

SOCIAL MOVEMENT MASTER FRAMES AND INTERNET ACTIVISM:
COMPARING REFORMATIVE AND TRANSFORMATIVE
GENDER AND SEXUALITY MOVEMENTS

By

Katie Marie Mills

A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Sociology

Committee Membership

Dr. Mary Virnoche, Professor, Committee Chair

Dr. Jennifer Eichstedt, Professor, Committee Member

Dr. Loren Cannon, Lecturer, Committee Member

Dr. Joshua Meisel, Associate Professor, Graduate Coordinator

May 2014

ABSTRACT

SOCIAL MOVEMENT MASTER FRAMES AND INTERNET ACTIVISM: COMPARING REFORMATIVE AND TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER AND SEXUALITY MOVEMENTS

Katie Marie Mills

Social movements emerge to create change, yet even within movements there exists tension surrounding any single vision of social change. Movement participants often choose between two fundamentally different approaches: fighting for change by reforming existing institutions or transforming institutions and society to affect change. While not always explicitly stated, this question of reforming versus transforming frames the vision, goals, objectives and tactics of social movements worldwide.

This choice of approach is particularly salient in the gender and sexuality movements. The differences between reformative and transformative framing of these movements are clear, as victories range from achieving same-sex marriage rights through successful litigation to culturally challenging binary conceptualizations of gender and sexuality.

Throughout history technology has affected social movement tactics. The Internet has enabled activists to participate in social movements in unprecedented ways. This study explores the relationship between a gender and sexuality movement organization's master frames and the types of online activism they deploy.

In this study I examined gender and sexuality movement websites. Using content analysis, I coded sites on their use of transformative or reformative master frames, particularly exploring community identification, injustice framing, scope of issues addressed, and organizational type. I then further analyzed sites identifying e-mobilizations (brochureware and online facilitation of offline actions) and e-tactics, or online protest actions. I found that both transformative and reformative movements use e-mobilizations very frequently, while reformative movements were more likely to use online protest actions such as petitions, boycotts, and email or letter writing campaigns.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To the countless people who touched my life while I completed this journey: this space is not big enough to thank you one by one. Though you may not see your name listed below, know that your kind words, late night phone calls and chat sessions, warm couches, and shared meals are neither forgotten nor taken for granted.

To my one-of-a-kind, fiercely devoted, and absolutely crazy (in the best way) family, Mom, Dad, Ginger, Ricki, Chas and Jade: you have unquestionably and unconditionally loved and supported me through my victories and failures. All of you have always given me your best, and I will always do the same for you. To the newest member of my family, my soul mate, my best friend, and my partner for life, Asia: your unparalleled resilience, patience, and integrity inspire me every day to realize my greatest potential as a scholar, activist, and person. Everything you and I have experienced together and every moment spent apart has driven me to always keep trying for you, for me, and for us. It's been a wild ride, but that is what family is for, right? <3

To the Humboldt State Department of Sociology: even though I finally completed my studies, you will never *really* be rid of me. Alicia Persson, thank you for always having the answers (no seriously...always). Dr. Betsy Watson, thank you first and foremost for your friendship, and for convincing a jaded physics major to declare sociology instead.

To my thesis committee, Dr. Mary Virnoche, Dr. Jennifer Eichstedt, and Dr. Loren Cannon: thank you for your mentoring, patience and support. Loren, thank you for

joining my committee before getting to know me or my work, and for being flexible as I took longer than expected to finish my thesis. Jennifer, thank you for perfectly timed pep talks, constructive feedback that helped me grow as a writer, and personal support when I *really* needed it. Mary, just saying thank you will never be enough. I have been guided by some incredible mentors, and you have been by far the most influential. You have graciously offered me invaluable opportunities, and so many of my academic accomplishments are because of your professional influence. I am so grateful and honored you have believed in me both as a scholar and a person. Thank you for your patience as I took the long way en route to finishing my degree.

To all of my graduate cohort, and a special thanks to Dusty Mabry, Jimmy Valdes, Vanessa Villavicencio, and Jen Maksim: thank you for the enduring friendships forged deep into the night (and more often than not, in the data lab). An extra special thanks to Tabitha Gray: we were in this together, long after everyone else had moved on, our lives paralleling each other in strange and significant ways. Thank you for being the perfect thesis buddy and an even better friend; I couldn't have done this without you (or green tea steamers and chocolate éclairs).

And finally, to the activists, the advocates, the drag queens, the protesters, the educators, the dykes, the litigators, the agitators, the queers, the organizers, the lobbyists, the gender-conforming and the not-so gender-conforming: someday, history will look at this time and you will be remembered as the people who changed the world, however you chose to change it. Thank you for all the work you do!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY	4
Introduction to Social Movement Theory.....	5
Mass Society Theory and Relative Deprivation Theory.....	5
Resource Mobilization Theory.	6
Political Process Theory.	7
New Social Movements.	8
The Move to Framing Processes.....	8
Collective Action Frames	9
Frame Resonance	10
Core Framing Tasks	10
Discursive Processes.....	12
Strategic Processes.....	13
Contested Processes	13
Master Frames.....	14
Attribution, Articulation, and Mobilizing Potency.....	15

Master Frames and Cycles of Protest.....	16
Selected Master Frames	17
Individual and Collective Identities	19
Identity Work Processes	20
Social Movement Organization Structures	23
Gender and Sexuality Movements	25
Development of Modern Gender and Sexuality Movements.....	25
Theoretical Conceptualizations of Gender and Sexuality.....	29
Reformative Framing of Gender and Sexuality Movements	30
Transformative Framing of Gender and Sexuality Movements.....	33
CHAPTER THREE: INTERNET ACTIVISM	36
The Internet and Changes in Social Movement Theory	37
Political Participation Online	39
Empirically Developed Typologies of Online Activism	40
E-mobilization.....	41
E-tactics.....	41
E-movements.	42
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY	43
Research Question and Definition of Terms.....	43
Master Frames.....	43
Gender and Sexuality Movements	44
Movement Websites.....	45
Internet and the World Wide Web	45

Internet Activism	46
Unit of Analysis	46
Description of Sample	47
Organization Type	47
Scope of Issues Addressed.....	49
Community Identification.....	50
Injustice Framing	50
Sampling.....	51
Generation of Sample Population	51
Selection of Potential Movement Websites	55
Collecting Data from Websites.....	59
Identification of Movement Websites.....	60
Identification of Transformative and Reformative Movement Websites	62
Coding and Analysis.....	63
Open Coding	64
Focused Coding	65
Limitations	66
CHAPTER FIVE: MASTER FRAMING AND ONLINE ACTIVISM.....	67
The Landscape of Transformative Movement Websites	67
Organizational Structure	68
Scope of Issues Addressed.....	68
Community Identification.....	69
Injustice Framing	69

Reformative Movement Websites	70
Organizational Structure	71
Scope of Issues Addressed.....	71
Community Identification.....	71
Injustice Framing	72
Prevalence of Internet Activism Types.....	72
Brochureware	73
Online Facilitation of Offline Actions	74
Online Protest Actions	75
Movement Framing and Internet Activism.....	75
Framing and Internet Activism	75
Framing and Online Protest Actions.....	76
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION	77
Master Frame and Internet Activism	77
Organization Type and Internet Activism.....	78
Future Research Opportunities	78
Social Media	78
Scope of Issues Addressed and Online Protest Actions.....	80
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION.....	81
REFERENCES	83
Review of the Literature	83
Results.....	91
Appendix A. Movement Websites in Sample.....	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Master Frame of Movement Websites.....	47
Table 2. Movement Websites and Organization Type.....	48
Table 3. Identity Phrases in Population Search Queries.....	52
Table 4. Injustice Framing in Population Search Queries	53
Table 5. Types of Results Excluded from Sample.....	56
Table 6. Non-Conforming Framing of Movement Websites by Organizational Type.....	62
Table 7. Internet Activism in Movement Websites	73
Table 8. Examples of Brochureware (E-Mobilization).....	73
Table 9. Examples of Online Facilitation of Offline Actions (E-Mobilizations)	74
Table 10. Examples of Online Protest Actions (E-Tactics).....	75
Table 11. Master Frame and Internet Activism	76
Table 12. Master Frame and Online Protest Actions	76
Table 13. Selected Examples of Social Media.....	79
Table 14. Non-Conforming Websites in Sample.....	93
Table 15. Reformative Websites in Sample.....	93
Table 16. Transformative Websites in Sample	94

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A. Movement Websites in Sample..... 93

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In March 1989, what we know as the World Wide Web was introduced to the world, a network able to connect users across the globe (Pew Internet Research 2014). At that time, no one could have foreseen how digital communications would change the course of human history. Twenty five years later, the Internet, or underlying technology protocols that enable the Web (Pew Internet Research 2014), affects the social experiences of nearly everyone, from adolescents reinforcing existing relationships (Subrahmanyan and Greenfield 2008) to members of complex virtual communities existing entirely online (Chen, Sun and Hsieh 2008).

The Internet can also be used as a technology to empower the oppressed (Castells 1996). The 1994 Zapatistas movement in Chiapas, Mexico and the 1999 World Trade Organization (WTO) protests in Seattle, WA are considered among the most prominent early examples of the Internet and digital communication technologies affecting social movement outcomes. Global networks supported the local rebellion of Zapatistas, linking them to others engaged in similar struggles against neoliberalism worldwide (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010; Edelman 2001). During the WTO protests in Seattle, coordinated actions were aided by the Internet to mobilize activists (Van Aelst and Walgrave 2002). More recently, the role of blogging in Egyptian protests (Salah Fahmi 2009) and the Occupy Wall Street movement's use of Twitter (Juris 2012) have caused interest in social media's role in protest.

While many empirical studies analyze how different social movements use the Internet to engage in activism, the question remains: what about differences *within* movements? Individual movements and causes vary greatly in their understanding of injustices and the resulting actions that must be taken to remedy those injustices. The astounding range of gender and sexuality activism clearly illustrates this intra-movement conflict. Actors affected by how gender and sexuality combine to affect their lives make a wide variety of claims, from declaring that equality is a matter of constitutional rights (Nava and Dawidoff 1994) to arguing that fundamental conceptualizations of binary sexuality should be challenged (Ault 1996).

In this methodological study, I explore the landscape of gender and sexuality movements on the Internet and seek to understand how framing of this social movement affects online activism. In Chapter Two I review literature elucidating several relevant social movement conceptual frameworks and theories, focusing on framing processes and master frames. In this chapter I also define my conceptualization of gender and sexuality movements, differentiating between what I call reformative and transformative master frame narratives. In Chapter Three I review theoretical and empirical literature linking the Internet with social movement activism, examining the typologies of Internet activism I use to develop my methodology. Chapter Four provides an in depth account of my methodological processes, specifically with respect to my sampling methodology and coding processes. In Chapter Five I present the results of my findings, including classification of movement websites as reformative or transformative and ways in which those websites use the Internet to engage in activism. In Chapter Six I draw conclusions

from my results in relation to literature reviewed and reflect on the research study process. As this exploratory study led me to consider exciting questions and possibilities, in Chapter Seven I conclude by providing recommendations for future research opportunities.

CHAPTER TWO: SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY

Before attempting to identify relationships between reformative and transformative framing of movement websites and opportunities to engage in online activism, several key theoretical concepts must be explored and defined. First, I review social movement framing processes and how critical these processes are to understanding intra-movement conflict. Then, I review the major differences between transformative and reformative framing employed by social movements. Next, I define gender and sexuality movements within the context of this thesis. After defining gender and sexuality movements, I describe how reformative and transformative movement framing is situated in current movement activism. Finally, I review theoretical perspectives and empirical studies evaluating how the Internet has affected social movement theory and activism.

Social movements have successfully challenged injustices and changed society by mobilizing groups of people to affect social change (Tilly 2004). Before the proliferation of new social movement theory, several approaches dominated the theoretical landscape, including mass society theory, relative deprivation theory, resource mobilization theory, and political process theory (Locher 2002). This review focuses more specifically on framing processes, including collective identity framing, collective action frames, and master frames.

Introduction to Social Movement Theory

Social movements are products of sociopolitical environments, and follow protest cycles of contention (Tarrow 1998; Edelman 2001). Tarrow (1998) distinguishes contentious politics from social movements, arguing that social movements result from shared group understandings and mobilization. A variety of theoretical approaches were developed to understand the processes of social movements, and several are introduced in this chapter (Buechler 1995; Benford and Snow 2000).

Mass Society Theory and Relative Deprivation Theory

In the early 1970s, mass society and relative deprivation theories were major players in social movement theories (Edelman 2001). Mass societies are dominated by large-scale institutions with few intermediate social groups to foster social ties and connections; this leads to individual isolation and alienation (Buechler 2011). Mass society theory suggests that mass societies produce mass movements as a response to crisis politics; Locher (2002) cites fascism and Naziism as example of mass society movements where charismatic leadership united alienated populations in crisis. Alternatively, relative deprivation theory suggests that when large numbers of people feel deprived and overcome the cognitive dissonance related to blaming themselves for personal circumstances, social change can occur (Locher 2002). However, Locher (2002) argues that these theories fail to address substantial questions; mass society theory only really accounts for specific movements resulting in alienated individuals being drawn to charismatic leadership, while relative deprivation theory does not acknowledge factors

outside of individual psychology.

Resource Mobilization Theory.

By the mid-1970s, two different paradigms emerged in social movement theory; European sociologists focused on collective action and identity as response to claims and grievances whereas American sociologists focused more on strategies and resource mobilization (Edelman 1995). Resource mobilization theory was the dominant paradigm in American social movement theory from the 1970s to the 1990s (Tilly 2004).

Resource mobilization theory makes several assumptions. First, by emphasizing the role of economic and political factors, the theory assumes that all societies are capable of social movements if resources can be mobilized (Locher 2002). Second, leadership is critical in affecting social change; resource mobilization theory values strong leadership and the development of social movement organizations (Locher 2002). Third, social movements must manage resources appropriately or they will ultimately fail (Locher 2002).

Using resource mobilization theory, Tilly (2004) argues that social movements are particular political phenomena involving the combination of social-movement repertoire, campaign, and displays of worthiness, unity, numbers and commitment (WUNC). Social movements make three types of claims: program claims support or oppose a movement's actions, identity claims declare a unified front by actors within a movement, and standing claims assert ties to other political actors not directly part of the movement identity (Tilly 2004). Campaigns or claims are not static and are affected by interactions between objects, claimants, and third party actors (Tilly 2004).

Locher (2002) argues that the strategy of resource mobilization can be problematic due to a movement's heavy dependence on outside help in order to succeed. Not valuing solidarity and other intangibles of movements has also been noted as a weakness of resource mobilization theory (Edelman 2001).

Political Process Theory.

