a formal board for anti-violence organizations during the same year (as was the case with KYIX noted above), they were assigned a value of “0.5” for that specific year of analysis. Given that this measure was already a dichotomous measure—that is, anti-violence groups either had or did not have a formal board—I
did not need to take the additional steps to construct a binary measure as I did with the annual size of staff and annual number of staff with graduate or professional degree measures.

To capture the fifth and final organizational resources measure, location of headquarters, I drew on each anti-violence organization’s website to determine where its headquarters were physically located. I identified the location of each AVAWOs’ headquarter via its organizational website, which listed the organization’s physical address and contact information. Adopting the same procedure utilized to assess the other four organizational resource measures, I began by examining each anti-violence organizations’ website via the Wayback Machine for each year spanning from 2011-2015. To account for any variation in the location of headquarters for each of the eight AVAWOs within a year, I examined the first and last available web capture for each year in my period of analysis; however, there was no variation in the location of the headquarters for all eight anti-violence organizations throughout my period of analysis. Given the importance of influencing mass media, law, and policy around violence against women, I operationalized location of headquarters by assigning all anti-violence organizations with a headquarters in Washington D.C. a value of “1” and those with headquarters elsewhere a value of “0.”

Taking these five organizational resources into account, I created an organizational resource index which added the five indicators together. Given that my unit of analysis for the population of mass media news items is the combination of the AVAWO mentioned in the news item and the year in which the news item was published, again, I created annual measures for the five organizational resource indicators for each of the eight AVAWOs (see Appendix C). For example, for KYIX, I constructed an annual measure (that is, for each year individually from 2011 to 2015) that captured its date of origin (1=established prior to my period of analysis; 0=established during my period of analysis), size of staff (1=above annual average; 0=below
annual average), number of staff with professional degrees (1=above annual average; 0=below annual average), whether it had a formal board (1=had formal board in given year; 0=did not have formal board in given year) and whether its headquarters were located in Washington D.C. (1=headquarters located in DC in given year; 0=headquarters not located in DC in given year).

After creating the annual measures for each organizational resource indicator for the eight AVAWOs, I created a total organizational resource measure for each AVAWO that summed all five organizational resource indicators separately for each individual year from 2011 to 2015. For example, for KYIX, I created a total organizational resource measure for each year during my period of analysis—that is, a separate measure for KYIX for 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015—that was the sum of the five organizational resource indicators (i.e., date of origin, size of staff, number of staff with professional degrees, formal board, and location of headquarters). It was these year-specific total organizational resource measures for each AVAWO that comprise my organizational resource index. This index had a high internal reliability with a Chronbach alpha of .80 for the population of mass media news items that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations included in my sample (N=412) (Lance et al. 2005).

**Media Tactics**

The third and final type of movement organizational independent variable included in my analysis takes into account the tactical repertories and media strategies employed by each AVAWO. The media tactics variable was measured by assessing two distinct characteristics of each AVAWO: 1) the use of a media strategist (or social media manager) and 2) the publication of op-eds by AVAWOs in response to news articles or stories. Table 10 provides an overview of the eight AVAWOs included in my sample and the two media tactics measures utilized in my analysis. This table represents the binary coding of the two media tactics measures for the eight
anti-violence organizations included in my analysis from 2011 to 2015. Anti-violence organizations were assigned a value of “1” for a given year if they had a dedicated social media manager or published op-eds on their websites and were assigned a value of “0” for a given year if they did not. To account for whether the use of a social media manager or publication of op-eds by AVAWOs in the previous year influenced the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence groups received in the following year, I gathered data for the year 2010 which enabled me to lag both media tactic measures by one year.\textsuperscript{27} Both media tactic measures were lagged because it is likely that the effect of having a social media manager or publication of op-eds by AVAWOs on mass media coverage does not happen immediately; rather, it takes time for the impact of media tactics to influence media coverage. This one-year lag structure is reflected in both media tactic measures in Table 10 below, such that, for example, the value for the 2011 social media manager and publication of op-eds measures is the 2010 value.

As I noted previously, both End Rape on Campus (EROC) and Know Your IX (KYIX) did not exist prior to 2013, thus, NA in Table 10 represents that the specific media tactic measure is not available for each respective organization.

\textsuperscript{27} Media tactics were not included in the analysis that examined the factors that account for variation in the presence of coverage that anti-violence organizations received. As described in the dependent variable section below, the stratified random sample was utilized to assess presence of coverage and was comprised of 300 distinct news items in which 150 news items mentioned one of the eight anti-violence organizations and 150 did not. Given that half of the news items in the stratified random sample had missing values when it came to movement organizational measures, only broad environmental factors were included in the analysis that examined presence of coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media Manager</th>
<th>EROC</th>
<th>KYIX</th>
<th>SAFER</th>
<th>RAINN</th>
<th>NNEDV</th>
<th>NCADV</th>
<th>Futures</th>
<th>Break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication of Op-Eds</th>
<th>EROC</th>
<th>KYIX</th>
<th>SAFER</th>
<th>RAINN</th>
<th>NNEDV</th>
<th>NCADV</th>
<th>Futures</th>
<th>Break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Media tactic measures were captured by a binary measure with a value of “1” assigned to AWAWOs that had a dedicated social media manager or published op-eds for the given year and a value of “0” assigned to AWAWOs that did not. NA represents that data for the organizational resource was unavailable for each respective anti-violence organization for the specific year.

To operationalize the first media tactics variable, the presence of a social media manager, I assessed whether each AWAWO had a social media manager as part of its staff for each year of my analysis. A social media manager was defined as a paid employee who was listed on each anti-violence organizations’ website and whose title included social media or communications specialist. As was the case with number of staff and number of staff with professional degrees, all volunteer social media positions were not included as part of this measure. Utilizing a similar tactic employed to capture the organizational resource measures, I drew on the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine. Using the Wayback Machine, I examined each anti-violence groups’ organizational website, which listed the names, biographies, and positions of all staff associated with each AWAWO. More specifically, I assessed the first and last available web capture of each AWAWO’s website for each year from 2011 to 2015.
To measure social media manager, I began by constructing an annual measure for each of the eight AVAWOs that captured whether an anti-violence organization had a social media manager or communications manager as part of its formal staff for each year during my analysis. I assigned a value of “1” to AVAWOs that had a dedicated social media manager (or communications manager) as part of its formal staff and assigned a value of “0” to AVAWOs that did not. To account for a potential lagged effect, I included the year 2010 to lag social media manager by one year across my period of analysis. For example, I assigned the 2013 value to the 2014 social media manager measure for EROC, which allowed me to gauge the effect of not having a social media manager in 2013 on the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that EROC received in 2014.

To operationalize the second media tactics variable, publication of op-eds by anti-violence-against-women organizations, I began by first examining each anti-violence organizations’ website, which often listed the op-eds written by members of each AVAWO in mainstream mass media outlets. Utilizing the Wayback Machine, I examined the first and last available web capture for each AVAWO for each year spanning from 2011 to 2015. To ensure that I captured whether anti-violence groups published op-eds, I ran an additional check via LexisNexis to assess whether the eight anti-violence groups published op-eds in newspapers or news magazines and Google News to assess whether the eight AVAWOs wrote op-eds for digital-only news outlets during my period of analysis (i.e., 2011 to 2015). LexisNexis has an advanced search function that allows you to only search news items that were classified as letters to the editors (i.e., op-eds). While this additional check allowed me to assess whether an AVAWO published op-eds that they did not list on its organizational website, it is important to note that LexisNexis does not have records of all newspapers and news magazines, thus it is
possible that some AVAWOs may have published op-eds that were not captured on its organizational website or through the additional check via LexisNexis. For Google News, I utilized the advanced search function which allows you to search digital-only news items that were classified as blogs (i.e., op-eds) since digital-only news outlets, such as HuffingtonPost.com and Slate.com, publish op-eds as blogs. These two additional checks allowed me to ensure that I captured AVAWOs that published op-eds, even if an AVAWO did not necessarily list these op-eds on its organizational website.

Drawing on the data from the organizational website of each AVAWO and the additional checks via LexisNexis and Google News, I captured *publication of op-eds* by assigning a value of “1” to an AVAWO that published op-eds in mainstream media outlets and assigned a value of “0” to anti-violence organizations that did not.\(^28\) Again, to account for a potential lagged effect, I also gathered data for the year 2010 which enabled me to lag *publication of op-eds* by one year. For example, I assigned the 2011 value to the 2012 *publication of op-eds* measure for SAFER, which allowed me to assess the effect of not publishing op-eds in 2011 on the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that SAFER received in 2012.

**Broad Environmental Factors**

Broad environmental factors may influence mass media coverage of movement groups. My independent variables take into account the broad environmental factors potentially associated with mass media coverage. I focused on two distinct types of broad environmental factors: 1) political opportunities and 2) discursive media opportunities.

\(^28\) Although detail may be lost by operationalizing *publication of op-eds* as a single binary measure rather than a count measure, the overarching goal of this variable was not to capture the frequency of op-eds, but rather, to assess whether publishing op-eds as a media tactic impacts the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence groups received. Operationalizing *publication of op-eds* as a single binary measure facilitates this.
Political Opportunities

The first type of independent variables included in my analysis measures the larger political structure. Given that social movement groups do not operate in a social vacuum, scholars (McAdam 1996, 199; Rohlinger 2002; Meyers 2004; Meyers and Minkoff 2004; Rohlinger 2014) have argued that the success of social movements is often dependent on political opportunities. To capture the presence of political opportunities that may shape mass media coverage of anti-violence organizations, I examined the presence of elite allies that support efforts to curb violence against women. Given that Democrats have historically shown greater support for issues related to violence against women (Weldon 2002), I defined elite allies as the presence of Democratic leaders in Congress, the Senate, and the Executive branch.29 Two political opportunity measures were utilized: 1) the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress and 2) the mention of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address.

To capture the first political opportunity measure, Democratic advantage, I drew on data from the Congressional Quarterly.30 This measure assessed whether there was a Democratic majority in Congress—that is, a Democratic majority in both the Senate and House—for each year of the analysis stemming from 2011 to 2015. Table 11 provides an overview of the years in which there was a Democratic advantage in Congress. To measure Democratic advantage, I assigned a value of “1” to the years in which there was a Democratic advantage and a value of “0” to the years in which there was not. To assess whether the presence of a Democratic advantage in the previous year influenced the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media

29 I considered including the party affiliation of the President, but given that there was no variation during my period of analysis, I did not include this variable as part of my political opportunities measures.
30 I accessed the Congressional Quarterly via http://cqrolleall.com/cq/
coverage that anti-violence organizations received in the following year, I gathered data for the year 2010 which enabled me to lag Democratic advantage by one year. For example, I assigned the 2011 value to the 2012 Democratic advantage measure, which allowed me to gauge the effect of a Democratic majority in the House and Senate in 2011 on the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received in 2012.

In addition to taking into account the party makeup of Congress, I also assessed whether the President included mentions of violence against women during the annual State of the Union Address for each year of my analysis. To capture the second political opportunity measure, state of the union, I drew on data from the American Presidency Project, which is affiliated with the University of California Santa Barbara and has online transcripts of the President’s annual State of the Union Address for all U.S. Presidents. Table 11 provides an overview of the years in which the President included mentions of violence against women in the annual State of the Union Address. To construct state of the union, I began by downloading the transcripts of President Barack Obama’s State of the Union Address for each year of my analysis and searching each transcript using a set of four key phrases related to violence against women: 1) domestic violence, 2) sexual assault, 3) violence against women, and 4) intimate partner violence. Next, I assigned a value of “1” to the years in which there was mention of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address and a value of “0” to years in which there was no mention of violence against women. Again, to account for whether mentions of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address in the previous year influenced the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that anti-

---

31 The State of the Union Address takes place each January between a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives
32 I accessed the American Presidency Project via http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/
violence organizations received in the following year, I gathered data on the year 2010 which enabled me to lag state of the union by one year. For example, I assigned the 2013 value to the 2014 state of the union measure, which allowed me to assess the effect of the President mentioning issues of violence against women in 2013 on the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received in 2014.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Democratic Advantage in Congress</th>
<th>VAW Mentioned in State of the Union Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Political opportunity measures were captured by a binary measure with a value of “1” assigned to years in which there was a Democratic advantage in Congress or violence against women was mentioned in the President’s State of the Union Address and a value of “0” assigned to years that did not.

Discursive Media Opportunities

The second type of broad environmental independent variable included in my analysis focused on the presence of discursive media opportunities. This measure acknowledges that a social movement organization’s ability to achieve its desired outcomes is often dependent on the opportunities and constraints presented by larger cultural and political-legal contexts. The notion of discursive media opportunities expands on previous scholars understanding of discursive

---

33 I originally included a second discursive media opportunity measure that captured a distinct year that represents a unique opportunity for anti-violence groups to garner mass media attention. The year 2014 represented a distinct year in which the most discursive media opportunities occurred in the larger cultural and political-legal context. This second discursive media opportunity measure was operationalized by assigning a value of “1” to news items published in 2014 and a value of “0” to news items that were not. I decided to remove this measure from my analysis after lagging my political opportunity measure that captures whether the President mentions violence against women in the annual State of the Union Address because the two measures were identical.
opportunities (Ferree 2003; McCammon et al. 2007), which emphasize the importance of cultural
and political ideas being viewed as legitimate by the public (Koopmans and Statham 1999;
Koopmans and Olzak 2004). Discursive media opportunities are founded on the notion that the
resonance of a discursive opportunity plays a critical role in determining whether movement
groups receive mass media coverage.

To operationalize the presence of discursive media opportunities, I constructed a count
measure that represents the annual frequency of opportunities in the larger discursive media
structure related to violence against women. This measure focused on events in the cultural and
political-legal context that influence broader social attitudes pertaining to violence against
women between 2011 and 2015, such as the publication of the “Dear Colleague Letter” by the
U.S. Department of Education in 2011 and the passage of “Yes Means Yes” law by California
and New York state legislatures in 2015.

I identified the cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women using
an inductive coding process that was part of the larger qualitative coding of the mass media news
items. More specifically, prior to coding all news items, I developed a list of 10 distinct cultural
and political-legal events that represented discursive media opportunities which occurred
between 2011 and 2015. This list was constructed by searching Google News’ archives for each
respective year in the period of analysis using four key phrases related to violence against
women (i.e., domestic violence, sexual assault, violence against women, and intimate partner
violence).34 An event was defined as an incident related to domestic violence or sexual assault
that impacted the political-legal and cultural sphere that spurred public discourse. The political-

34 These four phrases related to violence against women were the same four phrases utilized to gather news items
related to violence against women for the stratified random sample. As noted previously, these four phrases were
gleaned from the Violence Against Women & Girls’ Resource guide which provides a detailed overview of the
language and terminology associated with violence against women (http://www.vawgresourceguide.org/terminolgy).
legal sphere is defined as the executive and congressional branches of government, while the cultural sphere refers to broader social institutions like religion, education, sports, and family that shape attitude and beliefs.

A prominent example of a political-legal event related to violence against women was the Founding of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. This political-legal event has been acknowledged as key turning point in unleashing the wave of new journalism that focused on violence against women (Smith 2014; Hoff Sommers 2015). The founding of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault took place in 2014 with the mission of supporting and providing institutions of higher education with additional tools to respond to and address rape and sexual assault (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault 2017). This political-legal event exemplifies the types of events this measure captures—events related to domestic violence or sexual assault that impacted the executive and congressional branches of government that served as a foundation to spur public discourse around violence against women.

While there are many incidences of domestic violence and sexual assault that take place, it is important to note that not all cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women become discursive media opportunities—that is, some events are emphasized by the mass media and spur public discourse, while others are often overlooked. To determine the level of public discourse around each cultural and political-legal event, I examined Google News’ archives. More specifically, if a cultural or political-legal event related to violence against women appeared 10 or more times in the Google News’ archive, it was included as part of the initial list of discursive media opportunities. For example, the mention of violence against women in President’s State of the Union Address was a political opportunity that was not a
political-legal discursive media opportunity. In 2013, President Obama stated that women should live their lives free of gender discrimination and fear of domestic violence, referencing the Violence Against Women Act. When searching Google News’ archives for mention of the President’s 2013 State of the Union Address in conjunction with “domestic violence” as the key search string, I found only 8 news items, which did not meet the criteria outlined above. While this mention of domestic violence in the State of the Union Address served as a political opportunity, in that it helped mainstream violence against women within the larger political context, it did not translate into a political-legal discursive media opportunity since it did not spur public discourse within the broader mass media.35 Throughout the coding process, the team of research assistants and I identified additional cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women and continued to add them to our codebook if it appeared in at least 10 of the news items that comprise the population of mass media news items. To determine the frequency, I ran a search via Google News’ archives using the name of the specific event (e.g., “Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act,” “Bill Cosby,” “Hunting Ground,” etc.) on the mass media news items to determine the number of times the specific cultural or political-legal event appeared. If an event met the criteria—that is, it appeared 10 or more times in the Google News’ archive—it was added to the list.

35 This operationalization aligns with previous social movement scholarship which has examined how social movements are able to seize key events and identify discursive opportunities that allow them to make its claims politically resonant. More specifically, in the case of Vasi and colleagues (2015), they examine the role that environmental documentaries had not only in shaping broader public attitudes, but the ways in which social movements were able to capitalize on the dissemination of popular documentaries to amplify its message and increase its overall presence via mass media and social media coverage. In the case of scholars who write about violence against women, Clark (2016) identified the role that the arrest of Ray Rice had in altering the media landscape and providing anti-violence organizations with an opportunity to interject their voice into the larger discursive environment, while Heldman and Brown (2014) identified the role that the publication of the Dear Colleague Letter and establishment of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault had in alternating the discursive landscape of violence against women.
Included in the list of cultural and political-legal events is the arrest of Ray Rice for third-degree aggravated assault (cultural event), the establishment of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (political-legal event), and the Title IX violations filed with the U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights (political-legal event). Given that it is possible that a cultural or political-legal event that takes place in the previous year influences the presence of discursive media opportunities for AWAWS in the following year, I lag this measure to assess this possibility.

For each discursive media opportunity included in my measure, I grouped them by the year in which they occurred. Table 12 lists the 15 cultural and 10 political-legal events that comprised the discursive media opportunities annual count measure that was included as part of my analysis. The cultural and political-legal events are organized by both year and count to show the year in which the events took place, as well as how they were operationalized as an annual count measure. As shown in Table 12, the majority of discursive media opportunities related to violence against women occurred in 2014 (N=9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Roestlisberer Investigated for Sexual Assault</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of Slutwalks</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of &quot;Account of Sexual Assault&quot; by Angie Epifano</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier of The Invisible War</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Akin's &quot;Legitimate Rape&quot; Comments</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape in Steubenville, Ohio</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier of &quot;Makers&quot;</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Rice Arrested for Third-Degree Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress Performance: Carry that Weight by Emma Sulkowicz</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of &quot;Bill Cosby Raped Me&quot; by Barbara Bowman</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of &quot;A Rape on Campus&quot; by Sabrina Erdely</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Duggar's Sexual Assault Charges</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape by Stanford Student Brock Turner</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of &quot;Missoula: Rape and the Justice System in a College Town&quot;</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier of the Hunting Ground</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of &quot;Dear Colleague&quot; Letter</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding of White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of the White House &quot;It's on Us&quot; Campaign</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of &quot;Not Alone&quot; by White House Task Force</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Accountability and Safety Act Introduced to Congress</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Violations filed with U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage of &quot;Yes Means Yes&quot; by California</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage of &quot;Yes Means Yes&quot; by New York</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drawing on these cultural and political-legal events, I constructed the annual count measure of the frequency of opportunities in the broader discursive media structure related to violence against women. This variable was operationalized by constructing a single measure that captures the number of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women that occurred in each year and assigning an annual count to the associated year.
Dependent Variables

To empirically examine the factors that account for why some anti-violence organizations are more successful when it comes to gaining mass media attention, as well as to investigate the factors influencing the quantity and quality of mass media coverage, I constructed three key types of dependent variables that measure mass media coverage. In the following discussion, I describe the construction of my three types of dependent variables that capture the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that each AVAWO received.

Presence of Media Coverage

The first dependent variable, the presence or absence of media coverage, was operationalized as whether the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs was included in the news item being analyzed. This measure was constructed for the stratified random sample of 300 news items. Half of the sample did not mention an AVAWO and half of the sample did mention at least one of the eight AVAWOs. Again, as noted earlier, of the 150 news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs there were 17 news items that mentioned more than one AVAWO. Thus, the stratified random sample resulted in 317 separate cases included in my analysis because there were 167 separate cases that represent the unique combination of the individual news items and the direct mention of at least one of the eight AVAWOs in each respective news item. This measure was operationalized by assigning a value of “1” to news items that mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs, and assigning a value of “0” to news items that did not mention an AVAWO.
Quantity of Media Coverage

The second type of dependent variable takes into account the quantity of mass media coverage—that is, the amount of coverage devoted to a social movement organization. These measures were constructed for the population of 412 news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs. I used two quantity measures that focused on the amount of coverage anti-violence organizations received by taking into account two key components: 1) length of coverage and 2) multiple mentions of social movements organizations in the mass media news item.

The first quantity of coverage measure assessed the overall length of coverage devoted to a particular AVAWO. For the measure length of coverage, I constructed a count measure that assessed the word count for each broadcast, print, and digital-only news item. For print and digital-only media, I took the word count of the entire article that discussed an AVAWO. Unlike print and digital media, the transcripts for broadcast news items were much longer in length given that they covered a variety of news stories within a specific news segment. As such, for each broadcast transcript, I took a word count only of the part of the transcript that specifically mentioned the name of each of the eight AVAWOs. More specifically, I took a word count for each broadcast transcript beginning with the anchor introducing the news story that mentioned one of the eight AVAWOs, to the anchor’s closing remarks. The mean length of coverage for

---

36 Again, as noted previously, it was the case that for 115 news items there was more than one AVAWO mentioned; thus, there were 527 cases that represent the unique combination of each AVAWO and the individual news item that were included in my analysis that drew on the population of mass media news items.

37 The mean length of broadcast news items were 1,557 words, while the mean length of print news items were 1,155 words and the mean length of digital news items were 1,244 words. Thus, taking the word count of each broadcast transcript beginning with the anchor introducing the story related to an anti-violence organization to the anchor’s closing remarks did not result in lower average word counts relative to print and digital news items in which the entire article’s word count was captured.
the 412 news items was 1,246 words (SD=1,381), with a range spanning from 106 to 11,760 words.

The second quantity of coverage measure assessed the number of times the name of an AVAWO was mentioned in each individual news item. To account for the frequency at which an anti-violence organization is mentioned in mass media coverage, I constructed a count measure that assessed the number of times the name of the AVAWO was mentioned in each individual news item. Given that most AVAWO were only mentioned once by name (n=411), I transformed this count measure into a binary measure by assigning a value of “1” to news items if they mentioned the name of one of the eight AVAWOs more than once, and a value of “0” to news items if they mentioned the AVAWO only once. Although detail is sacrificed by operationalizing multiple mentions as a single binary measure, rather than measuring it as a continuous measure, my models seek to assess the difference between anti-violence groups that received one mention and multiple mentions and constructing multiple mentions as a single binary measure facilities this.

**Quality of Media Coverage**

The third and final type of dependent variable takes into account the quality of mass media coverage—that is, the type of coverage devoted to a social movement organization. This measure was constructed for the population of news items (N=412) because all the news items mentioned of at least one of the eight AVAWOs. I used three distinct quality measures that focused on the visibility of social movement organizations in mass media coverage: 1) the tone of news items, 2) the media standing allocated to AVAWOs, and 3) the incorporation of an anti-violence organization’s preferred movement frames.
The first measure of quality of media coverage takes into account the tone of coverage of each anti-violence organization in each news item. The tone of mass media coverage can depict social movement organizations in a positive, negative, or neutral light. To measure tone of coverage, I coded each news item covering an anti-violence organization as displaying a positive, negative, or neutral tone with regards to a particular organization. More specifically, the tone of an anti-violence organization in each news item was measured by coding the ad hominin frames included in the coverage. Ad hominen frames are “those that focus on the individual or group making the claims,” and are identified as positive, negative, or neutral to indicate their implied support for, opposition to, or nonevaluative stance toward the social movement organization, its mission, and/or overarching goal of a social movement organizational mission (Kruse 2001: 73). The ad hominen frames used to assess the tone of each news item regarding the particular anti-violence organization were developed using an inductive coding procedure in which I identified key words associated with each evaluative stance (i.e., positive language, negative language, or neutral language). To capture the tone of coverage with direct mention of each AWAWO, the first two sentences above and below each mention of the eight AWAWOs included in my analysis were coded using ad hominin frames. Given that most news items depicted anti-violence organizations in a neutral tone (n=421), I assigned news items a value of “1” if they discussed the AWAWO in a positive tone and a value of “0” if they discussed in the AWAWO in a neutral or negative tone.38

An example of positive tone of coverage was coverage that End Rape on Campus (EROC) received with regards to the founding of the White House Task Force to Protect

---

38 There were only 9 news items that portrayed an anti-violence organization in a negative tone. Given the small number of news items that utilized a negative tone, I decided to focus on news items that referred to AWAWOs in a positive tone.
Students from Sexual Assault. One news item focused on the role that EROC had in spearheading the movement to bring awareness to campus-based sexual violence and described the founders of EROC as “brave” and “courageous,” noting that the work that EROC pursued with filing Title IX complaints against the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill helped put pressure on the White House when it came to addressing the epidemic of campus sexual assaults.

