THE FRAMING OF OCCUPY WALL STREET BY *THE NEW YORK TIMES* AND *NEW YORK POST*

by

Ryan Leach, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
with a Major in Mass Communication
December 2018

Committee Members:

Sandhya Rao, Chair

Ray Niekamp

Vanessa Higgins Joyce

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

Duplication Permission

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to thank my thesis committee: Dr. Sandhya Rao, Dr. Ray Niekamp and Dr. Vanessa Higgins Joyce for their guidance; Mor Fleisher-Leach and Evan Hendrix for their coding assistance and to Dr. Michel Haigh for her support and help with carrying out this thesis' content analysis. Dr. Haigh is indefatigable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table **Page**

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare how a liberal paper, *The New York Times*, and a conservative paper, the *New York Post*, framed Occupy Wall Street (OWS) during its nearly two-month occupation of Zuccotti Park in 2011. *The New York Times* and the *New York Post* were selected because they were both based in New York City where OWS occurred. OWS centered around economic issues originating from the 2007-2008 economic recession. This study utilized the frames previous scholars found to be prevalent among newspaper coverage of social movement organizations. A content analysis was used to analyze *The New York Times* and *New York Post* articles that spanned OWS' Zuccotti Park occupation. Research results found that disparaging frames were present in both *The New York Times* and the *New York Posts'* coverage of OWS and that there were no statistically significant differences between the two papers in their utilization. In regards to OWS, the movement was treated by *The New York Times* and the *New York Post* as illegitimate.

I. INTRODUCTION

Mass media typically frame social movement organizations (SMOs) in an overall negative light (Gitlin, 1980). Starting with the Vietnam War protests of the 1960s and 1970s, communication scholars have applied framing theory to coverage of SMOs to demonstrate mainstream media's overall support of the status quo (Baran & Davis, 2015). This thesis examined the *New York Times* and the *New York Post's* coverage of the Occupy Wall Street movement (OWS). It found that the overall trend of conservative news framing was present with both papers. It also uncovered the degree to which the *New York Times* and the *New York Post's* coverage differed. Unlike previous studies (Brasted, 2005; Xu, 2013), this thesis analyzed two newspapers based in the city in which OWS occurred.

OWS's focal point was the Zuccotti Park occupation which lasted from September 17, 2011, to November 15, 2011. Occupy was concerned with questions of growing wealth inequality, housing foreclosure, and debt relief in the United States. Occupy activists were critics of failing American democracy and neoliberal economic policies that disproportionately favored the financial sector (Chari, 2015).

Although greatly diminished, the embers of the Occupy movement still glow in a website (occupywallst.org) with a message board and mailing list. The problems Occupy addressed—wealth inequality chiefly among them—are still ubiquitous. Additionally, there's a myth that the *New York Times* is a "liberal" paper. While it does represent the "left" in the narrow spectrum of American politics, McChesney (1999) points out the *New York Times* is a stridently pro-capitalist newspaper that has treated labor (and its inclusion into the policy-making process) very poorly. Occupy, being an anti-capitalist movement, had a different value system and was far to the left of most *New York Times* journalists and editors, let alone the staff at News Corp-owned *New York Post*.

Occupy Wall Street

Antecedents to Occupy Wall Street. The Occupy movement wasn't sparked by a single organization or public figure; rather, its genesis was the amalgamation of domestic and global events pushing for greater democracy from below, and the connection of likeminded people sharing ideas online (Carty, 2015).

Occupy Wall Street (OWS)—the Occupy movement spread to hundreds of cities worldwide, but this paper will focus on the initial Zuccotti Park occupation in New York City—drew inspiration from the early 2011 protests in Wisconsin against Governor Scott Walker's push to undermine public-sector labor unions and implement state budget cuts. Demonstrators occupied Wisconsin's Capitol building in Madison for weeks. Additional inspiration for OWS came from the concurrent Arab Spring protests (notably, the occupation of Cairo's Tahrir Square in early 2011) and the Indignados anti-austerity uprising in Spain, whose focal point was the occupation of Madrid's Puerta del Sol by demonstrators (Carty, 2015; Gitlin, 2012). Like their predecessors in Madison, Cairo and Madrid, OWS occupiers relied heavily on the world wide web and social media networking sites to share information and spread the message of their movement (Carty, 2015). OWS was the first significant protest in the United States to utilize smartphones (Deluca, Lawson & Sun, 2012). Martin Luther King, Jr.'s legacy of nonviolent protest provided a template for OWS's civil disobedience (Quiggin, 2011). A popular OWS slogan was "The 99 percent is 100 percent nonviolent" (Gitlin, 2012, p. 127).

New York City before the Zuccotti Park Occupation. In February 2010, journalist David DeGraw posted a call for a 99% movement on his website. His idea went viral after being picked up by left-wing news site, *Alternet*. Occupy later used DeGraw's 99% call as a rallying slogan. On June 9, 2011, *Adbusters*—a Canadian anticorporate magazine—selected September 17, 2011, as a day to "Occupy Wall Street." The magazine encouraged protesters to "BRING TENT" (Gitlin, 2012, p. 15). On June 14, without any knowledge of the *Adbusters* call to Occupy Zuccotti Park, New Yorkers Against Budget Cuts—with assistance from city employee unions and a group called Picture the Homeless—demonstrated for two weeks across the street from City Hall, protesting New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg's budget cuts (they dubbed their encampment "Bloombergville," a play on Depression-era Hooverville encampments). On June 13, 2011, A99, a subgroup of Anonymous, made an aborted attempt to occupy Zuccotti Park. Among their list of demands: Break up too big to fail banks, and the resignation of Ben Bernanke, then Chairman of the US Federal Reserve. When they found out that *Adbusters* had called for a similar occupation on September 17, A99 decided to regroup three months later. Some of the A99 protesters went off to join the "Bloombergville" encampment (Gitlin, 2012).

September 17, 2011. "Occupy is the first major public response to thirty years of class war," (Chomsky, 2013, p. 9). The Occupation of Zuccotti Park (also known as Liberty Plaza) began on September 17, 2011. A few dozen protesters with sleeping bags claimed the Lower Manhattan park, and began living there full time. They had no idea how fast their ideas and movement would spread (Gitlin, 2012).

Initial OWS demonstrators were overwhelmingly young, middle-class Caucasian students and college graduates (Lewis & Luce, 2012). OWS participants weren't demonstrating in the traditional sense with a list of demands, but were occupying Zuccotti Park to create a space to share and spawn new ideas (Gitlin, 2012). Some, who had campaigned for President Barack Obama in 2008, had become disillusioned by the perceived tepidness of his presidency. They were convinced that the political process was exclusively the preserve of the top one-percent. Capturing the sentiment of some OWS occupiers was New School instructor Jeremy Varon: "This is the Obama generation declaring their independence from his administration. We thought his voice was ours. Now we have to speak for ourselves" (Gitlin, 2012, p. 27). Posters were ubiquitous among protesters, ranging from professionally printed signs by the National Nurses United organization ("Heal America. Tax Wall Street"), to homemade ones stating, "Shit is fucked up and bullshit" (Gitlin, 2012, p. 65).

OWS was known for its nebulous demands and non-hierarchal organizational structure. (Occupy Denver, one of the hundreds of Occupy groups inspired by OWS, was quoted in the movement's newspaper, *Occupied Wall Street Journal*, as having elected the group's first leader: a three-year-old border collie dog named Shelby [Gitlin, 2012]). Carty (2015) posits the lack of any form of central leadership was a strategic tactic that increased inclusivity and participation among demonstrators. OWS brought many different people together and that the mutual support demonstrated at Zuccotti Park (and other Occupy sites) was likely its most important contribution (Chomsky, 2013).

Egalitarian principles were embedded in the movement's day-to-day operation. OWS was governed by a general assembly, reaching decisions on budgets (coming in through donations) to mundane issues like handling laundry and taking care of sanitation by consensus. Approval or disapproval to speakers' ideas was demonstrated by listeners' hand signals (van Gelder, 2011). Everyone could speak at a general assembly; minutes were kept and posted online and facilitators helped keep the debate on track (Gitlin, 2012). One aspect of OWS that caught the media's attention was the movement's use of the "people's mic." The New York City Police Department (NYPD) outlawed the use of electric amplification (megaphones) at Zuccotti Park, so OWS relied on participants repeating in unison what speakers said—often only a few words at a time—so that the whole general assembly could hear their voice. OWS's Zuccotti Park base was lined with working groups who met weekly to keep the encampment running. They performed reasonably well tasks such as sanitation, medical aid and banking; there was a functioning library (staffed by volunteer librarians) and groups for media and labor outreach (Gitlin, 2012).