Political process theory was another popular approach in the 1970s and 1980s (Locher 2002). Political process theory focuses on the ability of the social movement to balance the costs and benefits of engaging in a particular action (Tarrow 1998). Contrary to resource mobilization theory, political process theory places equal emphasis on internal and external factors (Locher 2002). According to political process theory, three major factors contribute to movement success: organizational strength, cognitive liberation, and political opportunities (Locher 2002). Like resource mobilization theory, political process theory emphasizes existing organizations (Locher 2002). As opposed to resource mobilization theory, political power and opportunities are keys to movement success (Locher 2002). Political process theory has also been criticized as deterministic and reducing collective action to political actions focusing entirely on the state (Buechler 2011).

Today, social movement theory has moved away from the resource mobilization model (Tilly 2004) and more toward understanding the role of identity politics in social movement advocacy (Buechler 1995). This shift in theoretical application has led to the study of what are described as new social movements (Buechler 1995; Edelman 2001).

New Social Movements.

New social movements emerged from European sociology, and emphasize symbolic information and cultural resources (Edelman 2001). Edelman highlights Touraine (1988) and Melucci's (1989) arguments that differentiate between old, labor movements and new social movements. In new social movements, horizontal, loose networks are major actors in addition to traditional hierarchical organizations found in resource mobilization (Edelman 2001). New social movements consider how people embody multiple identities and how those identities are interrelated (Edelman 2001; Melucci 1989). Since participation itself is a goal in new social movements, it is important to consider who does not participate in movements and why (Edelman 2001). Edelman (2001) cites Melucci's (1989) identification of three primary characteristics of new social movements: shared identities, objectives, and understandings; adversaries who make the same claims; and actions requiring systemic change. This focus on shared identities leads theory to shift more toward an emphasis on framing processes.

The Move to Framing Processes

Framing processes have been included as part of social movement studies since the mid-1980s (Benford and Snow 2000). European and American social movement scholarship on framing processes differs in several key ways (Carroll and Ratner 1996; Klandermans 1984). In American sociology, the concept of framing processes resulted from attempting to address gaps in resource mobilization theory (Carroll and Ratner 1996), yet did not seek to completely *replace* resource mobilization theory (Buechler 2011). European sociology was more focused on new social movements (Melucci 1989;

Buechler 1995). From a neo-Gramscian perspective, framing can be seen as the cognitive aspect of counterhegemonic politics (Carroll and Ratner 1996).

Framing processes address the perceived weaknesses of resource mobilization theory concerning the role of ideology in social movements (Edelman 2001). Before resource mobilization theory, ideology was only discussed as static and descriptive as opposed to dynamic and analytic, assuming that meaning was a given and non-negotiated (Snow and Benford 1992). Social movements are not simply carriers of meanings and ideas; meanings are produced and reproduced within social movement processes (Snow and Benford 1992).

Collective Action Frames

All social movements attempt to provide a “framework” or “frame” through which potential participants can understand the dynamics/situations they experience. Collective action frames differ from non-action frames in that they aim to mobilize people (Benford and Snow 2000). Framing is an active, contentious process (Benford and Snow 2000). Generally speaking, frames are how we understand the world around us, providing context for individuals in circumstances (Snow and Benford 1992). Within social movements, collective action frames are meanings and beliefs used by social movement organizations to unite and inspire members to action (Benford and Snow 2000; Tarrow 1998). Benford and Snow (2000) argue:

Collective action frames are constructed in part as movement adherents negotiate a shared understanding of some problematic condition or situation they define as in need of change, make attributions regarding

who or what is to blame, articulate an alternative set of arrangements, and urge other to act in concert to affect change (P. 615).

Collective actions frames are dynamic and continuously evolving (Tarrow 1998; Benford and Snow 2000). Unlike in previous iterations of social movement theory, political resources and opportunities play no consistent role in frame resonance, or how frames can relate to potential movement actors (Benford and Snow 2000).

Frame Resonance

A broad range of issues covered by a collective action frame is more likely to resonate with more people (Benford and Snow 2000) and therefore potentially recruit more people or maintain them as movement participants. There are three major components to frame resonance: empirical credibility, experiential commensurability, and narrative fidelity (Snow and Benford 1992). Credibility relates to the consistency of frame presentation, the soundness of empirical claims, and the credibility of the claim makers (Benford and Snow 2000). Narrative fidelity refers to a frame's salience within the greater context of existing belief systems and narratives; relatively high narrative fidelity is likely to lead to mobilization (Snow and Benford 1992).

Core Framing Tasks

Core framing tasks and discursive processes are major features of collective action frames (Benford and Snow 2000). Core framing tasks address both consensus mobilization and action mobilization (Klandermans 1984; Benford and Snow 2000). Consensus mobilization is how social movements find support for positions, while action mobilization is how people are moved to participate (Klandermans 1984). There are three

tasks of core framing: diagnostic framing, prognostic framing, and prescriptive framing (Snow and Benford 1988; Benford and Snow 2000; Tarrow 1998).

Diagnostic framing.

Diagnostic framing identifies the problem that needs to be addressed (Snow and Benford 1988). Controversies at the diagnostic level exist within movements and even within single social movement organizations, specifically with respect to assigning blame to the source of the problem (Benford and Snow 2000). Sometimes diagnostic framing results in adversarial framing, or what Gamson (1995b) describes as the assigning of movement antagonists and protagonists, but this is not always effective (Benford and Snow 2000). For example, Benford and Snow (2000) describe Klandermans, de Weerd, Saubecedo and Costa's (1999) study of agrarian mobilizations in Europe where movement actors found it difficult to consistently identify who to blame and where to direct anger when dealing with negative circumstances; framing movement actors as "good" or "evil" is not always possible.

Prognostic and prescriptive framing.

Prognostic framing identifies solutions to the identified problem and is significantly impacted by diagnostic framing (Benford and Snow 2000). Identification of the problem significantly affects what solutions are available to movement actors (Benford and Snow 2000). Benford (1993) identifies prognostic frame disputes between nuclear disarmament social movement organizations based on their radical, moderate, or liberal politics; the solutions to the problems at hand differs significantly for each of these political factions.

The prognostic dimension is a key point in movement differentiation (Benford and Snow 2000; Haines 1996). Haines (1996), in his study of death penalty movements, describes a tendency of movement actors to emphasize issues that may have broader appeal; Haines argues that this has limited the growth of the anti-death penalty movement. Haines (1996) describes two main players adopting distinct frames in the anti-death penalty movement: abolitionists and litigators. Tension between the two is related to “which objective should take precedence: the short-term goal of preventing and overturning death sentences or the long-term goal of abolition” (Haines 1996:119). Philosophical arguments abound over making immediate tangible changes instead of waiting a painfully long time for public opinion to change (Haines 1996). This is an example of frame dissonance with respect to the prognostic function.

After a solution has been identified, prescriptive framing accounts for how to call people to action and how actions are described (Benford and Snow 2000; Tarrow 1998): Gamson (1995b) describes this as the “agency” part of collective action frames.

Discursive Processes

In addition to core framing tasks described above, there are discursive, strategic and contested processes that lead to development of collective action frames (Benford and Snow 2000). Discursive processes refer to any spoken or written communication related to movement activities, and occur in two processes: frame articulation and frame amplification (Benford and Snow 2000). Frame articulation refers to how frames are assembled, how individual ideas are put together in context (Benford and Snow 2000). Frame amplification highlights individual pieces that are more salient than others, such as

catchphrases like “Power to the People” or “Homeless, Not Helpless” (Benford and Snow 2000).

Strategic Processes

Strategic processes that lead to development of collective action frames are deliberative and goal directed; these are called frame alignment processes (Benford and Snow 2000; Snow et al. 1986). Frame bridging occurs when seemingly unrelated frames are linked together; Benford and Snow reference Gerhards and Rucht’s (1992) study of West German activists mobilizing actions against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund by bridging frames with peace, labor, and ecology groups. Frame amplification occurs when elements of a frame are highlighted, while frame extension happens when the frame moves to include more than a single primary interest. Finally, frame transformation occurs when understandings of a frame move beyond initial understandings; Benford and Snow (2000) note White’s (1999) study identifying the efforts of a Black feminist collective to transform public understanding of rape.

Contested Processes

Contested processes include counterframing, disputes within movements, and the interplay between frames and events (Benford and Snow 2000). Counterframes result from opposition to movements and how movements respond to that opposition. Frame disputes involve intra-movement disagreements about diagnostic and prognostic frames, including disputes surrounding frame resonance (Benford 1993). Benford and Snow (2000) highlight Ellingson’s (1995) study of dialectical tensions in movement framing within the context of how abolitionism was framed in antebellum Cincinnati; following

actions taken after initial framing of the issue, discourse continued to shape actions and vice versa. Changes in political opportunity can also change the resonance of a frame, leading to changes in framing (Benford and Snow 2000). Changes in existing cultural meanings can also lead to changes in frame in order to maintain resonance (Benford and Snow 2000).

Master Frames

According to Snow and Benford, “master frames are generic [while] specific collective action frames are derivative” (1992:138). If collection action frames adopt universal enough claims, they can develop into master frames (Benford and Snow 2000). Benford and Snow discuss Evans’s (1997) analysis differentiating master frames from organizational frames, which may be adopted across an entire movement while not useful to a *different* movement. Master frames widely adopted by a variety of movements include but are not limited to: rights frames, choice frames, injustice frames, environmental justice frames, and hegemonic frames (Benford and Snow 2000; Tarrow 1998).

The study of master frames is largely unexplored, with the exception of Snow and Benford (1992) (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Carroll and Ratner (1996) explore master frames of injustice, or how movement participants frame power and domination. Cross movement activists tend to share a political-economy injustice master frame (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Contrastingly, liberal framing effectively frames issues in terms of human rights (Carroll and Ratner 1996). In Carroll and Ratner’s (1996) study, all coalition

activists employ a political-economic master frame; this was unsurprising, because coalitions move beyond single issue activism.

Attribution, Articulation, and Mobilizing Potency

There are three major features of master frames: attribution, articulation, and mobilization (Snow and Benford 1992). All collective action frames, including master frames, perform an attribution function, or diagnostic function (Snow and Benford 1992). Attribution theory finds that behavior is attributed to either external or internal factors (Snow and Benford 1992). Snow and Benford (1992) describe the “psychosalvational” frame adopted by Scientology as an internal attribution of blame, where personal suffering is seen as the result of individual failings. Alternatively, the “civil rights” frame argues that external structural arrangements are the cause of personal suffering (Benford and Snow 1992).

Snow and Benford (1992) discuss Bernstein’s (1970) articulation of master frames as the use of two linguistic codes: restricted and elaborated. Restricted code is noted for a limited range of syntax yielding precise, predictable meaning and structure (Bernstein 1970). Because they embody a narrow range of ideas, restricted master frames are “syntactically rigid and lexically particularistic,” and less likely to be amplified or extended (Snow and Benford 1992:140). Elaborated code has a greater range of syntax, yielding more flexible and less predictable interpretations of meaning (Snow and Benford 1992). Because they encompass a wide variety of ideas, elaborated master frames are more inclusive and conducive to amplification and extension (Snow and Benford 1992).

The third function of master frames is mobilizing potency (Snow and Benford 1992). Mobilizing potency is rooted in two factors: position in continuum of restricted and elaborated code, and frame resonance (Snow and Benford 1992:140). More elaborated master frames have greater appeal and influence to more individuals and groups and therefore have more mobilizing potency (Snow and Benford 1992). However, a master frame's ability to resonate with many groups does not necessarily indicate a deep resonance – resonance can be “superficial or skin-deep” (Snow and Benford 1992:140). Snow and Benford (1992) hypothesize that greater frame resonance also leads to greater mobilizing potency.

Master Frames and Cycles of Protest

Snow and Benford (1992) identify a relationship between cycles of protest and master frames. New cycles of protest and contention emerge with construction of an innovative master frame. Though structural conditions may seem conducive to mass mobilization, the lack of a resonant master frame may hinder mobilization. Master frames, or anchoring frames, adopted by movements early in a cycle of protest, are likely to influence frames developed later in the protest's cycle. It follows that framing efforts of movements developing later in a cycle of protest will be constrained by earlier master frames (Snow and Benford 1992). This was particularly noticeable in the nuclear freeze movement, when framing disputes erupted between single and multi-issue groups later in the movement's lifetime; there was resistance to change of the original master frame (Snow and Benford 1992; Benford 1993).

Snow and Benford (1992) argue that new master frames influence innovation in tactics; while boycotts and rallies were not new to activists, they were first used in context with civil rights advocacy. In addition to being a function of environmental factors, movement tactics are constrained by anchoring master frames. For example, the peace movement faced dire consequences in the form of public opinion when a rogue activist engaged in nonviolent tactics, an action in direct violation of the movement's master frame (Snow and Benford 1992). Finally, the range of tactics available to a movement is directly related to its restricted or elaborated code; the more restricted framing, the fewer options, while the higher elaboration, the greater number of options (Snow and Benford 1992).

As cultural climates change, the anchoring master frame of a protest cycle may become less salient, losing empirical credibility or experiential relevance (Snow and Benford 1992). The anchoring frame may be further weakened by emerging, competing frames, both external and internal to the movement (Snow and Benford 1992). The subsiding mobilizing potency of the anchoring frame indicates the conclusion of a protest cycle (Snow and Benford 1992).

Selected Master Frames

Carroll and Ratner (1996) identified three master frames in a cross movement study of social movement organizations: political economy, identity, and liberal frames. The identity politics frame understands power as part of human relations and a result of agency (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Power is attached to identity markers, with greater power associated with white men (Carroll and Ratner 1996). In this frame, power shifts

as people reject older models of relations and interactions; counterpower refers to empowerment and sharing power with greater numbers of actors (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Oppression is a result of exclusion, marginalization, and invalidation of individuals (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Identity is a particularistic frame, related to new social movements (Carroll and Ratner 1996). The political economy and liberal frames as described by Carroll and Ratner (1996) are the theoretical basis for transformative and reformative framing as conceptualized in this study.

Transformative: Political-economy frame.

The political-economy frame is universalistic, and therefore can be seen as a master frame (Carroll and Ratner 1996). The political-economy frame identifies power as systemic, institutional, structural, and materially grounded (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Structures of power are discussed simultaneously and in relation to other structures (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Oppression is a result of material deprivation, or exploitation (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Counterpower is about resisting, opposing domination, and most importantly, transforming the system (Carroll and Ratner 1996). The political-economy frame suggests that those in power attempt to maintain that power through state and economic policies (Carroll and Ratner 1996). The political-economy frame is key to understanding counterhegemonic politics:

[A]ctivism that pushes beyond conventional movement boundaries requires a common language and an analytical perspective that emphasizes the systemic and interconnected character of the various injustices and problems of late modernity" (Carroll and Ratner 1996: 616).

Essentially, the political-economy frame advocates *transformation of hegemonic society*.

Reformative: Liberal frame.