In contrast to positive coverage, an example of negative tone of coverage was media attention that Know Your IX (KYIX) received, which as an organization was portrayed as having a “harmful” role in the wrongful persecution of young men who were sanctioned by their respective universities after they were found to have committed an act of domestic and/or sexual violence. An example of neutral tone of coverage was media coverage that National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) received in its efforts to partner with the National Football League after the arrest of Ray Rice for domestic violence. The news item provided a descriptive overview of the mission of NCADV and its work with the NFL, but refrained from using language that indicated support or disapproval of NCADV more broadly.

The second quality of coverage measure assessed whether the news outlet granted anti-violence organizations media standing. Media standing refers to the extent to which social movement organizations have a voice in the media and are seen as a “media source whose interpretations are directly quoted” (Ferree et al. 2002: 13). Media standing is operationalized as whether a social movement organization (or individual representing the movement group) was quoted in the mass media coverage. To measure quoted in coverage, I assigned a value of “1” to news items that included direct quotes for the AVAWO and assigned a value of “0” to news items that did not include direct quotes for the AVAWO.
The third and final quality of coverage measure assessed whether the preferred frame of a social movement organization was amplified by mass media coverage—that is, whether the media mentioned the issues of concern as the movement group articulated them. To capture whether mass media coverage amplified the preferred frames of an AVAWO, I began by first analyzing the frames of the anti-violence organizations. Following the steps of Benford and Snow (2002), I identified the diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames of each anti-violence organization using its mission statement and internal materials available on its organizational website. Given that some AVAWOs altered the mission statements and/or the internal materials available on its organizational websites during the time-period, I used the Wayback Machine to access the websites of each anti-violence group. For each of the eight AVAWOs, I identified the first and last available webcapture via the Wayback Machine from 2011 to 2015. While some AVAWOs altered its organizational materials, the broader diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames did not change over the course of the period of analysis. Drawing on these frames, I was then able to identify the movement frames of each of the eight anti-violence organizations included in my sample to determine whether the preferred frame of each AVAWO was included in the individual news items. To measure preferred frame in coverage, I drew on Rohlinger’s (2002) operationalization of preferred frames which identifies three distinct criteria: 1) social movement actors must be quoted, 2) social movement’s position and actions are discussed, and 3) the social movements’ frame(s) are included without distortion. In order for the preferred frames of an AVAWO to be included in mass media coverage, the following criteria needed to be met: 1) the anti-violence organization or a representative must be quoted in the news item, 2) the anti-violence organizations positions and actions must be included in coverage, and lastly, 3) the AVAWO’s frames must be included in coverage without
distortion. Taking into account these three criteria, I assigned a value of “1” to news items that included the preferred frames of the AVAWO that were quoted in coverage and assigned a value of “0” to news items that did not include the preferred frame of the AVAWO that were quoted in media coverage.

**Methodological Approach**

*Content Analysis of Mass Media News Items*

Content analysis is a systematic technique to analyze textual data (Riffe, Lacy, and Fico 2014). For sociologists interested in mass media, content analysis is a technique often utilized to systematically analyze mass media content (Altheide and Schneider 2013). To code the mass media news items included as part of my analysis, I hired, trained, and oversaw a team of two research assistants who used ATLAS.ti, a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software program. Both research assistants were hired between May 2016 and August 2016 through a $3,000 grant I obtained through Vanderbilt University’s College of Arts & Science Summer Research Award. Beginning in May, each research assistant went through a month-long training process in which they became familiarized with the codebook, operationalizing the codes, and applying the codes to each news item via ATLAS.ti. Once each research assistant demonstrated sufficient proficiency in operationalizing the codes and applying them to each news item, I divided the 412 news items equally so that each research assistant was responsible for coding 15 broadcast news items, 46 print news items, and 74 digital news items, while I was responsible for coding the remaining 20 broadcast news items, 46 print news items, and 76 digital news items. After testing for intercoder reliability, a Krippendorff Alpha of .78 was obtained.  

---

39 This Krippendorff Alpha is below the 0.80 cut-off. While the 0.80 cut-off is ideal, previous scholars (Krippendorff 2004; Reidsma and Carletta 2008) have noted that the acceptable range is between 0.67 and 0.80. A Krippendorff
Throughout the four-month period, the two research assistants attended weekly research meetings in which we would collectively discuss any coding questions that they had and continued to refine the codebook. To ensure data quality, I had each research assistant upload their respective ATLAS.ti files on a shared Google Drive folder on a weekly basis. Once the two research assistants had finished coding their allocated news items, I merged these ATLAS.ti files into one complete file using the copy bundle function. Once the ATLAS.ti files were merged, I then exported the qualitative codes into an Excel file. I had two separate Excel files, one for the stratified random sample of 300 news items and one for the population of 412 news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AAVWOs.

*Exporting Codes from ATLAS.ti to Excel*

Once the codes from ATLAS.ti were exported into two separate Excel files, I cleaned the data to check for any missing values, outliers, and any other inconsistencies for both the stratified random sample and the population of news items. This step also involved transforming all qualitative codes by assigning them quantitative values. For example, tone of coverage was originally coded as either “positive,” “neutral,” or “negative” in ATLAS.ti. I transformed this variable by assigning all “positive” codes a value of 1, and all “neutral” and “negative” codes a value of 0. This step was taken for the qualitative codes to ensure that the Excel file only contained quantitative values. These two Excel files were then merged with another Excel file that contained data for the movement organizational and broad environmental variables.

Alpha of 0.78 indicates that there may be some instances in which the research assistants and myself did not operationalize and apply the codes in the same manner.”
Construction of Dataset

Once these two Excel files had been merged with the Excel file comprised of movement organizational and broad environmental variables, I completed the final step of the dataset construction by converting the respective Excel files into two separate SAS data files via StatsTransfer. These SAS data files consisted of 1) the stratified random sample of 300 news items (which resulted in 317 cases) to be used to assess the presence of mass media coverage and 2) the population of 412 news items (which resulted in 527 cases) to be used to assess the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that the eight AVAWOs included in my analysis received.

Regression Analyses

Drawing on these two SAS data files, I ran several different regression analyses. To assess presence of mass media coverage, I ran a logistic regression in which I focused on the influence that broad environmental factors had on the presence or absence of mass media coverage for the eight AVAWOs included in my analysis. I ran a logistic regression because the dependent variable—that is, the presence or absence of mass media coverage—was a binary measure and logistic regression allowed me to assess the broad environmental factors associated with increased odds of AVAWOs receiving mass media coverage. This analysis drew on the stratified random sample of 300 news items (again, which resulted in 317 cases). Given that this sample was comprised of 150 news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs and 150 that did not, half of the news items had missing values when it came to the movement organizational measures because no AVAWOs were referred to in the news item. Thus, the logistic regression analysis that examines presence of mass media coverage focuses solely on the broad environmental factors—that is, political opportunities and discursive media.
opportunities—that shape the odds that anti-violence organizations are included in mass media coverage.

To assess quantity of coverage, I ran two separate regression analyses. These two analyses drew on the population of 412 mass media news items (again, which resulted in 527 cases) that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations included in my analysis. The first quantity of coverage measure captured the length of news items operationalized as a word count. Given that this is a count measure, I ran a negative-binominal regression to assess both the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that account for the overall length of coverage that AVAWOs received. To assess the second quantity of coverage measure, multiple mentions, I ran a logistic regression that assessed both the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that account for variation in the odds of anti-violence organizations receiving multiple mentions in mass media coverage. Multiple mentions is a binary measure that captures whether an AVAWO is mentioned more than one by name in each news item or not.

To assess quality of coverage, I ran three separate logistic regression analyses drawing on the population of 412 mass media news items that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations included in my analysis. These three analyses examined the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that account for variation in the tone of coverage anti-violence organizations received, as well as variation in whether anti-violence organizations are quoted in coverage and whether its preferred frames are included in coverage. All three quality of coverage measures were binary measures that captured whether an AVAWO received positive tone of coverage, was quoted in coverage, and whether its preferred frames were included in coverage or not.
Conclusion

This chapter presented a detailed overview of my research design, data, and methods utilized to assess the ways in which anti-violence organizations strategically influence and alter the media discourse around violence against women. I began the chapter with an overview of the period of analysis and a description of the eight AVAWOs included in my study. Next, I moved on to a detailed discussion of my data collection and the three types of mass media utilized to construct two samples: 1) a stratified random sample of 300 mass media news items that mentioned at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women and 2) a population of 412 mass media news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs. This discussion also included a description of the data utilized to capture the movement organizational and broad environmental measures. This was followed by an overview of how I operationalized my independent and three sets of dependent variables. I concluded this chapter with a discussion of the content analysis, data file construction, and regression analyses undertaken.
CHAPTER IV
BROAD ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS ON THE PRESENCE OF MASS MEDIA COVERAGE

When it comes to examining the relationship between social movements and mass media, scholars have paid increasing attention to the role that the media have in facilitating social movements ability to achieve social change (Gamson and Wolfsfed 1993; Ryan et al. 2005; Andrews and Caren 2010; Rohlinger 2014). To capture this relationship, the majority of previous scholarship (McCarthy et al. 1996; Oliver and Myers 1999; Amenta et al. 2009) has operationalized mass media coverage as a binary measure which captures whether social movements are mentioned by name in mass media coverage. Expanding upon the work of previous scholars, this chapter employed the same binary measure to assess the role that environmental factors had on the presence of mass media coverage for anti-violence-against-women organizations (AVAWOs).

Drawing on the stratified random sample of mass media news items (N=300) that mentioned at least one of four key phases related to violence against women (i.e., domestic violence, sexual assault, violence against women, and intimate partner violence), this chapter empirically assessed the influence that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities had on the mass media coverage of anti-violence groups. Given that some individual news items mentioned more than one of the eight AVAWOs, the stratified random sample was comprised of 317 total cases that represent the unique combination of each AWAWO and the individual news item included in the stratified random sample.40 Because half of the

---

40 As noted in Chapter III, 150 of the 300 distinct news items that comprise the stratified random sample mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations included in my study, while the remaining 150 news items did not. Of these 150 news items, 17 mentioned more than one AWAWO, thus there were 167 separate cases that captured the combination of each AWAWO and the individual news item included in the stratified random sample.
news items that comprise these 317 cases had missing values when it came to movement organizational measures—that is, they did not mention one of the eight AVAWOs—the movement organizational measures were not available for these cases. As such, the analysis for this chapter focused solely on broad environmental factors.

With regards to the outcome measure, presence of coverage, I constructed a measure that captured whether the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs included in my analysis was mentioned in the stratified random sample of news items. As outlined in Chapter III, I utilized a stratified random sampling procedure that ensured that at least half of the news items in the sample mentioned the name of at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations. Table 13 presents the descriptive statistics for presence of coverage. As illustrated in Table 13, approximately 55% of the 317 cases that comprise the stratified random sample mentioned the name of an AVAWO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Coverage</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assess the influence that broad environmental factors had on the mass media coverage of anti-violence groups, this analysis investigated the role that political and discursive media opportunities had. Table 14 presents the descriptive statistics for the three measures that captured the presence of political and discursive media opportunities. The first two predictor measures assessed the role of political opportunities. The first measure, Democratic advantage, captured the presence of a Democratic majority in the House and Senate. As noted in Chapter III, this measured was lagged by one year to assess whether a Democratic advantage in Congress in the
previous year impacted the odds of anti-violence groups receiving mass media coverage. According to Table 14, nearly 20% of the 317 cases were published in a year following a Democratic advantage in Congress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14. Descriptive Statistics for Broad Environmental Factors (N=317)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of The Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second environmental predictor captured the presence of elite allies by assessing whether the President mentioned violence against women in the annual State of the Union Address. Table 14 presents the descriptive statistics for *State of the Union*. This measure was also lagged by one year to assess whether mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address in the previous year impacted the odds of anti-violence groups receiving media coverage. As illustrated in Table 14, approximately 35% of the 317 cases that comprised the stratified random sample were published in a year following mentions of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address.

The third and final broad environmental measure included in this analysis assessed the role that discursive media opportunities had on the odds of anti-violence groups receiving mass media coverage. As noted in Chapter III, this measure is based on the idea that the resonance of a discursive opportunity plays a critical role in determining which movement groups received mass media coverage. *Discursive media opportunity count* is an annual count measure that captured

---

41 Chapter III provides an overview of how *Democratic advantage* was operationalized and the data sources utilized to capture this measure.
42 Chapter III provides an overview of the data sources for *State of the Union* and how the measure was operationalized.
the frequency of events related to violence against women that occurred in the greater cultural and political-legal contexts, and in the present analysis, the measure was lagged one year to capture the influence of discursive media opportunities for the preceding year impacting the present. As noted in Table 14, there was an annual average of 4.83 discursive media opportunities (SD=2.66), with a range from 1 to 9 over the course of the five-year time period for the 317 cases.

**Results**

As noted above, this analysis drew on the stratified random sample of 300 distinct mass media news items that mentioned at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women (i.e., domestic violence, sexual assault, violence against women, and intimate partner violence). Because some news items mentioned more than one AVAWO (17 news items did so), the analysis is based on 317 cases comprised of 150 news items that did mention at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations and 150 that did not. Given that over half of the new items had missing values for movement organizational measures because none of the eight AVAWOs were referred to in the news item, the logistic regression analysis for this chapter only examined the influence of the broad environmental factors on mass media coverage.

Prior to running the logistic regression analysis, I accounted for potential issues of multicollinearity among the predictor measures. Given that an R² is necessary to calculate the VIF, and that there is no equivalent R² statistic produced for logistic regression, I determined it was not an appropriate goodness-of-fit test to use to assess issues of multicollinearity for my

---

43 Chapter III provides an overview of the data sources utilized and how discursive media opportunity count was operationalized. Similar to the two political opportunity measures, this measure was lagged by one year to assess whether the frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women in the previous year impacted the odds of anti-violence groups receiving mass media coverage.
analysis (Allison 2012; Oliva and Illie 2013). Thus, I examined potential multicollinearity among broad environmental predictor factors via a correlation coefficient matrix. As outlined in the correlation coefficient matrix (see Appendix E), among the broad environmental measures, there were no intercorrelations greater than .65.

To examine the broad environmental factors that accounted for variation in the presence of coverage for the anti-violence organizations included in my analysis, I examined a logistic regression model, the results for which I present in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.57, 3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.57, 2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.91, 1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer and Lemeshow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $X^2/df$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8069/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p ≤ .001; **Significant at p ≤ .01; *Significant at p ≤ .05

Table 15 displays the logistic regression results for presence of coverage regressed on broad environmental factors. The results show that broad environmental factors did not account for variation in the presence of coverage that the eight anti-violence organizations received between 2011 and 2015. As demonstrated in the table, the presence of political opportunities and discursive media opportunities did not predict the odds of anti-violence organizations receiving mass media coverage. More specifically, neither the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress or mentions of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union
Address accounted for variation in the coverage that anti-violence organizations received. With regards to the larger discursive media context, the results indicated that the overall frequency of discursive media opportunities was not a statistically significant predictor of mass media coverage for the eight anti-violence groups included in my analysis.

To ensure that the model was correctly specified, I ran two separate goodness of fit tests. The first test examined the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, which are two well-known statistics for comparing the observed number with the expect number of observations (Allison 2014). The deviance and Pearson’s chi-square were both not statistically significant at the .05 level, thus indicating that the model was correctly specified (Allison 2014). In addition to assessing the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, I ran an additional goodness of fit test, the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test, which groups cases together according to their predicted values from the logistic regression model. For each group, the observed number of events and non-events, as well as the expected number of events and non-events is calculated and the Pearson’s chi-square is then compared to the observed and expected counts (Allison 2014). The p-value for the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test was greater than .05, thus indicating that the model is correctly specified.

**Discussion**

This chapter investigated the influence that broad environmental factors had on the presence of coverage that anti-violence organizations received during my period of analysis spanning from 2011 to 2015. Drawing on a stratified random sample of print, broadcast, and digital news items (N=300), this analysis examined 317 cases in which a news item mentioned at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women (i.e., domestic violence, sexual assault, violence against women, and intimate partner violence) to assess the influence that broad
environmental factors had on the presence of mass media coverage for the eight anti-violence organizations included in my analysis.

Given that this analysis drew on a stratified random sample of mass media news items in which half of the sample mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations, there were missing values for the movement organizational predictor measures that ensured regression analyses could only be conducted on the broad environmental factors. With this in mind, this chapter empirically assessed the role that both political and discursive media opportunities had the odds of anti-violence organizations receiving mass media attention. With regards to the larger political structure, the findings demonstrate that the presence of political opportunities was not a statistically significant predictor of whether anti-violence organizations received media coverage. As noted in Figure 1 below, the findings do not provide support for the fourth hypothesis which posited that the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress would have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a Democratic majority in the House and Senate would have greater mass media coverage of anti-violence organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong>: The presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress will have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a Democratic advantage in Congress will have greater coverage of anti-violence organizations.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5</strong>: The mention of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address will have a lagged effect, such that news item published in the year following mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address will have greater coverage of anti-violence organizations.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6</strong>: The presence of discursive media opportunities will have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a greater frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women will have greater coverage of anti-violence organizations.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to assessing the presence of Democratic allies, this analysis also accounted for the influence that the executive office had by assessing mentions of violence against women in
the President’s annual State of the Union Address. The results from this analysis do not lend support for the fifth hypothesis which posited that the mentions of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address would have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address would have greater mass media coverage of anti-violence organizations.

To better understand lack of significance between political opportunities and mass media coverage of anti-violence groups, it is important to revisit previous scholarship that has empirically examined the relationship between political opportunities and mass media coverage for social movement organizations. Although political opportunity perspective has a rich history within the broader field of social movement research (McAdam 1996, 1999; Meyers and Minkoff 2004), it is more limited with regards to accounting for movements success when it comes to achieving mass media coverage since political opportunity theorists often focus on movement groups that target the existing political structure. Among movement scholars who have examined the relationship between political opportunities and mass media coverage, they have noted that movement organizations are more likely to receive media coverage when major policy changes occur that favor movement organizations (Amenta and Young 1999; Amenta et al. 2009). The two political opportunity measures included in the analysis—that is, the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress and mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address—theoretically should also result in greater media coverage of anti-violence groups since they foster a receptive political environment. The lack of a relationship between political opportunities and media coverage of anti-violence groups suggests that there may not be a lagged effect, such that the news items published in the year following a political opportunity
do not result in greater mass media coverage, or that this lagged effect was not captured in a one-year time period employed in the present analysis.

To assess the possibility of a contemporaneous effect or a longer lagged effect, I ran two additional regression analyses to examine the influence that political opportunities had on the mass media coverage of anti-violence groups (see Appendix F). The first analysis examined the contemporaneous effect of the two political opportunity measures, while the second analysis examined a two-year lagged effect of the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress and mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union. The results for these additional analyses reveal that there was no relationship between political opportunities and mass media coverage for anti-violence groups—that is, the presence of political opportunities did not have a contemporaneous or longer lagged effect on the mass media coverage of anti-violence groups.

One potential explanation for the lack of statistical significance between political opportunities and mass media coverage of anti-violence groups is that political opportunities do not directly impact the mass media coverage of anti-violence groups; rather, the political environment may shape the tactics employed by anti-violence groups (Rohlinger 2006), which in turn, may account for variation in the mass media coverage that AWAWS received. Given the external nature of political opportunities, movement scholars (Tilly 1978; Tarrow 1998; McAdam 1996) have noted that the success of social movements is dependent on groups’ ability to not only recognize but capitalize on political opportunities. When success is measured by the presence or absence of mass media coverage, social movement groups must continuously refine their tactical repertories and use of media tactics in light of political opportunities to garner media attention (Rucht 2004; Rohlinger 2006; Sobieraj 2010). For example, it may be the case that mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address shapes the tactics
employed by AVAWOs, such that anti-violence groups write op-eds in mainstream media outlets reflecting on the President’s acknowledgement of the reality of domestic violence and sexual assault, which in turn, increases the mass media coverage that AVAWOs received.

Ultimately, the lack of a direct effect between political opportunities and greater media coverage for anti-violence groups may be explained by additional factors not included in the analysis, such as the organizational characteristics of movement groups, which may potentially mediate this relationship. For example, it may be the case that the presence of political opportunities influences whether social movement groups utilize mass media tactics, which in turn, influences whether social movements groups receive mass media coverage. As noted by Amenta and his colleagues (2009), there are a number of other factors that account for increased media coverage of social movement organizations, such as the use of disruptive tactics, having a large number of movement constituents, and the existence of policies favorable for social movement organizations. Future research should explore the potential mediating effect that movement organizational factors have in the relationship between the presence of political opportunities and whether anti-violence groups receive mass media coverage.

In light of the findings by Amenta et al. (2009), it may be the case that only taking into account presence of political opportunities without assessing movement organizational factors as well, such as movement organizational tactics and resources, accounts for the lack of significance between political opportunities and presence of coverage for anti-violence groups. Given the constraints of the regression techniques utilized in the present analysis, future research should utilize other analytic techniques that allow for the incorporation of movement organizational characteristics of social movements groups. By altering the analytical strategy, future research could incorporate movement organizational factors as predictor measures to
provide a more robust analysis of the relationship between broad environmental and mass media coverage of anti-violence groups.

The third and final environmental factor examined in the present analysis was the frequency of discursive media opportunities. As noted in Table 15, there was no statistical significance between the frequency of discursive media opportunities and mass media coverage of anti-violence groups. As outlined in Figure 1 above, the results do not lend support for the sixth hypothesis which posited that the presence of discursive media opportunities would have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a greater frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women would have greater coverage of anti-violence groups.

The lack of a relationship between the frequency at which cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women occurred and the presence of mass media coverage for anti-violence organizations may be attributed to the role of the mass media in the agenda-setting process and the time it takes for the media to deem certain issues newsworthy. As noted by McCombs and Shaw (1972), the process of agenda-setting refers to the notion that the broader public learns about which social and political issues are important from the priorities of the news media, which in turn, influences their own personal attitudes and beliefs on these same social and political issues. In the case of violence against women, scholars (Bullock 2007; Morgan and Simons 2017) argue that it is only once journalists no longer viewed incidences of domestic violence and sexual assault as isolated occurrences, but rather, as part of a broader social problem that the mass media begin to prioritize violence. The transformation of violence against women into a social problem is facilitated by the frequency at which incidences of violence
against women occur and the accumulation of incidences over time (Tierney 1982; Bullock 2007).

With regards to discursive media opportunities, I argue that it may take more than one year for these types of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women to influence the agenda-setting of the mass media. Given that it is the accumulation of incidences of violence against women taken together over time that shapes the agenda-setting of the mass media (Bullock 2007; Morgan and Simons 2017), the one-year lag effect employed in the present analysis may not capture the influence that the frequency of discursive media opportunities had on mass media coverage of anti-violence organizations. Ultimately, although cultural and political-legal events may serve as a catalyst for the broader mass media to focus its attention on violence against women, the present analysis demonstrates that the frequency at which discursive media opportunities occur did not impact the mass media coverage of anti-violence organizations.

Conclusion

This chapter presented insights into the role that broad environmental factors had with regards to anti-violence organizations ability to garner mass media coverage. Given the constraints of the regression analyses, this chapter was unable to empirically assess the movement organizational factors that accounted for variation in the presence of coverage that anti-violence groups received; however, the results do shed light on whether broad
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44 Given that the present analysis drew on data for cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women spanning from 2010 to 2015, I did not have the data necessary to lag the discursive media opportunity count measure by two years. Although I was unable to empirically assess the potential two-year lagged effect of discursive media opportunities, I did examine the contemporaneous effect of the frequency of discursive media opportunities on the mass media coverage of anti-violence organizations; however, the result did not show a statistically significant relationship.
environmental factors are responsible for the overall odds of anti-violence organizations being included in mass media coverage. With respect to the broader environmental context, this analysis accounted for both the presence of political and discursive media opportunities. The findings illustrate that the presence of neither political nor discursive media opportunities can account for why some anti-violence groups garner greater media attention.

The lack of significance between broad environmental factors and the mass media coverage of anti-violence groups suggests that there may be additional factors that were not included in the analysis that accounted for the variation AAWOs have with regards to receiving mass media attention. More specifically, it is possible that movement organizational factors, such as the resources and tactics employed by movement groups, are better predictors of whether anti-violence organizations received media coverage. It is also possible that movement organizational factors, specifically the use of media tactics by anti-violence groups, mediate the indirect relationship between political opportunities and media coverage that anti-violence groups received. The constraints of the analytical strategy utilized in this chapter, specifically the use of logistic regression, did not facilitate the inclusion of movement organizational factors as predictor measures; thus, future research should utilize analytical techniques that would facilitate the use of movement organizational factors as predictor measure, and ultimately, provide a more comprehensive analysis of the factors that accounted for variation in the presence of mass media coverage for anti-violence organizations.
CHAPTER V

MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONAL AND BROAD ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS ON THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF MASS MEDIA COVERAGE

Drawing on the population of mass media news items that mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs included in my analysis (N=412), this chapter examined the influence that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received. The results below represent the 527 cases in which the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs was mentioned in the population of 412 news items spanning from 2011 to 2015.

With regards to the first type of outcome measure, quantity of coverage, I utilized two distinct variables. The first variable assessed the overall length of coverage. Table 16 presents the descriptive statistics for length of coverage. The mean length of coverage was 1,246 words (SD=1,318), with a range between 106 and 11,760 total words for the 527 cases that represent the population of news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs. The second quantity of coverage variable assessed the frequency at which AVAWOs were mentioned by name in mass media news items. Table 16 presents the descriptive statistics for multiple mentions, based on the news items that mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs more than once in the news item. Approximately 20% of the 527 cases in my analysis included news items in which the name of one of the eight AVAWOs was mentioned more than once.

