

# Marching for Our Lives, Not Yours: An analysis of frames, news coverage, and the March for Our Lives movement

Maren Tergesen  
University of British Columbia

**Abstract.** This article examines youth activists from the “March for Our Lives” movement and how their identities impact their framing of gun violence. Analyzing speeches orated at one of the largest gun violence prevention (GVP) protests ever, this article exposes how the positionality and lived experience of white and/or affluent actors influences their framing and results in the exclusion of urban gun violence acted upon Black people and people of colour. This article finds that the MFOL movement reinforces racial hierarchies of worthy victims by describing the ‘characters’ and ‘settings’ of gun violence as those consistent with mass or school shootings. Despite the shortcomings of the MFOL movement, this paper suggests that the current issue attention cycle is conducive to conversations about the intersections of gun violence with race and that activists of colour are the ones leading these conversations.

## Introduction

On February 14th, 2018, fourteen students and three faculty of Marjory Stoneman Douglas (MSD) High School were killed in a school shooting in Parkland, Florida. Within three days of the shooting, a group of survivors formed an organization dubbed “Never Again MSD,” planned a nationwide day of protest called “March for Our Lives” (MFOL) and raised \$3.7 million dollars for the cause (Andone 2018). These youth activists were widely applauded for their swift action and “for reminding America that the shooting was not a freak accident or a natural disaster but the result of actual human decisions” (Witt 2018). Setting themselves apart from other mass shooting survivors, these youth entered the public eye “not only to control the media’s message about MSD, but to create a sense

of shared urgency among young people nationwide” (Bent 2019:58). Asserting the importance of their lived experience, the founders of MFOL understood themselves as the engineers of the gun violence narrative and they actively harnessed media attention to ensure their voices were heard.

MFOL activists saw their voices and their experience as central to the debate on gun violence. In turn, the media responded by positioning them as authorities within this conversation. Due to the authority they were given, it is vital to consider how their lived experience with gun violence and their positionality shape their work. Given that MFOL actors are survivors of a mass shooting, a form of gun violence which comprised less than 2% of gun-related deaths in 2016 (BBC 2019), it is important to explore how their experience corresponds with the forms of gun violence privileged, or displaced, by this movement and by the media outlets that follow them. Further, as nearly all the key MFOL actors are white or white-passing and from an affluent, suburban area, it is equally as important to examine how their activism extends beyond themselves to serve those most frequently impacted by gun violence, namely people of colour, people of low socioeconomic status (SES), people from inner-cities and those existing at these intersections.

In 2017, Black Americans accounted for more than half (59%) of gun homicides (Amnesty n.d.). Representing only 13% of the American population, it is clear that Black people are disproportionately victims of this form of violence (Amnesty n.d.). To begin addressing this overrepresentation, it is imperative that discourse center the specific experiences of Black people and advance the policies that will support them. Although MFOL has been praised for using their platform to speak about gun violence acted upon Black and Brown people, scholars have yet to examine whether this praise is merited. Following this gap in scholarship, I will analyze speeches and media coverage from the March 24th, 2018 MFOL protest in Washington, D.C. and ask two questions: 1. How do founding actors of the MFOL movement frame the gun violence issue in their speeches and which forms of gun violence do they privilege?; and, 2. Which MFOL actor frames, if any, are reflected in newspaper coverage of the event in America’s top three, most circulated newspapers? To answer these questions, speeches from eight key MFOL actors were analyzed, along with twelve news articles printed in *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and *USA Today*. My findings suggest that while MFOL actors wield the media presence to disseminate their frames, they both frame the issue in ways that neglect urban gun violence and use language that privileges mass shootings. In spite of their intentions to be inclusive, I argue that the work of these activists obscures the issue of urban gun violence and reproduces the racially unequal hierarchy of “worthy” gun violence victims. By analyzing the meaning behind MFOL speeches and the presence or absence of MFOL frames within the media, I will explore a central dynamic of this organization and uncover the extent to which these actors succeed at translating their interpretations into public discourse on this issue. Analyzing this process is significant as it will reveal whether they succeed at “shap[ing] how people think about social problems and their solutions” (Smith et al. 2001:1400), known as the agenda-building process. Before outlining my method-

ological decisions and analyses, I will introduce the social movement in question, then review the literature on MFOL, gun violence, and social movements and the media.

## Case Overview

In the wake of the February 14th, 2018 mass shooting, a group of MSD students who were united under the banners of “never again” and “enough is enough” (Bent 2019:56) formed an organization with the mission of rejecting political “passivity and demand[ing] direct action to combat this epidemic” (March for Our Lives). Fitting into the gun violence prevention (GVP) sector, this organization is referred to interchangeably as Never Again M.S.D. and “MFOL,” the latter being how I will refer to them in this paper.