The liberal frame conceptualizes the state as the primary agent arbitrating conflicts between groups (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Power is a reflection of ability to mobilize resources and is sought by a plurality of groups (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Counterpower is self-interested and effective when using established structures and processes, like judicial processes (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Injustice is framed in terms of rights, and disenfranchisement is a matter of oppression (Carroll and Ratner 1996). Given that the tactical choices of liberal framing suggest a course following established processes, it cannot be seen as a counterhegemonic master frame (Carroll and Ratner 1996). The liberal frame is about *change within hegemonic society*.

Individual and Collective Identities

Identity construction is inherent to framing processes (Benford and Snow 2000; Tarrow 1998), but until the late 1980s, the processes leading to collective identity development were largely ignored (Gamson 1995b). New social movement scholars posit that collective identity is both a means to collective action and an end, as identity is constantly reflexively evolving (Gamson 1995b). Increasingly, identity plays a larger role in social movement theory (Snow and McAdam 2000). However, it is problematic to conceptualize group identities without considering the relationship between group and individual identities or ignoring processes where identity is constructed and maintained at the group and individual levels (Snow and McAdam 2000). Collective identity can be described as a shared feeling of “us” among individuals in a collectivity (Snow and

McAdam 2000). Collective identity is an enlargement of individual identity (Snow and McAdam 2000; Gamson 1995b). Reconciling individual and collective identity is a matter of aligning the two (Snow and McAdam 2000).

There are two approaches to aligning individual and collective identities, described as dispositional and structural (Snow and McAdam 2000). The dispositional approach suggests there is a psychological links between certain personality types and movement behavior; movement participants have different personalities (Snow and McAdam 2000). Individuals seek collective identities because something is missing from their individual identities (Snow and McAdam 2000). Yet this does not account for the role of ideology in movement engagement, or how framing processes interact with individual and collective identities to create dynamic changes in both (Snow and McAdam 2000; Ellingson 1995). Alternatively, the structural perspective assumes that identities are embedded within structures, like roles and networks (Snow and McAdam 2000). However, individuals with similar group memberships do not necessarily share similar identities (Snow and McAdam 2000).

Identity Work Processes

Identity work processes are how individuals develop personal identities that align with their self-concepts (Snow and McAdam 2000). According to Snow and McAdam (2000), there are several issues to address by current conceptualizations of identity work: the construction of collective identity through symbolic resources, correspondence of individual and collective identity, and the maintenance of both collective identity *and* the personal relationship between individual and collective identity. Two forms of identity

work address these concerns: identity convergence and identity construction (Snow and McAdam 2000).

Identity convergence.

Identity convergence is the “coalescence of a movement and individuals who already identify with it” (Snow and McAdam 2000:47). This happens through identity seeking and identity appropriation (Snow and McAdam 2000). Identity seeking occurs when individuals search for groups constituted by people with similar identities to their own (Snow and McAdam 2000); Snow and McAdam (2000) highlight Balch and Taylor’s study of participants in UFO cults as an example of “metaphysical seekers” (1978:71) looking to find membership in a group of like-minded individuals. Identity appropriation is facilitated by *organizers* attempting to develop a movement of people with similar individual identities (Snow and McAdam 2000). Snow and McAdam describe Oberschall’s (1973) study of the appropriation of existing solidarity networks in an effort to mobilize participants more quickly. Both Balch and Taylor (1978) and Oberschall (1973) demonstrate how individual identities can converge into a collective identity.

Identity construction.

Identity construction within a movement is made up of four processes similar to framing processes: amplification, consolidation, extension, and transformation (Snow and McAdam 2000; Benford and Snow 2000). Amplification refers to the individual embellishment of an identity to be compatible with a movement’s collective identity (Snow and McAdam 2000). Consolidation refers to the individual’s adoption of a new

identity by combining two seemingly unlike identities (Snow and McAdam 2000).

Extension describes how the individual identity expands to include the collective identity (Snow and McAdam 2000). Identity transformation links the three stages, bridging individual and group identities together (Snow and McAdam 2000).

Snow and McAdam (2000) pose the question: what are processes that mediate identity construction - framing processes, engaging in collective action, or both? They suggest that the type of movement determines the importance of collective identity processes (Snow and McAdam 2000). More politically radical movements are more likely to value identity construction processes over identity convergence processes (Snow and McAdam 2000).

Different identity work may be more important at certain points in a movement's life (Snow and McAdam 2000). As movements emerge, they tend to develop from established networks, appropriating collective identity; this yields high participation (Snow and McAdam 2000). When movements institutionalize, the organizational center transfers from the original network to newly established social movement organizations (Snow and McAdam 2000). Since there is no longer a network with an established collective identity, identity amplification and extension are more important than appropriation (Snow and McAdam 2000).

Identity seeking.

Finally, as movements diffuse, a new type of identity work begins: identity seeking; this refers to when individuals seek an organization (Snow and McAdam

2000:60). Snow and McAdam (2000) outline the struggles established movements face, noting that,

As movements grow beyond their localized origins, targeted recruitment tends to bring ever more diverse elements into the struggle, thus expanding the potential for intramovement conflict. Movements that attain the degree of popular support and expansion characteristic of this third and final stage of development are even more vulnerable to the perils of conflict and factionalism. ... Movements, under these circumstances, are less likely to resemble tightly knit and internally cohesive insurgent communities than they are broad, fractious, and increasingly amorphous collections of people who share only the most rudimentary definition of the struggle (P.61).

The more salient a collective identity, the more people can adopt that identity without contributing to producing and reproducing it (Snow and McAdam 2000). A core part of social movements is “the extent to which they are about essentializing - claiming fixed, shared, and enduring identities that may differ significantly from people’s daily experiences and belief” (Rubin 2004:125).

Social Movement Organization Structures

Professional social movement organizations (SMOs) are citizen groups and advocacy groups that exist everywhere from the local to the international stages (Minkoff, Aisenbrey, and Agnone 2008). Interest groups, SMOs and political parties are sometimes considered indistinguishable based on political process (Minkoff et al 2008). Professional SMOs are the most dominant form of SMO, characterized by little to no accountability of leadership to members, weak member engagement, little diversity in

organizational structure, and members' primary engagement being monetary contributions (Minkoff et al. 2008).

Minkoff et al. (2008) propose that reformative organizations dominate the landscape when compared to transformative cultural based organizations, and that progressive/radical groups are more likely to engage in grassroots participation and mobilization rather than professional SMOs. Minkoff et al. (2008) found that two major organizational forms dominate the advocacy organization landscape: national associations with members and non-membership organizations. Progressive organizations were more likely to be involved in protest activities (Minkoff et al 2008).

Some SMOs employ hierarchical leadership; this leads to decision making rarely being questioned (Schussman and Earl 2004). Alternatively, consensus making processes allow members to hold leaders accountable in volunteer organizations (Schulman and Earl 2004).

Gender and Sexuality Movements

Gender and sexuality movements are conceptualized in this study as social movements addressing injustices related to gender expression, gender identity, and sexual orientation. Understanding the interplay between gender identity, expression, and sexual orientation is critical to understanding the internal tensions that lead participants to adopt one of two master frames: transformative and reformative. In turn, these master frames yield subsets of what Vaid (1994) describes as liberation movements and legitimization movements (Vaid 1994). Liberation movements are radical and revolutionary, while legitimization movements are reform-based, assimilation oriented and seek mainstream acceptance (Vaid 1994).

Development of Modern Gender and Sexuality Movements

Before World War II, the term “homosexual” referred to a broad category of pathologized sexual and/or gender behaviors differing from dominant social paradigms (Valocchi 1999). Later, the “homosexual” was redefined as someone expressing or acting on same-sex desire within the context of a heterosexual-homosexual binary (Valocchi 1999). This simplistic and reductionist approach disregards community and individual experiences, wrongly assuming a homogeneous collective identity (Bernstein 2003; Valocchi 1999).

After World War II, homosexuality was defined as a sexual minority rather than a perversion of sexuality (Vaid 1994). However, being labeled as a minority by dominant society leads to consequences; homosexuality and normality were by definition mutually

exclusive (Valocchi 1999). In the 1950s, the homophile movement attempted to mainstream homosexuality through public displays of gender normative behavior (Gamson 1995a:395). Homosexuals struggled with a dilemma: while those labeled as homosexuals did not necessarily identify with the mainstream identity of “homosexual,” to deny the categorization was to deny the opportunity to shape public perception of gay people (Valocchi 1999).

On June 28, 1969, a gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender crowd spontaneously rioted when police raided the Stonewall Inn in New York City, galvanizing the gay liberation movement (Vaid 1994; Armstrong and Crago 2006). Despite similar responses to police actions during the Compton Cafeteria Riots of 1966 and the 1966 New Year’s Ball in San Francisco, Stonewall is one of the most widely commemorated moments in modern LGBT movement history (Armstrong and Crago 2006). Gay liberation in the late 1960s and early 1970s celebrated difference in gay sexuality, embracing it as different from dominant sexual paradigms (Vaid 1994). Radical theory in the 1970s did not challenge social definitions of sexuality, but instead attempted to legitimize homosexuality as normal (Seidman 1994). Foucault argued that homosexual identity is distinctly modern and that sexuality is socially and politically defined (Seidman 1994:171).

Vaid (1994) describes the development of two distinct movements in the 1970s. The cultural gay movement focuses on identity of homosexuality as an alternative to heterosexuality, emphasizing the establishment of communities and services. The political gay movement embraces a civil rights framework to argue for legal equality,

lobbying in Washington and establishing reform organizations (Vaid 1994). These two arms of the gay movement are at times in tension with each other.

An example of the tensions between cultural and political outcomes is sodomy law reform. Bernstein (2003) describes how early activist discourse shaped by elites opted to try to change laws rather than challenge cultural norms about sexuality. Activists did this because they were concerned by how the existing political climate would affect Supreme Court decisions. By focusing on privacy and the idea of victimless crimes, the idea was to operate within an existing civil rights framework. Despite the resistance from gay liberation activists to emphasize sodomy law repeal, the political resources available addressed the most immediate threat of criminalization (Bernstein 2003). Like the preceding revolutionary movements that so heavily influenced gay liberation, by the mid-1970s the gay liberation movement shifted to a more moderate course seeking legal and political gains (Vaid 1994).

In the 1980s, the AIDS crisis emotionally overwhelmed the gay and lesbian community, shifting priorities and outcomes from political to cultural (Bernstein 2003; Vaid 1994). After this shift, organizations like the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) directly addressed sexuality discourse, finally challenging existing conceptualizations of sexuality as an institution. Because cultural victories were regarded as more important at the time, mobilization outcomes were prioritized over political outcomes (Bernstein 2003).

Vaid (1994) argues that during the AIDS crisis, several strategic decisions affected the movement's trajectory for years to come. At the time, the New Right used

AIDS to facilitate backlash against homosexuality (Seidman 1994). Despite disproportionately devastating gay communities, gay activists worked to separate AIDS from homosexuality in order to gain mainstream attention and access to services (Vaid 1994). Gay and lesbian sexuality was downplayed, leading to increased visibility in the media, yet moving away from the sexual liberation ideology of the 1970s (Vaid 1994). AIDS reform was decoupled from systemic reform, yielding quick results but ultimately only short lived gains. These strategies saw the AIDS movement seek reform rather than addressing institutionalized systemic oppression (Vaid 1994). Liberation goals were transformed into reform goals, focus shifted from movement building to building institutions, and grassroots political organizing was rejected in favor of traditional organizational politics (Vaid 1994).

As we moved into the 1990s, mainstream gay and lesbian activism shifted its focus, turning to stopping the military from discharging gay service members (Vaid 1994). The gay rights community believed they had an ally in presidential hopeful Bill Clinton, who promised to resolve this issue in exchange for the support of gay and lesbian voters (Vaid 1994). The 1994 policy “Don’t Ask Don’t Tell” mandated that while the military branches would no longer conduct investigations attempting to uncover gays (i.e. they would no longer “ask”), if a soldier told someone they were gay or lesbian they would still be dishonorably discharged. The argument was that gay persons could serve in the military as long as nobody knew they were gay. Basically, this “compromise” reiterated the belief that non heterosexual people are not accepted, no matter how they dress, act, or look (Vaid 1994). This policy was an example of what Vaid describes as

virtual equality, the notion that without a cultural shift, or fundamental attitudinal change in society, any legal equality will still fall short of true equality (Vaid 1994).

Theoretical Conceptualizations of Gender and Sexuality

Queer theory evolved in the late-1980s out of sociology, feminist theory, and post-structuralist philosophy (Gamson 1995a). Queer theory suggests that identities are multiple and intersecting, and there exist an infinite number of combinations (Seidman 1994). Queer theory rejects a reliance on a homosexual-heterosexual binary, which Seidman (1994) argues leads to the heterosexualization of society. Instead, queer theory suggests that homosexuality and heterosexuality should be seen as categories of knowledge, the language that frames how members of the queer community conceptualize themselves rather than categories of identity (Seidman 1994). In this sense, queer identity is a transformational identity.

Deconstructionist arguments around identity are promoted by some to potentially weaken civil rights approaches to gay rights: as boundaries are blurred, there is no clear group with a stable identity filing grievances (Gamson 1995a). This results in a fundamental quandary: clear identities are both necessary and hazardous (Gamson 1995a). Despite being unable to be all inclusive, identity categories can be valuable (Kulick 2000). Cultural oppression is better fought by loosening categories, yet institutional oppression is better fought by tightening categories (Gamson 1995a).

Queer politics oppose the idea of normal behavior, not just normal behavior itself (Gamson 1995a). That is, queer politics attempts to destabilize what is framed as normal versus abnormal. Queer politics can be described as decentralized and local, featuring

anti-organizational culture, non-conformist presentation, and underground alternative communications; these qualities were exemplified by Queer Nation (Gamson 1995a). As was demonstrated by Queer Nation's actions in San Francisco in 1993, queer politics is "in your face," aggressive, and against the grain (Gamson 1995a).

Queer identity.

In the 1960s, "gay" appeared to be the encompassing term to describe the community and movement, until lesbians argued against it in the late 1960s; thus the gay and lesbian movement was born (Kulick 2000). Letters continued to be added to the community acronym, until LGBT (and sometimes Q) have become the most commonly adopted set (Kulick 2000). Conflict over inclusion has continued, with bisexuals and transgender persons facing exclusion from identified gay and lesbian spaces and communities (Gamson 1995a).

Much to the dismay of older generations who experienced stigma attached to the word in the past, younger generations may identify themselves as queer in an attempt to encompass the wider community (Gamson 1995a; Valocchi 1999). There is danger of encompassing all identities as one, though; by blurring lines of identity and denying the differences of people's experiences, a single queer identity prevents individual differences from being acknowledged (Gamson 1995a).

