Making an Online Movement:

A Content Analysis of Tweets by @AMarch4OurLives Twitter Account

Erin Hannan

State University of New York at New Paltz, Honors Program

May 15, 2020

Abstract

The March for Our Lives movement began four days after another historic school shooting

occurred at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. With more than

400,000 followers in 2020 and more than a million supporters taking part in nationwide school

walkouts and protests over the last two years, this social media movement that began with

#MarchForOurLives has developed into a rigorous campaign to call on U.S. elected officials to

change gun-control and for citizens to get educated and vote. This study looks at how Twitter

users engaged with the March for Our Lives movement's (@AMarch4OurLives) original tweets

from February 18, 2018 to December 31, 2019. The impact of this social media movement has

resulted in unprecedented U.S. policy changes on gun-reform and an ongoing conversation on

gun control policy. A content analysis was conducted ($n = 500$) to discover what characteristics

of the tweets such as topic, tone, hashtags, and year influenced social media engagement in the

form of likes, retweets, and replies. The purpose of this research was to uncover how the

popularity of this movement online could have played a role in setting a new political agenda on

gun-control. The results showed that tweets about the topics of the NRA received the most

replies from Twitter users, and tweets pertaining to the topic of shootings gained greater user

engagement in the form of likes and retweets. The general tone of @AMarch4OurLives tweets

on a 5-point scale of negative to positive varied depending on the topic of the tweet, with an

average tone of all the tweets being slightly above neutral (M= 3.38). Lastly, the results of this

study reflected that tweets posted in 2019 received less user engagement than tweets in 2018

which were shared closer to the events of the Parkland shooting.

Keywords: *Digital Media Management, citizen journalism, content analysis, social media
movements, March for Our Lives, new media*

Background on the Movement:

On February 14, 2018 a gunman opened fire at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, killing 17 people including students and faculty and injuring 17 others (Condon et al., 2019). Four days later @AMarch4OurLives Twitter account was created by surviving students from this shooting and an online movement for gun control would begin. According to The March for Our Lives (MFOL) organization website, the group's primary goals is to enact a Peace Plan in the U.S. which involves: a goal to decrease deaths by gun violence by half in America in 10 years, advocate and change gun legislation, hold gun lobbyists accountable, create a National Director of Gun Violence Prevention in the federal government, enforce community-based prevention to gun violence, and encourage young people to get involved through voter registration ("A Peace Plan for a Safer America"). The group held its first protest on March 24, 2018 in Washington D.C., inspired by the Women's March on Washington held every January since 2017 protesting the inauguration of President Donald Trump. The March for Our Lives protest brought an estimated 1.2 million marchers out including more than 450 sister marches during that weekend (Lopez, 2018). On the one-month anniversary of the Parkland shooting thousands of students and faculty across the country participated in a national school walkout for 17 minutes to honor the lives of those lost (Gray, 2018).

Since the movement's inception, its social media presence continues with more than 461,000 Twitter followers, 337,000 Instagram followers, and over 300,000 Facebook page followers in 2020. The Pew Research Center reports that in the six months after the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High, 50 new gun-control laws were enacted across U.S. states (Vasilogambros, 2018). Overall, this study will examine how the March for Our Lives' Twitter impacted a public agenda on gun-reform in the U.S. during a 22 month period since the shooting.

The group now has more than 150 local chapters across the country working to continuously promote their mission (Visarm, 2019). By analyzing tweets by this group, this research will uncover what characteristics of tweets bring the most user interaction and traction with the @AMarch4OurLives account and what bigger implications social media has for bringing about political and social change.

Literature Review:

To fully unpack the implications of the MFOL movement, this study must examine how it was made possible by way of new media, its role as a form of citizen journalism, and by and large how it is historically rewriting the public agenda on gun-control in America. This study focuses on the social media site of Twitter, which has served as the primary platform for the MFOL movement. Pew Research Center reports that the majority of Americans they survey classify social media as an important tool for accomplishing political goals and creating social movements (Anderson et al., 2018). The following research is an investigation of past studies on these critical components that helped start and sustain the MFOL movement.

i. New Media

The concept of communities forming in a public sphere pre-date the advent of Twitter, the Internet, or even television. German philosopher Jürgen Habermas defined the idea of the public sphere, where people in eighteenth and nineteenth century Europe began to create communities where people could gather outside the privacy of their homes (Tufekci, 2017). While this early on took the form of coffee shops or concert halls, the public sphere allows people to openly exchange beliefs that has transformed with technology into a digital forum for mass communication. Technological changes over the course of human history continuously

rewrites how society is structured from culture to culture, no longer limiting one's ability to exist in a public sphere of their choosing (Tufekci, 2017). The split in global perception of old media to new media is a complicated discussion dealing with understanding the different implications of what is online, digital, and social media (Siapera, 2017). In *Understanding New Media*, by Eugenia Siapera, new media is defined as the ideological shift in the reason for media (Siapera, 2017). In looking at this research through the lens of social movements and policy the use of new media particularly has altered mass global communication which infiltrates the public agenda set in communities. According to lifelong American political strategist Joe Trippi, who served as national campaign manager for the 2004 Presidential race for Howard Dean**,** technology has altered the campaign process; where, online campaigns now require a spectacle that involves a more expensive and " vicious" process to keep up with trends of new media (Trippi, 2004). Social movements created in the online space have had the power to take a physical form in streets through protests. This new wave of activism must maintain a level of vitality in a digital forum to intervene in public life and become a part of the public agenda.

 ii. Online Activism

 When tracking social media movements the conversation does not just come from the top-down of one singular account with many followers, rather it is about how users engage with an account, hashtag, or topic of conversation (Lotan et al.,2011). Social media movements, in their short history, can be tied back to social justice activism, in using technology to report an injustice and call on for bigger change (Rohlinger et al., 2012). In 2011, a series of political uprisings coming from the Tunisia Revolution became known to the world as the Arab Spring movement. (Lotan et al., 2011). These real time protests coming from the Middle East were broadcasted online for the rest of the world to see by those first hand impacted by the

demonstrations (Lotan et al., 2011). Regular citizens became a new type of journalist sharing live news and creating a sphere of online activism. New media in social platforms like Twitter allow ordinary people to report, discuss, and share news as it directly impacts them as an alternative or additional resource to traditional media news reports (Luo & Harrison, 2019).

According to agenda-setting theory, personal experience can often be more powerful in its impact than news media because it portrays a direct effect on people's lives that allows humans to resonate with (McCombs, 2014, p. 9). The March for Our Lives movement that was born four days after the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, was formed by a group of "Generation Z" kids, who grew up in a strictly digital age and could bear witness to the social media movements that came before them: Black Lives Matter, Me Too, Je Suis Charlie, or Occupy Wall Street. According to data collected by Pew Research Center, half of Americans participated in some form of political or social driven involvement on social media in 2018 (Anderson et al., 2018). Social justice groups that succeed in the online space today have effectively learned how to use their social media to their advantage to turn supporters that simply like their tweets to actively participating in protests, events, and engaging in a new wave of active citizenship.

iii. The Medium Twitter

The MFOL Twitter account has more followers than the other social media platforms of Instagram and Facebook that the movement occupies. With only 280 characters the account must post succinct messages that can easily contribute to mass dialogue, which is made easier by posting alongside a hashtag with trending potential. The content that @AMarch4OurLives posts are both sensitive and controversial when it comes to the discussion of politics, mass shootings, and changing gun laws. Engaging in a dialogue with followers and adversaries alike is made

easier on Twitter which strives to be more lenient in monitoring certain content. The U.S.

