

The McMaster Journal of
Communication

Volume 4, Issue 1

2007

Article 5

Social Movements and the News
Media

Katherine Phipps

Katryna Szagala†

McMaster University

†McMaster University

Copyright ©

2007 by the authors. The McMaster Journal of Communication is
produced by The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress).

<http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/mjc>

Social Movements and the News Media

Katherine Phipps and Katryna Szagala

Abstract

This paper analyzes the paradoxical relationship that exists between social movements and the news media. The concept of framing is explored, particularly the ways in which social movements come to be contextually framed within the news media and the consequent impact on the social movement itself. In order to gain an understanding of the relationship between social movements and the news media, several literary frameworks were discussed. In studying this phenomenon, coverage from an anti-poverty demonstration that took place on June 15, 2000 at Queen's Park in Toronto was utilized as a comparative case study. To gain a broader understanding of the ways in which the news media frame social movements, the coverage used was split between two popular news sources: the Toronto Star and the Globe and Mail. These sources were chosen due to their politically opposing orientations, and were analyzed at the level of both content analysis and discursive interpretation. The interpreted data reinforced central hypotheses concerning the political biases of the respective news sources, yet some discrepancies were noted. On the whole, it was found that the subjective framing of social movements within the news media often serve to impede or undermine the intents of the organizations.

KEYWORDS: Social movements, news media, protest, demonstration, OCAP, the Toronto Star, the Globe and Mail, media analysis, homelessness

The McMaster Journal of Communication
2007 Volume 4, Issue 1

Social Movements and the News Media

Katherine Phipps and Katryna Szagala
McMaster University

Introduction

Social movements are the vehicles of social change. Within the context of a democratic society, which in theory promotes mass participation in all political and social matters, social movements should be seen as a positive and necessary means by which citizens can actively express their concerns and contribute to the overall well being of the society of which they are a part. This report will analyze social movements, particularly regarding the ways in which social movements are contextually framed within the news media. As a case of study the above phenomenon, this paper will focus on an antipoverty/homelessness demonstration that took place on June 15, 2000 at Queen's Park in Toronto, Ontario. This event was chosen as a case study because of the substantial media attention it attracted.

The demonstration was organized and executed as a result of insensitive and punitive policies implemented by the Conservative Harris government that served to further disadvantage and marginalize the poor. These policies came in addition to laws that in effect criminalized the survival tactics of the already vulnerable homeless population. Some of these policies included the implementation of the Safe Streets Act, which gave rise to anti-squeegee and pan-handling laws, and imposed severe cuts to welfare including "a 21.6% cut to welfare benefit programs" (Ibbitson, 1997:120). This has been since considered one of the most politically controversial aspects of the Harris government.

The primary participants involved in this demonstration were activists associated with, or supporters of, the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty (OCAP). First founded by John Clarke in 1989, the group states that it is "a direct-action anti-poverty organization based in Toronto, Ontario" (What is OCAP?, 2006). A federation composed of activists, social workers and the poor, OCAP promotes and organizes action and discourse in the interest of Toronto's poor and homeless population. OCAP focuses principally on "day-to-day legal casework around poverty, disability, immigration and status issues"; they have, however, come to be known principally for their public campaigns and demonstrations (What is OCAP?, 2006).

Media coverage of events is often shaped and adapted to serve a particular purpose, a practice that is often referred to as *framing*. To better understand how this practice impacted media coverage of the June 15, 2000 demonstration at Queen's Park, it is imperative to note the main perspectives of OCAP and the objectives they hoped to achieve. According to OCAP leader John Clarke, the demonstration was "organized to demand action from the Provincial Tory Government on the growing crisis of homelessness" (2006). The goal sought by the organizers of the event was to "break through that Government's notorious intransigence by demanding that a delegation of six people affected by homelessness be allowed to address a session of the Legislative Assembly" (Clarke, 2006). However, the activists' attempts to engage in discussion with government officials and to gain access to the Legislation were unsuccessful, as the Toronto Police Force quickly

intervened. This ultimately gave rise to the militant battle that came to be known as the “Queen’s Park Riot”.

Literature Review

In order to achieve a better understanding of how the OCAP demonstration was represented within the news media, various literary frameworks will be presented and discussed. It is important to look at the literature surrounding social movements, demonstrations and protests. As noted by Carroll and Ratner, social movements depend heavily on the mass media in order to communicate their message to the general public (1999:2).