Reformative Framing of Gender and Sexuality Movements

Goals of inclusion and legal recognition versus more transformative goals have divided the gay, lesbian and bisexual movements (Vaid 1994), and they threaten to do the same to the trans community (Spade 2011). Vaid (1994) calls this reformative approach

“legitimation” seeking. Vaid (1994) argues that legitimation movements are primarily concerned with protecting the status quo; by working for reform in an existing institution, gay advocacy movements seeking legitimation are associated with mainstreaming, integration, and assimilation. Legitimation movements deemphasize difference and argue that gay people are just like straight people (Bernstein 2003). By focusing on connecting to straight society and educating straight people about how gay and lesbian people are just like everyone else, legitimation movements aim for political and civic equality (Vaid 1994).

Mainstreaming.

The goal of mainstreaming is understandably appealing, as it allows gays and lesbians to be accepted by the majority rather than seen as immoral outcasts (Vaid 1994). However, this is only an option available to middle-class gays and lesbians who can pass as straight and acceptable (via access to specific clothes, consumption patterns, etc), and who can assimilate into the dominant culture (Vaid 1994). Valocchi (1999) argues the mainstream gay and lesbian advocacy movement has been dominated by middle class ideology and membership, emphasizing the ways that gays and lesbians act in normative social ways and deemphasizing parts of the gay/lesbian community that engage in romantic/sexual practices, styles of dress, living situations, and politics that are not in line with middle class heterosexual society.

Rights framing.

As suggested above, mainstreaming tends to focus on civil rights which does little to oppose dominant political culture, thereby reinforcing existing identity boundaries and

categories, which serves to oversimplify the complexities of queer people's lives and experiences (Gamson 1995a). Paralleling the experiences of women and people of color, even after laws change, newly protected classes of people still experience discrimination and oppression (Vaid 1994).

Vaid (1994) denounces a civil rights/mainstreaming approach for several reasons. First, a civil rights approach does not address the antigay prejudice related to sexual behavior (Vaid 1994). By emphasizing *biological* equivalence of homosexuality to heterosexuality (as a naturally occurring opposite state), the civil rights paradigm does not argue for the *moral* equivalence of homosexuality. Civil rights are a reward for passing; actual equality is not available to gender nonconforming or queer persons (Vaid 1994). Vaid (1994) argues that gay and lesbian civil rights should be part of a larger focus on institutional change.

Strategies and tactics of reform movements.

There are three major tactical strategies in legitimization, or reformative, movements: engaging in electoral campaigns, seeking legal reform and litigation, and lobbying for nondiscrimination laws (Vaid 1994). In the 1980s, mainstream gay activists dismissed the New Right, argued for legislation, and sought the support of the straight community. By emphasizing a top-down approach to power the movement implied that changes at the federal level will trickle down to the state and then local levels. Power in the movement was widely viewed by self-identified women as threatening and male driven (Vaid 1994). Critics pointed out a disconnect between powerful, wealthy gay folks

and everyone else; the wealthiest had the most political access, and thus political interests were not always representative of the larger gay and lesbian community.

Vaid argues (1994) that generally, gay and lesbian organizations are undemocratic, offering few opportunities for people to participate; they serve a decentralized constituency yet operate within a centralized power structure. Vaid (1994) discusses how gay and lesbian reformative organizations focus on expediency and results; typically working to achieve incremental change and reform, this framework is very goal oriented. Vaid (1994) also argues that there was still a focus on providing social services to LGBT persons, and since social services agencies often depend on government and private funding, they are unlikely to contribute to progressive change (Vaid 1994).

Transformative Framing of Gender and Sexuality Movements

Transformative queer movements do not frame struggle in terms of civil rights, as this denies a distinct queer culture (Mertus 2007). Transformative movements argue that the intersection of sexuality, race, gender, and economic issues is critical for large scale social change, yet this remains a contentious and controversial point and is not agreed upon in consensus by all gay activists (Vaid 1994).

True “liberation,” some activists argue, requires a shift from emphasizing political to cultural outcomes (Vaid 1994). Contrary to legitimization movements, liberation movements strive for deep social change, reconstructing social institutions in revolutionary fashion (Vaid 1994). Based upon a freedom based or radical approach, liberation movements seek to “do the right thing,” working beyond a goal of mainstream

integration and more toward a better society as a whole (Vaid 1994:4). Rather than seeing heterosexual and gay as two sides of the same coin called sexuality, as legitimization movements do, liberation movements see sex identity as fluid and impossible to constrain within the binary sexual orientation institution accepted today (Vaid 1994). One subset of the queer movement, concerning transgender politics and persons, has taken up the issue of the administration of binary gender.

Challenging binary conceptualizations of sexuality and gender.

Transformative movements frame queer sexuality as different from straight sexuality and no less morally acceptable (Vaid 1994). Queer sexuality identifies dominant conceptions of sexuality as oppressive of everyone, regardless of orientation (Vaid 1994). Queer sexuality requires both a transformation of social institutions and a shift in perceptions and opinions (Vaid 1994).

Spade (2011) argues that the administration of binary gender is the greatest cause of harm to transgender persons; critical systems including prisons, homeless shelters and foster care enforce rigid gender binaries. Spade (2011) argues that "administrative systems that classify people actually invent and produce meaning for the categories they administer," and these categorizations control marginalized persons (P.32). Crucially, by focusing on law reform as a primary advocacy strategy, structural inequality is ignored in favor of emphasizing individuals causing harm (Spade 2011).

Current trans politics focuses on "legal recognition and equality claims" (Spade 2011:19). There are costs to "legal equality gains," including lost opportunities to build coalitions and no change in transphobic attitudes (Spade 2011). Laws fail to create

change in what people experience; for example, hate crime legislation fails to deter hate crimes (Spade 2011). Instead, Spade (2011) argues that prison abolition, wealth redistribution, and immigration enforcement are three key sites to focus efforts. The prison industrial complex and the military industrial complex are just a few examples of how law, power, knowledge, and policing of norms are experienced in multiple ways (Spade 2011).

Intersectionality.

According to Spade (2011), critical trans politics argues for more than legal protection and inclusion, instead seeking to transform the state. Spade's (2011) conceptualization of critical trans politics combines elements of critical race theory, women of color feminism, queer theory, and disability studies. Traditional legal frameworks of discrimination and equality ignore key elements of power, systems of meaning, and control (Spade 2011).

Legal struggles usually are what the T in mainstream LGBT politics stands for; gender identity inclusion, anti-discrimination, and hate crime laws are the most common trans issues in mainstream LGBT politics (Spade 2011). Instead, law reform should focus on changing systems of administration, addressing identity documentation, sex segregation, and access to health care (Spade 2011).

CHAPTER THREE: INTERNET ACTIVISM

Computer-mediated communication has dramatically affected the ways in which the world networks on a local, national, and global scale (Castells 1996; Kreimer 2001). In the United States, the number of Internet users has jumped from about fifteen percent in 1995 to over eighty-seven percent in 2014 (Pew Research Center 2014).

In the early days of the Internet, content was produced by few and consumed by many (Manovich 2009:320; Handsfield et al. 2009). Now, Web 2.0 is characterized by an emphasis on social networking, creation of “microcontent” (content small in terms of size and effort to produce), nonhierarchical data filtering, and the blogosphere (Alexander 2008; Handsfield et al. 2009; Han 2010). Web 2.0 represents the shift from a top down approach of building content to users being able to “create, edit, manipulate and collaborate online” (Handsfield et al 2009:40). Some examples of Web 2.0 tools include blogs, digital storytelling and wikis, such as WikiLeaks or Wikipedia, as well as podcasts and social networking sites (Handsfield et.al. 2009; Pew Internet 2014). These tools have created dynamic changes in the structure and culture of everyday life. Within social movements, these changes are reflected in movement organization, mobilization, coalition building processes and tactics.

Scholarly accounts of social movements often discuss how advances in technology have affected social movement repertoire throughout history (Tilly 2004; Tarrow 1998). Computer-mediated communication, including mobile devices and several tools utilizing the Internet, such as e-mail, instant messaging, and forums has been

utilized by activists around the world (Adams and Roscigno 2005; Costanza-Chock 2008; Friedman 2007; Kreimer 2001; Juris 2005). This chapter explores how the Internet has (or has not) impacted social movement theory.

The Internet and Changes in Social Movement Theory

Earl et al. (2010) study the extent to which online activism requires changes to the landscape of social movement theory. Earl and her co-authors note three major schools of thought: the Internet has no effect on social movement processes, the Internet changes the dynamics of activism to the point where theoretical model changes are required, and the differences between online and offline activism are in scale rather than substantive (Earl et al 2010). There has been no real consensus regarding the effect of the Internet on political participation and modern social movement theory (Ayres 1999; Earl et al. 2010; Anduiza, Cantijoch and Gallego 2009; Albrecht 2006).

Some argue that the Internet does not affect social movement processes, suggesting that face to face interaction is required to build meaningful ties (Tarrow 1998; Tilly 2004; Albrecht 2006; Earl et al 2010). According to this argument, the digital divide is too much to overcome for the Internet to have a lasting impact on activism (Tarrow 1998; Tilly 2004).

Other scholars have concluded that the Internet changes things substantially, to the point that theoretical model changes are required (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010; Earl et al 2010; Anduiza et al. 2009). This change manifests in a variety of ways. The lowered costs of social action allow online activism to diminish the importance of resources,

directly refuting mobilization claims and reducing the importance of SMOs (Earl et al 2010). This leads to activism “theory 2.0,” changing how social movement theory considers the role of the Internet (Earl et al 2010:426). Free-riding in social movements refers to the tendency of rational actors to enjoy the benefits of social movements without actually participating (Buechler 2011; Tarrow 1998). But online, freeriding is fundamentally different, because the costs to organizers are so low when the distribution of and access to resources are free (or nearly free) and easy to increase in scale (Earl et al 2010). Van Laer and Van Aelst (2010) argue that the Internet facilitates and supports traditional action, but also creates new modes of collective action.

The third and most widely accepted view is that differences in online and offline activism are more related to degree, or scale (Earl et al. 2010). Cost reductions in participation and mobilization do not change general approaches to activism; rather, the Internet is simply an additional resource (Earl et al. 2010). The Internet itself is a new resource, drastically reducing the cost of participation and mobilization without changing fundamental activism process (Earl et al 2010).

However, some argue that the Internet profoundly affects political activity, reducing the cost of participation and broadening political opportunities (Anduiza et al. 2009). Direct action politics and new social movements have been great beneficiaries of this new technology (Anduiza et al. 2009).

Political Participation Online

The Internet has the tendency to reinforce existing behaviors (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010). The Internet creates weak rather than strong ties; support comes and goes, networks grow then disperse (Earl and Shussman 2004; Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010). Since political and economic power has moved to an international level (Castells 1996), the Internet allows social movements to also operate globally at a reduced threshold, though mobilization still occurs rather infrequently (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010). The Internet also creates new hazards to activists, such as tracking of IP addresses and decreased anonymity (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010).

Political participation has decreased in most industrialized nations, coinciding with people reporting a general discontent with the process of representative democracy (Anduiza et al. 2009). The Internet allows an alternative way to engage politically outside of traditional institutions (Anduiza et al. 2009). Single-issue mobilizations benefit from the Internet's ability to unite people across space and time (Anduiza et al. 2009). Additionally, certain movements, like the global justice movement, have more quickly adapted to use the Internet due to characteristics of the movement (horizontal organization, decentralized, high levels of networking, etc.).

Some have argued that that Internet has reduced political participation due to reduction of social ties. Others have argued the Internet will contribute to increased participation (Anduiza et al. 2009). In general, the cost of participation heavily influences the likelihood of political engagement (Anduiza et al. 2009). Knowledge of how to utilize the Internet reduces costs of participating online (Anduiza et al. 2009). The Internet can

save time and money, reducing the cost of participation (Anduiza et al. 2009). Effectively utilizing the Internet improves cognitive and analytical skills (Anduiza et al. 2009). However, just because information is widely available, this does not mean people are necessarily equipped with the cognitive skills to navigate this information effectively (Anduiza et al. 2009).

Empirically Developed Typologies of Online Activism

Anduiza et al. (2009) identified three types of political participation: only offline, online and offline, and only online. A new medium such as the Internet provides new opportunities for activism that are available only online, such as Twitter feeds citing Twitter feeds (Anduiza et al. 2009). Additionally, certain offline activities do have online equivalents, such as petitioning, contacting a local congressperson, or reaching out for donations (Anduiza et al. 2009).

. Van Laer and Van Aelst (2010) describe a typology of online activism with two variables: actions (real and virtual) and threshold (low and high). They argue that Internet-based forms of action only exist *because* of the Internet, whereas Internet supported actions are traditional actions made easier because of the Internet; the Internet has either a creative or facilitative function, respectively (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2010).

Earl et al. (2010) develop a more nuanced typology that identifies four major types of Internet activism: brochure-ware, online facilitation of offline action, online participation on online actions, and online organizing. Earl and Kimport (2011) clarify this concept to qualify internet activism as e-mobilizations, e-tactics, or e-movements.

E-mobilization.

E-mobilizations are either brochureware or online facilitation of online actions (Earl and Kimport 2011). Brochureware provides information to users with no opportunity to interact. Information is not time sensitive, and there are few costs to reach large audiences. Brochureware is associated with scale changes rather than model changes to social movement theory (Earl et al. 2010).

The online facilitation of offline actions is about information distribution, primarily about offline events (Earl et al. 2010). In this case, the Internet is used as a space for organizing. This refers to actions like coordinating ride shares for an offline event, or organizing an offline rally; the event occurs offline even though the Internet is used to facilitate the event. Scale related changes in social movement theory are most frequent, though Tarrow (1998) argued that there are no scale changes in online facilitation for offline actions.

E-tactics.

E-tactics involves participation in online protest actions (Earl and Kimport 2011). This includes online petitions, boycotts, email campaigns, letter writing campaigns, virtual sit-ins, virtual rallies, and demonstrations. Some examples of illegal and disruptive online protest actions include DDOS (distributed denial of service) attacks, similar in effect to “black faxes” (Earl 2006). In this type of action, participants engage in action while online (Earl et al. 2010). Model changes to social movement theory are more common; some argue that protestors are less likely to find group solidarity (Brunsting and Postmes 2002), or that slacktivism has increased. However, this research still relates

to scale related changes (Earl et al 2010).

E-movements.

In e-movements, all aspects of organizing and action occur online (Earl and Kimport 2011). There is no face to face coordination, no offline locations to act as a hub. This is the least studied type of action, and notable model changes are suggested with some scale related change noted as well (Earl et al 2010). An example of this type of action is the voter trading movement studied by Earl and Schussman (2004).

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY

This research is based on content analysis of data collected from gender and sexuality movement websites during February and March 2014. Using a qualitative methods approach, I analyzed 245 individual webpages found on fifty eight movement websites for examples of internet activism and evidence of reformative or transformative master frames. Building on existing research discussed in Chapters Two and Three, as well as principles of grounded theory, I developed an analytic framework in order to explore relationships between movement website master frames and internet activism. I used ATLAS.ti to assist with the organization and analysis of the data. In this chapter I outline my methodology and link my decisions to existing methodological literatures.

