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Abstract

How are framing and counter framing tactics used by social movements to create change and affect/produce coverage of their desired issues? Although there has been research on this topic in the past on more traditional forms of media such as newspapers and nightly TV news, there is a gap in the literature in the wake of technological advancements like blogs, social media and other online sources that movements themselves can produce. Moreover with some notable exceptions (Rohlinger 2002), studies have largely ignored movement-countermovement dynamics in their examinations. This study will conduct a content analysis of the messages that were produced during the 15 NOW campaign in Seattle, WA. It will analyze the framing messages produced by both the 15 NOW campaign and their opponents, Sustainable Wages Seattle (SWS) and Forward Seattle (FS), to measure how those messages fit into diagnostic, prognostic and motivational subframes within the larger collective action master frame (Benford and Snow 2000). This study will model the content analysis fundamentals set out by Holsti (1968) and followed up more contemporarily by Rohlinger (2002) and Krippendorff (2004). It utilizes a deductive form of reasoning drawing from collective identity frameworks (Benford and Snow 2000) to conceptualize movement frames. It also incorporates insights into movement-countermovement dynamics stemming from Meyer and Staggenborg’s (1996) foundational work on the topic.
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In the time since the pivotal work of Piven and Cloward (1977) on “poor people’s movements,” there has been great scholarly interest in social movements that fit under that umbrella. Examples include welfare advocacy (Reese 2011), homeless mobilization (Snow and Cress 2000), and the anti-payday lending movement (Lee and Peoples 2013), to name a few. One recent manifestation of poor people’s movements is the fight for higher minimum wages in cities around the country (e.g. Myers-Lipton 2015:35-6). Perhaps the most high-profile example of this is the 15 NOW organization/campaign that began in Seattle, WA.

As hinted at in the organization’s title, 15 NOW is a campaign with the mission of raising the minimum wage to 15 dollars per hour. It began in Seattle, WA., where it has incorporated different social movement tactics including protests, leafleting, boycotts, and alliance building with unions and community organizations, as well as the launch of digital media campaign to articulate their message and mobilize their constituent base. The 15 NOW campaign has also faced countermobilization from organizations such as Sustainable Wages Seattle (SWS) and Forward Seattle (FS) who have sought to either completely stop a minimum wage increase or to modify legislation to make accommodations for small businesses or apply a ‘tip credit’ to people that work in service industry jobs that earn gratuity. In June 2014, 15 NOW succeeded in their goal with the passage of city council legislation to raise the minimum wage, to be phased in over a period of years.

Each of the three groups—15 NOW; SWS and FS—articulated their arguments by using new media: Facebook, Twitter, Websites and blogs to the public. Following the
collective action frame theories (Benford and Snow 2000), this study will analyze this content and determine if each organization followed diagnostic, prognostic and motivational messages to the public and the extent to which they were successful in doing so. It will then compare and contrast the messages produced by each group on each of their Facebook and blog sites and apply that data to the movement-countermovement theoretical model. Thus this study seeks to do two things: (1) apply the theoretical collective action frame model to this social movement, (2) incorporate the movement-countermovement dynamics in the application of those frames into a digital media context. In so doing, the study examines the success of this movement and how its use of social media may have been critical.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Background on Social Movements

Social movements consist of groups, organized as a collective, working toward some goal(s) using non-institutional tactics such as protests, rallies, etc. The reason why non-institutional tactics are used in social movements is because movements and their members typically lack access to conventional politics due to few, if any, connections to these mainstream institutions and their agents (e.g. politicians). This is certainly true of poor people’s movements.

Poor people’s movements, as the name implies, are made up of poor people and their allies/advocates (Piven and Cloward 1977). Conventional politics are typically not a realistic option for these individuals given their relative lack of resources and limited access to power players. Engaging in non-institutional tactics via social movements/mobilization is therefore their primary avenue through which they can affect change.
As already noted in the Introduction, there are a number of examples of movements that can fit under the umbrella of poor people’s movements, and one contemporary example is that of minimum wage mobilization. Campaigns have popped up in a number of cities across the U.S. seeking to raise the minimum wage. One of the most highly-profile campaigns is the one that began in Seattle, WA: 15 NOW.

*History of 15 NOW:*

Well before the 15 NOW campaign, labor activists in the state of Washington sought to increase the minimum wage from $2.30 to $3.85 per hour with the passage of ballot initiative 518, an 85% increase from its previous level (Washington Secretary of State Office 2014). Arguments were launched against the ballot initiative contending that such an increase would kill small businesses and price unskilled workers out of the job market wreaking havoc on the economy. Meanwhile, supporters of the initiative asserted that there was no evidence that it would have negative impacts on the economy (Murphey 1988). Supporters won the day as ballot initiative 518 passed. This battle in 1988 set the stage for a more contemporary wage battle replete with the same messaging and counter messaging tactics of a generation before.

In 2014, rising up in the wake of the Occupy Wall Street movement, the 15 NOW campaign in Seattle began as a social movement whose goals seemed unrealistic. The minimum wage in Seattle was $9.32 per hour and had only been raised 28 cents in the last two years. Also, at the time the highest minimum wage in the country was only $10.55 in San Francisco, CA. The idea of raising the minimum wage more than five dollars higher than its current level represented an enormous leap even for a progressive city like Seattle.
(Tausanovich and Warshaw 2014). Moreover, a countermovement emerged in response to 15 NOW, with groups such as SWS and FS recycling the arguments from 1988 that higher wages would destroy the local economy.

Despite the seemingly unrealistic goals of the movement and the emergence of countermobilization, it was successful. Pioneered by the city’s newly elected and only socialist city council woman, Kashama Sawant—and propelled by a targeted, savvy social media presence—the 15 NOW campaign was able to sway voters and city officials within only a matter of months. The city council passed minimum wage legislation on June 2\textsuperscript{nd} and it was signed by the mayor the following day. The impact of 15 NOW has spread well beyond the city limits of Seattle.