In their study entitled *Critical Social Movements and Media Reform*, Carroll and Hackett introduce the notion of critical social movements, which provides a concise and accurate description of OCAP as an organization. They describe critical social movements as, “[...] committed to empowerment of the marginalized [...] that challenge the hegemonies of dominant groups and institutions [and which] are key to revitalizing democracy today” (Hackett and Carroll, 2004:1). In addition, Hackett and Carroll introduce the idea that there exists an asymmetrical relationship of dependency between social movement organizations and the media. This relationship describes a situation whereby social movements “greatly depend on the media to help them mobilize, and to validate their standing, while news organizations are less dependent on movements for the stories they feature”; as a result the media have the power and ability to influence how events are perceived (Hackett and Carroll, 2004:1).

This theoretical framework is consistent with the findings of Carroll and Ratner, which are based on the work of Gamson and Wolfsfeld. In their research, Gamson and Wolfsfeld formed the strategic considerations of a movements’ use of news media into a model whereby movements and media can be seen as interacting systems (Carroll and Ratner, 1999:3). It is here that a relationship of asymmetrical dependency becomes evident as, “the position of media at the center of a mass communications network gives media a spectrum of options for ‘making news’, while movements have few options beyond the mass media for getting their message to the public” (Carroll and Ratner, 1999:3). Through this relationship, social movements can be seen to depend on the media for three main purposes: to mobilize and attract wide support of the public, to validate their existence as a political collective and to enlarge the scope of conflict by bringing in third parties in order to alter the balance of forces in a favourable direction (Carroll and Ratner, 1999:3). Gamson and Wolfsfeld further contend that social movements are concerned with gaining legitimacy, preferred framing, and sympathy in terms of the issues they are attempting to elucidate (Carroll and Ratner, 1999:3).

Another study conducted by Oliver and Maney examined what they refer to as “a triadic relation of politics, protest and news media” which they conceived as being inextricably intertwined (2000:464). They argue that the news media’s coverage of a protest is largely shaped by institutional politics and political cycles, as is the likelihood that a protest will occur. They note that protests are often stimulated by external events such as proposed pieces of legislature (Oliver and Maney, 2000:564), as was the case with OCAP’s anti-poverty demonstration. Oliver and Maney further state that “the presence of conflict, and for protests, especially legislative conflict, has a strong effect on news coverage. This is consistent with both the importance of ‘drama’ for news value and the implicit news value of institutional politics” (2000:482). This focus on ‘news value’, however, points to a problematic aspect of the relationship between social movement organizations and the news media. The strategies used by social movement organizations to gain media attention do not garner the approval of the target audience, namely the legislative and governmental decision makers that movement actors ultimately hope to influence. (Smith et al., 2001:1402-1403).

The majority of the findings within Smith et al. are consistent with those discussed by Oliver and Maney in terms of the paradoxical relationship that exists between social movement activists and the news media. Namely, this paradox is attributed to the fact that in order to gain media attention, activists must partake in dramatic and often controversial activities (Smith et al., 2001:1401). It is often the case that the contentious tactics utilized by protestors become the focus of the media coverage at the expense of the issues they are attempting to bring to the forefront of public attention. However, Smith et al. diverge from Oliver and Maney by correlating this trend to a broader issue of inherent journalistic biases towards events and issues they consider newsworthy.

Smith et al. identify two distinct forms of bias in the media's recording of protest events: selection bias and description bias. Selection bias refers to the process by which journalists consciously and actively chose to include and omit certain issues, events and angles from a broad spectrum of available options (Smith et al., 2001:1401). Issues presented in the news media are selectively chosen from a broad range of potential issues occurring at any moment in time. The issues which the news media chose to present are done so from a certain viewpoint which has a significant impact on how that issue is received and understood by the public. In terms of which events the news media choose to present, Smith et al. argue that, an "event will likely be reported if its substantive focus can be used to illustrate some issue with which the media are already concerned" (2001:1401).

Description analysis refers to the ways in which the reporters portray protest activities or organizers in a manner that will captivate the interest of its audience (Smith et al., 2001:1401). The description of an issue or event has a profound impact on the way in which it is conceptualized by audiences. The words social, movement, protest, demonstration and riot can all be applied to the same event; however, all of these words convey very different meanings and elicit very different understandings of an event. Furthermore, Smith et al. contend that due to a focus on sensationalizing events, media representatives demonstrate that conveying the issues that precipitate protest and demonstration are of secondary importance (2001:1401). To become more effective in engaging the media, social movement organizers must increase their knowledge of news media operation and production routines (Smith et al., 2001:1401). Thus, it is extremely difficult for social movement activists to get their message across to the public. In order for an issue to capture the attention of the news media, activists are forced to partake in radical behavior; however, once their event has been selected from the broad spectrum of potential events and issues, the occurrence of radical behavior, and not the issues they were trying to draw attention to, become the focus of the media spotlight.