Research Question and Definition of Terms

My research asked: “What is the relationship between master framing of gender and sexuality movements and internet activism types?” The foundations for most of these conceptualizations are developed in Chapters Two and Three of this thesis, but definitions of terms are reviewed below.

Master Frames

While collective action frames refer to a single social movement’s articulation and conceptualization of its goals and objectives, master frames are more generic and can be adopted by multiple movements. Within the context of this thesis, I focused on transformative and reformative master frames.

Reformative master frame.

Reformative framing of goals and objectives seeks the reform of existing institutions within the context of existing, mainstream social norms. Effectiveness of reformative movements is often but not always measured in successful passing of legislation and victories in court. Structurally, organizations are often hierarchical in nature, employing a “top-down” leadership strategy. Reformative movements tend to have a greater focus on sexuality than gender, and are likely to conceptualize sex, gender, and sexuality as binary. Reformative movements are often associated with assimilation, or legitimation.

Transformative master frame.

Transformative frames are recognized by narratives that actively engage in transformative social change themes. Goals and objectives are radical and include language that calls for transformation of existing institutions from oppressive to empowering agents. Evaluation of transformative movements is difficult to quantify, as results are often associated with changes in social attitudes and institutions. Transformative movements are often democratic or collective in organizational structure, employing grassroots strategies. Transformative movements are often associated with liberation or revolution.

Gender and Sexuality Movements

Gender and sexuality movements are conceptualized in this study as social movements addressing injustices related to gender expression, gender identity, and sexual orientation. Frequently, high profile movements of this type are described as LGBT

movements, yet this description does not fully encompass the breadth of movement activity on this topic.

Movement Websites

Movement websites are websites associated with social movement activity and characterized by several qualities: advancing or advocating for gender and sexuality movements as central or primary to the purpose of the website. Movement websites are associated with a variety of organizational types, including offline professional social movement organizations and online only networks. Movement websites focused on in this study are categorized as reformative movement websites or transformative movement websites. Movement websites adopting a reformative master frame are defined as *reformative movement websites*, while movement websites adopting a transformative master frame are defined as *transformative movement websites*. Movement websites not clearly adopting either transformative or reformative master frames were categorized as *non-conforming* with respect to adoption of master frames examined in this study.

Internet and the World Wide Web

While the Internet and the World Wide Web (often simply referred to as the Web) are used interchangeably, they are different technologies (Pew Research Center 2014; Earl et al. 2010). The Internet refers to protocols that allow computer networks to communicate, while the Web allows people to easily access content hosted by other computers (Pew Research Center 2014). In this study I refer to the Internet when describing movement websites actually found on the Web, a practice consistent with how most people discuss these technologies (Pew Research Center 2014).

Internet Activism

Internet activism refers to movement actions taking place on the Web, and can take the form of e-movements, e-mobilizations, or e-tactics (Earl et al. 2010; Earl and Kimport 2011), Internet activism in this study specifically focuses on e-tactics and e-mobilizations.

E-tactics.

E-tactics refer to protest tactics that occur partially or entirely online (Earl and Kimport 2011:233). Examples of e-tactics include but are not limited to online petitions, online boycotts, and online letter writing and email campaigns.

E-mobilizations.

E-mobilizations refer to “the use of online tools to facilitate offline protest” (Earl and Kimport 2011:233). Examples of e-mobilizations include static informational content called brochureware (Earl et al. 2010) and Web-based coordination of protests, marches, or community building events (Earl and Kimport 2011).

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis in this research was the gender and sexuality movement website. Each case included content from multiple webpages found on each website in the sample. As defined here, gender and sexuality movement websites were associated with a variety of organization types. Like the work of Earl and Kimport (2011), this research focused on internet activism, and did not distinguish between devices used to access the Internet.

Description of Sample

The sample included a total of fifty eight movement websites. Of those fifty eight movement websites, 38% (n=22) were reformative movement websites and 41% (n=24) were transformative, while 21% (n=12) were not clearly identified as either transformative or reformative (Table 1).

Table 1. Master Frame of Movement Websites

<i>Master Frame</i>	<i>Cases (n)</i>	<i>Percent of Movement Websites</i>
Reformative	22	38%
Transformative	24	41%
Other	12	21%
Total	58	100%

While all websites were accessible to worldwide audiences by nature of being available on the Internet, 28% (n=16) were associated with national organizations, followed by the Northeast (24%, n=14) and Midwest (17%, n=10). Movement websites were also affiliated with organizations based in the South (7%, n=4) and the West (10%, n=6) with another 14% (n=8) either entirely online or based in regions unknown. Nearly all (95%, n=55) movement websites contained examples of e-mobilization, and 29% (n=17) engaged in e-tactics.

Organization Type

I examined content on each movement website related to membership, meeting and organizing policies, financial reports, and organizational description found on the website in order to identify organization type (Table 2).

Table 2. Movement Websites and Organization Type

<i>Organization Type</i>	<i>Percent of Movement Websites (n)</i>
Alliance, Activist, or Advocacy Organization	71% (41)
--Professional SMO	38% (22)
--Non-Professional SMO	16% (9)
--Education and/or Outreach	5% (3)
--Networks or Coalitions	5% (3)
--Entirely Online Operation	7% (4)
Community Services and Development	21% (12)
Event Website	9% (5)
Total	100% (58)

Alliance, activist or advocacy organizations accounted for nearly three quarters (71%, n=41) of all websites in the sample. These organizations were defined by a primary focus on advocacy, activism, or alliance building. Professional social movement organizations' (38%, n=22) websites were extensions of offline organizations, characterized by a traditional hierarchical organizational structure, emphasis on political advocacy strategies, and frequently employment of paid staff. Non-professional social movement organizations (16%, n=9) were movement websites associated with offline organizations based in direct action, consensus building, and non-hierarchical organizational structure. These included collectives, self-identified networks, and other similar organizational types.

Education or outreach websites (5%, n=3) were also associated with offline organizations, but were primarily concerned with knowledge production and dissemination through training and education. Networks and coalition websites (5%, n=3) served primarily to create connections between existing offline organizations. Some websites focusing on advocacy were based entirely online (7%, n=4). These websites had

no offline equivalent organization, and adopted structures associated with both professional and non-professional social movement organizations.

Community services and development websites (21%, n=12) were all associated with offline organizations. These advocacy and service provider websites were affiliated with organizations or community centers that actively provided services while engaging in advocacy. Event websites (9%, n=5) were often affiliated with offline organizations, but the actual website served primarily to facilitate or coordinate a major event (usually a conference).

Scope of Issues Addressed

Websites identified a variety of issues ranging in how frequently they appeared across and within cases in the sample. A total of forty distinct issues appeared across the sample, with an average of about six issues featured on each website. Only a few cases (7%, n=4) featured more than fifteen issues, while the majority (76%, n=44) featured fewer than ten issues. Generally, a few issues were frequently discussed across a large number of websites.

Youth issues were the most frequently discussed, appearing on nearly half of all cases (48%, n=28). Concerns for general safety (43%, n=25) and more specifically bullying (31%, n=18) and violence and assault (33%, n=19) were also discussed relatively frequently across the sample and within cases. Family issues related to adoption (31%, n=18) and same-sex marriage (38%, n=22) were also prevalent. Efforts to pass non-discrimination laws (34%, n=20) were also often emphasized. A third (33%) of all issues (n=16) appeared in less than ten percent of all cases, while just 16% (n=9) in

more than twenty percent of all cases. Examples of less frequently discussed issues across the sample include sex segregation of facilities (12%, n=7) social stigma (10%, n=6), and incarceration policies (10%, n=6).

Community Identification

Communities and individuals constituting gender and sexuality movements in this sample proudly identified a staggering number and diversity of community identification terms. Community identification terms were categorized as influenced by transformative or reformatory framing. Just six reformatory identity terms were referenced nearly *two and a half times* as frequently as more than twenty transformative identity terms. However, reformatory community identification terms were frequently combined with transformative terms, like when the Audre Lorde Project argued that “...Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Two Spirit, Trans and Gender Non Conforming (LGBTSTGNC) People of Color are everywhere” (Audre Lorde Project 2014). Reviewing identity labels in context is important.

The majority of websites (66%, n=48) did not focus on specific smaller communities within larger gender and sexuality movements. However some websites specifically identified particular groups, including websites with transgender (19%, n=11), lesbian (3%, n=2), bisexual (5%, n=3), intersex (3%, n=2), or asexual (3%, n=2) emphasis. Thirteen websites (22%) explicitly addressed persons or communities of color.

Injustice Framing

After identifying communities targeted by a movement website, I looked for instances of injustice framing, or themes used to describe struggles and injustices faced

by claims makers. Websites cited equality most frequently (59%, n=34), with rights (48%, n=28), intersecting oppression (45%, n=26), and need for legal protection (43%, n=25) following in prevalence. Issues were also framed in the context of empowerment (47%, n=27), social justice (36%, n=21) and discrimination (36%, n=21).

Sampling

I collected my sample in several stages. First, I performed Internet searches to generate a sample population of websites using search strings related to gender and sexuality movements. Second, I selected a sample of potential movement websites from that population by eliminating results from the sample using several criteria described in detail below. Next, I analyzed content from individual webpages found on potential movement websites that allowed me to identify a final sample of cases identified as movement websites adopting reformative or transformative master frames.

I identified a final sample of content from 245 pages found on fifty eight websites as a reasonable estimation of the range of content that a typical user online would encounter (Appendix A).

Generation of Sample Population

Attempting to randomly sample the entirety of the Internet for gender and sexuality movement websites was well beyond the scope of this research. Therefore, like Earl et al. (2010), I generated a population of “reachable” websites, or websites likely to be found by users using a search engine and not being provided with a uniform resource locator (URL), frequently called a web address (Earl and Kimport 2011).

I developed a series of search strings to identify websites that were likely to enable online protest actions affiliated with gender and sexuality movements. Each search string contained terms or phrases from one of three lists I developed after reviewing literature on gender and sexuality movements: identity, master frames, and advocacy and action. Terms in each list were not exclusive to either reformative or transformative framing, but were certainly more likely to be associated with one or the other.

I developed the first list of identity terms to ensure a variety of self-identification terms would be included in my results (Table 3).

Table 3. Identity Phrases in Population Search Queries

<i>Reformative Framing</i>	<i>Transformative Framing</i>
gay	queer
lesbian	genderqueer
bisexual	pansexual OR asexual
transgender	trans*

Whereas no list of community identifiers could be exhaustive, I selected terms and phrases most frequently encountered in the literature for my searches. In these searches I used transformative and reformative language to describe gender and sexuality identification.

I developed the second list of master frame terms to capture language relating to reformative and transformative master framing (Table 4). These terms and phrases included examples of framing language, tactics, goals and objectives of gender and sexuality movements.

Table 4. Injustice Framing in Population Search Queries

<i>Reformative Framing</i>	<i>Transformative Framing</i>
reformative	transformative
mainstream	radical
integration	liberation
equality	revolution
civil rights	oppression
nonprofit	intersectionality
hate crime legislation	grassroots
anti-discrimination legislation	collective
(same sex OR gay marriage) legislation	(systemic OR institutional) oppression

To reiterate: these terms and phrases are not mutually exclusive, but were chosen due to the frequency they appeared in transformative or reformative master framing of gender and sexuality movements.

The third fixed phrase in each search query was intended to produce results related to advocacy and activism, and included the following terms: education, activism, advocacy, campaign, mobilize, and organize. This fixed phrase was included to increase the likelihood of finding relevant websites with relatively low user traffic. When I first started this study, I developed another list of direct action terms to include in this third phrase: donation, survey, petition, protest, boycott, and letter-writing. However, due to the timing of protest events during the Sochi 2014 Winter Olympics, including direct action terms like “protest” overwhelmingly biased my results to media coverage of protest events rather than websites engaging in advocacy or activism. Since my research emphasis was not to examine a current event but instead a larger picture, I removed the second list of protest actions.

After developing distinct lists of identity, master frame, and advocacy and action

terms and phrases, I joined the three sets of terms and phrases using a variety of relational operators: one variable from the first list, one variable from the second list, and one fixed phrase joining the terms and phrases from the third list. I used four major operators to join these terms and phrases: AND, OR, INTEXT, and AROUND.

The AND and OR operators allowed me to designate whether a term was required or optional, respectfully. Google does not always include direct results from search queries (Google 2014); the INTEXT relational operator required the directly following term or phrase to be included within the text of the result. Finally, the AROUND relational operator allowed me to require that two terms were near each other within the text of the document. For example, the search string “intext:gay AND intext:(hate crime AROUND(3) legislation) AND intext:(education OR activism OR advocacy OR campaign OR mobilize OR organize)” returned relevant results related to hate crime advocacy for gay people with encouraging frequency. This strategy generated a total of 128 unique strings.

There are many search engines available, the most well-known including Google, Yahoo! and Bing. I selected Google to conduct the searches, the most frequently used search engine in the world (Alexa 2013). I conducted all searches on university computers rather than a personal device, since Google’s search algorithms consider user context (such as Web History) when returning results (Google 2014). University computer histories are purged daily of all user data, minimizing prior browsing bias in search results. I turned off “safe search” to prevent censoring or filtering of results not intended for all ages due to flagging for sexual content.

I recorded the first ten results for each unique search string, excluding all sponsored or highlighted results. I stopped at ten results because the first ten results account for 90% of all web traffic for a specific query (Chitika Online Advertising Network 2013). Using the Google Chrome browser (v. 33.0.1750.117 m) and the SEOquake extension (v. 1.0.18), I exported the first ten results of each query to individual .csv files, recording the query used to generate the results as well as the URL for each result. These 128 .csv files were then consolidated into one spreadsheet including 1280 results, my sample population.

Selection of Potential Movement Websites

After generating the sample population, I filtered the 1280 webpage results in three steps. I eliminated duplicate results and filtered redundant results to identify unique websites, then excluded website results that did not *clearly* meet criteria to be considered gender and sexuality movement websites. This resulted in the final collection of eighty four (n=84) potential movement websites.

Duplicate results were webpages that appeared in multiple searches, while redundant results were any more than one webpage found on any website. Of the initial 1280 results in the sample population, I identified 23% (n=296) as duplicate results, leaving a total of 984 unique *webpages*. Next, because my unit of analysis was the movement website and not its affiliated webpages, I filtered the results to identify unique *websites*. I removed 18% (n=232) results from the initial population that did not represent a unique website, leaving a total of 752 results representing unique websites.

The next phase was the most time intensive. Due to the sheer size of the data set,

it was beyond the scope of this research to include all content that could be considered relevant to this study. Each website included in the initial sample had to meet the following criteria to be further reviewed: 1) a primary focus on communities identified as part of gender and sexuality movements as defined in Chapter Two; 2) primary operations in the United States; and 3) must state a focus or engagement in at least one of the following strategies or tactics in relation to members of the communities described above: a) provide direct services; b) engage in advocacy; c) facilitate direct actions; or d) include “explicit claims making” (Earl:2010:436), specifically regarding gender and sexuality issues.