New 15 NOW campaigns are up in cities across the country. For instance, shortly after Seattle’s passage of the 15 dollar per hour minimum wage, San Francisco followed suit passing the same phase-in wage hike across a five-year period in their 2014 elections (San Francisco Department of Elections 2014). Today the 15 NOW campaign claims to have chapters in 22 cities across the United States.

The demand for a 15 dollar minimum wage has grown into a larger rallying cry for the labor movement across the United States, spilling outside boarders of the official 15 NOW organization. The Service Employees International Union (SEIU), the largest healthcare and property services union and the second largest public services union in the nation, has made raising the federal minimum wage to 15 dollars one of their official campaign items. Additionally, the movement has resonated with low-wage workers across labor sectors from fast food workers to adjunct professors, and national direct action campaigns have emerged in diverse ways. These mobilization efforts have culminated in a
national day of action symbolically taking place on tax day—April 15th, 2015—with protests around the country. Still, the importance of digital framing tactics have remained at the forefront with the broader movement incorporating the use of the hash tag #fightfor15 to aggregate their messages and advance their movement.

What led to the great success of the 15 NOW campaign in Seattle despite its seemingly unrealistic goals and the presence of countermobilization? Resources and political opportunity would seem to be relevant factors. Having an ally on city council (resource) and existing in a progressive region (opportunity) almost certainly contributed to the success of the movement. But being able to frame issues and form a cohesive collective identity via social media—and doing a better job of it than opposing groups—was also likely a pivotal factor in the movement’s success. This will be the main theme of the present study; but first, some theoretical background on resource mobilization/political opportunity, collective identity/ framing, and movement-media interactions will be provided.

Overview of Social Movement Theories:

*Resource Mobilization/Political Opportunity Theories:*

In early theorizing about movement origins, etc, *relative deprivation* and *strain* were the dominant theories. These theories effectively argued that inequality (deprivation) and the resultant subjective feelings of injustice (strain) were the primary drivers for social movement mobilization. Although it is undoubtedly true that deprivation and strain are critical, scholars began pointing out that they are necessary—but not sufficient—to bring about mobilization (Gurney and Tierney 1982). Other factors must also be present to ultimately result in a social movement.
Two of the main theories that emerged out of this critique were *resource mobilization* and *political opportunity* theories. Both theories have arguments that match their labels well: resource mobilization theory argues that resources such as people and money are important for successful mobilization (McCarthy and Zald 1977); political opportunity theory contends that political context matters as well and that the timing needs to be right (Meyer 2004).

As noted earlier, a cursory look at the 15 NOW campaign in Seattle suggests that both resources and opportunity likely helped it reach success. Having a strong ally on city council was likely a key resource; operating in a progressive city presented a favorable opportunity. But again, these external factors to the movement were likely only part of the story; the movement’s collective identity/framing and use of media were likely also critical.

*Collective Identity/Framing Theory:*

*Collective identity theory* effectively argues that a collective identity is important for social movements today, particularly in terms of building cohesion. In a sense, collective identity is a way of getting at the cultural effects that social movements have on the larger social environment (Polletta and Jasper 2001). “Framing” is likely important in this process. As previous studies have shown, framing tactics are crucial for a social movement’s ability to mobilize its human resources (Snow and Rochford 1986). Moreover, the extent to which these frames resonate with their participants can affect the degree to which they have lasting power to define a movement (Babb 1996).

Social movements use framing techniques to build and maintain collective identity among movement participants through the use of fortifying myths that connect movement participants to previous generations of participants (Voss 1998). These framing techniques
also serve as tools to recruit new members to the movement and to project their image to the outside public (Benford and Snow 2000). Collective action master frames operate in a number of ways, all of which were likely important in 15 NOW, and, thus, are critical for the present study: through these frames, a movement (1) articulates what the problem is through diagnostic sub frames, (2) articulates what should be done about it through prognostic sub frames, and (3) enlists a call to action through messages meant to motivate participants to enact the prognosis.

Both formal and informal cultural practices affect our actions, providing us with toolkits we can pull from in choosing what we do. In this line of thought, the ideas we identify with form a collective identity that can include social activism (Swidler 1986). Our collective identities frame concepts of social issues that become a part of the definition of our collective identities. Social networking sites (SNS) such as blogs, Facebook and Twitter have changed our cultural landscape and diversified our toolkits. They provide us with access to a plethora of new collective identities and different ways of framing ideas that we may align ourselves with, at ready access whenever we wish to seek them out. Social media therefore represent a new world for social movements that allow greater ability to share information, particularly relative to the past when more conventional media outlets were dominant.

**Social Media in Social Movements:**

Conventional media sources have traditionally served as gatekeepers for the dissemination of information by social movement organizations (SMO’s). In past social movements, protest activity has been subject to three types of bias at the hands of conventional media: selection bias, no coverage at all; description bias of what is covered by
only covering certain aspects of activity; and reliability bias by presenting protestors in a negative way (McCarthy, McPhail and Smith 1996). Elaborating on this point, Peoples (2008) argues that this creates a paradoxical dilemma for SMO’s whereby the more disruptive protest activity becomes, the more likely it is that the movement will get coverage—but negative coverage—from the media.

What is a movement to do? If conventional media outlets are typically biased against movements, but communicating movement ideas/goals is important, perhaps nonconventional media are the answer. They have been the answer for some movements in the past, and are the answer for some today. Just as the labor movement has used new forms of media in the past with the invention of the radio to bypass traditional media sources and mobilize some of the largest labor protests in United States history (Roscigno and Danaher 2001), so have contemporary SMO’s latched on to SNS as a resource for information dissemination to activists and participants (Veenstra and Hossain 2014, Kahn and Kellner 2004).