Methodology

As the research has suggested, the ways in which social movements are presented by the media are far from objective. Instead, their representation is subject to biases inherent within the individual and/or the organization for which they are reporting. These biases, whether implicit or explicit, have very real consequences for social movement organizations in regards to the ways in which their issues are represented. In order to gain a fuller understanding of the ways in which the news media frame social movements, and how these frames affect the ways in which the movements are received and interpreted en masse, a comparative analysis of media coverage related to the 'Queen's Park Riot' was conducted. It was decided to focus on the coverage from the *Globe and Mail* and the *Toronto Star*. These news sources were chosen because it was felt that each would frame the demonstration differently in accordance with their respective political orientations. It was hypothesized that: a) Violence would be the dominant frame found throughout the coverage surrounding the Queen's Park demonstration, particularly in light of the available literature which suggests this is a common trend among protests that receive widespread media attention. b) The

Globe and Mail, commonly viewed as a paper with a more conservative perspective, would be more critical of the demonstration and the activists yet more sympathetic towards the Conservative Harris government. c) In contrast, The *Toronto Star*, commonly viewed as a paper with a more liberal perspective, would be critical of the Harris government and sympathetic toward the activists.

For the purposes of this analysis, it was determined that the review would focus on articles written by regular columnists as opposed to editorials. This decision was made based on the content of editorials, which typically reflect the personal opinions of the writer, rather than the purported factual reporting of news articles.

In light of the academic research surrounding social movements and news discourse, the goal was to address the following questions in term of OCAP's Queen's Park anti-poverty demonstration:

- 1) How were the issues, participants and the event itself framed within the news media? To what degree, if at all, do the frameworks differ between the coverage found in the *Toronto Star* and the *Globe and Mail*?
- 2) What impact did the media framing have on the activist organization and the issues being brought forward? Did it help or hinder the protestors' cause?
- 3) What purpose, if any, did the introduction of news issues unrelated to those of the demonstration serve?

In order to address these questions, two levels of analysis were conducted. The first level focused on content analysis, which was used to gather quantitative and empirical evidence. Of particular interest was data related to the issues and actors which were given precedence in the coverage. The second level consisted of conducting a discourse analysis by examining the content with respect to the concept of 'framing'. This secondary level of analysis was felt to be significant as, "the intended meaning of a news story has the capability of directing attention as well as restricting the perspectives available to audiences" (Pan and Kosicki, 1993:61). The discourse analysis focused specifically on the dominant framing in terms of issues, participants and events involved at the OCAP demonstration. The theoretical concept of lexical framing was also examined. This form of framing explores journalists' conscious and deliberate use of particular language and the implicit connotations associated with the selected lexicon.

Content Analysis

In terms of content analysis a comparison of the *Globe and Mail* and the *Toronto Star's* coverage of the Queen's Park demonstration was conducted in order to gain a sense of which issues took precedence in the media. For the purposes of this paper, all of the articles analyzed were published within the week following the event. Within the *Globe and Mail's* and the *Toronto Star's* coverage issues were broken down into three categories; 'violence', 'issues OACP were trying to bring forward' and 'other issues'. The number of occurrences within each article were then tallied and analyzed in terms of these categories in order to gain a better understanding of the prominent themes found in the news coverage of the event. A review of the participants who were given a 'voice' through quoted references in newsprint was also conducted. In terms of 'voice' privilege, the coverage was broken down into five categories according to the principle figures in the protest; 'OCAP/activists', 'John Clarke', 'Mike Harris/government officials', 'police officials' and 'others'. A glance at the comparative tables below demonstrates some interesting findings that will be further interpreted and discussed in the conclusion of this paper.

Frequency Table 1: *Toronto Star* Table of Issue Coverage:

Article/ Issue	The number of
	times violence was
	mentioned/referred

to

		Issues OCAP was	Other Issues
		trying to bring	
		forward*	
Article 1	10/24 : 41%	1/24 : 4%	N/A
Article 2	14/22 : 63%	7/22 : 31%	2/22 : 9%
Article 3	11/33 : 33%	11/33 : 33%	2/33 : 6%
Article 4	11/15 : 73%	1/15 : 6%	N/A
Article 5	18/19 : 94%	N/A	2/19 : 1%
Article 6	3/7 : 42%	7/7 : 100%	N/A
	67/130 : 51 %	27/130 : 2%	6/130 : 4%

*Issues being brought forward by OCAP include homelessness, poverty, oppressive governmental policies.