While demands were varied and OWS's leaders non-existent, anti-austerity measures and wealth inequality in the United States were focal points for occupiers (Zuccotti Park was selected due to its close proximity to Wall Street). OWS homed in on what participants perceived to be the leading causes of crises facing the United States and rest of the world: Wall Street banks, big corporations and wealth usurpation by the top 1% (van Gelder, 2011). On September 23, 2011, OWS released a living document that was—approved by Zuccotti Park's General Assembly—entitled "Principles of Solidarity;" the document outlined the values and beliefs of OWS. Principles of solidarity included: engaging in direct and transparent participatory democracy; exercising personal and collective responsibility; recognizing individuals' inherent privilege and the influence it has on all interactions; reflecting how labor is valued, etc. (van Gelder, 2011). Other popular demands at Zuccotti Park included: ending the Fed (by the libertarian wing of the movement), reinstating Glass-Steagall, taxing Wall Street transactions, cuts to military budgets and the total public financing of elections (Gitlin, 2012).

OWS-inspired events weren't confined to the Zuccotti Park encampment. More than 700 demonstrators were arrested on October 1, 2011, while marching on the Brooklyn Bridge. Over ten thousand marched from Zuccotti Park to New York City's courthouse center at Foley Square on October 5, 2011. It was the first time an Occupy event climbed to more than ten thousand participants (Gitlin, 2012). On November 17, 2011, two days after the Zuccotti Park eviction, OWS—assisted by labor unions—brought out more than thirty-five thousand protesters, again to Foley Square (Lewis & Luce, 2012).

By late October 2011, dissatisfaction with Zuccotti Park's General Assembly—and the encampment itself—began to grow. Because of its inclusive nature, reaching decisions to simple problems could take hours, so a new body, the Spokes Council, was comprised of working group members who would represent and caucus with their group. Because the Spokes Council met indoors and was more intimate, the "people's mic" wasn't used. The Spokes Council met for the first time on November 7, 2011, only eight days before occupiers were forced out of Zuccotti Park by the NYPD on November 15, 2011. The Spokes meetings were chaotic and not well regarded by occupiers. Rules of rotating speakers broke down, as did many other guidelines (Gitlin, 2012).

By November, life at Zuccotti Park grew more dangerous. Homeless people, indifferent to the OWS' General Assembly, were conspicuous. Their concerns weren't the same as middle-class college students. Violence against women occurred, and some money was stolen from OWS' coffers. Todd Gitlin, who was as Zuccotti Park, interviewed a mental health worker who felt the encampments were growing, "Too intense" (Gitlin, 2012, p. 69). Heavy drug use was reported. By the time riot police cleared Zuccotti Park on the early morning of November 15, 2011, the privately expressed opinion among some occupiers to Gitlin (2012) was one of relief.

After the Zuccotti Park Occupation. The Occupy movement continued after the Zuccotti Park eviction on November 15, 2011, although the movement essentially collapsed thereafter (Mirowski, 2013). Attempts were periodically made to re-occupy Zuccotti Park; all were pushed back by the NYPD. On May 1, 2012, OWS-supported May Day protests brought marchers and strikers out by the thousands all over the United States. The biggest turnouts were in the San Francisco Bay Area and New York City (15,000 to 20,000 estimated), and brought unionists, occupiers and parents with children together (Gitlin, 2012). Although Occupy was criticized for not having clear goals (Deluca et al., 2012; Mirowski, 2013), the movement helped bring attention to home foreclosures via protests before and after the Zuccotti Park occupation (Lewis & Luce, 2012). Occupy helped change America's class consciousness. The Pew Foundation released a poll in 2012 indicating Americans felt income inequality was one of the greatest sources of tension in society. The survey itself didn't measure inequality, but the public's perception of it. It was the first time public sentiment about income inequality registered highly in a Pew Foundation poll, and it's a testament to the legacy of the Occupy movement (Chomsky, 2013). Phillip Mirowski (2013) states OWS fell victim to its own lack of structure:

The collapse of the "Occupy" movement over 2011-2012 was largely due to the long-discredited notion that political action could be sustained and effective in the absence of any sort of theoretical guidance and hierarchal organization on short- to longer-term goals (p. 327).

A timeline of OWS is included in Table 1.

Table 1. Occupy Wall Street Timeline

Date	Event
February 2010	Journalist David DeGraw posts a call for a 99% movement on his website. His idea goes viral after being picked up by left-wing news site, *Alternet* (Gitlin, 2012).
June 9, 2011	*Adbusters*—a Canadian anticorporate magazine—selected September 17, 2011, as a day to "Occupy Wall Street." The magazine encouraged protesters to "BRING TENT" (Gitlin, 2012, p. 15).
September 17, 2011	Occupy protesters take over Zuccotti Park (Gitlin, 2012).
September 23, 2011	Principles of Solidarity, a living document outlying the values and beliefs of Occupy Wall Street, is approved by Zuccotti Park's General Assembly (van Gelder, 2011).
October 1, 2011	More than 700 demonstrators associated with OWS are arrested, marching on the Brooklyn Bridge (Gitlin, 2012).
October 5, 2011	Over 10,000 protesters march from Zuccotti Park to New York City's courthouse center at Foley Square (Gitlin, 2012).
November 7, 2011	Spokes Council meets for the first time (Gitlin, 2012).

Table 1. Continued Occupy Wall Street Timeline

November 15, 2011	Occupy protesters are forced out of Zuccotti Park by the NYPD (Gitlin, 2012).
November 17, 2011	Two days after the Zuccotti Park eviction, OWS—assisted by labor unions—bring out more than 35,000 protesters, again to Foley Square (Lewis & Luce, 2012).
May 1, 2012	OWS-supported May Day protests bring marchers and strikers out by the thousands all over the United States. The biggest turnouts are in the San Francisco Bay Area and New York City—respectively, 15,000 and 20,000 estimated protesters (Gitlin, 2012).

Coverage and Framing of the Occupy Movement. Occupiers arrived at Zuccotti Park on September 17, 2011. They were met with a total mainstream media blackout for eight days. This was significant—OWS was a major protest in the heart of the world's financial district and it was ignored for over a week (Deluca et al., 2012). *The New York Times* was the first major newspaper to cover Occupy on September 25, 2011. OWS' lack of coverage fared worse in the other four major American newspapers; *The Washington Post* didn't cover OWS until October 3, 2011. The newspaper of record for the financial sector, *The Wall Street Journal*, conspicuously avoided OWS coverage—writing about Occupy only three times in its first twenty-five days. (Deluca et al., 2012) The same blackout didn't occur in international news coverage. *The Guardian* covered OWS on September 19, 2011; *The Agence France-Presse* covered OWS on its first day, September 17, 2011 (Deluca et al., 2012).

Once mainstream media began covering OWS, they were dismissive of the movement (Chomsky, 2013). Arrests often became the basis for coverage; reporters let police frame their stories. Photos selected for mainstream newspapers didn't highlight the thousands marching in solidarity with OWS, but confrontations between police and occupiers (Gitlin, 2012). The first *The New York Times* article highlighting OWS (Ginia Bellafante's "Gunning for Wall Street, with Faulty Aim") was steeped in derision, framing occupiers as deviant and disruptive. *The New York Times'* first front-page coverage of OWS on October 1, 2011 ("Wall Street Occupiers, Protesting Till Whenever") repeated the same negative frames (Deluca et al., 2012).

Unlike mainstream media, Deluca et al. (2012) found the blogosphere loaded with coverage of OWS—a search on Google Blog of the first month of OWS (September 17, 2011, to October 17, 2011) turned up over ten million results. While right-leaning blogs challenged the authenticity of OWS, left-leaning blogs felt the movement was truly grassroots and populist. Much of the perceived lack of legitimacy of OWS from the right blogosphere was attributable to labor unions'—the perennial bane of conservatives—support of Occupy. Left-leaning blogs had no such qualms. Many leftist bloggers felt labor union participation only aided OWS' validity (Deluca et al., 2012). Progressive blogs saw OWS participation by the unemployed, young people riddled with student-loan debt, and even the homeless as legitimizing OWS' messages, not undermining them (as did their rivals). Where right-wing blogs entertained conspiracy theories that people of color were paid (including undocumented immigrants) to participate in OWS, left-wing blogs wondered why there wasn't a greater Latino and African-American presence at OWS (Deluca et al., 2012). Left-leaning blogs recognized OWS' cacophony of messages, but were overall supportive—offering constructive criticism while acknowledging that the overall message of OWS was clear—that elections are bought; and that Wall Street (1%) got bailed out after the 2008 Recession, while Main Street (99%) got sold out. Deluca, et al. (2012) posit that social media create new opportunities for activism, bypassing the gatekeepers of traditional mass media organizations.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Two early seminal works on framing theory in mass communication came out in 1978 and 1980. The first, *Making News* (1978), was written by Gaye Tuchman, a journalist and sociology professor at Queens College. The second, *The Whole World is Watching* (1980), was written by Todd Gitlin, a journalist and communications professor at Columbia University.