Although there have been powerful GVP organizations, arguably what distinguishes MFOL from others is their relationship with the media. Seeking to flip the dominant narrative, these youth actively worked to destabilize their victimhood and the “thoughts and prayers rhetoric” that defines responses to mass shootings by getting in front of cameras and demanding legislative change. They also sought out media attention as they understood it could amplify their message and encourage mobilization. Their calls to action were met with both support from the public, including celebrities such as Oprah and the Clooneys (Andone 2018), and with great hostility, particularly from the National Rifle Association (NRA) and gun rights activists such as Colion Noir (Shear 2018). One month after the shooting, activists organized a national student walk-out, which was followed shortly after by the “March for Our Lives” (MFOL) protest. The protest event, which was scheduled for March 24th, 2018, remains one of the largest demonstrations against gun violence in history (Lopez 2018). Following the protest, a number of movement actors travelled across America to help people register to vote, to educate others and to inspire gun control action. Notably, within a year of the Parkland shooting, 67 new gun control-related policies had been enacted across the U.S. (Atkinson 2019).

## Literature Review

### MFOL and Gun Violence

Though the MFOL protest represents one of the largest GVP rallies in history, there are few researchers who have studied this movement to date. Within the literature, a few researchers have focused on activist Emma Gonzalez and her rhetorical tactics (Cardell and Douglas 2020; Conti 2018), some on the authority of youth voices in activism (Bent

2019), and others (Fisher and Jasny 2019) discuss how MFOL fits into a protest cycle, or “phase of heightened conflict across the social system” (Staggenborg and Ramos 2016:65), that has ignited across America.

However, the literature discussing biases between forms of gun violence offers important insights for analyzing GVP movements like MFOL. Bernstein, McMillan and Charash (2019) explore how mass shootings and urban gun violence are treated as distinct within our collective imaginaries. They contend that a consequence of dividing these forms of violence is that they are ascribed different - and unequal - importance. Shootings in cities acted upon Black and Brown people are seen as everyday occurrences unworthy of attention, while shootings involving white people in suburban areas are tragedies demanding justice. In other words, the effect of race, status and place are multiplicative, and it is the sum of being racialized and low-income and from the inner-city - a space that is deeply stigmatized and perceived through a lens of criminality - that drives these imbalances.

Resulting from these differing perceptions along racial lines is that “Parkland become[s] the public face of a movement while the same and even larger loss of life that takes place during an average year in Hartford or a weekend in Chicago is dismissed as less significant” (Bernstein et al. 2019:1171). In other words, white GVP activists, like MFOL members, dominate a conversation that most deeply and directly implicates people of colour, resulting in a surplus of dialogue about mass shootings and a dearth of dialogue about gun violence and its intersections with race. Exemplifying this lack of dialogue is Merry’s (2018) study of gun control and gun rights Facebook groups, which reveals that among gun control groups only 3% of posts mention race-related issues. Posts about child victims and mass shootings formed the bulk of content in gun control groups (Merry 2018), which again lays bare the biases within this conversation and the shortcomings of activists.

The lack of dialogue focusing on urban gun violence has severe consequences for Black people and people of colour. Specifically, Parham-Payne (2014) examines the responses from authorities to the Sandy Hook mass shooting and the calls to action that ensued, exposing how public reactions to gun violence are racially unequal. Central to these unequal responses, Parham-Payne (2014) argues, is the media and their reinforcement of racial stereotypes that ascribe notions of criminality to people of colour, precluding their victimhood and innocence. She affirms that it is both (white) policymakers and the media who are complicit in reproducing representations of unworthiness, as the media shapes public opinion, which in turn shapes the ideas and policies of government employees (Parham-Payne 2014).

Gun violence is a particularly stark example as the media can choose whether to portray it as an issue of public health, criminal behaviour or social inequality. While the media too often portrays gun violence against people of colour through the lens of

criminality, representing this violence as a function of social inequality or as a public health issue could shift the mindset - and political agendas - of those in positions of power. Considering the impact of the media, it is all the more pressing to study whether MFOL actors disrupt or maintain these representations.

## Social Movements and the Media

Key to understanding how MFOL actors represent the gun violence epidemic is through their 'framing' of the issue. Framing is the process whereby actors represent a problem in such a way as to inspire a particular response or understanding of it. In other words, framing is the "conscious signifying work" (Lindekilde 2014:206) that movement actors engage in to motivate individuals and to coordinate action about a problem. Frames are not fixed entities, but rather they are fluid and "continuously being constituted, contested, reproduced, transformed and/or replaced" (Benford and Snow 2000:628). There are three 'tasks' of framing: problem identification or diagnostic framing; solution articulation or prognostic framing; and, reason for engagement or motivational framing. Within a social movement sector, Benford and Snow (2000) note that the most variability exists across diagnostic frames, as groups may agree that an issue exists, but disagree as to the source of it. For example, activists across GVP movements can agree that gun violence needs to be stopped, but may diverge in whether they see the issue as stemming from mass shootings or urban violence. Another important consideration for social movement organizations is how to disseminate their frames, a process often involving the media. Successfully disseminating frames, however, requires that organizations have certain qualities and strategies. Specifically, Rohlinger identifies that organizations that adapt their frames or arguments to reflect the current political climate, employ media coordinators and/or are "attuned to journalistic norms and routines [...] but also engage in newsworthy and timely actions" (2000:483) are more likely to receive media attention. Additionally, Rohlinger (2000) finds that organizations that view media attention as an end unto itself are more likely to have formalized practices and, in turn, more likely to receive coverage. That said, even if an organization overcomes both the internal (i.e., by having a media department) and external (i.e., by understanding journalistic practices) barriers to receiving coverage, there is no guarantee that reporting will be substantial or favourable.