These criteria eliminated a wide variety of results that potentially included online activism and could be identified as embodying reformative or transformative movement framing (Table 5).

Table 5. Types of Results Excluded from Sample

<i>Type of Result</i>	<i>Cases (n)</i>
Community Developed Reference	117
International	87
Social Media	82
Academic Publication or Affiliation	73
Multi-Issue Focus or non-Gender and Sexuality Movement	60
Restricted Content	57
Media/Community - Gender and Sexuality	46
Miscellaneous	41
Media/Community - General	29
Professional Association/Networking	28
Oppositional Websites/Media	17
Irrelevant	17
Individual Author/Activist	12
Total Removed	666

I identified some common themes when exploring results, and made decisions to exclude results from the final sample that could be relevant in order to keep the scope of this study manageable. In this stage I removed 52% (n=666) of website results in the sample population. Community developed references were community developed encyclopedia or reference websites, such as Ask.com, or Infoplease; Wikipedia alone accounted for 92% (n=108) of the 117 results of this type that were excluded. They were excluded because with open contribution, there is no way to determine a collective identity or movement behind framing of content.

International websites were websites primarily serving international communities, accounting for eighty seven results excluded from the population sample. United Kingdom (n=24), Canada (n=19) and Australia (n=8) were the most frequently represented nations, with twenty regions and nations overall. International websites were not included because movement framing and tactics are distinctly tied to political climate and the focus of this study was gender and sexuality movements in the United States.

Due to the implications that social media has on research of online communities, websites in this sample could not be hosted in a format primarily considered social media (n=82). Social media includes blogs (n=40), Facebook pages (n=13), and Tumblr pages (n=11). Social media brings a new dimension to the study of social movements, a dimension that is beyond the scope of this study.

A total of seventy three results directly linking to academic content were also removed from the sample; this included academic publications (n=62), scholar websites (n=2), and university reference results not providing resources or services (n=9). While

scholarly works are certainly valuable to social movements, the production of content in the academy is not consistent with social movement framing processes and is not part of this study.

Restricted content was defined as content unavailable to the public without payment or membership. Of the fifty seven excluded results of this type, Google Books (n=22) and Amazon (n=18) appeared the most frequently.

Media and community websites were identified by an emphasis in reporting on and discussing current events. While many of these websites also included a community component, the primary focus was breaking stories. These websites were further defined by a primary focus on gender and sexuality issues (n=29) or a general coverage of all topics (n=46). Results of this type included mainstream media outlets (e.g. Fox, MSNBC, Huffington Post), alternative media outlets (e.g. AlterNet), and gender and sexuality media and community (e.g. The Advocate, AutoStraddle). Social movement actors do not often control how the media frames issues and events (Benford and Snow 2000), so websites of this type were not included in this study.

I struggled when identifying multi-issue or non-gender and sexuality movement websites (n=60). Multi-issue websites were defined as movement websites advocating for multiple causes, including gender and sexuality issues. To be included in the sample, gender and sexuality had to be a primary focus of the website. For example, a vegan feminist website mentioned sexuality in passing, but the overwhelming focus of its content was veganism and feminism; this result was not included. On the other hand, the American Civil Liberties Union included a full section of its website dedicated to LGBT

issues, and was included in the sample.

Several other excluded types of content were relatively less prevalent, but still substantial. Professional associations and networking websites leading to professional connections (n=28) were not included in this study. Given the search strings used to generate the sampling population, I anticipated some oppositional results, but only seventeen websites opposed gender and sexuality movement activities, mostly in the form of religious websites and communities. Individual authors, activists and speakers (n=12) were excluded from the sample because I wanted to focus on collective actions of organizations, networks or collectives. Some results were completely irrelevant to gender and sexuality movements (n=17); most of these were related to action against the Trans Pacific Partnership. Another forty one results were excluded for a variety of miscellaneous reasons; this included government websites (n=5), broken links (n=4), marketing and consulting firms (n=7) and more.

This process of carefully identifying appropriate website results reduced the sample from 752 unique websites to a sample size of eighty four potential movement websites. I needed to examine these potential movement websites more carefully to determine whether or not they mobilized populations for action, a clear requirement for social movement websites.

Collecting Data from Websites

The next stage of sampling involved the collection of textual content from individual webpages on the eighty four potential movement websites. Whenever possible, I included content explicitly identifying the values, mission, goals and objectives of a

website (e.g. “About Us”). I also included statements and positions on all major topic areas explicitly identified as important to the website (i.e. legalizing same-sex marriage or advocating for changes in administrative policies involving gendered spaces). Each of the eighty four websites in the sample contained content from at least one webpage on the website, and in some cases I included up to twelve webpages if content met the criteria listed above.

After identifying the webpages relevant to the sample of eighty four potential movement websites, I created text documents (.rtf) incorporating the content found on the sample webpages recorded and included the URL. I initially intended to code images for representations of persons involved with movements. However, I decided not to after finding only a small number of websites in the sample presented images in relevant content sections (mission, values, goals and objectives, etc).

I created a separate document for content from each distinct website; content from multiple webpages on the same website were included within one document. Framing language was more important than preserving the layout of each website, so only content was imported. Each unique website’s content was imported as a primary document in ATLAS.ti (v. 7.1).

Identification of Movement Websites

Many websites were included in the original sample due to statements surrounding advocacy and education. For example, “support services, resources, programs, advocacy, training, education and consultation are provided” to members of the NYU community (NYU LGBTQ Student Center 2014). After analysis, I further

refined the websites sample to only include movement websites. Movement websites clearly articulated a goal of social change through mobilization and collective action of claims makers as the primary function of the website or organization directly affiliated with the website. Websites identified as non-movement websites often engaged in some movement activities, and certainly contribute to the advancement of gender and sexuality movements. However, when identified by primary focus, these were eliminated from consideration as movement websites.

Excluded community center and service provider websites (n=3) were associated with a specific community center, serving an identified regional area by providing community support and development. Service provider websites emphasized delivery of services to a population, and could either be associated with a physical location or nationally focused. Functions of websites within these categories were not mutually exclusive, as community centers frequently provided services. While community development is a key element of social movements, excluded websites included advocacy and mobilization as *secondary* goals of providing services.

Funding providers (n=5) and research institutes (n=2) did not directly contribute to mobilization of claims makers, though they did support organizations that did so. University websites (n=11) not considered movement websites were similar to community centers and service providers websites in that they provided services and contributed to community development. However, they differed as they were extensions of university organizations that emphasized students, staff, and faculty within distinct university communities. University websites were service providers (n=5), student

programs (n=3), or university offices (n=3). University offices tended to focus on university-wide goals and objectives surrounding diversity and inclusion. Student centers and programs provided social and educational programming, built a sense of community, and improved campus experiences for people of all sexual orientations, gender presentation, and gender identities.

This stage of sampling reduced the pool of eighty four (n=84) potential movement websites to fifty eight (n=58) movement websites.

Identification of Transformative and Reformative Movement Websites

Social movements are messy; unsurprisingly, the data on framing of social movement websites is messy. While many websites in the sample adopted either transformative or reformative master frames, some websites were not clearly in either category due to either insufficient framing examples or inconsistencies between tactics and framing. In this study I describe these as non-conforming frames, and non-conforming websites accounted for 21% (n=12) of all movement websites (Table 6).

Table 6. Non-Conforming Framing of Movement Websites by Organizational Type

<i>Organization Type</i>	<i>Percent of Type Adopting Non-Conforming Frame (n)</i>
Alliance, Activist, or Advocacy Organization	17% (7)
--Professional SMO	14% (3)
--Non-Professional SMO	0% (0)
--Education and/or Outreach	66% (2)
--Networks or Coalitions	33% (1)
--Entirely Online Operation	25% (1)
Community Services/Development	42% (5)
Event Website	0% (0)
Total	100% (12)

These non-conforming frame websites were more likely to be found on community services and development websites instead of alliance, activist or advocacy organizations. Social movement organizations of any type were very unlikely (10%, n=3) to use framing identified as non-conforming; they consistently presented unified messaging throughout website content. Similarly, websites focusing on a single event were all identified as either reformative or transformative.

Coding and Analysis

I coded each primary document for framing language using ATLAS.ti. Since I was interested in how movements frame themselves, I only coded content developed (or presented as developed) by the movement websites. Throughout the coding process I maintained a project journal, recording difficulties, successes, limitations and working theoretical frameworks. Using the memo feature in ATLAS.ti, I maintained individual history logs for each case, outlining coding progress and notes specific to each website in my sample. I diligently updated code descriptions as I developed concepts more completely.

Before I began coding, I had a general idea that I would be interested in language relating to community identification, attitudes toward issues, goals, and objectives. However, I wanted to use a grounded theory approach and allow the data to shape my conceptualizations of transformative and reformative framing found on these websites (Charmaz 2006). I began using a line-by-line open coding approach, and as new themes emerged I reviewed the data with a more focused coding approach. I frequently coded in

vivo, particularly when identifying language commonly used to frame motivations for engaging in certain strategies, goals, and objectives (see Charmaz 2006 for further discussion on coding processes).

Open Coding

Movement framing.

I developed a variety of codes, ranging from advocacy issues (e.g. same-sex marriage, dismantling racist institutions) to framing language used to describe people's attitudes (e.g. issues of right and wrong, hope for the future).

After discovering that certain terms repeatedly appeared, I used the auto-coding feature in ATLAS.ti to quickly identify and code in vivo community identification terms (e.g. gay, queer, transgender, etc.) and specific phrases and terms related to framing of issues and attitudes (e.g. equality, fairness, liberation, etc.). After coding all or part of about one quarter of my sample I switched to coding complete sentences for content. The only exception to this approach was when coding for community identification terms, which were always coded in vivo, or as a direct quote (Charmaz 2006).

Internet activism.

My initial coding processes were different when looking for instances of internet activism. Instead of coding content already collected and imported into my ATLAS.ti project, I explored each movement website in depth, going well beyond the previously sampled webpages selected for identification of master frame. When I found an opportunity to engage in internet activism, I copied and recorded the URL in the text of the document for that website in ATLAS.ti, coding the URL text for type of internet

activism. I used a primarily open coding approach, loosely defining “activism” during this stage, identifying all instances of online engagement I could find on each website.

I coded for opportunities for users to engage in online protest, activism, or advocacy, but I was more interested in the variety of types of internet activism found on each website than the frequency of those actions. For example, if one website included links to five online petitions, I coded that website for “online petition.”

Focused Coding

Movement framing.

After I coded all websites for at least some or all content, I analyzed the codes to identify emerging themes. I identified several major themes in the codes I developed: community identification, organizational type, scope of issues emphasized, and examples of injustice framing. Community identification identified persons affected by or affecting advocacy. Organizational type referred to the type of organization associated with the website (elaborated on in Description of Sample). Scope of issues emphasized codes described the issues that were relevant to the movement’s goals and objectives. Injustice framing described framing of attitudes, tactics, goals, objectives, and identifying language used to frame the issue at hand in a way that explained motivation behind actions and evoked certain responses, such as hope or anger. While grouping codes by these categories, I also identified subcategories informed by the review of the literature and related specifically to transformative and reformative movement framing.

Internet activism.

After one round of coding, I started grouping similar actions into categories that

more closely resembled e-mobilizations and e-tactics as described in Chapter Three (Earl et. al 2010; Earl and Kimport 2011). For example, the specific terms associated with the use of surveys were put into the larger category of e-tactics, while I described lists of information as brochureware. This yielded similar categories to Earl and Kimport (2011) but allowed for some flexibility to analyze this data in a more detailed way and potentially identify other trends.

Limitations

When coding for internet activism and specific instances of online protest actions, I used a binary coding approach: either an action was present or it was not. Although not analyzed in this work, I observed a great range of prevalence of Internet activism types, with some websites hosting more than ten while others hosted a single action.

CHAPTER FIVE: MASTER FRAMING AND ONLINE ACTIVISM

In this chapter, I identify and compare types of online activism used on transformative and reformative gender and sexuality movement websites. In the first section, I show how issues, community identification, injustice framing and organizational type demonstrate a transformative or reformative master frame. I also present my findings on prevalence of internet activism found on each site, including examples of brochureware, online facilitation of offline actions, and online protest actions.

In the second section, I discuss relationships between transformative or reformative movement framing and online activism. Reformative movements were more likely to utilize e-tactics while both equally used e-mobilizations.

The Landscape of Transformative Movement Websites

Movement websites adopting a transformative frame included cases with primarily transformative attitudes towards community identification, motivational framing language, tactics, and organizational structure. For example, the Chicago Dyke March Collective described itself as:

...a grassroots mobilization and celebration of dyke, queer, bisexual, and transgender resilience. It is an anti-racist, anti-violent, volunteer-led, grassroots effort with a goal to bridge together communities across race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, age, size, gender identity, gender expression, sexuality, culture, immigrant status, spirituality, and ability. We challenge fatphobia and are body positive (Chicago Dyke March Collective 2014).

The Chicago Dyke March Collective clearly embraced transformative community identification (dyke, queer), injustice framing (anti-racist, anti-violent), tactics (grassroots, all volunteer), and structure (collective).

Organizational Structure

Transformative movement websites frequently signaled non-hierarchical organizational structures. The Silvia Rivera Law Project argued that the “working environment of an organization shapes the work, and for this reason we strive to create an environment that is non-hierarchical in structure and operates by consensus” (2014). The movements in this study often sought to avoid hierarchical organizational structures, relying on collectives, consensus, and involving all members of the community.

Transformative websites also utilized tactics and strategies more frequently associated with direct action and grassroots movements, such as decentralized campaigns. The Lesbian Avengers (2014) described a 1993-1994 Lesbian Avengers Civil Rights Organizing Project (LACROP) campaign against an anti-gay ballot initiative in Idaho where grassroots activist tactics led to far more success than mainstream, centralized advocacy. According to the Lesbian Avengers (2014), in 1993, “queers” were divided on strategy to defeat the measure, demonstrating the fundamental differences in tactical approaches by transformative and reformative movements.

Scope of Issues Addressed

The most frequently discussed issues by transformative movement websites were youth issues, preventing violence and assault, and dismantling the prison industrial complex. Health care access and quality, safer environments, and non-discrimination

policies and laws were followed by police accountability, homelessness, and same-sex marriage in frequency co-occurrence.

Community Identification

Transformative movement websites frequently encouraged communities and individuals to challenge existing perceptions of gender, sex, and sexuality. These movements also tended to emphasize communities that acknowledge and affirm counterhegemonic identities. GenderQueer Revolution notes:

Our stories tell us that genderqueer and gender non-conforming people need a safe haven, a uniquely genderqueer, gender-defying, gender-gifted, gender non-conforming, non-binary space. ... Beyond Labels. Beyond Gender. Beyond Arbitrary Distinctions and Divisions... (2014).