Tuchman was a working journalist who spent ten years conducting interviews and doing participant observations at three newsrooms and one television station (Tuchman, 1978). Tuchman was interested in how journalistic norms serve organizational needs, as well as how media frame events and shape news consumers' knowledge of progressive movements—specifically, how newspapers framed the second-wave feminist movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s. In coming up with her ideas of "news as frame," Tuchman was indebted to Canadian-American sociologist Erving Goffman. Whereas Tuchman uses frames as a method to describe media's handling of news stories—their usage of words, images and presentation style of events—Goffman used it to describe an individual's cognitive understanding of an event (Druckman, 2001).

Goffman developed frame analysis theory as a micro-level theory to uncover how individuals make sense of their social world (Baran & Davis, 2015). To Goffman, order is not an intrinsic quality of everyday life; rather, one employs past experiences to frame events in order to make sense of the social environment. Without a frame, people struggle to comprehend information and everyday encounters with others (Tuchman, 1978). Frames not only assist us in making sense of the everyday world, they also help guide action (Benford & Snow, 2000).

As a university student in the 1960s, Gitlin was involved in Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), a New Left activist movement comprised of college students. The portrayals of SDS in newspapers and television didn't reflect his views of the messages and actions of the group. Gitlin (1980) felt journalists misrepresented SDS and the New Left. It wasn't until Gitlin employed framing theory to media coverage of SDS that he got a clearer understanding of the systematic biases corporate media employed.

To Gitlin, media are mobile spotlights, not passive mirrors on society. They adopt certain frames that reject or downplay conflicting viewpoints. Borrowing from both Gramsci and Goffman, the media employ a hegemonic frame, always nimble and shifting to maintain the status quo (Gitlin, 1980). Gitlin and Tuchman's research was later labeled "transactional" in that it focused on the relationship between SMOs and the media (Corrigall-Brown, Snow & Vliegenthart, 2007). Although written in 1980, subsequent research findings have confirmed many of Gitlin's assertions in *The Whole World is Watching* (Baran & Davis, 2015).

Since the mid-1980s, the number of academic articles and papers referring to framing theory have risen precipitously. Alongside resource mobilization and political-opportunity processes, framing theory has been pivotal in understanding the character and direction of social movements (Benford & Snow, 2000). Social movement organizations have adapted to framing theory, developing their own frames to garner media coverage during critical moments (Corrigall-Brown et al., 2007).

Framing Theory

Framing theory was developed by Canadian-American sociologist Erving Goffman in his classic work *Frame Analysis* (1974) (Haynes, Merolla & Ramakrishnan, 2016). Framing theory was influenced by symbolic interactionism and social constructionism (Baran & Davis, 2015). Goffman pulled what he felt were the strongest elements from both theories. Goffman viewed social institutions as powerful—perhaps dictating culture—but allocated individuals a modicum of free agency within the guidelines set by socializing institutions (school, government, law, etc.). People use frames to make sense of day-to-day interactions. Often, they're not even conscious of doing it; it happens perfunctorily. However, people occasionally need to down shift—consciously reframe—if faced with a serious situation (such as setting off an alarm passing through airport security or engaging in a casual conversation that turns tense) (Baran & Davis, 2015).

While Goffman employed framing theory on an individual (cognitive) level, Tuchman—the first scholar to apply framing to news (Brasted, 2005)—and Gitlin applied it to media theory in their respective seminal works, *Making News* (1978) and *The Whole World is Watching* (1980). As Gamson, Croteau, Haynes and Sasson note, framing "plays the same role in analyzing media discourse that schema does in cognitive psychology—a central organizing principle that holds together and gives coherence and meaning to a diverse array of symbols" (1992, p. 384).

Critical cultural studies scholars, Tuchman and Gitlin were inspired to apply Goffman's framing theories to media studies by what they felt was the misrepresentation of their SMOs (respectively, second-wave feminist and New Left) in the press and on television. They discovered ways in which the media systematically belittled SMOs, by "balancing" demonstrators with dissimilar right-wing extremists in stories, as well as misrepresenting SMOs by focusing on the most extreme examples of protesters (Gitlin, 1980). Reporters often let police set the agenda and frame their stories for them by focusing on arrests at marches as opposed to a SMO's popular support, thereby obscuring the movement's goals (Gitlin, 2012). As Gitlin notes, "A news story adopts a certain frame and rejects or downplays material this is discrepant" (Gitlin, 1980, p. 49).

Broadcasted facts and images take on their meaning through frames (Gamson et al., 1992). When certain frames are repeated consistently, they become themes (Luther & Miller, 2005). In that sense, media frames are not passive mirrors on society, but a hegemonic frame acting in political and economic elites' best interests (Gitlin, 1980; Luther & Miller, 2005). Media frames make a difference in how SMOs are perceived by the public. Frames have the power to undermine progressive social movements. This is worrisome for SMOs as they have little control over the media (Brasted, 2005).

Gamson et al. (1992) made important distinctions in applying frames to media discourse, which they admit is riddled with ambiguities. It's possible to analyze the framing of a *singular event* (for example, the nuclear explosion at Three Mile Island). Meanwhile, issue-frames—such as nuclear power—appear in "an ongoing strip, requiring continuing interpretation" (Gamson, et al., 1992, p. 285). Lastly, larger frames transcend singular issues, and can be used to analyze many issues.

Although Tuchman and Gitlin's works dealt mostly with textual framing, they also covered visual framing techniques. Tuchman (1978) described the visual frames photographers and cameramen used to get the desired emotional responses they sought from viewers (i.e., bird's eye view of a group of people to dehumanize the individuals in the mass). Gitlin detailed the way photos are cropped to create distorted impressions of public events like protests (1980).

Dimitrova and Rodriguez (2011) recognized visual frames as being underutilized vis-à-vis textual frames, and that it was likely attributable to the general confusion among scholars regarding the application of visual framing analysis. To consolidate and provide a framework for their study, Dimitrova and Rodriguez propose a four-tiered model for identifying and analyzing visual frames. They are: (1) visuals as denotative systems, (2) visuals as stylistic-semiotic systems, (3) visuals as connotative systems and (4) visuals as ideological representations. Denotative frames describe the cognitive functions people use to make sense of visual images. They describe the proximity of objects, their similarities and cognitive closure, and how these aspects aid in putting the pieces of a picture together to make sense of it. It's been described as making a "blueprint of the scene" (Dimitrova & Rodriguez, 2011, p. 53). Visuals as stylistic-semiotic systems describe stylistic conventions; for example, close-up shots to signify intimacy or its opposite—the long shot to signify context. Visuals as connotative systems are essentially concept-loaded images. For example, the toppling of Saddam's statue symbolizing the end of authoritarian rule and liberation of the Iraqi people for some viewers. (Dimitrova & Rodriguez, 2011) Visuals as ideological representations tackle questions concerning macro-level framing and power. This type of visual framing seeks to answer whose interests are being served and whose ideas dominate in a photograph.

Framing Studies of SMOs

Monica Brasted's (2005) analysis of the 1968 Democratic Convention is a frame analysis of protesters. Brasted conducted a content analysis to compare the frames utilized by *The New York Times* and the *Chicago Tribune*. Brasted (2005) sought to uncover whether the two papers supported the status quo; to see if differences existed between *The New York Times* (nonlocal paper) and the *Chicago Tribune* (local paper); and how the papers influenced readers' perceptions of the protesters at the '68 Democratic Convention.

Brasted (2005) examined issues of *The New York Times* and the *Chicago Tribune* from Monday, August 19, 1968, to Sunday, September 8, 1968. This three-week window enabled analysis of the papers before, during and after the convention (Brasted, 2005). News stories, editorials and letters to the paper were analyzed to answer Brasted's research questions. 96 stories were reviewed, 61 from the *Chicago Tribune*, 35 from *The New York Times*. To determine themes, coding categories were created; they included "conflict (battle), social disorder, event focus or context focus, selection of leaders…and framing protesters as delegitimized, marginalized, or demonized" (Brasted, 2005, p. 9).