Despite these barriers and potential consequences, social movements still seek out coverage as it relays their issues to a broader audience. Although the internet and social media have opened up new opportunities, one avenue continuously used to draw attention is public demonstrations. While protests can attract mass media outlets, Smith et al. (2001) find that these outlets may not report on these events as desired by movement actors because "conveying protesters' specific policy or issue concerns is of secondary importance to those reporting on public protests" (p. 1402). In other words, structural,

organizational and ideological features of the media may conflict with disseminating a movement's messages. Due to the latter features, movements face a battery of obstacles to receiving coverage, such as having to present a chronic problem as newsworthy and not jeopardizing the news entity's capital or elite interests. Another factor highlighted in Smith et al.'s (2001) research is that problems in the "issue attention cycle" (i.e., those receiving a surge of attention) were more likely to receive coverage that is thematic, or that unpacks the issue, in place of surface-level or episodic reporting (Smith et al. 2001). Considering the multi-dimensional nature of studying social movements and the media, some scholars have called for studying triadic interactions or "those between news organizations, practices, and actors, movement actors, and the political and social contexts in which they engage" (Amenta et al. 2017:2) to better understand these relations.

Scholars have also observed that news outlets tend to devalue social movement organizations and their actions, a phenomenon known as the protest paradigm. Thus, despite their efforts, the media generally "demonize[s] protesters [...] and under or inadequately report[s] their grievances, demands, and agendas of movements" (Kilgo and Harlow 2019:510). Included in this paradigm is the overuse of official sources (i.e. institutional actors) or problematic frames, the invocation of public opinion, delegitimization and/or demonization (McLeod 2007). Others, however, suggest that not all protests are subject to this paradigm equally. Through their study of newspaper coverage on a range of protests, Kilgo and Harlow observed that certain social issues are seen as more legitimate than others, creating a "hierarchy of social struggle" (2019:523). Specifically, they found that race-related protests were most often described using the paradigm (Kilgo and Harlow 2019).

## Hypotheses

As this review suggests, GVP activism is often fraught with racial inequities, and the relationship between the media and movement actors is complex. In light of this, I return to the case of MFOL and the protest to propose hypotheses for my research: Hypothesis 1: As Benford and Snow (2000) suggest that diagnostic frames differentiate a movement, I hypothesize that due to their positionality and lived experience, the diagnostic frames forwarded by MFOL actors will define the problem in ways that neglect how this issue intersects with social inequalities, race, and so on. Hypothesis 2: In line with Merry (2018), I hypothesize that MFOL actors will privilege forms of gun violence such as mass shootings or those involving child victims and will not make mention of race. Hypothesis 3: Following Rohlinger (2000), I hypothesize that despite the protest paradigm, MFOL actors will have their frames mentioned in half of the sampled articles as media attention is among their organization's central goals.

## Methods

### Data Selection

In order to study how key MFOL actors frame the gun violence issue, I chose to analyze speeches orated at the March 24th, 2018 protest in Washington, D.C., which attracted an estimated 800,000 protestors (Durando 2018). Although I was unable to find estimates of the crowd's demographics, clips of the crowd from speech videos show the participants as predominantly under 24 years old and largely white. In other words, the make-up of the crowd was somewhat reflective of the positionality of MFOL actors. I chose to study speeches delivered at this event as I wanted to see how individual representatives of this movement framed this issue when they had their most influential platform and when they were given the liberty to express themselves in their own words. Due to this protest taking place a month after their activism began, I felt it also allowed them the time to educate themselves on the issue and to mature as leaders of this movement. Eight of the twenty-four students credited with founding MFOL spoke at the demonstration and these eight speeches, given by David Hogg, Cameron Kasky, Emma Gonzalez, Sarah Chadwick, Ryan Deitsch, Alex Wind, Jaclyn Corin and Delaney Tarr, formed my sample. MFOL speeches were delivered between noon and 2:00PM of that day, interspersed with performances and speeches by other non-MSD students. Speeches ranged in length from three to seven minutes and were accessible on the MFOL YouTube page.