Transformative framing of community identity frequently did not attempt to list every imaginable identity term. For example, the Fargo Moorhead Pride Collective & Community Center did “[not try] to create the sense of inclusion by assigning everyone a letter” (2014), focusing instead on developing inclusive programming for all persons regardless of identity.

Injustice Framing

Transformative injustice framing emphasized intersecting oppression more than twice as frequently as the next most frequent theme. Social justice, economic justice, and racial justice were all prominently discussed, followed closely by transphobic behavior in society and the intersections and criminalization of identity. Transformative movement websites often explicitly recognized the limitations of single-issue politics, arguing that,

We will need to reject a narrow "gay rights only" approach to winning justice, and instead make common cause with all people, gay and non-gay, who face discrimination and attacks. ... **In short, only by supporting the**

justice struggles of "other" movements, can we expect and deserve support from non-LGBTQs (Gay Liberation Network 2014, emphasis original).

Transformative movement websites were most strongly associated with issues surrounding the prison industrial complex and economic inequality. Unemployment, sexual assault and partner violence, and law enforcement accountability were also emphasized. Homelessness, incarceration policies, and sex-segregation are among other issues that were more likely to be linked to transformative movement websites instead of reformative movement websites.

Reformative Movement Websites

Movement websites adopting a reformative frame tended to utilize certain definitions of community identification and injustice framing related to assimilation and legitimization philosophies. For example, Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders argue that,

Civil rights have never been easy to win. Fighting for them takes passion, skill and an absolute determination to prevail. That's what GLAD delivers every single day. GLAD's bold and effective advocacy has achieved scores of precedent-setting legal victories to end discrimination based on sexual orientation, HIV status and gender identity and expression, benefiting individuals, couples and families across New England and throughout the United States. Whether it's [sic] marriage for same-sex couples, non-discrimination policies for transgender people in the workplace, or protections for people with HIV, GLAD doesn't shrink from tough issues. And we don't compromise on our belief that every citizen deserves full equality under the law – without exception (Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders 2014).

GLAD clearly embraces reformative framing of issues (same sex marriage), injustice

framing (protections under the law, equality, civil rights framing), and tactics (litigation to gain protected status).

Organizational Structure

Reformative movements tend to be professional movement organizations; 73% (n=16) of professional movement websites were found to have adopted a reformative master frame. These movements tended to defer to members with status as “people who are considered national experts in their respective areas of work” (Equality Michigan 2014). Litigation and influencing legislation were key strategies in reformative movement websites.

Scope of Issues Addressed

Same sex marriages and youth issues were by far the most dominantly discussed issues linked to reformative movement websites. Also strongly linked to reformative movement websites were issues surrounding adoption and parenting issues, workplace benefits and discrimination, healthcare access, safety issues, and non-discrimination laws. Reformative framing language was also associated with bullying, hate crimes legislation, immigration and citizenship issues, though not as strongly as aforementioned issues.

Community Identification

It was not uncommon for reformative websites to describe their goals as inclusive, while not addressing or acknowledging anyone identifying outside of binary gender and sexuality constructs. For example, Fair Wisconsin “envisions a fair, safe, and inclusive society in which lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people are treated with dignity and respect” (2014).

By far, the issue most frequently associated with any community identification was same-sex marriage. Reformative identification was more than fifty times more likely than transformative identification to be linked to same-sex marriage discussion. Adoption and family issues, immigration and citizenship, and non-discrimination laws and policies were also strongly associated with reformative community identification. Military service, housing access, HIV and AIDS issues, bullying, and aging communities were also more likely to be associated with reformative framing than transformative framing.

Injustice Framing

Reformative injustice framing overwhelmingly emphasized a rights framing of issues, focusing on notions of achieving equality and protection under the law. Ideas of fairness, respect and being included as part of society were also prominently discussed, followed closely by the importance of swaying public opinion and notions of reforming existing society. Rights framing was by far the most dominant injustice framing. Equality was also prominently discussed. Campaign for Southern Equality “believe[s] that federal equality is the most efficient and effective pathway to equality for LGBT people in the South” (2014).

Prevalence of Internet Activism Types

E-mobilizations in the form of brochureware (93%, n=54) and online facilitation of offline action (95%, n=55) was very frequently found across all gender and sexuality movement websites, with nearly all of movement websites containing at least one example of each (Table 7). E-tactics (online protest actions) (29%, n=17) were also

frequently found.

Table 7. Internet Activism in Movement Websites

<i>Internet Activism Type</i>	<i>Percent of Movement Websites (n)</i>
Brochureware	93% (54)
Online Facilitation of Offline Action	95% (55)
Online Protest Actions	29% (17)

Each of these types of online activism is further elaborated on in the following sections.

Brochureware

Brochureware included static content found on websites that, while important to movement activities, did not require or result in active participation by a website user (Table 8).

Table 8. Examples of Brochureware (E-Mobilization)

<i>Example of Brochureware</i>	<i>Percent of Movement Websites (n)</i>
passive informational media	78% (45)
archived past events	40% (23)
contact information for networking	36% (21)
distributable materials/manuals	36% (21)
contact information for services	34% (20)
official statements/content	33% (19)
interactive informational media	14% (8)

Passive informational media was the most frequently found type of brochureware (78%, n=45) and described content intended to educate, mobilize, or inspire potential or current movement participants. Distributable materials and manuals (36%, n=21) referred to content produced in a way that was intended and encouraged to be reproduced and shared; however, because the website did not *facilitate* reproduction, the distributable content itself was considered brochureware. Press releases and official statements (33%,

n=19) were specifically prepared for media. Contact information for services (33%, n=19) and organizations (36%, n=21) were frequently featured on movement websites, and provided resources to persons or groups interested in movement activities or services for certain communities. Interactive informational media (14%, n=8) did involve user participation, but only to retrieve the information.

Online Facilitation of Offline Actions

Making a donation to a movement website (83%, n=48) was by far the most common example of online facilitation of offline actions (Table 9).

Table 9. Examples of Online Facilitation of Offline Actions (E-Mobilizations)

<i>Example of Online Facilitation of Offline Action</i>	<i>Percent of Movement Websites (n)</i>
make a donation	83% (48)
promoting an event	66% (38)
online coordination/facilitate offline event	29% (17)
shop/make a purchase	26% (15)
online contact/facilitate offline event	24% (14)
contact elected officials	12% (7)
enable user to promote an event	9% (5)
register for an event	9% (5)
register to vote	7% (4)

Promoting an event (66%, n=38) referred to using the website to advertise or facilitate participation in an upcoming event. This differed from contacting the website to coordinate an offline event (24%, n=14) and coordinating offline events using the website (26%, n=15), the former requiring interested parties to merely contact the website while the latter referred to actual coordination of events (such as venue scheduling, speaker request forms, etc).

Online Protest Actions

I specifically paid attention to examples of online protest actions of letter writing campaigns, petitions, and boycotts, as described by Earl et al. (2010; Earl and Kimport 2011) (Table 10).

Table 10. Examples of Online Protest Actions (E-Tactics)

<i>Example of Online Protest Action</i>	<i>Percent of Movement Websites (n)</i>
user generated content to build movement	19% (11)
letter writing/email campaign	17% (10)
sign a petition	7% (4)
sign a pledge	7% (4)
boycott products	5% (3)
take a survey	5% (3)
contact elected official	3% (2)
send an e-card	3% (2)

User generated content (19%, n=11) referred to opportunities for the user to contribute content in order to build community or camaraderie; this included user submissions of stories for sharing on the website. Letter writing and email campaigns (17%, n=10) referred to opportunities to send a letter or email to a person in order to influence that person's decisions (usually a congressperson). Signing a petition (7%, n=4) and signing a pledge (7%, n=4) indicated user support for a particular issue and did not appear frequently in the sample.

Movement Framing and Internet Activism

Framing and Internet Activism

Every reformative website contained some instance of brochureware (100%, n=22) and online facilitation of offline action (100%, n=22) (Table 11).

Table 11. Master Frame and Internet Activism

<i>Internet Activism Type</i>	<i>Percent Reformative (n)</i>	<i>Percent Transformative (n)</i>
Brochureware	100% (22)	92% (22)
Offline Facilitation of Online Action	100% (22)	96% (23)
Online Protest Actions	50% (11)	8% (2)

Most transformative websites contained brochureware (92%, n=22) and online facilitation of offline action (96%, n=23). However 50% (n=11) of all reformative websites, compared to only 8% (n=2) of transformative websites, offered opportunities to engage in online protest actions.

Framing and Online Protest Actions

Reformative movement websites were more likely to engage in all types of online protest actions than transformative movement websites (Table 12).

Table 12. Master Frame and Online Protest Actions

<i>Online Protest Action Type</i>	<i>Percent Reformative (n)</i>	<i>Percent Transformative (n)</i>
Boycott	9% (2)	0% (0)
Email/Letter Writing Campaign	41% (9)	4% (1)
Sign a Petition	14% (3)	0% (0)

The most pronounced difference between reformative and transformative movement websites was in the case of email and letter writing campaigns; 41% (n=9) of all reformative movement websites compared to only 4% (n=1) of transformative movement websites linked to or hosted email or letter writing campaigns. Reformative movement websites also hosted or linked to petitions (14%, n=3) and boycotts (9%, n=2), while transformative movements did not host these actions at all.

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

Opportunities to engage in Internet activism were related to adoption of reformative or transformative master frames. Reformative movement websites were more likely to engage in online protest actions than transformative movement websites. This trend was most clearly seen in the specific example of email and letter writing campaigns. Professional social movement organization websites were most likely to engage in online protest actions; most professional social movement organizations websites were found to facilitate reformative master framing.

Master Frame and Internet Activism

A review of the literature suggested that framing of movements influences social movement repertoires, though no direct studies of the relationships between master framing and internet activism or online protest actions were found. My findings were consistent with literature examining how certain *offline* tactics such as petitions, letter writing campaigns, and boycotts were frequently found in reformative movements. It follows that the online equivalents of such actions were also associated with reformative framing.

Targets of most letter writing or email campaign were political figures, such as congresspersons or state senators. Given that appeal to political advocacy is often associated with reformative movements, it was unsurprising that a majority of opportunities to participate in letter writing and email campaigns were found on

reformative movement websites. While this trend is not as pronounced with petitions, it still follows. Human Rights Campaign was the only case to contain all three online protest actions (boycott, petition, and letter writing/email campaign).

Organization Type and Internet Activism

Organizational type was related to master frame of a movement website; this is consistent with findings indicating the likelihood of reformative movements to develop professional social movement organizations. Professional SMOs were overwhelmingly the most likely of all movement websites to participate in online protest actions (59%, n=13), particularly when considering email or letter writing campaigns (36%, n=8). In comparison, non-professional movement organizations did not participate in any online protest actions.

Unsurprisingly, websites focusing on a single event emphasized facilitation of offline events (100%, n=5) and availability of general information in the form of brochureware (100%, n=5) rather than engaging in online protest action or facilitation of online activism (0%, n=0); the primary function of these websites was to facilitate offline action.

Future Research Opportunities

Social Media

Social media is an inherently different use of the Web, and interest in social media has produced substantial research. Movement websites in the sample utilized a variety of social media *connections* to develop media, social connections, and community

(Table 13).

Table 13. Selected Examples of Social Media

<i>Example of Social Media</i>	<i>Percent of Cases (n)</i>	<i>% Cases</i>
Facebook	84% (49)	84%
Twitter	74% (43)	74%
Blogs (all)	53% (31)	53%
<i>Blog Hosted by Organization</i>	<i>48% (28)</i>	<i>48%</i>
<i>Tumblr</i>	<i>14% (8)</i>	<i>14%</i>
<i>Blogspot</i>	<i>3% (2)</i>	<i>3%</i>
<i>Wordpress</i>	<i>2% (1)</i>	<i>2%</i>
Share via Social Media (any)	47% (27)	47%
YouTube	31% (18)	31%

Facebook (84%, n=49) and Twitter (74%, n=43) were the most frequent links to social networking services. Blogs (53%, n=31) were also often found on movement websites, including third party blog services like Tumblr (14%, n=8) and Blogspot (3%, n=2) and blogs hosted by the organization (48%, n=28). Some websites linked to more than one blog service. Nearly half (47%, n=27) of all movement websites contained a link to share content via social media, and another 31% (n=18) websites linked to YouTube channels.

Transformative movement websites included fewer direct links to different social media profiles and services (mean=3.6) than reformative movement websites (mean=4.6). Reformative websites were much more likely (73%, n=16) to host or link to a blog than transformative websites (33%, n=8). This trend continued when comparing reformative (55%, n=12) and transformative (25%, n=6) links to YouTube channels. In general, reformative websites were anywhere from slightly more to substantially more likely to link to social media.

However, this study did not include *standalone* social media such as Tumblr profiles with multiple authors not affiliated with a formal SMO, or Facebook groups used as the primary facilitator of specific protest actions; Andrews and Edwards (2008) also suggest studying these types of non-traditional websites associated with social movement activity. This study only included *links* to social media by movement websites. Further research could compare social media websites affiliated with movement websites with standalone social media websites (such as Facebook activist groups linking to other Facebook users and groups). Use of social media to engage in online protest actions (for example, Facebook petitions) could also be an interesting opportunity to explore in future research.

Scope of Issues Addressed and Online Protest Actions

Given that many issues found in this study were likely to be associated with either transformative or reformative movements, future research could examine differences in implementation of certain types of internet activism and instances of online protest actions when compared to specific advocacy issues. It would be interesting to see if issues more likely to be associated with reformative movements – such as same-sex marriage and non-discrimination laws - are more or less likely to be associated with certain types of internet activism or online protest actions; the same question could be posed for issues more likely associated with transformative movements, such as abolition of the prison industrial complex and reform of identity documentation laws. Such analyses could cross boundaries defined by type of movement website.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION

This study explores reformative and transformative gender and sexuality movements and their use of the Internet to engage in what previous research (Earl and Kimport 2011) has identified as e-mobilizations and e-tactics.. Reformative movements are more likely to engage in online protest actions of petitions, boycotts, and email and letter writing campaigns. This is likely due to the nature of petitions, boycotts, and email letter writing campaigns as appeals to reform existing institutions of power. Reformative and transformative movements were both likely to participate in e-mobilizations such as brochureware and online facilitation of offline actions. Future research could explore the likelihood of transformative movements being more likely to engage in community development using social media technologies as such technologies continue to grow more prevalent across the globe.

This research built on Earl and Kimport's (2011) assertion that social movement theory does indeed change when considering the role of the Internet in action repertoire. By further exploring the ways in which particular social movement factions may utilize different e-tactics based upon adoption of specific master frames, this study provides insight into intra-movement dynamics. Though this study only examined gender and sexuality movements, the decision to examine master frames instead of collection action frames specific to gender and sexuality movements was intentional; hopefully the findings of this study may be compared to future similar studies of different movements.

