

5-2016

Framing bottled water : an analysis of the framing contest between the anti-bottled water movement and the bottled water industry.

Eileen Schuhmann
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [Politics and Social Change Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schuhmann, Eileen, "Framing bottled water : an analysis of the framing contest between the anti-bottled water movement and the bottled water industry." (2016). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2422.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/2422>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

FRAMING BOTTLED WATER:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE FRAMING CONTEST BETWEEN
THE ANTI-BOTTLED WATER MOVEMENT AND
THE BOTTLED WATER INDUSTRY

By

Eileen Schuhmann
B.A., University of Kentucky 2000

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts
in Sociology

Department of Sociology
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY

May 2016

FRAMING BOTTLED WATER:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE FRAMING CONTEST BETWEEN
THE ANTI-BOTTLED WATER MOVEMENT AND
THE BOTTLED WATER INDUSTRY

By

Eileen Schuhmann
B.A., University of Kentucky 2000

A Thesis Approved on

April 14, 2016

by the Following Thesis Committee:

Gul A. Marshall, PhD (Department of Sociology)

Patricia Gagne, PhD (Department of Sociology)

Carol L. Hanchette, PhD (Department of Geography)

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my husband and daughter

Babacar and Yacine Diop

who have patiently endured the long haul with me and cheered me on along the way.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair Dr. Gul Marshall for guiding me, challenging me, believing in me and introducing me to the counterframing literature which helped me to arrive at my research topic. I would also like to thank my second reader Dr. Patricia Gagne who introduced me to the framing literature and has been a great teacher and mentor. I am also thankful to my third reader Dr. Carol Hanchette who brought a unique perspective to my research and offered very helpful critical feedback that improved my thesis. I extend my thanks to the late Dr. Clarence Talley who helped stoke a fire in my belly for sociological research and social justice issues.

Also, I have many thanks to extend to the organization for which I work, the Presbyterian Hunger Program of the Presbyterian Church (USA), and my many colleagues there. I would like to offer special thanks to our program coordinator Ruth Farrell, my supervisor Valery Nodem and my former supervisor Lionel Derenoncourt for encouraging me in my pursuit of this degree, cheerleading me along the way, and providing me the flexibility to make it happen.

I am grateful to my graduate program cohort and friend Srijita Sarkar who provided me with invaluable advice and support. I extend my gratitude to my dear friend Durga Pearson who helped me to stay spiritually grounded when life's pressures seemed overwhelming. I give thanks for the spiritual guidance and strength that my guru Mata Amritandamayi Devi, known as Amma, provides me every day.

I have many family members to thank. Thanks to my mom and dad, Carole and Dennis Schuhmann, who always believe in me and support me in everything that I do, but have really bent over backwards these past years to provide me time and space to get work done by taking care of my daughter on many weeknights and weekends over the years when I needed help. Thanks to my aunt Eileen Blanton who also has provided me much moral support and my daughter hours of creative play time. Thanks to my sister Andrea Schuhmann and my brother-in-law Edward Henry for their invaluable academic advice, edits, and encouragement at all hours of the day and night. Thanks to my brother Matt Schuhmann for cheering me on along the way. I would like to express my thanks to my husband Babacar Diop for his understanding, patience and love during my long journey to this point. Thanks to my daughter Yacine Diop for helping me to make time to laugh and play.

ABSTRACT

FRAMING BOTTLED WATER: AN ANALYSIS OF THE FRAMING CONTEST BETWEEN THE ANTI-BOTTLED WATER MOVEMENT AND THE BOTTLED WATER INDUSTRY

Eileen Schuhmann

April 14, 2016

Frame analysis is paired with documentary analysis to analyze the framing techniques of two opposing groups: the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM) and the bottled water industry. Specifically, this research examines the core framing tasks, frame alignment processes and master frames utilized by two ABWM organizations, Corporate Accountability International and Food & Water Watch, and one bottled water industry group, International Bottled Water Association. The analysis reveals that both groups engage in all three core framing tasks: diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing, however, the bottled water industry was found to prioritize prognostic framing to undermine the frames of the ABWM. Both the ABWM and the bottled water industry utilize frame bridging, frame amplification, and frame extension to support their core framing tasks, however, the bottled water industry was the only group observed to engage in frame transformation. The ABWM applies both anti-neoliberal and human rights master frames while the bottled water industry applies a choice master frame.

Keywords: bottled water, framing, counterframing, anti-bottled water movement, social movement

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEDICATION	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
ABSTRACT	VI
LIST OF TABLES	X
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	6
The Age of Consumption and the Corporation	6
Anti-Corporate Movements.....	8
Corporate Control of Water and the Anti-Bottled Water Movement	11
CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	18
The Framing Perspective.....	18
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY	26
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	33
Core Framing Tasks	33
Diagnostic Frames	34
Diagnostic Framing by the Anti-Bottled Water Movement.....	35
Corporate Control.....	35
Public Water Undermined	36

Environmental Harm.....	40
Community Harm.....	41
Attribution of Blame	43
Diagnostic Framing by the Bottled Water Industry	44
Bottled Water Bans	45
Restricted Choice and Shifting Consumption	45
Public Health Emergency.....	48
Attribution of Blame	50
Prognostic Frames.....	51
Prognostic Framing by the Anti-Bottled Water Movement.....	52
Boycott and Ban Bottled Water.....	52
Choose Tap Water.....	56
Resist Water Bottling Plants	57
Label the Source.....	58
Invest in Public Water	59
Prognostic Framing by the Bottled Water Industry	61
Promote Bottled Water’s “Good Story”	61
Promote Healthy Hydration	64
Promote Recycling	66
Advocacy	68
Motivational Frames	72
Motivational Framing by the Anti-Bottled Water Movement	72
Water Crisis.....	72
Motivational Framing by the Bottled Water Industry.....	73
Obesity Crisis	73
Disaster Emergency.....	74
One for All and All for One	75
Frame Alignment Processes	76
Frame Bridging	76
Frame Amplification.....	83
Frame Extension	86
Frame Transformation	93
Master Frames	93
Anti-Neoliberalism	94
Human Rights	96
Choice	99
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	103
REFERENCES.....	108
APPENDICES.....	127

CURRICULUM VITA 134

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1: CORE FRAMING TASKS.....	21
2: FRAME ALIGNMENT PROCESSES.....	23
3: ABWM & IBWA CORE FRAMING TASKS.....	34
4: ABWM DIAGNOSTIC FRAMES SUMMARY.....	44
5: IBWA DIAGNOSTIC FRAMES SUMMARY.....	51
6: ABWM PROGNOSTIC FRAMES SUMMARY.....	61
7: IBWA PROGNOSTIC FRAMES SUMMARY.....	72
8: ABWM & IBWA MOTIVATIONAL FRAMES SUMMARY.....	76
9: ABWM & IBWA FRAME BRIDGING SUMMARY.....	83
10: ABWM & IBWA FRAME AMPLIFICATION SUMMARY.....	86
11: ABWM & IBWA FRAME EXTENSION SUMMARY.....	92
12: ABWM & IBWA MASTER FRAMES SUMMARY.....	102

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to gain insight into the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM) in the U.S. and its opposition, the bottled water industry. In the United States, the majority of people have convenient and cheap access to clean water from the faucet in the kitchen sink. However, despite this in-home convenience, since the 1990's, more and more Americans have been choosing to buy water packaged in a handy plastic bottle that can be transported with them wherever they go and then thrown away when they are finished with it - making bottled water one of the most popular beverages. By 1992, bottled water was already a well-established industry in the U.S. with 430 bottling facilities producing and distributing 700 brands of bottled water (Olson, 1999). As bottled water has grown as an industry, it has been met with growing contestation. This research analyzes the anti-bottled water campaigning of the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM), which has emerged to contest bottled water and defend public tap water systems, and the counter response of the bottled water industry.

Between the years 1990 and 1997, U.S. sales of bottled water increased dramatically by more than 3000%, from \$115 million to \$4 billion due to: 1) anti-obesity public health messages, 2) millions of dollars pumped into advertising by the industry, promoting perceived health benefits, and 3) the development and manufacturing of polyethylene terephthalate (PET) bottles which were lightweight and break resistant

(Royte, 2008). After several decades of continued and seemingly unstoppable growth, the bottled water industry in the U.S. experienced a minor setback due to a dip in revenues and sales in 2008 and 2009, which the industry attributes to the effects of the economic recession (Beverage Marketing Corporation [BMC], September 2011).

Despite the recent setback, the Beverage Marketing Corporation (September 2011) states that “longer-term developments point to a continued thirst for bottled water.” In 2010, 28.3 gallons of bottled water, up 2.7% from the previous year, were consumed per person in the United States, the largest market for bottled water, bringing in \$10.6 billion for bottled water corporations (BMC, 2011). So despite convenient access to cheap clean tap water, “[E]very second of every day in the United States, a thousand people buy and open up a plastic bottle of commercially produced water, and ... a thousand plastic bottles are thrown away. Eighty-five million bottles a day... More than thirty billion bottles a year... And for every bottle consumed in the U.S., another four are consumed around the world” (Gleick, 2010, p. ix).

Advertising has demonized tap water, convincing people that bottled water is a better, healthier, more pure choice than tap water (Wilk, 2006; Magiera, 1994; Olson, 1999). Contrary to the industry’s negative messages about tap water, in 2006, almost fifty percent of bottled water in the United States came from municipal sources (Royte, 2008). Bottled water is typically sold to consumers for 1,900 times the cost of that of tap water (Environmental Working Group [EWG], October 2008). Furthermore, bottled water is argued to have a detrimental impact on the environment, as oil is required for the production of the bottles, producing with it carbon dioxide, and many bottles end up in

the landfill. Additionally, large-scale water extraction for the bottling of water can lead to drops in water tables and depleted water resources (Boldt-Van Rooy, 2009).

It is within this context that an Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM) has emerged to challenge the bottled water industry and build support for public tap water. The ABWM has achieved many successes, including the restriction or ban of bottled water sales on more than 90 college and university campuses across the United States (Savedge, March, 13, 2012). The movement has also managed to limit or ban bottled water sales within municipalities and state parks (Pickering, April, 26, 2012; Bly, February 7, 2012). So far, six states have voted to eliminate taxpayer expenditure on bottled water in state offices and other facilities (Wheeler, 2011). Additionally, local efforts to prevent or restrict the extraction of spring and other water sources by bottled water corporations have also made gains. In 2009, a citizen coalition in McCloud, California mobilized and managed to prevent Nestlé from installing what would have been the largest water bottling plant in the U.S. in McCloud, which would have drawn on water from local springs (Jaffee & Newman, 2013).

The gains of the ABWM have been met with opposition from a corporate industry group diametrically opposed to its mission. The bottled water industry has not only engaged new marketing strategies, corporate social responsibility initiatives and promotional relations efforts, but a full-fledged counterframing effort which is analyzed as a part of this research.

This thesis analyzes how opposing organizations, the ABWM and the bottled water industry, frame bottled water and prioritize particular framing activity. This study

identifies and describes the collective action frames, modes for organizing meaning and interpretation in order to influence action by potential adherents and constituents (Benford & Snow, 2000), by analyzing the websites of two U.S. based non-profit organizations engaged in anti-bottled water campaigns as well as the website of one U.S. based bottled water industry organization engaged in a campaign to defend and protect bottled water.

This study develops further the literature on framing and counter-framing, or modes of dismantling existing frames. It adds to the understanding of the interplay between anti-corporate framing and corporate counterframing. Minimal research has been conducted on the ABWM, and no research presently exists in which its framing processes have been analyzed nor have those of the bottled water industry, therefore, this research is an important addition to what is currently a deficient literature.

This thesis draws upon the social movement framing work of Robert Benford and David Snow, which borrows from and expands upon Erving Goffman's (1974) frame analysis work, to answer the following questions:

1. How do the ABWM and bottled water industry frame and counterframe bottled water? What are the differences and similarities?
2. Which of the core framing tasks (diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing) and frame alignment processes (frame bridging, amplification, extension and transformation) do the ABWM and the bottled water industry prioritize? What are the differences and similarities?

3. What master frames do the ABWM and bottled water industry employ?

The paper is divided into five sections. The first section is the Literature Review. The literature reviewed for this study is divided into three subsections. The first subsection provides context on growing consumption and the rise of corporations. The second subsection describes anti-corporate movements that have emerged in response to growing corporate power and a culture of consumerism, as well as examines corporate responses to anti-corporate campaigning. The third subsection describes the evolution of the global trend toward water privatization and the growth of the bottled water industry, as well as introduces the Anti-Bottled Water Movement.

The second section is the theoretical framework where I detail the framing perspective that guides this thesis. Within this section, collective action frames, core framing task, frame alignment processes and master frames are described and explained. The third section is the Methods. Frame analysis and documentary analysis are paired together as complementary methodologies for this research and are explained in this section. The fourth section is the findings and analysis where the specific core framing tasks, frame alignment processes and master frames for both the ABWM and bottled water industry are identified and described. The final section is the discussion and conclusion.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The Age of Consumption and the Corporation

The 1920's and 1930's began the shift from a society focused on production to one focused on consumption (Perry, 2006). It is during this time period that citizenship and civic participation became equated with consumerism (Perry, 2006; Marcuse 1964). During the Depression, political language was incorporated into product advertising in order to transform the act of purchasing into that of exercising the rights and duties that come with citizenship such as voting, freedom, and fulfilling one's civic obligations (Dickinson, 2005; McGovern, 1998). This advertising ultimately established consumption as the main conduit of citizenship and equated "good consumer" with "good American" (Dickinson, 2005, p.274). In the 1950s, state policy drew parallels between consumption and democracy, touting consumption as a mode for egalitarianism (Dickinson, 2005). After September 11, 2001, advertisers drew correlations between corporations and the nation; corporations began to resemble citizens and the United States became a nation of "citizen consumers" (Dickinson, 2005, p.275). In 2010, in *Citizens United v. FEC*, the Supreme Court granted corporations the right to fund political candidates and campaigns without limit, justifying its decision by stating that corporations are "associations of persons" and should thus be afforded the same constitutional rights as "natural persons" (Ellis, 2011, p. 721).

The twenty-first century has progressively advanced the agenda of corporations, empowering them to swell in size and influence over ordinary citizens (Vogel 1996; Nace 2003; Anderson and Cavanagh, 2000; Jones, Comfort and Hillier, 2006, as cited in Soule, 2009). This swell in corporate size and influence can be attributed, at least in part, to the deregulation and liberalization of markets that started in the early 1970's (Soule, 2009), where government oversight, a form of checks and balances on corporate power, was systematically reduced and at times eliminated in order to encourage "freer" flowing capital. Then in the 1980s, privatization, or "the deliberate sale by a government of state-owned enterprises or assets to private economic agents," became a global trend after the Thatcher government of Great Britain rendered the practice commonplace (Megginson & Netter, 2001, p. 321). The privatization of "public goods and services" by corporations has further contributed to their growing power and public influence (Rondinelli, 2002, p.14).

Not only have corporations grown in political power over the past several decades, they have also grown in social power and influence over the lives of almost everyone worldwide thanks greatly to advertising and marketing efforts. U.S. expenditure on advertising doubled in the decade from 1950 to 1960, increasing from \$5.7 billion to \$12 billion, as corporations began to focus advertisement efforts on television, using methods such as motivational analysis, demographic targeting and "subliminal advertising" (Advertising Age, 2005). Then in the mid-1980s, corporations shifted their focus from producing things to producing "*images* of their brands;" marketing began to replace manufacturing as an economic driver (Klein, 1999, p.4). Corporations began to distinguish their products by manufacturing "image-based

difference[s]” when product differences were lacking (Klein, 1999, p.6). Brands worked to incorporate cultural meaning and symbols and then project those back on to consumers and society (Klein, 1999). However, brands require a lot of tending and maintenance, always necessitating more aggressive marketing to continue to maintain a prominence in the market (Klein, 1999). According to Kantar Media, by 2012, U.S. advertising expenditure reached \$140 billion (as cited in Klein, 1999). Advertising used to focus on reaching the consumer at home, but now people are surrounded by brand advertisements at every turn from product placements on television to advertisements in doctor examination rooms, email, cellphones, digital billboards, video screens in taxis, subway turnstiles, etc. (Story, 2007). It is estimated that the average city dweller views 5,000 advertisements per day (Story, 2007). People indicate allegiance to particular brands by putting bumper stickers on their cars and following their favorite companies on Facebook. People are even going so far as adorning their bodies with corporate logo tattoos as a means of expressing the connection between their own self-identity and the values and lifestyle that their brand of choice communicates (Orend & Gagné, 2009).

Anti-Corporate Movements

This corporate swell has been met with a complementary growth in anti-corporate activism (Soule, 2009). Worldwide, people are organizing and using boycotts and other tactics to attack the reputations of corporate brands in order to put pressure on corporations to shift their business practices with the goal of ultimately limiting the power of corporations and balancing the overall economic and political systems (Hertz, 2001). The perception of anti-corporate activists is that the nation state is no longer the

center of political power, and therefore the focus of direct action must shift from targeting politicians to targeting “the new political power” - corporations (Hertz, 2001, p.114). “[T]here is an increasing realization that tarnishing the corporate image of unethical companies, or leaving their products on the shelves, are powerful weapons” (Hertz, 2001, p.114). Anti-corporate campaigning can be understood as the pressuring of corporations, through focused tactics, to make certain changes in their business practices and policies, by individual organizations or alliances of organizations (Sadler, 2004). Another, broader definition is that anti-corporate campaigning encompasses more general actions which fight for the sovereignty of nation states and citizens over the influence and control of corporations (Sadler, 2004). At the heart of anti-corporate campaigning is concern for and opposition to the ever-expanding power and reach of corporations (Soule, 2009).

Anti-corporate movements can have very different motivations and objectives. Karagianni and Cornelissen (2006) developed a typology for anti-corporate movements:

- 1) Corporate watchdogs, that have clear corporate targets and emphasize the need for corporate regulation and democratic control of corporations;
- 2) Reformers, that mobilize around multiple social issues that need attention such as the environment, human rights and fair trade;
- 3) Visionaries, that work to shift values with the goal of eventually influencing politics and the economy, such as anarchists or socialists;
- 4) Small boxers, that defend small-scale businesses over “large-scale, multinational, big box corporations;”
- 5) Preservers, that “express an ongoing critique of modernization and aim to restore or preserve morals and norms of the past that they claim will ensure a better way of life” (pp. 169-170).

Anti-corporate movements often attack the images of corporations as part of their strategy. One such way is through boycotts. In 2001, the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (CIW), a worker-based human rights organization, called for a nation-wide boycott of Taco Bell in protest of low wages paid to migrant farmworkers who pick tomatoes for Taco Bell restaurants and for unfair labor practices in the fields; the boycott resulted in the concession of Taco Bell to the demands of the CIW in 2005 (Tessier, 2007). Anti-retailer internet campaigns are a growing phenomenon with many websites and blogs dedicated to campaigning against specific large-scale retailers, like “Against the Wal,” a website (<http://www.againstthewal.com/>) dedicated to campaigning against Walmart (Jones, Comfort and Hillier, 2006). Another tactic is “culture jamming,” or organized social activist strategies that mimic and mock the images and messaging of corporate brands, which is used to undermine brands and the corporate messaging strategies behind them (Carducci, 2006, Klein, 1999). This particular tactic works to wake people up to the everyday intrusion of advertising in their lives and to move them towards altering their lifestyle choices and consumptive practices (Humphery, 2010). One example is a sign that looks just like a “Bank of America” sign, complete with logo, only it says “Bankrupt America.” Another example is the spoof advertising for Camel Cigarettes where “Joe Chemo” takes the place of “Joe Camel.”

Anti-corporate activism has impacted the images, brands, reputations and bottom lines of corporations globally, obligating corporations to engage in corporate image repair strategies. Elizabeth Smith (2012) studied the websites of Philip Morris (tobacco), Kraft (processed foods) and Nestlé (infant formula) after the corporations had been identified as promoting disease. Smith (2012) found that all three corporations “defined the

problems they were addressing strategically” (p.582); avoided responsibility for their actions; shifted responsibility for problem solving onto others; and aligned themselves with public health organizations.

Corporate Control of Water and the Anti-Bottled Water Movement

Corporate control of public water resources is growing worldwide, including the privatization of municipal water systems as well as the bottling of municipal water and other water sources for sale. In a context of global water scarcity, international organizations such as the World Trade Organization, World Bank and International Monetary Fund are promoting the privatization and commodification of water (Robbins, 2003). Craig Anthony (Tony) Arnold (2009) defines water privatization as “the private ownership, control, development, exploitation, trade in, and use of water for private purpose or gain” (p. 790). In his analysis of water privatization trends in the U.S., he identifies the growing trend for water to be valued exclusively for its monetary or economic value, or in other words, as a consumer commodity (Arnold, 2009). Arnold states that the American economy and society are built on consumerism and the “growth imperative” where the focus is on growing the economy and in order to do so there must be increased consumption (2009, p.813). This dependence on growing consumption “facilitat[es] uses of natural resources beyond nature’s carrying capacity” (Arnold, 2009, p. 813). The commodification of water results in water becoming “disconnected conceptually and politically from its places of origin: particular watersheds, ecosystems, and landscapes” (Arnold, 2009, p.812). Barlow and Clarke argue that privatization leads to inequity and a lack of sustainability as corporations focus on profit maximization

through cost-cutting measures at the expense of public interests (2002).

In 1996, Stockton, California Mayor Gary Podesto made the decision to privatize the city's water system stating, "It's time that Stockton enter the 21st Century in its delivery of services and think of our citizens as customers" (Snitow, Kaufman and Fox, 2007, p. 36). Proponents of public water control argue that public water ownership and management is much more transparent in its operations than private ownership and management (Snitow, Kaufman and Fox, 2007). When water is treated as a public good, all major decisions are subjected to public processes of decision-making (Snitow, Kaufman and Fox, 2007). When water is treated as a public good, citizens are entitled to water, and through their citizenship, they are empowered to hold their municipality/government accountable for the provision of clean, safe and affordable water (Snitow, Kaufman and Fox, 2007, p.11). Those opposed to water privatization claim that private water ownership and management lacks transparency and accountability (Snitow, Kaufman and Fox, 2007, p. 11).

The practice of bottling water in the United States is not a new phenomenon and actually started in 1820 with the bottling of Saratoga Spring waters by Rev. D. O. Griswold (Chapelle, 2005). Americans began turning to bottled spring waters as a safer source of clean drinking water during a time when municipal tap water sources were often contaminated (Chapelle, 2005). The invention of chlorination all but annihilated the bottled water industry in the early twentieth century, so what has led Americans to purchase bottled water again, revitalizing the bottled water industry when clean and inexpensive tap water runs from the faucet (Chapelle, 2005)?

In the 1960's, Americans became concerned again about the quality of their tap water; much of it sourced by rivers, as the accumulations of years of disposing untreated sewage and industrial waste in rivers began take its toll on water quality (Chapelle, 2005). Rachel Carson's book *Silent Spring* came out in 1962 and led to heightened concern among Americans about the harmful effects of chemical pesticides on the environment and water sources. On June 22 of 1969, Americans watched as the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland caught fire (Gleick, 2010). The fire sparked the modern day environmental movement and "led to the federal Clean Water Act of 1972, the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, and the creation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)" (Gleick, 2010, p.16). In 1974, Congress passed the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) (Gleick, 2010).

Bottled water corporations soon ramped up their marketing efforts. In 1977, Perrier launched a multi-million dollar advertising campaign in the U.S., selling Americans handheld green bottles of water (Chapelle, 2005). In 1994, Pepsi entered the bottled water market with their bottled water Aquafina and five years later Coca-Cola unveiled Dasani, both bottling municipal tap water sources in the U.S. and packaging them for sale (Royte, 2008). In 2006, more than 40% of bottled water in the United States came from municipal sources (Royte, 2008); yet, bottled water is typically being sold to consumers for 1,900 times the cost of that of tap water (EWG, October 2008).