Brasted (2005) found *The New York Times* and the *Chicago Tribune* supported the status quo. However, there were differences in support. The *Chicago Tribune* relied heavily on Mayor Daley and other officials as sources. When the *Tribune* quoted movement representatives, it was typically in a negative manner—highlighting protesters' plans to break the law and create disorder, for example. The *Chicago Tribune* utilized the social-order frame more often in their stories than *The New York Times* did. The *Tribune's* coverage "depicted a city that had been invaded by outsiders and whose peace and order were threatened" (Brasted, 2005, p. 20). The '68 Democratic Convention was a violent event and the *Tribune* showed no sympathy for protesters who were victims of police brutality. Quite the opposite—the police and Mayor Daley were praised for their actions. Brasted (2005) found *The New York Times* to support the status quo; however, its coverage was more balanced and included protesters' perspectives. Unlike the *Chicago*

Tribune, *The New York Times* did run stories critical of Mayor Daley and the Chicago police.

Brasted (2005) found framing differences existed between *The New York Times* and the *Chicago Tribune*. Differences were likely attributable to the proximity of the *Tribune*—which "told the story from the perspective of Chicagoans" (p. 21)—and the paper's close ties to Mayor Daley. The *New York Times* was more objective due to geographical distance from the protests; their reporters appeared to be under no political or editorial pressure. Brasted (2005) notes that it would have been interesting to see how *The New York Times* would have handled the 1968 Democratic Convention protest had it occurred in New York City.

Lastly, Brasted (2005) found—through letters to the editor—that press coverage influenced readers' perceptions of the protesters. The *Chicago Tribune's* coverage framed the movement as a battle between police and protesters and the former's efforts to maintain control. "The protesters were depicted as the enemy of the citizens of Chicago" (Brasted, 2005, p. 21). This influenced *Tribune* readers' perceptions. Brasted (2005) found similar bias against protesters with *The New York Times'* readership, but with greater subtlety due to the paper's greater balance of sources and fairer treatment of protesters.

Luther and Miller (2005) analyzed newspaper stories featuring pro-war and anti-war demonstrators of the 2003 US-Iraq War. A total of 386 news stories that covered demonstrations from January 29, 2002, to May 1, 2003, were analyzed. They analyzed stories that covered pro-war or anti-war demonstrations; articles that covered both demonstrations happening simultaneously (and they often did) were jettisoned.

Luther and Miller (2005) used computer-assisted content analysis programs to produce lists of words in alphabetic order—as well as their frequency of occurrence—of "partisan stakeholder texts" (p. 83) to examine frames selected and highlighted by the two groups. From the lists, Luther and Miller (2005) "chose 40 substantive words for each stakeholder group." Examples from the anti-war organizations included: war, nonviolent, antiwar, people, resistance, aggression, globalization, occupation, etc. Examples from the pro-war organizations included: weapons, biological, chemical, troops, freedom, support, America's, liberty, security, etc. To define the pro-war and anti-war "master frames"—larger frames that serve to connect likeminded groups—"texts were coded for the sets of identified frame words and then submitted to mapping and clustering analysis programs to derive the groups of terms that define master frames" (Luther & Miller, 2005, p. 84). The two pro-war master frames uncovered were "Fighting for Freedom and Democracy" and "Threat from Weapons of Mass Destruction." The anti-war master frames were "Anti-War Protest Efforts" and "Global Resistance against the U.S. 'Empire.'"

Luther and Miller (2005) had three framing hypotheses: 1.) Stories covering pro-war demonstrations will reflect pro-war frames more than stories covering anti-war demonstrations. 2.) Stories covering anti-war demonstrations will reflect anti-war frames more than stories covering pro-war demonstrations. 3.) The average of pro-war frames in pro-war demonstration stories will exceed the average of anti-war frames in anti-war demonstration stories.

All the master frames data matched Luther and Miller's (2005) first and second hypotheses except in one case. The pro-war "Threat from Weapons of Mass Destruction" frame had a higher mean in the anti-war stories. The reason for this anomaly was found to be that the anti-war side used it as a counter-theme, questioning the Bush Administration's claim that Iraq had a stockpile of weapons of mass destruction. Nevertheless, the anti-war and pro-war groups were successful at setting frames for reporters at their respective demonstrations (Luther & Miller, 2005). Luther and Miller's (2005) third hypothesis—that the average of pro-war frames in pro-war stories would exceed the usage of anti-war frames in anti-war stories—was false. "In coverage of anti-war groups, anti-war frames exceeded pro-war frames by 20.02 compared to 3.53 for coverage of pro-war groups" (Luther & Miller, 2005, p. 87).

Fragmentation

"All that was once directly lived has become mere representation" (Debord, 1994, p. 12). Postmodern media theorists have posited the idea of a fragmentation of meaning. They argue that fragmentation transcends framing in describing present-day media saturation (Gamson et al., 1992). As Baudrillard perceptively observes, "We live in a world where there is more and more information, and less and less meaning" (1994, p. 79). The reason for this obfuscation of information is the fetishization of immediate content—for example, the live television broadcasts of Scud missile attacks during Desert Storm. What occurs with this deluge of "real-time" events in media is the proliferation of ephemeral images that have no real meaning—and therefore no frame (Gamson et al., 1992). Where we think "information produces meaning, the opposite occurs" (Baudrillard, 1994, p. 80). The result is the alienation of the masses, dovetailing with the "implosion of meaning at the microscopic level of the sign" (Baudrillard, 1994, p. 81).

Centralization of Media, Journalists and Framing Theory

Newspapers need to constantly create new content to attract the ad revenue their operating expenses are dependent upon. This is a relatively new phenomenon. It wasn't until 1833 that the *New York Sun* carried ads for products. The *Sun* was different from previous newspapers. It was less partisan and emphasized sensational and shocking stories (Tuchman, 1978). Capitalizing on newspapers' hunger for more content, especially from distant cities, the Associated Press was established in 1846 and the centralization—as well as maximization of information for the lowest price—of news stories had begun (Tuchman, 1978). Wire services like the Associated Press frame what is and isn't newsworthy. Newspapers regularly send their own reporters to national events they learn about through wire services, duplicating much of the same information the latter provides (Tuchman, 1978). Tuchman found the values of news professionalism developed in tandem with the needs of modern news organizations. The symbiotic relationship between reporters and newspapers serves to legitimate the status quo (Tuchman, 1978). Additionally, media contest and raise questions about government policy almost exclusively within the framework set by state and corporate elites, only rarely deviating from their narrow consensus (Chomsky, 1989).

Because of corporate consolidation, five transnational corporations own most of the newspapers, magazines, movie studios, book publishers, radio and television stations in the United States. Due to their vast size and drive to maximize profits, they prefer stories that can run anywhere and everywhere (Bagdikian, 2004). Media conglomerates now serve a global market; new communication technologies have enabled them to market the same messages in multiple media (Gamson et al., 1992)

Flipping the Script: Social Movement Organizations Create Their Own Frames

Gitlin (1980) reports that SDS initially was uninterested in media coverage from 1960 to the late winter of 1965. However, social movement organizations (SMOs) have become perceptive to framing techniques and regularly create their own—notably injustice framing (Benford & Snow, 2000). Movements employ injustice frames to demonstrate the repressive actions of an authority. They're used regularly by SMOs advocating political and/or economic change (Benford & Snow, 2000). Social movements need to ascribe blame to an organization or group of people to highlight the real or perceived sources of wrongdoing to their constituents and to enact action. However, intramovement conflict can result as social movement factions may splinter over the perceived salient causes of oppression.

Benford and Snow (2000) label prognostic framing as the second core framing task. They reference V.I. Lenin's influential call-to-arms pamphlet *What is to be Done?* (1902). Prognostic framing involves proposing solutions and providing plans on how to carry them out. Prognostic framing typically anticipates "counterframing" by oppositional groups (government, corporations, etc.). Benford and Snow (2000) mention the 1989 Chinese democracy movement and the students' anticipation of the state's counterframings, labeling student dissidents as "counterrevolutionaries." To counter these claims, students carefully advocated reform and embedded them in traditional Chinese cultural narrations of community devotion and self-sacrifice.

The third core framing task carried out by social movement groups is motivational framing. It provides the rationale for collective action and the "appropriate" vocabularies of motive. Again, not all members of a social movement may agree on motivational frames and it can lead to contradictory messages.

Framing and Fragmentation in the 21st Century

Communication technologies have changed vastly since Tuchman and Gitlin's early texts on media framing. Callaghan (2005) believes the Internet may be undermining elites' hold on framing through traditional media. Additionally, SMOs have grown media savvy, employing their own frames to garner attention and to steer framing (Benford & Snow, 2000). Druckman (2007) doesn't downplay elites' control over framing, but posits that they don't unilaterally control framing discourse (2003). Gamson (1992) shares Tuchman and Gitlin's belief that elites utilize frames that propagate their conservative viewpoints. However, he believes SMOs can generate alternate frames to bring about progressive social change (Gamson, 1992).