---

45 As noted in Chapter III, the 412 distinct news items resulted in 527 cases in which the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs was mentioned in an individual news item
Table 16. Descriptive Statistics for Quantity and Quality of Coverage (N=527)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of Coverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Coverage</td>
<td>1246.34</td>
<td>1318.98</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Mentions</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Coverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone of Coverage</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quoted in Coverage</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Frames in Coverage</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the second outcome measure, quality of coverage, I utilized three distinct variables. The first variable captured the tone of coverage for broadcast, print, and digital news items. Tone of coverage assessed the ways in which mass media depicted the eight anti-violence organizations. Table 16 presents the descriptive statistics for tone of coverage. Of the 527 cases, 27% contained positive tone of coverage, while 73% contained neutral or negative tone of coverage. The second quality of coverage measure assessed whether news items included a direct quote from a representative of the AVAWO, thus granting the anti-violence organization media standing. The descriptive statistics for the dichotomous measure quoted in coverage are presented in Table 16. Over half of the 527 cases (58%) contained a direct quote from an AVAWO.

The third and final quality of coverage measure accounted for whether the preferred message of an anti-violence organization was included in the news item. Following the steps of Benford and Snow (2002), I identified the diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames of each anti-violence organization using their mission statement available on its organizational websites. Using these frames, I examined all direct quotes from anti-violence organizations’
representatives and determined whether the groups’ positions and actions were included in the coverage without distortion. The descriptive statistics for the binary variable *preferred frames in coverage* are presented in Table 16. Nearly a quarter (24%) of all cases that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs contained the preferred frames of anti-violence organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Resources Index</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Origin</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Staff</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degrees</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters in D.C.</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the quantity and quality of coverage dependent variables, seven independent variables were included in the present analysis that assessed movement organizational and broad environmental factors. Table 17 presents the descriptive statistics for the four independent variables that captured movement organizational factors. The first measure, *broad organizational identity*, assessed each anti-violence organizations’ identity in terms of its language and framing of issues related to violence against women. Approximately 65% of the 527 cases mentioned an anti-violence organization that exhibited a broad organizational identity.

---

46 To determine whether the preferred frames of anti-violence organizations were included in mass media coverage, I drew on Rohlinger’s (2002) operationalization of preferred frames, which identifies three distinct criteria that must be present in the media coverage: 1) social movement actors must be quoted, 2) social movement’s position on the issue and actions are discussed, and 3) the social movement’s frame(s) are included without distortion.
The second movement organizational factor assessed the organizational resources that each anti-violence group possessed. The variable organizational resource index is an index that consisted of five distinct resource characteristics of each anti-violence organization. Table 17 provides the descriptive statistics for the organizational resources index, which had a high internal reliability with a Chronbach alpha of .80 (Lance et al. 2006). The mean number of resources among the 527 cases according to the index was 2.82 (SD=1.69), with a range from 0 to 5.

The third and final movement organizational factor I examined was the media tactics adopted by each anti-violence organization. The media tactics variables were measured by assessing two distinct characteristics of each anti-violence organization: 1) the use of a dedicated media strategist (or social media manager) by an organization and 2) the publication of op-eds by AVAWOs in mainstream media outlets. Table 17 presents the descriptive statistics for the binary measures social media manager and publication of op-eds. Approximately 66% of the 527 cases that captured the population of mass media news items mentioned anti-violence organizations that had a dedicated social media manager, while 73% of the cases mentioned an anti-violence organization that published op-eds on its organizational websites.

In addition to the four movement organizational variables, this analysis utilized three predictor measures that captured broad environmental factors. Table 18 presents the descriptive statistics for the three broad environmental factors for the 527 cases based on the population of 412 mass media news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs. The first two
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47 The five measures that comprise the organizational resource index include 1) date of origin which captured whether each AVAWO was established prior to the beginning of the time period (i.e., before 2011), 2) size of organizational staff, 3) number of organizational staff with professional and graduate degrees (e.g., JD, PhDs, etc.), 4) whether each AVAWO has a formal board, and 5) the location of the headquarters. Chapter III provides greater detail of the data collection and operationalization procedures utilized to construct the five factors that comprise the organizational resources index.
predictor variables assessed the presence of political opportunities. The first independent variable
Democratic advantage captured the existence of a Democratic advantage in Congress.\textsuperscript{48} Table 18
presents the descriptive statistics for the binary measure Democratic advantage which captured
the years in which there was a Democratic advantage in Congress. Approximately 16% of all
cases were published in a year in which there was a Democratic advantage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18. Descriptive Statistics for Broad Environmental Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N=527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of The Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to assessing for the presence of a Democratic advantage, this analysis
accounted for another political opportunity which captured the presence of elite allies by
assessing whether the President mentioned violence against women in the annual State of the
Union Address.\textsuperscript{49} Table 18 presents the descriptive statistics for the binary state of the union
measure which captured the years in which the President included mentions of issues related to
violence against women in the State of the Union Address. Of the 527 cases that represent the
population of news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOS, 39% were published

\textsuperscript{48} Chapter III provides an overview of how Democratic advantage was operationalized and the data sources utilized
to capture this measure. This measure was lagged by one year to assess whether the presence of a Democratic
advantage in Congress in the previous year impacted the quantity and quality of mass media coverage an AVAWO received.

\textsuperscript{49} Chapter III provides an overview of the data sources for state of the union and how the measure was
operationalized. Similar to Democratic advantage, this measure was also lagged by one year to assess whether the
presence of the President including mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address in the
previous year impacted the quantity and quality of mass media coverage an AVAWO received.
in a year in which the President included mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address.

To account for the broad environmental factors that shape the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received, I also assessed the presence of discursive media opportunities during my period of analysis. This touches on the idea that the resonance of a discursive opportunity plays a critical role in determining not only which movement groups received mass media coverage, but which organizations have their preferred frames included, and therefore amplified by the mass media. This analysis assessed the presence of discursive media opportunities by assessing the frequency of events related to violence against women that occurred in the broad cultural and political-legal contexts, and in my analysis, the measure is lagged one year to capture the influence of discursive media opportunities for the preceding year impacting the present. Table 18 presents the descriptive statistics for *discursive media opportunity count*, which is an annual count measure of the frequency of discursive media opportunities occurring in any given year across my period of analysis (2011-2015). As noted in Table 18, there was an annual average of 5.18 discursive media opportunities (SD= 2.75), with a range spanning from 1 to 9 over the course of the five-year time period for the 527 cases.

**Results**

Prior to running my regression analyses, I examined potential issues of multicollinearity among the independent variables. Although the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is one of the most commonly used diagnostics for multicollinearity, it is calculated for each predictor measure
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50 Chapter III provides an overview of the data sources utilized and how *discursive media opportunity count* was operationalized. Similar to the two political opportunity measures, this measure was lagged by one year to assess whether the frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women in the previous year impacted the quantity and quality of mass media coverage an AVAWO received.
by analyzing a linear regression of predictor measures on all other measures and obtaining the R² from the regression. Given that you need to obtain a R² to calculate the VIF, and that there is no equivalent R² statistic produced for logistic regression, I determined it was not an appropriate goodness-of-fit test to use to assess issues of multicollinearity for my analysis (Allison 2012; Oliva and Illie 2013).

To account for multicollinearity, I examined a correlation coefficient matrix which allowed me to assess which predictor variables were highly correlated and eliminate multicollinearity effects by removing (one at a time) highly-correlated predictors. As shown in the correlation coefficient matrix (see Appendix G), several of the organizational resource variables exhibited intercorrelations greater than .65. More specifically, the following measures exhibited high levels of correlation: date of origin, headquarters, professional degrees, and board. These are all indicators of organizational resources, and thus, to account for issues of multicollinearity among them, I created an index measure that added the six different organizational resources together (Olivia and Illie 2013).

To assess the movement organizational and broad environmental factors associated with the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received, I examined several different logistic regression models, which I present below.

**Quantity of Coverage: Length of Coverage**

For the first measure of quantity of coverage—length of coverage—I ran a negative binominal regression model since length of coverage was operationalized as a count measure (Allison 2005). I originally ran a Poisson regression, but after assessing the model fit, I determined that Value/DF was much larger than 1 (Value/DF=848.0557), which indicates that the model does not fit well due to overdispersion (Allison 2005; Atkins et al. 2013). I
determined the underlying factor that resulted in poor model fit by examining the skewness of the variable length of coverage and determined that it was positively skewed since the mean was greater than the median (Mean=1246; Median=882). This was further confirmed with a histogram, which visually illustrated the positively skewed distribution. To account for the overdispersion of length of coverage, I ran a negative binominal regression model, which indicated a much better model fit with a Value/DF closer to 1 (Value/DF=1.0960). Ultimately, the negative binominal regression is a more appropriate regression technique relative to a Poisson regression given the overdispersion of the outcome variable length of coverage (Atkins et al. 2013).

For ease of interpretation, I have taken the exponent of all coefficients for the negative binominal regression and interpreted them as odds ratios since the regression coefficients are on a log scale (Atkins et al. 2013; McLaughin et al. 2012). Like odd ratios, the exponentiated coefficients are inversely proportion around 1 and the distance above or below 1 is “interpreted as the percentage increase or decrease in the outcome for a one unit increase in the predictor” (Atkins et al. 2013: 169).

Table 19 provides the negative binominal regression results for length of coverage regressed on movement organizational factors. The findings show that only one organizational characteristic plays an important role when it comes to accounting for the variation in the length of coverage that the eight AVAWOs received during my period of analysis. As noted in Table 19, the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity accounted for variation in the length of coverage that AVAWOs received. More specifically, the predicted value of length of
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51 I ran separate analyses for the movement organizational factors and broad environmental factors for this chapter. In Chapter VI, I examine the full model that takes into account both movement organizational and broad environmental factors simultaneously, as well as any potential interactions between the two sets of predictor variables.
coverage is 32\% (e^{-0.28}=1.323) less for AVAWOs that exhibited broad organizational identities compared to their counterparts with more focused organizational identities. As noted in Table 19, neither organizational resources nor the two measures of media tactics were statistically significant predictors of the length of coverage that anti-violence groups received. The lack of significant results suggests that not all movement organizational factors can predict the overall length of coverage that anti-violence groups received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-0.53, -0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Resources Index</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.13, 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03, 0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.13, 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>7.16, 7.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p \leq .001; **Significant at p \leq .01; *Significant at p \leq .05

With regards to broad environment factors, Table 20 shows that one broad environmental factor played an important role when accounting for the variation in length of coverage that the eight AVAWOs received during my period of analysis. The frequency of discursive media opportunities was a significant predictor of the length of mass media coverage that anti-violence groups received. For each additional discursive media opportunity that occurred in a given year, the predicted value of length of news media coverage is 4\% (e^{0.04}=1.041) greater. That is, for each additional discursive media opportunity that takes place, the odds of anti-violence organizations receiving greater length of coverage is increased. The statistically significant influence that discursive media opportunities have is illustrative of the important role that the
larger discursive media environment has on the length of mass media coverage that anti-violence groups received.

Regarding the other broad environmental factors—that is, the presence of political opportunities, Table 20 indicates that neither the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress nor the President mentioning violence against women in the State of the Union Address had a statistically significant influence on the overall length of coverage that anti-violence organizations received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.57, 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.16, 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>* 0.02</td>
<td>0.00, 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>*** 0.17</td>
<td>6.60, 7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value/DF</td>
<td>1.0953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p ≤.001; **Significant at p ≤.01; *Significant at p ≤.05

**Quantity of Coverage: Multiple Mentions**

With regards to the second measure of quantity of coverage—multiple mentions—I ran a logistic regression in which multiple mentions was operationalized as a binary outcome. Table 21 displays the results from this analysis and demonstrates that movement organizational characteristics do not play a role when it comes to accounting for variation in anti-violence organizations’ ability to receive greater quantity of coverage.
Table 21. Logistic Regression Results of Movement Organizational Factors on Multiple Mentions of AWAWOs in Coverage (N=527)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.54, 3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Resources Index</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.65, 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.52, 2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.85, 3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviance 0.1177  
Pearson Chi-Square 0.0770  
Hosmer and Lemeshow 0.1615  
Model X^2/df 5.2804/4

***Significant at p ≤ .001; **Significant at p ≤ .01; *Significant at p ≤ .05

As illustrated in Table 21, the organizational identity, organizational resources, and media tactics adopted by anti-violence groups were not statistically significant. None of these influenced the odds of anti-violence organizations receiving multiple mentions in a news item. The lack of significance suggests that movement organizational factors alone do not explain the variation in this measure of the quantity of coverage that anti-violence organizations received during my period of analysis.

To assess model fit for this logistic regression analysis, I examined two goodness of fit tests to ensure that my model was correctly specified. The first goodness of fit test I conducted was to examine the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, which are two well-known statistics for comparing the observed number with the expect number of observations (Allison 2014). The deviance and Pearson’s chi-square were both not statistically significant at the .05 level, thus indicating that the model was correctly specified (Allison 2014). In addition to assessing the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, I ran an additional goodness of fit test, the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test, which groups cases together according to their predicted values from the
logistic regression model. For each group, the observed number of events and non-events, as well as the expected number of events and non-events is calculated and the Pearson’s chi-square is then compared to the observed and expected counts (Allison 2014). The p-value for the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test was greater than .05, thus indicating that the model was correctly specified.

**Table 22.** Logistic Regression Results of Broad Environmental Factors on Multiple Mentions of AVAWOs in Coverage (N=527)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.41, 4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.63, 2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.96, 1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>0.0626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.0701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer and Lemeshow</td>
<td>0.3504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $\chi^2/df$</td>
<td>3.6560/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p ≤.001; **Significant at p ≤.01; *Significant at p ≤.05

In addition to assessing the role that movement organizational factors had on the odds of anti-violence groups receiving multiple mentions in mass media coverage, this analysis also examined the role that broad environmental factors have when it comes to accounting for the variation in anti-violence groups being mentioned by name more than once in mass media coverage. Table 22 demonstrates that broad environmental factors did not play a role in accounting for the variation in the quantity of coverage that AVAWOs receive. More specifically, neither the presence of political opportunities—that is, the presence of a Democratic advantage or mentions of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union
Address—nor the presence of discursive media opportunities were statistically significant predictors of anti-violence groups being mentioned more than once in a news item.

As was the case with the previous regression analysis, I also examined two goodness of fit tests to assess that my model was correctly specified. As demonstrated in Table 22, neither the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square were significant at the .05 level, which indicates that the model was correctly specified (Allison 2014). To further assess the model specification, I ran the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test, which produced a p-value that was greater than .05, thus indicating that the model was correctly specified with no significant predictors.

**Quality of Coverage**

For the three quality of coverage measures—that is, tone of coverage, quoted in coverage, and preferred frame in coverage—I ran three different logistic regression models since each quality measure is a binary outcome. As was the case with quantity of coverage, I examined the influence that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received. As Table 23 illustrates, certain movement organizational factors were statistically significant predictors in anti-violence organizations ability to receive greater quality of coverage.

Model 1 examines the movement organizational factors that account for the variation in tone of coverage that AVAWOs received. This first model shows that organizational identity is a significant predictor of whether an anti-violence organization received positive tone of coverage. More specifically, for AVAWOs that have a broad organizational identity, the odds of them receiving positive coverage is 70% less relative to their counterparts who exhibit a more focused organizational identity. This finding indicates that anti-violence organizations with more focused
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organizational identities—identities that concentrated on issues related to campus-based sexual violence and violence against women within institutions of higher education—had greater overall odds of being depicted in a positive light by journalists and news organizations relative to their counterparts, whose organizational identities discussed issues related to violence against women in a broader, more encompassing manner. With respect to organizational resources, there was no statistically significant relationship between the number of resources anti-violence organizations possessed and odds of them receiving positive tone of coverage. Additionally, as demonstrated in Model 1, the adoption of media tactics by AVAWOs did not account for variation in the overall tone of coverage given that the presence of a social media manager and publication of op-eds did not reach statistical significance.

Table 23. Logistic Regression Results of Movement Organizational Factors on Quality of Coverage (N=527)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Model 1 (Tone of Coverage)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Quoted in Coverage)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Preferred Frames in Coverage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Resources Index</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>0.0213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer and Lemeshow</td>
<td>0.1230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model X^2/df</td>
<td>37.4950</td>
<td>***/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p ≤.001; **Significant at p ≤.01; *Significant at p ≤.05
Model 2 examines the movement organizational factors that account for variation in whether an anti-violence organization was directly quoted in a news item. Similar to Model 1, Model 2 shows that the organizational identity of an AVAWO is a significant predictor of whether an AVAWO is directly quoted in a news item. More specifically, the odds of anti-violence organizations that exhibited broad organizational identities being directly quoted is 78% less relative to anti-violence organizations that exhibited more focused organizational identities. In addition to organizational identity, Model 2 also demonstrates that organizational resources play a crucial role when it comes to accounting for the factors that predict whether an AVAWO is directly quoted in mass media coverage. According to Model 2, the odds of being directly quoted in a news item is 51% greater for each additional organizational resource an anti-violence organization possessed. With respect to media tactics, the odds of being directly quoted in media coverage is 86% greater for AVAWOs that published op-eds in mainstream media news items relative to AVAWOs that did not publish op-eds. The presence of a social media manager did not have a statistically significant impact on the overall odds of AVAWOs being directly quoted in mass media coverage.

The third and final model, Model 3, assessed the movement organizational factors that account for whether the preferred frames of an anti-violence organization was included in mass media coverage. This third model illustrates that organizational identity is a significant predictor in accounting for whether the preferred frames of AVAWOs were included in news items. More specifically, this model illustrates that for an anti-violence organization with a broad organizational identity, the odds of its preferred frames included in mass media coverage is 80% less relative to its peers who exhibit more focused organizational identities. With regards to organizational resources, this third model indicates that organizational resources were not a
statistically significant predictor of whether an anti-violence group had its preferred frames included in mass media coverage. Moreover, as was the case with Model 1, this third and final model demonstrates that there was no statistically significant relationship between the adoption of media tactics and increased odds of an anti-violence organization having its preferred frames included in a news item.

To assess the model fit of each logistic regression model in Table 23, I ran two separate goodness of fit tests. As illustrated in Table 23, for the first model, the deviance and Peason’s chi-square were statistically significant at the .05 level, which indicates that there may be potential interactions or non-linearities present in the model (Allison 2014). To further assess the model specification, I ran the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test, which produced a p-value that was greater than .05, thus indicating that Model 1 is correctly specified. As noted in Table 23, for both Model 1 and Model 2, the deviance and Peason’s chi-square, as well as the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test were not statistically significant at the .05 level, thus indicating that these two models were correctly specified (Allison 2014).

In addition to assessing the movement organizational factors that accounted for variation in the quality of coverage, this analysis also accounted for the broad environmental factors. Table 24 demonstrates that broad environmental factors did not play a role in accounting for the variation in the quality of coverage that AVAWOs received. Model 1 examines the broad environmental factors that accounted for variation in the tone of coverage that AVAWOs receive. Model 1 shows that neither the presence of political opportunities or the frequency of discursive media opportunities were associated with greater odds of anti-violence organizations receiving positive tone of coverage.
Table 24. Logistic Regression Results of Broad Environmental Factors on Quality of Coverage (N=527)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tone of Coverage</td>
<td>Quoted in Coverage</td>
<td>Preferred Frames in Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.18, 1.43</td>
<td>0.39, 2.11</td>
<td>0.19, 1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.82, 2.83</td>
<td>0.73, 2.17</td>
<td>0.60, 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89, 1.15</td>
<td>0.96, 1.20</td>
<td>0.85, 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>0.8778</td>
<td>0.1757</td>
<td>0.2739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.8777</td>
<td>0.1760</td>
<td>0.2770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer and Lemeshow</td>
<td>0.9990</td>
<td>0.6082</td>
<td>0.7573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model X^2/df</td>
<td>12.9873**/3</td>
<td>6.1747*3/3</td>
<td>4.8544*/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p ≤ .001; **Significant at p ≤ .01; *Significant at p ≤ .05

Model 2 assessed the factors that accounted for whether an AVAWO received media standing in individual news items. As was the case with Model 1, neither the presence of political opportunities or the frequency of discursive media opportunities were statistically significant predictors of whether an AVAWO was directly quoted in a news item. More specifically, there was no statistically significant relationship between news items being published in a year in which there was a Democratic advantage in Congress or published in a year in which the President included mentions of violence against women in the annual State of the Union, and AVAWOs odds of being directly quoted in mass media coverage.
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Moreover, as demonstrated in Table 24, the frequency of discursive media opportunities did not have a statistically significant impact on the odds of AVAWOs being directly quoted in media coverage.

When it comes to assessing the broad environmental factors that account for whether the preferred frame of an anti-violence organization is included in coverage, Model 3 shows that, again, neither the presence of political opportunities or discursive media opportunities accounted for variation in the odds of an anti-violence group having its preferred frames included in mass media coverage. The lack of significant results between the presence of political opportunities and discursive media opportunities and whether an AVAWO had its preferred fame included in a news item indicates that broad environmental factors do not explain variation in whether the mass media amplify the preferred message of an anti-violence organization.

To assess whether the models in Table 24 examining the effects of broad environmental factors on quality of coverage were correctly specified, I ran two goodness of fit tests. As outlined in Table 24, the deviance and Pearson chi-square, as well as the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test p-values were not statistically significant at the .05 level, thus indicating that all three models were correctly specified (Allison 2014).

**Discussion**

This chapter examined the influence that movement organizational and broad environmental factors have on the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received. Drawing on the population of print, broadcast, and digital news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs (N=412), this analysis examined 527 cases in which a news item mentioned an AVAWO to assess the role that movement organizational factors, including the organizational identity, organizational resources, and media tactics adopted
by anti-violence organizations, or broad environmental factors, such as the presence of political and discursive media opportunities, had on anti-violence organizations ability to achieve greater quantity and quality of mass media coverage.

**Quantity of Coverage**

This chapter examined two measures of quantity of coverage. The first of these measures captured the length of coverage of news items, while the second measure captured whether AVAWOs were mentioned multiple times by name in mass media news items. With regards to movement organizational factors, the findings demonstrate that when it comes to overall length of coverage, anti-violence organizations that exhibited broad organizational identities actually had decreased odds of receiving lengthier coverage. Additionally, there was no statistically significant relationship between the scope of the organizational identity of AVAWOs and the odds of anti-violence groups receiving multiple mentions in news items. As summarized in Figure 2 below, the quantity of coverage findings run counter to the first hypothesis which posited that anti-violence organizations that exhibited broad organizational identities would receive greater quantity of coverage—that is, greater odds of receiving lengthier coverage and greater odds of being mention multiple times in a news item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong>: AVAWOs with broad organizational identities will receive greater quantity of coverage</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong>: AVAWOs with greater organizational resources will receive greater quantity of coverage</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong>: AVAWOs that adopt media tactics will receive greater quantity of coverage</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To better understand these findings, it is crucial to revisit previous scholarship that has empirically examined the relationship between the scope of organizational identity and
movement groups’ ability to garner mass media coverage. As argued by Rohlinger (2002, 2014), elaborate or broad organizational identities are associated with greater mass media coverage since the greater flexibility an organization possesses in terms of its language and ability to frame its issues of concerns, the greater likelihood that journalists will turn to such movement groups. Given that mainstream media outlets position themselves to appeal to a general audience, the scope of organizational identity of social movement groups plays an important role in determining which movement groups receive mass media coverage (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993). More specifically, because mainstream news organizations prefer to include moderate views in their stories that are more representative of public attitudes, journalists often seek sources that represent a broad perspective that encapsulates culturally resonate themes (Gamson 1990; Snow and Benford 1992; Rohlinger 2014). Expanding upon this perspective, I posited that AVAWOs with broad organizational identities would be better positioned to receive greater quantity of mass media coverage because their mission statements and organizational websites would reflect their commitment to a range of issues related to violence against women, and thus, increase the likelihood that journalists would reach out to them as sources for stories pertaining to domestic violence and sexual assault. In short, this hypothesis was based on the theoretical argument that anti-violence groups with broad organizational identities would be more likely to tap into culturally resonant themes, and as a result increase their overall odds of greater quantity of coverage.

Although previous scholarship on the influence of the scope of organizational identity on mass media coverage does show a relationship—specifically one in which broad and elaborate organizational identities are associated with greater odds of receiving mass media coverage—my results do not, perhaps due to the type of mass media included in my analysis. Unlike the
majority of previous research (Rohlinger 2002; Andrews and Caren 2010) which draws primarily on newspaper and broadcast coverage to examine the relationship between organizational identity and mass media coverage, my analysis also examined digital-only news items. It is possible that the incorporation of digital-only news items may account for why there was no statistical significance between anti-violence groups with broad organizational identities and increased quantity of coverage. Unlike more traditional forms of mass media, such as print and broadcast media, digital-only news outlets can produce more news items on a daily basis and tend to focus on niche topic areas with a specialization in investigative journalism (Jurkowitz 2014). Thus, it may be the case that digital-only outlets writing about violence against women sought sources with organizational identities that directly aligned with the subject matter they were writing about. The rise of digital-only news outlets in recent years (Franklin 2014; Mitchell 2014) and the ability of digital-only news outlets to publish more news stories relative to their more traditional counterparts may account for why anti-violence organizations with more focused and narrow organizational identities had increased odds of receiving lengthier coverage given that digital-only news outlets may seek sources who have narrowed expertise for the issue covered in the news item.

To assess the possibility that the type of mass media—specifically, the incorporation of digital-only news items—had a conditional effect on the relationship between the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity and the odds of them receiving greater quantity of coverage, I ran an additional analysis (see Appendix H). This analysis examined the moderating effect that digital-only news items had on the relationship between the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity and the length of coverage that AVAWOs received. The results revealed that the type of mass media—that is, whether a news item is published on a digital-only
platform or in more traditional news outlets like print and television—did not have a moderating effect on the relationship between the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity and length of coverage. This additional analysis presents the need for future research that can further examine the relationship between scope of organizational identity and quantity of coverage, specifically when it comes to anti-violence organizations and their odds of receiving lengthier coverage.