Frequency Table 2: *Globe and Mail* Table of Issue Coverage:

Article/Issue

Number of times

Issues OCAP was

Other Issues

**violence was
mentioned/referred**

to

		trying to bring	
		forward*	
Article 1	3/11: 27%	N/A	7/11: 64%
Article 2	12/15: 80%	5/15: 33%	5/15: 33%
Article 3	9/40: 23%	6/40: 15%	7/40: 18%
Article 4	15/19: 79%	5/19: 26%	N/A
Article 5	16/27: 50%	3/27: 11%	N/A
Article 6	8/11: 73%	8/11: 73%	N/A
	63/123: 51%	27/123: 22%	19/123: 8%

*Issues being brought forward by OCAP include homelessness, poverty, oppressive governmental policies.

Frequency Table 3: Precedence of Voice within *Toronto Star* Articles:

Article/Voice	OCAP/Activists	John	Mike	Police	Others
		Clarke	Harris/Government	Officials	
			Officials		
Article 2	1/4: 25%	N/A	3/4: 75%	N/A	N/A
Article 3	2/7: 28%	N/A	N/A	N/A	5/7: 71%
Article 4	2/6: 33%	N/A	N/A	N/A	4/6: 66%
Article 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	4/4: 100%	N/A

Note: Only direct quotes included in counts

Frequency Table 4: Precedence of Voice within *Globe and Mail* Coverage:

Article/Voice	OCAP/Activists	John	Mike
		Clarke	Harris/

Government Officials

				Police	Others
				Officials	
Article 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4/4: 100%
Article 3	N/A	5/14: 36%	4/14: 29%	N/A	5/14: 36%
Article 4	4/10: 40%	5/10: 50%	N/A	1/10: 10%	N/A
Article 5	N/A	1/9: 11%	2/9: 22%	3/9: 33%	3/9: 33%

Note: Only direct quotes included in counts.

Discourse Analysis

The goal of the discourse analysis was to explore the phenomenon of framing and to examine the manner in which the event, the issues, and the participants were portrayed by the news media. Of additional interest was if and how the coverage differed between the *Globe and Mail* and the *Toronto Star*. This analytical approach further examined the purpose, if any, of the introduction of unrelated issues. The question of what impact the media framing had on the activist organization and the issues being emphasized was reviewed to determine whether the media framing helped or hindered the protestors' cause.

In terms of the *Globe and Mail's* coverage of the OCAP Queen's Park demonstration, the most dominant theme or 'frame' as evidenced in Frequency Table 1 was violence. All six of the articles explicitly discussed or referred to the violent nature of the protest. With the exception of the front page article that ran the day following the event, which discussed in great detail the violent nature of

the protest without taking any apparent stance, it was determined that the articles could be most notably differentiated in terms of how the violence was interpreted.

Although none of the articles in the *Globe and Mail's* coverage condoned the violence at Queen's Park, some articles were more critical of the aggressive nature of the protest while others were more sympathetic. Of the six articles, two in particular were extremely critical and dismissive of OCAP and its leader John Clarke as a result of the violence. For example, in the article entitled "Rioters help Mike Harris's Tories", (previously and hereinafter referred to as Article 2), the author began the article by stating: "the stones that flew at Queen's Park yesterday afternoon were not garden variety, the kind that anybody might find lying around this or any other nice clipped lawn in Toronto. They were jagged edged chunks of quarried rock and concrete, intended for the purpose of injuring police" (Barber, 2000). He subsequently states that "on one level, that's all you need to know about yesterdays "protest" against homelessness" (Barber, 2000). Of the six articles, only one of them entitled "Is the war of words over?" (previously and hereinafter referred to as Article 3), could be considered entirely sympathetic to the aggressive protest tactics. This article, while certainly not condoning the violence, did attempt to explain why OCAP would feel the need to pursue such dramatic tactics. For example, the author notes that:

A few weeks ago, the Toronto Disaster Relief Committee, which works tirelessly to keep homelessness on the political agenda, held a public meeting on the issue at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Few, if any, reporters were present. On Thursday, OCAP organized one of its action specials at Queen's Park on homelessness and poverty and there was wall-to-wall media in attendance (Valpy, 2000). Through this statement the author is implying a similar theme to the one examined above in the literature surrounding social movements and the media, namely that protestors have to make noise, so to speak, in order to be heard.