monitoring of social media content can be considered vastly liberal to areas of the world such as

China, whereas the government blocks western social media sites like Twitter, in replacement of

their own (Luo & Harrison, 2019). Of Twitter's 145 million daily active users, Twitter's head of

legal, policy, and trust and safety Vijaya Gadde, reported that enforcing strict censorship rules to

protect users from harmful and incorrect content is more challenging on Twitter than on other

social media platforms (Koebler & Cox, 2019). Gadde described Twitter's purpose in an

interview with Vice Media in 2019 as needing to stay transparent, which involves not removing

all tweets that may violate Twitter Rules and instead allow users to opt to hide, block, or report

tweets and accounts from their view (Koebler & Cox, 2019). From January to June of 2019

Twitter released a report that over 15 million tweets were reported for violation of these Twitter

rules. The more lenient monitoring of the platform could explain why so many social media

movements start on Twitter with the ability to go viral and help MFOL sustain the vitality of

controversial movement.

   iv. Agenda Setting

   Agenda setting theory explains how media's coverage of news and events determines

what key issues get brought to the public's focus, and by-and-large gains attention by the

governing body ("Agenda-Setting Theory in Mass Communication," 2018). Maxwell McCombs

and Donald Shaw first introduced the concept of agenda-setting through surveying North

Carolina voters on what they believed were the most important political issues during the 1968

U.S presidential election (McCombs, 2014). The two core assumptions of McCombs and Shaw's

theory was that media distorts and shapes the way we receive stories, and that issues that the

media covers are the issues that people will consider to be most important ("Agenda-Setting

Theory in Mass Communication ", 2018). However, traditional agenda setting studies focused on

how newspapers, television, and the radio shared information and greatly dictated people's

thoughts and beliefs.

These initial studies occurred before the advent of Twitter or Instagram, and now

researchers are looking at how new media presents changes to the way the agenda was originally

set. McCombs and Guo have since set out to distinguish how mass media communication,

including the rise of citizen journalists, alters the way in which the public agenda is formed

(McCombs & Guo, 2015). This new agenda setting theory coined by McCombs and Guo, the

Networking Agenda Setting Model, demonstrates that even with the influence of the Internet,

media still sets the public agenda (McCombs & Guo, 2015). Although, it is now in a more

convoluted way that is continuously being constructed through vast information networks, rather

than a linear path of communication that McCombs and Shaw found in their original agenda

setting theory (McCombs & Guo, 2015). While their research is still ongoing, new media has

changed how people process information as more communication channels are added (McCombs

& Guo, 2015). In the case for MFOL, social media influenced not only a public agenda online,

but what traditional news outlets were reporting and the pressure for politicians to respond. This

study follows in Network Agenda Setting theory in understanding how the MFOL movement

communicates their mission in an online public sphere. Increased information and content shared

through social media has allowed for dominant social media movements to rise in prioritizing

certain issues through a chain of networks in a similar way to how traditional media outlets did

in a linear path during McCombs' study in a pre-Internet era.

v. Generation Lockdown

Author and journalist Dave Cullen has spent his career researching and reporting on mass shootings in America and views the creation of the MFOL movement as expected for kids growing up in a post Columbine Era (Cullen, 2019, p. 9). When Columbine High School students Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris shot and killed 13 of their classmates and faculty on April 20, 1999 it had been the worst school shooting in U.S history at the time (" Columbine Shooting, " 2020). In the subsequent years following this shooting there was an increase in security preventative measures in schools across the country to prevent future shootings, including installing security cameras, lockdown drills, and security personnel on school campuses (King & Bracy, 2019). There have been more than 300 school shooting related deaths in the U.S. since Columbine (The Times Editorial Board, 2019). The continuous efforts by the students of Marjory Stoneman Douglas and representatives of March for Our Lives chapters across the country, represent how activism and political change is approached by citizens in a digital age.

Social media movements have allowed for a streamlined approach to political activism, whereas with little cost groups can create viral campaigns directly addressing political parties and candidates in a wave of posts that makes it hard for those targeted to ignore (Rohlinger et al., 2012). The movement was founded by Parkland classmates who had survived the shooting, David Hogg, Emma González, Cameron Kasky, Alex Wind, and Jaclyn Corin, along with supporters of their school and community (Chen et al., 2019). According to reporter Cullen's detailed research with these co-founders, the movement officially sparked a mere eight hours after the Parkland shooting whereas David Hogg, in an interview with Fox News, called on

viewers to call their Congress members to take action to stop these mass shootings instead of sending thoughts and prayers (Cullen, 2019).

　　vi. The War on Guns

The relationship between guns and American culture is convoluted and particularly present in new media, recurring in the spotlight of the public agenda. According to research in the book *The Gun Debate: What Everyone Needs to Know,* no other country links the rightful possession of firearms to the intensity and value that the United States does (Cook & Goss, 2014). More than 36,000 Americans are killed by gun violence each year, with the majority not mass shooting related, rather suicide, homicide, law enforcement related, or accidental ("Gun Violence Statistics"). In defining gun violence as a public health issue there is considerable debate on changing gun control with passionate supporters on opposite sides of the spectrum. This particularly plays a part when it comes to the mental health of gun owners, the type of gun in citizens' possession, and the role guns play in their purpose of self-defense ("Is Gun Violence a Public Health Issue", 2019). According to a 2017 Pew Research survey, 30% of Americans reported personally owning a gun, with the top reasoning for this possession being for self-defense (Gramlich & Schaeffer, 2019). The deadliest mass shootings in America share one common trait --- the most common firearms used in mass shootings are assault rifles or semi-automatic handguns with rapid firing capacities (Follman et al., 2020). In the case of the Parkland shootings, the 18-year-old shooter used a legally purchased AR-15 style semi-automatic rifle to shoot 34 students in the six minutes he was in the school (Cullen, 2019). Expectation and preparation for mass shootings in America has become embedded in American culture with 57% of American teens reporting they were fearful of a school shooting shortly after Parkland (Graf, 2018). Understanding the impact of gun violence is no longer an issue for

politicians or adults to handle. As more American teens face its wrath first hand, their digital

nativity has allowed them to keep gun control at the forefront of the U.S. public agenda.

In the months to follow the Parkland shooting in 2018, twenty-six states and Washington

D.C. passed some form of gun safety law (Andone, 2019). The disparity between American

political parties, Democrat versus Republican, is further represented in the debate on gun reform.

A survey conducted by Pew Research Center in 2019 found that Democrats are more likely to be

in favor of banning assault-style weapons and high-capacity magazines than Republicans

(Gramlich & Schaeffer, 2019). However, of the states that enacted gun-control laws in the five

months after the Parkland shooting, 14 were Republican governed states. In Florida alone two

new bills were passed in 2018 and 2019 (Senate Bill 7026 & Senate Bill 7030) which increased

the purchase age of firearms to 21-years-old, implemented a school safety officer at each public

school, and created a suspicious activity reporting app ("Office of Safe Schools"). This study

aims to examine a correlation that can be found between the popularity of the March for Our

Lives movement and increased pressure on both U.S. states and the federal government to enact

gun-reform legislation.