Methodologically, this study explored the ways Internet content can be sampled when it is not possible to attempt a representative sample; the tiered sampling procedures developed in this study can be honed in interesting ways to cater to future research in specific topics related to this study. The process of developing a sampling population using combinations of search terms to develop can be refined to generate innumerable possibilities.

REFERENCES

Review of the Literature

- Adams, Josh, and Vincent J. Roscigno. 2005. "White Supremacists, Oppositional Culture and the World Wide Web." *Social Forces* 84(2):759–78.
- Albrecht, Steffen. 2006. "Whose Voice Is Heard in Online Deliberation?: A Study of Participation and Representation in Political Debates on the Internet." *Information, Communication & Society* 9(1):62–82.
- Alexander, Bryan. 2008. "Web 2.0 and Emergent Multiliteracies." *Theory Into Practice* 47(2):150–60.
- Anduiza, Eva, Marta Cantijoch, and Aina Gallego. 2009. "Political Participation and the Internet." *Information, Communication & Society* 12(6):860–78.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth A., and Suzanna M. Crage. 2006. "Movements and Memory: The Making of the Stonewall Myth." *American Sociological Review* 71(5):724–51.
- Ault, Amber. 1996. "Ambiguous Identity in an Unambiguous Sex/Gender Structure: The Case of Bisexual Women." *The Sociological Quarterly* 37(3):449–63.
- Ayres, Jeffrey M. 1999. "From the Streets to the Internet: The Cyber-Diffusion of Contention." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 566(1):132–43.

- Balch, Robert W., and David Taylor. 1978. "Seekers and Saucers: The Role of the Cultic Milieu in Joining a UFO Cult." Pp. 43-65 in *Conversion Careers*, edited by J. Richardson. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Benford, Robert D. 1993. "Frame Disputes within the Nuclear Disarmament Movement." *Social Forces* 71(3):677-701.
- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611-39.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1970. "A Socio-Linguistic Approach to Socialization." in *Directions in Socio-Linguistics*, edited by J. Gumperz and D. Hymes. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Bernstein, Mary. 2003. "Nothing Ventured, Nothing Gained? Conceptualizing Social Movement 'Success' in the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *Sociological Perspectives* 46(3):353-79.
- Brunsting, S., and T. Postmes. 2002. "Social Movement Participation in the Digital Age: Predicting Offline and Online Collective Action." *Small Group Research* 33(5):525-54.
- Buechler, Steven M. 1995. "New Social Movement Theories." *The Sociological Quarterly* 36(3):441-64.
- Buechler, Steven M. 2011. *Understanding Social Movements: Theories from the Classical Era to the Present*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

- Carroll, William K., and R. S. Ratner. 1996. "Master Framing and Cross-Movement Networking in Contemporary Social Movements." *The Sociological Quarterly* 37(4):601–25.
- Castells, Manuel. 1996. *Rise of the Network Society*. 1st ed. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chen, Chien-Hsun, Chuen-Tsai Sun, and Jilung Hsieh. 2008. "Player Guild Dynamics and Evolution in Massively Multiplayer Online Games." *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 11(3):293–301.
- Chitika Online Advertising Network. 2013. "The Value of Google Result Position." Retrieved April 3, 2014 (<http://chitika.com/google-positioning-value>).
- Earl, Jennifer. 2006. "Pursuing Social Change Online: The Use of Four Protest Tactics on the Internet." *Social Science Computer Review* 24(3):362–77.
- Earl, Jennifer, and Katrina Kimport. 2011. *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Earl, Jennifer, Katrina Kimport, Greg Prieto, Carly Rush, and Kimberly Reynoso. 2010. "Changing the World One Webpage at a Time: Conceptualizing and Explaining Internet Activism." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 15(4):425–46.
- Edelman, Marc. 2001. "Social Movements: Changing Paradigms and Forms of Politics." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30:285–317.

- Ellingson, S. 1995. "Understanding the Dialectic of Discourse and Collective Action: Public Debate and Rioting in Antebellum Cincinnati." *American Journal of Sociology* 101:100–144.
- Evans, J. H. 1997. "Multi-Organizational Fields and Social Movement Organization Frame Content: The Religious Pro-Choice Movement." *Sociological Inquiry* 67:451–69.
- Gamson, Joshua. 1995a. "Must Identity Movements Self-Destruct? A Queer Dilemma." *Social Problems* 42(3):390–407.
- Gamson, W. A. 1995b. "Constructing Social Protest." Pp. 85–106 in *Social Movements and Culture*, edited by H. Johnston and B. Klandermans. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gerhards, J., and D. Rucht. 1992. "Mesomobilization: Organizing and Framing in Two Protest Campaigns in West Germany." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:555–95.
- Google. 2014. "Algorithms – Inside Search." Retrieved March 31, 2014a (<https://www.google.com/insidesearch/howsearchworks/algorithms.html>).
- Haines, Herbert H. 1996. *Against Capital Punishment: The Anti-Death Penalty Movement in America, 1972-1994*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Han, Sam. 2010. "Theorizing New Media: Reflexivity, Knowledge, and the Web 2.0." *Sociological Inquiry* 80(2):200–213.

- Handsfield, Lara J., Tami R. Dean, and Kirstin M. Cielocha. 2009. "Becoming Critical Consumers and Producers of Text: Teaching Literacy with Web 1.0 and Web 2.0." *The Reading Teacher* 63(1):40–50.
- Juris, Jeffrey S. 2012. "Reflections on #Occupy Everywhere: Social Media, Public Space, and Emerging Logics of Aggregation: Reflections on #Occupy Everywhere." *American Ethnologist* 39(2):259–79.
- Klandermans, B., M. de Weerd, J. M. Sabucedo, and M. Costa. 1999. "Injustice and Adversarial Frames in a Supranational Political Context: Farmers' Protest in the Netherlands and Spain." Pp. 134–47 in *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*, edited by Donatella della Porta, H. Kriesi, and D. Rucht. London, UK: MacMillan.
- Klandermans, Bert. 1984. "Mobilization and Participation: Social-Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory." *American Sociological Review* 49(5):583–600.
- Kreimer, Seth F. 2001. "Technologies of Protest: Insurgent Social Movements and the First Amendment in the Era of the Internet." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 150(1):119.
- Kulick, Don. 2000. "Gay and Lesbian Language." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29:243–85.
- Locher, David A. 2002. *Collective Behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Manovich, Lev. 2009. "The Practice of Everyday (media) Life: From Mass Consumption to Mass Cultural Production?" *Critical Inquiry* 35(2):319–31.

- Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs and Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Mertus, Julie. 2007. "The Rejection of Human Rights Framings: The Case of LGBT Advocacy in the US." *Human Rights Quarterly* 29(4):1036–64.
- Minkoff, Debra, Silke Aisenbrey, and Jon Agnone. 2008. "Organizational Diversity in the U.S. Advocacy Sector." *Social Problems* 55(4):525–48.
- Nava, Michael, and Robert Dawidoff. 1994. *Created Equal: Why Gay Rights Matter in America*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Pew Research Center. 2014. "The Web at 25 in the U.S." Retrieved April 20, 2014 (<http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/02/27/summary-of-findings-3/>).
- Rubin, Jeffrey W. 2004. "Meanings and Mobilizations: A Cultural Politics Approach to Social Movements and States." *Latin American Research Review* 39(3):106–42.
- Salah Fahmi, W. 2009. "Bloggers' Street Movement and the Right to the City. (Re)claiming Cairo's Real and Virtual 'Spaces of Freedom.'" *Environment and Urbanization* 21(1):89–107.
- Schussman, Alan, and Jennifer Earl. 2004. "From Barricades to Firewalls? Strategic Voting and Social Movement Leadership in the Internet Age." *Sociological Inquiry* 74(4):439–63.
- Seidman, Steven. 1994. "Queer-Ing Sociology, Sociologizing Queer Theory: An Introduction." *Sociological Theory* 12(2):166.

- Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization." *International Social Movement Research* 1(1):197–217.
- Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford. 1992. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest." Pp. 133–55 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Snow, David A., and Doug McAdam. 2000. "Identity Work Processes in the Context of Social Movements: Clarifying the Identity/Movement Nexus." in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by Sheldon Stryker, Timothy J. Owens, and Robert W. White. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4):464.
- Spade, Dean. 2011. *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law*. Brooklyn, NY: South End Press.
- Subrahmanam, K., and P. Greenfield. 2008. "Online Communication and Adolescent Relationships." *Future Child* 18(1):119–46.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 2004. *Social Movements, 1768-2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Touraine, Alain. 1988. *Return of the Actor: Social Theory in Postindustrial Society*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Vaid, Urvashi. 1994. *Virtual Equality: The Mainstreaming of Gay & Lesbian Liberation*.
New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Valocchi, Steve. 1999. "The Class-Inflected Nature of Gay Identity." *Social Problems*
46(2):207–24.
- Van Aelst, Peter, and Stefaan Walgrave. 2002. "New Media, New Movements? The Role
of the Internet in Shaping the 'Anti-Globalization' movement." *Information,
Communication & Society* 5(4):465–93.
- Van Laer, Jeroen, and Peter Van Aelst. 2010. "Internet and Social Movement Action
Repertoires: Opportunities and Limitations." *Information, Communication &
Society* 13(8):1146–71.
- White, Aaronette M. 1999. "Talking Feminist, Talking Black: Micromobilization
Processes in a Collective Protest against Rape." *Gender and Society* 13(1):77–
100.

Results

Campaign for Southern Equality. 2014. "About « Campaign for Southern Equality."

Retrieved February 22, 2014 (<http://www.southernequality.org/about/>).

Chicago Dyke March Collective. 2014. "About Us | Chicago Dyke March Collective."

Retrieved February 22, 2014 (<http://chicagodykemarch.wordpress.com/about-2/>).

Equality Michigan. 2014. "About Us | Equality Michigan." Retrieved February 22, 2014

(<http://www.equalitymi.org/about-us>).

Fair Wisconsin. 2014. "Fair Wisconsin | About Us." Retrieved February 22, 2014

(<http://fairwisconsin.com/about>).

Fargo Moorhead Pride Collective and Community Center. 2014. "ABOUT | Pride

Collective & Community Center." Retrieved February 22, 2014

(<http://www.pridecollective.com/about/>).

Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders. 2013. "GLAD / About GLAD / Our Mission."

Retrieved February 22, 2014 (<http://www.glad.org/about/mission>).

Gay Liberation Network. 2013. "What Next for the LGBTQ Movement in Illinois?"

Retrieved February 22, 2014

(<http://www.gayliberation.net/equality/2013/1121what-next.html>).

GenderQueer Revolution. 2008. "About GQR." Retrieved February 22, 2014

(<http://www.genderqueerreolution.org/gqr/home/about.html>).

Lesbian Avengers. 2013. "Lesbian Avengers | LACROP | Civil Rights Organizing Project." Retrieved February 22, 2014

(<http://www.lesbianavengers.com/about/LACROP.shtml>).

Sylvia Rivera Law Project. 2014. "Collective Structure | Sylvia Rivera Law Project."

Retrieved February 22, 2014 (<http://archive.srlp.org/about/collective>).

APPENDIX A. MOVEMENT WEBSITES IN SAMPLE

Table 14. Non-Conforming Websites in Sample

<i>Name of Non-Conforming Website</i>	<i>URL</i>
American Civil Liberties Union	https://www.aclu.org/lgbt-rights/
BiNet USA	http://www.binetusa.org
Bisexual Organizing Project (BOP)	http://www.bisexualorganizingproject.org
Fargo Moorhead Pride Collective and Community Center	http://www.pridecollective.com
Good as You	http://www.goodasyou.org
Hartford Gay & Lesbian Health Collective (CT)	https://www.hglhc.org
It's Pronounced Metrosexual	http://itspronouncedmetrosexual.com
Louisiana Trans Advocates	http://www.latransadvocates.org
Out Boulder	http://outboulder.org
Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)	http://www.splcenter.org
Trans Student Equality Resources	http://transstudent.org
Trans Youth Equality Foundation	http://www.transyouthequality.org

Table 15. Reformative Websites in Sample

<i>Name of Reformative Website</i>	<i>URL</i>
Advocates for Informed Choice	http://aiclegal.org
Campaign for Southern Equality	http://www.southernequality.org
Campus Pride	http://www.campuspride.org/
Equality Arizona	http://www.equalityarizona.org
Equality California	http://www.eqca.org
Equality Michigan	http://www.equalitymi.org
Equality Ohio	http://www.equalityohio.org
Fair Wisconsin	http://fairwisconsin.com
Freedom to Marry	http://www.freedomtomarry.org
Garden State Equality (NJ)	http://www.gardenstateequality.org
Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders	http://www.glad.org
Gay Grassroots of Northwest Florida	http://www.ggnwfl.com
GLAAD	http://www.glaad.org
Human Rights Campaign (HRC)	http://www.hrc.org
Immigration Equality	http://immigrationequality.org
Lambda Legal	http://lambdalegal.org
LGBT Aging Project	http://www.lgbtagingproject.org
Massachusetts Transgender Political Coalition (MTPC)	http://www.masstpc.org
National Center for Transgender Equality (NCTE)	http://transequality.org
Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays	http://pflag.org
Transgender Law and Policy Institute	http://www.transgenderlaw.org

<i>Name of Reformative Website</i>	<i>URL</i>
Transgender Legal Defense & Education Fund (TLDEF)	http://www.transgenderlegal.org

Table 16. Transformative Websites in Sample

<i>Name of Transformative Website</i>	<i>URL</i>
Against Equality	http://www.againstequality.org/
Asexual Awareness Week	http://asexualawarenessweek.com
Audre Lorde Project	http://alp.org
Basic Rights Oregon	http://www.basicrights.org
Black & Pink	http://www.blackandpink.org
Chicago Dyke March Collective	http://chicagodykemarch.wordpress.com
Gay Liberation Network	http://www.gayliberation.net
Gay-Straight Alliance Network	http://gsanetwork.org
Gender Justice League	http://www.genderjusticeleague.org
GenderQueer Revolution	http://www.genderqueerrevolution.org
Lesbian Avengers	http://www.lesbianavengers.com
Midwest Bi* Activist	http://www.midwestbiactivist.org
National Gay and Lesbian Task Force	http://www.thetaskforce.org
Out Now (OH)	http://outnowyouth.org
Partnership for Asexual Visibility and Education	http://acesandallies.org
Queer in Flux: A Radical Queer Convergence - OSU	http://queerinfux.wordpress.com
Queerocracy	http://queerocracy.org
Survivor Project	http://www.survivorproject.org/
Sylvia Rivera Law Project (SRLP)	http://srlp.org/
The Network/La Red	http://tnlr.org
Trans and/or Women's Action Camp	http://twac.wordpress.com/about/
Transcending Boundaries	http://www.transcendingboundaries.org
Vermonters Ending Transgender Oppression (VETO)	http://vtveto.wordpress.com
Youth Action Conference	http://youthactionconference.com