My second research question asked whether MFOL frames were disseminated into newspapers. To sample newspaper articles, I searched Factiva using the search terms "MFOL" or "March for Our Lives" and limited my search to articles published on the day of and the day after the protest. I chose to limit my sample to the three most widely circulated newspapers in America, which are *USA Today*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and *The New York Times*. These three newspapers were selected as they are the most circulated and, therefore, among the most influential news sources. Being published in these papers could reveal whether MFOL frames reached America's top policy and decision makers. In addition, these three papers offer different political slants, with *The New York Times* leaning slightly to the left, *USA Today* as generally center and *The Wall Street Journal* as somewhat right leaning. Including papers from various slants allows me to observe if political leaning impacts whether MFOL frames get published. A preliminary search of Factiva garnered 50 articles, half of which were published by *USA Today*, 20 of which were from *The New York Times* and the remaining five were from *The Wall Street Journal*. Duplicates and articles that did not focus explicitly on the protest event in some way were excluded. This resulted in a sample of twelve articles, five of which were from *USA Today*, five from *The New York Times* and two from *The Wall Street Journal*. Seven of the articles were published on March 24th, 2018 and five on the 25th, 2018.

## Analysis

As I was interested in examining frames and MFOL members as signifying agents, my research was suited to doing a frame analysis. Following Lindekilde's (2014) model of frame analysis, I transcribed the speeches and then categorized relevant "speech acts" from the transcripts into one of the three framing tasks as defined by Benford and Snow (2000), which acted as "theoretically deduced coding categories" (Lindekilde 2014:213). Once relevant parts of speeches were organized into the three categories, I read and re-read the transcripts to synthesize themes into one- or two-word frames that I generated inductively. I then compared the 'problem,' 'solution' and 'motive' frames between speeches to see whether patterns emerged in how actors outlined the issue. From the eight speeches, two recurrent diagnostic frames were identified, two prognostic and three motivational, which were organized into what Lindekilde (2014) terms a "display" (See Appendix 1). To examine which forms of gun violence were privileged, I employed a qualitative content (QC) analysis. Following Mayring's (2000) model for conducting deductive QC analyses, I applied Merry's (2018) codes of 'character' and 'setting' to expose who MFOL actors articulated as victims of gun violence (e.g., students or people of colour) and where they located this violence (e.g., at schools or on the streets). Therefore, I re-read speeches and coded setting and character speech acts (such as 'student' or 'in the streets') into one of two gun violence categories: mass/school shooting; or, 'other' (i.e. any form that is not a mass shooting) (See Appendix 2: Table 1 and Table 2). I then tabulated these categories to see which form of gun violence received more mention. Finally, using the key MFOL frames, I analyzed the newspaper articles to see if any MFOL actor frames were included and, if they were, which ones were included (see Appendix 3 for codebook).

## Findings

### MFOL Actor Speeches and Frames

Founding MFOL actors defined the gun violence issue as resulting from authority inaction (coded as inaction) or political manipulation due to industry influence (coded as industry). For example, one actor asserted the inaction frame by stating that "[the people in power] have gotten used to being protective of their position, choosing safety, the safety of inaction" (Hogg 2018). Industry frames almost exclusively centered on denouncing the NRA, as the following exemplifies: "To all the politicians out there, if you take money from the NRA, you have chosen death." (Wind 2018). Both of these diagnostic frames see the problem of gun violence as stemming from politicians, with one frame positioning them as unwilling to pick a side in the gun violence debate and the other positioning them as corrupted by corporate money. Framing the issue in this way, MFOL actors are in



turn suggesting that the gun violence epidemic is essentially the result of a lack of policy. Although policy changes could include a range of approaches, the failure to make any explicit links between gun violence and social inequality or race suggests that the policies they envision amount to gun control. While gun restrictions could in part lessen the toll of urban gun violence, they do not address the social factors, such as lower job opportunities or over-policing, that contribute to making certain communities more prone to issues that in turn increase the rates of urban gun violence. The fact that the diagnostic frames are so broad and that they characterize the problem as a lack of policy - and not a lack of resources, programs, opportunities - reveals that MFOL actors are thinking through the issue as people from privileged backgrounds who are unfamiliar with the social contexts and deprivations that foster violence. This framing leads me to accept my first hypothesis seeing as the diagnostic frames neglect the contexts that give rise to urban gun violence.

Prognostic and motivational frames were similarly broad and failed to articulate the particular needs of urban communities of colour. The proposed solutions to these diagnostic frames included voting out corrupt politicians and voting for sensible gun legislation (coded as vote), and to educate individuals on the gun violence issue (coded as educate). The latter two codes are encapsulated in one actor's quote: "They might preach NRA, they might preach G-U-N, but we're preaching R-E-V: Register, educate, vote" (Deutsch 2018). Finally, 'call to action' frames included the urgency of the issue (coded as urgency), its widespread nature (coded as pervasiveness-prevalence) and the power of individual action (coded as agents of change). An example that captures both pervasiveness-prevalence and agents of change motives is the following: "In the end, we are all fighting for our lives. But we are a great generation and we'll be the ones to make America safe" (Corin 2018). As these findings suggest, MFOL actors do not define the gun violence issue in ways that extend beyond their own positionality and lived experience. This leads me to affirm Bernstein et al.'s (2019) assertions that white GVP activists invariably center themselves and their communities within this fight against violence.