Research Questions

RQ1: Hashtags

Viral social media movements most often start with a hashtag to define and situate the

movement among a vast web of online content. Hashtagged words have the potential to get on

the trending page for Twitter, allowing the most public exposure on the application ("Twitter

Trends FAQs"). The #MarchForOurLives emerged from the Parkland shooting to call attention

to the protest march in Washington D.C. on March 24, 2018, a little over a month after the

shooting. According to data collected by the #MoveMe project at the Haas School of Business at

UC Berkeley, the hashtag was used over 3.6 million times within a month after the march (Chen

et al., 2019). In the two years since the first March for Our Lives protest, groups organizers have

developed an entire organization surrounding ending gun violence with a focus on voter turnout

and calling on legislators to create gun reform policy. Therefore, the use of the hashtags and

corresponding hashtags meaning has changed over time from the initial intent to just promote

one event.

Data collected from Chen et al. (2019), found frequent phrases and hashtags posted by

the @AMarch4OurLives Twitter account: #NeverAgain, #GunControlNow, #WeCallBS, and the

original #MarchForOurLives (Chen et al., 2019). These hashtags were utilized by key co-

founders of the movement and those participating in sister marches alike in March of 2018, to

encourage support for the event and movement (Milstein, 2018). Similar studies by Tan et al.

(2013), on the Occupy Wall Street movement, have measured the popularity of certain hashtags

from social media movements. This study will further examine the influence of hashtags related

to MFOL, thus the following research question is posed:

RQ1 : **What is the relationship between using hashtags in @AMarch4OurLives tweets and**

social media engagement with the @AMarch4OurLives Twitter account?

RQ2: Topics

The March for Our Lives website promotes its primary mission of creating sensible gun

violence prevention through increased voter registration, limiting the power of pro-gun groups in

evolvement in politics like the NRA, and community empowerment as mass shootings continue

across America ("Our Plan", 2020). These key topics are complex in themselves; therefore, the

following is further research pertaining to each of these key characteristics of the MFOL

movement:

I.   *Laws and Legislation*

Understanding politics, legislation, or legal jargon is no longer just up to our elected

officials and reporters, but public discourse on social media calls for citizens to increase their

knowledge of these laws and act upon them. The student survivors of the Parkland shooting

demonstrated what social media movements of the past have done, to call on lawmakers to stop

the tragedy or injustice at hand from occurring again, often being met with sympathy rather than

active legislation. Except this time, change has been met in the form of policy rather than

"thoughts and prayers" in the case of the Parkland shooting. Just one month after the shooting,

the House of Representatives passed the STOP School Violence, which would give schools

grants to increase school security (Parkinson, 2018). Pew Research reported the level of gun-

control reform passed in 2019 to be "unparalleled" to any gun-control movement in U.S. history

(Vasilogambros, 2018). The MFOL movement's ability to draw attention to gun laws is critical

to examine for this study. Media that either show support or criticize state and federal bills can

have persuasive power from a Twitter account with more than 461,000 followers (Muin, 2016).

Political communication is central to this movement, and how users engage with it could reflect

how average citizens are choosing to immerse themselves in policy agenda like never before.

II.   *NRA*

MFOL is particularly focused on challenging pro-gun groups like the National Rifle

Association (NRA), known for their lobbying and donating to politicians that support the

organization. In response to public comments made by student leaders of March for Our Lives

against the NRA and American politicians affiliated with the group, MFOL is continuously met

with backlash from these pro-gun groups. The NRA sued the state of Florida after the first gun

reform legislation since the Parkland shooting was enacted in March 2018, of Florida Senate Bill

7026 or the " Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act " (Willingham, 2018).

A critical part of this legislation was raising the minimum age to buy a firearm from 18 to 21-

years-old. The tense dialogue between pro-gun groups and the MFOL team is fueled by social

media, as can be seen by both groups creating content critiquing each other's missions (Griggs,

2018). This study aims to explore how this ongoing debate that MFOL has with the NRA

influences social media user engagement.

     III.   Voting

     The MFOL organization created an additional program, Vote For Our Lives, that focuses

on increasing youth voter registration. In the summer of 2018 members across MFOL chapters

stopped at cities across 34 U.S. states as part of the "Road to Change " tour, where they worked

to spread mission on ending gun violence and prioritized increasing voter registration ("Road to

Change", 2018). The group reported that through their campaign they registered 50,000 new

voters ("Mission & Story", 2020). The impact of their work could be seen in the 2018 Midterm

Elections, as Pew Research Reports a record high of Generation Z, Millennial, and Generation X

voters of 62.1 million votes compared to 60.1 million votes by Baby Boomers and older

generations (Cilluffo & Fry, 2019). This study tests how the topic of voting is engaged with by

social media users, as younger generations become more involved with their voting rights that

coincides with a primary component of the MFOL movement.

IV.   Shooting

Mass shootings existed in the U.S. before and after the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooting. The National Gun Violence Archive reports 337 mass shootings in 2018 with 55, 246 gun violence related deaths, and 418 mass shootings in 2019 with a total of 39,452 gun violence related deaths in the U.S. (" Past Summary Ledgers", 2020). The role that the media plays in reporting on gun violence in America has an influence over how the public processes these tragedies. Studies on how journalists report mass shootings have been analyzed to uncover if public knowledge of the details of these events, including information about the shooter themselves, can encourage subsequent shootings (Jetter & Walker, 2018). Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist Connie Schultz, commented on this precedent as journalists' role should go beyond sharing news, but igniting a public agenda (Sullivan, 2019). This study will examine how @March4OurLives reports on gun violence in America and how Twitter users engage with that sensitive information. According to a survey polled by CNN, there is disparity amongst Americans' beliefs on the cause of gun violence, ranging from laws, mental health, lack of training, and income level ("Will gun violence increase in the next decade?", 2016). The public discourse on gun violence is not cohesive amongst Americans; therefore, this study aims to assist in uncovering how social media users engage in this dialogue.

V.   Politics, Politicians, and Political Parties

New media plays a heavy influence on politics today, because it adds another level of discourse for people openly sharing their opinion on politics and the capabilities of politicians' social media presence (Min, 2016). This is most easily seen in President Donald Trump's use of Twitter to aid in his election and become an essential tool to his presidency. In a content analysis of Trump's tweets by The New York Times, they found from the more than 11, 000 tweets

starting from his inauguration on January 20, 2017 to October 2019, that almost 6,000 were tweets directed at attacking someone or something (Shear et al., 2019). According to the Times's research, Trump's Twitter account earned more "impressions" than any other account, even at times if his tweets seemed to violate Twitter rules and policies (Shear et al., 2019). The controversy that inherently exists in politics, particularly America's political party divide, could lead to more or less popularity for tweets engaging in this popular topic. MFOL efforts to achieve gun reform consists of demanding action in the form of protests, promotional events, and calling on politicians online to implement stricter gun-control (Chen et al., 2019). While the organization defines themselves as non-partisan, with no plans to endorse any candidates for office, several co-founders on their own have announced political candidacy support for the upcoming 2020 presidential election (Klar, 2020). The group also has highlighted politicians on their Twitter account that participate in MFOL events and support their initiatives, such as Senator Elizabeth Warren attending marches in Massachusetts 2018 and former congressman Beto O'Rourke when he announced his support for the MFOL Peace Plan in 2019 (Chan, 2019).

Through research of the groups goals, this study focuses on five central topics of conversation emerged from the group's Twitter: laws and legislation, the NRA, voting, reports of shootings, and mention of politicians, political candidates, and political parties. These topics are not mutually exclusive, thus the following is a closer examination at each of these key topics. The relationship between these topics and user engagement have not been examined as a tactic for this movement and upon further investigation could explain how these topics gain popularity. Thus, this study will examine the following research question:

RQ2: What popular topics of @AMarch4OurLives tweets generate the most user interaction?