Miguel Doria reviewed the literature on bottled water (2006) and found important differences in consumers' reasons for choosing bottled water when comparing consumer survey data for the U.S., Canada and France. U.S. consumers primarily chose bottled

water over tap water due to the following factors: 1. health and risk, and 2. substitute for other beverages (Doria, 2006). Hu, Morton and Mahler found in their survey across 21 states that there is a significant negative relationship between perception of ground water quality and bottled water use (2011). They also found significant relationships between age and gender and bottled water use when controlling for all other variables; young people and females consume more bottled water. They argue that young people are perhaps more vulnerable to marketing and advertising and that females are more sensitive to perceptions of risk (Hu et al., 2011). Hu et al. did not find a significant relationship between environmental attitude and bottled water use, stating that, “Consumers with stronger overall concern about the environment do not seem to transfer this concern to pollution and waste problems associated with purchasing bottled drinking water” (2011, p. 575).

In 2009, the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) conducted a study to evaluate: 1) the Food and Drug Administration’s (FDA) regulation of bottled water, 2) federal and state regulation of the content of bottled water labels, and 3) the environmental impact of bottled water. The GAO found that in general, the FDA’s regulation of bottled water as a “food,” under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), is less stringent than that of the EPA’s regulation of tap water, under the Safe Drinking Water Act (2009). “[S]tate regulatory requirements for bottled water often meet or exceed those of FDA,” however there are inconsistencies and variations from state to state and state requirements for bottled water are not as comprehensive or as consistent as those for tap water (GAO, 2009, pp.8). Further, the FDA does not have the statutory

authority to supervise the regulation process of states like the EPA does under the Safe Drinking Water Act (GAO, 2009).

Among the inconsistencies are the regulations regarding the labeling of bottled water. The GAO sampled 83 bottled water labels from across the U.S. and found that in general the information contained on the labels was accurate; however, they questioned whether the information was sufficient (2009). Very few of the labels sampled provided consumers with access to further water content and quality information through telephone numbers, addresses, websites or emails, and the FDA has not required the industry to provide this information to consumers (GAO, 2009).

In 2010, the Environmental Working Group (EWG) surveyed the labels and websites of 173 bottled waters with the goal of evaluating their practices of disclosure, including geographic source, treatment methods and purity of their products (Nneka, Gray, & Houlihan, 2011). EWG found that less than 20% disclosed the geographic source of their water and nearly a third of those surveyed failed to disclose any information regarding water treatment or purity on their labels, websites, nor by request (Nneka et al., 2011). Of the top 10 selling domestic water brands, 9 failed to disclose basic facts about water source, treatment methods and purity on their labels (Nneka et al., 2011).

As for the environmental impacts, the GAO (2009) found that 1) most plastic bottles end up in the landfill as opposed to a recycling facility, 2) bottled water requires more energy for both manufacturing and transportation than does tap water, and 3) groundwater extraction for bottled water “can, in some cases, alter local groundwater

levels and flows to nearby surface waters, according to the U.S. Geological Survey” (p.27). Furthermore, large scale water extraction for the production of bottled water often 1) clashes with local efforts to conserve water supplies; 2) reduces the water table of the aquifer at a rate greater than the rate of replenishment; and 3) leads to the depletion of the water sources of local wells and intrusion of salt water which damages the freshwater dependent environment (Boldt-Van Rooy, 2009).

Gleick and Cooley (2009) calculated the energy required to produce and transport bottled water to consumers in the U.S. for sale. Included in their calculation was the energy required for: the production of the polyethylene terephthalate (PET) plastic and the plastic bottles, the processing of the water at the bottling plant, the bottling of the water (including the rinsing, filling, sealing and labeling), the transportation from the bottling facility to the point of sale (3 different transportation scenarios were analyzed), and the refrigeration required to keep the product cool until sold (Gleick & Cooley, 2009). The authors estimate that bottled water production costs 2000 times more in energy than that of tap water production (Gleick & Cooley, 2009). The primary contributor to the energy cost of bottled water is the energy required in the production of the plastic bottles, yet long distance transport can produce comparable energy costs (Gleick and Cooley, 2009, pp.6). Gleick and Cooley estimate that in the United States, for the 33 billion liters of bottled water that Americans purchased in 2007, “an energy input equivalent to between 32 and 54 million barrels of oil” was required (Gleick and Cooley, 2009, pp.6).

The rapid and tremendous growth of bottled water has been met with opposition from a social movement against bottled water, the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM). This movement is campaigning primarily on two fronts: 1. Urging consumers, public institutions and local governments to abandon bottled water in favor of the tap; and 2. Opposing spring water extraction at the local level (Jaffee & Newman, 2013). The ABWM has enjoyed many successes since its advent including bottled water bans or limits on U.S. college and university campuses (Savage, 2012), in municipalities and state parks (Pickering, 2012, April, 26; Bly, February 7, 2012) and even the elimination of tax expenditures on bottled water in several states (Wheeler, 2011). Daniel Jaffee and Soren Newman (2012) conducted ethnographic interviews in McCloud and Cascade Locks, two communities where the installation of Nestlé bottling plants was heavily contested, with public officials, community residents, coalition group members and Nestle Waters. They found competing framings regarding control of water - opponents of the bottled water stressed the risk of losing control of local water to a powerful corporation while Nestlé emphasized that it would just be a consumer (Jaffee & Newman, 2012). They found rival narratives in relation to “the purity, uniqueness, and/or mundaneness... of spring water to be bottled, bottled water itself and the public tap water” (Jaffee & Newman, 2012, p.328). Despite Jaffee and Newman’s study, there is little other, if any, academic research currently available on the ABWM which is why I became interested in developing academic research on the subject.

CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Framing Perspective

A major theoretical concept important for the understanding of social movements is framing. Framing “refers to an interpretative schema that simplifies and condenses the ‘world out there’ by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of action within one’s present or past environment” (Snow & Benford, 1992, p.137). Social movement scholars adopted the concept of framing primarily from Erving Goffman’s *Frame Analysis* (1974) where he describes how individuals use frames daily “to locate, perceive, identify, and label” life experiences and the world (p. 21). However, frames are not only used by individuals to create meaning and to interpret events within their own lives, frames are generated and modified within interactions between individuals and in society (Benford and Snow, 2000). Frames define problems, interpret causation, make value-based assessments, and recommend solutions (Entman, 1993). The generated frame serves a “focusing function,” working as a lens which guides the “vision” or understanding of the target audience by controlling what is “in the frame” versus “out of frame” (Snow, 2004, p. 384) rendering whatever is selected to be included within the frame as more salient (Entman, 1993). Frames serve an “articulation function,” fusing together interspersed elements of the scene to ensure that a particular narrative prevails over another (Snow, 2004, p. 384). And frames serve a “transformation function,” reconstructing elements of social reality as “in the

transformation of routine grievances or misfortunes into injustices or mobilizing grievances in the context of collective action” (Snow, 2004, p.384). For a frame to be successful in mobilizing potential adherents, it must be constructed in such a way as to simultaneously *resonate* with current belief systems, while challenging the status quo (Hewitt & McCammon, 2005).

Framing processes, or collective action frames, are strategic interpretation and meaning production resources that social movements use to mobilize current and potential supporters to action while demobilizing opponents (Snow & Benford, 1988). “[C]ollective action frames are action oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of social movements” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p.614). Collective action frames are engaged by activists to bring injustices to light, attribute blame, and assign responsibility for remedial action (Snow & Benford, 1992). William Gamson (1995) proposes that the mobilization of social movement adherents hinges on three components of collective action frames: 1. *Injustice component* - identifying a clear target that is causing harm and suffering whether it is individuals, groups, corporations, or government, with the goal of moving constituents to action; 2. *Agency component* – recognizes the power of a movement to overcome “collective helplessness” and achieve social change; and 3. *Identity component* – establishes “who we are,” linking participants’ sense of self with a larger collective identity, while distinguishing themselves from the opposition, “who they are.” While injustice frames are relatively pervasive in social movement discourse when the struggle is for economic/and or political change, Benford and Snow (2000) argue that the presence of an injustice component is not necessarily compulsory and could be absent in religious

movements for example. There are considerable similarities between Gamson's work on frames and that of Snow and Benford; the main difference being that Gamson's approach is from the perspective of potential adherents whereas Benford and Snow's approach is from the perspective of social movements (Noakes & Johnston, 2005).

Snow and Benford (1988) name three *core framing tasks*: 1. *Diagnostic framing*, which diagnoses a social problem that needs to be addressed and assigns causality or culpability; 2. *Prognostic framing*, which proposes a remedy to the identified problem and determines the strategic course of action, tactics and targets ; and 3. *Motivational framing* , which urges people to take action (see Table 1). Diagnostic and prognostic frames serve as mechanisms of “consensus mobilization,” while motivational frames are geared towards “action mobilization” (Snow & Benford, 1988, pp. 202). Consensus mobilization does not necessarily translate into action, but rather participation hinges on the production of motivational frames (Snow & Benford, 1988). All three framing tasks must be engaged to achieve mobilization (Snow & Benford, 1988). “The more the three tasks are robust or richly developed and interconnected, the more successful the mobilization effort, *ceteris paribus*” (Snow and Benford, 1988, p.199, original emphasis).

Table 1: Core Framing Tasks

Core Framing Task	Description of Framing Task
Diagnostic Framing	Identification of a problem Attribution of blame or causality
Prognostic Framing	Solutions to the problem Strategies, tactics and targets
Motivational Framing	Call to arms or <i>rational for action</i> Vocabulary for motives

Source: Snow and Benford, 1988

In addition to the three core framing tasks, Benford and Snow (2000) identify three framing processes that enable the “development, generation, and elaboration” of collective action frames (p.612): 1. *Discursive processes* denote the production of texts by social movement actors through “frame articulation,” which packages social reality in a particular way, and “frame amplification,” which emphasizes an aspect of social reality over other aspects; 2. *Strategic processes* refer to framing processes which are goal oriented, otherwise known as “frame alignment processes”: frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension and frame transformation; and 3. *Contested processes* concern the challenges that movements struggle through in their interactive meaning development: “counterframing by movement opponents, bystanders, and the media; frame disputes within movements; and the dialectic between frames and events” (p. 623-625).

Social movements engage disparate strategies in order to appeal to a particular public. The core framing tasks indicate the problem, the offender, the solution and the action required. *Frame alignment processes* occur when movement collective action frames are in agreement with individual frames; they are crucial for movement participation (Snow, Rochford, Worden, and Benford, 1986, p.467). Snow et al. (1986) identify four frame alignment processes (see Table 2): 1. *Frame bridging* connects two or more compatible frames that once were unconnected and links collective action frames to “unmobilized sentiment pools and or public opinion preference clusters” (p.467); 2. *Frame amplification* is the process of defining or reinvigorating an interpretative frame or certain values and beliefs (p.467); 3. *Frame extension* broadens the boundaries of the frame to incorporate the perspectives, concerns or beliefs of the target audience (p.467); and 4. *Frame transformation* “refers to changing old understandings and meanings and/or generating new ones” (Benford and Snow, 2000, p. 625).

Table 2: Frame Alignment Processes

Frame Alignment Process	Description of Frame Alignment Process
Frame Amplification	Idealization, embellishment, clarification, or invigoration of existing values or beliefs
Frame Bridging	Linking a movement organization to individuals and groups with common grievances
Frame Extension	Extending the boundaries of the primary framework to attract potential adherents
Frame Transformation	Changing old understandings and meanings and/or generating new ones

Source: Benford and Snow, 2000

Master Frames, while similar in function, are much broader in their scope than movement-specific collective action frames (Snow & Benford, 1992) and actually “shape and constrain movement-specific frames” (Noonan, 1995, p.87). Master frames are a means for facilitating the meaningful alliance of heterogeneous groups in a common political struggle (Carroll & Ratner, 2008). Master frames “provide the interpretative medium through which collective actors associated with different movements assign blame for the problem they are attempting to ameliorate” –diagnostic framing on a macrolevel (Snow & Benford, 1992, p.139). Another characteristic is that they can restrict collective action frames through narrow definitions making it difficult to amplify or extend frames, or they allow for flexibility in interpretation (Snow & Benford, 1992).

For a master frame to have good mobilization potential, it needs to be elaborative as well as relevant and resonate with potential constituents (Snow & Benford, 1992).

Counterframing differs from framing in that it works to “discredit, undermine, rebut, and otherwise neutralize the movement’s claims, myths, collective identity, and interpretive frameworks” (Benford, 1987, p.75). Where a frame affects an individual’s initial understanding and interpretation of a subject matter, a persuasive counterframe can cause that same individual to revisit and revise her prior viewpoints (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, Waller & Conaway, 2011). An organization under attack by social activists will not always contradict the activists’ allegations directly, but alternatively, will often attempt to manipulate and co-opt the values that the activists are defending in order to improve the organization’s image (Gallo-Cruz, 2012). Framing struggles are used to engage advocates and motivate them to join a social movement and take action, while counterframing struggles work to disengage those same advocates while simultaneously persuading others to join their efforts (Gallo-Cruz, 2012). In 1998, Nike successfully employed counterframing tactics in response to the negative media attention generated by anticorporate campaigning directed specifically at Nike for alleged human rights violations and the use of sweatshop labor in its overseas factories, which threatened its reputation for good corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Waller & Conaway, 2011). Nike improved its CSR standing and market performance through a counter-campaign, which included the employment of counterframes that indicated that economic empowerment of poor Asian and African women in developing countries was a priority for the company (Waller & Conaway, 2011). Through counterframes, Nike was able to redirect the conversation away from sweatshops to economic empowerment.

Counterframing efforts work to redefine the frame through which people perceive and interpret events.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Johnston (2002) identifies five fundamental elements of a frame: 1. “a frame has content” (p.64); 2. “a frame is a cognitive structure or schema” (p.64); 3. “frames are *both* individual and social”(p.64-65, original emphasis); 4. “frames are both fixed cognitive structures and emergent cognitive processes”(p.66); and 5. “frames are based on text...symbolic behaviors and their structure” (p.66). Researchers gain access to social movement frames and framing activities primarily through the written and spoken language of participants (Johnston, 2002).

In order to identify, analyze and compare the core framing tasks, frame alignment processes, and master frames of the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM) and the bottled water industry, I analyzed the content of the websites of two ABWM organizations, Corporate Accountability International (www.stopcorporateabuse.org) and Food and Water Watch (www.foodandwaterwatch.org), as well as the web content of the International Bottled Water Association (www.bottledwater.org) and its campaign website “Bottled Water Matters” (www.bottledwatermatters.org).

For the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM), I sampled Corporate Accountability International and Food and Water Watch because they 1) are non-profit organizations based in the U.S.; 2) have functional and extensive web presences; 3) contain information specific to their ideology and actions regarding the ABWM; 4) have

active campaigns to engage supporters to abandon bottled water in support of tap water; and 5) are the most visible ABWM organizations in the U.S.

For the bottled water industry, I sampled the International Bottled Water Association because 1) the organization is located in the U.S.; 2) it “unifies the bottled water industry;” 3) it has a functional and extensive web presence; and 4) it has an active campaign to engage supporters to defend bottled water (the campaign is housed on the Bottled Water Matters site).

The work of both Corporate Accountability International and Food and Water Watch encompasses more than work on bottled water. However, this research focused on webpages and web content related to bottled water and the specific campaigns against bottled water. In the case of Corporate Accountability International, the focus was on the “Think Outside the Bottle” campaign. In the case of Food and Water Watch, the focus was on the “Take Back the Tap” campaign. I not only analyzed the website of International Bottled Water Association, but also analyzed its associated “Bottled Water Matters” website since it is the site of its campaign oriented work – their “advocacy website.”

I analyzed content currently available on each of the websites dating back to 2005 because it marks the year that the first of the three campaigns was founded - “Take Back the Tap,” “Think Outside the Bottle” followed in 2006, and “Bottled Water Matters” in 2007. Web content was downloaded from each website within one month between August 24, 2015 and September 24, 2015. The open source and free software Zotero (www.zotero.org) was used to manually archive web material including: snapshots of

webpages, PDFs, images, and other documents. Zotero was employed because it is one of the most extensively used software programs for manually archiving data in academic research (Mosca, 2014). Content from the sampled core web pages was also copied and pasted into Microsoft Word to enable quicker searches and note taking. YouTube videos posted on the webpages of the three groups were viewed between August 24, 2015 and November 1, 2015. Most issues of IBWA's *Bottled Water Reporter Magazine* were viewed online live between August 24, 2015 and November 1, 2015 because issues were not accessible in a downloadable format. Each document, which includes any video, audio or written texts contained on the websites under analysis, served as the units of analysis. So, each webpage, article, resource, video was analyzed as one unit.

I sampled the core webpages for the International Bottled Water Association, the organization (for more detail see Appendix 3). A total of 170 documents (including videos, images, etc.) were sampled from IBWA. 36 issues of *Bottled Water Reporter Magazine* between the Sept/Oct 2015 issue and the Oct/Nov 2009 issue were sampled. Given the high volume of IBWA press releases available online dating back to 2006, 30 press releases were sampled by using the random number generator function in Excel to randomly select titles of press releases. Press releases which were overly technical about bottled water technology or specific to conference and trade show registrations and award ceremonies were not included. Thirty-seven "statements and letters" dated between September 10, 2008 and August 28, 2015 were sampled. Three documents were sampled under the heading "Report, Studies & Resources." Documents published by outside sources or technical procedure type resources were not included. Twenty-one images were sampled from the "image library" and 13 short videos were sampled. On IBWA's

Bottled Water Matters website, the core webpages were sampled (for more detail see Appendix 3). Due to the high volume of content under the heading “News,” 30 news posts were randomly sampled using the method described previously, however if there was a redirect to an outside website for the core of the content, then the post was not included. The “News” posts for the Bottled Water Matters website are very similar in function to a blog.

For Corporate Accountability International, the core webpages with a special focus on CAI’s work on water issues were sampled (for more details see Appendix 1). A total of 136 documents were sampled for CAI. Under the heading “Resources,” filtered by the campaign “Think Outside the Bottle,” 18 resources were sampled. 20 press releases filtered by the campaign “Think Outside the Bottle” were sampled as well as 51 press releases filtered by the campaign “Challenge Corporate Control of Water.” Twenty-three news articles filtered by “Challenge Corporate Control of Water” were sampled. Duplicates of press releases and articles were not collected. If the news item was published from an outside source, it was not included unless a CAI staff member wrote the article. When filtering by the broader category of “Challenge Corporate Control of Water,” articles were selected if bottled water was mentioned somewhere in the article or if the article mentioned a corporation which bottles water. Thirteen statements filtered by “Challenge Corporate Control of Water” were sampled. Under the heading of “Blog,” Eleven posts filtered by “Think Outside the Bottle” were sampled. One video was available to sample, “The Story of Bottled Water,” which was produced in part by both CAI and FWW. Ten Newsletters were sampled dating from June 18, 2012 to September 18, 2015.

Food & Water Watch overhauled their website right after I downloaded content to Zotero. Therefore, the webpages analyzed are no longer accessible (the new version of the website is not included in this study; for more details on the pages analyzed see Appendix 2). Many of the core web page links no longer work or contain redirects to new web pages. However, the Internet Archive Way Back machine <https://archive.org/web/> can be used to view the webpages by entering a webpage in the browser and then selecting a date within the sampling time frame of this study. A total of 65 documents were sampled for FWW. Eight newsletters were sampled from Winter 2013 – Fall 2015. Eleven press releases tagged “bottled water” were sampled. Given the high volume of blog posts filtered by “bottled water,” 30 blog posts were randomly selected using the technique previously described. Under the header “Research,” 10 fact sheets, one issue brief and five reports were sampled and one resource (there were only two water-related resources, one of which was already sampled under “Research”) under the heading “Tools and Resources” was sampled based on bottled water related content or content pertaining to the “Take Back the Tap” campaign.

Since this research is concerned with describing collective action frames and framing processes, frame analysis was employed as the guiding methodology. And because this research is concerned with the analysis of web-based documents, documentary analysis was used to support the systematic identification and analysis of frames. “Documentary analysis is a form of qualitative analysis that requires readers to locate, interpret, analyze and draw conclusions about the evidence presented” (Fitzgerald, 2012, p.297).

I coded documents based on core framing tasks (diagnostic, prognostic, or motivational) and frame alignment processes (frame amplifying, bridging, extending, or transforming). I define diagnostic framing in this research as content that characterizes the impact of bottled water as well as proponents and opponents of bottled water. Prognostic framing was indicated as content that describes particular actions or inactions, strategies and tactics to address the problem or culpable target identified in the diagnostic frame; this includes counterframing or countering claims made by rivals. Motivational framing was identified based on the use of galvanizing or dissuading language that communicates the urgency, or lack thereof, to mobilize for action.

Frame alignment processes were coded as frame bridging, amplifying, extending and transformation. Frame bridging was defined in this research as content that works to reach out to other individuals or groups, including other social movements, who would probably agree with the stance taken, but may not already be involved. Frame amplifying was defined as persuasive content that works to remind the audience of how the issue connects to values that they already hold or works to reinforce or change beliefs. Frame extension was defined as content that incorporates the issues and concerns of other groups, which were not previously aligned, in order to encourage those groups to join the cause. Frame transformation was defined as basically a frame makeover, where a reframing or redefining of the issue or concern takes place.

An open coding technique was used to identify core framing tasks and frame alignment processes.

In open coding, events/actions/interactions are compared with others for similarities and differences. They are also given conceptual labels. In this way, conceptually similar events/actions/interactions are grouped together to form categories and subcategories (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, p.12).

Once categories and subcategories emerged from the data, I asked the following questions of the data: is this an identified problem for the organization, is this a proposed solution, is this communicating an urgency to take action and is there content indicative of frame alignment processes.

Benford and Snow (2000) state that “Only a handful of collective action frames have been identified as being sufficiently broad in interpretive scope, inclusivity, flexibility, and cultural resonance to function as master frames” (p.619). They list the following master frames identified by many different researchers which meet the qualifications: rights frames, choice frames, injustice frames, environmental justice frames, culturally pluralist frames, sexual terrorism frames, oppositional frames, hegemonic frames and “Return to Democracy” frames (Benford & Snow, 2000, p.619). After I identified the collective action frames, they were analyzed to determine if any of them match with any of the above listed master frames. However, I did not limit master frames to the Benford and Snow list. Macro-level frames were identified and the literature on master frames was then examined for a comparable master frame.

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter will describe in detail the core framing tasks: diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational, and frame alignment techniques: frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension and frame transformation used by both the Anti-bottled Water Movement (ABWM) and the bottled water industry. This chapter will also describe frames of the ABWM and the corresponding counterframes by the bottled water industry. Finally, this chapter will describe collective action frames that were correlated as master frames.

Core Framing Tasks

The research has found that the International Bottled Water Association (IBWA), which is the sampled organization for the bottled water industry in this study, primarily frames bottled water as a healthy consumer choice, a substitute for less healthy packaged beverages. Whereas, both Corporate Accountability International (CAI) and Food & Water Watch (FWW), the sampled organizations for the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM) in this study, frame bottled water as a form of corporate control of a public resource. It is, of course, not surprising that the bottled water industry and the ABWM would frame bottled water differently. However, despite their differences, both IBWA and the ABWM employ each of the three core framing tasks. Diagnostic, Prognostic and Motivational frames used by the bottled water industry and the ABWM will be described here. For a comparison of the core framing tasks of the ABWM and the IBWA see Table 3.