As previous research has shown, an SMO’s network attributes function as an important factor in its ability to recruit new participants and grow (Snow, Zurcher and Ekland-Olson 1980), and the incorporation of SNS can help to expand this network. SNS provide SMO’s with direct access with the public, allowing them to shape the arguments and to put their framing tactics into effect without being hampered by editors, news cycles, and publication deadlines. It is no wonder then, that SMO’s are turning to SNS as a tool to disseminate their message to current and future movement participants using their own voice.

Due to its free and open democratic nature, SNS have shown their ability to galvanize the self-organization of autonomous groups within a larger SMO (Mercea 2013), just as 15
NOW is an autonomous sub-group within the larger U.S. labor movement. Additionally, studies have shown that online activism can translate to offline activism, settling concerns that protest activity may be moving online and resulting in less real world protests, also known as the “slacktivist” effect of SNSs (Harlow and Harp 2012). Furthermore, there is evidence to show that collective action framing messages are put to use by both SMO activists and the general public in the digital idiom (Kim, Kim and Yoo 2014). However, this digital idiom is a rapidly evolving one, initially starting with websites and email campaigns in what has been termed cyber-activism 1.0, and growing to incorporate things like Youtube videos, twitter accounts, blogs and Facebook pages into what has become known as cyber-activism 2.0 (Sandoval-Almazan and Gil-Garcia 2014). The study of Kim, Kim and Yoo (2014) performed a content analysis of SNS’s similar to this one on a South Korean anti-military SMO, showed that the collective action frames described above translated to digital platforms in the movement they analyzed.

While in the past the use of collective action frames have been analyzed in major media publications taking movement-countermovement dynamics into consideration (Rohlinger 2002), there has yet to be research on how these collective action frames play out in a movement-countermovement dynamic in the digital realm and if those messages have an effect on each other over time. This study seeks to fill that gap.

OVERVIEW OF STUDY:

To address the gap in the literature, this study will conduct a content analysis to investigate whether a movement-countermovement dynamic is at play with the digital messages produced by 15 NOW, SWS and FS. Following the theoretical frameworks
outlined above, this study will first seek, via descriptive analysis, evidence that the messages produced by the original movement (15 NOW) fall into diagnostic, prognostic or call-to-action subframes. Then it will seek evidence that the emergent countermovements (SWS and FS) followed suit, creating their own versions of those subframes.

This study will go further than descriptive analysis, though. As noted above, one possible reason why 15 NOW was so successful is that they better utilized social media than their opponents, SWS and FS. If, as Benford and Snow (2000) argued, successful social movements utilize the collective action framework, then it is possible to infer that the more effectively a group is able to utilize that frame, the better it is for that movement. Specific to this study, if the 15 NOW campaign has a higher frequency of messages—and there is a relatively high proportion of those messages fitting into one of the relevant subframes—this would help explain its success relative to its opposition. This study will run regression models to determine if there were significant differences between 15 NOW and SWS/FS in their framing.

I have developed the following hypotheses from the literature above:

*Hypothesis 1:* Messages produced by the 15 NOW campaign were framed more completely (fitting into all three subframes: diagnostic, prognostic and motivational frames) than their opponents’ frames.

*Hypothesis 2:* Media outreach efforts from 15 NOW were more prolific (more frequent Facebook and blog posts) than their opponents’ efforts.

*Hypothesis 3:* The 15 NOW campaign was more on topic, using a larger concentration of economic justice master frame terminology than did their opponents.
Hypothesis 4: The messages produced by one SMO had an effect on the others over time.

To seek evidence to support or refute these hypotheses I have developed the following research questions:

1.) Do the SNS messages produced by each group fit into collective action framing categories and if so, to what extent?

2.) What was the frequency of new media messages produced by each of the three groups?

3) Which group had a higher concentration of on topic key terms in their messages?

4.) Is there a lagged time series effect that will provide evidence that one group’s messages signal influence on the other’s?

METHODS:

This study will conduct a content analysis of the social media and blog messages from 15 NOW, SWS and FS. Using methods set out by Holsti (1968) and Krippendorff (2004), the analyses compare the messages produced by each of the groups to better describe and understand the messaging tactics centered around this movement and countermovement over time.

Procedure:

Data will be collected from both the websites and Facebook pages of 15 NOW, SWS and FS. One of the advantages of this study is that the movement occurred in a relatively short time frame, so messages will be collected from when each of the organizations created
their SNS through until city-wide legislation was passed and include all messages produced by each of the three groups.

In total, the three groups produced 189 Facebook messages and this study coded all of them. Due to the considerably longer length of blog posts, I have set parameters and coded one in ten blog posts from each group (rounding up). There were 95 blog posts produced by the 15 NOW campaign of which I have coded 10, 45 produced by SWS and coded 5, and 14 produced by FS and coded 2. This brings the total number of coded Facebook and blog posts to an $N$ of 206.

Incorporating Twitter posts was also considered for this study but was omitted because of the large overlap that occurs between Facebook posts and Tweets since they are linked on many devices allowing a user or group to post to multiple platforms at once. Also, this study focuses on original messages there was a high frequency of re-tweets that had occurred especially from 15 NOW that would have dilutes the original voice of the movement for the purposes of this study.

Frequency data from each of their blog updates will provide me with an idea of which group made a larger attempt to communicate their message to the public as is outlined in hypothesis two. I will also apply time series comparative data analysis techniques to establish an interaction effect between the movements and countermovement message generation in a temporal setting.

*Coding Method:*

This study utilizes two coders with the same codebook working independently. As principle researcher, I coded all the data and trained an inter-coder on how the codebook is to
be read and applied to the data (see Appendix). Messages were coded looking for indicators of what subframe the messages fall into. For example, questions were asked such as: Does this message address a problem? Does this message present a solution to a problem? Does this message provide a call to action to the person who reads it? To assess if they fit into diagnostic, prognostic and motivational subframes of the collective action master frame. All data were coded into dichotomous variables, Yes=1 No=0 (with the exception of dates that each message was posted, which allows for a comparative time analysis).