RQ3: Tone

Developing a tone of voice can help an organization thrive in an online sphere. Even though MFOL is not selling a product, their social media serves to advertise their brand and encourage supporters to stand behind the movement and even contribute monetarily. In a study on the influence of tone on Humans of New York Facebook post engagement, Wang et al. (2017), found that the tone of the post is highly correlated with the number of likes and shares. For the social media platform of Facebook users tend to post positive content of personal events rather than negative content (Wang et al., 2017). This study aims to further examine what different impact tone on voice has on Twitter which fundamentally serves users a different experience than Facebook (Walton, 2019). The 5-point scale of tone tested for this variable consists of: Negative, Somewhat-Negative, Neutral, Somewhat-Positive, and Positive. Negative is coded with the post's harsh, angry, and critical verbiage, providing no optimistic outlook. Somewhat-negative is coded as an overall sad tone, demanding action, but not strictly aggressive. Neutral is coded as neither overtly positive nor negative, most often dealing with event promotion. Somewhat-positive is coded as containing hopeful verbiage and a positive call for action despite dealing with a sensitive topic. Lastly, a positive tone is defined as overly optimistic, encouraging, and the use of exclamations in the tweet. To understand how this tone scale impacts MFOL public reception, this study will examine the following research question:

RQ3: What is the relationship between tone of post and social media engagement?

RQ4: Year

There are limited studies on the lifespan of social media movements and what causes some to come and go, while others stick around. In the case of the #BlackLivesMatter the hashtag has continued to remain relevant online over the last five years since it first appeared on Twitter in 2013 following the death of Trayvon Martin (Anderson et al., 2018). In Pew Research analysis of the social media movement the hashtag had been used nearly 30 million times over their five year study, with periodic peaks of popularity and decline that follow the responses of real world events of police brutality on black communities (Anderson et al., 2018). When it comes to school shootings in the U.S., studies have shown a similar pattern of heightened online searches that quickly drop as user attention moves on from the event (Badger & Schaul, 2015). In a study using Google Trends by the Washington Post, the outlet found sharp, short lived spikes of search interest in mass shootings followed by periods of little activity in between shootings like the Aurora movie theater, Newtown, the Washington Navy Yard, and the Charleston church shooting (Badger & Schaul, 2015). This data demonstrates a trend in short lived social justice movements, that are not able to sustain user engagement online continuously. This study will look into how the difference in year of MFOL posts impacts user engagement. Particularly as the MFOL movement slowly transitioned away from its focus on the Parkland shooting and its aftermath, this study will examine if that impacted the popularity of their tweets. Thus, the following research question is posed:

RQ4: How does the difference in year of @March4OurLives tweets impact Twitter users involvement?

Methodology

To answer the research questions posed above, I conducted a content analysis of 23 variables to test if there were any correlations between numerous criteria critical to being discovered on Twitter and specific characteristics to the campaign of the March for Our Lives movement and strategies of other social media movements.

Data Collection Method

Five-hundred tweets (*n*=500) from the @AMarch4OurLives twitter account, were randomly collected for data analysis. The unit of analysis is individual original tweets from @AMarch4OurLives which excludes retweets, a form of tweeting content not original to the account. A tweet is a message posted to a Twitter account containing photos, a video, a GIF, and/or 280 characters, including letters, numbers, spaces, punctuation, and accent marks (Twitter Help Center, 2020). The population this sample size was taken from is 1,621 original tweets (N= 1,621) covering an approximately 22-month span from the first tweet from this account on February 18, 2018 until December 31, 2019. The sample was taken from a nearly two year span to consider the impact that time has on this social media movement and its user engagement. This research began in the start of 2020 therefore it was appropriate to collect data until December 31, 2019. Tweets were collected through tweet history website AllMyTweets.net which provides up to 3,000 original and retweet posts. This provided tweets from March 28, 2019 until the most recent access date of the website. In order to collect the rest of the original tweets occurring a month before that date, on February 18, 2018, manual data collection was used with the advanced search feature on the Twitter application. This sample size chosen covers one-third of the population of total tweets from @AMarchforOurLives. Analyzing 500 tweets provided an adequate introduction to this study to find out if there is significance in the variables

being tested to call for a larger scale analysis. This sample was collected with the sampling

method of random sampling with a random number generator to pull from the total population of

collected tweets. Random sampling from a 22-month span best allowed for unbiased collection

from across this time period to achieve a wider range of results.

Looking at other social media studies using content analysis, the sample sizes vary

depending on the variables of time period and tweet criteria being examined, such as looking at

hashtags, accounts, or keywords. In a study looking at tweets containing content related to eating

disorders, Cavazos-Rehg et al. (2019) collected a random sample of 3,000 tweets from a total

population of 28,642 tweets over the course of a single year. In their study they collected tweets

that included a set of eating disorders and body image keywords, coming from any Twitter

account. To justify the @AMarch4OurLives sample size, this analysis focuses on original tweets

coming from a single Twitter account which considerably cuts down the population size the

sample is being pooled from. In Cavazo-Rehg's study about 10 percent of the total population

was collected for one year versus my study which took 30 percent of the population for 22

months (Cavazo-Rehg et al., 2019). The content analysis of this research will involve coding for

23 different variables to allow for a variety of statistical tests to uncover the impact of these

variables on Twitter users' interaction with @AMarch4OurLives account.

Intercoder Reliability

To establish consistency, I conducted intercoder reliability. I assigned an additional coder 10 percent of my sample (n= 50 tweets) and compared their analysis with my own. This coder was given the first 50 tweets of the entire sample and a training explaining the code book to the best of their understanding. All variables were tested with ReCal online reliability calculator using Kripenndorrf's alpha for nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio data sets. These tests proved reliable of a reliability score of at least 0.8 with several reaching complete reliability and four having no variation at all. The nominal variables alpha score ranged from 0.87 - 1 with several nominal variables testing for no variation, so no reliability scores could be computed. The nominal variables with no variation remained in the study for possibility of occurrence with the rest of the sample, but were not tested in the ending analysis because they could not be proved reliable. For the ordinal variable, the alpha score was 1. For the ratio variables, alpha scores ranged from 0.873 - 0.995. Lastly, the interval variables had an alpha reliability score ranging from 0.901-0.915. It is important to note that this assessment proved successful for the variable of tone with a reliability alpha score of 0.901. The coder who assisted with this study received the most training on how the interval variable of tone should be defined on a scale of 1- 5, as it was the variable that could be most misinterpreted.

Results:

RQ1 set to examine the relationship between the number of hashtags and the most

popular hashtags from the MFOL movement that tested reliable in intercoder reliability of

#MarchForOurLives and #NeverAgain. Thus, the following tests were performed:

The relationship between #MarchForOurLives and the number of retweets and liked

proved very significant with an independent sample t-test of *t(497)=3.179, p <.01* between this

hashtag and retweets, and *t(497)= 2.432*, p< .01 between this hashtag and number of likes. The

valid percentage of tweets containing #MarchForOurLives was only 9.0% (Table O). Yet, the

number of retweets *(M=902.18, SD=1077.416)* and likes *(M=2570.09, SD=2538.270)* that posts

received that contained this hashtag was far greater than the number of retweets *(M=402.09,*

SD=999.578) and likes *(M=1399.31,SD=3127.850)* that didn't include the #MarchForOurLives.

However, user engagement in the form of number of replies with this hashtag was not

significant, *t(497)=1.684*, p=0.09.