The QC analysis acted to reinforce the findings from my framing analysis. Through references to 'characters' and 'settings,' MFOL actors were twice as likely to privilege mass shootings over other forms of gun violence (See Appendix 2: Table 1). This included referencing 'students,' 'teachers,' 'children,' and 'school' more often than broad terms such as 'Americans,' 'people,' 'this country' and 'cities.' Moreover, there were no mentions of race or people of colour and few references to urban gun violence (i.e. only four mentions of violence 'in the streets'). The only quasi-allusion to race is as follows: "We openly recognize that we are privileged individuals and would not have received as much attention if it weren't for the affluence of our city. Because of that, however, we shared the stage today and forever with those who have always stared down the barrel of a gun" (Corin 2018).

These findings confirm my second hypothesis, which was that actors will privilege mass shootings and child victims, and will ignore race. While these actors frame the

problem broadly to offer the semblance of inclusivity, they nonetheless describe the characters and setting of gun violence as being victims of mass or school shootings. In other words, their imagined victims are not experiencing ‘every day’ or urban forms of gun violence. Further, they fail to draw explicit attention to how this issue intersects with race. Therefore, their positionality and lived experience are reflected in the language they use to unpack this issue, and specifically in how they illustrate this problem as occurring to children and within a school. By alluding to victims of mass school shootings, MFOL members are embedding representations about who suffers from gun violence and who is worthy of protection in our collective imaginaries. As they construct the issue in this way, they are simultaneously shifting our focus away from the Black and Brown adult victims, who become constructed as starkly opposed to the helpless and fragile child. The result of this process is that children, particularly white children, become the highest policy priority, or the top of the hierarchy, while Black and Brown victims of gun violence become a policy afterthought.

## MFOL Frames and Newspaper Coverage

From my sample, all but two articles, one from *The New York Times* and one from *USA Today*, included frames of students. Of those ten articles, half were coded as including MFOL frames. As MFOL frames were observed in half of the sample, I accept my third hypothesis. Among the articles that incorporated MFOL framing, both diagnostic frames (i.e., industry and inaction) and all three motivational frames (i.e., urgency, agents of change and pervasiveness-prevalence) were included. The prognostic frame ‘vote’ was identified three times but the ‘educate’ frame did not appear. Across the five articles, there were seven examples of motivational frames, five diagnostic and only three prognostic. Though the size of the protest surely contributed to the amount of coverage, the inclusion of MFOL frames reveals that gun violence is on the issue attention cycle.

That said, it is interesting to note that articles included more motivational frames than any other. Seeing as motivational frames do not necessarily unpack the issue, their overrepresentation speaks to how structural and ideological factors (e.g., industry/elite influence) may still limit how these news outlets describe this problem. The contentious nature of the gun debate in America may also be linked to this quasi-episodic coverage.

However, complicating these conclusions is the fact that eight of the ten articles (four from *USA Today*) mentioning student frames included non-MFOL actors and nearly all of these students were people of colour who spoke at the rally about gun violence and its racial intersections (e.g. Naomi Wadler, Edna Chavez, Trevon Bosley, etc.). In other words, these students collectively received more coverage than founding MFOL members and, unlike the latter, they had no prior media presence. They also directly spoke about issues of race and racism. Notably, *The New York Times* (2018) published

student-activist Edna Chavez asserting of her south Los Angeles neighbourhood that, “it is normal to see flowers honoring the lives of black and brown youth that have lost their lives to a bullet.” Chavez’ words do exactly what MFOL framings fail to: they reinforce that the burden of gun violence disproportionately falls on people of colour living in under-resourced neighborhoods. Yet, Chavez and other students of colour were not subject to the protest paradigm as Kilgo and Harlow (2019) may have anticipated, and their frames were reported. While there are certainly a number of factors involved in explaining why anti-racist, non-MFOL actors received more attention, I argue that, in contrast to Kilgo and Harlow’s (2019) findings, the current political climate is conducive to discussions of racism and violence against Black and Brown people, particularly since the rise of Black Lives Matter and due to the current protest cycle (Fisher and Jasny 2019). This finding is significant as it is the framings of Black and Brown activists that will hopefully facilitate conversations about the harms of gun violence in communities of colour and combat the racial hierarchies of victims.

## Limitations

While this study has offered insights, there are a number of limitations. Firstly, by analyzing speeches at one event, I only offer a glimpse of how certain members of this organization frame this issue at one point in time. Secondly, the small sample size of articles and only sampling from three newspapers also limits the generalizability of these findings. Selecting articles from the three largest newspapers could further have biased my findings as the organizational, structural and ideological characteristics of larger newspapers influence reporting in myriad ways. As ten articles in my sample were published by left leaning and center newspapers, it is likely that my sample is more progressive and, thus, more likely to support direct action.