Similarly, within the *Toronto Star's* coverage of the Queen's Park demonstration, the dominant recurring theme was violence. The coverage within the *Toronto Star*, as was the case with the *Globe and Mail*, could be divided into critical or sympathetic based on how the violence was presented and interpreted and whether or not there was an attempt to explain the motives behind the violence. One way in which the coverage between the two papers differed, however, can be found within the *Toronto Star* article entitled "Marchers shocked by onslaught" (previously and hereinafter referred to as Article 4).

This article provided a substantial voice to OCAP members, activists and the homeless in terms of explaining in their own words their experience of the violence, as demonstrated in Frequency Table 3. For example, as stated by Kira Heineck of the Toronto Disaster Relief Committee, "we knew that we were supporting a march in which people were going to attempt to force themselves inside the Legislature [however] we didn't expect riot cops on horseback. We didn't expect their continual onslaught" (Dunphy, 2000). Another article within the *Toronto Star* entitled, "Was uprising bigger than one angry man?", (previously and hereinafter referred to as Article 3), included a quote by street nurse and founding member of the Toronto Disaster Relief Committee, Cathy Crowe, in which she stated, "I don't understand why they couldn't have prevented what happened [...] horses should never have been used on Queen's Park. Clearly decisions were made (by authorities) not to de-escalate. Why were over a 1000 people on the lawn targeted and attacked by horses?" (Simmie, 2000). In this respect, the *Toronto Star's* coverage did provide a more sympathetic framing of the violence than the *Globe and Mail's* coverage.

Although the most dominant frame within the *Globe and Mail's* coverage was violence, the idea that it was 'premeditated' continuously emerged as a prevalent subframe. This theme was most often made reference to by journalists who were already extremely critical of OCAP and John Clarke in order to further demonize and discount the organization and their tactics. For example, within Article 2 the journalist states that OCAP "came with the intention of inciting violence with fire

bombs, as well as rocks” (Urquhart, 2000). Furthermore, within the front page article entitled “Violence explodes at legislature protest” (previously and hereinafter referred to as Article 4), statements such as “the violence, [was] promised in near explicit terms by protest organizers,” and “many showed up prepared for battle, wearing goggles and bandannas” clearly emphasize the premeditated nature of the violence (Luciw and Freeze, 2000). Article 4 provides a substantial quote by John Clarke in which he explicitly states his position towards violent tactics. Speaking to activists through a megaphone at Queen's Park on the day of the event, John Clarke is quoted as having stated: “those people who have elected to be at the front, please put on the goggles and other equipment necessary for the situation, and let's prepare to move forward” (Luciw and Freeze, 2000). Within the *Globe and Mail's* coverage, the idea that the violence was premeditated is utilized as a means of reducing the potential for public sympathy towards the issues.

Similarly, within the *Toronto Star's* coverage, OCAP was quoted explicitly stating its intent to use aggressive, forceful tactics at Queen's Park if necessary. In an excerpt taken from OCAP's letter to Harris entitled “Excerpts From Protestors' Letter to Harris” (previously and hereinafter referred to as Article 6), OCAP is quoted as stating: “we intend to see mobilization against you and all you stand for to a level that is powerful and disruptive enough that your hateful government can no longer proceed with its agenda”. Although this excerpt in the *Globe and Mail* coverage did not directly attack OCAP or Clarke, it still reinforced the theme of the premeditated nature of the Queen's Park violence. Only one article within the *Toronto Star* directly used Clarke's name in relation to premeditated violence, stating that “the protestors, led by John Clarke of the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty, came looking for trouble” (Urquhart, 2000). Like the *Globe and Mail*, premeditated violence was a prominent sub-frame that emerged in the coverage of the demonstration provided by the *Toronto Star*.

Unlike the *Globe and Mail's* coverage, which made reference to premeditated violence specifically in relation to OCAP and John Clarke's intentions, Article 5 of the *Toronto Star* offered an account of the police officers' anticipated response to this violence. The publication did not directly target OCAP or Clarke but was critical in its coverage by directing focus on themes related to the expected violence of the event. The entire article was a synopsis of the preplanned measures developed by police in anticipation of the demonstration, evidenced by countless references that detailed their calculated security measures. One officer admitted that “more than a month's worth of planning went into the police response” (Mallan, 2000). Although this article did not directly attack OCAP or John Clarke, it was damaging to their image, as it begins with the assumption of pre-meditated violence and never once questions that assumption. This is further evidenced in a statement made by Toronto Police Force spokesperson Constable Devin Kealey in which he asserts: “when you have people showing up with goggles, boulders, fire bombs, this is not a peaceful protest, they obviously wanted confrontation and this is what they're getting” (Mallan, 2000). This article clearly gave great precedence to the police department's depiction of the event at the expense of that of the demonstrators and their cause.