Table 3: ABWM & IBWA Core Framing Tasks

Core Framing Tasks	ABWM	IBWA
Diagnostic	Bottled Water Corporate Control Public Water Undermined Environmental Harm Community Harm	Bottled Water Bans Restricted Choice and Shifting Consumption Public Health Emergency
Prognostic	Boycott and Ban Bottled Water Resist Bottling Plants Label the Source Invest in Public Water	Bottled Water’s “Good Story” Promote Healthy Hydration Promote Recycling Advocacy
Motivational	Water Crisis	Obesity Crisis Disaster Emergency One for All and All for One

Diagnostic Frames

Diagnostic frames used by the ABWM (see Table 4) and the bottled water industry (see Table 5) are described in this section. The ABWM and IBWA use diagnostic framing to indicate what they see as the problem, who has been victimized and

who is responsible. The ABWM diagnoses bottled water as its primary problem with four main associated problems: corporate control, public water undermined, environmental harm and community harm. The IBWA diagnoses bottled water bans as its primary problem with two main associated problems: restricted choice and shifting consumption, and public health emergency.

Diagnostic Framing by the Anti-Bottled Water Movement

For the ABWM, the primary problem identified is bottled water. Whether water is bottled from a municipal source or a natural spring, the bottling and selling of water is problematic. According to the ABWM, bottled water is a form of corporate control of what should be a publicly managed resource. Through misleading marketing tactics, bottled water corporations undermine confidence in the tap that leads to the deterioration of public water infrastructure. Bottled water is argued to be harmful to the environment by creating plastic waste and stressing water resources. The ABWM also maintains that bottled water corporations harm communities through back room deals, false promises, and resource abuse. The ABWM places blame for the problems associated with bottled water on bottled water corporations and their industry groups, specifically: Nestlé, Coca-Cola, Pepsi and International Bottled Water Association.

Corporate Control

The ABWM consistently refers to bottled water as a form of corporate control of water. Within this frame, the ABWM argues that when corporations control water, it becomes a commodity. Corporate Accountability International states that, “Bottled water corporations are changing the way people think about water” – turning water into a commodity (Corporate Accountability International [CAI], June 1, 2011, p. 12). And

Food and Water Watch maintains that, “The sale of bottled water amounts to the privatization of a natural resource” (Food and Water Watch [FWW], September 6, 2013). As water transfers from public hands to private, the pricing of water becomes focused on profit making rather than ensuring access. Access to water then becomes determined by a person’s ability to pay for it. Patti Lynn of CAI states, “Behind many of the problems facing our water resources and systems lies corporate control of water. Big corporations often have priority access to water, which they then overuse, abuse or appropriate to benefit their bottom line without regard for the costs to the public” (Lynn, October 16, 2009).

As with other forms of water privatization, the ABWM argues that when water is bottled, the cost becomes exorbitantly higher. “Research conducted by [the] Conference [of Mayors] staff has found that bottled water is being sold for as much as 4000 times the cost of tap water delivery even though up to 40 percent of bottled water comes from the same source” (CAI, June 21, 2008). Deborah Lapidus of CAI states that this essentially means “corporations are transforming water from a low-cost public resource to a high-priced luxury” (CAI, November 25, 2008).

Public Water Undermined

The ABWM argues that one of the ways that the bottled water industry undermines public water (the tap) is through misleading marketing tactics. The ABWM asserts that marketing techniques used by bottled water corporations often portray their products as “purer” than tap water. FWW states,

Multinational bottling companies have created a market that capitalizes on the false premise that bottled water is somehow better and purer than tap water. This misconception is largely the result of crafty marketing tactics, despite the fact that the U.S. federal government requires more rigorous safety monitoring of municipal tap water than it does bottled water” (April 2013, p.1).

CAI echoes this sentiment stating, “Through marketing and promotion that presents bottled water as somehow cleaner or safer than tap water, the bottled water industry has effectively cast doubt on the quality of the tap” (CAI, January 5, 2011, p.3). For the ABWM, they insist that consumers are being duped by water bottlers into paying up to thousands of times more for water in a bottle when they could drink water from the tap for around a penny per gallon. The ABWM asks the question of why consumers would feel inclined to spend money on bottled water when they have access to clean, safe and affordable tap water. According to the “Story of Bottled Water” video, produced in partnership with FWW and CAI, bottled water corporations manufacture demand through strategies of scaring us, seducing us and misleading us (Story of Stuff, 2010). The ABWM points to bottled water advertisements from the recent past which raised questions about the quality of public tap water and led to consumer insecurities. Further, bottled water corporations have connected their product, through images on labels and brand names, to pristine, natural landscapes, giving the impression that the water within the bottle was extracted from such places. However, the ABWM claims that around 40% of bottled water comes from municipal sources – tap water (CAI, June 1, 2011). The ABWM criticizes bottled water corporations for failing to label the source of their waters. So, for the ABWM, not only are bottled water corporations undermining the public’s confidence in public water through marketing tactics, but they are misleading the public

by selling what the ABWM maintains is essentially tap water in a bottle, but at a cost of thousands of times more than tap water from the faucet.

The irony for the ABWM is that not only does much of bottled water come from a tap water source, bottled water is not subjected to the same level of regulations as public tap water. Bottled water is regulated as a food product by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) whereas municipal water or public drinking water is regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The ABWM argues that the FDA's regulations on bottled water are not as stringent as the EPA's regulations on tap water. "Both (tap and bottled water) are evaluated using similar standards, but tap water is tested far more frequently and has more independent oversight by state and federal environmental authorities" (Louaillier, January 1, 2008, p.14). FWW explains further that,

The FDA only requires testing for bottled water sold across state lines, which excludes the 60 to 70 percent of bottled water sold within a single state. For the 30 to 40 percent it does regulate, it only requires bottlers to test their source once a week for microbiological contaminants, once a year for chemical contaminants and once every four years for radiological contaminants (FWW, June 24, 2013).

Therefore, the bottled water industry's claim that it has a better quality product to offer than the tap is unfounded since it is not subjected to the same level of testing.

Not only does the ABWM argue that the bottled water industry undermines people's confidence in public water, but they also argue that the industry undermines the political will to fund public water infrastructure. In a press release, CAI stated, "As confidence [in the tap] has waned, so too has the political will to adequately fund public water, leaving these systems with a \$22 billion funding gap" (CAI, April 20, 2010).

Federal Funding of public water systems has dropped from 78% to 3% over 35 years (CAI, March 22, 2012). A major cause of the gap in funding has been the marketing and promotion of bottled water. The ABWM consistently ties waning confidence in the tap to waning infrastructure funding. “Marketing campaigns, such as Nestlé’s Born Better, have convinced one in five people to believe the only place to get clean drinking water is from a bottle. And as public confidence in tap water has waned, so too has the political will to invest in public water” (Louaillier, December 2009). CAI quotes Nestlé Waters North America’s former CEO Kim Jeffrey as stating, "we believe tap infrastructure in the U.S. will continue to decline. People will turn to filtration and bottled water for pure water needs" (Samuelrich, April 23, 2010). The ABWM claims that rather than translating an infrastructure problem into a desire for infrastructure improvements, people will shift to alternative sources like bottled water and filters as suggested by Jeffrey. The ABWM argues that this is what the bottled water industry is banking on – the failure of public water. The ABWM points out “the connection between declining public [water] infrastructure and increased bottled water sales” (FWW, September 30, 2010). FWW states,

“[I]n the last 10 years, while bottled water sales steadily increased, citing many years with double-digit growth in sales, the federal funding for water infrastructure declined to a historic low in 2008, when adjusted for inflation. Poorly funded water systems can further compromise public confidence in drinking water” (FWW, March 2010).

Another point made by the ABWM, is that municipalities, states and federal government organizations are spending tax dollars on bottled water that diverts funds away from public water infrastructure improvements while further undermining the

public's confidence in the tap. The ABWM maintains that every tax dollar spent on bottled water is a dollar that isn't available for public water infrastructure. Further, the ABWM makes the point that this expenditure has been taking place during an economic recession in the U.S. when all levels of government have had to cut programs and services. CAI states that, "Over the past several years, more and more cities and towns from Seattle to New York City have realized that spending taxpayer money on bottled water is an unnecessary expense that sends the wrong message about the importance of the public water systems cities are entrusted to maintain" (CAI, January 1, 2010, p.5).

Environmental Harm

The ABWM asserts that one of the primary problems with bottled water is that it causes environmental harm. Much of the environmental problem is argued to originate from the plastic bottles themselves. In the video "The Story of Bottled Water," a visual is provided of plastic bottles circling the globe five times to demonstrate the half million bottles of water that are consumed weekly in the U.S. The ABWM argues that the majority of the plastic bottles goes un-recycled and ends up in landfills. According to Food & Water Watch, "About 77 percent of PET plastic water bottles are not recycled, with 4 billion pounds of plastic going to landfills" per year (FWW, June 24, 2013). But plastic water bottles aren't only ending up in landfills. The ABWM describes the bottles as littering and polluting the shores and oceans. Wenohah Hauter, the executive director of FWW warns that the planet's oceans are being turned into "giant trashcans for the bottled water industry's waste" (FWW, June 24, 2013). The ABWM criticizes the production of plastic water bottles as contributing millions of tons of carbon dioxide emissions to the atmosphere every year. Corporate Accountability International produced

an image of a plastic water bottle lying on its side with an oil tanker on the inside of the bottle, and the text under the image states that “The equivalent of more than 17 million barrels of oil is used annually just to produce the bottles of water Americans buy each year. This same amount of oil – 17 million barrels – could fuel over a million cars annually (CAI, January 1, 2008). The ABWM also claims that the production of bottled water is much more energy-intensive than that of the production of tap water. CAI estimates that bottled water requires up to 2,000 times more energy to produce than tap water (CAI, October 14, 2010). And then there is the issue of transportation, where water is bottled at one source and then transported sometimes long distances to its point of sale. The transportation of bottled water is pointed out as another way the bottled water industry contributes to carbon dioxide emissions and pollution. The ABWM also makes the case that bottled water corporations over-mine aquifers beyond their natural capacity for replenishment, causing issues of groundwater depletion and adversely impacting the surrounding eco-system. The ABWM argues that bottled water corporations even continue to pump and bottle in locations faced with extreme drought and water shortages.

Community Harm

The ABWM argues that bottled water is bad for communities for many reasons. For one, bottled water companies promise that they will bring jobs and economic growth to communities; however, the ABWM claims that the jobs will be few in number, benefit mostly out of town workers, pay low-wages and be dangerous work. Food and Water Watch (FWW) states that most bottled water plants only employ around 24 workers and anywhere from only two to ten of those workers will be local residents (June 2008). FWW provides statistics to demonstrate that the bottled water plant jobs pay up to

\$10,000 less a year compared with a typical manufacturing job (June 2008). And as far as dangerous for workers, FWW provides more statistics to show that bottled water workers injure themselves 50% more frequently than manufacturing workers (June 2008).

A second claim is that bottled water plants negatively impact community streams, lakes, wetlands and groundwater wells since bottlers remove large amounts of groundwater. It is argued that bottled water not only harms the local ecosystem, but also local economic activities that depend on water. “The production of bottled water takes water that local communities need. Big bottling companies often take water from municipal or groundwater sources that local people depend on for drinking, recreation and more” (FWW, June 2012, p. 1). Bottled water corporations are permitted to withdraw water at much cheaper rates than the rest of the community. “In 2003, Nestlé negotiated a deal [in Mt. Shasta, CA] to pay a little less than 1/100th of a cent per gallon for at least 50 years, before any public meeting or knowledge of the project” (CAI, April 1, 2009). The bottler makes major profits from this arrangement and the community sees very little in terms of financial returns. During times of drought when residents have to conserve water, water bottlers are often permitted to continue their operations as usual. Further, the ABWM argues that bottled water operations increase traffic, resulting in increased noise pollution with all the trucks coming and going at all hours and stress local roads.

A third claim is that bottled water corporations are not transparent in their deals to bottle a community’s water. Local residents are often notified late in the process and not given opportunities to provide feedback or input. And perhaps most importantly, the ABWM maintains that communities lose control of the decision making processes

surrounding the management of their own water resources when bottled water comes to town. Deborah Lapidus of CAI states, “For years Nestlé employed a range of tactics to wrest water rights from rural communities and downstream users, keeping its abuses out of sight and out of mind to the public. Well, affected communities have now made it clear there is a pattern that needs to stop” (CAI, April 1, 2009).

Attribution of Blame

The ABWM places the blame for bottled water and its associated problems squarely on bottled water corporations and their industry groups, specifically Nestlé, Coca-Cola, Pepsi and the IBWA. Nestlé, Coca-Cola, and Pepsi have all been targets of specific campaigns initiated by the ABWM as well as publications. Nestlé in particular has been a favorite target due to the fact that its U.S. subsidiary Nestlé Waters North America is the largest bottler in the U.S. with multiple brands. FWW has written at least four reports focused specifically on Nestlé. Nestlé has received a lot of blame from the ABWM due to its conflicts with communities over control of local water resources.

However, Nestlé is not only a target of criticism for mining community water, but for bottling tap water through its Pure Life brand. The ABWM charges Nestlé with rolling out Nestlé Pure Life in order to compete with Coca-Cola’s bottled water brand Dasani and Pepsi’s brand Aquafina. Both Dasani and Aquafina were early targets of the ABWM for bottling municipal sourced water without labeling it as such. Finally, the ABWM points to the lobbying power of the IBWA, blaming the IBWA for political interference in ABWM campaign efforts. The IBWA has also presented legal challenges to ABWM bans by calling their legality into question.

Table 4: ABWM Diagnostic Frames Summary

ABWM Diagnostic	Key Points
Corporate Control	Commodification, privatization, high prices, inequitable access
Public Water Undermined	Manufactured demand, marketing purity, doubts about tap quality, lack of investment in public water, diversion of tax dollars
Environmental Harm	Plastic waste, carbon emissions and pollution, energy-intensive, ground water depletion
Community Harm	Lack of transparency, little financial returns, diversion of community water, stress on community resources and infrastructure
Attribution of Blame	Bottled water corporations, Nestle, Coca-Cola, Pepsi, IBWA

Diagnostic Framing by the Bottled Water Industry

For the IBWA, the primary problem identified is the banning of bottled water. According to the IBWA, banning bottled water is problematic because it restricts the choices available to consumers, which then causes a shift in consumption; in the case of bottled water, consumers shift from consuming bottled water to sodas and other packaged beverages. Bottled water bans are argued to add to what is already a public health

emergency – obesity and diabetes. The IBWA places blame for bottled water bans and their associated problems associated on anti-bottled water activists and organizations, specifically CAI, FWW and Environmental Working Group, and legislators, governors and mayors who have supported anti-bottled efforts.

Bottled Water Bans

Bottled water has been banned from many U.S. colleges, universities, and national parks. Municipal and state governments are phasing out tax dollar expenditures on bottled water. Restaurants have stopped serving bottled water to customers. And communities are blockading the bottling of their water sources. IBWA has identified bottled water bans as problematic for several reasons. One reason is that bans place a restriction on consumer choice and in bottled water's case, the restriction forces consumers to shift their consumption to other packaged beverages. Another reason presented is that the shift in consumption is usually to sugary beverages that cause obesity and other health issues.

Restricted Choice and Shifting Consumption

These bans are of primary concern for the IBWA. The industry group asserts that placing a ban on bottled water or limitations on its sale will not necessarily translate into consumers turning to tap water more often, but rather will most likely lead to the substitution of other packaged beverages, which IBWA contends are often less healthy. IBWA argues that it's not a tap water versus bottled water issue as framed by anti-bottled water activists, but it is a consumer choice issue. Chris Hogan, the Vice President of Communications for IBWA, states that, "Bottled water competes with other packaged

drinks, not tap water” (International Bottled Water Association [IBWA], December 9, 2014, p. 3). IBWA maintains that, “Banning the sale of bottled water in the U.S. national parks *robs consumers of the right to purchase* healthy, reliable, zero-calorie, caffeine-free, additive-free bottled water where other packaged beverages are sold” and “banning bottled water *forces consumers to choose* [emphasis added] less-healthy drink options that are proven to have more packaging, more additives (e.g., sugar, caffeine), and greater environmental impact than bottled water” (IBWA, June 24, 2013). IBWA is making the case that choice is being forcibly taken from the consumer and the consumer is then left with only the option of selecting a packaged beverage that is not good for their health or the environment. Chris Hogan of IBWA goes so far as to suggest that consumers aren’t able to make healthy drink choices without bottled water. Hogan states, “While we understand that there are some people who object to bottled water, we disagree with activists *fighting to take away the consumers’ ability to make healthy beverage choices*” (emphasis mine, IBWA, December 10, 2012). Removing bottled water from the shelves or vending machines leaves consumers primarily with unhealthy choices - sugary packaged beverages. IBWA makes the case that:

Banning or restricting access to bottled water on college campuses directly impacts the right of people to choose the healthiest beverage on the shelf. And for many, bottled water is a critical alternative to other packaged beverages, which are often less healthy. Bottled water must therefore be available wherever packaged beverages are sold (IBWA, January 2013, p. 4).

IBWA indicates that consumers have rights when it comes to choosing what they purchase and consume and those rights are being violated.

IBWA points out that most consumers of bottled water also drink tap water, but consumers desire convenience, and packaged beverages provide consumers with the convenience that their busy lives require. According to IBWA, 70% of what people drink originates from a package (IBWA, January 2013, p.10). So, IBWA poses the argument, that if people are drinking so many packaged beverages then shouldn't they have access to the healthiest packaged beverage around – bottled water – and if bottled water isn't accessible then doesn't that discourage water consumption. Given that there are so many packaged beverages, IBWA questions why activists have singled out bottled water among beverages packaged in plastic. IBWA argues that bottled water is just “one of thousands of food and beverage products that are packaged in plastic containers” and that compared with other beverages packaged in plastic, bottled water uses less water in its production and single-serve PET bottles of water contain less plastic.

IBWA lifts up a study, published in the *American Journal of Public Health*, conducted by researchers at the University of Vermont (UVM), a University that banned bottled water in 2013. The study concluded that banning bottled water on the UVM campus led to increased shipments of unhealthy sugary beverages to campus, and failed to reduce the shipment of plastic bottles to campus (Bottled Water Matters [BWM], July 22, 2015). This occurred despite UVM's investments in free reusable water bottles for students, improvements in water filling stations and an education campaign. The researchers claimed that the unintended negative consequences of the UVM ban could repeat themselves in bottled water bans in the national parks.

Owners, suppliers, executives and employees in the U.S. bottled water industry addressed their concerns about bottled water bans in a letter to the Director of the National Park Service and stated

Research shows that when bottled water isn't available, 63 percent of people will choose soda or another sugary drink. Banning bottled water sales only hinders efforts to encourage people to choose healthier drink options. If the goal of the NPS (National Park Service) is to reduce waste in the parks, we should work together to achieve that goal rather than single out for elimination the healthiest choice among bottled beverages (IBWA, April 23, 2015).

Public Health Emergency

The IBWA consistently points to health problems in the United States such as obesity, diabetes, heart disease and dehydration as issues of concern. The IBWA pays particular attention to the issue of obesity in the United States. The IBWA highlights data from many different sources to underscore how problematic obesity is in the United States. The IBWA references a 2009 study from the U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) that documents that 72.7% of all Americans are obese or overweight. The CDC report states,

“The prevalence of obesity in America has doubled in the past two decades... A high prevalence of overweight and obesity is of great public health concern because excess body fat leads to a higher risk for premature death, type 2 diabetes, hypertension, dyslipidemia, cardiovascular disease, stroke, gall bladder disease, respiratory dysfunction, gout, osteoarthritis, and certain kinds of cancers (IBWA, January 14, 2009).

Another study presented as evidence is the 2010 report by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Trust for America's Health in which it was found that obesity rates increased in 28 states within one year's time while 38 states have adult obesity rates which exceed 25%, (Lauria, August/September 2010, p.30). More statistics are presented

from the Institute of Medicine to document that by 2030, as many as 42% of Americans could be obese (IBWA, June/July 2012, p.6). The IBWA also highlights data from the *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* that states children's obesity rates have climbed from 5-17% over the past 30 years (Bottled Water Matters [BWM], March 19, 2015). The IBWA (June/July 2012) makes the argument that there are economic costs associated with the epidemic by highlighting research by Cornell University which found that obesity related medical care costs \$109 billion a year in the U.S. The IBWA calls obesity a "public health emergency" (IBWA, January 14, 2009).

For the IBWA, consumption of sugary, high calorie beverages are very much to blame for obesity and many other health problems in the U.S. – "added sugars equal added health issues" (Sims, March/April 2015, p.36). The IBWA points to conclusions made by the Added Sugars Working Group of the Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee (DGAC) to demonstrate this point. The Added Sugars Working Group believes that there is sufficient evidence to indicate that there is a clear association between the consumption of added sugars from food or sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs) and "unfavorable body weight" (Sims, March/April 2015, p. 37). The group also found a positive relationship between the intake of SSBs and risk for Type 2 diabetes in adults (Sims, March/April 2015). The group determined from their research that "the consumption of added sugars, especially SSBs, is consistently associated with hypertension, stroke, coronary heart disease, high blood pressure, and serum triglycerides" (Sims, March/April 2015, p.37). Additionally, the group concluded that there is a positive relationship between sugar consumption and the development of cavities (Sims, March/April 2015). Tamika Sims, PhD Director of Science and Research

for IBWA, states, “Because 47% of added sugars in our diets come from beverages – and 20% of our daily caloric intake -- it is clear that Americans need guidance on how to be more aware of what they drink and to reduce their calorie consumption from beverages (IBWA, March 24, 2015).

The IBWA expresses concern that bans on bottled water will only lead to a worsening of the obesity epidemic. In the IBWA’s video “Meet Norman,” Norman is an “ordinary guy living in an ordinary town,” but his town has just recently banned the sale of bottled water (BWM, December 7, 2012). Norman begins to drink more sugary beverages since bottled water is no longer available and he begins to gain weight. In a year Norman gains 28 pounds just from drinking two sugary beverages a day and becomes at risk for diabetes. When he looks at his diet, he realizes that 30% of his calories are coming from sugary beverages. He also notices that his neighbors are gaining weight too. The IBWA makes the point with this video that when the healthiest convenient packaged beverage is no longer available people will just choose what is available – sugary beverages - and therefore be at risk for obesity and other related health problems.

Attribution of Blame

The IBWA attributes blame for the restrictions and bans on bottled water largely to “anti-bottled water activists.” Joe Doss, IBWA President, has characterized activists’ attacks on the bottled water industry as a war on bottled water products and a threat to the future of the industry (IBWA, November 4, 2008). Bryan Shinn (September/October 2015), IBWA Chairman, likens the IBWA to the superhero Batman and equates anti-

bottled water activists with the supervillain the Joker. IBWA portrays activists as often well-meaning, but misinformed when it comes to the truth about bottled water. In addition to the general label of anti-bottled water or environmental activists, IBWA specifically attributes blame to specific groups such as Corporate Accountability International, Food & Water Watch, and Environmental Working Group. IBWA often directly rebuts statements and reports produced by these groups about bottled water in their press releases and other news items, Bottled Water Reporter Magazine, and videos. Additionally, IBWA names legislators, governors and mayors that have enacted policies unfavorable to the bottled water industry.

Table 5: IBWA Diagnostic Frames Summary

IBWA Diagnostic Frames	Key Points
Restricted Choice and Shifting Consumption	Limits choices, substitution of less healthy beverages, discourages water consumption, ignores importance of convenience, singled out among plastic products
Public Health Emergency	Obesity, diabetes, heart disease, dehydration, increased consumption of sugary beverages
Attribution of Blame	Anti-bottled water activists, Corporate Accountability International, Food & Water Watch, Environmental Working Group

Prognostic Frames

Prognostic frames used by the ABWM (see Table 6) and the bottled water industry (see Table 7) are described in this section. The ABWM and IBWA use prognostic framing to indicate the solution to the diagnosed problems and the necessary

countermeasures. The ABWM indicates four solutions and their corresponding tactics for the problems they have diagnosed: boycott and ban bottled water, label the source, resist bottling plants, and invest in public water. The IBWA indicates four solutions and their corresponding tactics for the problems they have diagnosed: promote bottled water's "good story," promote healthy hydration, promote recycling and advocacy.