Another limitation is that this paper only looked at the dissemination of frames within the news media, when social media, particularly Twitter and Instagram, are increasingly acting as spaces for activist dialogue. Analyzing the conversations happening on social media platforms would have offered an interesting look at whether individuals accept, extend or challenge the frames put forward by MFOL actors. While this paper focused on how framings and responses differ between mass/ school shootings and urban gun violence, it is important to recognize that there are other systemic issues which fuel the overrepresentation of Black people and people of colour among victims of gun violence, namely police perpetrated gun violence. Although discussions of police violence were beyond the scope of this paper, it is crucial that future research explore the framings of this issue and whether they advance solutions that address the systemic roots and that align with the calls to action voiced by BIPOC. Despite these limitations, these analyses contribute important information, such as the fact that framing analyses can overlook linguistic subtleties that QC analyses can capture, that actors who are not associated with

MFOL can have their voices elevated, etc.

## Conclusion

This paper sought to uncover how founding members of an influential movement define the gun violence issue and whether their positionality and lived experiences influence their presentation of this social problem. The findings suggest that these actors ignore urban gun violence in their framing and that they privilege mass shootings over other forms of gun violence in their narratives. Thus, I argue that the positionality and lived experience of these actors does lead them to reaffirm the socially constructed distinction between mass shootings and urban gun violence that Bernstein et al. (2019) highlight. By reinforcing this divide, these activists are also reproducing the hierarchy of worthy victims, which locates losses in white affluent communities above those that occur in less-privileged communities of colour. A further finding of this research is that while MFOL actors do receive news coverage and their frames are included in articles, it is the motivational frames that receive the most representation. This could be due to the fact that these outlets are not necessarily unpacking the gun violence issue, or perhaps that they want to inspire their readers to register and vote. This research also exposed that non-MFOL activists of colour collectively received more coverage than the Parkland students, which speaks to how the current political context is arguably open to discussions of race and racism.

Given that gun violence is understood by many as an epidemic, this research is significant as it explores how actors on the frontlines of this debate are involved in shaping how the wider public thinks about this issue. As MFOL actors are engaged in the agenda building process, they are influencing how gun violence is thought of in our collective imaginaries, in turn shaping how we feel and respond to this epidemic. Ergo, their emphasis on mass shootings could incite a ripple effect on the public, policies and social change. While this study focused on MFOL members, it is clear from the findings that non-MFOL actors and their framing should be examined in future research. Ultimately, GVP activists of colour are seizing this debate and their framings may be able to reset unjust hierarchies and, in effect, create change for all our lives.

## References

Amenta, Edwin, Thomas A. Elliot, Nicole Shortt, Amber C. Tierney, Didem Türkoglu and Burrell Van Jr. (2017). *From Bias to Coverage: What Explains How News*

- Organizations Treat Social Movements. *Sociology Compass*, 11:e12460. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12460>.
- Amnesty. n.d. "Gun Violence - Key Facts." *Amnesty International*. Retrieved March 20, 2021 (<https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/arms-control/gun-violence/>).
- Andone, D. (2018). In Just 3 Days, Parkland Students have Raised \$3.7 Million. Here's How They'll Spend it. *CNN*, February 22. Retrieved April 14th, 2020 (<https://www.cnn.com/2018/02/22/us/iyw-march-for-our-lives-gofundme-trnd/index.html>).
- Atkinson, K. (2019). The Flurry of New State Gun Laws After Parkland. *Axios*, February 14. Retrieved April 15, 2020 (<https://www.axios.com/parkland-gun-control-state-legislation-b82f56a2-26dd-41b5-99b0-5f48c6669edf.html>).
- BBC. (2019). America's Gun Culture in Charts. *BBC*, August 5. Retrieved April 14, 2020 (<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-41488081>).
- Benford, R., & Snow, D. (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1):611-639.
- Bent, E. (2019). Unfiltered and Unapologetic: March for Our Lives and the Political Boundaries of Age. *Jeunesse: Young People, Texts, Cultures*, 11(2):55-73.
- Bernstein, M., McMillan, J., & Charash, E. (2019). Once in Parkland, a Year in Hartford, a Weekend in Chicago: Race and Resistance in the Gun Violence Prevention Movement. *Sociological Forum*, 34(S1):1153-1173.
- Blinder, A., Bidgood, J., & Wang, V. (2018). In Gun Control Marches, Students Led but Had Plenty of Help From Adults. *The New York Times*, March 25. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- Cardell, K., & Douglas, K. (2020). Emma Gonzalez, Silence and Youth Testimony. Women: *A Cultural Review*, 31(1):1-22.
- Chadwick, S. (2018). Sarah Chadwick Speaks at March For Our Lives – "We Are No Longer a Statistic". *YouTube*. Retrieved April 12, 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ulfS-BSx1zE&list=PL1Zle27A-lpX6b6WOO3GBJruBIGPpGWkj&index=11>).
- Conti, M. (2018). The Sound of Silence: A Viewer's Guide to Emma Gonzalez's March for Our Lives Speech. *Theatre Journal*, 70(4):E-8-E-11.
- Corin, J. (2018). Jaclyn Corin Speaks at March For Our Lives – "Parkland Is My Home". *YouTube*. Retrieved April 12, 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zitgrmpWw2s&list=PL1Zle27A-lpX6b6WOO3GBJruBIGPpGWkj&index=18>).
- Deitsch, R. (2018). Ryan Deitsch Speaks at March For Our Lives. *YouTube*. Retrieved April 12, 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gCy5AzdqixQ&list=PL1Zle27A-lpX6b6WOO3GBJruBIGPpGWkj&index=6>).