Callaghan (2005) posits that the Internet in particular—via chat rooms and websites—and twenty-four-hour satellite news shows require a more complex framing model than the old one built on traditional media (network news, daily newspapers and magazines). These new media may disrupt the hegemonic hold elites had to establish dominant frames (Callaghan, 2005).

Chong and Druckman (2007) have recently studied the overlooked effects of competing frames. They found that the relative strength of a frame was the most important dimension of influence. Only less knowledgeable respondents were affected by the repetition of a weak frame, but in none of their experiments did repetition of a weak frame prevail over a stronger oppositional one.

Druckman and Nelson (2003) maintain that cross-cutting interpersonal communication moderates the impact of political elites' ability to frame. However, interpersonal communication that simply repeats common perspectives does not.

Blanka Earhart (2012) sees Facebook and Twitter as leading to the fragmentation of the self. Users fragment their psyche among various social media platforms, accepting the terms dictated to them by the social networking sites they frequent. "Instead of acting from a position of will, most (users) simply give up their power" (Earhart, 2012, p. 133). The realization of self is impossible, because the individual subjective experience cannot be commodified and sold to advertisers, and is discouraged by Facebook's (and other social media sites') resume-like profile structure (Earhart, 2012). Users are reduced to commodities—a status most are benighted to. Earhart (2012) accepts Marshall McLuhan's maxim that "the medium is the message." Stories told via social media are used to impress one another. Due to the limited time available to catch the viewer's attention, short, emotional bursts are encouraged, while constructive meaning-making narratives are discouraged (Earhart, 2012). Economist Philip Mirowski (2013) found Occupy Wall Street's fascination with "neoliberal technologies of the self" (p. 328) to be contradictory to their critique of wealth concentration.

Hypotheses

Professional reporters internalize the values of their news organizations (McKnight, 2012); they're fiercely loyal to their paper (Gitlin, 1980). They know they need to turn in stories that meet the organizational needs and standards of their employers (Tuchman, 1978). "Star reporters" meet with "star sources." The greater in number and more powerful a journalist's sources are the better her standing is within her newspaper or television station's hierarchy. Official sources in government are always highly valued as contacts; social movement leaders aren't (Tuchman, 1978). Democratic and Republican Party elites understand the importance of frames and compete with one another to address issues first, as it'll likely set the parameters of discourse with the public (Haynes et al., 2016). Quoting official sources supports the status quo by telling the story from those sources' perspectives (Brasted, 2005).

One of the hazards of journalism is the threat of libel. Journalists are under constant deadlines and cannot always verify facts. To get around this, Tuchman (1978) again borrows from Goffman—specifically his theory of multiple realities—when she posits journalists "relocate facticity." Journalists will go to multiple official sources with competing views to absolve themselves of libel, using various truth-claims as a framework for readers to decide the truth (Tuchman, 1978). Tuchman makes the important distinction between legitimate and quasi-legitimate groups. Legitimate sources (congressmen, secretary of defense, etc.) are privy to centralized information. Quasi-legitimate sources, like the figurehead of a progressive group, are not. However, the latter achieve their recognition as a national leader of likeminded people. The more people the movement spokesperson represents, the greater his legitimacy (Tuchman, 1978). Corrigall-Brown et at. (2007) recognize political elites are prized sources—a phenomenon labeled "indexing." Corrigall-Brown et al. (2007) studied newspaper coverage of the 2005 French riots in six countries for three weeks. They found the usage of sources varied over time. Initially, newspapers relied on residents and protesters in the first two weeks of events; state sources entered the debate late, but the latter became much more prominent as the rioting subsided. As time passed, protesters and residents were referenced less. They found state actors were more inclined to invoke non-structural diagnoses as causes of the riots (French President Sarkozy flippantly labeled protesters "thugs" and "scum"). Meanwhile, international actors and residents/protesters placed the blame on the current government or the French state in general (Corrigall-Brown et al., 2007). In the current study, New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg and police sources were selected based on Brasted's (2005) similar coding categories for her content analysis of the *Chicago Tribune* and *The New York Times'* framing of the 1968 Democratic Convention. Furthermore, based on Tuchman's (1978) findings that journalists value official sources, the following hypothesis has been put forth:

H^1: The *New York Post* will cite more official sources than *The New York Times*.

For-profit media perpetuate the values of corporate and commercial interests while marginalizing or ignoring conflicting viewpoints (McChesney, 1999). Newspapers employ disparaging devices like non-speech quotation marks to distance themselves from left-wing groups that challenge the status quo. For example, Tuchman (1978) found when reporters referred to the New Left of the late 1960s and early 1970s, they typically placed quotation marks around the movement's name ("New Left") to undermine the legitimacy of the movement's messages and protests. The mainstream media also controlled the lexicon of the movement in their papers and newscasts, referring to people who avoided the Vietnam draft as "draft evaders" as opposed to "draft resisters," a label they preferred (Tuchman, 1978, p. 2). In the current study, based off Tuchman's (1978) discoveries that journalists' employ non-speech quotation marks to delegitimize SMOs, the following hypothesis has been put forth:

H$_2$: The *New York Post* will use more non-speech quotations than *The New York Times*.

Lawlessness

Conflict frames involving protesters, counter-demonstrators and police help to enhance the newsworthiness of protests (Luther & Miller, 2005). As the Vietnam War progressed in the late 1960s, the media began to focus more and more on the growing militancy of the anti-war movement (Gitlin, 1980). It was the outlying extremists that the media reported on. When asked in 1968 why *The New York Times* gave light coverage to the Jeanette Rankin Brigade (the first women's Vietnam antiwar action), *NYT* managing editor Clifton Daniel stated it was for two reasons: the small size of the group and the unlikely event that the Jeanette Rankin Brigade's protest would end in violence (Gitlin, 1980). The media's violent framing of protesters—by the late 1960s violence had become almost a prerequisite for newspaper coverage—helped to discredit the movement. It also aided the movement's disintegration. Newcomers to the Vietnam anti-war movement expected that one had to be violent to show commitment (Gitlin, 1980).

Gitlin (1980) discovered newspapers typically granted demonstrators and counterdemonstrators equal photographic space, regardless of how outnumbered counterdemonstrators were. Conflict equated newsworthiness. In one edition of *The New York Times* (April 18, 1965), editors selected a UPI shot framed to give equal weight to anti-war and pro-war protesters, leading viewers to believe the two opposing groups were equal in size. However, war protesters outnumbered counterdemonstrators *one hundred and fifty to one* (Gitlin, 1980).

Gottlieb (2015) reported that a *New York Times* journalist, in a self-reflexive article, speculated that protesters' conflict with city officials and police treatment of occupiers was what helped fuel media interest in OWS—which had been minimal until police used pepper spray on protesters. Gottlieb (2015) analyzed the frequency of OWS stories in *The New York Times*. OWS stories were driven by conflict and arrests—the greater the conflict and number of occupiers arrested, the more coverage OWS received in *The New York Times*. In the current study, based on Gitlin's (1980) discoveries that journalists focus on the violent aspects of protesters, the following hypothesis has been put forth:

H_3: The *New York Post* will discuss lawless aspects of protesters more often than *The New York Times*.

Focusing on Arrests

Reporters often let police set the agenda and frame their stories for them by focusing on arrests at marches as opposed to a SMO's popular support, thereby obscuring the movement's goals (Gitlin, 2012). "When the power to define news is, in effect, turned over to the police, the media are serving to confirm the existing control mechanisms in society" (Gitlin, 1980, p. 43). Protesters are typically described as troublemakers and anarchists who threaten the social order, while police are described as responsive and preventive, protecting the social order (Xu, 2013). Police actions against demonstrators are rarely described as violent (Brasted, 2005).

Unsurprisingly, the practice of disparaging dissident voices and reinforcing the status quo is especially prominent among conservative newspapers. In the early 2003 buildup to the disastrous invasion of Iraq, British newspaper the *Sun* downplayed the significance of the million-strong “Stop the War” protest by proclaiming “fifty-eight million other Brits didn’t march on London” (McKnight, 2012, p. 170). Like Gitlin’s framed Vietnam-era photograph, newspapers still “balance” protesters with a counterfactual silent majority-inspired countermovement. In the current study, based on Xu’s (2013) findings that protesters are framed as disruptions to the social order, the following hypothesis has been put forth:

H_4: The *New York Post* will mention occupier arrests more often than *The New York Times*.