When examining the relationship between posts using the #NeverAgain and likes,

through an independent sample t-test the results were extremely significant, (*t(498)= 4.957*, p

<.001). The same level of extreme significance was found in the independent sample t-test

between #NeverAgain and retweets, t(498)=3.770, p= .001. Although, the frequency of

#NeverAgain posts occurred only 7 times (Table M). The number of likes for posts that included

#NeverAgain (*M=7125.14, SD=8411.819*) was significantly higher than the number of likes for

posts that did not include #NeverAgain (*M=1422.28, SD=2895.329*).

This study also tested to see if user engagement would change if the names or Twitter

handles of key figures of the movement, co-founders Emma González and David Hogg, were

mentioned. The results of two independent sample t-tests showed no significance between the

mention of MFOL co-founder Emma González and likes, t (498)= 1.143, p= .25. The results

were also insignificant between the mention of MFOL co-founder David Hogg and likes was

t(498)= -.009, p=.99. During the intercoder reliability tests these variables proved no variation to

compute a score and only had a combined frequency of appearance in the sample tweets (n=500)

of 15 (Table P & Table Q).

RQ2 set to test the relationship of social media engagement and the relationship between

five topics most related to the MFOL movement of laws and legislation, voting, the NRA,

shootings, and politicians, political candidates or political parties. The results of this was the

following:

Through a series of independent sample t-tests, it was found that the topics of legislation

and voting held no significance between the number of replies, likes, retweets, or what the

intention of the post was. These topic variables had the same valid percentage of 12% out of all

posts coded for legislation and voting (Table C & Table E). The frequency of these topics was

higher than the frequency of tweets containing topics of the NRA and shootings, which both

exhibited a level of significance in different social engagement tests.

The topic of the NRA resulted in a very significant comparison with the number of

replies by Twitter users in an independent sample t-test, t(498) = 2.992, $p < .01$. While the

topic's relationship to retweets and likes remained insignificant. In other words, tweets that

discussed the NRA (M= 67.83, SD = 200.426) received more replies than tweets that were not

about the NRA (M=27.76, SD = 57.649). My study also found that tweets about the NRA were

more likely to have a persuasive intention to their posting. The results of an independent sample

t-test compared this topic to the interval variable of intention, coded on a 3-point scale from

informative to persuasive, was significant, $t(498)= 2.027$, p<.05. For the total sample coded for

their intention it averaged 2.80, placing the overall intention of these tweets to be a high

combination of informational and persuasive (Table S). For frame of reference the intention of

tweets containing posts about the NRA had a M=2.94 on the 3-point interval scale.

An independent sample t-test revealed that the presence of the topic shooting resulted in

more likes on average (M = 2923.45) than posts that did not contain this topic (M = 1347.69),

t(498) = 2.42, p = .001. However, there was no significance in the amount of replies compared to

tweets that discussed shootings, $t(498)= 1.449$, p= .148. The number of replies on tweets related

to shootings *(M=45.69, SD=56.657)* was too similar to the number of replies that tweets that did

not contain the topic of shooting had *(M= 28.92, SD=78.791)*.

Similarly to topics of legislation and voting, the topic of tweets discussing politicians,

political candidates, and political parties held no significance in its relationship to the number of

replies, likes, or retweets when tested with independent sample t-tests. However, it did prove

extremely significant in this topic's relation to the intention of the tweet, $t(498)= 3.565$, p <.001.

This means tweets mentioning the topic of politicians and politics were more persuasive

(M=2.95, SD=.214) than tweets not pertaining to this topic *(M=2.76,SD= .473)*.

To examine how these topics correlate as mutually exclusive, a chi-square test of

comparison was run for nominal variables of the topic of NRA and the topic of politicians,

political candidates, and political parties. The results showed no significant difference between

the mention of these topics in the same tweet, $x_2(1) = .988$, p = .320.

RQ3 set to test how different measures of tone on a 5-point scale of negative to positive

correlated to the differing central topics of the MFOL movement. The overall tone of the entire

sample for this research was M=3.38, SD=1.411, which places the average tone slightly above

neutral (Table S). Through a series of independent t-tests the results showed no significance

between the tone of tweet and if the tweets topics were about politics (*M=3.19 for tweets about*

politics and M= 3.41 for tweets not about politics) or laws and legislation (*M=3.22 for tweets*

about laws and M=3.40 for tweets not about laws).

In comparing the NRA, voting, and shootings to the tone, with a series of independent

sample t-tests, an extreme level of significance was found. Tweets about the NRA *(M=2.26,*

SD=1.421) were coded as overall somewhat-negative, while tweets that did not mention the

NRA *(M=3.46, SD=1.375)* were coded more towards a neutral to somewhat positive tone. The

topic of shootings was also extremely significant in its relationship to tone, $t(498)= 8.349$,

p<.001. In other words the tone of tweets pertaining to the topic of shooting were M=1.88. This

was a significantly lower ranking of tone, classified as an average tone of negative to somewhat-

negative than the tone of tweets not pertaining to shootings *(M=3.54, 1.357),* being neutral to

somewhat-positive.

Lastly, tone was tested through independent sample t-tests with the variables of MFOL

event promotion and replies to other accounts to examine the tone of voice @March4OurLives

adopts to specifically engage with their users. In terms of relationship between tone and MFOL

event promotion there was extreme significance, $t(497)= 5.647$, p<.001. The mean of tone

utilized in event promotion tweets was, M= 3.83, showing a more positive tone than the tone

used for tweets not promoting MFOL events *(M=3.11, SD=1.511).* When testing the

significance level between tone of tweet and if the tweet was a reply to another Twitter account

there was no significance, $t(498)=1.282$, p =.20. The valid percentage of tweets coded as a reply

was rather low of 7.6 % (Table K).

RQ4 set to test how the year that @AMarch4OurLives tweeted in impacted user

engagement over the 22 month time window of analysis. To answer this question, I conducted an

independent sample t-test and found that more likes were generated in tweets posted in 2018

(M= 2186.53, SD, 3569.51) than in 2019 (*M=1049.63, SD 2643.324*). This was extremely

significant despite the lower frequency of 2018 tweets analyzed of 199 tweets versus the 301

tweets randomly sampled and analyzed from 2019, $t(498)=$ 4.086, p<.001 (Table R).

Independent sample t-tests also revealed the number of retweets to be extremely significant

($t(498)=$ 4.277, p<.001) depending on the year the tweet was posted, and significant in

comparing the variable of year and the number of replies, $t(498)=2.46$, p<.05.

Lastly, for this study the year of the tweet and the nominal variable of MFOL event

promotion was compared to determine if there was significance in the amount of posts about

MFOL events as the date moved farther away from the year of the Parkland shooting in February

of 2018. The results of this chi-square test of comparison were significant, $x_2(2) = 74.819$,

p<.001. With 58.8% of tweets about MFOL events being posted in 2018 and 20.9 % of tweets

about MFOL events were posted in 2019, it is evident that MFOL promotion was tweeted less as

time went on.

Discussion:

This study examined the impact of hashtags, key topics to the MFOL movement of laws, voting, the NRA, shootings, and politics, tone, and the year of @AMarch4OurLives tweets, on user engagement measured by likes, retweets, and replies. The results showed varying degrees of significance between these characteristics of the sample set of tweets and how Twitter users interacted. This research would improve through deeper examination of each of these key findings and how it can apply to other social media movements past, present, and still to come.