With regards to organizational resources, the findings indicate that the number of resources an anti-violence organization possessed did not shape its odds of receiving greater quantity of coverage. As outlined in Table 19 and Table 21, there was no statistical significance between the number of organizational resources an anti-violence group possessed and its odds of receiving lengthier coverage or multiple mentions. As demonstrated in Figure 2, this finding does not provide support for the second hypothesis which posited that AVAWOs with greater organizations resources (e.g., size of staff, number of staff with professional degrees, location of headquarters, etc.) would be positively associated with lengthier coverage and greater odds of being mentioned multiple times in mass media news items.

The lack of significance between the number of organizational resources an AVAWO possessed and its ability to garner greater quantity of coverage does not align with what previous movement scholars have empirically demonstrated. Scholars such as Amenta et al. (2009) and Andrews and Caren (2010) have examined the role that movement organizational resources play when it comes to gaining mass media coverage and adopted a resource mobilization framework (McCarthy and Zald 1977) to support their argument that the greater resources an organization possesses, the more legitimate a movement groups is viewed as in the eyes of the public and mass media, and in turn, the greater odds that the group will receive mass media coverage. While
previous scholars have examined the ways in which organizational resources account for why some movement groups are more successful than others when it comes to receiving mass media coverage, the large majority of previous scholarship (Barker-Plummer 2002; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010) has only accounted for the role that organizational resources have in the absence or presence of coverage. The present findings illustrate that while resources may explain the why some movement groups received coverage, they do not account for the overall quantity of coverage movement groups gained. The lack of significance between organizational resources and increased quantity of coverage suggests that organizational resources do not predict quantity of coverage.

My findings indicate that the use of social media tactics is not associated with the length of coverage that anti-violence organizations received or the frequency at which anti-violence groups were mentioned in mass media coverage. In terms of the first measure of quantity of coverage, as outlined in Table 19, the results demonstrate that the adoption of a dedicated social media manager and the publication of op-eds by anti-violence organizations do not have a statistically significant impact on the overall odds of anti-violence groups receiving lengthier coverage. With regards to the second measure of quantity of coverage, as outlined in Table 21, neither the presence of a social media manager or publication of op-eds were associated with increased odds of AAWOs receiving multiple mentions by name in mass media news items.

As shown in Figure 2, these findings do not provide support for the third hypothesis which posited that anti-violence organizations that employed media tactics would receive greater overall quantity of coverage. As noted by previous scholars (McCarthy et al. 1996; Rohlinger 2002, 2006, 2014; Soberaji 2010), social movement groups utilize an array of tactics to portray themselves as legitimate news sources in an attempt to capture mass media attention. Again, as
was the case with organizational resources, the lack of significance between the use of media tactics and greater quantity of coverage do not align with previous research and suggests that media tactics do not predict whether anti-violence groups will receive lengthier coverage or multiple mentions in news items.

In addition to assessing the role that movement organizational factors had on the quantity of coverage anti-violence groups received, this analysis also examined the influence that broad environmental factors had. The findings demonstrate that broad environmental factors did not shape the odds of anti-violence organizations receiving greater quantity of coverage. As shown in Table 20 and Table 22, the results indicate that the presence of political opportunities did not account for variation in the length of coverage or whether AVAWOs were mentioned by name more than once in news items. As outlined in Figure 3, these findings do not provide support for the first hypothesis, which posited that the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress would have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following the presence of a Democratic majority in the House and Senate would result in greater quantity of coverage for AVAWOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3. Quantity of Coverage for Broad Environmental Factors</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4:</strong> The presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress will have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a Democratic advantage in Congress will result in greater quantity of coverage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5:</strong> The mention of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address will have a lagged effect, such that news item published in the year following mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address will result in greater quantity of coverage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6:</strong> The presence of discursive media opportunities will have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a greater frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women will result in greater quantity of coverage.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to assessing the presence of Democratic allies, this analysis also accounted for the influence that the executive office had by assessing mentions of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address. With regards to quantity of coverage, there was no statistically significant relationship between mentions of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address and greater length of coverage or greater odds of AVAWOs receiving multiple mentions by name in individual news items. As outlined in Figure 3, these findings do not provide support for the second hypothesis which posited that mentions of domestic violence and sexual assault in the annual State of the Union Address would have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the following year would be associated with greater overall quantity of coverage for AVAWOs.

The lack of significance between the presence of political opportunities and the quantity of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received may be due to a longer lagged effect. Although both political opportunity measures were lagged by one year, it may be the case that the presence of political opportunities do not impact media coverage within a one-year time frame; rather, the influence of political opportunities on mass media coverage may have a longer lagged effect, such that it may take two or three years for a favorable political environment to impact the quantity of coverage that anti-violence groups receive. Ultimately, although political opportunities may encourage political actors to seek out mass media attention and challenge previously held beliefs, the lack of statistical significance demonstrates that political opportunities themselves do not foster greater quantity of coverage.

With regards to the larger discursive media environment, the findings indicate that the presence of discursive media opportunities were associated with greater length in coverage; however, there is no statistically significant relationship between the presence of discursive
opportunities and greater odds of AVAWOs receiving multiple mentions in mass media coverage. As noted in Figure 3, these findings provide mixed support for the third hypothesis, which posited that discursive media opportunities would have a lagged effect, such that, for news items published in the year following a greater frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women, anti-violence organizations would receive lengthier coverage and greater odds of receiving multiple mentions in news items.

The mixed support for the third hypothesis may be explained by frequency at which cultural and political-legal events that comprise the broader discursive media opportunity count measure were mentioned in mass media coverage. As outlined in Figure 4, the greatest frequency of mentions of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women occurred in 2014—that is, 73 mentions of a cultural event and 89 mentions of political-legal events in the 527 cases that comprise my population of mass media news items. This year also represented the greatest number of mass media news items that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations. The increased frequency of cultural and political-legal events in 2014, as well as mentions of the cultural and political-legal events in mass media coverage, may be the driving force underlying the relationship between the frequency of discursive media opportunities and overall lengthier coverage for anti-violence groups. It is possible that these cultural and political-legal events resulted in more in-depth reporting by journalists and news organizations, which would produce lengthier news broadcasts and stories regarding the anti-violence organizations, thus accounting for greater quantity of mass media coverage.
### Figure 4. Overview of Mentions of Cultural and Political-Legal Events Related to Violence Against Women by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Political-Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality of Coverage

In addition to the two quantity of coverage measures, this chapter also examined three quality of coverage variables. The first of these measures captured the tone of coverage, while the second and third measures captured whether an AVAWO was directly quoted in mass media coverage and if an anti-violence groups’ preferred frames were included in a news items. With regards to movement organizational factors, the findings demonstrate that the scope of AVAWOs’ organizational identity is a significant predictor of whether an anti-violence group received greater quality of media coverage; however, the findings demonstrate that anti-violence groups that exhibited narrow and focused organizational identities had greater odds of receiving positive tone of coverage, being directly quoted in coverage, and having its preferred frames included in coverage. As shown in Figure 5, the findings do not support the first hypothesis, which posited that anti-violence organizations with broad organizational identities would receive greater quality of coverage relative to their counterparts with more focused organizational identities.
Figure 5. Quality of Coverage for Movement Organizational Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: AVAWOs with broad organizational identities will receive greater quality of coverage</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: AVAWOs with greater organizational resources will receive greater quality of coverage</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: AVAWOs that adopt media tactics will receive greater quality of coverage</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of significance between broad organizational identities and anti-violence groups’ odds of greater quality of coverage may be the result of a broader shift in what was viewed as culturally resonant. Given that mainstream journalists seek sources that are representative of public attitudes in an attempt to appeal to a broad and general audience (Snow and Benford 1992; Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993), the organizational identity of movement groups must align with what the mainstream media deem to be culturally resonant. With regards to violence against women, as noted by Silbaugh (2015), the landscape of journalism shifted with the publication of the Dear Colleague letter by the Office of Civil Rights in 2011, which unleashed a wave of journalism that focused on the implications of Title IX and higher education. Given the resurgence of interest in campus-based sexual violence by the mass media, it is possible that anti-violence organizations with focused organizational identities that center on sexual violence within higher education would receive greater quality of coverage. Among the eight anti-violence organizations, the three organizations that possessed narrow organizational identities—that is, End Rape on Campus (EROC), Know Your IX (KYIX), and Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER)—all focused specifically on campus-based sexual violence and addressing the growing epidemic of sexual violence within educational institutions. Thus, it may be possible that AVAWOs that exhibited focused organizational identities better aligned with the shift in what was viewed as culturally resonant among the broader public with regards to violence against women, and in turn, better positioned to receive greater quality of mass media.
coverage by journalists and news organizations. This finding emphasizes the importance of organizational identity in accounting for variation in the quality of coverage that movement groups receive, especially with regards to the ability of groups identity to tap into culturally resonant themes.

When it came to examining the role that movement organizational resources have on AVAWOs overall quality of coverage, the findings demonstrate that movement organizational resources did not account for variation in the tone of coverage that AVAWOs received or whether an AVAWOs’ preferred frames were included in mass media coverage, but did account for variation in whether anti-violence organizations were quoted in media coverage. More specifically, the more resources an anti-violence group possessed, the greater the odds of the anti-violence group being quoted in coverage. As noted in Figure 5, this finding provides partial support for the second hypothesis, which posited that the more organizational resources an anti-violence organization possessed, the greater quality of coverage they would receive.

The mixed support for this second hypothesis does not align with previous scholarship. Among social movement scholars (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Baker-Plummer 2002; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010), it is understood that movement groups that possess greater organizational resources achieve greater media coverage relative to their grassroots counterparts given that organizational resources signal legitimacy of the group and their broader claims; however, as noted previously, the majority of social movement scholars who have examined the role that organizational resources play with regards to mass media coverage have only examined the effect that resources have on the presence or absence of coverage—that is, they have failed to examine the role that organizational resources have with regards to overall quality of mass media coverage. Thus, the mixed support for the second hypothesis may be the
result of examining outcomes beyond presence or absence of coverage. It is possible that the predictive power that organizational resources have with regards to presence of coverage does not translate to quality of coverage measures such as whether a social movement organization received positive tone of coverage.

Lastly, with regards to the role of media tactics, the findings indicate that the presence of a social media manager and the publication of op-eds by AVAWOs did not account for variation in whether an anti-violence group received positive tone of coverage or whether their preferred frames were included in coverage. With regards to receiving media standing, the results indicate that the presence of a social media manager was not a significant predictor; however, the publication of op-eds in mainstream news outlets by anti-violence groups did have a significant impact on the odds of AVAWOs being quoted in news items. As outlined in Figure 5, these findings provide mixed support for the third hypothesis which posited that the use of media tactics by AVAWOs would be associated with greater quality of coverage relative to AVAWOs that abstained from employing tactics specifically focused at targeting the mass media. While scholars (Gamson 1990; Ryan 1991; Rohlinger 2013) have noted that movement groups who have a dedicated media spokesperson and produce information and events ready for journalistic consumption (i.e., video and press releases) are viewed as more legitimate sources and increase their overall odds of receiving mass media coverage, it is possible that not all media tactics translate into movement groups being viewed as a legitimate source. In an increasingly savvy media environment, anti-violence groups must continue to refine their tactics and align with the broader context.

In addition to assessing the role that movement organizational factors have on the quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received, this chapter also examined
broad environmental factors. The findings demonstrate that the presence of political opportunities—that is, a Democratic advantage in Congress and mentions of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address—were not associated with greater odds of quality of coverage for anti-violence organizations (i.e., whether an AVAWO receives positive tone of coverage, whether an AVAWOs is quoted in coverage, and whether the preferred frames of an AVAWOs were included in news items). As outlined in Figure 6, these findings do not support the fourth and fifth hypotheses, which posited that both the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress and the mention of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address would have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a Democratic advantage in Congress and mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address would result in greater overall quality of coverage for anti-violence organizations. Again, as noted in the previous discussion related to quantity of coverage, it may be the case that the lack of significance between the presence of political opportunities and the quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received is the result of a longer lag effect not captured in the one-year time frame employed in the present analysis. Ultimately, the lack of significance between the presence of political opportunities and overall quality of coverage anti-violence organizations received suggests that political opportunities themselves do not foster greater quantity of coverage.
Figure 6. Quality of Coverage for Broad Environmental Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4: The presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress will have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a Democratic advantage in Congress will result in greater quality of coverage.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: The mention of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address will have a lagged effect, such that news item published in the year following mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address will result in greater quality of coverage.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: The presence of discursive media opportunities will have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a greater frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women will result in greater quality of coverage.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that the frequency of discursive media opportunities related to violence against women does not account for variation in the quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received. There was no statistical significance between the frequency of discursive media opportunities and greater odds of an anti-violence group receiving positive tone of coverage, being directly quoted in coverage, and having its preferred frames included in mass media coverage. As outlined in Figure 6, these findings do not provide support for the sixth hypothesis which posited that the presence of discursive media opportunities would have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a greater frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women would result in greater quality of coverage for anti-violence groups. The lack of significance between the presence of discursive media opportunities and greater quality of mass media coverage for anti-violence organizations indicate that broad environmental factors do not predict whether AAVWOs will receive greater quality of coverage.

Conclusion

Overall, this chapter sheds light on the role that movement organizational and broad environmental factors have when it comes to understanding the variation in the quantity and
quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received. When it comes to the movement organizational factors, the findings demonstrate that the scope of anti-violence groups organizational identity accounted for variation in the quantity of coverage AVAWOs received; however, it was the case that anti-violence groups that exhibited narrow and more focused organizational identity possessed greater odds of receiving lengthier coverage. With regards to quality of coverage, the scope of organizational identity was a significant predictor such that anti-violence groups with more focused organizational identities had greater odds of not only receiving positive tone of coverage, but being directly quoted in coverage and having its preferred frames included in coverage. Organizational resources and media tactics played a significant role in the odds of anti-violence groups receiving media standing, such that anti-violence groups that possessed greater resources or published op-eds on its organizational websites were associated with greater odds of being quoted in coverage.

In light of the broad environmental factors, this chapter found that when it comes to receiving mass media coverage, there was no statistically significant relationship between the lagged effect of the presence of political opportunities and AVAWOs ability to garner greater quantity or quality of coverage. With regards to the larger discursive context, the results indicate that the frequency of discursive media opportunities did have a lagged effect, such that news items published in the year following a greater frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women was associated with greater odds of anti-violence groups receiving lengthier coverage; however, the lagged effect of the presence of discursive opportunities did not account for variation in the quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received. In short, by taking into account the organizational identity, resources, and tactics of social movement groups, or the presence of political and discursive media opportunities, this
research is able to provide greater scholarly understanding of the role that movement
organizational and broad environmental factors have in shaping mass media coverage of social
movement groups—both the quantity and quality of coverage
CHAPTER VI

MODERATING EFFECT OF BROAD ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS AND QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF MASS MEDIA COVERAGE

Social movements do not exist in a vacuum; rather, as demonstrated by previous scholars (McAdam 1996; Meyers and Minkoff 2004) movements are embedded in the larger social, political, and economic structure. As such, when it comes to assessing the relationship between social movements and mass media, scholars (Rohlinger 2006; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010) have acknowledged the role that both movement organizational characteristics and shifts in the broader social structure have in accounting for variation in the coverage that social movement groups receive. Expanding upon previous research, this chapter drew on the population of media news items (N=412) that mentioned the name of at least one of the eight anti-violence-against-women organizations (AVAWOs) included in my analysis to investigate the influence that movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received, as well as the moderating effect that the environmental context had on the relationship between movement organizational factors and the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received. Unlike previous research that has focused solely on the movement organizational or broad environmental factors, this chapter examined both factors simultaneously while also taking into account the moderating effect that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities had on AVAWOs’ ability to garner greater quantity and quality of coverage.

Drawing on the 527 cases in which one of the eight AVAWOs was mentioned in the population of mass media news items (N=412), this chapter utilized the same two types of

---

52 As noted in Chapter III, although the population of news items that mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs was comprised of 412 distinct news items, it was the case that multiple AVAWOs were mentioned in the same news
dependent variables examined in Chapter V. The first type of dependent variables utilized in the present analysis captured the quality of coverage that AVAWOs received (i.e., length of coverage and multiple mentions in coverage), while the second type of dependent variables captured the quality of coverage that AVAWOs received (i.e., tone of coverage, quoted in coverage, and preferred frame in coverage). To account for the influence that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the quantity and quality of coverage that anti-violence organizations received, this chapter also examined the same seven predictor variables utilized in Chapter V. The first four measures assessed the movement organizational factors and included broad organizational identity, organizational resources, social media manager, and publication of op-eds. Three measures assessed the broad environmental factors and included Democratic advantage, State of the Union, as well as discursive media opportunity count.

In addition to assessing the direct effects that movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received, this chapter also examined the moderating effect that political and discursive media opportunities had. To do so, I constructed 12 interactions terms that captured the potential moderating effect that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities had on the direct relationship between a) movement organizational identity, b) organizational resources, and c) the use of media tactics by anti-violence organizations and the quantity and quality of coverage that AVAWOs received (see Appendix I for overview of 12 interaction item. Among the population of mass media news items, there were 115 news items in which there was more than one AVAWO mentioned. This resulted in a total of 527 separate cases that represent the unique combination of each AVAWO and the individual news item. These 527 cases were utilized to assess the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received.

53 Chapter V provides the descriptive statistics for the two quantity of coverage measures and the three quality of coverage measures.

54 Chapter III provides an overview of the data sources and how the seven predictor variables were operationalized.
terms). In the regression results below, I only present interaction terms that reached statistical significance in the models.

Results

As was the case with Chapter IV and Chapter V, prior to running my regression analyses, I examined potential issues of multicollinearity among independent variables. While the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is one of the most commonly used diagnostics for multicollinearity, given that an $R^2$ is necessary to calculate the VIF and there is no equivalent $R^2$ statistic produced for logistic regression, I determined VIF was not an appropriate goodness-of-fit test to use to assess multicollinearity for my analysis (Allison 2012; Oliva and Illie 2013). Instead, I examined multicollinearity among the independent variables via a correlation coefficient matrix. The correlation coefficient matrix allowed me to assess whether predictor variables were highly correlated, which are indicative of potential issues of multicollinearity.

To assess the potential moderating effects that broad environmental factors had on the direct relationship between movement organizational factors and the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received, I examined eight different regression models, which I present below. For the regression models, only interaction terms that reached statistical significance were shown in the model.55

Quantity of Coverage: Length of Coverage

The first quantity of coverage measure was length of coverage. Given that this was a count measure, I ran a negative binominal regression (Allison 2005). As was the case for Chapter

55 To determine which interactions were statistically significant, I included all twelve interaction terms separately in the initial analysis. After identifying which interactions were statistically significant, I present only these significant interaction effects below.
V, I originally ran a Poisson regression but determined that the model did not fit well due to overdispersion given that the Value/DF was much larger than one (Value/DF=836.4064). In the analysis presented below, I took the exponent of all coefficients for the negative binominal regression and interpreted them as odds ratios since the regression coefficients are on a log scale (Atkins et al. 2013; McLaughin et al. 2013). Similar to odd ratios, the exponentiated coefficients are inversely proportion around 1 and the distance above or below 1 is “interpreted as the percentage increase or decrease in the outcome for a one unit increase in the predictor” (Atkins et al. 2013: 169).

Table 25 displays the results from this negative binominal regression and demonstrates that neither movement organizational or broad environmental factors played a role when both are included in the analysis in accounting for variation in the length of mass media coverage that anti-violence groups received. As illustrated in Table 25, there was no statistical significance between anti-violence organizations that possessed broad organizational identities, greater organizational resources, or employed media tactics and overall greater length of coverage. Moreover, with respect to broad environmental factors, Table 25 illustrates that there was no statistically significant relationship between the presence of political opportunities (i.e., Democratic advantage in Congress or mention of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union address) or discursive media opportunities and the overall length of coverage that anti-violence organizations received.
Table 25. Negative Binominal Regression Results of Movement Organizational and Broad Environmental Factors on Length of Coverage (N=527)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.43, 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Resources Index</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.14, 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.03, 0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.23, 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.59, 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.23, 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.03, 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6.91, 7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value/DF</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p < .001; **Significant at p < .01; *Significant at p < .05

In addition to the lack of significance between the direct effects that movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the length of coverage that anti-violence groups received, the presence of political and discursive media opportunities did not have a conditional effect on the relationship between a) the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity, the number of resources anti-violence groups possessed, and the media tactics adopted by anti-violence organizations and b) the overall length of coverage that AWAWOs received. None of the interaction terms reached statistical significance and thus were omitted from Table 25.

**Quantity of Coverage: Multiple Mentions**

In addition to assessing the overall length of coverage that anti-violence groups received, this analysis examined the frequency at which anti-violence groups were mentioned in mass media coverage. For the second quantity of coverage measure—multiple mentions—I ran a logistic regression in which multiple mentions was operationalized as a binary outcome.
Table 26 provides these results and is comprised of two different models. Model 1 examines the direct effect that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on whether AVAWOs received multiple mentions in mass media coverage. The results from this model demonstrate that neither movement organizational factors or broad environmental factors played a role when accounting for variation in anti-violence organizations’ odds of receiving multiple mentions in mass media coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.57, 3.42</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.74, 4.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Resources Index</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.64, 1.11</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.59, 1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.52, 2.21</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.57, 2.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.71, 3.20</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.29, 1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.37, 3.84</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.41, 4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.59, 2.69</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.18, 1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.92, 1.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.96, 1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union x Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.23, 13.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviance                       | 0.0352  |          |          |          | 0.0812   |          |          |
Pearson Chi-Square              | 0.0024  |          |          |          | 0.0761   |          |          |
Hosmer and Lemeshow            | 0.1935  |          |          |          | 0.4510   |          |          |
Model X²/df                    | 6.6165/7|          |          |          | 12.0753/8|          |          |

***Significant at p ≤ 0.01; **Significant at p ≤ 0.05; *Significant at p ≤ 0.05

Model 2 in Table 26 examines the moderating effect that broad environmental factors had on the relationship between movement organizational factors and anti-violence groups’ ability to receive multiple mentions in mass media coverage. Model 2 shows that the presence of political opportunities moderated the relationship between the use of media tactics and anti-violence groups’ odds of receiving multiple mentions in mass media coverage such that AVAWOs that published op-eds were 3.00 times more likely to receive multiple mentions in the year following mentions of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address.
To better understand how a political opportunity—specifically the mention of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address—moderates the relationship between the use of media tactics and AVAWOs’ odds of receiving multiple mentions, I graphed the predicted values of multiple mentions for the observed values of State of the Union and publication of op-eds. As illustrated in Figure 7, the predicted values visually demonstrate that in the year following mentions of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address, the odds of AVAWOs receiving multiple mentions was greater for anti-violence groups that published op-eds relative to their counterparts that did not.

Figure 7. Moderating Effect of One Year After Mention of Violence Against Women in the State of the Union Address on the Relationship Between Publication of Op-Eds and Odds of AVAWOs Receiving Multiple Mentions in Mass Media Coverage

To assess model fit for this logistic regression analysis, I examined two goodness of fit tests to ensure that the models were correctly specified. The first goodness of fit test I conducted was to examine the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, which are two well-known statistics for comparing the observed number with the expect number of observations (Allison 2014). For
Model 1, the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square were both statistically significant at the .05 level which indicates that there may be potential interactions or non-linearities present in the model (Allison 2014). For Model 2, the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square were not statistically significant at the .05 level, thus indicating that the model was correctly specified.

In addition to assessing the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, I ran an additional goodness of fit test, the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test, which groups cases together according to their predicted values from the logistic regression model. For each group, the observed number of events and non-events, as well as the expected number of events and non-events is calculated and the Pearson’s chi-square is then compared to the observed and expected counts (Allison 2014). The p-value for the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test was greater than .05 for both models, thus indicating that the models were correctly specified.

Quality of Coverage

To examine the influence that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the quality of mass media coverage, I ran five separate regression analyses that captured the effect that movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on a) the tone of coverage, b) whether an anti-violence organization was quoted in coverage, and c) whether the preferred frames of anti-violence groups were included in coverage. For each analysis, I also examined the potential moderating effects that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities had on the relationship between a) AVAWOs organizational identity, organizational resources, and use of media tactics and b) the odds of AVAWOs receiving greater quality of coverage. Table 27 investigates the first of these three quality of coverage measures and examines the influence that movement organizational and broad...
environmental factors had on the odds of anti-violence groups receiving positive tone of coverage.

Model 1 examined the direct effect that movement organizational and broad environmental factors had with regards to the tone of coverage that AVAWOs received. As shown in this first model,
the scope of AVAWOs’ organizational identity was a significant predictor of whether anti-violence groups were depicted in a positive tone in media coverage, such that the odds of AVAWOs with broad organizational identity receiving positive tone of coverage was 65% less their counterparts who exhibit a more focused organizational identity. With respect to other movement organizational factors, Model 1 illustrates that neither organizational resources or the adoption of media tactics were significant predictors of whether anti-violence groups received positive tone of coverage. Additionally, Model 1 shows that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities did not account for variation in the tone of coverage that AVAWOs received.

Model 2 assessed the moderating effect that broad environmental factors had on the relationship between the movement organizational characteristics and the odds of anti-violence groups receiving positive tone of coverage. This model showed that the presence of political opportunities moderates the relationship between the adoption of media tactics and anti-violence groups’ odds of receiving positive tone of coverage such that AVAWOs that had a dedicated social media manager were 1.73 times more likely to receive positive tone of coverage in the year following mentions of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address.