Operational definitions for hypothesis 1:

For the purposes of this study, a diagnostic subframe is defined as messages that are used by one of the groups that define what they perceive to be a problem that concerns them. The problem can, and often does, vary from message to message. For example, one message from the 15 NOW campaign may say that the problem is “cost of living” while another may articulate the problem being “corporate interests.” While these are different “problems,” they both count as “diagnostic” for the purpose of this study.

In a similar fashion, prognostic subframes will be defined as messages that provide a solution proposed in their own words. Again, the “prognosis” does not need to be the same, even within a group; it simply provides the reader with an idea of what can be done.

The motivational subframe is defined as messages that are calling the reader to do something. There are many different motivational messages that can range from simply imploring the reader to “like” a post to attending a protest and making a donation to one of the organizations. The key for this motivational subframe is that it is eliciting some type of action from the reader.
The organizations will be judged if their framing messages “fit more completely” by assessing the level to which their messages occupy each of the three subframes. For example, if 15 NOW has produced messages that fit into each category in approximately equal levels it will have produced a complete collective action master frame as set out by Benford and Snow (2000). In contrast, if FS has a higher proportion of messages that occupy the diagnostic frame relative to other subframes, then they have produced an incomplete collective action master frame.

I have also created a scaled variable from zero to four where zero represents a post that has no collective action subframe messages and four represents all four aspects included in the message. This will provide a numerical representation of frame completeness and also allow for a linear regression model.

Operational definitions for hypothesis 2:

The sheer number of messages that were produced by each group across platforms will measure how prolific they were. Since the minimum wage battle in Seattle was relatively short, about seven months, the movement-countermovement dynamic emerged very quickly. Because establishing an SNS presence is not hampered by any outside influences, its free and open nature to make as many posts as they like is an indication of the effort they put forth to use this tactic of communication. In this case the unit of analysis will be number of messages produced.

Operational definition for hypothesis 3:

The economic justice master frame is comprised of terms and phrases that describe issues and their solutions from an economic perspective. While there is no complete list of these terms and phrases, they are used as tools to articulate a message. As hypothesis three
suggests, the economic justice master frame does not define what justice is, only that each side is struggling to define what that justice is within the broader frame for their own movement.

For example, 15 NOW asserts that the 15 dollar per hour mandate is a “living wage” and that is a term they are using that exists in the economic justice master frame. Conversely, SWS may assert that wages should be determined by the “free market”, which is another term in the economic justice master frame. For the purpose of this study, defining what “living wage” or “free market” means is unnecessary, but the concentration of these terms and others like them is a measurement of how the level each group stayed on-topic.

I will also create a list of key terms that are used that fall into other economic justice master frames on both sides, for example: corporate profits, working class, exploitation, and cost of living on behalf of 15 NOW. By contrast, for the countermovement organizations, master frames might include: loss of small businesses, loss of jobs, tip credit and phase-in. All of these key terms (see Appendix) have been pulled from the websites of each organization.

*Operational definition for hypothesis 4:*

The study seeks evidence that there is a movement-countermovement dynamic taking place on SNS. If this dynamic exists there will a statistical lagged time effect that presents itself through data analysis in SPSS.

RESULTS:

To ensure data reliability, the data analyzed by the two coders was tested with a Krippendorff’s Alpha. Krippendorff (2004) recommends 20% of the data to be intercoded for
a sample of this size, but in the interest of a conservative methodological approach, 59 of the 206 cases were intercoded, or just under 30%. Furthermore, a threshold $\alpha_{\text{min}} \geq 0.667$ no lower than .667 with a desirable level of .800, will be applied, consistent with the available methodological literature (Krippendorff 2004).

Although SPSS, STATA and SAS have the ability to calculate Cohen’s $k$, they are unable to calculate the more conservative Krippendorff’s alpha with two coders (Freelon 2010). Therefore, to apply the K-alpha model, the data will be incorporated into ReCal2, an open source web application that is consistent with SPSS and STATA data input platforms to accommodate the needs of this study.

Data were saved in the form of screenshots from the Facebook and blog sites in electronic format. The codebook is available digitally and data was collected into an Excel sheet with each variable treated as column and cases as rows to allow for importation into SPSS. Each variable will be dichotomous with 1= “present” and 0= “not present,” with the exception of the scaled variable to measure completeness of frame. This variable has been constructed similar to a Rasch model.

The Krippendorff’s Alpha reliability test yielded acceptable levels above the .667 level for all variables except for the key terms working class, exploitation, living wage and tip credit, so they have been excluded from all of the following data analysis including the indexed “key terms” variable. This is largely because of the sparseness of the positive occurrences of those terms in the Facebook messages. All other collective action framing variables and economic justice key terms have met the minimum criteria levels for the reliability test allowing for further analysis.
All three groups produced messages that fit into the collective action subframes.

Table 2 shows the frequency of messages and the means of each category. Since the message totals differ from each group the means provide insight to the representation each of the subframes occupy in the messages.

15 NOW produced higher frequencies of messages than the two other groups. Of their framing messages the subframe they produced most was call to action messages (66) followed by identifying solutions to problems (54). The fewest framing messages produced were placing blame for problems (30) followed by identifying the very problem in the first place (38). Mean messages for the 15 NOW reflect their frequency distributions with call to action frames holding the highest mean (.69) and blame being the lowest (.32).
SWS’s framing messages were distributed differently: messages that identified problems occurred in the largest frequency (27) followed by messages that place blame (22). Framing messages that occurred with the lowest frequency were messages that identified solutions for problems (12) and messages that elicited calls for action (15). Again, SWS produced fewer total messages than 15 NOW so mean values allow for useful comparison. SWS’s highest mean was .47 for messages that identifying problems, followed by .39 for messages placing blame, .26 for messages that are calls for action and finally .21 for messages that provide solutions.