RQ1: In testing the relationship between certain hashtags and social media engagement the results were significant. Tweets that contained the #MarchForOurLives and #NeverAgain received more likes and retweets than posts without these hashtags present. This demonstrated that the use of key hashtags has the potential to greatly influence how users either find the post or their decision to join in the public discussion. These findings coincide with research on the Occupy Wall Street Movement by researchers Tan et al. (2013), which discovered a high volume of tweets containing the #occupywallstreet with frequency levels rising and dropping surrounding events promoting the movement. While there was a heightened response to tweets with these two hashtags for the MFOL movement, the frequency percentage of the times @AMarch4OurLives account actually used these hashtags was considerably low in comparison to the entire sample. Tweets mentioning the #NeverAgain occurred 7 times, and tweets mentioning #MarchForOurLives appeared 45 times or 9% of the 500 tweets analyzed (Table M & Table O). While research on the MFOL movement showed these hashtags to be the most popular and this data showed higher user engagement, its infrequency could reflect the MFOL's transition away from the early missions of the movement that pertain mainly to what was happening in Parkland and the earlier March For Our Lives protests.

RQ2: In examining the core topics of the MFOL movement through research of their

Peace Plan and missions, the results of this study found the most interaction occurred with tweets

mentioning topics of the NRA and shootings. Unpacking the results of this study on the topic of

the NRA is of particular interest. As out of all the topics, tweets mentioning this pro-gun rights

group showed high level of significance in replies that no other topic did. This study didn't

investigate the tone of the replies to tweets of varying topics, but due to the controversial nature

of MFOL community and the NRA it is reasonable to say this could correlate to increased

number of replies, whether they were negative or positive. Tweets mentioning the topics of laws,

voting, or politics and politicians did not impact user's expression of engagement in the form of

likes, replies, or retweets. Even though action in the form of voting and active conversation with

politicians are at the heart of the MFOL movement (" A Peace Plan for a Safer America", 2020).

Despite the movement's work in registering over 50,000 new voters and 12% of tweets

pertaining to the topic of voting (See Table E), Twitter users in this study did not demonstrate

heightened interaction with this topic ("Mission & Story", 2020).

RQ3: The tone of posts from negative, somewhat-negative, neutral, somewhat-positive,

and positive resulted in a significant correlation between the variables of the NRA, shooting,

voting, and MFOL event promotion. The overall tone of these sample tweets reflects an average

of 3.38, conveying that this movement chooses to adopt a slightly above neutral tone of voice for

their tweets (Table R). This study both reflected and contradicted the findings by Wang et al.

(2016), which discovered that Humans of New York Posts on Facebook receive more likes when

having a positive tone and more comments when having a negative tone. The tone of posts about

the NRA showed significance in the mean of tone being 2.6, which codes between somewhat-

negative and neutral, with an increased number of replies to this topic. However, the topic of

shooting had an even lower tone rating of a mean of 1.88, which codes between negative and somewhat-negative, but showed no significance in the number of replies. This means that even though tweets about shootings were determined to be overall more harsh, demanding, and pessimistic it did not increase users desire to engage in a dialogue like it did for tweets about the NRA. On the opposite side of the tone scale, tweets that were coded to be about a MFOL event showed a positive correlation with tone being an average of 3.83, reflecting a neutral to somewhat-positive tone of voice. This tone for tweets about MFOL events is ranked higher than the average of the total 500 sample size (Table R). This demonstrates that the MFOL team wishes to present heighted positivity in tweets encouraging physical turn out for their events, to promote activism that isn't just on social media.

   RQ4: Lastly the data showed that the year of tweets posted influenced user engagement and MFOL event promotion. This reflects what the vitality of this social media movement currently is and the future of it. The earliest tweets of the randomly selected population was February 18, 2018, just four days after the Parkland shootings, and the latest tweets collected were on December 31, 2019. There is disparity in the frequency of 2018 and 2019 tweets that were randomly chosen, being 199 tweets sampled from 2018 and 301 tweets sampled from 2019 (Table R). Even though our results showed an uneven sampling from each year, the results of testing the year to user engagement proved significant. Tweets by @AMarch4OurLives in the year 2018 received an average of more than double than the likes on tweets posted in 2019. This portrays a heightened social media engagement when the MFOL account was posted in the same year as the Parkland shooting.

   As seen in the most popular social media movements, public traction often rises and falls surrounding an injustice that sparks the movement, with some whose presence does not survive

over time (Badger & Schaul, 2015). This data correlates to the findings in the research of the

Occupy Wall Street movement, whereas Tan et al., found declines in the mention of

corresponding hashtags to the movement five months after they began collecting tweets during

the initial rise of the movement (Tan et al., 2013). There were rises of user engagement to

Occupy Wall Street in renewed periods of traction surrounding events pertaining to the

movement (Tan et al., 2013). To reflect these findings in my own research a test between the

year and mentioning of a MFOL event was performed showing significance in this correlation.

Tweets in 2018 (M= 58.8%) more often promoted a MFOL event than tweets in 2019

(M=20.9%). This reflects a change in the physical involvement of MFOL over a 22-month span,

where higher levels of promoting their events decreased as time moved away from the tragedies

at Marjory Stoneman Douglas in February 2018. There were particular central events created by

this group that were put on in 2018 that could contribute to these results: such as the first March

for Our Lives protest in Washington, National School Walkout Day, and the Road to Change

Tour that members of MFOL across their national chapters participated in the summer and fall of

2018 to promote their organization across 24 states ("Road to Change", 2018).

 Conclusion and Limitations

        The rise of citizen journalism through social media has allowed movements like March

for Our Lives to exist despite being run by teenagers with no-professional experience in the

world of reporting, politics, or policy alike. This study aimed to convey that the March for Our

Lives movement reflects present agenda setting theory on new media, in its ability to impact

gun-reform legislation and maintain a public agenda on controversial gun-control policy. This

research is particularly timely in not only a country of frequent mass shootings, but how new

communication channels greatly complicate what social media movements sustain vitality while others may disappear overnight.

The primary research performed in this study would be best replicated with a larger sample size to better explore the findings made. There were several limitations to this research including that only one other coder was used to test for intercoder reliability, leaving a higher chance for inaccuracies when coding a portion of the sample for reliability. This study also only looked at original tweets by the @AMarch4OurLives account which could have varying results if retweeted posts were collected and not removed for this study. When testing the influence that year of tweets had on social media engagement, to improve accuracy an equal sample size should have been chosen from each year rather than a random sample from both years combined, which left the data with more tweets in 2019 than 2018. For future research, this study could be expanded to March for Our Lives' other platforms to look out how this organization alters their image and if user interaction is vastly different depending on the social media site. Similar studies could focus on other social media movements, to further examine the vitality of online movements and explore why March for Our Lives is still relevant in comparison to other movements. I hope this research can serve as a foundation for future studies to continue to explore the role social media movements play in rewriting how the public and political agenda is set.

References

A Peace Plan for a Safer America. (2020). Retrieved from https://marchforourlives.com/peace-

plan/

Anderson, M., Toor, S., & Smith, A. (2018, July 11). 1. Public attitudes toward political

engagement on social media. Retrieved from

https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2018/07/11/public-attitudes-toward-political-

engagement-on-social-media/

Andone, D. (2019, February 11). Parkland survivors called for change. Here's what's happened

in the year since the shooting. Retrieved from

https://edition.cnn.com/2019/02/11/us/parkland-change-gun-control-

legislation/index.html

Badger, E., & Schaul, K. (2015, October 3). How soon we forget about mass shootings.

Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/10/03/the-short-

american-memory-how-mass-shootings-vanish-almost-instantly/

Cavazos-Rehg, P. A., Krauss, M. J., Costello, S. J., Kaiser, N., Cahn, E. S., Fitzsimmons-Craft,

E. E., & Wilfley, D. E. (2019). "I just want to be skinny.": A content analysis of tweets

expressing eating disorder symptoms. PLOS ONE, 14(1), e0207506.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207506

CBS News Poll: Will gun violence increase in the next decade? (2016, March 13). Retrieved

from https://www.cbsnews.com/news/cbs-news-poll-will-gun-violence-increase-in-the-

next-decade/

Chan, T. F. (2019, August 23). Beto O'Rourke Only Candidate to Endorse March For Our Lives'

    Gun Control Plan. Retrieved from https://www.newsweek.com/march-our-lives-guns-

    plan-beto-orourke-1455988

Chen, Y., Hammer, J., Lee, S., & Yang, E. (2019). #MoveMe - A Guide to Social Movements

    and Social Media. Retrieved from https://moveme.berkeley.edu/project/marchforourlives/

Cilluffo, A., & Fry, R. (2019, May 29). Gen Z, Millennials and Gen X outvoted older

    generations in 2018 midterms. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-

    tank/2019/05/29/gen-z-millennials-and-gen-x-outvoted-older-generations-in-2018-

    midterms/

Columbine Shooting. (2020, March 30). Retrieved from

    https://www.history.com/topics/1990s/columbine-high-school-shootings

Cook, P. J., & Goss, K. A. (2014). The Gun Debate. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cullen, D. (2019). Parkland (1st ed.). New York , New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Follman, M., Aronsen, G., & Pan, D. (2020, February 26). A Guide to Mass Shootings in

    America. Retrieved from https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/07/mass-shootings-

    map/

Graf, N. (2018, April 18). A majority of U.S. teens fear a shooting could happen at their school,

    and most parents share their concern. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-

    tank/2018/04/18/a-majority-of-u-s-teens-fear-a-shooting-could-happen-at-their-school-

    and-most-parents-share-their-concern/

Gramlich, J., & Schaeffer, K. (2019, October 22). 7 facts about guns in the U.S. Retrieved from

https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/10/22/facts-about-guns-in-united-states/

Gray, S. (2018, March 14). Thousands of Students Walked Out of School Today in Nationwide

Protests. Here's Why. Retrieved from https://time.com/5195960/national-school-walkout-

march-14/

Griggs, B. (2018, March 25). Here's what the NRA had to say about the March for Our Lives.

Retrieved from https://edition.cnn.com/2018/03/24/us/nra-march-response-

trnd/index.html

Gun Violence Statistics. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://lawcenter.giffords.org/facts/gun-violence-

statistics/

Guo, L., & McCombs, M. (2015). The Power of Information Networks: New Directions for

Agenda Setting (Routledge Studies in Global Information, Politics and Society) (1st ed.).

Retrieved from

https://books.google.com/books?id=frk0CwAAQBAJ&source=gbs_navlinks_s

Is Gun Violence a Public Health Issue? (2019). Retrieved from

https://onlinedegrees.kent.edu/college-of-public-health/public-health/community/is-gun-

violence-a-public-health

Jetter, M., & Walker, J. (2018). The Effect of Media Coverage on Mass Shootings (11900).

Retrieved from http://ftp.iza.org/dp11900.pdf

King, S., & Bracy, N. L. (2019). School Security in the Post-Columbine Era: Trends, Consequences, and Future Directions. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 35(3), 274–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986219840188

Klar, R. (2020, February 20). March For Our Lives co-founders endorse Sanders. Retrieved from https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/483915-march-for-our-lives-co-founders-endorse-sanders

Koebler, J., & Cox, J. (2019, October 7). How Twitter Sees Itself. Retrieved from https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/a35nbj/twitter-content-moderation

Lopez, G. (2018, March 26). March for Our Lives was one of the biggest youth protests since Vietnam. Retrieved from https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/3/26/17160646/march-for-our-lives-crowd-size-count

Luo, Y., & Harrison, T. M. (2019). How citizen journalists impact the agendas of traditional media and the government policymaking process in China. Global Media and China, 4(1), 72–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/2059436419835771

McCombs, M. (2014). Setting the Agenda (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Millstein, S. (2018, March 23). The March For Our Lives Hashtags You Can Use To Show Your Support. Retrieved from https://www.bustle.com/p/the-march-for-our-lives-hashtags-you-can-use-to-show-your-support-8595149

Mission & Story. (2020). Retrieved from https://marchforourlives.com/mission-story/

Office of Safe Schools. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/safe-schools/

Past Summary Ledgers. (2020). Retrieved from https://www.gunviolencearchive.org/past-tolls

RANDOM.ORG - Integer Generator. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.random.org/integers/

Road to Change. (2018). Retrieved from https://marchforourlives.com/road-to-change/

Rohlinger, D. A., Bunnage, L. A., & Klein, J. (2012). How Social Movements are using the

    Internet to Change Politics. Retrieved from

    https://scholars.org/sites/scholars/files/ssn_key_findings_rohlinger_on_virtual_power_pl

    ays-2.pdf

Shear, M. D., Haberman, M., Confessore, N., Yourish, K., Buchanan, L., & Collins, K. (2019,

    November 2). How Trump Reshaped the Presidency in Over 11,000 Tweets. Retrieved

    from https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/11/02/us/politics/trump-twitter-

    presidency.html

Siapera, E. (2017). Understanding New Media (2nd ed.). Retrieved from

    https://books.google.com/books?id=5AxADwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=g

    bs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

Sullivan, M. (2019, August 4). The media's by-the-numbers coverage of gun massacres must

    change. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/gdpr-

    consent/?next_url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.washingtonpost.com%2flifestyle%2fstyle%2ft

    he-medias-by-the-numbers-coverage-of-gun-massacres-must-

    change%2f2019%2f08%2f04%2f98696038-b6d2-11e9-b3b4-2bb69e8c4e39_story.html

Tan, L., Ponnam, S., Gillham, P., Edwards, B., & Johnson, E. (2013). Analyzing the impact of

    social media on social movements: a computational study on Twitter and the occupy wall

    street movement. Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE/ACM International Conference on

    Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining - ASONAM '13, 1259–1266.

    https://doi.org/10.1145/2492517.2500262

The Times Editorial Board. (2019, April 18). In the 20 years since Columbine, we have more

    school security and more school shootings. Retrieved from

    https://www.latimes.com/opinion/editorials/la-ed-columbine-anniversary-threat-

    shootings-20190418-story.html

Trippi, J. (2004). The Revolution Will Not Be Televised. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Tufekci, Z. (2017). Twitter and Tear Gas. New Haven, CT: Yale University of the Press.

Twitter Help Center. (n.d.). Twitter trends FAQs. Retrieved from

    https://help.twitter.com/en/using-twitter/twitter-trending-faqs

Twitter Help Center. (2020). About different types of Tweets. Retrieved from

    https://help.twitter.com/en/using-twitter/types-of-tweets

Vasilogambros, M. (2018, August 2). After Parkland, States Pass 50 New Gun-Control Laws.