As demonstrated in Figure 8, I graphed the predicted values of positive tone of coverage for the observed values of State of the Union and social media manager. The predicted values visually demonstrate that in the year following mentions of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address, the odds of AVAWOs receiving positive tone of coverage was greater for organizations that had a dedicated social media manager relative to their counterparts that did not.
Similar to Model 2, Model 3 also assessed the moderating effect that broad environmental factors had on the relationship between the movement organizational characteristics and the odds of anti-violence groups receiving positive tone of coverage. Model 3 shows that the presence of political opportunities moderates the relationship between the adoption of media tactics and the odds of anti-violence groups receiving positive tone of coverage such that AVAWOs that published op-eds were 2.82 times more likely to receive positive tone of coverage in the year following mentions of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address.

To provide a visual representation of the moderating effect that broad environmental factors have on the use of media tactics and the odds of anti-violence groups receiving positive tone of coverage, I graphed the predicted values of positive tone of coverage for the observed values of *State of the Union* and *publication of op-eds*. Figure 9 displays these predicted values and shows that in the year following mentions of violence against women in the President’s State
of the Union Address, the odds of AVAWOs receiving positive tone of coverage was greater for groups that published op-eds relative to their counterparts that did not.

**Figure 9.** Moderating Effect of One Year After Mention of Violence Against Women in the State of the Union Address on Publication of Op-Eds and Odds of AVAWOs Receiving Positive Tone of Coverage

To assess model fit for this regression analysis, I examined two goodness of fit tests to ensure that all three models were correctly specified. The first goodness of fit test I conducted was to examine the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, which are two well-known statistics for comparing the observed number with the expect number of observations (Allison 2014). For Model 1, the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square were both statistically significant, thus indicating that there may be potential interactions or non-linearities in the model (Allison 2014). For Model 2 and 3, the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square were both statistically significant; however, both interaction terms included in the two models were also significant. In addition to assessing the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, I ran an additional goodness of fit test, the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test for all three models, which groups cases together according to their predicted values from the logistic regression model. The p-value for the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s
test was greater than .05 for all three models, thus indicating that the models were correctly specified.

In addition to assessing the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that accounted for variation in the odds of anti-violence groups receiving positive tone of coverage, this analysis also took into account two other quality of coverage measures. The first of these two measures captured whether anti-violence groups received media standing. Table 28 presents the results for the direct effects that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the odds of anti-violence groups being quoted in media coverage. As shown in Table 28, the scope of organizational identity was a significant predictor of anti-violence groups receiving media standing such that the odds of anti-violence groups that exhibited broad organizational identities being quoted in mass media coverage was 76% less relative to their counterparts with more focused organizational identities. The amount of resources an anti-violence group possessed was also a significant predictor of whether anti-violence groups received media standing. Table 28 shows that for each additional resource an AVAWOs possessed, the odds of the group being quoted in a news item were 51% greater.
Table 28. Logistic Regression Results of Movement Organizational and Broad Environmental Factors on Quoted in Coverage (N=527)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.38 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Resources Index</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.11 1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31 1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3 3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44 2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.91 1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviance 0.1422
Pearson Chi-Square 0.2218
Hosmer and Lemeshow 0.3718
Model $X^2$/df 27.6623***/7

***Significant at $p \leq .001$; **Significant at $p \leq .01$; *Significant at $p \leq .05$

With regards to the other movement organizational and broad environmental factors, neither the use of media tactics or the presence of political and discursive media opportunities were significant predictors of whether anti-violence groups received media standing. Moreover, the presence of political and discursive media opportunities did not have a conditional effect on the relationship between a) the scope of anti-violence groups organizational identity, the number of resources anti-violence groups possessed, and the media tactics adopted by anti-violence organizations and b) the overall length of coverage that AVAWOs received. None of the interaction terms reached statistical significance and thus were omitted from Table 28.

To assess the model fit for this regression analysis, I ran two goodness-of-fit tests. I first examined the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, which were both not statistically significant at the .05 level, thus indicating that the models were correctly specified (Allison 2014). In addition to assessing the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, I ran an additional goodness of fit test, the
Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test. The p-value for the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test was greater than .05 for the model, thus indicating that the model was correctly specified.

The third and final quality of coverage measure captured whether the preferred frame of anti-violence groups was included in mass media coverage. Table 29 presents the results for the direct effects that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the odds of anti-violence groups having their preferred frame included in mass media coverage. Similar to the other two quality of coverage measures, the scope of organizational identity was a significant predictor of whether the preferred frame was included in news items such that the odds of anti-violence groups that exhibited broad organizational identities having their preferred message included in media coverage was 79% less relative to their counterparts with more focused organizational identities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 29. Logistic Regression Results of Movement Organizational and Broad Environmental Factors on Preferred Frame in Coverage (N=527)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Resources Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Op-Eds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer and Lemeshow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model X²/df</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p ≤.001; **Significant at p ≤.01; *Significant at p ≤.05
As shown in Table 29, organizational resources and the use of media tactics did not predict whether anti-violence organizations preferred frames were included in mass media coverage. With regards to broad environmental factors, the presence of political opportunity and discursive media opportunities did not account for variation in the preferred frame of AWAWOs being included in individual news items. Moreover, the presence of political and discursive media opportunities did not have a conditional effect on the relationship between the movement organizational characteristics of anti-violence groups and the odds of AWAWOs having its preferred frames included in mass media coverage. None of the interaction terms reached statistical significance and thus were omitted from Table 29.

Again, to assess the model fit for this regression analysis I ran two goodness-of-fit tests. The first examined the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, which were both not statistically significant at the .05 level, thus indicating that the models were correctly specified (Allison 2014). In addition to assessing the deviance and Pearson’s chi-square, I ran an additional goodness of fit test, the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test. The p-value for the Hosmer-Lemeshow’s test was greater than .05 for the model, thus indicating that the model was correctly specified.

Discussion

This chapter empirically examined the influence that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence-against-women organizations (AWAWOs) received, while also taking into account the potential moderating effect that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities had on anti-violence groups’ ability to garner greater quantity and quality of coverage. Drawing on the population of news items that directly mentioned the name of at least one of the eight AWAWOs (N=412), this chapter assessed 527 cases in which a news item mentioned an
AVAWO to determine the role that organizational identity, organizational resources, and media tactics employed by anti-violence groups, as well as the presence of political and discursive media opportunities had when it comes to explaining variation in the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence groups received. Unlike previous research that has focused solely on movement organizational or broad environmental factors, this analysis took both types of factors into account, not only to provide a more complete explanation of the factors that account for variation in the quantity and quality of coverage that anti-violence organizations received, but to assess the moderating effect of political and discursive media opportunities.

Quantity of Coverage

Similar to Chapter V, this chapter examined two quantity of coverage measures. The first of these two measures captured the length of coverage of news items, while the second measure captured whether anti-violence groups were mentioned multiple times in mass media news items. The results show that neither movement organizational and broad environmental factors can account for the variation in the quantity of coverage that anti-violence groups received. Although the direct effects between movement organizational and broad environmental factors did not explain the variation in whether anti-violence groups received lengthier coverage or multiple mentions in individual news items, the results show that broad environmental factors did have a conditional effect on the direct relationship between movement organizational factors and the quantity of coverage that anti-violence groups received; however, as the findings demonstrate, this was dependent on both the type of organizational and broad environmental factor, as well as the quantity of coverage measure included in the analysis.

With regards to the first movement organizational factor—that is, the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity—the findings demonstrate that the presence of political
and discursive media opportunities did not have a conditional effect on the scope of anti-violence groups organizational identities and the odds of AVAWOs receiving lengthier coverage and multiple mentions in mass media coverage. More specifically, as illustrated in Table 25 and 26 above, the interaction term that captured this moderating effect did not reach statistical significance. As summarized in Figure 10 below, the quantity of coverage findings do not support the seventh hypothesis which posited that political and discursive media opportunities would have a moderating effect on the relationship between organizational identity and greater quantity of coverage such that anti-violence groups that exhibited broad organizational identities would receive lengthier coverage and multiple mentions in mass media news items in the year following the presence of political opportunities and greater frequency of discursive media opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 10. Moderating Effect of Broad Environmental Factors on the Relationship Between Movement Organizational Factors and Quantity of Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypotheses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Political and discursive media opportunities will moderate the relationship between organizational identity and mass media coverage, such that AVAWOs that possess broad organizational identities will receive greater quantity of coverage in the year following the presence of political opportunities and greater frequency of discursive media opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Political and discursive media opportunities will moderate the relationship between organizational resources and mass media coverage, such that AVAWOs that possess greater organizational resources will receive greater quantity of coverage in the year following the presence of political opportunities and greater frequency of discursive media opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: Political and discursive media opportunities will moderate the relationship between the use of social media tactics and mass media coverage, such that AVAWOs that employ media tactics will receive greater quantity of coverage in the year following the presence of political opportunities and greater frequency of discursive media opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to assessing the role that organizational identity played, this chapter examined the potential moderating effect that broad environmental factors had on the relationship between organizational resources and quantity of coverage. Similar to organizational identity, the results
shown in Table 25 and Table 26 demonstrate that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities did not have a conditional effect on the relationship between the number of organizational resources that anti-violence groups possessed and their ability to garner lengthier coverage and multiple mentions in mass media news items. These findings do not support the eighth hypothesis noted in Figure 10, which posited that political and discursive media opportunities would have a conditional effect on the relationship between organizational resources and quantity of coverage such that anti-violence groups that had greater organizational sources would receive lengthier coverage and multiple mentions in news items following years in which there was the presence of political opportunities (i.e., Democratic advantage in Congress or mentions of violence against women in the President’s annual State of the Union Address).

This analysis also examined the moderating effect that broad environmental factors had on the relationship between the use of media tactics by anti-violence organizations and the quantity of coverage that AVAWOs received. As shown in Table 25 and 26, although the direct effects between the use of a social media manager or publication of op-eds were not statistically significant, the results show that broad environmental factors did moderate this relationship. More specifically, as highlighted in Table 26, for anti-violence groups that published op-eds in mainstream mass media outlets, the odds of receiving multiple mentions were greater than their counterparts who did not publish op-eds in the year following mentions of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address.

This finding provided partial support for the ninth hypothesis outlined in Figure 10 which posited that political and discursive media opportunities would have a moderating effect on the relationship between the use of media tactics and AVAWOs’ quantity of coverage such that anti-
violence groups who had a dedicated social media manager or published op-eds would receive lengthier coverage and multiple mentions in the year following the presence of political opportunities—that is, the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress or mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union Address—or greater frequency of discursive media opportunities. The results provide partial support for this hypothesis given that the interaction term that captured the conditional effect of mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union on the relationship between a) the publication of op-eds and b) odds of anti-violence groups receiving multiple mentions in mass media coverage was statistically significant.

The lack of support for the seventh and eight hypotheses in contrast to the mixed support for the ninth hypothesis suggests that there is something unique about the presence of political opportunities—specifically the mentions of violence against women by the President—that impacts the influence of media tactics employed on the quantity of coverage that anti-violence groups received. When it comes to garnering mass media coverage, social movements engage in a range of visible and conventional tactics, such as protests and press releases that are intentionally designed to communicate a message to the broader public comprised of both supporters and opponents (Rohlinger 2006). As noted by previous scholars (Tilly 1978; McCarthy et al. 1996; Oliver and Myers 1999; Meyer 2004; Rutch 2004; Rohlinger 2006), the broader political context can shape and ultimately influence the impact that tactics adopted by social movements have on their media coverage.

The external nature of political opportunities warrants that the success of movements is often dependent on how the tactics are received (Tilly 1978; Tarrow 1998; McAdam 1996). In favorable political climates (e.g., Democratic advantage in Congress and incumbency of
Democratic president), it may be that certain tactics better resonate with movements’ targets which aids in groups’ ability to achieve their desired outcomes. For example, in the present analysis, mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union address fostered a political environment that was receptive to AVAWOs that wrote op-eds in mainstream media outlets reflecting on the reality of domestic violence and sexual assault, which in turn, increased the quantity of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received. Unlike the scope of organizational identity or the number resources AVAWOs possess, the results indicate that the relationship between media tactics adopted by AVAWOs and quantity of coverage is conditioned by the broader environmental context, such that a receptive political environment positively impacts the effect that media tactics had on anti-violence groups’ ability to garner greater quantity of coverage.

**Quality of Coverage**

In addition to the two quantity of coverage measures, this analysis also examined three quality of coverage variables. Similar to Chapter V, the first of these measures assessed the tone of coverage, while the second and third captured whether an AVAWO was directly quoted in mass media coverage and if an anti-violence groups’ preferred frames were included in individual news items. The results show that when assessing both movement organizational and broad environmental factors, organizational identity and organizational resources are the only two factors that remain significant predictors of the quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received. With regards to the moderating effect that political and discursive media opportunities had on AVAWOs’ ability to garner greater quality of coverage, the findings demonstrate that the presence of political opportunities moderates the relationship between movement organizational factors and the quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence groups received. However,
similar to quantity of coverage, this moderating effect is dependent on the type of organizational and broad environmental factor and the quality of coverage measure included in the analysis.

With regards to the first movement organizational factor—that is, organizational identity—the results show that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities did not have a moderating effect on the relationship between the scope of anti-violence groups’ identity and the odds of AVAWOs receiving positive tone of coverage, being directly quoted in coverage, and having its preferred frame included in mass media coverage. As demonstrated in Table 27, 28, and 29, the interaction terms that captured this moderating effect did not reach statistical significance. As outlined in Figure 11 below, these findings do not lend support to the seventh hypothesis. This seventh hypothesis posited that political and discursive media opportunities would have a conditional effect on the relationship between the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity and quality of coverage, such that AVAWOs with broad organizational identities would have greater odds of not only receiving positive tone of coverage, but also being directly quoted in coverage and having their preferred frame included in coverage in the year following the presence of political opportunities and greater frequency of discursive media opportunities.
This chapter also examined the potential moderating effect that broad environmental factors had on the relationship between the organizational resources that anti-violence groups possessed and the odds of AVAWOs receiving greater quality of coverage. Similar to the role of organizational identity, the findings demonstrate that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities did not moderate the relationship between the number of organizational resources AVAWOs possessed and its odds of receiving greater quality of coverage. As noted in Figure 11 above, the findings do not lend support for the eighth hypothesis, which posited that political and discursive media opportunities would have a conditional effect on the relationship between organizational resources and quality of coverage such that anti-violence groups that had greater organizational sources would have greater odds of receiving positive tone of coverage, being quoted in news items, and having its preferred frames included in news items the year following the presence of political and discursive media opportunities.

The last and final movement organizational factor included in this analysis was the use of media tactics by anti-violence groups. The findings show that broad environmental factors did moderate the relationship between the adoption of media tactics and anti-violence groups quality
of coverage; however, this moderating effect was dependent on the quality of coverage measure included in the analysis. More specifically, as shown in Table 27, mentions of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address moderate the relationship between both a) the use of a dedicated social media manager and b) the publication of op-eds by anti-violence organizations and positive tone of coverage, such that in the year following the presence of political opportunities the odds of receiving positive tone of coverage was greater for anti-violence groups that adopted both types of media tactics. While broad environmental factors did moderate the relationship between the use of media tactics and the odds of anti-violence groups receiving positive tone of coverage, there was no conditional relationship between the use of media tactics and the odds of anti-violence groups being directly quoted in mass media coverage or having their preferred frames included in individual news items. As shown in Table 28 and 29, the interaction terms that captured these potential moderating effects did not reach statistical significance. These findings provide mixed support for the ninth hypothesis, as outlined in Figure 11 above, which posited that political and discursive media opportunities would have a conditional effect on the relationship between the use of media tactics and quality of coverage such that anti-violence groups that had a dedicated social media manager or published op-eds would have greater odds of receiving positive tone of coverage, being quoted in news items, and having its preferred frames included in news items the year following the presence of political and discursive media opportunities.

With regards to quality of coverage, the mixed support for the ninth hypothesis in light of the lack of support for the seventh and eighth hypotheses indicates that there is something unique about the broader political context that shapes the relationship between media tactics and quality of coverage that AVAWOs received. Similar to quantity of coverage, it is the mentions of
violence against women by the President in the State of the Union Address that conditions the relationship between the use of media tactics and the overall odds of anti-violence groups receiving positive tone of coverage. The influence that the broader political context has on the relationship between movement tactics and mass media coverage aligns with previous research that has empirically demonstrated that the impact of movement tactics is impacted by the presence of political opportunities or constraints (Rutch 2004; Rohlinger 2006). Although this finding supports the larger body of research that examines the relationship between political opportunities and media tactics, the results indicate that the larger political environment does not moderate all measures of quality of coverage, rather, only the odds of anti-violence groups receiving positive tone of coverage. It may be that in light of the remarks about violence against women by the President, journalists and other news media organizations are more receptive to the media tactics employed by AVAWOs, and in turn write about them in a more positive tone. As noted by Schudson (2002), there exists a mutual dependency between political elites and the larger mass media given that politicians are often dependent on the mass media to vocalize and echo their concerns. As such, the politicians often play a key role in shaping the agenda-setting process of the mass media (McCombs and Shaw 1972; Schudson 2002). Thus, in the present analysis, it may be that only once the President acknowledged violence against women as a social problem did the mass media pay closer attention to anti-violence organizations, specifically those AVAWOs that adopted media tactics, and the media began to write about these organizations in a positive light.

**Conclusion**

This chapter expanded previous scholarship that has often focused on movement organizational or broad environmental factors separately. Rather, I examine both sets of factors...
simultaneously. Beyond accounting for both the role of movement organizational and broad environmental factors, this chapter also assessed the potential moderating effects that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities had on the relationship between the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity, the organizational resources AVAWOs possessed, and the adoption of media tactics by anti-violence groups, on the one hand, and the quantity and quality of mass media coverage they received, on the other.

Taken together, the findings from this chapter illustrate that movement organizational and broad environmental factors do not account for variation in the quantity of coverage that anti-violence groups received; however, the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity and the organizational resources AVAWOs possessed did account for the variation in the quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received when examining both factors simultaneously. Moreover, with regards to the moderating effect that political and discursive media opportunities had, the findings from this chapter illustrate that political opportunities—specifically, recent mentions of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address—did have a conditional effect on the relationship between a) the use of media tactics by anti-violence groups and b) the odds of AVAWOs receiving both multiple mentions in mass media coverage and positive tone of coverage. In short, these findings demonstrate that the broader environment does indeed moderate the direct relationship between movement groups’ organizational characteristics and the quantity and quality of coverage they received. However, this was dependent on the type of quantity and quality measures included in the analysis.
CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

Violence against women has continued to dominate mass media discourse in recent years (Edelman 2018). From #MeToo to the rise of the campus-based sexual violence movement, the mass media have played a key role in amplifying the messages of anti-violence activists across the nation. Many of these activists are affiliated with national anti-violence organizations that have increasingly targeted the mass media as a means of fostering cultural change.

While social movement scholars have provided a nuanced understanding of the cultural consequences associated with social movement activism (Giugni 1998; Earl 2004; McCammon et al. 2017), it is only recently that they have begun to pay increasing attention to the ways in which the mass media represent a distinct type of movement outcome (Rohlinger 2006; Amenta et al. 2009; Ryan et al. 2005; Andrews and Caren 2010). This research fills this dearth by investigating the movement organizational and broad environmental factors that account for variation in the mass media coverage that anti-violence-against-women organizations (AVAWOs) received to better understand the relationship between social movements, mass media, and cultural change.

Below, I provide an overview of the results presented in the three analysis chapters, as well as the larger theoretical contributions that this dissertation research makes to the study of social movements, mass media, and cultural change. This research addresses the need for scholars interested in cultural outcomes to explore the factors that account for variation in whether social movements groups receive mass media coverage, as well as the variation in the quantity and quality of coverage they garner.
Chapter Summaries

In the preceding analysis chapters, this research empirically examined the influence that movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence-against-women organizations (AVAWOs) received. In addition to examining the direct effect that movement organizational and broad environmental factors have on mass media coverage of anti-violence groups, I also assessed the moderating impact that broad environmental factors—specifically, the presence of political and discursive media opportunities—had on the relationship between movement organizational factors—that is, the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity, the number of resources AWAWOs possessed, as well as the media tactics adopted by anti-violence groups—and the quantity and quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received.

Chapter IV expanded upon the work of previous scholars (McCarthy et al. 1996; Oliver and Myers 1999; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010) who have assessed the relationship between social movements and the mass media coverage. As noted in the chapter, the large majority of previous scholarship has conceptualized and measured media attention in a binary fashion as the presence or absence of mass media coverage of movement groups. Although there are limitations associated with a binary measure of mass media attention, my analysis began by empirically assessing the influence that broad environmental factors had on the presence or absence of coverage for anti-violence organizations. To do so, I drew on a stratified random sample of mass media news items (N=300) that mentioned at least one of

---

56 As noted in Chapter III, 150 of the 300 distinct news items that comprise the stratified random sample mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations, while the remaining 150 news items did not. Of these 150 news items, 17 mentioned more than one AWAWO, thus there were 167 separate cases that captured the combination of each AWAWO and the individual news item included in the stratified random sample.
four key phrases related to violence against women (i.e., domestic violence, sexual assault, violence against women, and intimate partner violence).

The findings from this chapter showed that broad environmental factors did not account for variation in the presence of coverage that anti-violence groups received. More specifically, the findings revealed that neither political or discursive media opportunities influenced the odds of anti-violence groups receiving mass media coverage during the period of analysis. As I posited in the chapter, the lack of statistical significance may be attributed to a potential mediating effect that movement organizational factors, such as the amount of resources or tactics adopted by movement groups, have in the indirect relationship between the presence of political opportunities and whether AVAWOs received mass media coverage. This chapter presents the opportunity for future scholars to utilize regression techniques that allow for a further examination of the multitude of factors—that is, both movement organizational and broad environmental factors—that influence whether social movement, and anti-violence groups more specifically, receive mass media coverage.

Chapter V moved beyond a binary measure of mass media attention and assessed the influence that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors had on the quantity and quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received. Expanding upon the work of movement scholars (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Rohlinger 2002; Andrews and Caren 2010), quantity of coverage refers to the actual amount of coverage devoted to a social movement and was operationalized as the length of coverage and whether an AVAWO received multiple mentions, while quality of coverage refers to the tone and visibility of movement organizations in mass media coverage and was operationalized as whether AVAWOs received positive tone of coverage, as well as whether AVAWOs were directly quoted in coverage and had their preferred
frames amplified in coverage. To assess the influence that these two sets of factors (i.e., movement organizational and broad environmental factors) had on quantity and quality of coverage anti-violence groups received, my research drew on the population of mass media news items (N=412)\(^{57}\) that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence groups included in my analysis.

The results from this chapter revealed that when it comes to quantity of coverage, neither organizational resources or the use of media tactics by anti-violence groups had a statistically significant impact on the length of coverage or whether anti-violence groups received multiple mentions in a news item. While the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity did account for variation in the quantity of coverage AVAWOs received, it was the case that anti-violence groups that exhibited narrow and more focused organizational identities had greater odds of receiving lengthier coverage. Although this finding does not support previous research that has shown that broad organizational identities are associated with greater odds of receiving mass media coverage (see Rohlinger 2002; Andrews and Caren 2010), I posited that my finding may be due to the use of digital-only news items in my analysis. Unlike other forms of mass media, digital-only news outlets can produce news on a daily basis and tend to focus on specialized issues, such as violence against women.

To assess whether the influence of the scope of organizational identity on mass media coverage of AVAWOs is dependent on the type of mass media, I ran an additional analysis to assess whether digital-only news items moderated the relationship between broad organizational identities and the odds of AVAWOs receiving lengthier coverage (see Appendix H). As noted in Chapter V, I found that the type of media—specifically, whether a news item was published in a

\(^{57}\) As noted in Chapter III, the 412 distinct news items resulted in 527 cases in which the name of at least one of the eight AVAWOs was mentioned in an individual news item.
digital-only platform or more traditional format like print or television—did not have a conditional effect on the relationship between AVAWOs’ organizational identity and the length of coverage anti-violence groups received. Given that the type of mass media does not explain why AVAWOs’ with more focused and narrow organizational identities had greater odds of receiving lengthier coverage, future research should continue to investigate this relationship in light of the evolving mass media landscape.

With regards to broad environmental factors, the results showed that while the presence of political opportunities did not account for variation in the quantity of coverage AVAWOs received, the frequency of discursive media opportunities did have a lagged effect that resulted in greater length of coverage for anti-violence groups. As noted in the chapter, this lagged effect may be attributed to the frequency at which cultural and political-legal events that comprise the broader discursive media opportunity count measure occurred in 2014. In addition to the increased frequency at which mentions of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women were included in mass media coverage, 2014 also represents the year in which the greatest number of mass media news items mentioned at least one of the eight AVAWOs. This increase in both the frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women, as well as the increase in news items that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence groups may explain the underlying relationship between the lagged effect of discursive media opportunities and overall greater quantity of coverage for anti-violence groups.

In addition to assessing quantity of coverage, Chapter V also explored the factors that accounted for variation in the quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received. The results indicated that while broad environmental factors did not have a statistically significant impact on the quality of coverage AVAWOs received, movement organizational factors impacted the
overall quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received. More specifically, the findings showed that the greater resources anti-violence groups had, the greater odds of them being directly quoted in a news item. Additionally, for anti-violence groups that published op-eds in mainstream news outlets, the results showed that they had greater odds of also being quoted in a news item.