Prognostic Framing by the Anti-Bottled Water Movement

This section will detail the various prognostic frames of the ABWM. The ABWM has focused a lot of organizing efforts on banning bottled water from college and university campuses, cities, government budgets and national parks. The ABWM also works to promote the consumption of tap water over bottled water. Another tactic is to advocate for the requirement of improved labeling for bottled water; targeting particularly brands that bottle tap water so that they disclose their water source. A third tactic is to support communities in their resistance to the installation of bottling facilities or in their efforts to scale back the water mining activities of bottled water corporations after they are already in place. And finally, the ABWM works for greater funding for public water infrastructure.

Boycott and Ban Bottled Water

With bottled water diagnosed as the problem for the ABWM, the primary solution posed is to eliminate bottled water sales and purchases. The ABWM works to achieve this solution by working for bans on college and university campuses, city wide bans on single-serving bottled water, bans in national parks, ending tax payer spending on bottled water and encouraging individuals, organizations and institutions to choose tap water over bottled water.

The ABWM organizes students on college and university campuses to ban bottled water. The ABWM solicits the help of students, which it claims is the “target demographic” of the bottled water industry, to educate their peers on the negative social and environmental impacts of bottled water and work to organize their campus community to improve access to tap water and cut bottled water spending. In an effort to raise awareness, both CAI and FWW assist students with organizing blind taste tests on campuses where participants are asked if they can tell the difference between bottled water brands Dasani (Coca-Cola), Aquafina (Pepsi), Nestlé (whatever the local brand is), and tap water. The exercise is meant to help participants realize that it is actually difficult to tell the difference between bottled water and tap water. Organizers also use this exercise to explain why students should opt for tap water over bottled water. Additional awareness raising activities include running pledge drives where students can indicate that they are choosing tap water over bottled water, spreading the word through social media, showing water films like “Flow” and “Tapped” on campus, and building giant sculptures from empty plastic water bottles on campus to demonstrate the amount of plastic waste that comes with bottled water sales.

Beyond awareness raising efforts, the ABWM encourages students to work with their peers, student government and school administrators to reduce or even eliminate school spending on bottled water. Students are encouraged to organize a campus water audit that will determine the number and locations of water fountains and bottled water vending machines on campus - mapping out the accessibility of bottled water versus tap water. The audit also uncovers how much the school spends on bottled water and whether there is an existing contract between a bottled water company and the school. Audits like

these help student organizers when making demands for improvements in tap water accessibility. After student organizers achieve broad-based support through pledge drives, they can leverage that support to achieve an institutional pledge to choose tap water over bottled water and ban bottled water from campus. FWW estimated in 2012 that at least 50 colleges and universities had instituted bans, but the number could be as high as 90 (FWW, June 2012). CAI touts that in 2013 that Brown, Hampshire, Loyola, Macalester, Mount Holyoke and Stonehill universities all held bottled-water-free graduation ceremonies (CAI, May 20, 2013). Grace Morris, of CAI, stated, “Today’s graduates are recognizing they’ve been sold a bill of goods when it comes to bottled water. They won’t be made lifelong consumers of a product they don’t need. And they’re standing up to corporations like Nestlé that are jeopardizing our most basic human right for private gain” (CAI, May 16, 2013).

In addition to bans on campuses, CAI estimates that as of 2013, 140 cities and six states have taken action to go bottled water free (CAI, March 4, 2014). In 2008, “the U.S. Conference of Mayors, representing more than 1200 mayors, passed a resolution encouraging mayors to phase out city spending on bottled water” (CAI, March 23, 2010). In their resolution, the mayors indicate that “the evidence suggests that banning bottled water from government use highlights the importance of municipal water and decreases the impact of bottled water on municipal waste” (CAI, January 1, 2009). In 2012, Concord, Massachusetts became the first city to ban bottled water from sale. Wenonah Hauter, of FWW, in a statement declared, “Concord’s decision to ban the sale of water in single serving PET plastic bottles should be seen as an historic victory for water and environmental advocates, and shows the effectiveness of citizens to demand sound

legislation that promotes water as a human right” (FWW, September 6, 2013). Many restaurants within cities across the U.S. have gone bottled water free and now only serve tap water. Additionally, six states have begun to cut spending on bottled water: Connecticut, Vermont, New York, Colorado, Illinois and Maryland (CAI, September 29, 2011). CAI has written two reports on “Getting States off Bottled Water” for governors, state policy makers and state employees, in which they have provided case studies on states and their tax dollar expenditures on bottled water and bottled water contracts as well as information on state water infrastructure spending. Through the reports CAI “recommends the elimination of all unnecessary state spending on bottled water and calls for renewed investments in the nation’s public water systems” (CAI, January 2010, pp.1).

Corporate Accountability International (CAI) has a campaign to end the sale and distribution of bottled water in U.S. national parks while improving access to public water in parks. As of June 2015, 75 national parks have gone bottled water free. The campaign’s message is “Water, like our parks, is not for sale, and it deserves our long-term investment” (CAI, January 4, 2013). CAI argues that permitting bottled water companies to sell bottled water in national parks is just one more way that they profit from public resources. CAI’s national parks campaign flier states the following: “Coke, Nestlé and Pepsi are using one national treasure (our parks) to profit from another (our water)” (CAI, January 4, 2013). CAI argues that bottled water is harmful for the environment and therefore does not deserve a place in spaces where the environment is being protected. The campaign makes the case that by going bottled water free, “your park can further its leadership in environmental stewardship, reduce its carbon footprint, raise park visitor awareness of sustainability initiatives, and realize economic benefits”

(CAI, June 5, 2015, p.2). CAI suggests that phasing out bottled water and increasing visitor access to tap water and park spring water could reduce parks' overall solid waste stream and result in disposal cost savings. CAI holds that educating visitors about why the parks have gone bottled water free will encourage them to follow the park's lead and choose tap water over bottled water. In order to go bottled water free, CAI recommends that national parks work with concessioners to develop a plan to phase out bottled water sales from concession operations, develop a reusable water bottle to be sold, install water bottle refill stations, create educational materials for visitors that explain the importance of choosing tap water and map out water bottle refill stations, publicize the park's leadership on this issue and work with other parks to go bottled water free (CAI, June 5, 2015). CAI encourages people to send a letter through their website to Jon Jarvis, the National Parks Service Director to tell him that National Parks should go bottled water free. More than 24,000 people have sent the letter. CAI also urges constituents to contact their members of Congress through the CAI website to ask them to vote no on legislation that would prevent the National Park Service from spending money to implement bottled water free policies, specifically an amendment to the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (S.1645) for which IBWA has lobbied.

Choose Tap Water

The ABWM encourages individuals to choose tap water over bottled water. Both CAI and FWW sell reusable water bottles with their campaign names on them and encourage institutions and organizations working to ban bottled water to either sell reusable water bottles or give them away. Individuals are encouraged to always keep their

reusable bottle on hand and to avoid purchasing bottled water. FWW created an App for iPhone and Android called Tap Buddy meant to assist individuals in choosing tap water over bottled water. “Use Tap Buddy to kick the bottled water habit! Tap Buddy lets you find and share water fountains so you can hydrate without hurting the environment or your wallet. You can also pledge to drink tap water and track which college campuses are leading the way in reducing bottled water consumption” (FWW, 2015 a). FWW has written several resources that help people to choose tap water. In their “Take Back the Tap Guide to Safe Tap Water,” they explain how to obtain and read water quality reports as well as inform about water filtration technologies. They have another resource called “How Your Organization Can Promote Tap” which guides organizations, businesses and institutions on how to install water filling stations and retrofitted water fountains. A third resource, “Free Your Event from Bottled Water” provides helpful information for individuals who wish to plan a bottled water free event.

Resist Water Bottling Plants

Another solution proposed by the ABWM is to support communities to organize grassroots resistance efforts against the siting and installation of bottled water plants or organize efforts to scale back the amount of water extracted by a bottling plant after it is operational. FWW states on their website that “We worked with community organizations from coast to coast to stop Nestle water bottling facilities including victories in McCloud, CA and Wacissa, FL” (FWW, 2015 b). In 2011, in Wacissa, FL, local activists successfully prevented Nestle Waters North America from pumping water from the Wacissa River for the production of bottled water. In a statement about the victory, Wenonah Hauter of FWW said,

This victory shows that communities across the country continue to reject Nestle's attempts to enter towns to extract precious water resources for an unnecessary product at the expense of local residents and the environment. Food & Water Watch will continue to work with our regional allies in Florida to protect the state's essential resources from Nestle and other water bottlers (FWW, July 29, 2011).

In 2003, McCloud, CA community members caused Nestlé to withdraw from what would have been a 50-year agreement to bottle millions of gallons of groundwater by “push[ing] for a review of the agreement and comprehensive assessment” (Hays, November 6, 2008). In a statement, Mark Hays (November 6, 2008) of CAI said,

We have seen proof that communities who recognize the importance of protecting water are taking action to protect it. For example, several communities in Maine, including Shapleigh, and most recently Wells, have enacted moratoriums or other restrictions on water withdrawals for the bottled water industry until further assessments can be made both by authorities and members of their communities at large. The community of Barnstead, NH has enacted a local ordinance which restricts the extraction of water for various commercial uses, prioritizing the value of the water for the community itself (Hays, November 6, 2008).

Label the Source

The ABWM has been calling on bottled water corporations to include information on quality, sourcing and testing on the labels of their bottled water brands. The primary targets of this initiative have been bottled water brands that bottle municipal tap water: Dasani (Coca-Cola), Aquafina (Pepsi), and Pure Life (Nestlé). In 2007, Pepsi's Aquafina agreed to print “public water source” on its labels (CAI, April 22, 2009). In 2008, Nestlé's Pure Life followed suit with similar labeling. However, Coca-Cola's Dasani still has not agreed to labeling changes. Leslie Samuelrich of CAI states,

Water bottlers are clearly having difficulty reading the writing on the wall or else there would already be clearer writing on their labels. The public is calling on

corporations like Coke to clearly label the source of its water and come clean about the quality of the water they bottle. State governments are calling for it. Congress is calling for it. The longer the industry avoids transparency, the more it forces the hand of civil servants to advocate the consumer's right to know (CAI, January 5, 2011).

CAI members sent thousands of letters to the corporations asking that they be more transparent in their labeling. CAI has also called on supporters to leave messages on Coke's Facebook to encourage the company to reveal the source of Dasani. Further, CAI has participated in shareholder meetings. Shareholder resolutions were passed calling on more transparency in labeling. Congress subpoenaed bottlers to provide source and quality information for their brands after a 2009 Government Accountability Organization report indicated that there were gaps in the regulation of bottled water. The labeling provides information to consumers that the ABWM says they have a right to know. Labeling the source is also a strategy to poke holes in the bottled water industry's marketing tactics that give consumers the impression that their bottled water is better than the tap when in fact it is sourced from the tap.

Invest in Public Water

The ABWM insists that more funding needs to be dedicated to improving public water infrastructure. For the ABWM, public water systems are the only mechanism for delivering and ensuring the human right to water. For the ABWM, it is imperative that there be funding for public water infrastructure at the federal level. The ABWM pushed to have more federal funding included in the 2009 Economic Recovery Act. In a statement, CAI stated,

Now is the time to restore and renew our public sector and public institutions that are the foundation of our democracy. We are calling on mayors and governors to

support investment in public water systems at the federal level and to do their part to ensure that public water systems get the resources they need. We're also calling on our members and people around the country to ask their elected officials to make sure investments in our public water systems are a big part of our response to the economic crisis, and that Big Business not be allowed to profit from the economic stimulus package by buying up or gaining control of our public water systems (Folsom, February 17, 2009).

One of the primary solutions that the ABWM proposes is the establishment of a Clean Water Trust Fund. A Clean Water Trust Fund would function in the same way that other trust funds function in that it would provide federal funds for problems that are too large for states to tackle on their own. FWW claims that,

A public trust fund utilizing money collected and apportioned by the federal government represents the best, and most realistic, solution to the challenges facing our clean water infrastructure. A national trust fund can address needs across the country, not just locally. It can address issues equitably, in particular the needs of small and rural communities. A trust fund will enable the country to reach water quality goals uniformly instead of focusing issue by issue. Clean water investments ensure that social and environmental objectives are met – and will create jobs across the country (FWW, August 2007, p.4).

Activists propose that the Trust Fund be paid for by corporations and industries that use and abuse water systems – “a ‘polluter pays’ approach” (FWW, August 2007, p.7).

Table 6: ABWM Prognostic Frames Summary

ABWM Prognostic Frames	Key Points
Boycott and Ban Bottled Water	College and university campuses, city and states, national parks
Choose Tap Water	Pledging to drink tap, reusable water bottles, water filling stations, bottled water free events, Tap Buddy App
Resist Water Bottling Plants	Grassroots resistance, blocking Nestle
Label the Source	Transparency in labeling, Dasani, Aquafina and Nestle Pure Life, “public water source” label, consumer’s right to know
Invest in Public Water	Need for federal funding, clean water trust fund, “polluter pays” model

Prognostic Framing by the Bottled Water Industry

This section will detail the various prognostic frames of the IBWA. The IBWA works to dispel the myths of bottled water as told by activists, or counterframing the frames of activists, by promoting bottled water’s “good story.” IBWA also promotes healthy hydration or drinking more water as a solution. A third solution proposed is to improve recycling rates through working for curbside recycling programs, community recycling events and doing recycling coalition work. Finally, the IBWA engages in advocacy including lobbying on Capitol Hill, lobbying state lawmakers, grassroots organizing, and industry and government coalition work.

Promote Bottled Water’s “Good Story”

IBWA repeatedly tells its members throughout its *Bottled Water Reporter (BWR) Magazine* that it is important that people hear bottled water’s “good story.” Philippe

Caradec, former IBWA chairman, in the February/March 2012 issue of BWR stated, “Too often our product’s image is clouded by unwarranted negativity, and, as an industry, we need to fight back with our amazing bottled water story” (pp.2). Caradec emphasized the importance again in the April/May 2012 issue of BWR stating, “It’s important we continue to tell and share our good story at every opportunity. The more people understand the value of bottled water, the easier it will be for us to ensure it remains accessible to those who choose it” (p. 2). IBWA identifies positive aspects of bottled water that their members can promote: one of the healthiest beverages; lowest water and carbon footprint of packaged beverages; packaging is 100% recyclable; safe, highly regulated, quality product; alternative to sugary/caffeinated beverages, convenient and needs to remain freely accessible and there in times of emergency (Caradec, February/March 2012, p.2).

Part of sharing the “good story” is framed as correcting the facts about bottled water. IBWA argues that there are many bottled water mistruths and myths that are being communicated by anti-bottled water activists and other bottled water opponents. IBWA calls on members to work to correct misinformation and communicate the facts about bottled water. IBWA claims that one myth is that bottled water is not really regulated or not as regulated as tap water. The IBWA counters this myth with information on how the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates and ensures the safety and reliability of bottled water. A second myth named is that bottled water is not safe or not as safe as tap water. The IBWA counters this by saying that the bottled water industry uses a multi-barrier approach safeguarding from contamination and that in the past decade the FDA has found no outbreaks of illness or safety concerns connected to bottled

water, however, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimates that millions of people suffer from tap water caused acute gastro-intestinal illnesses every year in the U.S. A third myth addressed is that bottled water labels lack sufficient information. The IBWA rejects this myth stating that the bottlers of water follow strict FDA regulations on labelling. A fourth myth cited is that PET plastics contain the chemical compound Bisphenol-A (BPA) which is harmful. IBWA argues that the FDA has approved PET plastic as a safe container for food and beverages, but PET bottles of water do not contain BPA, which they contend is a safe chemical compound anyway. A fifth myth is that bottled water is not sustainable and has a high environmental footprint. The IBWA contradicts this myth by explaining that plastic water bottles are 100% recyclable and make up only 0.91 of plastics produced and one-third of 1% of the U.S. waste stream (Hogan, April/May 2013, p.54). Additionally, IBWA argues that the industry reduced the weight of plastic in water bottles by 32.8% over 8 years (Lauria, June/July 2011, p.38). Further, IBWA claims that the water industry is very efficient in its use of groundwater stating that 87% of the water withdrawn is consumed by humans in the final product (BWM, 2015 a). A sixth myth proposed is that bottled water is excessively expensive or even called a luxury item. IBWA refutes this myth by explaining that water is available at many different price points and often consumers purchase water in bulk for cost savings rather than in individual serving sizes which is more expensive (Hogan, April/May 2013). A seventh myth is that bottled water is just tap water in a bottle. IBWA negates this concept with information about multi-barrier approaches and treatments that water, whether from a spring or municipal system, goes through before it is bottled (Lauria, June/July 2011).

Promote Healthy Hydration

For the IBWA, the solution to many of the health problems that individuals face in the U.S. including obesity, diabetes, heart disease and dehydration is to “drink more water.” The IBWA states that an estimated 75% of Americans don’t drink enough water; the IBWA explains, “being hydrated is a lifestyle habit” (Pearson, March/April 2015, p.28). The IBWA draws on statements from health care professionals who explain that children learn early on habits of drinking sugary beverages like juice and then soda. Kristi L. King, MPH, RD, LD, senior pediatric dietician at and spokesperson for the Texas Children’s Hospital and Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, says “People grab a soda because it’s easy. Well, water is just as easy. We need to make it easy for parents” (Culora, February/March 2014, p. 15). The IBWA suggests that bottled water is an “avenue to get people to water” (Sims, March/April 2015). The IBWA explains to its members that marketing the benefits of drinking bottled water can not only create healthy families, but also be good for business (Culora, February/March 2014, p.12). Rob Chaput, president of Lighthouse marketing and IBWA member, provides IBWA members with 4 marketing strategies for helping children and their families learn healthy hydration habits: 1) educational programs – integrating bottled water product and hydration information into school modules and menus. “This is a nice balance because it provides education for kids and classic marketing and brand building exposure” (Culora, February/March 2014, p.16); 2) event marketing; 3) sponsorships; and 4) classic brand marketing – marketing to kid-consumers and parents separately (Culora, February/March 2014). The IBWA points members to tools available for teaching children about healthy hydration like “Habit Heroes,” which is a comic produced by Anthem Blue Cross Blue

Shield where heroes promote healthy hydration, eating and exercise. One of the heroes, Agent Quench, encourages kids to drink bottled water.

The IBWA offers a number of tools to members for the promotion of healthy hydration as well as to consumers concerned about healthy hydration. The IBWA provides a hydration calculator on its website (IBWA, 2015 a) where consumers can enter their weight, number of minutes they exercised and the intensity of their exercise in order to receive an estimate of how many ounces of water that they should drink and the best times of day to drink water. The IBWA provides members with social media tools including suggestions for bottled water facts posts for Facebook and healthy hydration oriented tweets for Twitter that they can use throughout the year. Here are two example tweets that the IBWA suggested as options during warmer months: “May is American Stroke Month. Could hydration improve stroke outcomes? Short Answer: YES.” And “June is Great Outdoors month. Grab some bottled water and hit the trails!” (IBWA, May/June 2015, p.8). And here are two example tweets that the IBWA suggested as options for promoting healthy hydration to students: “Fighting off the Freshman 15? Drink Bottled Water and Exercise.” And “Love water but don’t like litter? Recycle those bottled water containers! Industry needs them for new products” (IBWA, September/October 2014, p.7).

One of the IBWA’s strategies for encouraging Americans to drink more water was to become a supporter of First Lady Michelle Obama and the Partnership for a Healthier America’s “Drink Up” campaign. The “Drink Up” campaign encourages

Americans to drink one more glass of water every day to improve their health. At the 2013 campaign kickoff event Mrs. Obama was quoted as stating,

The truth is we all have a choice about what we drink. And when we choose water, we're choosing to be at our very best. And we don't even need science to tell us that that's a good idea. Most of us already know this from our own experience...It doesn't matter where you get it from – the tap, a water bottle, a water fountain – just drink one more glass of water a day (IBWA, October/November/December 2013, p.6).

Companies across water industries have joined the campaign as supporters – tap, bottled, filtered, reusable bottles and others. The “Drink Up” droplet logo appears in advertisements, on social media and on the products of supporters. IBWA lifts up marketing analytics from Nielson Catalina Solutions which demonstrate that households exposed to “Drink Up” ads between October 2 and December 31, 2014 increased their bottled water consumption, which led to a 4% increase in bottled water sales. The IBWA also points to research by the Natural Marketing Institute (NMI) that documents that within just a few months between the end of 2013 and half-way through 2014, American adult consumption of water increased by more than 68 million 8-ounce servings. The IBWA encourages its members to support the “Drink Up” campaign and use its promotional materials in their own marketing efforts and social media strategies.

Promote Recycling

The IBWA recognizes that recycling rates are much lower than they could and should be, including rates for bottled water recycling. The IBWA states that all plastic and glass bottled water containers are 100% recyclable.

IBWA actively supports comprehensive curbside recycling programs, partners with other beverage and food companies, municipalities, and the recycling

industry, as we seek to educate consumers about recycling, and work to increase all recycling to reduce litter. Currently, 30.9% of all bottled water containers are recycled – a record high result for any PET plastic container (IBWA, March 18, 2010).

The IBWA is placing much emphasis on recycling education for improving rates. There are materials available on its websites with recycling facts and information on its benefits. The IBWA has made several YouTube videos that educate about recycling. One such video is “Adventures of Recycle Kitty” where there is an average housecat, which turns into a superhero, and flies around saving plastic water bottles from ending up in the landfill by moving bottles from trash cans into a blue recycle bin. The video ends with the message “If a kitty cat can recycle... you can too!” (BWM, October 13, 2011). In the video “Every Bottle Counts,” a young woman explains that bottled water is convenient, but finding a recycling bin isn’t always as convenient. She provides suggestions on how to make sure the bottles end up in the recycling bin like placing them in a plastic bag in the car until you can get home to place them in the recycling bin, or flatten them out and placing them in your purse, and writing city officials to request more public space recycling which other cities have done and are making money off of it (BWM, April 5, 2011). Another way the IBWA is working to improve recycling education is through its sponsorship of Curbside Value Partnership which is a non-profit that initiates grassroots education campaigns to increase participation and tonnage collected in residential curbside recycling programs.

The IBWA encourages members to get involved in their communities to improve recycling rates. One way proposed is for member companies to get their employees to work with local recycling organizations to volunteer at community recycling events

where anything from electronics to lightbulbs and old bicycles are brought to be recycled or reused. This kind of an event allows IBWA members to give back to their community, learn more about recycling, and “promote the environmental stewardship of the bottled water industry” (Davis, January/February 2015, p.18). The IBWA also suggests that members can donate bottled water to events like these. Beyond the community, IBWA encourages member groups to work to improve recycling within their own organizations.

The IBWA works in coalitions across industries and government to improve recycling rates nationwide. In May of 2008, the IBWA, through the National Recycling Partnership, funded a pilot project with the American Beverage Association, the Food Marketing Institute, the Grocery Manufacturers Association and the National Recycling Coalition in Hartford, Connecticut where households would receive financial incentives for the amount that they recycle.