Although the great majority of articles in the *Globe and Mail's* coverage did stress the premeditated nature of the violence that occurred at Queen's Park, Article 4 provided OCAP and its demonstrators the opportunity to voice their concerns. Through this article, the protestors were given the chance to justify themselves and their tactics; they did so by arguing that the police had actually incited the violence and that they merely came prepared for it due to prior experience with police conflict at demonstrations. This position challenges the dominant sub-frame of premeditated violence that had been embedded within the majority of *Globe and Mail* articles, as well as several from the *Toronto Star*.

Another prevalent trend found within the *Globe and Mail's* coverage was the tendency to frame OCAP and particularly OCAP leader John Clarke in an extremely negative and stereotypical manner.

This is best exemplified through the conscious lexical choices made by the journalists in their descriptions of OCAP and Clarke. For example, in Article 2 the journalist refers to OCAP as “a nasty bunch”, “raging lunatics” and “radical goons”, who are “strategically...dumb as mud” (Barber, 2000). Moreover, in the article entitled “Homeless riot marks end of left-wing protest” (previously and hereinafter referred to as Article 1), the journalist refers to OCAP as “a bloody-minded mob” (Barber, 2000). One article, however, attempted to reconcile the media’s characterization of OCAP and Clarke by explicitly stating the problematic nature of defining these actors as “goons”, “thugs” and “junkyard dogs” (Valpy, 2000). This form of characterization was common in the content of all of the articles in the *Globe and Mail’s* coverage of the events.

Similarly, Article 3 of the *Toronto Star* questioned the negative coverage that OCAP and Clarke received in terms of whether the approach was appropriate. The headline “Was uprising bigger than one ugly man?” in addition to a quote by OCAP member Sarah Vance in which she asserts: “I think there’s a certain agenda behind trying to paint OCAP as a one-man show led by a half-crazed, ideological maniac” (Simmie, 2000), prompt the questioning of these negative labels. This article thusly provided a positive counter-frame to the predominantly negative depiction of OCAP and Clarke. Unlike the extremely descriptive language utilized by the *Globe and Mail* in reference to the event, as described above, The *Toronto Star’s* coverage more commonly used the term ‘protestor’ to describe the participants (as opposed to goon or thug), which tends not to elicit the same negative imagery.

Another prevalent trend, clearly reflecting the lexical choices made by journalists within the *Globe and Mail’s* coverage, was the tendency to refer to the demonstration as a ‘riot’. This was especially the case in terms of the articles previously identified as being extremely critical of OCAP and John Clarke in other regards, most notably Articles 1, 2 and 4. Within these articles, the event was referred to primarily in terms of being not only a riot, but also as a “melee” and a “battle”. Article 3, however, with its more sympathetic viewpoint, used less severe terminology such as “political protest” and “anti-poverty demonstration” (Valpy, 2000). By referring to the Queen’s Park demonstration in terms of being a “riot” or “battle” as opposed to a “political protest” or “anti-poverty demonstration”, the *Globe and Mail* overtly framed this event in a negative manner, as the term riot can easily be connected to broader negative connotations.

The use of the term “riot” was also present in the content of the articles in the *Toronto Star*. The reference was most consistently found in Articles 5 and 2, which have previously been identified as being more critical of the demonstration. However, even the articles identified as more sympathetic, namely Articles 3 and 4, did at times include the use of this term. Although reference to the word ‘riot’ was made, it was not presented in a tone of deliberate and explicit bias that characterized the content of the *Globe and Mail’s* coverage.