FS’s highest frequency collective action subframe were also messages that identified problems (27), at the same frequency of SWS. FS’s second most produced message were those that placed blames for problems (16), followed by those that identified solutions for problems (14) and lastly those that were calls to action (10). Means for FS peaked at .5 and the lowest mean was only .19 for collective action subframes.

Messages that were event updates are included in the table below because of the high frequency of occurrences in messages. During the coding process it became apparent that each of the groups were utilizing SNS to provide updates to their followers on what was happening on the ground in the real world. Here again, 15 NOW had the highest frequency and mean number of messages that were event updates at 62 with a mean of .65. SWS also frequently used SNS to provide updates on events with 27 messages with a mean of .47. FS produced the fewest event updates with only 8 messages and a mean of .15.
Looking at these messages over time, compiling messages produced by all groups gradually grew from the start of the movement and countermovement. Beginning with six in December 2013 they grew until they peaked at 82 in April 2014, followed by a 50% drop in May just before the passage of legislation in June.

The 15 NOW SNS’s campaign began before both SWS and FS and had produced nearly half of their total messages by the time SWS and FS launched their media efforts in March. During the full months 15 NOW was producing messages (January-May) they maintained a relatively consistent rate with an average of 17 messages per month and a maximum of 26 messages in February, just before the creation of the SWS and FS campaigns. Both follow a similar message frequency pattern over time. They began their campaign at the end of March 2014 and started with a high frequency of messages at 33 and 36 messages during their first full month (April) then dropped off in May to 14 and 13 respectively.
Table 3 Messages Produced by Date: Frequency table from Dec.2013-Jun.2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>15 NOW Frequency</th>
<th>15 NOW Percent</th>
<th>SWS Frequency</th>
<th>SWS Percent</th>
<th>FS Frequency</th>
<th>FS Percent</th>
<th>All Groups Frequency</th>
<th>All Groups Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent may not add up to 100 due to rounding.


The above histograms show the message distributions over time. From left to right the first histogram shows total messages from all groups followed by 15 NOW, SWS and FS. The first histogram shows that there is a gradual ramp up in messages produced until the spike that occurs in April when all three groups started producing messages at the same time. All three histograms showing message frequency separated by group also show a drop off in message production during the month of May just before the passage of the minimum wage legislation in June with FS having the sharpest drop off after their leading message frequency in April.

Table 4 shows us the levels of concentration of the collective action frames analyzed. It allows us to measure to what level did each message produce a complete collective action frame by showing how many messages contained some, all or none of the frames that we looked for. It shows that the 15 NOW campaign had the fewest messages that were devoid of collective action frames both in terms of frequency (12) and percentage (12.6%).

While the number of messages produced by SWS and FS without collective action frames present were only 18 and 16, since their totals were lower those messages occupy a larger percentage of the population at 31.6 and 29.6. To put those figures somewhat differently with more significance to this study, 87% of the messages produced by 15 NOW contained at least one of the four collective action frames, compared to 70.4% of the messages from FS and 68.4% from SWS. 15 NOW also had the largest number of messages that produced a complete frame. The table shows that they produced 17 messages that were complete collective action frames, or 17% of their total. By contrast, SWS produced 3 (5.3%) and FS produced only 2 (3.7%) messages that contained all four frames.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Collective Action Frames Present</th>
<th>15 NOW</th>
<th></th>
<th>SWS</th>
<th></th>
<th>FS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collective Action Frames Within Messages from 15 NOW: Histogram of message distribution

Collective Action Frames Within Messages from SWS: Histogram of message distribution

Collective Action Frames Within Messages from FS: Histogram of message distribution
The above histograms show the distribution of collective action frames in messages separated by group. From left to right each bar begins with zero messages. Each bar represents a more complete frame formation ending with all four messages present. The 15 NOW histogram shows that most of their messages contained at least one of the collective action subframes followed by similar levels for messages that contain two, three and all four subframes. The SWS histogram shows that while there are a majority of messages that contain one or more subframes, instances of frame completion steadily decreases as the frames become more complete. FS has a similarly high level of messages that produces no collective action subframes, but they were more effective at constructing messages with at least half of the four subframes than were SWS, albeit with a dramatic drop off for 3 or more subframes.

Similar to Table 4, Table 5 shows the concentration of collective action key terms present within each message. Like the previous table this allows us to measure to what level did each message produce a complete collective action frame by showing how many messages contained some, all, or none of the key terms that we looked for.

15 NOW had 11 messages that contained no key terms or 11.6%. The most key terms that were logged for 15 NOW were 5 in a single message; but they used two key terms with a frequency of 40, or 42.1%, of their messages. SWS produced the fewest messages without key terms with a frequency of only 5 or 8.8%. The largest frequency of key terms contained one key term with 20 messages, or 35%, but they were able to produce two messages with six key terms. Similar to SWS, FS produced only 8 messages (14.8%) that contained no key terms. The largest frequency of key terms also contained one key term with 18 messages, or 33.3%, and they were also able to produce one message with 6 key terms.
### Table 5 Collective Action Key Terms Present Within Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Key Terms</th>
<th>15 NOW</th>
<th></th>
<th>SWS</th>
<th></th>
<th>FS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above histograms show the distribution of collective action key terms in messages separated by group. From left to right each bar begins with zero key terms and each bar represents a more key terms ending with six, the most present in any message. While 15 NOW did have the most messages that contained no key terms, we see here a high mound of messages containing either one or two key terms in comparison to SWS and FS before dropping off significantly at 3 or more terms in a message. As outlined in the table above although SWS has the fewest messages containing no key terms, here we see a significantly smaller mound of messages containing key terms than that of 15 NOW. Similarly, the FS histogram displays a smaller drop off of messages containing key terms, but the level is much lower than that of 15 NOW.
Table 6 is a regression analysis of collective action frame completeness in relation to messages produced by 15 NOW, FS and SWS. FS is the excluded category that 15 NOW and SWS are being compared to. The table shows that 15 NOW is statistically different than FS with a significance level p>.005. 15 NOW has a regression coefficient of .74 higher than FS with a 95% confidence interval of at least .327 but not more than 1.15. SWS does not meet the desired significance level.