Frivolity of Protesters

Once SDS and other Vietnam anti-war groups began receiving coverage in the mid-‘60s, deprecatory themes began to emerge. Trivialization—“making light of movement language, dress, age, style and goals”—became common (Gitlin, 1980, p. 27). Gitlin (1980) notes that a 1965 *New York Times* article refers to 15,000 students and a handful of adults protesting the war—the implication being that protests occur when the young go unsupervised. In the current study, based on Gitlin’s (1980) findings that journalists trivialize protesters for superficial reasons, the following hypothesis has been put forth:

H_5: The *New York Post* will discuss the frivolity of protesters more often *The New York Times*.

Ineffectiveness of SMOs’ Goals

Gitlin (1980) notes journalists portray SMO protesters as absurd to delegitimize their messages and objectives. For example, *The New York Times* reporter Natalie Jaffe’s coverage of Students for a Democratic Society’s 1965 annual convention employed an unambiguous frame: that SDS was ambitious beyond its means. The unifying tone of her piece was ridicule (Gitlin, 1980). Jaffe constructed this frame by penning faulty statements about SDS activities—“distorted in such a way as to seem not so much dangerous as incoherent, senseless, and, in their own way, absurd” (Gitlin, 1980, p. 67). Jaffe focused on protesters’ appearance and intentionally garbled the syntax of SDS members’ speeches “to guarantee senselessness” (Gitlin, 1980, p. 67). Jaffe further juxtaposed SDS with the (legitimate) civil rights and university reform groups to highlight the absurdity of the former—who, from her perspective, just endlessly churn out frivolous critiques of American society (Gitlin, 1980). In the current study, based on Gitlin’s (1980) findings that journalists systematically ridicule protesters, the following hypothesis has been put forth:

H_6: The *New York Post* will discuss the ineffectiveness of Occupy Wall Street’s goals more often than *The New York Times*.

Significance

The 2008 financial crisis was, in scope and scale, the largest financial failure since the Great Depression (Quiggin, 2011). As Quiggin (2011) notes the economics profession has continued operating as if nothing has happened. OWS’s primary concern was with wealth inequality—which continues to grow, with a greater concentration of income ending up in the hands of the ultra-rich (Liu, Wei, & Simon, 2017). The precipitous increase in wealth inequality is “one of the most disturbing social and economic issues of our time” (Berman, Ben-Jacob, & Shapira, 2016, p. 1). OWS’s demands for equitable wealth distribution remain unrealized; the existing research shows media framed them negatively (Xu, 2013; Gottlieb, 2015).

It’s imperative that SMOs understand media framing. As Brasted (2005) points out, social movement organizations can gain public acceptance or be undermined through frames. Media routinely employ framing devices that delegitimize SMOs, focusing on the youthful age, scruffy appearance and lawless acts of fringe protesters to tarnish progressive movements’ messages (Tuchman, 1978; Gitlin, 1980). This research will help SMOs better understand how they’re framed by local newspapers with different political viewpoints, enabling them to tailor their messages more effectively to media.

III. METHODOLOGY

This thesis examined how a recognized liberal newspaper, *The New York Times*, and a conservative paper, the *New York Post*, framed the Occupy movement during the events at Zuccotti Park. OWS's focal point was the Zuccotti Park occupation which lasted from September 17, 2011, to November 15, 2011.

September 17, 2011, was selected as the start date for the content analysis because it was the first day Occupy Wall Street took over Zuccotti Park. November 15, 2011, was selected as the end date for the content analysis as it was the day Zuccotti Park was cleared of occupiers by the New York City Police Department. Each article from *The New York Times* and the *New York Post* was analyzed.

A LexisNexis database search for *New York Times* articles with "Occupy Movement" or "Zuccotti Park" in the HLEAD (segment combining the headline and lead paragraph) for the period September 17, 2011, to November 15, 2011, turned up 37 results. The same search parameters for *New York Post* articles turned up 56 results. HLEAD was used to search for relevant articles; however, all articles were printed out and read in their entirety.

Newspapers. Two major American newspapers were selected for analysis—*The New York Times* and the *New York Post*. These newspapers were selected for two reasons. One, they are both based in New York City where OWS occurred. As Brasted's (2005) research noted, a newspaper's geographical proximity/distance impacts the way protests are framed. That issue is moot with these two papers. Two, *The New York Times* and the *New York Post* represent two ends of the mainstream political spectrum which will make for a good comparison. *The New York Times* is recognized as a dominant "liberal" voice in America (McChesney, 1999), while the News Corp.-owned *New York Post* is extremely conservative (McKnight, 2012).

Coders

The 93 total news articles were coded by two independent coders in summer 2018. Coding norms were established during a supervised training session. Twelve percent (12%)—12 news articles—of the sample was coded during the training phase. This sample size is well beyond the 5 to 7 percent subsample recommended by Kaid and Wadsworth (1989) to establish intercoder reliability for large samples; it also meets Baker's (2011) recommendation of "about (a) 15 percent" (p. 309) subsample to establish intercoder reliability. Coders established a high degree of standardization during the training phase over several training sessions, resulting in effective inter-coder reliabilities of 1.0 when employing Krippendorff's Alpha. Krippendorff's Alpha was selected because of its flexibility over other intercoder agreement methods (Artstein & Poesio, 2008).

Categories Coded and Definition of Terms

The posts were either marked "yes" or "no" if it included information about the topic. See Table 1 for a complete list of categories and the frequency each occurred. The coding categories employed were originally developed by Tuchman (1978), Gitlin (1980) and Brasted (2005) and were based off their research. The coding sheet is attached at Appendix A.

Citation of Official Sources. Stories were coded for having a quote from Mayor Bloomberg and/or a member of the New York City Police Department. If Mayor

Bloomberg and/or a member of the New York City Police Department was cited in an article, a “yes” was recorded.

Non-Speech Quotation Marks. Non-speech quotation marks could be used to delegitimize protesters in an article. Examples include: “Occupiers” to describe OWS protesters (“Zuccotti Anarchy,” 2011) and “general assemblies” to describe Occupy’s general assemblies (Kimmelman, 2011).

Lawlessness. The violent activity of protesters and the conflict between protestors and police were two categories coded representing lawlessness.

Occupier Arrests. How often the article mentioned protestors being arrested was also coded.

Frivolity of Protesters. Articles were also coded for their depiction of the protestors. For example, coders examined if the reporter discussed the independent categories of: young age, scruffy appearance, and/or unorthodox behavior of a protestor or protesters.

Ineffectiveness of Occupy Wall Street’s Goals. Articles were coded for discussing the OWS goals, if it was directionless, and/or incapable of constituting political or economic reforms.

Table 2. Coding Categories, Krippendorff's Alpha, Percent Present

	Cohen's Kappa	**Percent Coded as Present**
Citation of Official Sources – Mayor Bloomberg and/or Police Source	1.0	20.4%
Non-Speech Quotation Marks	1.0	31.2%
Violent Activity of Protestors and/or Conflicts between protestors and police	1.0	37.6%
Occupier Arrests	1.0	34.4%
Young Age, Scruffy Appearance and/or Unorthodox Behavior	1.0	66.7%
Ineffectiveness of Occupy Wall Street's Goals	1.0	24.7%

IV. RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine how *The New York* Times and the *New York Post* differed in their coverage of the Occupy Wall Street movement. A content analysis was conducted. Chi-Square analyses were run to answer Hypotheses 1-6.

H_1 predicted the *New York Post* would cite more official sources than *The New York Times.* Chi-Square analyses failed to find significant differences between the papers for the two coded categories, Mayor Bloomberg and police source: $\chi 2$ (1, N = 93) = 1.65, p = .20.

Table 3. Results of Chi-square for Differences between NYT and NYP Official Sources Citation

	Bloomberg			Police Source		
	Yes	N (Sample Size)	Percentage	Yes	N (Sample Size)	Percentage
New York Times	3	37	8.11%	4	37	10.81%
New York Post	8	56	14.29%	5	56	8.93%
Total	11	93	11.83%	9	93	9.68%

$\chi 2$ (1, N= 93) = 1.65, p = .20

H_2 predicted the *New York Post* would have more articles using non-speech quotation marks than *The New York Times.* H_2 was not significant: $\chi 2$ (1, N = 93) = 2.62, p = .11.

Table 4. Chi-square for Differences between NYT and NYP Usage of Non-speech Quotes

	Non-speech Quotes		
	Yes	N (Sample Size)	Percentage
New York Times	8	37	21.62%
New York Post	21	56	37.50%
Total	29	93	31.18%

$\chi 2$ (1, N= 93) = 2.62, p = .11

H_3 predicted the *New York Post* would discuss the lawless aspects of the protestors more often than *The New York Times.* Chi-Square results found significant differences between the papers for the two coded categories for lawlessness, violent activity of protesters and conflicts between protesters and police: $\chi 2$ (1, N = 93) = 2.58, p = .11.