One final trend that was extremely prevalent within the *Globe and Mail’s* coverage was the writers’ tendency to bring in other issues. This trend was most evident within those articles previously identified as being critical of the protest. For example, in Article 2 the journalist quotes who he refers to as “one of Toronto’s most effective and experienced leftists”, stating that “certainly the timing couldn’t be worse...we have Walkerton right now [...] Harris would love to get that off the front pages, and this could do it” (Barber, 2000). Furthermore, in Article 1 the journalist also makes reference to the issues of Walkerton, in addition to the rapid development in Toronto’s suburbs and an OPP investigation into the governments’ real estate dealings. This particular journalist condemned the rioters for diverting attention away from these other issues and accused the rioters of helping the Harris government by doing so. Furthermore, in Article 2 the journalist charges the rioters with being so radical that “moderate voices are drowned out”, creating a situation whereby “citizens of less certain conviction [are] forced to choose between someone else’s homelessness and their own safety” (Barber, 2000). These accusations reflect a strong upper middle class bias. By

blaming the rioters for diverting attention away from issues such as Walkerton and suburban land development, this journalist is implicitly suggesting that those problems faced by upper and middle class citizens are more important than those faced by the homeless and poverty stricken inhabitants of Toronto. The author also creates a false sense of dichotomy by suggesting that moderate individuals' only options are to choose between their own safety and others' state of poverty. The trend towards blaming rioters for diverting attention away from Walkerton was also found within Article 2 of the *Toronto Star*; however, this was the only other article which made a brief reference to this unrelated issue at the end of the article.

Discussion

As stated previously, the hypotheses of this paper were that:

a) Violence would be the dominant frame found throughout all the coverage surrounding the Queen's Park demonstration; b) The *Globe and Mail*, a more conservative paper, would be additionally critical of the demonstration and the activists and more sympathetic towards the conservative Harris government; c) The *Toronto Star*, a more liberal paper, would be more critical of the Harris government and more sympathetic towards the activists and their cause. In examining the issue coverage as demonstrated through Frequency Tables 1 and 2 of the content analysis, it was found that 51% of the content in both newspapers implicitly or explicitly referred to the issue of violence, making it the dominant frame of the event. Since violence has been deemed as particularly newsworthy by the media, as referenced throughout the supporting literature, this statistic reflects the expected outcome. This trend towards emphasizing violence was supported by the findings within the discourse analysis. In terms of issues presented within the articles, the consequent sub-frame of the premeditated nature of the violence was definitely prominent. This was also reflected in the ways in which OCAP, John Clarke and the event itself were framed. This trend was most evident through the use of lexical framing, in terms of the very colourful and descriptive language utilized in describing OCAP, Clarke and the demonstration. As previously mentioned, these findings were consistent with those presented within the literature review. More specifically, strategies to gain media attention used by social movement organizations are often counter-productive. The tactics of protesting and demonstrating give rise to real or perceived acts of violence. The subsequent media coverage focuses on these acts of violence rather than highlighting the social issues of the movement.

One statistic of particular interest, which can be found within the comparison of Frequency Tables 3 and 4, was that the *Globe and Mail's* coverage placed substantially more emphasis on the issues OCAP was trying to bring forward and provided OCAP representatives with more privilege of voice than did *The Toronto Star*. This trend was surprising, since it was anticipated that *The Toronto Star* would be more sympathetic towards OCAP and their initiatives. Furthermore, within the *Globe and Mail's* coverage it was predicted that the reportage would be more inclined to support Mike Harris and other police and governmental officials in terms of privilege of voice. Although this was the case statistically, it is important to note that within the coverage by both the *Toronto Star* and the *Globe and Mail*, neither news source supported or gave much sympathy to the Harris government or other officials.

In terms of the trend towards bringing in other issues, it was found that their introduction seemed to function merely as another means by which to persecute OCAP and John Clarke. It was through the introduction of these other issues, such as the Walkerton crisis or urban land development, that both papers, though to a greater extent *The Globe and Mail*, made explicit their upper middle class biases.

After analyzing the data in terms of the content and discourse analysis it was surprising to discover that the *Globe and Mail*, a more conservative paper, and the *Toronto Star*, a more liberal paper, had more commonalities than differences in the coverage of this event. However, it is significant to note that the *Globe and Mail* was far more ruthless than the *Toronto Star* in terms of the negative coverage presented. This trend could be attributed to the fact that as a more liberal newspaper, the *Toronto Star* attempts to appear more objective and thus their biases are more hidden. This was most evident through their use of more neutral concepts and terms in describing the issues, participants and events related to the Queen's Park demonstration. Within the *Globe and Mail's* coverage, however, the journalists' own opinions were more dominant and their biases as demonstrated through their lexical choices were made explicit.