Table 7 Collective Action Frame Completeness According to Group: Arch family regression analysis

| Model     | Coef. | Std. Error | z   | P>|z| | 95.0% Confidence Interval for B |
|-----------|-------|------------|-----|-----|-------------------------------|
|           | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| (Constant)| 1.478 | .139 | .000 | 1.000 | -.271 | .272 |
| 15 NOW    | 2.13E-08 | .139 | .000 | 1.000 | .294 | 1.182 |
| SWS       | .093 | .360 | .360 | .716 | -.407 | .592 |
| Arch lag 1 day |  |  |  |  |  |  |
Table 7 is a regression analysis of collective action frame completeness in relation to messages produced by 15 NOW, FS and SWS taking time into account. Similar to the previous regression analysis, FS is the excluded category that 15 NOW and SWS are being compared to. This table also shows that 15 NOW is statistically different than FS with a significance level p>.005. 15 NOW has a regression coefficient of .738 higher than FS with a 95% confidence interval of at least .294 but not more than 1.182. SWS does not meet the desired significance level, so we again see that there is not a significant difference between SWS and FS in this model. The Arch lag is set for one day and the regression model shows no statistical difference from one day to the next.

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this study was to explain how the messages produced by the 15 NOW campaign and its opponents FS and SWS fit into the collective action master frames as well as economic justice master frames. The data analyzed show that the 15 NOW ran a much more thorough online campaign to articulate their message to movement participants and the public at large. In comparison, SWS and FS also utilized the collective action and economic justice master frames through SNS, but in different ways. Where FS and SWS produced more messages that identified problems and placed blame for those problems, 15 NOW created more messages that identified solutions and elicited calls to action to the people that read them. There is also a contextual difference between groups.

To support hypothesis one the data show that messages produced by the 15 NOW campaign were framed more completely than their opponents’. Table 2 shows that 15 NOW was much more effective at creating messages that fit into all four sub frames than SWS and FS both in frequency and percentage of overall messages. Similarly, the regression analysis
conducted show that messages produced by 15 NOW had positive predicted values in completeness of collective action framing compared to FS. Unfortunately the regression analysis did not produce satisfactory significance levels to show predicted values for SWS for comparison. Nevertheless, evidence produced through the frequency tables and the regression results for 15 NOW still support hypothesis one.

The data also show support for hypothesis two, that media outreach efforts from 15 NOW were more prolific (more frequent Facebook and blog posts) than their opponents’ efforts. They produced 85 Facebook messages versus 52 from both FS and SWS, but with an important caveat. 15 NOW did produce more messages than their opponents over the entire course of the campaign, however they were producing messages over a longer period of time. If we only considered messages produced while all three groups were active at the same time 15 NOW only produced 31 messages from when their countermovements started to the passage of legislation, showing that both SWS and FS media outreach efforts were more prolific in the time that they were producing. In terms of blog posts, 15 NOW produced 95 posts more than double that of SWS at 45 and more than six times that of FS providing more support to hypothesis two. In this case taking time into account shows 15 NOW still produced more blog posts at 53, only 8 more than SWS in the same time period and 49 more than FS. So again, although 15 NOW produced more blog posts than their countermovements taking time into consideration paints a picture of similar media outreach efforts at least on the part of SWS.

In this instance the data provide context and a better understanding of what was occurring during the movement countermovement dynamic. On the surface it appears that 15 NOW put forth much more effort to get their messages out to the public, yet when taking
time into account the data show that SWS and FS produced comparably frequent messages. However time also provides another perspective to the message frequency distribution. The histograms show that 15 NOW’s message frequency was more consistent than SWS and FS over the course of their campaign. Their messages ramped up from January and peaked in February of 2014 before either SWS and FS had started their campaigns suggesting that the messaging push for 15 NOW was to initiate their own movement and get the ball rolling, and not to increase the messaging push in response to their countermovement. SWS and FS also had a big push at the beginning of the messaging campaigns but were much less consistent over the course of their campaigns than 15 NOW. FS especially produced over half of their messages in April followed by a steep drop in the messages produced in May. It is possible to infer that at least in terms of message frequency that the 15 NOW campaign was at least able to set the pace for message production during the debate over raising the minimum wage in Seattle.

The frequency time line also shows an interesting trend across groups. One might expect that messages would steadily increase and hit a peak just before the embattled legislation was voted on. Alternatively, one might assume that perhaps there would be a curvilinear trend where message frequencies start high as they are building momentum, exhibit a drop off in the middle and finish high again as a final push to get their messages out to the public. Instead, each group showed a peak at the beginning of their campaigns and messages from all groups saw a decline in May 2014, the month leading up to legislation passage.

We also see significant evidence to support hypothesis three, that the 15 NOW campaign was more on topic using a larger concentration of economic justice master frame
terminology. Table 5 shows that 15 NOW produced messages with a higher frequency of key terms, especially those that contained at least one and two key terms. They also had the lowest levels of messages that were devoid of any key terms at all. Even though SWS and FS did construct three messages that contained six key terms, they had less frequency of messages over all as is depicted in the histograms. It is possible that there could be a similar time effect that resembles the support for hypotheses one and two, but the key terms were not coded for time in this study, therefore based on the evidence presented, hypothesis three has been supported by the data.