Table 5. Chi-square for Differences between NYT and NYP Usage of Lawless Frame

	Violent Activity			Conflicts—Protesters and Police		
	Yes	N (Sample Size)	Percentage	Yes	N (Sample Size)	Percentage
New York Times	6	37	16.22%	11	37	29.73%
New York Post	19	56	33.93%	13	56	23.21%
Total	25	93	26.88%	24	93	25.81%

$\chi 2$ (1, N= 93) = 2.58, p = .11

H_4 predicted the *New York Post* would discuss occupier arrests more often than *The New York Times.* No significant difference was found between the two papers: $\chi 2$ (1, N = 93) = 2.62, p = 1.02. *The New York Post* discussed occupier arrests more frequently (n = 17) compared to *The New York Times* (n = 15), but the difference was not significant. Hypothesis 4 was not statistically supported; however, the pattern supports the idea that *New York Post* did discuss occupier arrests more often than *The New York Times*.

Table 6. Chi-square for Differences between NYT and NYP References to Occupier Arrests

	Occupier Arrests		
	Yes	N (Sample Size)	Percentage
New York Times	15	37	40.54%
New York Post	17	56	30.36%
Total	32	93	34.41%

$\chi 2$ (1, N = 93) = 2.62, p = 1.02

H_5 predicted the *New York Post* would discuss the frivolity of the protestors more often than *The New York Times.* Frivolity was coded using three different categories: young age, scruffy appearance, and unorthodox behavior. Chi-Square analyses found no significant differences between the two papers for these categories: $\chi 2$ (1, N = 93) = 4.92, p =.09.

Table 7. Chi-square for Differences between NYT and NYP Usage of Frivolity Frame

	Young Age			Scruffy Appearance			Unorthodox Behavior		
	Y	N (Sample Size)	Pct.	Y	N (Sample Size)	Pct.	Y	N (Sample Size)	Pct.
New York Times	6	37	16.22%	7	37	18.92%	17	37	45.95%
New York Post	3	56	5.36%	20	56	35.71%	32	56	57.14%
Total	9	93	9.68%	27	93	29.03%	49	93	52.69%

$\chi 2$ (1, N = 93) = 4.92, p = .09

H_6 predicted the *New York Post* would discuss the ineffectiveness of Occupy Wall Street's goals more often than *The New York Times.* H_6 was not statistically supported: $\chi 2$ (1, *N* = 93) = .83, *p* =.36. *The New York Post* discussed the ineffectiveness of OWS's goals more frequently (*n* = 12) compared to *The New York Times* (*n* = 11), but the difference was not significant.

Table 8. Chi-square for Differences between NYT and NYP Usage of Ineffectiveness Frame

	Ineffectiveness of OWS' Goals		
	Yes	N (Sample Size)	Percentage
New York Times	11	37	29.73%
New York Post	12	56	21.43%
Total	23	93	24.73%

$\chi 2$ (1, *N*= 93) = .83, *p* = .36

V. DISCUSSION

This thesis examined how a liberal paper, *The New York Times*, and a conservative paper, the *New York Post*, framed Occupy Wall Street during its occupation of Zuccotti Park from September 17, 2011, to November 15, 2011. Research was carried out to discover if there were statistically significant differences between the two papers' coverage of OWS during Zuccotti Park's occupation. All *The New York Times* and *New York Post* articles with "Occupy Movement" or "Zuccotti Park" in the HLEAD were analyzed in their entirety. Two independent coders examined 93 total articles using a coding sheet created to check for the presence of framing devices.

As Brasted (2005) notes, journalists' reliance on official sources allows them to frame stories, reinforcing the status quo. New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg and police sources were coded as "official sources" for this content analysis. H_1 predicted the *New York Post* would cite official sources more often than *The New York Times.* While the *New York Post* cited official sources more often than *The New York Times*, the differences between the two papers were statistically insignificant. *The New York Times* and the *New York Post's* reliance on Mayor Bloomberg—quoted in about 12% of the total articles—and the New York Police Department—cited in 9.68% of the total articles—for quotes supports Tuchman (1978) and Xu's (2013) findings that journalists value official sources.

Tuchman (1978) posited that journalists use non-speech quotation marks to undermine SMOs. Journalists do this not only to distance themselves from truth claims, but as a way of questioning the legitimacy of an organization. For example, Tuchman (1978) found that journalists referred to the New Left as the "New Left" throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s. H_2 predicted the *New York Post* would have more articles using non-speech quotation marks than *The New York Times.* Compared to *The New York Times* (21.62%), the *New York Post* did have a higher percentage (37.50%) of articles in which non-speech quotes appeared. However, these differences proved to be statistically insignificant. An example of non-speech quotation mark usage from this sample is the *New York Post's* employment of quotes around "Occupiers" ("Zuccotti Anarchy," 2011).

Gitlin (1980) found that journalists highlight the lawlessness of fringe protesters to discredit SMOs as a whole. In Gitlin's (1980) analysis of the Vietnam anti-war movement, he discovered that "the media were giving lurid prominence to the wildest and most cacophonous rhetoric, and broadcasting the most militant, violent, bizarre, and discordant actions, and, within the boundaries of any action, the most violent segments" (p. 182). With Gitlin's (1980) findings in mind, H_3 predicted the *New York Post* would discuss the violent activity of Occupy Wall Street protesters more often than *The New York Times.* There *were* statistically significant differences between the *New York Post* and *The New York Times'* coverage for this category—with the former discussing the violent activity of protesters in 33.93% of the stories analyzed compared to 16.22% for the latter. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the two papers in how they utilized the other coded category for lawlessness—protester conflicts with police. An example of an article from this sample employing the lawlessness frame is the *New York Post's* "It's Crime All the Time at Zuccotti Park" (Celona, 2011), which focuses on supposed OWS drug sales and sexual assaults.

Journalists utilize protester arrests as news hooks for stories, thereby undermining SMOs' popular support (Gitlin, 2012; Xu, 2013). H_4 predicted the *New York Post* would discuss occupier arrests more often than *The New York Times.* The differences between the two newspapers proved statistically insignificant. There was a notable presence of news articles highlighting protester arrests in both *The New York Times* (for example, see Sorkin, 2011 and Bellafante, 2011) and the *New York Post's* (for example, see Celona, 2011 and Harshbarger & Freund, 2011) OWS coverage. Occupier arrests appeared in 40.54% of *The New York Times'* articles and in 30.36% of the *New York Post's* articles. An example of an article highlighting an OWS arrest(s) was Harshbarger and Freund's (2011) "Camper's Mac Attack" piece in the *New York Post*—a 109-word article whose sole focus was on the actions of an Occupier who threw a credit card reader at a McDonald's employee.

Media delegitimize SMOs' messages by focusing on trivial issues—specifically, the young age, dress and style of protesters (Gitlin, 1980). H_5 predicted the *New York Post* would discuss the frivolity of OWS protestors more often than *The New York Times.* Frivolity was coded into three different categories: young age, scruffy appearance and unorthodox behavior. *The New York Times* mentioned the young age of protesters more often than the *New York Post*. Young age appeared in 16.22% of *The New York Times'* articles; 5.36% of the *New York Post's* articles. However, the differences between the two papers were statistically insignificant for all three frivolity categories. Bobby Martinez and Liz Sadler's "AWOL FLA. Mom's Neighbors: She's a Bizarre Hippie" (2011)—an article focusing on a woman interested in dreadlocks, veganism and "'unschooling her kids'" (p. 5) is an example of the *New York Post's* utilization of the frivolity frame—specifically, the coded category for unorthodox behavior.

Journalists portray SMOs as ambitious beyond their means. They've been found to systematically distort SMOs messages in such a way as to make them "seem not so much dangerous as incoherent, senseless, and, in their own way, absurd" (Gitlin, 1980, p. 67). H_6 predicted the *New York Post* would discuss the ineffectiveness of Occupy Wall Street's goals more often than *The New York Times. The New York Times* had a higher percentage of articles—29.73%—highlighting the ineffectiveness of OWS' goals; the same frame appeared in 21.43% of the *New York Post's* articles. However, there were no significant differences between the two papers. A *The New York Times* piece entitled "Gunning for Wall Street, with Faulty Aim" (Bellafante, 2011) captures the dismissiveness the paper showed toward OWS. Rather than focus on activists pushing for economic reform, the article quotes a woman dancing in her underwear and a protester whose goal is to "create spectacles" (Bellafante, 2011, p. 1).