The individuals involved in the demonstration and the events that took place were continuously described in an extremely negative and stereotypical manner throughout a great deal of the coverage. In terms of the impact the media framing had on the protestors, it stands to reason that the dominant sub-frame of premeditated violence did not help them appear legitimate and trustworthy in the eyes of the news media, public and political policy-makers. However, the question of whether this helped or hindered the activists and their goals is a paradoxical one, as suggested by the literature. On the one hand, they were able to attract widespread news media attention and coverage to OCAP and the issues of poverty and homelessness. By gaining the attention of the media, the activists were able to bring public attention to themselves and their issues, which is fundamental in the process of legitimizing a social and/or political problem. However, at the same time OCAP received a great deal of negative coverage and had their name, image and tactics slandered by the news media.

As previously stated, social movements are an indispensable means through which citizens of a democracy can actively exert their power and influence over the decisions that shape the society of which they are a part. Social movements such as civil rights causes and the women's liberation movement have proven to be significant cornerstones in the creation of an egalitarian society, as they have helped extend rights to groups once oppressed. Unfortunately, the mass media, although thought to be the most prominent vehicle for the distribution and dissemination of information, is far from democratic. As a result, the issues and concerns of regular citizens become overshadowed by the priorities of the media and the affiliated corporate and political elite. Instead of existing as a forum for issues to be brought forward and debated, the news media is dominated by common, attention-grabbing themes such as violence instead of covering the more subtle motivations behind a social movement's actions. As a result, organizations such as OCAP are not often legitimized or supported by news media coverage, as it tends to focus only on the sensational aspect of movements' actions, particularly emphasizing any form of violence. As such, organizations' attempts to foster public awareness of their causes become lost in biased news coverage.

Works Cited

- Barber, John. "Homless riot marks end of left-wing protest." *The Globe and Mail*. 17 June 2000.
- Barber, John. "Rioters help Mike Harris's Tories." *The Globe and Mail*. 16 June 2000.
- Breannan, Richard. "Facing a cloud of pepper spray." *The Toronto Star*. 16 June 2000.
- Capponi, Pat. "The stones missed the real target." *The Globe and Mail*. 19 June 2000.
- Carroll, William K. and R.S. Ratner. "Media Strategies and Political Projects: A Comparative Study of Social Movements." *Canadian Journal of Sociology*. 24.1 (1999): 1-34.
- Clarke, John "Fighting To Win." *Open for Business Closed to People: Mike Harris's Ontario*. Eds. Diana Ralph, Andre Regimbald and Serec St-Amanda. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1995. 157-164.
- Clarke, John. "What's At Stake In The "Queen's Park Riot" Jury Trial?" *Ontario Coalition Against Poverty*. 28 October 2006 <<http://www.ocap.ca/whatsatstake.html>>.
- Dunphy, Catherine. "Marchers Shocked by Onslaught." *The Toronto Star* 16 June 2000.
- "Excerpts from protestors' letter to Harris." *The Toronto Star* 16 June 2000: A22. Hackett, Robert A. and William K. Carroll. "Critical Social Movements and Media Reform." *Media Development*. The World Association for Christian Communication, 2004.
- Ibbitson, John. *Promise Land Inside the Mike Harris Revolution*. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada Inc., 1997
- Luciw, Roma and Colin Freeze. "Violence explodes at legislature protest." *The Globe and Mail*. 16 June 2000.
- Luciw, Roma and Colin Freeze. "Chow faces probe over riot events." *The Globe and Mail*.
- Mallan, Caroline. "200 officers fanned out at Legislature." *The Toronto Star*. 16 June 2000.
- Oliver, Pamela E., and Gregory M. Maney. "Political Processes and Local Newspaper Coverage of Protest Events: From Selection Bias to Triadic Interactions." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 106.2 (2000): 463-505.
- Ontario Coalition Against Poverty. "What Is OCAP?" 28 October 2006. <<http://www.ocap.ca>>.
- Pan, Z and G.M. Kosicki. "Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse." *Political Communication*. Taylor and Francis Ltd. UK. 10 (1993): 55-73.
- Simmie, Scott. "Was uprising bigger than one angry man?" *The Toronto Star*. 17 June 2000. A22.

Smith, Jackie., John D. McCarthy., Clark McPhail., and Bogulsaw Augustyn. "From Protest to Agenda Building: Description Bias in Media Coverage of Protest Events in Washington, D.C." *Social Forces*. 79.4 (2001): 1397-1423.

Urquhart, Ian. "Protestors were clearly looking for trouble." *The Toronto Star*. 16 June 2000: A1.

Valpy, Michael. "Is the war of words over?" *The Globe and Mail*. 17 June 2000.