    Retrieved from https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-

    analysis/blogs/stateline/2018/08/02/after-parkland-states-pass-50-new-gun-control-laws

Visram, T. (2019, August 9). Behind the scenes with March For Our Lives as they shift tactics

    and mature a movement. Retrieved from

https://www.fastcompany.com/90387159/behind-the-scenes-with-march-for-our-lives-as-they-shift-tactics-and-mature-a-movement

Walton, J. (2019, June 25). Twitter vs. Facebook vs. Instagram: What's the Difference? Retrieved from https://www.investopedia.com/articles/markets/100215/twitter-vs-facebook-vs-instagram-who-target-audience.asp

Willingham, AJ. (2018, March 14). The NRA's message for students walking out today: "I'll control my own guns, thank you." Retrieved from https://edition.cnn.com/2018/03/14/us/nra-tweet-response-stoneman-douglas-shooting-walkout-trnd/index.html

Appendix

Table A: Methodology

Variable Name	Description	Level of Measurement	Reliability alpha
Character Count	Code character count as 1= 0-70 characters, 2= 71- 140 characters, 3= 141-210, 4= 211-280 with ("Online Counter")	Ordinal	1
Number of Hashtags	Code as 0+	Ratio	0.87
Number of Replies	Code as 0+	Ratio	0.95
Number of Likes	Code as 0+	Ratio	0.93
Number of Retweets	Code as 0+	Ratio	1
Mention of Laws or Legislation	Code as 1= mention of laws or legislation and 2= no mention of laws or legislation(Luo & Harrison, 2019).	Nominal	0.88
Mention of the National Rifle Association (NRA)	Code as 1= mention of the NRA and 2= no mention of the NRA	Nominal	1
Mention of voting	Code as 1= mention of voting and 2= no mention of voting	Nominal	0.88
Mention of a shooting	Code as 1= mention of a shooting and 2= no mention of a shooting	Nominal	1
Mention of a politician, political candidate, and/or political party	Code as 1= mention of a politician, political candidate, political party and 2= no mention of a politician, political candidate, political party	Nominal	0.87
Category of Tweet	Code as 1= Text and Photo, 2= Text and more than 1 photo, 3= text and Video/GIF, 4= text and more than 1 video/GIF, 5= Combination of text, photo, and video/gif, 6= just text, 7= just a photo, 8= just a video/GIF	Nominal	0.91
Tone of Tweet	Code on a scale of 1-5 from 1= Negative(i.e. harsh, critical) 2= Somewhat Negative (i.e. sad, demanding action),	Interval	0.90

	3= neutral(i.e. .event promotion with no exclamation), 4= Somewhat Positive (i.e. hopeful, motivational call for action), 5=Positive (i.e. optimistic, encouraging, use of exclamation) (Wang et al., 2017)		
Intention of the Tweet	Code on a scale of 1-3, with 1= Strictly Informational (ex. no call to action, fact based news) 2=Somewhat Informational and Somewhat Persuasive (i.e. event promotion) 3=Persuasive (i.e. there is a deliberate call to action being asked)	Interval	0.91
Linked Content	Code as 1= hyperlink or embedded tweet attachment present and 2= no hyperlink or embedded tweet attachment present	Nominal	1
March for Our Lives events promotion	Code as 1= March for Our Lives event promotion and 2= no March for Our Lives event promotion	Nominal	0.96
Reply to another account	Code as 1= it is a reply to another account and 2= it is not a reply to another account	Nominal	0.88
Includes #GunControlNow	Code as 1= tweet contains #GunControlNow and 2=no tweet does not contain #GunControlNow (Tan et al., 2013) (Chen et al., 2019)	Nominal	No variation
Includes #NeverAgain	Code as 1= tweet contains #NeverAgain and 2=no tweet does not contain #NeverAgain (Tan et al., 2013) (Chen et al., 2019)	Nominal	1
Includes #WeCallBS	Code as 1= tweet contains #GunControlNow and 2=no tweet does not contain	Nominal	No variation

	(Tan et al., 2013) (Chen et al., 2019)		
Includes #MarchForOurLives	Code as 1= tweet contains #MarchForOurLives and 2=no tweet does not contain #MarchForOurLives (Tan et al., 2013) (Chen et al., 2019)	Nominal	1
Mention of Emma González (@Emma4Change)	Code as 1= mentions MFOL co-founder Emma González (@Emma4Change) and 2= not mention MFOL co-founder Emma González (@Emma4Change) (Lotan et al., 2011)	Nominal	No variation
Mention of David Hogg (@davidhogg111)	Code as 1= mentions MFOL co-founder David Hogg (@davidhogg111)and 2= not mention MFOL co-founder David Hogg (@davidhogg111) (Lotan et al., 2011)	Nominal	No variation
Year of Tweet	Code as 1= tweet from 2018 and 2= tweet from 2019	Nominal	1

Table B: Variable- Character Count

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = 0 - 70 words	81	16.2 %
2 = 71 - 140 words	111	22.2 %
3 = 141 - 210 words	137	27.4 %
4 = 211 - 270 words	171	34.2 %

Table C: Variable - Mention of Laws/Legislation

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of Laws/Legislation	60	12.0 %
2 = No Mention of Laws/Legislation	440	88.0 %

Table D: Variable- Mention of NRA

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of NRA	35	7.0 %
2 = No Mention of NRA	465	93.0 %

Table E: Variable - Mention of Voting

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of Voting	60	12.0 %
2 = No Mention of Voting	440	88.0 %

Table F: Variable - Mention of a Shooting

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of a Shooting	49	9.8 %
2 = Mention of a Shooting	451	90.2 %

Table G: Variable - Mention of Politician, Political Candidate, or Political Party

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of Politician/Candidate/Party	84	16.8 %
2 = No Mention of Politician/Candidate/Party	416	83.2 %

Table H: Variable - Category of Tweet

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Text and Photo	195	39.0 %
2 = Text and more than 1 photo	44	8.8 %
3 = Text and more than 1 video/GIF	97	19.4 %
4 = Text and more than 1 video/GIF	1	0.2 %
5 = Combination of text, photo, and video/GIF	2	0.4 %
6 = Just a text	158	31.6 %
7 = Just a photo	1	0.2 %
8 = Just a video/GIF	2	0.4 %

Table I: Variable - Linked Content

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Linked Content included	200	40.0 %
2 = No Linked Content included	300	60.0 %

Table J: Variable - March for Our Lives Events Promotion

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = March for Our Lives Event Promotion	181	36.2 %
2 = No March for Our Lives Event Promotion	319	63.8 %

Table K: Variable - Reply to Another Account

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Yes tweet is a reply	38	7.6 %
2 = No tweet is not a reply	462	92.4 %

Table L: Variable - #GunControlNow

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of #GunControlNow	1	0.2 %
2 = No mention of #GunControlNow	499	99.8 %

Table M: Variable - #NeverAgain

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of #NeverAgain	7	1.4 %
2 = No Mention of #NeverAgain	493	98.6 %

Table N: Variable - #WeCallBS

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of #WeCallBS	1	0.2 %
2 = No Mention of #WeCallBS	499	99.8 %

Table O: Variable - #MarchForOurLives

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of #MarchForOurLives	45	9.0 %
2 = No mention of #MarchForOurLives	454	91.0 %

Table P: Variable - Mention Co-Founder Emma González

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention of Co-Founder Emma González	7	1.4 %
2 = No mention of Co-Founder Emma González	493	98.6 %

Table Q: Variable - Mention Co-Founder David Hogg

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = Mention Co-Founder David Hogg	8	1.6 %
2 = No Mention Co-Founder David Hogg	492	98.4 %

Table R: Variable - Year of Tweet

Code Levels	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 = 2018	199	39.8 %
2 = 2019	301	60.2 %

Table S: Ratio and Interval Variables

Variable Name	Mean	SD
Number of Hashtags	.56	0.68
Number of Replies	30.57	77.02
Number of Likes	1502.12	3092.89
Number of Retweets	446.34	1015.03
Tone of Tweet	3.38	1.41
Intention of Tweet	2.80	0.47