From coding the data it became clear that there is a difference between the ways that frames were presented between Facebook messages and blog posts across groups. In blogs, frames tended to be constructed more completely, touching on each of the sub frames and including an event update across all three of the groups studied. On the other hand Facebook messages would more often contain fragmented frames with only some of the four sub frames in each message, however over time frames become more completely constructed if you aggregate the messages together as was done in this study. For example, in a blog post from 15 NOW on February is entitled with a call to action “Boycott McPoverty on Feb 20th!” and they quote a fast food worker to identify a problem and present a solution:

“’Because I make minimum wage I cannot afford daycare, healthcare, or my own place for me & my daughter,’ explained Brittany Phelps, who works at McDonald’s in Seattle, apartment. I’m fighting for a $15 minimum wage so I can afford the basic necessities of live and the solution is to raise the minimum wage.”
The blog goes further to place blame for this problem by attacking three major fast food chains “There’s no question that McDonald’s, Burger King, and Wendy’s can afford to lead by example with a $15 minimum wage — McDonald’s alone banked $5.6 billion in profit last year”. Finally the blog concludes with another call to action, “By joining fast food workers to Boycott McPoverty on February 20th at one or more of these locations below, the people of Seattle will show strong support for a $15 minimum wage that builds broad-based prosperity from the middle out.” –followed by a list of places and times readers can join boycott strikes at various places in Seattle.

Similarly, blogs from the countermovement contained similar higher levels frame construction. In a lengthy post from SWS on March 20th, they respond to the original movements arguments with identifying the problem and placing blame for it: “the ‘Income Inequality’ movement is their means to make us all equally miserable. They consider anyone who achieves, whether due to smarts, hard work, creativity, luck, or reliability, as immoral.” The “Income Inequality” movement is in reference to the 15 NOW campaign, mentioned in an earlier passage. The solution for the problem is somewhat murky but is exemplified later on in the passage with, “the only viable long-term way to answer the pro-minimum wagers claims, and/or demands, is to do something radical – argue vociferously and consistently that income inequality is moral. Argue for the positive, not just against the negative.” (emphasis in original). Finally, the post concludes with the call to action “Share your story, choose your platform!” implying that readers that wished to participate could do so through a number of SNS sites.

Conversely, Facebook messages were typically much shorter than blog posts creating parts but not the entire collective action frame. For example, one message from 15 NOW
from May 14th is a picture of a person holding a sign that reads “I’m going on strike because my paycheck shouldn’t all go to the rent!” identifying a problem but not presenting a solution or eliciting a call to action. The next day they followed it up with a message post that read “Just a few hours ago, 15 Now Seattle launched the signature gathering campaign for our Charter Amendment, which would have Big Business paying $15/hour beginning January 1st, and small businesses phasing in $15 over three years… Join the signature gathering campaign for 15 NOW!” a solution and a call to action. Together these posts complete the frame, but separate they are fragmented.

The data also provide an interesting added dynamic to the collective action frame concept in the idiom of SNS—that of event updates. If Benford and Snow (2000) define core framing tasks as messages that create, foster and facilitate agreement and action among social movement participants “moving people from the balcony to the barricades,” then event updates provided by social movements to their participants gives them the what, when and where to take part in direct action. Event updates also potentially buttress feelings of collective identity on the part of movement or potential movement participants because it keeps them involved in on-the-ground goings on of the movement, even if they were unable to attend a specific movement related event. Furthermore, the more social movements self publish event updates that are archived on SNS, the more information researchers can glean about social movement on the ground activity, both as the movement is happening in real time as well as after the fact. Since SNS have become ever present in contemporary American culture people are able to stay connected to the social movements and the groups analyzed in this study took advantage of this newly available technological resource.
In this case, the data coded shows that messages that were event updates occurred often enough to warrant consideration. For 15 NOW, event updates were the second most produced sub frame messages behind calls for action and event updates; for SWS tied for highest frequency sub frames with messages that identified problems. FS produced the fewest event updates and they represented their smallest frequency sub frame, but they are still present. If we take frequency as a measure of the importance that a group places on the type of message produced, then event updates out rank other parts of the collective action frame for both the 15 NOW social movement and SWS counter movement.

Through the limited data collection done presently, it seems that countermovement messages were more diluted and prone to a higher proportion of messages focused on diagnostic framing, for example, blaming workers, vilifying leading activists and the problems a wage increase would cause for small businesses, rather than messages of prognosis or call to action. Thus if the collective action master frame has three aspects to be complete, then the 15 NOW campaign more completely constructed one.

Implications of Results:

The results of this study suggest that 15 NOW did, indeed, have some agency over its own success via managing its social media presence in an active and savvy manner. Put differently, it was not just that 15 NOW had resources (a council member) and political opportunity contributing to its success; it also used SNS effectively to carry the movement forward and reach its goals in Seattle.

As the living wage movement expands across the country the implications of this study will be amplified if organizations in other areas are found to be using the same
messaging tactics. This study also supports the idea that social movements use new communication sources as a way to communicate their messages dating back to the invention of the radio (Rosigno and Danaher 2001).

It also weaves those ideas into a movement-countermovement dynamic not yet applied to SNS. The information collected here will be of interest to not only social movement scholars but also other SMOs and their opponents that hope to replicate these messaging tactics in the future.

*Future Research:*

Future research on the use of SNS by SMO’s will be critical in understanding how social movements interact with the public. Specifically, further research examining if the messages produced on SNS resonated in more conventional media sources like the Seattle Times might help us to better understand the relationship between SNS and mass media coverage on a larger scale than what was presented here. After all, conventional media sources employ their own SNS and are a part of the conversation at local, state, national and even global levels. A follow up content analysis to this one would have to be much larger in scope as the movement for a 15 dollar minimum wage has spread to the national level and spilled outside the boarders of the official 15 NOW organization.