Advocacy

IBWA members are encouraged to participate in “IBWA Hill Days” annually in Washington, D.C. where IBWA members visit with their members of Congress to educate them about their individual bottled water companies as well as the industry at large. IBWA offers to coach and accompany members on their visit. IBWA annual business conferences offer members courses in “Lobbying 101” and “Lobbying 201: facility tours.” When IBWA staff met with members of Congress in late January 2015, they discussed: “the Bottled Water Quality Information Act (H.R. 4978), the role of healthy hydration in the *2015 Dietary Guidelines for Americans*, the impact of new FDA vending machine labeling regulations, and actions by the National Park Service to ban the

sale of bottled water” (IBWA, March/April 2015, p.7). IBWA has participated in annual hot dog lunches on the Hill in partnership with the North American Meat Institute where IBWA staff have had opportunities to speak informally with members of Congress on issues important to the bottled water industry. IBWA members are also encouraged to lobby state lawmakers. The IBWA recommends that members build relationships with national and state lawmakers so that they are able to understand industry-impacting policies from the ground level. IBWA members are encouraged to host bottled water plant tours as a part of this strategy. Brothers Bryan and Doug Shin, co-founders of the Pennsylvania bottled water company The Water Guy were asked why invite a congressperson to your plant and they responded,

We are actively trying to reach out, particularly to legislators, so they better understand our business internally. As legislation is posed or created and they have to make a vote on a bill that affects the bottled water industry, they’ll have a sense and feel of what our business is about. They understand that we are family owned; create real jobs; we follow state, federal and industry regulations; and we’re well run. We give legislators a taste and feel of what bottled water businesses are really about (Kelly, June/July 2010, p.24).

The IBWA also encourages members and consumers to add their signatures to the Bottled Water Matters “Show Your Support” Signature Drive and to send letters to members of Congress through the “Take Action” page on the Bottled Water Matters website. And another tool the IBWA offers members is the IBWA Political Action Committee (PAC), established in 2009. The IBWA PAC was established to further build relationships with lawmakers by raising campaign contributions for them. The IBWA PAC provides strategic support to legislators representing areas where IBWA members operate. Members are encouraged to join the PAC and provide financial support.

In addition to legislative advocacy, IBWA encourages its members to advocate at the grassroots level. On April 26, 2011, the citizens of Concord, Massachusetts voted down a proposal to ban the sale of single-serve bottled water there. Joe Doss, President of IBWA, said this about the victory,

We commend the citizens of Concord for recognizing the importance of bottled water as a safe, healthy, convenient beverage. We also want to thank the Northeast Bottled Water Association (NEBWA) and Concord-based businesses for their tireless efforts in alerting Concord voters to the effects on the local economy of a total prohibition on the sale of bottled water (IBWA, April 27, 2011).

Leading up to this victory, the IBWA had called on its members to organize a grassroots campaign in Concord to fight the proposed ban. The IBWA provided three primary strategies for success in Concord. First, it is important to know your audience. The IBWA polled Concord residents and the following three resonant themes emerged: taxation, children's health and right to choose. The IBWA suggested that speaking to these issues would be critical for success in Concord. Second, the IBWA recommended selecting a local spokesperson, stating, "Stay away from big names or polished out-of-town spokespersons that would be a clear indication you don't know how things work in a small town" (Toner, June/July 2011, p. 37). In Concord, small business owners spoke out about how the ban would hurt business and parents spoke about their concerns for the health of their children. A third strategy put forth by the IBWA is to work the local angle or "maintain a local vibe." The IBWA encouraged people to place ads in local newspapers and posters in local businesses and set up social media accounts specific to their campaign work. The IBWA Bottled Water Matters website included a webpage with specific resources for people involved in the Concord advocacy efforts.

In addition to grassroots efforts, the IBWA works within coalitions. The IBWA has worked in coalitions on securing food safety, battling BPA restrictions and fighting taxes. One example of such coalition work was when the IBWA worked with the Northwest Bottled Water Association, the Washington Retail Association, and the Association of Washington Business to defeat a proposed sales tax on bottled water in the state of Washington in 2015. Another example is how the IBWA worked with the Grocery Manufacturers Association, the American Chemistry Council and the National Association of Manufacturers to prevent legislated restrictions on the use of BPA.

Another one of IBWA's advocacy strategies for increasing water consumption among Americans has been to join a water coalition consisting of industry, government, and health and science professionals with the mission of "ensur[ing] that all kids can drink water wherever they are" (Sims, July/August 2015, p.57). As a part of this coalition, IBWA has been working to make sure that more language about the benefits of water consumption be included in the *2015 Dietary Guidelines for Americans*, as well as advocating that water be added to the MyPlate food nutrition icon. IBWA staff have met with members of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) several times to ensure that the role of bottled water in healthy hydration is understood. In March 2015, IBWA staff also testified before the USDA and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) on the importance of bottled water in facilitating healthy lifestyles and the need for more pro-water consumption references in the *2015 Dietary Guidelines*.

Table 7: IBWA Prognostic Frames Summary

IBWA Prognostic Frames	Key Points
Promote Bottled Water's "Good Story"	Value of bottled water, refuting "myths"
Promote Healthy Hydration	Drink more water, lifestyle habit, marketing to children, social media, "Drink Up" campaign
Promote Recycling	Recycling education, curbside recycling programs, YouTube videos, community recycling events, National Recycling Partnership
Advocacy	IBWA "Hill Days," lobbying classes for members, facility tours, 2015 Dietary Guidelines for Americans, "show your support" signature drives, political action committee, grassroots campaigns, coalition work

Motivational Frames

Motivational frames used by the ABWM and the bottled water industry are described in this section (see Table 8). The ABWM and the IBWA use motivational frames to indicate that action is necessary and urgent. While both the ABWM and IBWA use different motivational frames, they both use similar language like "crisis" and "threat" to invoke a sense of urgency. The ABWM uses a water crisis/scarcity frame to urge action taking. The IBWA uses an obesity crisis frame, threatened freedom, disaster, and all for one and one for all to urge action taking.

Motivational Framing by the Anti-Bottled Water Movement

Water Crisis

The ABWM works to motivate its constituency primarily by speaking of corporate water grabs and a looming global water crisis. The ABWM argues that global water supplies are growing scarce. The ABWM claims that corporations or “water profiteers” are exploiting this crisis by grabbing up public water sources. They argue further that the bottled-water industry will have you believe that they can do a better job of providing people with clean water than democratically controlled public-water systems. The ABWM holds that ultimately corporations will prioritize profit over the human right to water. CAI communicates the urgency and severity by stating,

Coke, Pepsi, and Nestlé’s aggressive marketing is dangerous because it has changed the way that we think about water; getting us accustomed to treat water as a high-priced luxury commodity rather than a public good and a human right. This is occurring against the backdrop of a world water crisis. Right now over one billion people - one out of every six of us on this planet – do not have access to enough water. And the problem is only getting worse. By 2025, two out of every three people will not have access to enough water. Two out of every three! As water becomes scarce, its value grows, and corporations seek greater and greater value in controlling and profiting from water resources (CAI, June 2011, p. 14).

CAI is clearly communicating to college and university students that the world water crisis is going to soon get worse and the majority of the world’s population will have water access problems. They further emphasize corporations are going to grab control of more and more water for big profits.

Motivational Framing by the Bottled Water Industry

Obesity Crisis

The IBWA frequently talks about the emergency posed by growing obesity rates in the U.S. and the dangers of obesity rates growing worse if bottled water is banned. IBWA has made the case that for years, there has been much work done to encourage

people to drink water instead of high sugar beverages connected to obesity and other health problems. IBWA tries to motivate people by raising their concerns that we could lose the little bit of progress that has been made in getting people to drink more water if bans are passed. IBWA states in their “Student Activism 101” video that, “Removing the students’ freedom to choose packaged water is a serious issue. Telling students that they can or cannot buy bottled water is a step backwards, especially with the growing rates of obesity and diabetes in the U.S” (BWM, February 7, 2012).

Disaster Emergency

A motivational framing technique used by IBWA to motivate consumers is to discuss the importance of bottled water in situations when tap water has been compromised from human-caused or natural disasters. The IBWA provides some examples of times when the bottled water industry responded to urgent needs for potable water: Hurricanes Andrew, Charlie, Katrina, Gustav, and Hanna, earthquakes and forest fires in the West, terrorist attacks on the Pentagon and World Trade Center, and spring flooding in the Midwest (IBWA, September 9, 2008). In 2008, Nestlé Waters mobilized 8,500 employees and 2.7 million bottles of water to help citizens impacted by disasters and emergencies as well as relief workers (BWM, October 6, 2009). The IBWA suggests that without a strong bottled water industry, bottled water companies might not be in a position to provide bottled water to communities that have no access to safe, clean water supplies during emergencies like hurricanes, floods, tornados, fires or boil alerts. Joe Doss, President and CEO of the IBWA said the following in his written testimony before a Senate hearing on the Quality and Environmental Impacts of Bottled Water:

The efforts of the industry to provide crucial drinking water to citizens afflicted by disasters are contingent on a viable commercial market. The commercial market provides them with the capital and resources to respond when needed...To discourage the use of bottled water or question the safety of bottled water does a disservice to an industry that is called upon every year to provide much needed drinking water (IBWA, September 9, 2008, p.16).

One for All and All for One

The IBWA similarly uses motivational framing to motivate its member organizations to take action. The IBWA conveys the message that members should respond to action requests. When IBWA members work together, they can be much more impactful than going at it alone. The IBWA communicates that if members help with larger efforts and help fellow members in their time of need, then when you are in need of help in your locality, IBWA members will come to your aid. James Toner, former IBWA director of government relations writes the following:

If you are part of the bottled water industry and an IBWA member, I say to you the following: When IBWA sends out a member alert email requesting assistance, you should never question for whom is that email meant: it is meant for you. The collective voice of our membership, combined with other interested parties, can accomplish more than any individual company effort. In Olympia, Washington, we worked with NWBWA [North West Bottled Water Association], WRA [Washington Retail Association], and AWB [Association of Washington Business] – and our efforts were rewarded with a success. What happens when the next important issue we face occurs in your state? Who will help us in our educational efforts then? (Toner, September/October 2015, p.39).

Table 8: ABWM & IBWA Motivational Frames Summary

Group	Motivational Frames	Key Points
ABWM	Water Crisis	Water grabbing, water scarcity, water access problems
IBWA	Obesity Crisis	Growing obesity rates, backtracking on gains in health
IBWA	Disaster Emergency	Compromised tap, urgent needs for potable water, need for viable market
IBWA	All for One and One for All	Collective voice of membership

Frame Alignment Processes

Both the ABWM and the IBWA apply frame alignment processes. Both bridge frames through face to face encounters, social media and pledge or signature drives. The ABWM amplifies frames by speaking to existing sentiments that corporations can't be trusted while the IBWA speaks to sentiments that tap water can't be trusted. The ABWM extends frames to reach out to government, national parks enthusiasts and the environmental justice movement. The IBWA extends frames to reach out to the anti-obesity movement, disaster emergency response and the recycling movement. However, the IBWA was the only organization that was observed to engage in frame transformation.

Frame Bridging

Both the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM) and the Bottled Water Industry use frame bridging (see Table 9) to reach out to constituents and potential sympathizers. The ABWM uses many different frame bridging techniques. One major bridging

technique used is the organizing of water taste testing events on college and university campuses in which students blindly taste bottled water and tap water and then decide which is which or whether they can tell a difference. Corporate Accountability International (CAI) has named their taste testing events the “Tap Water Challenge” and Food and Water Watch (FWW) organizes tap water versus bottled water events on campuses and runs a contest between March 22, World Water Day, and April 22, Earth Day, called “Tap-a-Palooza” where colleges and universities can compete for funding for improved tap water hydration stations by collecting the most signed pledges, where signers commit to choose tap water over bottled water. At these events, student organizers introduce students to anti-bottled water frames and ask students to join their efforts. CAI recommends that student organizers say the following to participants in the tap water challenge:

Bottled water corporations use misleading promotion of bottled water to convince us that it’s safer, cleaner or healthier than the tap. Take our tap water challenge to learn the reality behind those images...Do you drink bottled water? What kind? Why do you drink bottled water or why do you choose tap water? We are holding Tap Water Challenges across the country because corporations are increasingly controlling our water, and bottled water is just one example of how they are doing this. Corporations like Coca-Cola (Dasani), Pepsi (Aquafina) and Nestlé (name local brand Poland Spring or Pure Life or Ice Mountain or Deer Park or Arrowhead or Zephyrhills or Ozarka) are attempting to change the very way we think about water, from something that’s a natural resource to something that’s sold to the highest bidder (CAI, July 5, 2011, p.5).

Through the taste tests, participants are asked to analyze their own water drinking habits and then question whether or not there is a distinguishable difference in the quality and taste of bottled water versus tap water. Through this exercise, students are introduced to

several of the ABWM's diagnostic frames (corporate control of water, misleading marketing, etc.) and prognostic frames (choose tap water over bottled water and support public water systems).

Both FWW and CAI emphasize the importance of college/university students to anti-bottled water campaign work. CAI works to reach out to students by claiming that the bottled water industry is targeting and manipulating them. CAI, in their "Think Outside the Bottle: Student Activism Guide," states,

Students are a target demographic for bottled water corporations that aim to convert young people into lifetime consumers. Students are tired of being manipulated by the bottled water industry's marketing and promotion, and are wise to the fact that this industry is manufacturing demand for something they can get safely and reliably from the tap. At a time when the global water crisis is looming large, already leaving over a billion people without access to enough safe drinking water to meet their basic needs, students are increasingly concerned about the commodification of our most essential public resource (June 1, 2011, p.3).

In this statement, CAI not only communicates that the bottled water industry is preying on students, but CAI makes the assumption that students are concerned about the commodification of water. FWW refers to college students as "pioneers in activism" and "a driving force behind the important fight against this senseless privatization of our water" (FWW, June 2012, p.1). FWW, in their "Introduction to Campus Take Back the Tap Campaigns," states that,

We are facing a long-term water crisis that involves both scarcity issues and toxic pollution. More and more students are realizing that they are in a great position to organize around these issues. As a result, a bottled water backlash is already stirring on campuses across the country. Concerned students are passing student body resolutions opposing bottled water, launching awareness campaigns, and removing bottled water from campus. With their position as both large institutions and centers of progressive thought, universities are important to have on board in the movement for water justice (July 12, 2012, p.3).

Here students get a sense that they are a part of a much larger effort, one that is national and global in scope, and that they are especially well poised to make important contributions to these efforts.

The ABWM bridges frames through social media, specifically Twitter and Facebook, listserves, conference calls, and action alert emails to get information out to current and potential sympathizers. CAI and FWW both use pledge drives, where individuals pledge to choose tap water over bottled water, to identify sympathizers and collect contact information, which allows them to grow their networks. Both use maps to indicate bottled water free sites so that sympathizers can identify efforts and successes near them. They use anti-bottled water film screenings for films like *Flow* and *Tapped* to grow awareness and create dialogue. The YouTube video “The Story of Bottled Water” produced in partnership with CAI and FWW has had more than 4.5 million views online – a large audience of potential supporters. The hydration stations in national parks that have banned bottled water contain educational signs for all visitors to see and read with information about why the parks have gone bottled water free and the importance of keeping plastic waste out of the parks. Both groups sell reusable bottles with the name of their particular anti-bottled water campaign which can be customized with logos of a college/university or other institution.

FWW and CAI are structured such that they do not only work on anti-bottled water advocacy, but they engage in many different campaigns that target corporations. The two organizations are able to bridge their anti-bottled water claims with broader anti-corporate frames.

Like the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM), IBWA has used signature drives as a frame bridging technique used to build a database of supporters. IBWA currently has a petition on their Bottled Water Matters (BWM) campaign site where individuals can indicate that they are a consumer of bottled water and support the right to bottled water as a beverage choice (BWM, 2015 a). IBWA does outreach to collect names and emails at trade shows like the InterBev trade show in which it participates. IBWA has also placed ads for the “Show Your Support” campaign on Google and a recycling site called Earth.911.com. However, one of the main ways that IBWA works to garner supporters is by pulling on the networks of its members.

Because a strong showing of signatures can be a key factor in effective advocacy of bottled water issues, IBWA and BWM are returning to our roots: member companies and their employees, families, and friends. IBWA’s retained economist John Dunham, of Guerrilla Economics, tells us companies that manufacture, distribute, and sell bottled water products employ more than 163,000 Americans, paying them nearly \$39 billion in wages and benefits. That’s an ample, core constituency with a direct interest in the continued success of bottled water products and one which, frankly, can be further encouraged to show their support (Lauria, April/May 2011, p.50-51).

Another tactic used by IBWA to garner signatures from all over the U.S. quickly was to pay “clipboard brigades” of college students to canvass the National Mall for signatures from visitors. The collection of signatures is seen as very important to IBWA so that they can show broad based support all across the U.S. when there are anti-bottled water actions initiated. IBWA states,

We need to have our industry’s voice amplified on legislative issues – and a database of citizens who value bottled water products is invaluable. An expanded roster of names is also an unbeatable tool to help IBWA inform and update concerned customers about news and industry positions that reinforce their support for one of their favorite beverages, or knock down a new activist myth,

without necessarily asking them to take any action at all (Lauria, April/May 2011, p.51).

So, IBWA reaches out to their database of supporters to ask them to take action, but also they reach out to them to counterframe the messages of the ABWM.

Another bridging technique used by the IBWA is writing letters to the editor of a variety of news and media outlets. The IBWA uses letters to the editor often to correct “misinformation” about bottled water and the bottled water industry. Letters to the editor are used to reach out to people in communities which are considering bans on bottled water in order to persuade them that a ban is not in the public’s interest.

The International Bottled Water Association (IBWA) also bridges frames through social media, especially YouTube. IBWA has created many YouTube videos that address many different bottled water topics. The star of many of these videos is a teenage girl who “discusses complicated questions with a ‘gee-whiz’ simplicity that makes it easier for viewers of any age to understand our [IBWA’s] sometimes very scientific methods” (Lauria, August/September 2011, p.22). The IBWA admittedly produces videos that look “homemade” so that they fit the YouTube mold (Lauria, Aug/Sep 2011, p.23). The IBWA’s probottled water campaign, Bottled Water Matters, posted a video to YouTube called “Student Activism: 101” to reach out to college students with their counterframes against campus bans. According to IBWA, this video caused quite the stir online and there was much debate amongst activists on both sides. When negative comments poured in, accompanied by “thumbs down” ratings, the IBWA emailed their lists of supporters to enlist help.

Because YouTube’s “thumbs down” ratings have a critical effect on video (and YouTube channel) search rankings—and because we felt the anti-bottled water reaction did not accurately reflect the way people feel about bottled water being sold on college campuses—IBWA launched a unique effort to harness the resources of our BWM supporters list. IBWA drafted an email outlining the negative assault on our YouTube page and sent it out to our BWM supporters, asking them to visit the BWM YouTube channel to vote and participate in the online debate happening in the video’s comment section. More than 5,380 people opened the BWM email and 932 linked to the BWM YouTube channel—taking action by signing on to their YouTube accounts and either giving the video a thumbs up or leaving a pro-bottled water comment. That activity created a nearly 20 percent swing from negative to positive; an impressive and significant change (Hogan, April/May 2012, p. 62-63).

This is an example of how IBWA used frame bridging to reach current sympathizers and supporters by emailing their database, but it also shows how they engaged their current supporters to help them bridge to potential supporters. IBWA needed to maintain the visibility of their video on YouTube in order to continue to reach out to their target audience.

The IBWA bridges health and choice frames to attract individuals to their message and efforts.

IBWA is the champion of water because our products are not only a smart, healthy, convenient, and safe beverage choice but also because for many individuals bottled water is a necessity. As obesity and diabetes rates unfortunately continue to be a public health crisis, it is in the general public’s best interest that bottled water products remain an everyday choice (Caradec, October/November 2011, p.2).

Again, IBWA consistently equates the choice of bottled water in the marketplace with health. Without bottled water, people will substitute unhealthy beverages.

Table 9: ABWM & IBWA Frame Bridging Summary

Group	Key Points
ABWM	Tap Water Challenge, Tap-a-Palooza, listserves, conference calls, action alert emails, pledge drives, maps, film screenings, campaign paraphernalia, hydration stations
IBWA	Signature drives, letters to the editor, YouTube, health and choice frames

Frame Amplification

Both the ABWM and the IBWA employ frame amplification (see Table 10). The ABWM amplifies the following values: human rights, democracy, equity, community, cooperation, public health, and environmental sustainability. The bottled water industry is identified as threatening those values. The IBWA amplifies the following values: health, safety, convenience, choice, freedom, family, individual responsibility, environmental stewardship and responsibility. Anti-bottled water activists and sympathizers are identified as threatening those values.

The ABWM amplifies people’s beliefs that corporations are only concerned with profits and aren’t concerned about the long-term impacts of their business operations on people and the environment. The ABWM describes bottled water corporations as greedy, exploitative, abusive, threatening, misleading, non-transparent, and untrustworthy. Bottled water corporations are often referred to as “water profiteers.” The act of bottling water is frequently labeled as a “corporate water grab” and “turning water into a profit-

driven commodity.” The ABWM amplifies beliefs that corporations are given special treatment in society. One example cited is that Nestlé was permitted to continue pumping water for bottling during California’s drought while residents were required to conserve water. Images of back room deals are evoked, suggesting that bottled water corporations are able to influence decision-making and skirt democratic processes through their powerful influence and deep pockets. Ben King (May 8, 2013) from FWW wrote the following in a blog post,

It’s no secret that big businesses try to influence the political environment and government through lobbying, PAC money and plying elected officials with campaign contributions. After reviewing contributions made by Nestlé Waters, it seems that the company is no stranger to this strategy... Nestlé, its employees and lobbyists have spent nearly \$650,000 on campaign contributions and support in the state of Maine. Notably, they spent \$218,000 to defeat a state bottled water tax in 2004 and 2005, and another \$106,000 to help repeal a state beverage tax in 2008. They’ve also given to dozens of candidates and PACs across the state, from Aroostook County to Portland. Among these legislators are more than a few representing districts where Nestlé’s springs and bottling operations are located, including those in Denmark, Fryeburg, Kingfield and Poland.

The ABWM is tapping into an existing distrust of corporations in society and the belief that they cannot be trusted because they are accountable only to their shareholders.

The IBWA amplifies people’s beliefs in the importance of a “free market.” The IBWA consistently refers to bottled water as being singled out amongst packaged beverages and other packaged products for bans and taxes that place bottled water at a competitive disadvantage with other packaged beverages. A letter to the editor in the Los Angeles Times compares bottled water bans with bans on large serving soda in New York, arguing that the NY ban would essentially give competitive advantage to other large serving beverages not included in the ban which might contain even more calories –

both bottled water bans and the NY soda ban are illustrations of an “unwelcome interference in the marketplace” for the author (IBWA, January 2013, p.17). Another author writes in an opinion piece in the Boston Globe in reference to the bottled water ban in Concord, MA that “this ban is un-American and a very clear example of government control of commerce” (IBWA, January 2013, p.18). Adriana Cohen argues for repealing Concord’s bottled water bylaw in a letter to the editor stating,

Bottled water and tap water can and should co-exist. Neither the government nor the private sector should have an exclusive monopoly on the water supply. Hence the reason we have anti-monopoly laws in this country. Giving either sector a monopoly on water simply affords too much control and power over the masses as water is a life critical resource. Remember that our Constitution was founded on the premise of Checks and Balances. There is no balance if the government controls the water supply exclusively. Therefore, banning the private sector from selling water is not only setting a bad precedent and is clearly anti-Capitalism, it's also a path to Socialism (IBWA, April 22, 2013).

Through belief amplification, IBWA reaches out to audiences who are pro-business and anti-big government. IBWA taps into an existing narrative in society and builds on it in order to persuade people that bottled water is being unfairly treated.