- Durando, J. (2018). March for Our Lives Could be the Biggest Single-Day Protest in D.C.'s History. *USA Today*, March 25. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- Fisher, D., & Jasny, L. (2019). Understanding Persistence in the Resistance. *Sociological Forum*, 34(S1):1065-1089.
- Gonzalez, E. (2018). Emma Gonzalez Speaks at March For Our Lives – “Six Minutes and Twenty Seconds”. *YouTube*. Retrieved April 12, 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M6VnYXv2grU&list=PL1Zle27A-lpX6b6WOO3GBJruBIGPpGWkj&index=4>).
- Hogg, D. (2018). David Hogg Speaks at March for Our Lives – “We Say No More”. *YouTube*. Retrieved April 12, 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DXC-SSdCEMg&list=PL1Zle27A-lpX6b6WOO3GBJruBIGPpGWkj&index=2>).
- Hong, N., & Epstein, R. (2018). After the 'March for Our Lives,' Student Activists Focus on Midterm Elections; Organizers of the Movement for Stricter Gun Laws Plan to Travel Across the U.S. and Register Young Voters for November Elections. *The Wall Street Journal*, March 25. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- Karp, B. & Boehning, H. C. (2018). Stop Shielding Gun Makers. *The New York Times*, March 25. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- Kasky, C. (2018). Cameron Kasky Speaks at March For Our Lives – “We Are the Change”. *YouTube*. Retrieved April 12, 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rgc2il-20g8&list=PL1Zle27A-lpX6b6WOO3GBJruBIGPpGWkj&index=5>).
- Kilgo, D., & Harlow, S. (2019). Protests, Media, Coverage, and a Hierarchy of Social Struggle. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 24(4):508-530.
- Lindekilde, L. (2014). Discourse and Frame Analysis: In-Depth Analysis of Qualitative Data in Social Movement Research in *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*, edited by Donatella della Porta. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lopez, G. (2018). It's Official: March for Our Lives was One of the Biggest Youth Protests Since the Vietnam War. *Vox*, March 26. Retrieved April 14, 2020 (<https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/10/2/16399418/us-gun-violence-statistics-maps-charts>).
- Mahtani, S. (2018). U.S. News: Students March on Capital - Protest Against Guns Set for Washington and Across Country after Parkland Deaths. *The Wall Street Journal*, March 24. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- March for Our Lives. (2020). Mission Statement. Retrieved April 12, 2020 (<http://mfol.wpadev.io/mission-statement/>).
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative Content Analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2):1-11.

- McLeod, D. (2007). News Coverage and Social Protest: How the Media's Protest Paradigm Exacerbates Social Conflict. *Journal of Dispute Resolution*, 1:185-194.
- Merry, M. (2018). Narrative Strategies in the Gun Policy Debate: Exploring Proximity and Social Construction. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4):747-770.
- Miller, R. (2018). Parkland Survivor Throws Up, Continues 'Incredible Speech' at March for Our Lives. *USA Today*, March 24. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- The New York Times. (2018). March for Our Lives Highlights: Students Protesting Guns Say 'Enough is Enough'. *The New York Times*, March 24. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- Parham-Payne, W. (2014). The Role of the Media in the Disparate Response to Gun Violence in America. *Journal of Black Studies*, 45(8):752-768.
- Penzenstadler, N. (2018). March for Our Lives: Martin Luther King Jr.'s granddaughter has dream 'enough is enough'. *USA Today*, March 24. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- Rohlinger, D. (2002). Framing the Abortion Debate: Organizational Resources, Media Strategies, and Movement-counter movement Dynamics. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 43(4): 479-507.
- Rossman, S. (2018). 11-year-old Naomi Wadler Sends Powerful Message at March for Our Lives: Honour African-American Victims. *USA Today*, March 24. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- Shear, M. (2018). Students Lead Huge Rallies for Gun Control Across the U.S. *The New York Times*, March 24. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- Smith, J., McCarthy, J., McPhail, C. & Augustyn, B. (2001). From Protest to Agenda Building: Description Bias in Media Coverage of Protest Events in Washington, D.C. *Social Forces* 79(4): 1397-1423.
- Staggenborg, S. and Ramos, H. (2016). The Protest Cycle of the 1960s Chapter 4 in *Social Movements*, 3rd Ed. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Tarr, D. (2018). Delaney Tarr Speaks at March For Our Lives – "They Want Us To Forget". *YouTube*. Retrieved April 12, 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NO-aG-PJNTU&list=PL1Zle27A-lpX6b6WOO3GBJruBIGPpGWkj&index=3>).
- Weiland, N. (2018). At Rallies, Students with a Different View of Gun Violence: As Urban Reality. *The New York Times*, March 24. Retrieved from Factiva April 12, 2020.
- Wind, A. (2018). Alex Wind Speaks at March For Our Lives – "Bullets Do Not Discriminate". *YouTube*. Retrieved April 12, 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tiY9NqdJals&list=PL1Zle27A-lpX6b6WOO3GBJruBIGPpGWkj&index=7>).