With regards to organizational identity, the findings in Chapter V also indicated that AVAWOs with more narrow and focused organizational identities had greater odds of not only receiving positive tone of coverage, but also being directly quoted in news items and having their preferred frames included in media coverage. I posited that this may be the result of a broad shift in what is view as culturally resonant by mass media with regards to violence against women. As noted by Silbaugh (2015), the landscape of journalism has shifted drastically since the publication of the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter, which unleashed a wave of journalism focused on issues related to campus-based sexual violence. This resurgence in campus-based violence against women may account for why anti-violence groups with more narrow and focused organizational identities had greater odds of receiving greater quality of coverage. Ultimately, these findings present the opportunity for future research to further explore this relationship an effort to better understand the role that organizational identity plays when it comes to the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that social movements receive.

In short, this chapter emphasized the role that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors have when empirically assessing the variation in the quantity and quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received. While the findings showed that movement organizational factors accounted for variation in the quantity and quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received, these results showed that broad environmental factors, specifically the
presence of political opportunities, did not influence the quantity or quality of media coverage. Ultimately, this chapter emphasizes the importance of adopting a multi-dimensional measure when it comes to assess mass media coverage as a social movement outcome and the influence that both movement organizational and broad environmental factors.

In Chapter VI, I further expanded on previous research that often focuses solely on movement organizational or broad environmental factors by empirically examining both sets of factors simultaneously. This final analysis chapter assessed the moderating effect that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities had on the relationship between the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity, the organizational resources AVAWOs possessed, and the adoption of media tactics by anti-violence groups, on the one hand, and the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs received, on the other. Drawing on the population of mass media news items (N=412) that mentioned at least one of the eight anti-violence groups, this chapter utilized the same quantity and quality of coverage outcome measures that were included in Chapter V.

The findings from this chapter showed that when examined simultaneously, neither movement organizational or broad environmental factors accounted for variation in the quantity of coverage that anti-violence groups received; however, both the scope of anti-violence groups’ organizational identity and their resources has a statistically significant influence when it came to quality of coverage. While the findings showed that the greater resources an AVAWO possessed, the greater odds of them being directly quoted in coverage, it was the case that AVAWOs with more narrow and focused organizational identities had greater odds of not only receiving positive tone of coverage, but also being quoted in a news item and having their preferred frames amplified. The influence of narrow organizational identities is similar to the results from Chapter
V. My findings, however, does not support previous research that has shown that the broader the scope of a social movement’s organizational identity, the greater likelihood that a movement group will receive mass media coverage. Again, although I posited that this may be attributed to the type of mass media included in my analysis, an additional analysis revealed that the type of mass media, specifically the use of digital-only news items, did not have a conditional effect on the relationship between scope of organizational identity and the quantity and quality of coverage that AVAWOs received.

With regards to the moderating effect that the presence of political and discursive media opportunities had on the relationship between movement organizational factors and the quantity and quality of coverage that AVAWOs received, this chapter revealed that broad environmental factors—specifically, mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union address—moderated the relationship between the adoption of media tactics and the quantity and quality of coverage that anti-violence groups received. In terms of quality of coverage, this chapter showed that mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union had a one-year lagged effect on the relationship between the publication of op-eds by AVAWOs and the odds of them receiving multiple mentions in mass media coverage—that is, mentions of domestic violence and sexual assault in the previous year strengthened the influence that the publication of op-eds had on AVAWOs’ odds of receiving multiple mentions in news items. With regards to quality of coverage, the findings revealed that mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union had a one-year lagged effect on the relationship between both the publication of op-eds by AVAWOs and the use of a dedicated social media manager and the odds of AVAWOs receiving positive tone of coverage. Specifically, this finding showed that mentions of violence against women by the President in the previous year strengthened the influence that the use of a
dedicated social media manager had on anti-violence groups overall odds of receiving positive coverage in mass media news items.

Taken together, this chapter demonstrated that the broader environment does indeed moderate the direct relationship between movement groups’ organizational characteristics and the quantity and quality of coverage they received; however, this moderating effect was dependent on the type of quantity and quality measures included in the analysis. Moreover, these findings highlight the important role that political opportunities play in influencing the impact that anti-violence groups’ media tactics have on their ability to garner greater quantity and quality of mass media coverage.

**Theoretical Contributions and Impact**

The primary theoretical contribution of this research is to the study of social movement cultural outcomes and the role of mass media coverage as a distinct cultural outcome. My dissertation extends previous discussions of cultural outcomes of movement groups by elaborating on the ways in which mass media coverage serves as a distinct type of cultural outcome for social movement groups. While social movement scholars have acknowledged the importance of the mass media in regards to the success of social movement groups (Rohlinger 2006; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010), there is an oversight among scholars with regards to the role both movement organizational and broad environmental factors have when it comes to movement groups receiving mass media coverage. This research provides insight by highlighting the factors that account for social movement groups’ ability to garner mass media coverage, as well as the factors that account for variation in the quantity and quality of coverage they receive. By addressing both sets of factors simultaneously, this research provides a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that account for variation in the mass media
coverage that social movements receive. Beyond assessing both sets of factors simultaneously, this research examined the influence that the broader political context had on the relationship between the use of media tactics and anti-violence groups’ ability to garner greater quantity and quality of mass media coverage. The results highlight the moderating effect that broad environmental factors have when it comes to the relationship between the use of media tactics by anti-violence groups and the overall quantity and quality of coverage they received.

The findings from this research provide theoretical support to social movement scholarship that emphasizes the importance of movement organizational factors in relation to mass media coverage. More specifically, my findings show that the scope of organizational identity (Rohlinger 2002, 2006), the number of organizational resources anti-violence organizations possess (McCarthy and Zald 1977; Amenta et al. 2009; Andrews and Caren 2010), and the adoption of media tactics by anti-violence groups (McCarthy et al. 1996; Oliver and Meyer 1999; Ferree et al. 2002; Rohlinger 2014) all accounted for variation in the quantity and quality of mass media coverage AVAWOs received. However, unlike previous scholars (Rohlinger 2002) who argue that movement groups with broad organizational identities are better positioned to receive mass media coverage, my results show that anti-violence groups with more narrow and focused organizational identities had greater odds of receiving greater quantity and quality of mass media coverage. This finding provides opportunity for scholars to further assess the role that organizational identity plays when it comes to mass media coverage of social movement organizations.

In addition to providing theoretical support for the influence of movement organizational factors on mass media coverage, my findings highlight the importance that broad environmental factors have when it comes to accounting for the variation in the quantity and quality of coverage
that AVAWOs received. While previous scholars (Amenta and Young 1999; Meyers and Minkoff 2004; Amenta et al. 2009) argue that the political environment—specifically, the presence of political opportunities—accounts for variation in the mass media coverage that movement groups receive, my findings only provide theoretical support for the influence that the broader discursive environment (Gamson and Meyer 1996; Koopmans and Olzak 2004; Vliegenhart et al. 2005) has on the mass media coverage that AVAWOs received. More specifically, my findings show that the frequency of cultural and political-legal events related to violence against women have a lagged effect when it comes to AVAWOs odds of receiving greater quantity of converge. The empirical support for the influence of discursive media opportunities on quantity of coverage provides future scholars with an opportunity to further assess how the broader discursive context influences both the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that social movement groups receive.

Beyond these theoretical contributions, my dissertation contributes to the broader field of sociology in terms of the data and methodology. I constructed two distinct datasets drawing on mass media coverage that mentioned at least one of eight anti-violence organizations, as well as mass media coverage that mentioned at least one of four key phrases related to violence against women. These two datasets allowed me to both qualitatively and quantitatively analyze news items to better understand the relationship between social movements and mass media. By adopting a mix-methods approach, this research attempts to provide a more robust understanding of the ways in which social movements are able to alter mass media discourse, and ultimately, shape broader cultural attitudes and beliefs.

Another methodological contribution of this research was expanding upon previous scholars by adopting multi-dimensional measures of mass media coverage. Simply taking into
account whether movement organizations receive media attention overlooks more nuanced aspects of media coverage. While scholars have acknowledged the crucial role that media coverage plays in terms of a variety of movement outcomes (Gamson and Modeligni 1989; Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; McCurdy 2012; Wooters 2013), operationalizing media attention as a binary variable fails to account for the amount of attention devoted to the social movement organization (i.e., quantity of media coverage) and whether movements’ frames are included in the coverage (i.e., quality of media coverage). The measurement contribution suggests to scholars how to better measure the mass media coverage that social movements receive.

Lastly, this research may impact existing social movements by providing them with a better understanding of the ways in which they can interact with the mass media to ensure that they are not only able to achieve mass media attention but disseminate their issues of concern through journalistic coverage. Given the role that mass media have in shaping the attitudes and beliefs of the broader public (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Ryan et al. 2005), anti-violence activists have acknowledged the crucial role that the media play. This research seeks to demonstrate the various movement organizational and broad environmental factors that shape the influence that anti-violence-against-women organizations can have on the mass media coverage. By outlining these characteristics, I believe that this research provides useful information to AVAWOs that seek to educate the public on issues related to violence against women.

**Limitations and Future Research**

As with all research, there are distinct limitations associated with the data and analysis employed in this dissertation. In addition to these limitations, there are a number of potential avenues for future scholarship to expand upon the findings highlighted and further assess the
movement organizational and broad environmental factors that account for variation in the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations receive. Broadly speaking, the limitations associated with my dissertation are centered on the data, measurements, and period of analysis utilized. Below, I elaborate on these limitations and also articulate the future research directions that scholars should explore.

**Data**

In regards to data, one of the key limitations is the potential bias associated with the use of mainstream mass media news items (McCarthy et al. 1996; Oliver and Meyers 1999; Earl et al. 2004). My research only considered mainstream mass media coverage targeted to a national audience. As such, it is possible that my data may suffer from a selection bias (Rohlinger 2014; Amenta et al. 2017). It may be possible that anti-violence organizations were successful in influencing alternative media outlets or local outlets. Given the nature of my data, I am unable to assess such influence. Future research should examine the influence that movement organizational and broad environmental factors have when it comes to garnering alternative mass media coverage to better understand the factors that shape the presence, quantity, and quality of all mass media coverage that social movements receive.

Beyond selection bias, another limitation of my data is the reliance of online databases for the transcripts of news and stories. It is possible that transcripts of some television programs and news articles may not be available via *LexisNexis* or their respective online archives. For example, *LexisNexis* does not have access to all print news sources across the country; rather, it has access to national sources such as the *New York Times* and select major regional newspaper such as the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* and the *Chicago Daily Herald*. Without access to the
full scope of mass media news outlets, my results may be biased when it comes to understanding the factors that shape the presence, quantity, and quality of coverage that anti-violence groups receive. Future research should expand the data sources utilized to ensure that a wider variety of mass media news outlets are included in the analysis.

Another potential limitation associated with the reliance of an online database for the transcript of news items was the limitations associated with my sample of print media news items. As noted above, my sampling frame was limited by the newspapers and news magazines available via LexisNexis. Given that LexisNexis does not have records of all newspapers and news magazines published throughout the United States, I had to strategically select print news items that reached a national audience and also represented geographic diversity in terms of the audience they served. Several of these newspapers, such as the New York Times, have a large and expansive national audience, while other newspapers like the Chronicle of Higher Education have a more narrow and distinct audience. I strategically chose to include trade specific newspapers like the Chronicle of Higher Education given that campus-based sexual violence was a distinct issue related to violence against women that occurred during my period of analysis and the Chronicle is one of the nation’s leading publications when it comes to reporting on issues related to higher education.

The limitation in the selection of print news items included in my two datasets presents the opportunity for future research to explore whether results vary based on the type of news source included in the analysis. For example, scholars could assess whether the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received differed if news items from the Chronicle of Higher Education were excluded. Additionally, future research could assess whether the presence, quantity, and quality of coverage that AVAWOs received
differed depending on political slant associated with certain news outlets. For example, future scholarship could assess whether the tone of coverage different for AVAWOs based on whether a news item was published by FOX.

Another limitation associated with my data was my inability to incorporate movement organizational measures in my analysis in Chapter IV. In this chapter, the use of logistic regression did not allow me to empirically assess the movement organizational factors that accounted for variation in the presence of coverage for AVAWOs given that half of the stratified random sample included news items that did not mention the name of at least one of the eight anti-violence organizations included in my analysis. Future research could alter the research design by incorporating eight additional AVAWOs from the Encyclopedia of Associations that were not mentioned in the stratified random sample of mass media news items to assess the movement organizational factors that account for variation in the presence of coverage. By incorporating eight additional AVAWOs that do not have an established history with the mass media and were not mentioned in the stratified news items, future scholars could incorporate movement organizational factors into the regression analysis and provide a more robust analysis of the relationship between both movement organizational and broad environmental factors and the presence of coverage for anti-violence groups.

**Measurements**

Beyond the limitations associated with the data included in this analysis, another limitation associated with my research was the measurement strategy utilized. With regards to the media tactic measure, I only included two types of media tactics, one of which assessed whether anti-violence organizations published op-eds on behalf of their respective organizations. It is possible that anti-violence organizations may write op-eds, but that these op-eds are never
published by news organizations. Thus, this measure may not fully capture anti-violence groups adoption of media tactics since some AVAWOs may write op-eds but remain unsuccessful when it comes to having their op-eds published in news outlets. Future research should either work directly with anti-violence groups to assess if they are writing op-eds or consider using another measure to assess the adoption of media tactics. Other types of media tactic measures include the use of Twitter and Facebook and could be operationalized as the number of tweets, or the length of time that each anti-violence group has had a dedicated Facebook group. Additionally, future scholars should assess the use of media tactics by AVAWOs by measuring the number of followers that anti-violence groups have both on Twitter, Facebook, and other social media platforms.

Another limitation associated with my measurement strategy was the overlap between the operationalization of my political opportunity and discursive media opportunity measures. In regards to the latter, the discursive media opportunity measure was operationalized by assessing the frequency of events related to violence against women that occurred in the cultural and political-legal spheres during my period of analysis, while the political opportunity measure was operationalized as the presence of a Democratic advantage in Congress and mentions of violence against women in the President’s State of the Union Address. Given that the discursive media opportunity measure captures events in the political-legal context—defined as the executive and congressional branches of government—it was possible that some political opportunities could also function as discursive media opportunities as long as they spurred public discourse (e.g., mentions of violence against women in the State of the Union, establishment of White House Task Forces related to violence against women, etc.). Given the overlap between these two broad environmental factors, future research should expand the discursive opportunity measure to
include all political opportunities that foster broader media discourse about issues related to violence against women. In short, it is possible that a more expansive and encompassing discursive media opportunity measure may be a better predictor of variation in the presence, quantity, and quality of coverage that anti-violence groups receive.

An additional measurement limitation is that grassroots activism is not included in my analysis. In addition to formalized organizations, there are individual and collective grassroots activists mobilized to change media coverage around issues related to violence against women. One example of individual grassroots activism is Emma Sulkowicz who embarked on a performance art piece in 2014 and 2015 called “Mattress Performance (Carry That Weight)” to highlight the sexual assault she endured during her tenure at Columbia University. Although Sulkowicz was not formally associated with any anti-violence organization, her performance piece as an individual activist spurred mass media discourse around campus-based sexual assault. By only focusing on formal anti-violence organizations, this research fails to account for the role that movement organizational and broad environmental factors have in regards to the mass media coverage that grassroots activists receive. Future research should assess both individual and collective grassroots activism, specifically the use of media tactics by social movement actors given that my findings show that the adoption of mass media tactics is associated with variation in the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs receive.

**Period of Analysis**

Another potential limitation is the period of analysis in which I drew on mass media news items. As I noted above, I drew on mass media news items over a five-year time period from 2011 to 2015. Given the increase in mass media discourse around violence against women in
recent years (Edelman 2018), it is possible that the movement organizational and broad
environmental factors that shape the presence, quantity, and quality of coverage may differ if I
was to include more recent mass media coverage. Future research should adopt a similar research
design but expand the period of analysis to 2018 to better understand the influence that cultural
and political-legal events, such as the rise of #MeToo in 2017, have on the presence, quantity
and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations receive.

In addition to presenting limitations associated with the frequency of discursive media
opportunities related to violence against women, my period of analysis also presents limitations
in terms of the variation associated with the presence of political opportunities. As noted above, I
examined the lagged effect of a Democratic advantage in Congress and mentions of violence
against women in the President’s State of the Union Address between 2011 and 2015. In this
specific time-frame, there was not much variation in terms of the Congress and the Executive
Branch. In light of the recent election of Donald Trump and the shift to a Republican led
Congress, future research should expand the period of analysis to 2018 to see how shifts in
political opportunities impact the presence, quantity, and quality of coverage that anti-violence
organizations received.

In conclusion, this dissertation lends support to the notion that mass media coverage is a
distinct type of cultural outcome. More specifically, the findings from this research show that the
quantity and quality of mass media coverage that anti-violence organizations received is
dependent on both movement organizational and broad environmental factors. Additionally, this
research highlights the moderating influence that the broad environmental context—specifically,
the presence of political and discursive media opportunities—has on the relationship between
movement organizational factors and the quantity and quality of coverage that anti-violence
organizations received. By better understanding the factors that account for variation in the presence, quantity, and quality of coverage that anti-violence groups receive, scholars can better understand how movement groups are able to influence mass media coverage and ultimately achieve cultural change by shaping attitudes around distinct social issues.
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APPENDIX A. Copy of Mission Statements for Anti-Violence Organizations (2011-2015)

2011

Students Active for Ending Rape (January 5th)

Started by Columbia University students in 2000, Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER) is the only organization that fights sexual violence and rape culture by empowering student-led campaigns to reform college sexual assault policies. An all-volunteer collective, SAFER facilitates student organizing through a comprehensive training manual; in-person workshops and trainings; free follow-up mentoring; our Campus Sexual Assault Policies Database; and a growing online resource library and network for student organizers. SAFER firmly believes that sexual violence is both influenced by and contributes to multiple forms of oppression, including racism, sexism, and homo/transphobia, and view our anti-sexual violence work through a broader anti-oppression lens. Committed to social change through community mobilization, SAFER arms students with the tools needed to mobilize communities and make lasting change on campus.

Rape, Abuse, & Incest National Network (January 16th)

The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network is the nation's largest anti-sexual assault organization. RAINN operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE and the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline at rainn.org, and publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services; educates the public about sexual assault; and leads national efforts to prevent sexual assault, improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

National Sexual Assault Hotline
Among its programs, RAINN created and operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE. This nationwide partnership of more than 1,100 local rape treatment hotlines provides victims of sexual assault with free, confidential services around the clock. The hotline helped 137,039 sexual assault victims in 2005 and has helped more than 1.5 million since it began in 1994.

National Sexual Assault Online Hotline
In 2007, RAINN expanded its hotline services with the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline, the nation's first secure web-based hotline that provides live and completely confidential help to victims through an interface as intuitive as instant messaging. In November 2007, RAINN won the 2007 NPower Greater DC Region Technology Innovation Award for its innovative use of technology in the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline.

Helping Policymakers and the Media
RAINN is a frequent resource for television, radio and print news outlets as well as local, state and national policymakers, law enforcement and rape treatment professionals on the issues related to rape and sexual assault.

Educating America to Prevent Sexual Assault
Extensive entertainment industry relationships allow RAINN to reach millions of Americans each month with important information about sexual assault prevention, recovery and prosecution. In addition, RAINN uses its community partnerships to put critical information into the hands of young women and men at concerts, on campus and in communities. Through these efforts, RAINN educates more than 120 million Americans each year about sexual assault.

In addition to these education efforts, RAINN also publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services and leads national efforts to improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

*We Can't Do It Alone*

We are proud to count entertainers, athletes, media networks and corporations as our partners. And, we are equally pleased to have the financial and volunteer support of tens of thousands of individuals across the U.S., from our RAINNMAkers who raise money to support our programs to RAINN Day volunteers committed to ending sexual assault on over 1000 campuses across the country.

**National Network to End Domestic Violence** (January 7th)

*Making domestic violence a national priority.*

NNEDV is the leading voice for domestic violence victims and their advocates. As a membership and advocacy organization of state domestic violence coalitions, allied organizations and supportive individuals, NNEDV works closely with its members to understand the ongoing and emerging needs of domestic violence victims and advocacy programs. Then NNEDV makes sure those needs are heard and understood by policymakers at the national level.

*Changing the way society responds to domestic violence.*

NNEDV offers a range of programs and initiatives to address the complex causes and far-reaching consequences of domestic violence. Through cross-sector collaborations and corporate partnerships, NNEDV offers support to victims of domestic violence who are escaping abusive relationships – and empowers survivors to build new lives.

*Strengthening domestic violence advocacy at every level.*

NNEDV further supports the fight to end domestic violence by providing state coalitions with critical information and resources. From training and technical assistance to innovative programs and strategic funding, NNEDV brings much-needed resources to local communities. At NNEDV’s national and regional meetings, members share information and ideas with NNEDV staff and with each other, working together to develop comprehensive solutions.

**National Coalition Against Domestic Violence** (January 5th)

The Mission of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) is to organize for collective power by advancing transformative work, thinking and leadership of communities and individuals working to end the violence in our lives.
NCADV believes violence against women and children results from the use of force or threat to achieve and maintain control over others in intimate relationships, and from societal abuse of power and domination in the forms of sexism, racism, homophobia, classism, anti-Semitism, able-bodyism, ageism and other oppressions. NCADV recognizes that the abuses of power in society foster battering by perpetuating conditions, which condone violence against women and children. Therefore, it is the mission of NCADV to work for major societal changes necessary to eliminate both personal and societal violence against all women and children.

NCADV's work includes coalition building at the local, state, regional and national levels; support for the provision of community-based, non-violent alternatives - such as safe home and shelter programs - for battered women and their children; public education and technical assistance; policy development and innovative legislation; focus on the leadership of NCADV's caucuses developed to represent the concerns of organizationally under represented groups; and efforts to eradicate social conditions which contribute to violence against women and children.

**Futures without Violence (January 24th)**

Everyone has the right to live free of violence. Futures Without Violence works to prevent and end violence against women and children around the world.

*Our Work*

Creating futures without violence has been our vision for over thirty years. Now, it is also our name. From domestic and dating violence, to child abuse and sexual assault, Futures Without Violence works to end some of the most pressing global issues of our time.

We advance the health, stability, education, and security of women and girls, men and boys worldwide. In 1994, Futures Without Violence was instrumental in developing the landmark Violence Against Women Act passed by the US Congress. Striving to reach new audiences and transform social norms, we train professionals such as doctors, nurses, athletic coaches, and judges on improving responses to violence and abuse. As well, we work with advocates, policy makers and others to build sustainable community leadership and educate people everywhere about the importance of respect and healthy relationships – the relationships that all individuals, families, and communities need and deserve.

**Break the Cycle (January 16th)**

Teen dating violence is an urgent, silent epidemic. One in three teens will experience abuse in a dating relationship and more than two-thirds of them will never report it to anyone.

**Break the Cycle believes everyone has the right to safe and healthy relationships.** We are the leading, national nonprofit organization addressing teen dating violence. We work every day towards our mission to engage, educate and empower youth to build lives and communities free from domestic violence.

Our success is demonstrated by more than a decade of leadership in working with teens to prevent and end domestic and dating violence.
Students Active for Ending Rape (January 12th)

Started by Columbia University students in 2000, Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER) is the only organization that fights sexual violence and rape culture by empowering student-led campaigns to reform college sexual assault policies. An all-volunteer collective, SAFER facilitates student organizing through a comprehensive training manual; in-person workshops and trainings; free follow-up mentoring; our Campus Sexual Assault Policies Database; and a growing online resource library and network for student organizers. SAFER firmly believes that sexual violence is both influenced by and contributes to multiple forms of oppression, including racism, sexism, and homo/transphobia, and view our anti-sexual violence work through a broader anti-oppression lens. Committed to social change through community mobilization, SAFER arms students with the tools needed to mobilize communities and make lasting change on campus.

Rape, Abuse, & Incest National Network (January 4th)

The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network is the nation's largest anti-sexual assault organization. RAINN operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE and the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline at rainn.org, and publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services; educates the public about sexual assault; and leads national efforts to prevent sexual assault, improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

National Sexual Assault Hotline
Among its programs, RAINN created and operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE. This nationwide partnership of more than 1,100 local rape treatment hotlines provides victims of sexual assault with free, confidential services around the clock. The hotline helped 137,039 sexual assault victims in 2005 and has helped more than 1.5 million since it began in 1994.

National Sexual Assault Online Hotline
In 2007, RAINN expanded its hotline services with the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline, the nation's first secure web-based hotline that provides live and completely confidential help to victims through an interface as intuitive as instant messaging. In November 2007, RAINN won the 2007 NPowers Greater DC Region Technology Innovation Award for its innovative use of technology in the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline.

Helping Policymakers and the Media
RAINN is a frequent resource for television, radio and print news outlets as well as local, state and national policymakers, law enforcement and rape treatment professionals on the issues related to rape and sexual assault.

Educating America to Prevent Sexual Assault
Extensive entertainment industry relationships allow RAINN to reach millions of Americans each month with important information about sexual assault prevention, recovery and
prosecution. In addition, RAINN uses its community partnerships to put critical information into the hands of young women and men at concerts, on campus and in communities. Through these efforts, RAINN educates more than 120 million Americans each year about sexual assault.

In addition to these education efforts, RAINN also publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services and leads national efforts to improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

_We Can't Do It Alone_

We are proud to count entertainers, athletes, media networks and corporations as our partners. And, we are equally pleased to have the financial and volunteer support of tens of thousands of individuals across the U.S., from our RAINNMakers who raise money to support our programs to RAINN Day volunteers committed to ending sexual assault on over 1000 campuses across the country.