The IBWA uses frame amplifying to feed people’s insecurities about tap water quality and safety. In 2015, the IBWA issued a press release in which they stated the following:

Regarding the quality and safety of tap water, as noted in the 2013 Drinking Water Research Foundation (DWRf) report, 'Microbial Health Risks of Regulated Drinking Waters in the United States,' researchers estimate that more than 500 boil alerts occurred in the United States in 2010. In addition, the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reports that waterborne diseases, such as Cryptosporidiosis and Giardiasis, cost the U.S. healthcare system as much as \$539 million a year in hospital expenses. In 2006, EPA

researchers reported an estimated 16.4 million cases of acute gastrointestinal illness per year are caused by tap water. Subsequent research has estimated that number of illnesses to be closer to 19.5 million cases per year, resulting in as many as 1,000 deaths annually (IBWA, June 24, 2015).

Posts like this occur throughout IBWA’s literature, usually in the form of warnings about having a back-up plan – bottled water - in case something happens to compromise public water. These statistics were contrasted with stats that indicated that there had not been any reported foodborne illnesses from bottled water in the past 5 years. This is the kind of data that bottled water corporations don’t put in their advertisements, but IBWA has put it out on the web. Someone exposed to marketing that communicates bottled water is a purer water source might already have reduced trust in public water, viewing the data presented above would only confirm their feelings.

Table 10: ABWM & IBWA Frame Amplification Summary

Group	Key Points
ABWM	Tap Water Challenge, Tap-a-Palooza, listserves, conference calls, action alert emails, pledge drives, maps, film screenings, campaign paraphernalia, hydration stations
IBWA	Signature drives, letters to the editor, YouTube, health and choice frames

Frame Extension

Both the ABWM and the IBWA engage in frame extension (see Table 11). There are many examples to be found of the ABWM’s use of frame extension. The ABWM

uses frame extension to communicate that not only is bottled water a waste of money when most people have access to cheap and clean water from the tap, but bottled water negatively impacts investment in public water systems. The ABWM puts forth the argument that bottled water corporations hurt tap water by calling its quality into question through marketing campaigns, and when states spend money on bottled water they further erode confidence in public water systems. “It stands to reason that each dollar spent on bottled water was a dollar that could have been spent on much-needed investment in our public water systems” (CAI, January 5, 2011, p.1). The ABWM argues that the bottled water industry sees the decline of public water infrastructure in the U.S. as an opportunity for great profit. “The bottled water industry isn’t just seizing an opportunity; it is banking on the decline of our water infrastructure as a key to the success of its business model” (CAI, January 1, 2011, p. 3). The ABWM details annual expenditures on bottled water by many states and municipalities. One such example is Minnesota, where in 2009, \$475,000 of state dollars were spent on bottled water (CAI, January 5, 2011, p.7). The ABWM argues that the money spent on bottled water should have been used for infrastructure improvements, especially during times when budgets are tight.

Perhaps nowhere else in the country, in the wake of the I-35 bridge collapse in 2007, is there greater understanding of the urgent need for reinvestment in public infrastructure. But current state spending on bottled water in Minnesota sends the wrong message about the state’s commitment to public water infrastructure, siphoning off money from critical infrastructure investments at a time when the state can scarcely afford to do so. Therefore, this finding points to the need for Governor Tim Pawlenty to issue a clear directive phasing out the purchase of bottled water by the state (CAI, January 5, 2011, p.7).

Another example of frame extension employed by the ABWM is the incorporation of environmental justice frames into its anti-bottled water framing. The

ABWM extends its criticisms of the bottled water industry and its misleading marketing to criticisms of marketing which purposely targets immigrant populations in the U.S. and “emerging markets” overseas. The ABWM lifts up the example of Nestlé and its marketing of its brand Pure Life to Hispanic communities in the U.S. “In 2008, the advertising magazine Brandweek reported that Pure Life’s target audience is ‘recent U.S. Hispanic immigrants, moms in particular, who are un-aculturated to American products, yet have an affinity for the Nestlé name’ (FWW, March 2011, p.9). The ABWM argues that these populations are being targeted because they are more likely to have a negative view of tap water quality since many of them come from countries where the tap water was not safe to drink. Nestlé has engaged Spanish-speaking celebrities in their ad campaigns and even installed a water store called Pure Life Mercado del Agua in the Bronx where more than 50% of the population is Hispanic. Arizona Congressman Raúl Grijalva stated,

All we’re asking for is some honesty and transparency in Nestle’s marketing, If those small things are too much to ask, we have to wonder why company marketers are targeting Hispanics so aggressively and so specifically...Anyone selling bottled water as a cure for the world’s environmental and health problems is selling snake oil, and working families should know all there is to know before they buy the hype (CAI, November 2, 2011).

The ABWM extends the frame further by arguing that Nestlé is not reaching out to these emerging markets with the goal of solving the world water crisis, but rather improving its bottom line as its American market shrinks.

While bottled water can be a temporary solution for obtaining clean water on an individual basis, it does not address the broader need to sustainably manage water resources in the United States or abroad, and it does not provide access to water for the billions of people around the world who can least afford it. To achieve this

goal, the global community must recognize that water should not be treated as a source of profits, but rather as a basic human right (FWW, March 2011, p10).

Another example of frame extension is seen through the work that the ABWM is doing to ban bottled water from National Parks. The ABWM has expanded their anti-bottled water framing to cast the bottled water industry as profiting off of the National Parks as well as using National Parks to greenwash their products. According to the ABWM, bottled water corporations make billions off of sales in National Parks every year and make donations to parks in order to be able to use park logos in “cause-marketing” and to maintain influence in the parks. “Coke, Nestlé and Pepsi are using one national treasure (our parks) to profit from another (our water) by selling and promoting bottled water in our nation’s most pristine places. It’s time for our national parks to go bottled water free” (CAI, January 4, 2013). The ABWM extends the frame of bottled water corporations profiting off public water to bottled water corporations profiting off of yet another public resource, the parks. Kristin Urquiza of CAI states, “By thinking outside the bottle, parks can make clear that water, like our parks, is not for sale” (CAI, April 24, 2013). The ABWM is calling on National Parks, as leaders and models of environmental stewardship and sustainability, to protect natural resources from environmentally harmful practices like the bottling of water which creates plastic waste and negatively impacts climate change through its carbon footprint. In going bottled water free, parks are protecting two valuable natural resources: the environment and public water.

IBWA also uses frame extension techniques. One such example is when IBWA extends its framing against bottled water bans to include the possibility that bans could

lead to an even greater obesity epidemic in the U.S. The IBWA in its framing emphasizes the health benefits that bottle water provides as well as its importance to a healthy lifestyle. However, IBWA takes it a step further and suggests that removing bottled water as a choice will lead people to choose unhealthier packaged beverages and ultimately will lead to higher obesity levels. In the Bottled Water Matters video “Meet Norman” the main character Norman starts to gain weight and becomes at risk for diabetes after bottled water had been banned in his community and he starts to substitute other sugary, high calorie beverages when bottled water is no longer available. Norman’s neighbors also gain weight. The video ends with the narrator stating that, “They [people who started the bottled water ban] didn’t solve any environmental issues, they added to a public health threat – called obesity” (BWM, December 7, 2012). So, IBWA is not only trying to persuade consumers that bottled water is important to their health, but that its absence in the marketplace directly threatens their health. IBWA repeats frequently that bottled water helps people to drink more water – helps people to be healthier. Kantor Panel Worldwide stated, “Bottled water helps people make the choice to drink more water; especially as it’s convenient for people on the go. In fact, 40 percent of all water servings come in the form of bottled water” (IBWA, October 7, 2014). An IBWA infographic states that, “by switching from soft drinks to bottled water, Americans have saved 300 billion calories each year” (IBWA, October 7, 2014).

The IBWA also employs frame extension to emphasize the importance of bottled water in times of compromised tap water and natural disaster. The bottled water industry donates water every year to communities faced with disasters such as hurricanes,

tornadoes and floods, but also boil alerts and contamination. Joe Doss of IBWA states, “During emergencies, we see how critical bottled water is for disaster-stricken communities and the importance of a coordinated, effective response to get drinking water to people in need” (BWM, January 14, 2009). So, the importance of bottled water in times of emergency is established, but IBWA expands on this to add that in order for bottled water corporations to be able to continue to respond to these disasters, they must continue to be a viable business.

The bottled water industry cannot exist for disaster response alone – a truth not always obvious to consumers. The industry’s efforts to provide crucial drinking water to citizens afflicted by disasters are contingent on a viable commercial market. The commercial market provides it with the capital and resources to respond when needed. To discourage the use of bottled water does a disservice to an industry that is called upon every year to provide much needed drinking water” (Hogan, August/September 2012, p.33).

So, bottled water bans may not be in the best interests of safety because the bottled water industry won’t be able to respond if there is no market. So a consumer could infer that if their community bans bottled water, essentially eliminating the bottled water market in that community, that the bottled water industry may not be able to respond to a water crisis there when one occurs.

Another example is when the IBWA extends its recycling frames from individual responsibility level framing to community level. IBWA emphasizes the importance of individuals recycling bottles after use, but broadens this to advocating for single-stream curbside recycling programs in communities as well as more public space recycling.

IBWA has long been an advocate for recycling programs and is working to build partnerships to help improve the recovery of recyclable materials, primarily

through the expansion of single-stream curbside recycling collection programs. IBWA’s Material Recovery Program framework assists in developing new, comprehensive solutions to help manage solid waste in communities by having all consumer product companies work together with state and local governments to improve recycling and waste collection efforts (IBWA, March 22, 2012).

Further, IBWA makes the argument that there is a strong market for recycled plastic bottles. In IBWA’s video “Recycling Empty Plastic Water Bottles,” a teen girl visits a plastic recycling factory where she is told that they don’t have enough bottles to meet their demand for production. Ben McElrath, the man who is giving her the tour, explains that the recycled plastic bottles are transformed into all kinds of everyday products like: carpet, pillow stuffing, furniture stuffing, mattress stuffing, bottles, and take-out containers. He goes on to explain, “it takes a lot less energy to make a product out of recycled raw materials than it does to make a product out of virgin raw materials” (BWM, May 31, 2011). The teen concludes that without recycled bottles, we wouldn’t have these other important products in our lives.

Table 11: ABWM & IBWA Frame Extension Summary

Group	Key Points
ABWM	Tap Water Challenge, Tap-a-Palooza, listserves, conference calls, action alert emails, pledge drives, maps, film screenings, campaign paraphernalia, hydration stations
IBWA	Signature drives, letters to the editor, YouTube, health and choice frames

Frame Transformation

The IBWA was the only organization observed to have engaged in frame transformation. The IBWA, in a 2012 article about their social media tactics, explained that they were surprised by some of the activists comments left on their YouTube video “Student Activism: 101.” The comments seemed to lead them to a different understanding than what they had previously had in regards to criticisms of their product by anti-bottled water activists. This statement was typed under a header named “changing arguments” and seems to indicate that they have decided that they need to shift their framing to adapt to the new understanding in light of the criticisms.

Initially, we understood student efforts to be focused primarily on recycling and environmental responsibility. Then, we started hearing the opinion that bottled water was simply unnecessary and campuses needed to install hydration stations and distribute reusable water bottles. More recently, the arguments have shifted to a global perspective...For many college activists, the bottled water industry is the new, faceless, corporate “them”: Big Tobacco, Big Oil, and now Big Bottled Water. A story we continue to hear is that the bottled water industry is a calculating global cabal out to suck dry the world of both water and money...Our messaging continues to adapt, and, as IBWA prepares to launch a completely revamped website, our industry’s social media tools and strategies will play an ongoing and important role in keeping our messages relevant to news and industry influencers (Hogan, April/May 2012, p.60).

Master Frames

This section identifies the master frames the ABWM and the IBWA engage (see Table 12). The ABWM employs both an anti-neoliberalism master frame, opposed to market-based policies, and a human rights master frame, focused on universal access. The IBWA employs a choice master frame, emphasizing the importance consumer choice in the marketplace.

Anti-Neoliberalism

The ABWM consistently points to corporate control of water as a primary problem. More and more water is shifting from the public realm to the private. The ABWM equates bottled water with the privatization of water and maintains that bottled water corporations have successfully transformed water into a product to be bought and sold – a commodity. Therefore, for the ABWM, bottled water corporations are commodifying water. Commodification can be understood as an expansion of the capitalist market to the point of encompassing more and more of human life in its expansion; everything in life becomes something that can be purchased or put up for sale (Allan, 2007). In the case of water, when water becomes commodified, it becomes valued based on monetary terms and its exchange value (Roberts, 2008). This shift towards the market governance of natural resources is emblematic of neoliberal economic globalization that embraces a policy of “market environmentalism” that “promises environmental ends via market means” (Bakker, 2003, p.27). This neoliberal framework “assert[s] that environmental goods will be more efficiently allocated if treated as economic goods” (Bakker, 2007, p.432). Further, neoliberalism “fosters a conception of rights supported through market forces rather than political membership” (Johnson, 2006, p. 664).

The ABWM contests that water should be treated as an economic good. For the ABWM, as more water becomes privately owned, it becomes “prioritize[d] [for] profit, not people’s needs for access” (CAI, 2015 a). Cathy Blair of Women’s Voices Raised for Social Justice states, “Populations across the world are growing increasingly dependent on water from private corporations in the form of bottled water or corporate-operated

water systems, but these systems are no substitute for public water works because they focus on profits, not the long-term needs of the communities they serve” (CAI, April 9, 2008). The ABWM argues that water is being treated by corporations as the “oil of the 21st century.” Like oil, water is in limited supply; however, water is essential to life. The ABWM poses the question of who should be trusted to manage such an essential resource, a corporation that is accountable primarily to its shareholders and its bottom line or public institutions accountable to citizens. In a statement to the U.N. Independent Expert on the Human Right to Water and Sanitation, Kathryn Mulvey (September 29, 2009) of CAI stated the following:

The more water becomes a high-priced commodity – the “oil of the 21st century” – the more public water sources and universal access to water become threatened. Bottled water corporations, for example, are convincing communities and individuals that the only place to get clean, safe water is from a bottle. However, bottled water has negative social, economic and environmental impacts. The growth of the bottled water industry threatens the political will to fund public water systems adequately. Public water systems have been critical to health and equality in the US, so they must be maintained in this country and secured throughout the world.

Both FWW and CAI engage in broad-based work on campaigns against bottled water and water privatization, as well as other campaigns addressing genetically modified organisms, fracking, free trade agreements and tobacco that pull on an anti-neoliberal master frame as a lens for diagnosing problems. Anti-neoliberalism as a master frame indicates an opposition to “market-based policies – neoliberalism -” crafted and enforced by the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and multinational corporations that have resulted in a democracy vacuum and an imbalance of power between citizens and multilateral institutions and corporations

(Ibrahim, 2015, p.19). The anti-neoliberal frame started to emerge during the Zapatista movement in Chiapas, Mexico when they gained international attention for their opposition to the North American Free Trade Agreement signed between the U.S. and Mexico in 1994 (Ibrahim, 2015). This master frame is broad enough in scope to intersect with the frames of many different social movements, providing activists with a framework for shared grievances and expression. CAI connects broadly to this master frame in their organizational mission statement stating, “As global corporations have grown richer and more powerful than many nations, they increasingly operate without limits on their power or influence. Around the world, global corporations drive government policies, unchecked by strong global policies to protect public health, human rights and the environment” (CAI, 2015 b). With this statement, CAI clearly states that democracy has been compromised by the unregulated power of corporations; that corporations are more powerful than governments and are well positioned to influence policy making. FWW states in their vision statement that they envision “a world where all people have the wholesome food, clean water and sustainable energy they need to thrive. We believe this will happen when people become involved in making democracy work and when people, not corporations, control the decisions that affect their lives and communities” (FWW, 2015 c). Here FWW indicates that the solution is for people to take back control of democratic process and decision-making.

Human Rights

The ABWM consistently defines water as a human right. Both CAI and FWW were involved in efforts to have a human right to water explicitly recognized by the

United Nations (U.N.). Before 2010, there was no unequivocal mention of a “human right to water” in any international human rights treaty “as an autonomous and independent issue” (Lopes 2006, p. 11). Therefore, previous to 2010, the human right to water had to be extrapolated from other recognized rights such as the right to life, adequate health and wellbeing, and food (Hammer 2004). In July of 2010, the U.N. General Assembly affirmed the human right to water and sanitation after more than a decade of grassroots organizing and lobbying worldwide. “For social movements, human rights are simultaneously a system of law, a set of values, and a vision of good governance” (Merry, Levitt, Rosen, & Yoon, 2010, p.101-102).

Given the anti-neoliberal framework of the ABWM, they are concerned that when water is treated as an economic good, it becomes commodified. Bottled water corporations, or as they call them, “water profiteers,” manage water resources as a good to be bought and sold like any other good with the goal of profit making. The ABWM argues that allowing water to be managed through market mechanisms necessarily leads to unequitable access. The ABWM argues that only democratic institutions can safeguard water and guarantee access for everyone. CAI explains,

Because the human right to water is a basic obligation of governments, universal access is best realized when the management and control of water is in the public’s hands. We support democratically accountable water systems and help create the political space for these public solutions to thrive through hard-hitting campaigns, advocacy and strategic alliances (CAI, 2015 c).

Wenonah Hauter, the Executive Director of FWW, makes a very similar statement in which she emphasizes the importance of funding public water. Hauter states, “The only long-term solution for achieving universal access to water is to make it a public service

and to use tax dollars to finance water infrastructure. It's an appropriate, necessary, and common role for government. And the global justice movement believes it's worth fighting for" (Hauter, April 28, 2011).

This human rights master frame is the lens through which the ABWM formulates its prognostic frames. Within this master frame, the ABWM pushes for solutions that work towards democratic control of water - public water – that will guarantee the human right to water for all. “[T]he very concept of a human right is suggested to represent a ‘master frame,’ where the idea of what it is to be ‘human’ is effectively repackaged and interpreted alongside ideas of ‘justice,’ ‘equality,’ ‘freedom,’ ‘dignity’ and so on (all of which are contested, evolving and ambiguous by their very nature – as all true frames should be)” (Miller, Short & Waites, 2011, p.115). A more general “rights” master frame is tied to the master frame of the “civil rights” movement (Morris, 1999; Snow & Benford, 1992). “Civil rights” frames appeal to values of equal opportunity and civil liberties grounded in U.S. citizenship (Valocchi, 1996, p.117). Human rights like civil rights are a set of laws, however, human rights are meant to be applied regardless of citizenship or country of origin (Merry et al., 2010). “Human rights are also a philosophical and moral system of values that claims universality and asserts the worth of all humans by virtue of their humanity” (Merry et al., 2010, p.107). Human rights frames appeal to values of human dignity, equality, nondiscrimination and freedom (Merry et al., 2010). Human rights frames also indicate a system of good governance “emphasiz[ing] participatory decision-making, transparency, and accountability” (Merry et al., 2010, p.107). Under this human rights frame, the ABWM is able to appeal to broad audiences,

motivate mobilization, legitimate actions and transform the debate on water (Hynes, Lamb, Short, & Waites, 2011).

Choice

IBWA consistently equates water and bottled water with choice as a master frame. Bottled water is frequently described as a “healthy choice,” “the right choice,” “critical beverage choice,” “drink of choice,” “smart beverage choice,” “excellent choice for hydration,” and “the most environmentally responsible packaged drink choice.” IBWA claims that the presence of bottled water in the marketplace makes it easier for unhealthy Americans to make healthier choices. “Convenient access to bottled water as a healthy alternative to sugary beverages helps consumers make better choices” (IBWA, 2015 b). So, not only is bottled water a choice, but it is a vehicle for healthy choice making. The IBWA supports the “Drink Up Campaign” in order “to encourage Americans to make an *easy choice* [emphasis added] to help improve their health and well-being every day: drink more water” (IBWA, 2015 b). IBWA argues that consumers should be able to choose their water source as in, “People should be drinking more water, whether it comes from a bottle, the tap, or a filtration system – but that the choice should be theirs” (IBWA, January 2013, p.11). IBWA explains that bottled water provides consumers with many choices in brands that a consumer can select from based on taste, quality and price. However, the IBWA points out that with public water systems (tap water), there are no choices - there is only one tap water option within any particular locality.

IBWA refers to bans and restrictions on the sale of bottled water as limiting consumer choice and leading to unhealthy substitution choices. The former IBWA chairman William Patrick Young (December/January 2013) explains,

In addressing this emerging trend (the recent attempt by colleges, national park, and one town so far to ban the sale of bottled water), we are engaging institutions and organization to lead them to the truth: bottled water is a choice. It is the choice for people who want a safe, great tasting, natural, anti-obesity, healthy beverage that is convenient (p.2).

IBWA states on its website that, “Attacks on bottled water only help to promote less healthy options among other packaged beverages, like soda and juices, which have more packaging, more ingredients, and greater environmental impacts than bottled water” (IBWA, 2015 c). Adriana Cohen writes in her opinion piece published in the *Boston Globe*, that Concord, MA’s proposed ban on bottled water “threatens our most basic civil liberties: consumer choice” and “would cap freedom of choice” (IBWA, January 2013, p.18). When IBWA put out a press release about the University of Vermont’s ban on the sale of bottled water, IBWA stated, “The decision restricts the freedom of choice for students to choose one of the healthiest beverages available in vending machines” (IBWA, February 2, 2012). IBWA’s diagnostic frame “bottled water bans,” originates from the choice master frame – banning bottled water is a problem because of its impact on the availability of choices in the marketplace.

Scott Davies (1999) writes about the choice master frame in connection to school-choice movements. Davies (1999) writes, “Choice as a master frame helps sustain a sense of injustice through its portrayal of public schooling as largely unresponsive and unaccountable to parents and the general public” (p.9). In the case of bottled water, the

bottled water industry holds that the absence of bottled water as a choice in the marketplace is an injustice in that it fails to acknowledge and respond to the convenience needs of people, therefore leading people to make unhealthy choices by virtue of convenience. Samantha Kwan (2009), in her study on the food industry, refers to the “market choice” master frame stating that, “The defining characteristics of this market choice frame are the choice to consume and individual responsibility over what one chooses to consume” (p.483). So, choices should be made available to consumers and it is up to the consumer to make the right choice for themselves. IBWA argues that bottled water should be made available and it is up to the consumer to decide whether to drink bottled water instead of a soda or refill their reusable bottle with tap water. IBWA uses the choice master frame to indicate that the choice should be left to the consumer and that choice should not be forced on the consumer.

Table 12: ABWM & IBWA Master Frames Summary

Group	Master Frame	Key Points
ABWM	Anti-Neoliberalism	Opposition to “market-based policies,” Zapatista Movement, imbalance of power, commodification, privatization, market environmentalism, market delivers “rights,” profit over people
ABWM	Human Rights	Human right to water declared 2010, market leads to unequitable access, democratic institutions guarantee universal access, “rights” and “civil rights” master frames
IBWA	Choice	Bottled water is a choice, vehicle for healthy choice making, no choice with tap, limited consumer choice, “choice” and “market choice” master frames

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The goal of this analysis has been to examine and describe the frames and counterframes of the Anti-Bottled Water Movement (ABWM) and the bottled water industry, represented by International Bottled Water Association (IBWA). As a part of this analysis, the core framing tasks (diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing) and frame alignment processes (frame bridging, amplification, extension and transformation) as well as master frames were analyzed. The analysis uncovered that both the ABWM and IBWA employ all three core framing tasks. However, the ABWM places more emphasis on diagnostic framing than does the IBWA while the IBWA prioritizes prognostic over diagnostic framing. I found that the diagnostic frames of the ABWM are counterframed within the prognostic frames of the IBWA, specifically the strategy of promoting bottled water's "good story." The IBWA strategically focuses on the prognosis to undermine the frames of the ABWM. The IBWA attempts to clarify that consumers are being misled by the diagnostic frames of the ABWM. And the prognostic frames of the ABWM appear as diagnostic frames for the IBWA; bottled water bans are a solution for the ABWM and a problem for the IBWA. For the IBWA, the prognostic frames don't necessarily address their own diagnoses, but rather appear to address some of the criticisms from the ABWM. For example, the IBWA's work to improve recycling rates seems to be a prognosis to the "environmental harm" diagnosis of the ABWM. And as previously documented, the prognosis of promoting bottled water's "good story" is directly counterframing diagnoses from the ABWM, which demonstrates that

counterframing can be identified by examining core framing tasks. The ABWM uses one primary motivational frame, the “water crisis,” while the IBWA employs several: obesity crisis, disaster emergency and “one for all and all for one.”