Conclusion

The were no statistically significant differences between *The New York Times* and the *New York Post's* coverage of OWS. Both newspapers employed the same disparaging frames. The overall agreement between the two papers isn't surprising. As McChesney (1999) states, "The corporate media system has a strong internal bias toward reflecting elite opinion; hence the so-called dominant "liberal" voices in the United States—*The New York Times* and the *Washington Post*—are stridently procapitalist" (p. 298). The same can certainly be said for the highly conservative *New York Post.* Occupy was a direct challenge to the political status quo and to capitalism (Chomsky, 2013). Although it may seem counterintuitive that these two papers' coverage of OWS was in relative agreement, past research (McChesney, 1999; Chomsky & Herman, 2002) reflects this thesis' findings that *The New York Times* routinely marginalized OWS protesters in a manner that was rarely statistically significant from the *New York Post*. Both ends of mainstream media's political spectrum—at the very least two of its leading newspapers—agreed: OWS was not to be taken seriously. The same framing devices Tuchman (1978) and Gitlin (1980) uncovered decades earlier—employed to make protesters appear immature, irrational, illegitimate and extremist—were still relevant and readily employed against OWS by both the *New York Post* and *The New York Times* in 2011.

Limitations

This study would have benefited from a larger sample size. Although all of the *New York Post* and *The New York Times* OWS articles from the founding to the eviction of the Zuccotti Park occupation were reviewed, the sample contained only 93 articles. Expanding the timeframe to include the period before and after the occupation would have provided a larger sample size. Of course, the sample could have been expanded within the same timeframe (September 17, 2011, to November 15, 2011) by including other newspapers.

Future Directions

Relative to *The New York Times*, the *New York Post* ran a statistically greater number of articles focusing on the violent activity of Occupy protesters. Future research comparing other conservative newspapers with their liberal counterparts for this coded category would demonstrate whether or not this frame was statistically significant with other right-wing papers.

While Occupy Wall Street was taking place in the fall of 2011, a right-wing populist group was also in the ascent: The Tea Party. While existing research tends to focus on how progressive groups are framed by mainstream media, a content analysis comparing the Tea Party's coverage to Occupy Wall Street's would demonstrate how journalists framed a right wing and a left-wing populist movement happening simultaneously.

Deluca et al. (2012) studied the blogosphere's handling of OWS. Further investigation of blogs' coverage of OWS would be a welcomed addition to framing studies of SMOs. While Baker (2007) found that most news stories still originate with newspapers, many framing studies are still centered around print media. With the rise of social media and citizen journalism, further research in new forms of reporting—blogs, Twitter, Instagram—is overdue, specifically with OWS—the first significant social movement in the United States to incorporate smartphones. Framing theory would generally benefit with a greater focus on digital-era technologies.

APPENDIX SECTION

APPENDIX A

Coding Sheet

Article name:

Article number:

Article date:

Newspaper: *The New York Times* or *New York Post*

1.) **State actors.** Did the article quote:

Mayor Bloomberg: 1 = No 2 = Yes

A police officer: 1 = No 2 = Yes

2.) Did the article use **non-speech quotation marks** to delegitimize Occupy protesters? 1= No 2 = Yes

3.) **Lawless aspects.** Did the article mention the following regarding Occupiers?

Violent activity of protesters: 1 = No 2 = Yes

Conflicts between protesters and police: 1 = No 2 = Yes

4.) Did the article mention **occupier arrests**? 1 = No 2 = Yes

5.) **Frivolity of Occupy protesters.** Did the article mention the following regarding Occupy Protesters?

Young age: 1 = No 2 = Yes

Scruffy appearance: 1 = No 2 = Yes

Unorthodox behavior of a protester or protesters: 1 = No 2 = Yes

6.) Did the article reference the **ineffectiveness** of Occupy Wall Street's goals?

1 = No 2= Yes

REFERENCES

Artstein, R., Poesio, M. (2008). Inter-coder agreement for computational linguistics. *Association for Computational Linguistics, 34*(4), 555-596.

Bagdikian, B. (2004). *The new media monopoly*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Baran, S. J. & Davis, D. K. (2015). *Mass communication theory*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

Baker, C. E. (2007). *Media concentration and democracy.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Baker, S. (2011). *Research methods in communication*. Northport, AL: Vision Press.

Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Bellafante, G. (2011, September 25). Gunning for wall street, with faulty aim. *The New York Times*. p. 1.

Benford, R. & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 611-639.

Berman, Y., Ben-Jacon, E. & Shapira, Y. (2016). The dynamics of wealth inequality and the effect of income distribution. *PLoS ONE 11*(4).

Brasted, M. (2005). Framing protest: The *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York Times* during the 1968 Democratic Convention. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 13*(1), 1-25.

Callaghan, K. (2005). *Framing American politics*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Carty, V. (2015). The Indignados and Occupy Wall Street social movements: Global opposition to the neoliberalization of society as enabled by digital technology. *Tamara Journal, 13*(3), 21-33.

Celona, L. (2011, November 7). It's crime all the time at zuccotti park. *New York Post*, p. 6.

Chari, A. (2015). *A political economy of the senses.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1989). *Necessary illusions*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Chomsky, N. (2013). *Occupy*. Westfield, NJ: Zuccotti Park Press.

Chomsky, N. & Herman, E. S. (2002). *Manufacturing consent*. New York, NY: Pantheon.

Chong, D. & Druckman, J.N. (2007). Public opinion in competitive democracies. *The American Political Science Review, 101*(4), 637-655.

Corrigall-Brown, C., Snow, D. A. & Vliegenthart, R. (2007). Framing the french riots: A comparative study of frame variation. *Social Forces, 86,* 385-415.

Debord, G. (1994). *The society of the spectacle*. Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books.

Deluca, K., Lawson & S. Sun, Y. (2012). Occupy Wall Street on the public screens of social media: The many framings of the birth of a protest movement. *Communication, Culture & Critique, 5*(4), 483-509.

Dimitrova, D. V. & Rodriguez, L. (2011). The levels of visual framing. *Journal of Visual Literacy, 30*, 48-65.

Druckman, J. N. (2001). The implications of framing effects for citizen competence. *Political Behavior, 23*, 225-256.

Druckman, J. N., Nelson, K. R. (2003). Framing and deliberation: How citizens' conversations limit elite influence. *American Journal of Political Science, 47*(4), 729-745.

Earhart, B. (2012). Reclaiming meaning across platforms: Fragmentation and expansion of the self. *Metaverse Creativity, 2*(2), 125-138.

Gamson, W.A. (1992). *Talking politics.* New York: Cambridge University.

Gamson, W.A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W. & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology, 18,* 373-393.

Gitlin, T. (2012). *Occupy nation*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gottlieb, J. (2015). Protest news framing cycle: How the *New York Times* covered Occupy Wall Street. *International Journal of Communication, 9*, 231-253.

Harshbarger, R. (2011, November 5). Camper's mac attack. *The New York Post*, p. 4.

Haynes, C. Merolla, J. L. & Ramakrishnan, S. K. (2016). *Media framing and effects on public opinion.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kaid, L. & Wadsworth, A. J. (1989). *Measurement of communication behavior.* NY, NY: Longman.

Kimmelman, M. (2011, October 16). In protest, the power of place. *The New York Times,* p. 1.

Lewis, P. & Luce, S. (2012). Labor and Occupy Wall Street: An appraisal of the first six months. *New Labor Forum. 21*(2), 43-49.

Liu, B., Wei, Y. D. & Simon, C. A. (2017). Social capital, race, and income inequality in the United States. *Sustainability*, *9*, *248*.

Luther, C. A. & Miller, M. M. (2005). Framing of the 2003 U.S.-Iraq war demonstrations: An analysis of news and partisan texts. *J&MC Quarterly*, *82*(1), 78-96.

McChesney, R. (1999). *Rich media, poor democracy*. New York, NY: The New Press.

McKnight, D. (2012). *Murdoch's politics*. London, UK: Pluto Press.

Mirowski, P. (2013). *Never let a serious crisis go to waste.* London: Verso.

Quiggin, J. (2011). *Zombie economics: How dead ideas still walk among us*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Sorkin, A. R. (2011, October 4). On wall st., a protest matures. *The New York Times*, p. 1.

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Van Gelder, S. (2011). *This changes everything: Occupy Wall Street and the 99% movement*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Xu, K. (2013). Framing Occupy Wall Street: A content analysis of *The New York Times* and *USA Today*. *International Journal of Communication 7*, 2412-2432.