_National Network to End Domestic Violence_ (January 2nd)

_Making domestic violence a national priority._

NNEDV is the leading voice for domestic violence victims and their advocates. As a membership and advocacy organization of state domestic violence coalitions, allied organizations and supportive individuals, NNEDV works closely with its members to understand the ongoing and emerging needs of domestic violence victims and advocacy programs. Then NNEDV makes sure those needs are heard and understood by policymakers at the national level.

_Changing the way society responds to domestic violence._

NNEDV offers a range of programs and initiatives to address the complex causes and far-reaching consequences of domestic violence. Through cross-sector collaborations and corporate partnerships, NNEDV offers support to victims of domestic violence who are escaping abusive relationships – and empowers survivors to build new lives.

_Strengthening domestic violence advocacy at every level._

NNEDV further supports the fight to end domestic violence by providing state coalitions with critical information and resources. From training and technical assistance to innovative programs and strategic funding, NNEDV brings much-needed resources to local communities. At NNEDV's national and regional meetings, members share information and ideas with NNEDV staff and with each other, working together to develop comprehensive solutions.

_National Coalition Against Domestic Violence_ (January 4th)

_The Mission of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) is to organize for collective power by advancing transformative work, thinking and leadership of communities and individuals working to end the violence in our lives._

NCADV believes violence against women and children results from the use of force or threat to achieve and maintain control over others in intimate relationships, and from societal abuse of
power and domination in the forms of sexism, racism, homophobia, classism, anti-Semitism, able-bodyism, ageism and other oppressions. NCADV recognizes that the abuses of power in society foster battering by perpetuating conditions, which condone violence against women and children. Therefore, it is the mission of NCADV to work for major societal changes necessary to eliminate both personal and societal violence against all women and children.

NCADV's work includes coalition building at the local, state, regional and national levels; support for the provision of community-based, non-violent alternatives - such as safe home and shelter programs - for battered women and their children; public education and technical assistance; policy development and innovative legislation; focus on the leadership of NCADV's caucuses developed to represent the concerns of organizationally under represented groups; and efforts to eradicate social conditions which contribute to violence against women and children.

**Futures without Violence** (January 7th)

Everyone has the right to live free of violence. Futures Without Violence works to prevent and end violence against women and children around the world.

**Our Work**

Creating futures without violence has been our vision for over thirty years. Now, it is also our name. From domestic and dating violence, to child abuse and sexual assault, Futures Without Violence works to end some of the most pressing global issues of our time.

We advance the health, stability, education, and security of women and girls, men and boys worldwide. In 1994, Futures Without Violence was instrumental in developing the landmark Violence Against Women Act passed by the US Congress. Striving to reach new audiences and transform social norms, we train professionals such as doctors, nurses, athletic coaches, and judges on improving responses to violence and abuse. As well, we work with advocates, policy makers and others to build sustainable community leadership and educate people everywhere about the importance of respect and healthy relationships – the relationships that all individuals, families, and communities need and deserve.

**Break the Cycle** (January 3rd)

Teen dating violence is an urgent, silent epidemic. One in three teens will experience abuse in a dating relationship and more than two-thirds of them will never report it to anyone.

**Break the Cycle believes everyone has the right to safe and healthy relationships.** We are the leading, national nonprofit organization addressing teen dating violence. We work every day towards our mission to engage, educate and empower youth to build lives and communities free from domestic violence.

Our success is demonstrated by more than a decade of leadership in working with teens to prevent and end domestic and dating violence.
2013

**End Rape on Campus** (August 18th)

The mission of End Rape on Campus is to provide free, direct support to campus activists who are filing federal complaints, like Title IX, to the Office for Civil Rights, and/or Clery complaints in order to hold colleges and universities accountable for their handling of sexual violations.

**Know Your IX** (August 6th)

Know Your IX is a campaign that aims to educate all college students in the U.S. about their rights under Title IX. Armed with information, sexual violence survivors will be able to advocate for themselves during their schools’ grievance proceedings and, if Title IX guarantees are not respected, file a complaint against their colleges with the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights.

This campaign was built by a large collective of survivor-activists and allies seeking to share the expertise of their first-hand experience with violence, the law, and activism. On this site you’ll find resources on Title IX and the Clery Act, guidance on engaging in campus activism, hotlines for emergency care, suggestions for supporting a survivor, and personal advice in our Dealing with section.

**Students Active for Ending Rape** (January 6th)

Started by Columbia University students in 2000, Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER) is the only organization that fights sexual violence and rape culture by empowering student-led campaigns to reform college sexual assault policies. An all-volunteer collective, SAFER facilitates student organizing through a comprehensive training manual; in-person workshops and trainings; free follow-up mentoring; our Campus Sexual Assault Policies Database; and a growing online resource library and network for student organizers. SAFER firmly believes that sexual violence is both influenced by and contributes to multiple forms of oppression, including racism, sexism, and homo/transphobia, and view our anti-sexual violence work through a broader anti-oppression lens. Committed to social change through community mobilization, SAFER arms students with the tools needed to mobilize communities and make lasting change on campus.

**Rape, Abuse, & Incest National Network** (January 1st)

The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network is the nation's largest anti-sexual assault organization. RAINN operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE and the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline at rainn.org, and publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services; educates the public about sexual assault; and leads national efforts to prevent sexual assault, improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

*National Sexual Assault Hotline*
Among its programs, RAINN created and operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE. This nationwide partnership of more than 1,100 local rape treatment hotlines provides victims of sexual assault with free, confidential services around the clock. The hotline helped 137,039 sexual assault victims in 2005 and has helped more than 1.5 million since it began in 1994.

National Sexual Assault Online Hotline
In 2007, RAINN expanded its hotline services with the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline, the nation's first secure web-based hotline that provides live and completely confidential help to victims through an interface as intuitive as instant messaging. In November 2007, RAINN won the 2007 NPower Greater DC Region Technology Innovation Award for its innovative use of technology in the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline.

Helping Policymakers and the Media
RAINN is a frequent resource for television, radio and print news outlets as well as local, state and national policymakers, law enforcement and rape treatment professionals on the issues related to rape and sexual assault.

Educating America to Prevent Sexual Assault
Extensive entertainment industry relationships allow RAINN to reach millions of Americans each month with important information about sexual assault prevention, recovery and prosecution. In addition, RAINN uses its community partnerships to put critical information into the hands of young women and men at concerts, on campus and in communities. Through these efforts, RAINN educates more than 120 million Americans each year about sexual assault.

In addition to these education efforts, RAINN also publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services and leads national efforts to improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

We Can't Do It Alone
We are proud to count entertainers, athletes, media networks and corporations as our partners. And, we are equally pleased to have the financial and volunteer support of tens of thousands of individuals across the U.S., from our RAINNMakers who raise money to support our programs to RAINN Day volunteers committed to ending sexual assault on over 1000 campuses across the country.

National Network to End Domestic Violence (January 3rd)

Making domestic violence a national priority.
NNEDV is the leading voice for domestic violence victims and their advocates. As a membership and advocacy organization of state domestic violence coalitions, allied organizations and supportive individuals, NNEDV works closely with its members to understand the ongoing and emerging needs of domestic violence victims and advocacy programs. Then NNEDV makes sure those needs are heard and understood by policymakers at the national level.
Changing the way society responds to domestic violence.
NNEDV offers a range of programs and initiatives to address the complex causes and far-reaching consequences of domestic violence. Through cross-sector collaborations and corporate partnerships, NNEDV offers support to victims of domestic violence who are escaping abusive relationships – and empowers survivors to build new lives.

Strengthening domestic violence advocacy at every level.
NNEDV further supports the fight to end domestic violence by providing state coalitions with critical information and resources. From training and technical assistance to innovative programs and strategic funding, NNEDV brings much-needed resources to local communities. At NNEDV's national and regional meetings, members share information and ideas with NNEDV staff and with each other, working together to develop comprehensive solutions.

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (January 4th)

The Mission of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) is to organize for collective power by advancing transformative work, thinking and leadership of communities and individuals working to end the violence in our lives.

NCADV believes violence against women and children results from the use of force or threat to achieve and maintain control over others in intimate relationships, and from societal abuse of power and domination in the forms of sexism, racism, homophobia, classism, anti-Semitism, able-bodyism, ageism and other oppressions. NCADV recognizes that the abuses of power in society foster battering by perpetuating conditions, which condone violence against women and children. Therefore, it is the mission of NCADV to work for major societal changes necessary to eliminate both personal and societal violence against all women and children.

NCADV's work includes coalition building at the local, state, regional and national levels; support for the provision of community-based, non-violent alternatives - such as safe home and shelter programs - for battered women and their children; public education and technical assistance; policy development and innovative legislation; focus on the leadership of NCADV's caucuses developed to represent the concerns of organizationally under represented groups; and efforts to eradicate social conditions which contribute to violence against women and children.

Futures without Violence (January 12th)

Everyone has the right to live free of violence. Futures Without Violence works to prevent and end violence against women and children around the world.

Our Work

Creating futures without violence has been our vision for over thirty years. Now, it is also our name. From domestic and dating violence, to child abuse and sexual assault, Futures Without Violence works to end some of the most pressing global issues of our time.

We advance the health, stability, education, and security of women and girls, men and boys worldwide. In 1994, Futures Without Violence was instrumental in developing the landmark
Violence Against Women Act passed by the US Congress. Striving to reach new audiences and transform social norms, we train professionals such as doctors, nurses, athletic coaches, and judges on improving responses to violence and abuse. As well, we work with advocates, policy makers and others to build sustainable community leadership and educate people everywhere about the importance of respect and healthy relationships – the relationships that all individuals, families, and communities need and deserve.

**Break the Cycle** (January 30th)

Teen dating violence is an urgent, silent epidemic. One in three teens will experience abuse in a dating relationship and more than two-thirds of them will never report it to anyone.

**Break the Cycle believes everyone has the right to safe and healthy relationships.** We are the leading, national nonprofit organization addressing teen dating violence. We work every day towards our mission to engage, educate and empower youth to build lives and communities free from domestic violence.

Our success is demonstrated by more than a decade of leadership in working with teens to prevent and end domestic and dating violence
2014

End Rape on Campus (January 23rd)

The mission of End Rape on Campus is to provide free, direct support to campus activists who are filing federal complaints, like Title IX, to the Office for Civil Rights, and/or Clery complaints in order to hold colleges and universities accountable for their handling of sexual violations.

Know Your IX (January 15th)

Know Your IX is a campaign that aims to educate all college students in the U.S. about their rights under Title IX. Armed with information, sexual violence survivors will be able to advocate for themselves during their schools’ grievance proceedings and, if Title IX guarantees are not respected, file a complaint against their colleges with the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights.

This campaign was built by a large collective of survivor-activists and allies seeking to share the expertise of their first-hand experience with violence, the law, and activism. On this site you’ll find resources on Title IX and the Clery Act, guidance on engaging in campus activism, hotlines for emergency care, suggestions for supporting a survivor, and personal advice in our Dealing with section.

Students Active for Ending Rape (January 5th)

Started by Columbia University students in 2000, Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER) is the only organization that fights sexual violence and rape culture by empowering student-led campaigns to reform college sexual assault policies. An all-volunteer collective, SAFER facilitates student organizing through a comprehensive training manual; in-person workshops and trainings; free follow-up mentoring; our Campus Sexual Assault Policies Database; and a growing online resource library and network for student organizers. SAFER firmly believes that sexual violence is both influenced by and contributes to multiple forms of oppression, including racism, sexism, and homo/transphobia, and view our anti-sexual violence work through a broader anti-oppression lens. Committed to social change through community mobilization, SAFER arms students with the tools needed to mobilize communities and make lasting change on campus.

Rape, Abuse, & Incest National Network (January 3rd)

The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network is the nation's largest anti-sexual assault organization. RAINN operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE and the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline at rainn.org, and publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services; educates the public about sexual assault; and leads national efforts to prevent sexual assault, improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

National Sexual Assault Hotline
Among its programs, RAINN created and operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE. This nationwide partnership of more than 1,100 local rape treatment hotlines provides victims of sexual assault with free, confidential services around the clock. The hotline helped 137,039 sexual assault victims in 2005 and has helped more than 1.5 million since it began in 1994.

National Sexual Assault Online Hotline
In 2007, RAINN expanded its hotline services with the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline, the nation's first secure web-based hotline that provides live and completely confidential help to victims through an interface as intuitive as instant messaging. In November 2007, RAINN won the 2007 NPower Greater DC Region Technology Innovation Award for its innovative use of technology in the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline.

Helping Policymakers and the Media
RAINN is a frequent resource for television, radio and print news outlets as well as local, state and national policymakers, law enforcement and rape treatment professionals on the issues related to rape and sexual assault.

Educating America to Prevent Sexual Assault
Extensive entertainment industry relationships allow RAINN to reach millions of Americans each month with important information about sexual assault prevention, recovery and prosecution. In addition, RAINN uses its community partnerships to put critical information into the hands of young women and men at concerts, on campus and in communities. Through these efforts, RAINN educates more than 120 million Americans each year about sexual assault.

In addition to these education efforts, RAINN also publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services and leads national efforts to improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

We Can't Do It Alone
We are proud to count entertainers, athletes, media networks and corporations as our partners. And, we are equally pleased to have the financial and volunteer support of tens of thousands of individuals across the U.S., from our RAINNMakers who raise money to support our programs to RAINN Day volunteers committed to ending sexual assault on over 1000 campuses across the country.

National Network to End Domestic Violence (January 3rd)

Making domestic violence a national priority.
NNEDV is the leading voice for domestic violence victims and their advocates. As a membership and advocacy organization of state domestic violence coalitions, allied organizations and supportive individuals, NNEDV works closely with its members to understand the ongoing and emerging needs of domestic violence victims and advocacy programs. Then NNEDV makes sure those needs are heard and understood by policymakers at the national level.
Changing the way society responds to domestic violence. NNEDV offers a range of programs and initiatives to address the complex causes and far-reaching consequences of domestic violence. Through cross-sector collaborations and corporate partnerships, NNEDV offers support to victims of domestic violence who are escaping abusive relationships – and empowers survivors to build new lives.

**Strengthening domestic violence advocacy at every level.**
NNEDV further supports the fight to end domestic violence by providing state coalitions with critical information and resources. From training and technical assistance to innovative programs and strategic funding, NNEDV brings much-needed resources to local communities. At NNEDV's national and regional meetings, members share information and ideas with NNEDV staff and with each other, working together to develop comprehensive solutions.

**National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (January 5th)**

The Mission of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) is to organize for collective power by advancing transformative work, thinking and leadership of communities and individuals working to end the violence in our lives.

NCADV believes violence against women and children results from the use of force or threat to achieve and maintain control over others in intimate relationships, and from societal abuse of power and domination in the forms of sexism, racism, homophobia, classism, anti-Semitism, able-bodyism, ageism and other oppressions. NCADV recognizes that the abuses of power in society foster battering by perpetuating conditions, which condone violence against women and children. Therefore, it is the mission of NCADV to work for major societal changes necessary to eliminate both personal and societal violence against all women and children.

NCADV's work includes coalition building at the local, state, regional and national levels; support for the provision of community-based, non-violent alternatives - such as safe home and shelter programs - for battered women and their children; public education and technical assistance; policy development and innovative legislation; focus on the leadership of NCADV's caucuses developed to represent the concerns of organizationally under represented groups; and efforts to eradicate social conditions which contribute to violence against women and children.

**Futures without Violence (January 1st)**

Everyone has the right to live free of violence.

Under the leadership and vision of founder Esta Soler for more than 30 years, Futures Without Violence has led the way and set the pace for ground-breaking education programs, national policy development, professional training programs, and public actions designed to end violence against women, children and families around the world. In 1994, Futures Without Violence was instrumental in developing the landmark Violence Against Women Act passed by the U.S. Congress.

Providing leadership from offices in San Francisco, Washington D.C. and Boston, we have established a state-of-the-art Center for Leadership and Action in the Presidio of San Francisco
to foster ongoing dialogue about gender-based violence and child abuse. Striving to reach new audiences and transform social norms, we train professionals such as doctors, nurses, athletic coaches, and judges on improving responses to violence and abuse. We also work with advocates, policy makers and others to build sustainable community leadership and educate people everywhere about the importance of respect and healthy relationships.

**Break the Cycle (January 2**\textsuperscript{nd})**

Break the Cycle is the leading national nonprofit organization providing comprehensive dating abuse programs exclusively to young people ages 12 to 24. From the classroom to the courtroom to the floor of Congress, we work every day to give young people, and those who care about them, the tools they need to live safer, healthier lives. Break the Cycle inspires and supports young people to build healthy relationships and create a culture without abuse.
2015

End Rape on Campus (January 18th)

End Rape on Campus (EROC) works to end campus sexual violence through direct support for survivors and their communities; prevention through education; and policy reform at the campus, local, state, and federal levels.

Know Your IX (January 1st)

Founded in 2013, Know Your IX is a survivor- and youth-led organization that aims to empower students to end sexual and dating violence in their schools. We envision a world in which all students can pursue their civil right to educations free from violence and harassment. We recognize women, transgender, and gender non-conforming students will not have equality in education or opportunity until the violence ends. We draw upon the civil rights law Title IX as an alternative to the criminal legal system — one that is more just and responsive to the educational, emotional, financial, and stigmatic harms of violence.

We accomplish our mission through:
1. Educating college and high school students in the United States about their legal rights to safe educations free from gender-based harms;
2. Training, organizing, and supporting student survivor activists in challenging their educational institutions to address violence and discrimination;
3. Advocating for policy change at the campus, state, and federal levels to ensure meaningful systemic action to end gender violence.

In the two years since our founding, Know Your IX has grown from a website dreamed up by two students to a nationally respected organization empowering students to end gender violence at high schools and colleges across the country. We maintain a one-stop-shop, information-rich website (this one!) and provide support to student survivor activists at more than 200 schools through regional bootcamps, online teach-ins, monthly newsletters, individual strategy consultation and implementation support, a suite of informational posters, graphics and stickers, and Know Your Rights Facebook “ads”. Our work and commentary is featured regularly in the national press, the White House attributed the creation of its 2014 Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault to our activism, and the U.S. Secretary of Education publicly thanked Know Your IX for demanding his attention — and the country’s. Politico Magazine recently named Know Your IX one of the 50 ideas transforming American politics in 2015.

Students Active for Ending Rape (January 6th)

Started by Columbia University students in 2000, Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER) is the only organization that fights sexual violence and rape culture by empowering student-led campaigns to reform college sexual assault policies. An all-volunteer collective, SAFER facilitates student organizing through a comprehensive training manual; in-person workshops and trainings; free follow-up mentoring; our Campus Sexual Assault Policies Database; and a growing online resource library and network for student organizers. SAFER firmly believes that
sexual violence is both influenced by and contributes to multiple forms of oppression, including racism, sexism, and homo/transphobia, and view our anti-sexual violence work through a broader anti-oppression lens. Committed to social change through community mobilization, SAFER arms students with the tools needed to mobilize communities and make lasting change on campus.

**Rape, Abuse, & Incest National Network (January 1st)**

The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network is the nation's largest anti-sexual assault organization. RAINN operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE and the National Sexual Assault *Online* Hotline at rainn.org, and publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services; educates the public about sexual assault; and leads national efforts to prevent sexual assault, improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

**National Sexual Assault Hotline**

Among its programs, RAINN created and operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline at 1.800.656.HOPE. This nationwide partnership of more than 1,100 local rape treatment hotlines provides victims of sexual assault with free, confidential services around the clock. The hotline helped 137,039 sexual assault victims in 2005 and has helped more than 1.5 million since it began in 1994.

**National Sexual Assault Online Hotline**

In 2007, RAINN expanded its hotline services with the National Sexual Assault *Online* Hotline, the nation's first secure web-based hotline that provides live and completely confidential help to victims through an interface as intuitive as instant messaging. In November 2007, RAINN won the 2007 NPower Greater DC Region Technology Innovation Award for its innovative use of technology in the National Sexual Assault *Online* Hotline.

**Helping Policymakers and the Media**

RAINN is a frequent resource for television, radio and print news outlets as well as local, state and national policymakers, law enforcement and rape treatment professionals on the issues related to rape and sexual assault.

**Educating America to Prevent Sexual Assault**

Extensive entertainment industry relationships allow RAINN to reach millions of Americans each month with important information about sexual assault prevention, recovery and prosecution. In addition, RAINN uses its community partnerships to put critical information into the hands of young women and men at concerts, on campus and in communities. Through these efforts, RAINN educates more than 120 million Americans each year about sexual assault.

In addition to these education efforts, RAINN also publicizes the hotlines' free, confidential services and leads national efforts to improve services to victims and ensure that rapists are brought to justice.

*We Can't Do It Alone*
We are proud to count entertainers, athletes, media networks and corporations as our partners. And, we are equally pleased to have the financial and volunteer support of tens of thousands of individuals across the U.S., from our RAINNMakers who raise money to support our programs to RAINN Day volunteers committed to ending sexual assault on over 1000 campuses across the country.

**National Network to End Domestic Violence** (January 1st)

*Making domestic violence a national priority.*
NNEDV is the leading voice for domestic violence victims and their advocates. As a membership and advocacy organization of state domestic violence coalitions, allied organizations and supportive individuals, NNEDV works closely with its members to understand the ongoing and emerging needs of domestic violence victims and advocacy programs. Then NNEDV makes sure those needs are heard and understood by policymakers at the national level.

*Changing the way society responds to domestic violence.*
NNEDV offers a range of programs and initiatives to address the complex causes and far-reaching consequences of domestic violence. Through cross-sector collaborations and corporate partnerships, NNEDV offers support to victims of domestic violence who are escaping abusive relationships – and empowers survivors to build new lives.

*Strengthening domestic violence advocacy at every level.*
NNEDV further supports the fight to end domestic violence by providing state coalitions with critical information and resources. From training and technical assistance to innovative programs and strategic funding, NNEDV brings much-needed resources to local communities. At NNEDV's national and regional meetings, members share information and ideas with NNEDV staff and with each other, working together to develop comprehensive solutions.

**National Coalition Against Domestic Violence** (January 7th)

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV), has worked since 1978 to make every home a safe home. NCADV works to raise awareness about domestic violence; to educate and create programming and technical assistance, to assist the public in addressing the issue, and to support those impacted by domestic violence.

**NCADV's Programming and Projects**

*Public Policy*
The NCADV Public Policy Office collaborates with other national organizations to promote legislation and policies that serve and protect victims and survivors of domestic violence, and we work to change the narrative surrounding domestic violence. We seek macro-level change in order to create a society in which domestic violence is never tolerated or minimized, in which victims and survivors are respected, and in which service providers have the resources to serve all victims and survivors. In turn, we rely on our members and our partners’ members to provide grassroots support, contacting their congressional delegations and making their voices heard at the local level. We also provide technical support to individuals and groups seeking information
on legislation, laws, policy, studies, and other resources pertaining to domestic violence at the national level.

The Cosmetic and Reconstructive Surgery Program (CRS)™
The Cosmetic & Reconstructive Support (CRS) Program™ of NCADV is the only direct service program NCADV offers to survivors. We currently work in partnership with the American Academy of Facial Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery (AAFPRS) to assist survivors of domestic violence who cannot afford the cosmetic and reconstructive surgery needed to repair injuries caused by an abusive partner to their head, face, or neck. Facial plastic surgeons from across the country volunteer their services to assist survivors in removing these physical scars of abuse. We will be expanding this program in 2015.

Remember My Name (RMN)™
Since 1994, NCADV has been memorializing the many women, children, and men killed by abusers in the U.S. through our Remember My Name™ project. Twenty years ago, RMN™ was created by Ms. Magazine and NCADV to bring awareness to the issue of domestic violence, honor those who have lost their lives, and spotlight the all-too-common outcome of abusers' choices. Each year, we produce a memorial poster listing the names and ages of those killed by an abuser and the state in which they died. To date, we have collected over 10,000 names from all across the U.S. from family, friends, and others who want to remember and honor those they have lost. RMN™ will be expanding soon through When I was Here™, a more in-depth arm of the program aimed at personalizing the lives of each victim through memories and information shared by those that knew them.

Reproductive Coercion
Reproductive coercion is the behavior used to pressure or coerce a woman into becoming pregnant or into continuing or ending a pregnancy against her will, through the use of manipulation, intimidation, threats, and/or actual acts of violence. The Feminist Women’s Health Center (FWHC), NCADV, and the National Organization for Men Against Sexism (NOMAS) have partnered to create a free educational toolkit to help bridge the gap between the fields of reproductive health and domestic violence; two fields that work for the good of our communities from different perspectives. This toolkit provides credible, unbiased information for women and individuals working in the domestic violence and reproductive health communities about reproductive coercion and offers practical solutions designed to empower women to take control of their own reproductive health. We will be offering trainings on this topic nationally in the near future.

Domestic Violence and HIV/AIDS
Domestic violence increases a woman's risk of HIV/AIDS and an HIV/AIDS diagnosis can increase a woman's risk of domestic violence. While both issues are prominent in communities, collaboration between agencies that serve each population does not intrinsically exist. NCADV partners with Ensync Diversified Management Systems, Inc. to provide free trainings on this issue to front-line advocates within domestic violence programs and HIV/AIDS service agencies so that they may better assist survivors of domestic violence with accessing information and resources about HIV and vice-versa. Our goal is to strengthen community collaboration, enhance services and safety planning, and create integrated client-centered services for survivors of DV and/or HIV.
Hope & Power for Your Personal Finances: A Rebuilding Guide Following Domestic Violence (Hope and Power)
NCADV’s Financial Education Project, Hope & Power, addresses one of the main barriers victims encounter when seeking safety and independence—financial independence. One of the most common reasons victims of domestic violence either stay with or return to an abuser is because they fear they will be unable to provide financially for themselves and or their children. In 2000, NCADV collaborated with the National Endowment for Financial Education (NEFE) to develop these financial education materials in an ongoing effort to support victims of domestic violence in their endeavors to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The Hope and Power materials include topics such as safety planning, budgeting, identity theft, banking, predatory lending, credit, getting a job, money management, and taxes.