Both the ABWM and the IBWA undertake frame alignment processes. The two assume similar tactics: face to face discussions, social media, and pledge or signature drives to bridge frames to “unmobilized sentiment pools.” Both groups amplify feelings of trust or distrust to attract adherents. The ABWM uses frame amplification to support their diagnostic frames and characterize bottled water as a social problem contributing to environmental destruction and the demise of democratic process. The IBWA uses frame amplification to support their diagnostic frames that characterize bottled water bans as harmful to commerce and public health. They both extend frames to reach out to constituents engaged in other movements or work related to their prognostic and motivational frames. The IBWA was the only organization in which a frame transformation was observed, but in order to effectively study frame transformations it would be necessary to do interviews or an historical study to observe how frames may have transformed over time.

Both the ABWM and the IBWA practice “diagnostic framing on a macrolevel” – engage in master framing (Snow & Benford, 1992, p.139). The ABWM applies both an anti-neoliberal and human rights master frame. The IBWA applies a choice master frame. Whereas the master frames of the ABWM are oriented in conflict with the market, the master frames of the IBWA are oriented in its favor. The core framing tasks for both the ABWM and the IBWA extend from these master frames. The ABWM’s diagnostic

frames align with macro-level criticisms of neoliberalism, while their prognostic frames align with protecting human rights. The IBWA's diagnostic frames align with macro-level economic frames that emphasize the importance of choice in the marketplace. The IBWA's prognostic frames align with protecting "freedom of choice."

Relatively few researchers have compared the framing techniques of social movements with those of the corporations or industry groups that they target with their campaigns. This research contributes to framing theory in that it has established that not only do social movements employ collective action frames, core framing tasks, frame alignment processes and master frames, but corporations and industry groups can do so as well. Future research could use similar methodology to examine the framing techniques of other social movements and opposing industry groups. For example, the Food Justice Movement (FJM) and opposing biotechnology industry could be analyzed in this way. A researcher could look at FJM campaigns to label genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and industry campaigns to block GMO labeling legislation.

Building on my research, future research could incorporate interviews with International Bottled Water Association (IBWA) staff and key IBWA members as well as staff and key members of Corporate Accountability International and Food & Water Watch to cross compare what they say with what they have published online. Such research could lead to an even better understanding of how these groups construct their frames. Future studies may look at the social media sites for these organizations to see if they prioritize different frames and framing techniques on social media than on their

websites. Studying social media would allow for the analysis of engagement with supporters.

This topic will continue to be relevant for years to come. In the fall of 2015, news emerged that Flint, Michigan residents had been exposed to toxic levels of lead from their tap water since April 25, 2014 when the city switched the sourcing of its water supply from the Detroit water system to the Flint River as a cost cutting measure. Distrust for public water systems is yet again in the news. Just the other night I heard an interview with a mother who said she will never give her children tap water again because of what happened in Flint. Bottled water corporations immediately responded to the emergency by donating truckloads of bottled water to residents. Organizations and individuals have also collected bottled water to ship to Flint. The news media has raised questions about what will happen with all of the plastic waste that is now accumulating in Flint from the bottled water. FWW and CAI haven't really addressed the bottled water issue directly, but rather have emphasized the importance of funding public water infrastructure improvements. CAI stated, "This crisis was human-made and would have been prevented had the city's water system been funded adequately in the first place" (CAI, January 20, 2016). The complexity for the ABWM is to draw attention to the deteriorating infrastructure without driving people to bottled water. The IBWA has created a web page specifically on bottled water and Flint, just as it did with the drought in California (IBWA, 2016 a). On the page, the IBWA explains that bottled water's purification processes remove lead, and bottled water's regulations on lead are more stringent than the EPA's for tap water, as well as emphasizes the importance of recycling. Future studies

may look at the impact of the Flint water crisis on the framing techniques of the ABWM and the IBWA or how the media frames the crisis.

The Flint water crisis definitely raises some important questions. Is bottled water the only “go-to-solution” for water quality emergencies in the U.S.? The average person would need 200 16oz bottles of water per day for daily water needs, that’s 20.4 million per day for the entire Flint population (Moore, January 27, 2016). Obviously, the people of Flint are in desperate need of potable water, but couldn’t other solutions be developed for future emergencies like water trucks, portable filtration systems and temporary relocations? Perhaps the most important question to ask ourselves is why isn’t clean tap water infrastructure a funding priority in this country when its absence carries with it irreversible consequences?

REFERENCES

- Advertising Age. (2005, March 28). 1950s TV Turns on America. Retrieved October 20, 2013, from <http://adage.com/article/75-years-of-ideas/1950s-tv-turns-america/102703/>
- Allan, K. (2007). *The social lens: An invitation to social and sociological theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Anderson, S., & Cavanagh, J. (2000). Top 200: The Rise of Global Corporate Power. Retrieved March 21, 2013, from http://www.ipse-dc.org/reports/top_200_the_rise_of_corporate_global_power
- Arnold, C. A. (2009). Water Privatization Trends in the United States: Human Rights, National Security, and Public Stewardship. *William & Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review*, 33, 785-849.
- Bakker, K. J. (2003). *An uncooperative commodity: Privatizing water in England and Wales*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bakker, K. J. (2007). The “Commons” Versus the “Commodity”: Alter-globalization, Anti- privatization and the Human Right to Water in the Global South. *Antipode*, 39(3), 430-455.
- Barlow, M., & Clarke, T. (2002). *Blue gold: The fight to stop the corporate theft of the world's water*. New York: New Press.
- Benford, R. D. (1987). *Framing activity, meaning, and social movement participation: The nuclear disarmament movement* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Texas at Austin, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611-639.
- Beverage Marketing Corporation. (2011, September). Bottled Water Recovers Somewhat From Recessionary Years. Retrieved February 27, 2012, from <http://www.beveragemarketing.com/redesign/includes/home/pressreleases.html>

Bly, L. (2012, February 7). Grand Canyon National Park bans sale of plastic water bottles. *USA Today*. Retrieved June 2, 2012, from <http://travel.usatoday.com/destinations/dispatches/post/2012/02/grand-canyon-national-park-bans-sale-of-plastic-water-bottles/621698/1>

Bottled Water Matters. (2009, January 14). 3/4 of Americans are Obese! So Drink Water, Bottled or Tap. Retrieved September 9, 2015, from <http://bottledwatermatters.org/article/34-americans-are-obese-so-drink-water-bottled-or-tap>

Bottled Water Matters. (2009, October 6). 5,000 Gallons to Atlanta Flood Victims and Counting. Retrieved September 9, 2015, from <http://bottledwatermatters.org/article/5000-gallons-atlanta-flood-victimsand-counting>

Bottled Water Matters. (2011, April 5). *Every Bottle Counts* [Video file]. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HsLanqs7sKA&list=UUcXQ2ToCG65c7GrYHLxGW-A&index=6&feature=plcp>

Bottled Water Matters. (2011, May 31). *Recycling Empty Plastic Bottles* [Video file]. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TL_qH1ra7J0

Bottled Water Matters. (2011, October 13). *The Adventures of Recycle Kitty* [Video file]. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/content/adventures-recycle-kitty>

Bottled Water Matters. (2012, February 7). Video Puts Bottled Water Bans at Colleges into Perspective. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://bottledwatermatters.org/article/video-puts-bottled-water-bans-colleges-perspective>

Bottled Water Matters. (2012, December 7). *Meet Norman* [Video file]. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=xmGhFn7bkEY

Bottled Water Matters. (2015 a). Luv Bottled Water. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwatermatters.org/luv-bottled-water>

Bottled Water Matters. (2015, March 19). Staying Hydrated, Choosing Healthy, Drinking Water. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://bottledwatermatters.org/article/staying-hydrated-choosing-healthy-drinking-water>

- Bottled Water Matters. (2015, July 22). Bottled Water Sales Ban Policy at America's National Parks Causes Controversy: Denies Visitors the Option to Make Healthy Beverage Choice. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://bottledwatermatters.org/article/bottled-water-sales-ban-policy-america%E2%80%99s-national-parks-causes-controversy-denies-visitors>
- Boldt-Van Rooy, T. (2009). Bottling Up Our Natural Resources: The Fight Over Bottled Water Extraction in the United States. *Journal of Land Use & Environmental Law* 18(2): 267-298.
- Caradec, P. (2011, October/November). Chairman's Commentary: Accuracy, Truth and Transparency. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.2). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g22160_IBWA_OctNov11/#/4
- Caradec, P. (2012, February/March). Chairman's Commentary: Marketing Just the Facts. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.2). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g24145_ibwa_bwr_ma_12/#/4
- Caradec, P. (2012, April/May). Chairman's Commentary: Marketing Just the Facts. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp. 2). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g25762_ibwa_bwr_aprmay2012/#/4
- Carducci, V. (2006). Culture Jamming: A Sociological Perspective. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 6(1), 116-138.
- Carroll, W. K., & Ratner, R. S. (2008). Master Frames and Counter-Hegemony: Political Sensibilities in Contemporary Social Movements. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 33(4), 407-435.
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent Spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Chapelle, F. (2005). *Wellsprings: A natural history of bottled spring waters*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons and Evaluative Criteria. *Qualitative Sociology* 13(1): 3-21.
- Corporate Accountability International. (2008, January 1). Graphic: 17 Million Barrels. Retrieved August 26, 2015, from https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/totb_17_million_barrels.pdf

Corporate Accountability International. (2008, April 9). Press Release: Brewmeisters, Restauranteurs, and Mayor Stay “Think Outside the Bottle” in St. Louis. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/press-release-brewmeisters-restauranteurs-and-mayor-stay-think-outside-bottle-st-louis>

Corporate Accountability International. (2008, June 21). Mayors Vote to End Taxpayer Spending on Bottled Water. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/mayors-vote-end-taxpayer-spending-bottled-water>

Corporate Accountability International. (2008, November 25). City, 5 Eateries Say No to Bottled Water. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/news/city-5-eateries-say-no-bottled-water>

Corporate Accountability International. (2009, January 1). 2008 U.S. Conference of Mayors Resolution. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/uscm2008resolution.pdf>

Corporate Accountability International. (2009, April 1). Press Release: Nestlé Asked to Stop Fooling with Community Water Supplies. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/press-release-nestle%20asked-stop-fooling-community-water-supplies>

Corporate Accountability International. (2009, April 22). Press Release: What is the Real Thing, Really? Coke’s Earth Day PR Thinly Veils Poor Track Record. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <http://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/press-release-what-real-thing-really-cokes-earth-day-pr-thinly-veils-poor-track-record>

Corporate Accountability International. (2010, January 1). Getting States off the Bottle: How taxpayer dollars are wasted on bottled water and its effect on public water systems. Retrieved August 26, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/getting-states-off-the-bottle-corporate-accountability-international.pdf>

Corporate Accountability International. (2010, March 23). Millions in Taxpayer Dollars Flow to Bottled Water. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <http://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/millions-taxpayer-dollars-flow-bottled-water>

Corporate Accountability International. (2010, April 20). Coke's Failure to Label Dasani Irks Congress, Prompts Ad Campaign. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/coke%E2%80%99s-failure-label-dasani-irks-congress-prompts-ad-campaign>

Corporate Accountability International. (2010, October, 14). Seattle University Goes Bottled Water Free. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <http://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/seattle-university-goes-bottled-water-free>

Corporate Accountability International. (2011, January 1). Getting States off the Bottle: Second Edition. Retrieved August 26, 2015, from https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/getting-states-off-the-bottle-2nd-ed_0.pdf#page=2

Corporate Accountability International. (2011, January 5). Corporate Accountability International Supports Recommendations of the Environmental Working Group's 2011 Bottled Water Labeling Scorecard. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/corporate-accountability-international-supports-recommendations-environmental-working>

Corporate Accountability International. (2011, June 1). Think Outside the Bottle: Student Activism Guide. Retrieved August 27, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/totb-student-activism-kit.pdf>

Corporate Accountability International. (2011, July 5). Tap Water Challenge Organizing Guide. Retrieved August 26, 2015, from https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/tap_water_challenge_organizing_kit.pdf#page=3

Corporate Accountability International. (2011, September 29). Maryland Governor Announces Plan to Buck Bottled Water. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <http://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/maryland-governor-announces-plan-buck-bottled-water>

Corporate Accountability International. (2011, November 2). Latino Leaders and Communities Pledge to Turn the Tide on Pure Life. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/latino-leaders-and-communities-pledge-turn-tide-pure-life>

Corporate Accountability International. (2012, March 22). Public Water Works Open Letter. Retrieved August 26, 2015, from https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/public_water_works_open_letter.pdf

Corporate Accountability International. (2013, January 4). National Parks Think Outside the Bottle Flier. Retrieved August 26, 2015, from https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/np_flier.pdf

Corporate Accountability International. (2013, April 24). Report: Parks Reduce Waste by a Third. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/report-parks-reduce-waste-third>

Corporate Accountability International. (2013, May 16). Mount Holyoke, Hampshire College to Celebrate Bottled-Water-Free Commencement. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/mount-holyoke-hampshire-college-celebrate-bottled-water-free-commencement>

Corporate Accountability International. (2013, May 20). Graduating from the Bottle to the Tap. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <http://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/blog/graduating-bottle-tap>

Corporate Accountability International. (2014, March 4). With Passage of Bottled-Water Ordinance, Board Sets National Precedent. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/passage-bottled-water-ordinance-board-sets-national-precedent>

Corporate Accountability International. (2015 a). About the Campaign. Retrieved August 24, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/about-campaign>

Corporate Accountability International. (2015 b). About Us. Retrieved August 24, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/about-us>

Corporate Accountability International. (2015 c). The Human Right to Water. Retrieved August 24, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/human-right-water>

- Corporate Accountability International. (2015, June 5). National Parks Guide to Thinking Outside the Bottle. Retrieved August 26, 2015, from https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/bwfg-final_for_web.pdf
- Corporate Accountability International. (2016, January 20). Water Crisis in Flint Preventable, Tragic and Human-Made. Retrieved March 18, 2016, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-statement/water-crisis-flint-preventable-tragic-and-human-made>
- Culora, J. (2014, February/ March). Building Healthy Hydration Habit: How marketing benefits of drinking bottled water can help create healthy families. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.12-17). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/final_bwr_feb-mar2014
- Davies, S. (1999). From Moral Duty to Cultural Rights: A Case Study of Political Framing in Education. *Sociology of Education*, 72(1), 1-21.
- Davis, J. (2015, January/February). How to Participate in Your Community's Recycling Event. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.18-23). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/2015_janfeb_bwr_final
- Dickinson, G. (2005). Selling democracy: Consumer culture and citizenship in the wake of September 11. *Southern Communication Journal*, 70(4), 271-284.
- Doria, M. F. (2006). Bottled water versus tap water: understanding consumers' preferences. *Journal of Water and Health* 4(2), 271-276.
- Ellis, A. R. (2011). Citizens United and Tiered Personhood. *John Marshall Law Review* 44 (3), 717-749.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward a Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 43(4), 51-58.
- Environmental Working Group. (2008, October). Bottled water contains disinfection byproducts, fertilizer residue, and pain medication. Retrieved December 13, 2011, from <http://www.ewg.org/reports/BottledWater/Bottled-Water-Quality-Investigation>
- Fairhurst, G. T., & Sarr, R. A. (1996). *The art of framing: Managing the language of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fitzgerald, T. (2012). Documents and documentary analysis: Reading between the lines. In A. R. Briggs, M. Coleman, & M. Morrison (Eds.), *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management* (pp. 296-308). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Folsom, S. (2009, February 17). Statement: Response to the Economic Recovery Act of 2009. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <http://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/statement-response-economic-recovery-act-2009>

Food and Water Watch. (2007, August). The Case for a Clean Water Trust Fund: New Realities, New Solutions. Retrieved September 12, 2015, from http://documents.foodandwaterwatch.org/doc/CleanWaterTrustFund_web.pdf

Food and Water Watch. (2008, June). The Unbottled Truth about Bottled Water Jobs. Retrieved September 12, 2015, from https://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/sites/default/files/unbottled_truth_about_jobs_fs_june_2008.pdf

Food and Water Watch. (2010, March). Bluewashing: Why the Bottled Water Industry's Eco Friendly Claims Don't Hold Water. Retrieved September 12, 2015, from http://documents.foodandwaterwatch.org/doc/bluewashing.pdf#_ga=1

Food and Water Watch. (2010, September 30). Another Round in the Battle Against the Bottle. Retrieved September 19, 2015, from <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/blogs/another-round-in-the-battle-against-the-bottle/>

Food and Water Watch. (2011, March). Hanging on for Pure Life: Why the Strategies Behind Nestlé's New Bottled Water Brand May be Good for the Company but Bad for Public Water. Retrieved September 12, 2015, from http://documents.foodandwaterwatch.org/doc/PureLife-web.pdf#_ga=1

Food and Water Watch. (2011, July 29). Victory in Wacissa: Food & Water Watch Applauds Local Activists as Nestle Abandons Plan to Bottle Local Water. Retrieved September 19, 2015, from <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/pressreleases/victory-in-wacissa-food-water-watch-applauds-local-activists-as-nestle-abandons-plan-to-bottle-local-water/>

Food and Water Watch. (2012, June). Banning the Bottle on Campus. Retrieved September 12, 2015, from <http://documents.foodandwaterwatch.org/doc/BanningTheBottleOnCampus.pdf>

Food and Water Watch. (2012, July 12). Introduction to Campus Take Back the Tap Campaigns. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <http://documents.foodandwaterwatch.org/doc/campusToolkit.pdf>

Food and Water Watch. (2013, April). Keep a Nestlé Water Bottling Plant Out of the Columbia River Gorge. Retrieved September 12, 2015, from http://documents.foodandwaterwatch.org/doc/Nestle_Columbia.pdf#_ga=1

- Food and Water Watch. (2013, June 24). Food & Water Watch, Surfrider Foundation Team Up to Protect Shores from Plastic Pollution. Retrieved September 19, 2015, from <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/pressreleases/food-water-watch-surfrider-foundation-team-up-to-protect-shores-from-plastic-pollution/>
- Food and Water Watch. (2013, September 6). Concord, Massachusetts First to Ban the Bottle. Retrieved September 19, 2015, from <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/impact/concord-massachusetts-first-ban-bottle>
- Food and Water Watch. (2015 a). Tap Buddy App. Retrieved September 9, 2015, from www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/take-back-the-tap/tap-buddy-app/
- Food and Water Watch. (2015 b). Victories. Retrieved September 9, 2015, from <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/about/aboutvictories/>
- Food and Water Watch. (2015 c). About. Retrieved September 9, 2015, from <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/about>
- Gallo-Cruz, S. (2012). Negotiating the Lines of Contention: Counterframing and Boundary Work in the School of the Americas Debate. *Sociological Forum* 27(1): 21-45.
- Gamson, W. A. (1995). Constructing Social Protest. In H. Johnston & B. Klandermans (Eds.), *Social Movements and Culture* (pp. 85-106). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gleick, P. H. (2010). *Bottled and sold: The story behind our obsession with bottled water*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Gleick, P. H., & Cooley, H. S. (2009). Energy implications of bottled water. *Environmental Research Letters*, 4(1), 1-6. Retrieved May 10, 2015, from http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/4/1/014009/pdf/erl9_1_014009.pdf
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hammer, L. (2004). Indigenous Peoples as a Catalyst for Applying the Human Right to Water. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, 10(2), 131-161.
- Hauter, W. (2011, April 28). The Next Big Thing in Industry: Water Profiteering. Retrieved September 19, 2015, from <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/news/next-big-thing-industry-water-profiteering>

- Hays, M. (2008, November 6). Statement: Corporate Accountability International, Before the Massachusetts State Legislature. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <http://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/statement-corporate-accountability-international-massachusetts-state-legislature>
- Hertz, N. (2001). *The silent takeover: Global capitalism and the death of democracy*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Hewitt, L. & McCammon, H. J. (2005). Explaining Suffrage Mobilization: Balancing, Neutralization, and Range in Collective Action Frames. In H. Johnston and J. Noakes (eds.), *Frames of Protest Social Movements and the Framing Perspective* (pp.33-52). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hogan, C. (2012, April/May). Social Media in Action: Effective and Creating Results. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.60-63). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g25762_ibwa_bwr_aprmay2012/#/62
- Hogan, C. (2012, August/September). When the Weather Turns Against You, Turn to Bottled Water. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.30-33). Retrieved September 9, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g28415_ibwa_bwr_aug-sept2012/#/34
- Hogan, C. (2013, April/May). Telling the Story, Communicating the Facts. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.54-55). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwa_apr-may_041513b_all
- Hu, Z., Morton, L. W., & Mahler, R. (2011). Bottled Water: United States Consumers and Their Perceptions of Water Quality. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health IJERPH*, 8(12), 565-578.
- Humphery, K. (2010). *Excess: Anti-consumerism in the West*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hynes, P., Lamb, M., Short, D. & Waites, M. (eds) (2011). *Sociology and Human Rights: New Engagements*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ibrahim, J. (2015). *Bourdieu and social movements: Ideological struggles in the British anti-capitalist movement*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

International Bottled Water Association. (2008, September 9). Written Testimony of Joseph K. Doss, President and CEO International Bottled Water Association, Before the Subcommittee on Transportation Safety, Infrastructure Security, and Water Quality of the Environment and Public Works Committee United States Senate Hearing on Quality and Environmental Impacts of Bottled Water. Retrieved September 9, 2015, from <http://bottledwatermatters.org/article/bottled-water-industry-goes-senate-promote-safe-healthy-beverage-choice>

International Bottled Water Association. (2009, January 14). With New Federal Statistics Showing 72.7% of Americans Overweight or Obese, IBWA Urges All Americans to Drink More Water. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/content/new-federal-statistics-showing-727-americans-overweight-or-obese-ibwa-urges-all-americans-dr>

International Bottled Water Association. (2010, March 18). World Water Day 2010 Focuses on “Clean Water for a Healthy World” and Includes an Important Role for Bottled Water. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/news/world-water-day-2010-focuses-clean-water-healthy-world-and-includes-important-role-bottled-water>

International Bottled Water Association. (2011, April 27). IBWA Applauds Citizens of Concord, MA, for Defeating Proposed Ban on Bottled Water. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/news/ibwa-applauds-citizens-concord-ma-defeating-proposed-ban-bottled-water>

International Bottled Water Association. (2012, February 2). College Bottled Water Ban Fails Students. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/content/college-bottled-water-ban-fails-students>

International Bottled Water Association. (2012, March 22). IBWA Supports World Water Day. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/content/ibwa-supports-world-water-day>

International Bottled Water Association. (2012, June/July). Recent Studies Highlight Important Role of Healthy Hydration in Fighting Obesity. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.6). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g26942_ibwa_bwr_junjul2012/#/8%20pp.6

International Bottled Water Association. (2012, December 10). Video Highlights How Bottled Water Bans Cause “Shift in Consumption.” Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/video-highlights-how-bottled-water-bans-cause-%E2%80%9Cshift-consumption%E2%80%9D>

International Bottled Water Association. (2013, January). College Campus Toolkit: Protect Your Right to Purchase Bottled Water the Healthiest Packaged Beverage Choice. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/files/College%20Campus%20Toolkit%20%28FINAL%201.28.13%29.pdf#overlay-context=reports-studies>

International Bottled Water Association. (2013, April 22). Letter: “Bottled Water and Tap Water Can and Should Coexist.” Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/letter-bottled-water-and-tap-water-can-and-should-coexist>

International Bottled Water Association. (2013, June 24). IBWA Comments on National Park Service’s Contradiction about Bottled Water and Healthy Food Standards. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/ibwa-statement-regarding-national-park-service%E2%80%99s-contradiction-bottled-water-and-healthy-food>

International Bottled Water Association. (2013, October/November/December). IBWA Supports Michelle Obama’s Campaign to Encourage Americans to Drink More Water. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.6). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwr_octnovdec2013_final

International Bottled Water Association. (2014, September/October). A Healthy Hydration Education Via Twitter. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwr_sept-oct_2014/1

International Bottled Water Association. (2014, October 7). Infographic Highlights Bottled Water’s Small Water Use and Big Health Benefits. September 1, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/infographic-highlights-bottled-water%E2%80%99s-small-water-use-and-big-health-benefits>

International Bottled Water Association. (2014, December 9). The Collegian Letter to the Editor. Retrieved September 2, 2015 from <http://www.bottledwater.org/public/The%20Collegian%20LTE%20%2812.9.14%29.pdf#overlay-context=letters-editor>

International Bottled Water Association. (2015 a). Hydration Calculator. Retrieved August 31, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/public/hydcals/input1.html>

International Bottled Water Association. (2015 b). The Healthy Choice. Retrieved August 31, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/health>

International Bottled Water Association. (2015 c). Learn More About Bottled Water. Retrieved August 31, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/education>

International Bottled Water Association. (2015, March 24). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Public Oral Comment Meeting. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.bottledwater.org/public/IBWA%20Oral%20Comments%20USDA_HHS%20March%202015%20Public%20Meeting%20FINAL.pdf#overlay-context=letters-editor

International Bottled Water Association. (2015, March/April). IBWA Members Kick Off the 114th Congress With Capitol Hill Visit. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.7). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwr_mar-apr2015_final

International Bottled Water Association. (2015, April 23). Stop the Ban of Bottled Water Sales Letter to the National Parks Service. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/public/Stop%20the%20Ban%20of%20Bottled%20Water%20Sales%20FINAL%20%28Ltr%20to%20NPS%204.2015%29.pdf>

International Bottled Water Association. (2015, May/June). Promoting Healthy Hydration in Warmer Months. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.8). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwr_may-jun_2015_final

International Bottled Water Association. (2015, June 24). Consumers Can Remain Confident About the Safety and Reliability of Bottled Water Products. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/consumers-can-remain-confident-about-safety-and-reliability-bottled-water-products>

International Bottled Water Association. (2016 a). Bottled Water & Flint. Retrieved March 18, 2016, <http://www.bottledwater.org/bottled-water-flint>

Jaffee, D., & Newman, S. (2012). A Bottle Half Empty: Bottled Water, Commodification, and Contestation. *Organization & Environment*, 26(3), 318-335.