Witt, E. (2018).How the Survivors of Parkland Began the Never Again Movement. *The New Yorker*, February 19. Retrieved April 14, 2020  
(<https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-the-survivors-of-parkland-began-the-never-again-movement>).



## Appendix 1

	Emergent Frames: Display
Diagnostic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Problem:</b> Industry influence in politics (e.g. NRA)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>"Industry"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Example: <i>"When politicians say that your voice doesn't matter 'cause the NRA owns them, we say 'no more'."</i> [David Hogg, 2:00]</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Problem:</b> Inaction of authority figures / unwillingness of authority figures to take a stance               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>"Inaction"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Example: <i>"Our elected officials have seen American after American drop from a bullet and instead of waking up to protect us, they have been hitting the snooze button."</i> [Jaclyn Corin, 1:47]</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Prognostic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Solution:</b> Vote politicians out of office who are inactive or who accept industry money               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>"Vote"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Example: <i>"And to the politicians that believe that their right to own a gun comes before our lives, get ready to get voted out. By us!"</i> [Sarah Chadwick, 1:25]</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Solution:</b> Education               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>"Educate"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Example: <i>"We must educate ourselves and start conversations that keep our country moving forward."</i> [Cameron Kasky, 0:59]</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Motivational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Motive:</b> Urgency of issue               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>"Urgency"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Example: <i>"This is real life. This is reality. This is what's happening in our country and around the world today."</i> [Ryan Deitsch, 0:24]</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Motive:</b> 'It happened to me, it could happen to you' / Pervasiveness of gun violence               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>"Pervasiveness-prevalence"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Example: <i>"Fight for your lives before it is someone else's job."</i> [Emma Gonzalez, 6:56; Note: Also coded as 'Urgency']</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Motive:</b> Heroism/ saviour/ Be the change               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Agents of change</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Example: <i>"We have to do this for them. We must stand beside those we've lost, and fix the world that betrayed them."</i> [Cameron Kasky, 2:52]</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Appendix 2

**Table 1:** Gun Violence Categories for Both ‘Character’ and ‘Setting’

	<b>Mass Shooting</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Alex Wind</b>	3	3
<b>Cameron Kasky</b>	7	1
<b>David Hogg</b>	2	2
<b>Delaney Tarr</b>	3	1
<b>Emma Gonzalez</b>	3	0
<b>Jaclyn Corin</b>	2	6
<b>Ryan Deitsch</b>	5	1
<b>Sarah Chadwick</b>	3	0
<b>Total</b>	28	14

**Table 2:** *Example: Jaclyn Corin* (Time = 3:51; Views = 3,648); **Title:** “Parkland is My Home”

	<b>Character</b>	<b>Setting</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Mass Shooting</b>		1. “Parkland” 2. “My community”	2
<b>Other</b>	1. “those who have always stared down the barrel of a gun” 2. “American after American” 3. “96 deaths by firearm everyday”	4. “Communities of all classes” 5. “America” 6. “Your community”	6

## Appendix 3

Variable Label	Variable Description
<i>ID</i>	Article ID Number.
<i>Newspaper</i>	Name newspaper that published the article (i.e. The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, USA Today).
<i>Article</i>	Newspaper article title.
<i>Date</i>	Date that the article was published.
<i>Thematic_episodic</i>	Whether the article offered thematic or episodic description. Articles were coded as thematic if they contextualized the MFOL and unpacked the key issues underlying the protest (e.g. mass shootings, urban gun violence, background checking, etc.). Articles were coded as episodic if they gave a 'surface level' description of the protest and movement actors (e.g. focus on the weather or 'where, when, what, how' and not 'why').
<i>Student_Frame</i>	Whether the article included student opinions on gun violence. Articles were either coded as yes (e.g. the article quoted or described a student or students and their stance/ framing of the issue) or as no (e.g. the article did not quote or describe the stances of students or students' framing of the issue).
<i>Student_Number</i>	Number of students referenced in the article, whether MFOL or not.
<i>MFOL</i>	Whether the student referenced in the article is among the eight students whose speeches were analyzed (e.g. Wind, Hogg, Corin, Deitsch, Gonzalez, Tarr, Kasky, Chadwick).
<i>Student_Excerpt</i>	If 'student_framing' is yes, then insert evidence from the article.
<i>MFOL_FR_Type</i>	The type of MFOL actor framing, whether diagnostic, prognostic or motivational, of gun violence included in the article.