Futures without Violence (January 2nd)
Everyone has the right to live free of violence.

Under the leadership and vision of founder Esta Soler for more than 30 years, Futures Without Violence has led the way and set the pace for ground-breaking education programs, national policy development, professional training programs, and public actions designed to end violence against women, children and families around the world. In 1994, Futures Without Violence was instrumental in developing the landmark Violence Against Women Act passed by the U.S. Congress.

Providing leadership from offices in San Francisco, Washington D.C. and Boston, we have established a state-of-the-art Center for Leadership and Action in the Presidio of San Francisco to foster ongoing dialogue about gender-based violence and child abuse. Striving to reach new audiences and transform social norms, we train professionals such as doctors, nurses, athletic coaches, and judges on improving responses to violence and abuse. We also work with advocates, policy makers and others to build sustainable community leadership and educate people everywhere about the importance of respect and healthy relationships.

Break the Cycle (January 10th)

Break the Cycle is the leading national nonprofit organization providing comprehensive dating abuse programs exclusively to young people ages 12 to 24. From the classroom to the courtroom to the floor of Congress, we work every day to give young people, and those who care about them, the tools they need to live safer, healthier lives. Break the Cycle inspires and supports young people to build healthy relationships and create a culture without abuse.
### APPENDIX B. Changes in Anti-Violence Organization’s Mission Statements by Year (2011-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of AWAWOs</th>
<th>Change in Mission Statement</th>
<th>Year Mission Statement Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End Rape on Campus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Your IX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Active for Ending Rape</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain, Abuse &amp; Incest National Network</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Network to End Domestic Violence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coalition Against Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures without Violence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break the Cycle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Origin (1=established prior to 2011; 0=established after 2011)</th>
<th>EROC</th>
<th>KYIX</th>
<th>SAFER</th>
<th>RAINN</th>
<th>NNEDV</th>
<th>NCADV</th>
<th>Futures</th>
<th>Break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Staff (1=above average; 0=below average)</th>
<th>EROC</th>
<th>KYIX</th>
<th>SAFER</th>
<th>RAINN</th>
<th>NNEDV</th>
<th>NCADV</th>
<th>Futures</th>
<th>Break</th>
<th>Size Staff Average&lt;sup&gt;58&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA&lt;sup&gt;59&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9(0)</td>
<td>10.7(0)</td>
<td>24(1)</td>
<td>6.5(0)</td>
<td>33.5(1)</td>
<td>13.5(0)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11(0)</td>
<td>10.5(0)</td>
<td>17(1)</td>
<td>6(0)</td>
<td>34(1)</td>
<td>15(0)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6(0)</td>
<td>25(1)</td>
<td>10(0)</td>
<td>9.5(0)</td>
<td>17.5(1)</td>
<td>5.5(0)</td>
<td>33.5(1)</td>
<td>17(1)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.5(0)</td>
<td>24.5(1)</td>
<td>10(0)</td>
<td>10(0)</td>
<td>17(1)</td>
<td>6(0)</td>
<td>34(1)</td>
<td>17(1)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>11(0)</td>
<td>23(1)</td>
<td>11(0)</td>
<td>10(0)</td>
<td>20.5(1)</td>
<td>7(0)</td>
<td>35(1)</td>
<td>16(0)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Degrees (1=above average; 0=below average)</th>
<th>EROC</th>
<th>KYIX</th>
<th>SAFER</th>
<th>RAINN</th>
<th>NNEDV</th>
<th>NCADV</th>
<th>Futures</th>
<th>Break</th>
<th>Prof Degree Average&lt;sup&gt;58&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.5(0)</td>
<td>2(0)</td>
<td>13(1)</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
<td>18(1)</td>
<td>8(1)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5(0)</td>
<td>2(0)</td>
<td>8(1)</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
<td>18(1)</td>
<td>8(1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>3(0)</td>
<td>2(0)</td>
<td>9.7(1)</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
<td>18(1)</td>
<td>8(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1.5(0)</td>
<td>0.5(0)</td>
<td>3.5(0)</td>
<td>3(0)</td>
<td>10(1)</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
<td>18(1)</td>
<td>7(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
<td>2(0)</td>
<td>4(0)</td>
<td>3(0)</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
<td>19(1)</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board (1=yes; 0=no)</th>
<th>EROC</th>
<th>KYIX</th>
<th>SAFER</th>
<th>RAINN</th>
<th>NNEDV</th>
<th>NCADV</th>
<th>Futures</th>
<th>Break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>58</sup> The average annual size of staff and average annual number of staff with professional degrees was calculated by summing the total number of size of staff and number of staff with professional degrees for all AVAWOs for each year and dividing by the total number of AVAWOs. These averages were then rounded to the nearest whole number. Using these annual averages, I then assigned a “1” to AVAWOs who had a greater than average number of staff and greater than average number of staff with professional degrees and a value of “0” to AVAWOs that did not. The number in parenthesis next to the annual average size of staff and annual average number of staff with professional degrees captures the binary code assigned for each AVAWO.

<sup>59</sup> Both EROC and KYIX did not exist prior to 2013, hence NA represents that data for the organizational resource was unavailable for each respective anti-violence organization for the specific year.
### Headquarters in DC (1=yes; 0=no)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EROC</th>
<th>KYIX</th>
<th>SAFER</th>
<th>RAINN</th>
<th>NNEDV</th>
<th>NCADV</th>
<th>Futures</th>
<th>Break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Organizational Resource Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EROC</th>
<th>KYIX</th>
<th>SAFER</th>
<th>RAINN</th>
<th>NNEDV</th>
<th>NCADV</th>
<th>Futures</th>
<th>Break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

60 Averages were not utilized to calculate the presence of a formal board, or location of headquarters for each AVAWO. As such, these three organizational measures are captured by a binary measure with a value of “1” assigned to AVAWOs that had a formal board or headquarter in DC for each year spanning from 2011 to 2015, respectively, and a value of “0” to AVAWOs that did not.
APPENDIX D. Mass Media News Item Coding Guidelines

Mass Media New Items
Coding Guidelines
(March 30th, 2017 Version)

Steps for Coding Mass Media News Items:

1) Please read these guidelines and look over the news items before beginning any coding session.

2) There are some news items that do not have the name of the AWAWO highlighted in red. Please make sure to double check the entire news item for mentions of the 10 AWAWOs included in our sample.

3) For blogs and letters to the editor, please add either a B (for blogs) or E (for letters to the editor) at the end of each news outlet code (e.g., NYT.B, Wash.E, etc.).

4) Please email me with any questions you may have and bring any questions you have to our coding meetings.
General Information for Each News Item

1) Source Code (Source)
   - Code all of the following general information for each news item as source
     - News Item ID
     - News Outlet
     - Publication Date
     - Author of News Item
     - Title of News Item

2) News Item ID (ID)
   - ID number assigned to each news item

3) News Outlet
   - Name of mass media organization that published each news item
   - If the name of the outlet is missing, please code the ID portion that contains the names of the news outlet.
   - For blogs and letters to the editor, please add either a B (for blogs) or E (for letters to the editor) at the end of each news outlet code (e.g., NYT.B, Wash.E, etc.).
   - The news outlet codes are as follows:
     
     **Broadcast Media:**

     **National Networks:**
     - American Broadcasting Company (ABC)
     - Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS)
     - National Broadcasting Company (NBC)

     **Cable Networks:**
     - Cable News Network (CNN)
     - Fox News Channel (FOX)

     **Print Media:**

     **Newspapers:**
     - Chicago Daily Herald (CDH)
     - New York Times (NYT)
     - San Jose Mercury News (SJMN)
     - The Atlantic Journal-Constitution (AJC)
     - The Chronicle of Higher Education (Chron)
     - USA Today (USA)
     - Washington Post (Wash)

     **News Magazines:**
     - Newsweek (Nweek)
     - New York Magazine (New York)
3) Publication Date (Date)
   - Date that news articles or news stories were published and/or broadcasted (e.g., August 9, 2014)
   - For news items that have been “updated,” please code the most recent date.

4) Author of the News Item (Author)
   - The name of the author(s) for each news item.
   - Please only code the name of the reporter—that is, do not include guests or those being interviewed as the author for each news item.
   - For letters to the editor, please code the name of the individual who wrote the letter to the editor as the “author”

Broadcast Media:
   - Name of broadcast announcer(s) for news stories
   - If the name of the reporters is also listed, please ignore and only include the name of the broadcasters.

Print and Digital Media:
   - Name of the reporter(s) for news articles

5) Title of News Item (Title)
   - The title of each news article or news story
   - Please only include the main title—that is, do not code any subtitles for the news item

Broadcast Media
   - Title of the broadcast transcript

Print and Digital Media:
   - Title of the article or news story
7) Issue of News Item (Issue)

- The main issue covered in each individual news item.
- This code is simply to generally categorize the news items. We only want to code one issue per news item.

List of Potential Issues (not exhaustive, will continue to add to this list):

- Title IX
- Campus Sexual Assault
- Women’s Rights
- Men’s Rights
- Violence Against Women Act
- Domestic Violence
- Sexual Assault
- Rape
- Stalking
- Sex Trafficking
- Dating Violence
- Rape Culture
- Social Media and Violence Against Women (e.g., revenge porn)
- Donating to AVAWO (e.g., donating cell phones to NCADV)
Presence of Mass Media Coverage

Mentions of AVAWO in News Item

- Whether an AVAWO is mentioned by name in mass media news item
- Please note that some news items that do not have the name of the AVAWO highlighted in red.

List of AVAWOs:

- End Rape on Campus (EROC)
- Know Your IX (KYIX)
- Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER)
- Student Coalition Against Rape (SCAR)
- Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN)
- National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)
- National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)
- Futures without Violence (Futures)
- NO MORE (No More)
- Break the Cycle (Break)

Broadcast, Print, and Digital Media:

- Include both mention of the name and the acronym of an AVAWO
Quantity of Mass Media Coverage

1) Length of News Item (Length)
   - Word count of the news item

   Broadcast, Print and Digital:
     - Word count of the entire news item.

2) Number of Mentions of AVAWO in News Item
   - Word count of the number of times a news item mentions the AVAWO
   - Please note that some news items that do not have the name of the AVAWO highlighted in red. Please make sure to double check the entire news item for mentions of the AVAWOs included in our sample.

List of AVAWOs:
   - End Rape on Campus (EROC)
   - Know Your IX (KYIX)
   - Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER)
   - Student Coalition Against Rape (SCAR)
   - Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN)
   - National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)
   - National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)
   - Futures without Violence (Futures)
   - NO MORE (No More)
   - Break the Cycle (Break)

Broadcast, Print, and Digital Media:
   - Number of mentions of the AVAWO (can be more than one AVAWO)
   - Include both mention of the name and the acronym of an AVAWO
Quality of Mass Media Coverage

1) Placement of News Item
   - The location of specific mass media coverage can signal the “newsworthiness” of the AVAWO.
   - This measure identifies two factors that capture the placement of news items.
   - Only code once per news item

1) Section or Time of Day: (Section)
   - Broadcast Media:
     - The name of the program and time of day that the news item is broadcasted (e.g., Today Show 10:00am)
   - Print and Digital Media:
     - The name of the section (e.g., education, women’s issues, sports, etc.) in which the news item appears (if applicable)

2) Page Number or Time Placement within Program: (Placement)
   - Broadcast Media:
     - Whether the news item mentions AVAWO before the first commercial break (if not, do not code for placement)
     - If it is not clear where the commercial break is, you can also interpret this code as whether the news item is the lead story (if not, do not code for placement)
     - Please highlight the name of the AVAWO included in the news item and add the code for “placement”
   - Print Media:
     - This is the page number that the news item is located (e.g., A04 for newspapers)
   - Digital Media:
     - The number of views or shares for each news story (if applicable)

2) Tone of News Item
   - News items can represent either a positive, negative, or neutral in the media coverage of AVAWOs.
   - News items often present neutral tones since the objectivity is emphasized and associated with presenting “both sides” of an issue.
   - To identify whether the media coverage of each AVAWO is positive, negative, or neutral, we identify the ad hominem frames—that is, the specific language used to describe or characterize each anti-violence organization.
   - We are coding two types of tone: 1) the tone of the coverage that mentions each AVAWO and 2) the tone of the entire news item.
   - Code the two sentences above and below the mention of each AVAWO in each news item to assess the tone of the coverage.
Please make sure to include the name of the AVAWO in the portion of the news item for which you code for tone of coverage of the AVAWO.

Enter the tone of coverage of the entire news item in the excel file.

Ad Hominem Frames: These are frames that focus on the individual or the group making the claims,” and are identified as either positive, negative, or neutral to indicate their implied support for, opposition to, or neutrality toward to social movement organizations’ mission (Kruse 2001).

Positive Ad Hominem Frames: (Positive)
- Congratulate
- Cultural shift in attitudes towards sexual violence
- Promote awareness
- Willingness for survivors to fight
- Inspiration
- Title IX enforcement
- Punish colleges
- New and powerful force
- Justice for victims
- Protect survivors of sexual violence

Negative Ad Hominem Frame: (Negative)
- Unfair (to the accused)
- Cautioned
- Concerned
- Biased policies (“victim-centered” policies)
- Promote victim blaming
- Skepticism
- Due Process and fair trial for accused
- Legal rights of the accused
- Distrust of rape victims

Neutral Ad Hominem Frame: (Neutral)
- An absence (or mixture) of positive and/or negative ad hominem frames

3) Media Standing

- This measure identifies five factors that capture the media standing of the AVAWO.

1) Direct Quote or Paraphrased: (Quote)
   - What is the direct quote from the AVAWO or movement actor included in the news item?
   - Code both the quote and the actor or representative associated with the quote
   - Do not code paraphrase from organization when there is no actor or representative associated

2) Name of AVAWO Actor or Representative: (Name)
Whether the name of the representative of the AVAWO is included in the news item

Code just the name of the actor or representative associated with the quote

3) Additional Actors Directly Quoted: (Quote Actor)

- Whether additional sources (that is, sources besides the AVAWO(s) included in the news item) are directly quoted in the news item
- Only code additional actors when they have been directly quoted (you can identify a direct quote by the use of quotation marks)
- Code both the quote and the actor or representative associated with the quote
- Only code one quote per additional actor

4) Name of Additional Actors Directly Quoted: (Actor)

- What is the name of the additional sources included in the news item?
- Code just the name of the actor or representative associated with the quote

5) Type of Additional Actors Directly Quoted:

- Type of the additional sources directly quoted in the news item?
- Code just the name of the actor or representative associated with the quote

List of Potential Types of Additional Sources (not exhaustive, will continue to add to this list):

- Academic Sources (S: Academic)
- Legal Sources (S: Legal)
  - Lawyers
  - Law groups
- Political Sources (S: Political)
  - Think tanks
  - Policy organizations
- Governmental Source (S: Government)
  - President or Vice President
  - White House representative
  - Legislators and Representatives
- Anti-Violence-Against-Women Organizational Sources (S: AVAWO)
- Medical Sources (S: Medical)
  - Doctors
  - Medical groups
- Media Sources (S: Media)
- Student Sources (S: Student)
- Other Sources (S: Other)

4) Media Framing

- Framing is a social movement concept that acknowledges the role the mass media has in terms of shaping cultural discourse.
Frames themselves “assign meaning to and interpret relevant events and conditions in ways that are intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists” (Snow and Benford 1988: 198).

Preferred frame refers to the “prominence of a movement organization’s frame in media discourse on the specific issue of concern” (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993: 121).

The preferred frame is considered to be included in coverage when the following three criteria are met: 1) social movement organization actors are quoted, 2) a social movements’ position and actions are discussed, and 3) the social movements’ frame(s) are included without distortion (Rohlinger 2002, 2014; Rohlinger and Brown 2013).

This measure captures the preferred framing of an AVAWO (or the representative associated with the organization).

1) Preferred Frame Included in Coverage: (Preferred)
   ○ Is the preferred frame of an AVAWO included in the news item? If so, what is the preferred frame of the AVAWO included in the news item?
   ○ There can be multiple preferred frames included in the coverage.
Discursive Media Opportunities:

1) Type of Discursive Media Opportunity
   - If the news item does directly reference or mention one of the discursive media opportunities, please list the discursive media opportunity (can be multiple discursive media opportunities).

List of Potential Types of Discursive Media Opportunities:

Political and Legal Opportunities: (Political-Legal)
- Publication of “Dear Colleague” Letter
- Founding of White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault
- Formation of the White House “It’s On Us” Campaign
- Publication of “Not Alone” by White House Task Force
- Campus Accountability and Safety Act introduced to Congress
- Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act
- Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act
- Passage of “Yes Means Yes” by California
- Title IX violations filed with U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights
- Passage of “Yes Means Yes” by New York

Cultural Opportunities: (Cultural)
- Publication of “Account of Sexual Assault” by Angie Epifano
- Ben Roestlisberger Investigated for Sexual Assault
- Premier of The Invisible War
- Todd Akin’s “Legitimate Rape” Comments
- Josh Duggar’s Sexual Assault Charges
- Rape by Vanderbilt Football Players
- Rape in Steubenville, Ohio
- Ray Rice Arrested for Third-Degree Aggravated Assault
- Mattress Performance: Carry that Weight by Emma Sulkowicz
- Publication of “Bill Cosby Raped Me” by Barbara Bowman
- Publication of “A Rape on Campus” by Sabrina Erdely
- Publication of “Missoula: Rape and the Justice System in a College Town”
- Premier of the Hunting Ground
- Emergence of Slutwalks
- Premier of “Makers”
APPENDIX E. Correlation Coefficient Matrix for Broad Environmental Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficients for Broad Environmental Factors (N=317)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Democratic Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Democratic Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) State of the Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) DMO Count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F. Logistic Regression Results of Contemporaneous and Two-Year Lagged Effect of Political Opportunities on Presence of Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.30, 1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.46, 1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.89, 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>0.2260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.6902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer and Lemeshow</td>
<td>0.6170/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p ≤.001; **Significant at p ≤.01; *Significant at p ≤.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.54, 1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.31, 6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.71, 1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>0.1786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.6130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer and Lemeshow</td>
<td>0.2737/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p ≤.001; **Significant at p ≤.01; *Significant at p ≤.05
## APPENDIX G. Correlation Coefficient Matrix for Movement Organizational and Broad Environmental Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficients for Movement Organizational and Broader Environmental Factors (N=527)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Broad Organizational Identity</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Date of Origin</td>
<td>0.88***</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Size of Staff</td>
<td><strong>-0.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.14</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Professional Degrees</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.41***</td>
<td>0.67***</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Board</td>
<td>0.73***</td>
<td>0.83***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Headquarters in D.C.</td>
<td>0.88***</td>
<td>0.88***</td>
<td><strong>-0.04</strong></td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.74***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Organizational Resources Index</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td>0.44***</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
<td>0.82***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Social Media Manager</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.52***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.59***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Democratic Advantage</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td><strong>-0.16</strong>*</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.18***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) State of the Union</td>
<td><strong>-0.13</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.22</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.13</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.27</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.35</strong>*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Discursive Media Opportunity Count</td>
<td><strong>-0.21</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.22</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>0.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.22</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.21</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.36</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.58</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.35</strong>*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H. Negative Binominal Regression Results of Movement Organizational Factors on Length of Coverage with Interaction Term for Broad Organizational Identity and Digital News Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity</td>
<td>-0.31 ** 0.13</td>
<td>-0.19 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Resources Index</td>
<td>-0.05 0.04</td>
<td>-0.05 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
<td>0.14 0.10</td>
<td>0.10 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Op-Eds</td>
<td>0.07 0.10</td>
<td>0.08 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital New Items</td>
<td>-0.10 0.07</td>
<td>0.02 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Organizational Identity x Digital News Items</td>
<td>-0.17 0.14</td>
<td>-0.45 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.37 *** 0.09</td>
<td>7.28 *** 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value/DF</td>
<td>1.0977</td>
<td>1.0997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at p < .001; **Significant at p < .01; *Significant at p < .05
APPENDIX I. Overview of Movement Organizational and Broad Environmental Factors Interaction Terms Organized by Broad Environmental Factors

Democratic Advantage

Broad Organizational Identity x Democratic Advantage
Organizational Resource Index x Democratic Advantage
Social Media Manager x Democratic Advantage
Publication of Op-Eds x Democratic Advantage

State of the Union

Broad Organizational Identity x State of the Union
Organizational Resource Index x State of the Union
Social Media Manager x State of the Union
Publication of Op-Eds x State of the Union

Discursive Media Opportunity Count

Broad Organizational Identity x Discursive Media Opportunity Count
Organizational Resource Index x Discursive Media Opportunity Count
Social Media Manager x Discursive Media Opportunity Count
Publication of Op-Eds x Discursive Media Opportunity Count

61 The “x” represents that the two variables were multiplied together to create an interaction term
APPENDIX J. PowerPoint Slides Providing Overview of Dissertation Research

REDEFINING A RAPE CULTURE:
The Influence of Anti-Violence-Against-Women Organizations on Mass Media Discourse

Allison R. McGrath
Vanderbilt University
Social Movements, Cultural Change, and Mass Media

- Dearth of research when it comes to understanding how social movements target mass media to achieve goal of fostering cultural change (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Andrews and Caren 2010; Rohlinger 2014)

- Culture can be viewed as a social-psychological phenomenon, in which social movements seek to change individual attitudes and beliefs (Hart 1996; Earl 2004; McCammon et al. 2017)

- Previous scholars have just focused on the presence or absence of coverage (McCarthy et al. 1996; Amenta et al. 2009)

- Must take into account quantity and quality of coverage to assess how social movements influence mass media discourse
  - **Quantity of Coverage:** amount of coverage devoted to social movement
  - **Quality of Coverage:** type of coverage devoted to social movement
Conceptual Model

Movement Organizational Factors
- Organization Identity
- Organizational Resources
- Media Tactics

Broad Environmental Factors
- Political Opportunities
- Discursive Media Opportunities

Presence of Coverage
- Length
- Multiple Mentions

Quantity of Coverage
- Positive Tone
- Media Standing
- Frame Amplification

Quality of Coverage

Cultural Change
Eight Anti-Violence Organizations
Research Questions

- What broad environmental factors account for the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs receive?
Research Questions

- What movement organizational factors account for the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs receive?
Research Questions

- How do broad environmental factors moderate the relationship between movement organizational factors and the **quantity** and **quality** of mass media coverage that AVAWOs receive?
Data Collection

■ **Part One:**
  - Two separate datasets
    ■ Stratified Random Sample (*N*1=300 [317 total cases])
    ■ Population of News Items Mention 8 AAWOs (*N*2=412 [527 total cases])
  - 3 types of mass media used: 1) broadcast, 2) print 3) digital (2011-2015)
    ■ **Broadcast:** ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, FOX (*n*1=100 *n*2=50)
    ■ **Digital:** Business Insider, Buzzfeed, Gawker, Huffington Post, Indiewire, Jezebel, Politico, Salon, Slate, The Daily Beast, Vox (*n*1=100 *n*2=224)

■ **Part Two:**
  - Conducted content analysis of each anti-violence organization’s website to assess mission statement, size of staff, type of staff, etc.
  - Assessed political opportunities through various sources including Congressional Quarterly and American Presidency Project
Independent Measures

**Movement Organizational Factors**
- *Organizational Identity*
  - Broad Organizational Identity
- *Media Tactics*
  - Social Media Manager
  - Op-eds Published on Website
- *Organizational Resources Index*
  - Date of Origin
  - Annual Size of Staff
  - Annual Number of Staff with Professional Degrees
  - Organizational Board in Given Year
  - Location of Headquarter in Given Year

**Broad Environmental Factors**
- *Political Opportunities*
  - Democratic Advantage in Congress
  - Mentions of Violence Against Women in State of the Union Address
- *Discursive Media Opportunities*
  - Frequency of Cultural and Political-Legal Events Related to Violence Against Women
Dependent Measures

- **Presence, Quantity, and Quality Measures**
  - **Presence**
    - Mentioned or Not
  - **Quantity**
    - Length of Coverage
    - Multiple Mentions
  - **Quality**
    - Tone of Coverage
    - Quoted in Coverage
    - Preferred Frames in Coverage
Methods and Analysis

- Create Codebook
- Hire RAs
- Code using ATLAS.ti
- Export to Excel
- Regression Analysis
- Construct Dataset
- SAS Data File
Findings:

- What broad environmental factors account for the presence, quantity, and quality of mass media coverage that AAVWOs receive?
Findings:

- What movement organizational factors account for the **quantity** and **quality** of mass media coverage that AVAWOs receive?
Findings:

- How do broad environmental factors moderate the relationship between movement organizational factors and the quantity and quality of mass media coverage that AVAWOs receive?
Summary of Findings:

- Findings lend support for notion of mass media as a distinct type of cultural outcome
  - Changes in the presence, quantity, and quality of coverage AVAWOs receive is illustrative of larger shifts in cultural attitudes and beliefs embodied by mass media

- Results show that quantity and quality of mass media coverage is dependent on both movement organizational and broad environmental factors
  - Confluence of both factors is content on what type of measure of mass media coverage is being examined

- Strength of narrow and focused organizational identities for AVAWOs

- Broad environmental context has conditional effect on relationship between movement organizational factors and quantity and quality of coverage

- Future research show further explore this moderating effect and the relationship between use of media tactics and quality and quality of coverage