Jaffee, D., & Newman, S. (2013). A More Perfect Commodity: Bottled Water, Global Accumulation, and Local Contestation. *Rural Sociology*, 78(1), 1-28.

Johnson, K. (2006). Framing AIDS Mobilization and Human Rights in Post-apartheid South Africa. *Perspectives on Politics*, 4(04), 663-670.

- Johnston, H. (2002). Verification and Proof in Frame and Discourse Analysis. In B. Klandermans & S. Staggenborg (Eds.), *Methods of social movement research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jones, P., Comfort, D., & Hillier, D. (2006). Anti-corporate retailer campaigns on the internet. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 34(12), 882-891.
- Karagianni, K. S., & Cornelissen, J. (2006). Anti-corporate movements and public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 32(2), 168-170.
- Kelly, J. (2010, June/July). Educating Legislators: How One IBWA Member Can Inspire Others. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.24-25). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/ygs/G14741IBWA_Nxtbook/#/26
- King, B. (2013, May 8). Nestlé Flexes Its Muscle With Political Contributions. Retrieved September 12, 2015, from <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/blogs/nestle-flexes-its-muscle-with-political-contributions/>
- Klein, N. (1999). *No logo: Taking aim at the brand bullies*. New York: Picador.
- Kwan, S. (2009). Individual versus Corporate Responsibility: Market Choice, the Food Industry, and the Pervasiveness of Moral Models of Fatness. *Food, Culture and Society: An International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 12(4), 477-495.
- Lauria, T. (2010, August/September). Bottled Water: Fighting Obesity and Working to Save the Planet. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.30-31). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g15569_augsept10_bwr/#/32
- Lauria, T. (2011, April/May). The Importance of IBWA's "Show Your Support" Signature Gathering Effort. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp. 50-51). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/G19428IBWA_AprMay11Nxtbk/#/52
- Lauria, T. (2011, June/July). The 7 Biggest Falsehoods about Bottled Water. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.38-39). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g20134ibwa_junjul11/#/40
- Lauria, T. (2011, August/September). IBWA YouTube Videos Help Bottlers Large and Small. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.22-23). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g21125_ibwa_augsept11/#/24

Lopes, P. D. (2006). Water Privatization and the Human Right to Water, presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, San Diego, California. Retrieved March 1, 2016, from http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p99132_index.html

Louaillier, K. (2008, January 1). Thinking Outside the Bottle: An Essay by Kelle Louaillier from the Altnet Book Water Consciousness. Retrieved August 26, 2015. https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/sites/default/files/resources/thinking_outside_the_bottle_by_k_louaillier_part1.pdf

Louaillier, K. (2009, December 7). Letter to the Editor: Re 'Millions in U.S. Drink Dirty Water, Records Show' (New York Times). Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <http://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/letter-editor-re-millions-us-drink-dirty-water-records-show-new-york-times>

Lynn, P. (2009, October 16). Common Dreams.Org - Corporations Badmouth Public Water. Retrieved August 28, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/news/commondreamsorg-corporations-badmouthing-public-water>

Magiera, M. (1994). Water Everywhere, but Only Bottles to Drink; Concerns about Purity Play into Marketers' Hands. *Advertising Age*. Retrieved October 14, 2014, from <http://adage.com/article/news/water-bottles-drink/88495/>

Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man; studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

McGovern, C. (1998). *Consumption and citizenship in the United States, 1900-1940*. In S. Strasser, C. McGovern, and M. Judt (Eds.), *Getting and spending: European and American consumer societies in the twentieth century* (pp.37-58). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Meggison, W. L., & Netter, J. M. (2001). From State to Market: A Survey of Empirical Studies on Privatization. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 39(2), 321-389.

Merry, S. E., Levitt, P., Rosen, M. Ş, & Yoon, D. H. (2010). Law From Below: Women's Human Rights and Social Movements in New York City. *Law & Society Review*, 44(1), 101-128.

Miller, H., Lamb, M., Short, D., & Waites, M. (2011). From "rights-based" to "rights-framed" approaches: A social constructivist view of human rights practice. In P. Hynes (Ed.), *Sociology and Human Rights: New Engagements* (pp. 105-121). New York, NY: Routledge.

Moore, Michael. (2016, January 27). Do Not Send Us Bottles of Water. Instead, Join Us in a Revolt. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved April 13, 2016, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-moore/do-not-send-us-bottles-of-water-revolt_b_9089592.html

Morris, A. D. (1999). A Retrospective on the Civil Rights Movement: Political and Intellectual Landmarks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25(1), 517-539.

Mosca, L. (2014). Methodological Practices in Social Movement Online Research. In D. della Porta (Ed.) *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research* (pp.397-417). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Mulvey, K. (2009, September 29). Statement: U.N. Independent Expert on the Human Right to Water and Sanitation. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-release/statement-un-independent-expert-human-right-water-and-sanitation>

Nace, T. (2003). *Gangs of America: The rise of corporate power and the disabling of democracy*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Nneka, L., Gray, S., & Houlihan, J. (2011). Bottled Water Scorecard. Retrieved September 11, 2011, from <http://www.ewg.org/bottled-water-2011-home>

Noakes, J. A., & Johnston, H. (2005). Frames of Protest: A Road Map to a Perspective. In H. Johnston & J. A. Noakes (Eds.), *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective* (pp. 1-29). Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Noonan, R. K. (1995). Women Against the State: Political Opportunities and Collective Action Frames in Chile's Transition to Democracy. *Sociological Forum* 10(1), 81-110.

Olson, E. D. (1999). Bottled water: pure drink or pure hype? Retrieved March 3, 2012, from <http://www.nrdc.org/water/drinking/bw/bwinx.asp>

Orend, A., & Gagne, P. (2009). Corporate Logo Tattoos and the Commodification of the Body. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 38(4), 493-517.

- Pearson, E. (2015, March/April). Hydrate Your Life: A registered dietitian shares tips on how water can help ensure a more healthful, hydrated life. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwr_mar-apr2015_final
- Perry, J. (2006). Consumer Citizenship in the Interwar Era: Gender, Race, and the State in Global-Historical Perspective. *Journal of Women's History*, 18(4), 157-172.
- Pickering, J. (2012, April 26). Bottles Banned. *Concord Patch*. Retrieved May 31, 2012, from <http://concord.patch.com/articles/town-meeting-votes-to-ban-single-serving-pet-water-bottles>
- Robbins, P. T. (2003). Transnational corporations and the discourse of water privatization. *Journal of International Development*, 15(8): 1073-1082.
- Roberts, A. (2008). Privatizing Social Reproduction: The Primitive Accumulation of Water in an Era of Neoliberalism. *Antipode*, 40(4), 535-560.
- Rondinelli, D. A. (2002). Transnational Corporations: International Citizens or New Sovereigns? *Business and Society Review Business & Society Review*, 107(4), 391-413.
- Royte, E. (2008). *Bottlemania: How water went on sale and why we bought it*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Sadler, D. (2004). Anti-corporate Campaigning and Corporate "Social" Responsibility: Towards Alternative Spaces of Citizenship? *Antipode*, 36(5), 851-870.
- Samuelrich, L. (2010, April 23). Alternet – Why Consumers, Community Groups and Investors are Saying no to Nestlé. Retrieved August 28, 2015, from <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/news/alternet-why-consumers-community-groups-and-investors-are-saying-no-nestle>
- Savedge, J. (2012, March 13). College Campuses Ban Bottled Water. *Mother Nature Network*. Retrieved May 31, 2012, from <http://www.mnn.com/money/sustainable-business-practices/blogs/college-campuses-ban-bottled-water#>
- Shinn, B. (2008, November 4). Bottled Water Reps Meet to Address Important Issues. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.bottledwater.org/content/bottled-water-reps-meet-address-important-issues>
- Shinn, B. (2015, September/October). Chairman's Commentary: But First Let Me Grab My Cape. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.2). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwr_sept-oct2015_final/1

- Sims, T. (2015, March/April). Added Sugars Equal Added Health Issues: According to a subcommittee making recommendations for the Dietary Guidelines. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.36-37). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwr_mar-apr2015_final
- Sims, T. (2015, July/August). Promoting a Taste for Water: How advocacy efforts by IBWA and health/science professionals are working. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.56-57). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwr_julyaug2015_final
- Smith, E. (2012). Corporate Image and Public Health: An Analysis of the Philip Morris, Kraft, and Nestlé Websites. *Journal of Health Communication, 17*(5), 582-600.
- Snitow, A., Kaufman, D., & Fox, M. (2007). *Thirst: Fighting the corporate theft of our water*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Snow, D. A. (2004). Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 380-412). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Snow, D. A. & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, Frame Resonance and Participant Mobilization. *International Social Movement Research 1*, 197-217.
- Snow, D. A. & Benford, R. D. (1992). Master Frames and Cycles of Protest. In A. D. Morris, and C. McClurg Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. Durham, NC: Yale University Press.
- Snow, D. A., Rochford, E. B., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation. *American Sociological Review, 51*(4), 464 -481.
- Soule, S. A. (2009). *Contention and Corporate Social Responsibility*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Story, Louise. (2007). Anywhere the Eye Can See, It's Likely to See an Ad. *The New York Times*. Retrieved October 20, 2013, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/15/business/media/15everywhere.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>
- Story of Stuff. (2010). The Story of Bottled Water [Video file]. Retrieved August 26, 2015, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Se12y9hSOM0>
- Tessier, S. (2007). Rethinking the Food Chain: Farmworkers and the Taco Bell Boycott. *Journal of Developing Societies 23*(1-2), 89-97.

- Toner, J. (2011, June/July). Local Grassroots Advocacy: The Concord Case Study. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.36-37). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.nxtbook.com/ygsreprints/IBWA/g20134ibwa_junjul11/#/38
- Toner, J. (2015, September/October). A Poetic Lesson in Government Relations. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.38-39). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from https://issuu.com/ibwa/docs/bwr_sept-oct2015_final
- United States Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2009). Bottled Water: FDA Safety and Consumer Protections Are Often Less Stringent Than Comparable EPA Protections for Tap Water. Retrieved May 10, 2014, from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-09-610>
- Valocchi, S. (1996). The Emergence of the Integrationist Ideology in the Civil Rights Movement. *Social Problems* 43(1), 116-130.
- Vogel, D. (1996). *Kindred Strangers*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Waller, R. L. & Conaway, R. N. (2011). Framing and Counterframing the Issue of Corporate Social Responsibility: The Communication Strategies of Nikebiz.com. *Journal of Business Communication* 48(1): 83-106.
- Wheeler, T. (2011). Maryland state offices going off the bottle: Cost savings, environment prompt government move to tap water. *The Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved June 5, 2012, from <http://www.baltimoresun.com/features/green/bs-gr-bottled-water-20110930,0,5377525.story>
- Wilk, R. (2006). Bottled Water: The pure commodity in the age of branding. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 6(3): 303-325.
- Young, W. P. (2013, December/January). Chairman's Commentary: Taking on Challenges Together. *Bottled Water Reporter* (pp.2). Retrieved September 2, 2015, from <http://www.flipsnack.com/5DAED858B7A/ibwa-reporter-dec-jan.html>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Webpages Sampled for Corporate Accountability International

www.stopcorporateabuse.org

About Us <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/about-us>

History <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/history>

Successes <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/successes>

Members Spotlight <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/members-spotlight>

Newsletters <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/newsletters>

What We Do <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/what-we-do>

Water <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/campaigns/challenge-corporate-control-water>

About the Campaign <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/about-campaign>

Public Water Works

<https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/campaigns/challenge-corporate-control-water/public-water-works>

Think Outside the Bottle

<https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/campaigns/challenge-corporate-control-water/think-outside-bottle>

The Human Right to Water <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/human-right-water>

Take Action <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/take-action>

Make National Parks Bottled Water Free

http://act.stopcorporateabuse.org/p/dia/action3/common/public/?action_KEY=155
[51](#)

Resources <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/resources>

Media Center <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/media-center>

News <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/news>

Press Releases <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/press-releases>

Statements <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/statements?tid=15&page=2>

Multimedia <https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/multimedia>

The Story of Bottled Water

<https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/video/story-bottled-water>

Blog

<https://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/blog>

APPENDIX 2: Webpages Sampled for Food & Water Watch

www.foodandwaterwatch.org

About Us <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/about/>

Victories <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/about/aboutvictories/>

What People are Saying <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/quote/>

Staff <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/about/who-we-are/>

Annual Report <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/about/annual-report/>

Take Action <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/take-action/>

Issues <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/issues/>

Take Back the Tap <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/take-back-the-tap/>

Bottled Water <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/bottled/>

Tap Vs. Bottled Water <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/bottled/tap-vs-bottled/>

Kick the Habit <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/bottled/kick-the-habit/>

Public Water Infrastructure <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/renew/>

Renew Your Community's Water

<http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/renew/your-water/>

Water Conservation <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/water-conservation/>

Groundwater Protection

<http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/water-conservation/groundwater/>

Water Privatization <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/water/private-vs-public/>

Research <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/research/>

Tools & Research <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/tools-and-resources/>

News & Blog <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/news/>

Newsletter <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/news/newsletter/>

Blog http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/blog_categories/bottled-water/blogs/

Press Releases http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/blog_categories/water/pressreleases/

APPENDIX 3: Webpages Sampled for International Bottled Water Association

www.bottledwater.org

Water Types <http://www.bottledwater.org/types>

Bottled Water <http://www.bottledwater.org/types/bottled-water>

Municipal Water (Tap Water) <http://www.bottledwater.org/types/tap-water>

Filtered Water (Home Filtration) <http://www.bottledwater.org/types/filtered-water>

Health <http://www.bottledwater.org/health>

Bottled Water vs. Tap Water <http://www.bottledwater.org/health/bottled-water-vs-tap-water>

Container Safety <http://www.bottledwater.org/health/container-safety>

Fluoride <http://www.bottledwater.org/health/fluoride>

Water Quality <http://www.bottledwater.org/health/water-quality>

Water's Role in Your Body

<http://www.bottledwater.org/content/water%E2%80%99s-role-your-body>

IBWA Supports: "Drink Up" Campaign <http://www.bottledwater.org/you-are-what-you-drink>

Hydration Calculator <http://www.bottledwater.org/public/hydcalfinput1.html>

Education <http://www.bottledwater.org/education>

Bottled Water Regulations <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/regulations>

FDA Bottled Water Regulations

<http://www.bottledwater.org/education/regulations/fda-vs-epa>

State Regulations

<http://www.bottledwater.org/education/regulations/intrastate-interstate>

IBWA Code of Practice <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/codes-of-practice>

Bottled Water Production <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/bottled-water-production>

Bottled Water Testing

<http://www.bottledwater.org/education/bottled-water-production/bottled-water-testing>

Labeling & Source Information <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/labels>

Water Quality Information

<http://www.bottledwater.org/education/labeling-&-source-information/water-quality-information>

Emergency Response <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/emergency-response>

Recycling <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/recycling>

Material Recovery Program

<http://www.bottledwater.org/education/recycling/material-recovery-program>

PET Facts <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/recycling/pet-facts>

The Environment <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/environment>

Ground Water Management

<http://www.bottledwater.org/education/environmental-impact/groundwater-management>

Environmental Footprint <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/environmental-impact/environmental-footprint>

Myths <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/myths>

Bottled Water Storage <http://www.bottledwater.org/education/bottled-water-storage>

Order IBWA Publications <http://www.bottledwater.org/content/ibwa-technical-publications>

Issues <http://www.bottledwater.org/issues>

Bottled Water Quality Information Act

<http://www.bottledwater.org/issues/bottled-water-quality-information-act>

Public Policy (no landing page)

Groundwater Management <http://www.bottledwater.org/newsroom/policy-statement/groundwater-management>

Labeling <http://www.bottledwater.org/newsroom/policy-statement/labeling>

Packaging <http://www.bottledwater.org/newsroom/policy-statement/packaging>

Security <http://www.bottledwater.org/newsroom/policy-statement/security>

Taxation <http://www.bottledwater.org/newsroom/policy-statement/taxation>

Environment & Health <http://www.bottledwater.org/newsroom/policy-statement/environment-and-health>

Bottled Water & California <http://www.bottledwater.org/california-drought>

Economics <http://www.bottledwater.org/economics>

General Industry Statistics <http://www.bottledwater.org/economics/industry-statistics>

How Much Does Bottled Water Cost?

<http://www.bottledwater.org/economics/real-cost-of-bottled-water>

Industry Economic Data <http://www.bottledwater.org/economics/industry-economics>

Bottled Water Advertising <http://www.bottledwater.org/economics/bottled-water-advertising>

Bottled Water Industry <http://www.bottledwater.org/economics/bottled-water-industry>

Bottled Water Market <http://www.bottledwater.org/economics/bottled-water-market>

Bottled Water Matters <http://www.bottledwater.org/economics/bottled-water-matters>

Newsroom <http://www.bottledwater.org/newsroom>

Press Releases no landing page

Statements & Letters <http://www.bottledwater.org/letters-editor>

Reports, Studies & Resources <http://www.bottledwater.org/reports-studies>

Bottled Water Reporter Magazine

<http://www.bottledwater.org/newsroom/bottled-water-reporter>

Bottled Water Videos <http://www.bottledwater.org/videos>

Image Library <http://www.bottledwater.org/bottled-water-visuals>

Industry Links <http://www.bottledwater.org/newsroom/industry-links>

Bottled Water Matters <http://bottledwatermatters.org/>

Bottled Water Matters

www.bottledwatermatters.org

Take Action <http://bottledwatermatters.org/take-action-for-bottled-water>

Economics <http://bottledwatermatters.org/economics>

Get Involved <http://bottledwatermatters.org/promote-bottled-water>

News <http://bottledwatermatters.org/news>

Luv Bottled Water <http://bottledwatermatters.org/luv-bottled-water>

Bottled Water Facts <http://bottledwatermatters.org/college-ban-facts>

Topics (no landing page)

The Environment <http://bottledwatermatters.org/bottled-water-and-environment>

Quality Information <http://bottledwatermatters.org/bottled-water-quality-information>

Why Chose Bottled Water <http://bottledwatermatters.org/why-choose-bottled-water>

Fluoride <http://bottledwatermatters.org/bottled-water-fluoride>

Global Water Availability <http://bottledwatermatters.org/bottled-water-availability>

Safety & Regulations <http://bottledwatermatters.org/bottled-water-regulations-and-safety>

Container Safety <http://bottledwatermatters.org/bottled-water-container-safety#>

Emergency Response <http://bottledwatermatters.org/bottled-water-emergency-response>

CURRICULUM VITA

NAME: Eileen D. Schuhmann
ADDRESS: 708 Zorn Ave Apt 20
Louisville, KY 40206
EMAIL: eschuhmann@gmail.com
PHONE: 502-876-5344

EDUCATION & TRAINING:

Degree: **M.A., Sociology** (2016)
Institution: University of Louisville
Thesis: Framing Bottled Water: An Analysis of the Framing Contest Between the Anti-Bottled Water Movement and the Bottled Water Industry
(Advisor: Dr. Gul Marshall)

Training: **Organizing for Social Change** (2010)
Institution: Midwest Academy in Chicago, IL

Degree: **B.A., French and Foreign Language International Economics** (2000)
Institution: University of Kentucky

Diploma: **Second Degree French Studies** (1999)
Institution: Université de Rennes II in Rennes, France

Diploma: **Certificate of First Degree French Studies** (1998)
Institution: Université de Caen in Caen, France

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Mission Specialist, International Hunger Concerns (2013-Present)
Presbyterian Hunger Program, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Program Assistant, International Hunger Concerns (2010-2013)
Presbyterian Hunger Program, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Bilingual Administrative Assistant, International Hunger Concerns (2006-2009)
Presbyterian Hunger Program, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Applicant Services Specialist in the Individual Assistance Cadre (2005)
Crisis Corps, U.S. Peace Corps, FEMA, Arkansas

Small Enterprise Development Agent (2001-2005)

U.S. Peace Corps, St. Louis and Kidira, Senegal, West Africa

Small Enterprise & Community Development Trainer (2002-2004)

U.S. Peace Corps, Senegal, West Africa

SELECTED WEB BASED PUBLICATIONS

Food and the Climate Crisis (2015)

www.pcusa.org/site_media/media/uploads/hunger/pdf/climate_hunger_spread.pdf

Fact Sheet: Land Grabbing (2014, May)

www.pcusa.org/site_media/media/uploads/joininghands/pdfs/join_hands_fact_sheet_updated_8.5.11.pdf

PUBLIC MEDIA:

Schuhmann, E. (2013, March). Heal the Land. *Presbyterians Today* 103:2, 37.

INVITED PRESENTATIONS:

Panelist: The Climate Crisis and Our Faithful Response (2015)

Presbyterians for Earth Care Conference

Montreat Conference Center, Montreat, NC

Presentation: Global Land Grab and the Threat to Food Sovereignty (2013)

Big Tent Conference

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A), Louisville, KY

Paper Presented: Water as a Commons (2011)

Dimensions of Political Ecology Conference

University of Kentucky