In any case, it is my hope that this study shows that the incorporation of new media outlets, particularly SNS still employ the same framing methods outlined by my predecessors (Benford and Snow 2000) and provide further empirical evidence to support their findings in a contemporary context. It is also my hope that this study contributes to the literature by incorporating the movement-countermovement theoretical model (Meyer and Staggenborg
1996) with collective action frames as it is applied to new media. With a more resourced study such as incorporating all of the messages produced by the satellite 15 NOW campaigns and their opponents with national media sources over time, we may be able to find a statistically significant interaction effect with messages produced by SNS and mainstream media sources on a national and perhaps global level, greatly contributing to the social movements literature.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY:

By definition, content analysis studies seek to explore and explain messages that are generated from sources. This in no way serves as a causal relationship between the messages produced by the groups studied and the relative success or failure of the groups, in that way it is low in internal validity. By analyzing all of the messages produced by each group I have tried to minimize the threat to internal validity, however this study does not address who created what messages for what purposes and why.

It is difficult to know if other social movements and their countermovements will produce messages of this type and frequency. However, this study is high in construct validity because this was a comprehensive analysis of messages that were all actually produced by each organization in the real world, a strength of the study. Since the unit of analyses are messages, it is also possible that the data analysis conducted here has taken some terms out of context from the true intention or meaning of each post. However, by analyzing each organizations websites and their blog entries as a whole I hoped to address some of these issues. Also, it is difficult to generalize what I find here to other social
movement’s and their countermovements, but it is encouraging that the findings of the research support Kim, Kim and Yoo’s (2014) study of social movement messaging tactics applied to a South Korean SMO. This study augments their analysis by applying it to a western culture and adding the countermovement dynamic to the collective action frame theoretical framework.

Methodologically, there appeared to be some intercoding issues concerning key terms as was shown in the K-Alpha table. Variable key terms working class, exploitation, living wage, cost of living and tip credit/tip penalty were excluded from analysis because they did not meet the reliability criteria for the study. All of the key terms were chosen because they were pulled from the blogs of each group; but those excluded did not occur in a high enough frequency to account for possible random error that is tested for in the K-Alpha test. I included them in the table to show that those variables were taken into consideration as a part of the study.

It is also important to mention that this study alludes to the possibility that frequency of Facebook event updates is an indicator of more conventional, on-the-ground activity. While there is a logical connection there, it could very well be that one group (15 NOW in this case) is better at documenting the activities that they are doing than another group (FS) even though they have similar activities occurring in the real world. Further, case study style research would be valuable to substantiate that possibility.

CONCLUSION:
As presented here, the use of collective action frames by social movements have traversed many mediums of media over time. In a contemporary setting, these action frames have been picked up and applied by SMO’s to new media sources in an attempt to have direct access to the public. Free from the constraints of the editorial boardroom, news cycles and biases of conventional news coverage, SNS have given SMO’s a digital forum to apply collective action framing techniques in their communication with the public. In many ways, SMO’s can now be their own gatekeepers to content, and can provide their audience with critical updates in real time. Similarly, opponents to social movements have the same resources at their disposal to counter the arguments made by the original movement, setting the stage for a messaging battle. In the case of 15 NOW campaign, the data show that the messages from both the movement and counter-movements fit the theoretical model, however with a varying level of veracity by each organization.

This study, and others like it, show that SNSs allow SMO researchers to develop a narrative of a SMO’s tactics in their own voice providing us with a clear picture of an evolution of ideas in ways like never before. The incorporation of SNS, now allows unprecedented access to data about SMOs’ evolving activities and messaging tactics. With this information, we can then make a more accurate comparison of a SMO’s use of collective action frames and conventional media coverage to get a better understanding of media bias. As demonstrated in this study, content analysis of SNS enable SMO researchers to listen in to the dialogue that occurs in the movement-countermovement dynamic.

This study also provides some hope to social movements. One of the potentially negative implications of resource mobilization and political opportunity theories for social movements is that movements have little agency over their successes (or failures)—instead,
success is largely a matter of structural features beyond their control. Even research on
movement interactions with conventional media offer the same bleak picture (Peoples 2008).
This study suggests, however, that new media in the form of SNS can provide movements
some agency, and, thus, control over their likelihood of success. The 15 NOW campaign
successfully utilized SNS to help garner support and ultimately have success in the policy
sphere. Other movements could follow in their footsteps and potentially increase their own
odds of success as well.
APPENDIX:

Codebook:

Instructions: The Facebook pages are documented in screenshots that scroll through the feeds of each organization. When coding the messages, please be careful not to double count the messages, as there is some overlap in the screenshots. Each post has a date and you will be able to track the progress from one post to another. There is one instance where the full post was not able to fit into one screenshot and those files are labeled “15 Now (61 P.1)” and “15 Now (61 P.2)”.

When looking at each post, please answer each of the following questions:

Does this message identify a problem? Yes/ No 1=yes 0=No
A problem is anything that the group is deciding is the issue in their own words. There can, and will be multiple problems that range anywhere from “cost of living” to “killing jobs”. There will also be messages that do not identify a problem and are only calls to action, or only casting blames.

Does this message identify who/what is to blame for a problem? Yes/ No 1=yes 0=No
Again, in their own words does the group blame a person, business or social structure (like capitalism) for an issue?

Does this message identify a solution for a problem? Yes/ No 1=yes 0=No
(*this can be as simple as something like “this is why we need a living wage” or “that’s why we advocate the implementation of a tip credit”)

Does this message illicit a call for action? Yes/ No 1=yes 0=No
Is the message asking the reader to ‘do’ something. It can be as simple as watching a posted video or reading an article all the way to asking for donations or joining a protest.

Did these messages incorporate the following key terms and how many times:
Dicotomous variable, the word is either mentioned or not. 1=yes 0=No
Corporate profits:
Working class:
Exploitation:
Living wage:
Cost of living:
Poverty:

Loss of small business:
Loss of jobs:
Tip credit:
Phase in:
Increased cost:
Free market:

**Instructions:** The websites of each organization’s blog posts, please answer the following questions:

Does this blog entry identify a problem? Yes/No

Does this blog entry identify who/what is to blame? Yes/No

Does this blog entry identify a solution for a problem? Yes/No

Does this blog illicit a call for action? Yes/No
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