<u>**SI Appendix**</u>

Supplementary Methods

Overview. I use plagiarism-detection software to track a random sample of business,

government, and social advocacy organizations' press releases about climate change, examining

which messages receive attention in three large American newspapers. First, I compile a large

random sample of business, government, and social advocacy organizations' press releases about

climate change from 1985 to 2013 (*N*=1,768). Next, I use plagiarism-detection software to track

which of these messages are quoted or paraphrased in all articles about climate change published

in *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and *USA Today* from 1985 to 2014 (total

N=34,948). Finally, I use multivariate regression analysis to examine how organizations'

characteristics and the content of their messages affect which messages receive coverage in

mainstream news outlets, as compared to those which do not.

 Sample: Press Releases. The sample of press releases has previously been described in

detail (Wetts 2020). Here I reproduce those portions of the description most relevant to the

current analysis. I use the searchable database of *PR Newswire,* the largest national distributor of

press releases, to discover U.S. press releases from 1985 to 2013 containing the words "climate

change," "global warming," "greenhouse effect," "greenhouse gas," or any of their derivations.

My search of *PR Newswire* results in a population of 21,599 press releases. I take a 20%

systematic sample for most years in the study period, with oversampling of earlier years in the

climate change debate, when many fewer press releases were distributed.[1] The resulting sample

yields 4,653 press releases. I analyze only press releases that engage in some substantive

---

[1] Though I am using computational methods, some phases of my analysis require manual processing of
press releases (e.g., excluding irrelevant releases). Thus, I take a systematic sample to make the corpus
manageable for analysis. I sample all press releases in years with fewer than 70 releases and take 50%
systematic samples in years with fewer than 175 releases.

discussion of climate change. These constitute about forty percent of press releases, for a final sample of 1,768 releases.

Independent Variables: Organization Type, Organizational Resources, and Message Content. To code press releases by *organization type,* I identify the industry of each organization in the sample, using the OneSource and Business Source Complete databases to identify its North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code. Organizations that could not be found in these databases I coded by hand as business or civil society organizations. Finally, I examine the mission statements of advocacy organizations to identify their main issue areas and ideological orientations.

To describe the *organizational resources* of the creator of each press release in my sample, I again use the OneSource and Business Source Complete databases to compile information on the assets, sales/revenue, and number of employees of businesses and government agencies. For civil society organizations, I collect data from the information submitted on the Internal Revenue Service's 990 forms, accessed through the GuideStar database. If multiple years of records were available, I used the record for the year closest to the year in which the organization released the press release.

Organizations that could not be found in these databases I coded as missing any financial and employee information, and values on all other organizational resources variables were set to zero. An additional 102 press releases were missing information on the number of employees of the sponsor organization; these press releases were removed from analyses that include variables describing organizational resources via listwise deletion. Analyses that include variables for

organizations' assets and revenue use multiple imputation to impute missing values for assets and revenue.[2]

Finally, to code the *message content* of each press release, I read each press release in its entirety to determine if it communicated support for or opposition to action to address climate change. I conceptualize "opposition to climate action" as including both 1) statements that deny the reality, anthropogenic causes, and/or seriousness of climate change, and 2) statements that argue we should not take action to address climate change, regardless of their position on the underlying science. This is a purposefully broad definition that includes both 1) epistemic skepticism and 2) response skepticism, respectively, in Capstick and Pidgeon's (2014) terms.

This broad conceptualization is helpful for methodological reasons and appropriate given my analytic goals. Methodologically, it allows me to avoid making potentially arbitrary judgment calls about the precise object of skepticism or opposition in any given statement, and to avoid imputing motivations for opposition to climate action, which are diverse and often opaque (Howarth and Sharman 2015; van Rensburg 2015). Analytically, I choose to examine "opposition to climate action" rather than focus on epistemic skepticism *per se* because this research seeks in part to understand how the social dynamics of the climate change debate may have led to stalled political action to address climate change in the United States. While much research suggests that epistemic skepticism has been a prominent and effective strategy to slow or prevent action to address climate change (e.g., Oreskes and Conway 2011), it is not the only such strategy. For example, organizations have at times acknowledged climate science but nevertheless argued that we should not act to prevent climate change because of countervailing economic concerns (McCright and Dunlap 2000).

---

[2] As shown in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2, inclusion of these variables does not substantively affect the analysis.

Therefore, I coded press releases as expressing opposition to climate action if they (a) call into question the reality, seriousness, or anthropogenic origins of climate change, or if they (b) include a rhetorical denunciation of personal, corporate, or political action to address climate change, without regard to the stated (or unstated) justifications for such opposition. In other words, any press release which states opposition to climate action, for whatever reason, is included in my definition. Conversely, press releases were coded as supportive of action to address climate change if they (a) expressed the reality, seriousness, and/or anthropogenic origins of climate change, or if they (b) stated support for some form of ameliorative action to address climate change, including personal, corporate, or political forms of mitigation or adaptation to climate change.

Finally, press releases were coded as ambiguous if they expressed opposition to one particular form of climate action (say, nuclear energy), but simultaneously expressed support for another form of action (say, solar power). These press releases, where one form of action was advocated for while another was denounced, were coded as ambiguous, regardless of which forms of action were being advocated and which were being opposed. Press releases were also coded as ambiguous if they (a) did not discuss the reality, seriousness, or anthropogenic origins of climate change, and also (b) did not state support for or opposition to any form of ameliorative action.

Using this procedure, most press releases were categorized as communicating either support for (83.2%) or opposition to (10.4%) climate action. The remainder (6.4%) were coded as ambiguous. I coded all press releases by hand. In addition, to assess the reliability of the coding scheme, a subsample of press releases (N=120) was coded by an independent coder trained in the same procedures. The independent coder and I agreed on press release

categorization for 92.3% of the sample (Cohen's kappa = .70). This indicates substantial levels of agreement across coders (Landis and Koch 1977), justifying the use of a single coder's scores for the larger sample.

Dependent Variable: News Coverage of Press Release. I code press releases as having received *news coverage* if the press release text was quoted or paraphrased in one or more of three national newspapers. First, I use the LexisNexis and Factiva archives to search for all articles containing the words "climate change," "global warming," "greenhouse effect," "greenhouse gas," or any of their derivations published in *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and *USA Today* from 1985 to 2014. These newspapers were selected because they are among the highest circulating national newspapers in the United States and because their editorial ideologies span the ideological spectrum from liberal (*The New York Times)* to centrist (*USA Today*) to conservative (*The Wall Street Journal)* (Groseclose and Milyo 2005). As such, these newspapers have been used in previous studies of environmental messaging (e.g., Feinberg and Willer 2013). The resulting search yields a total of 34,948 articles published between the three newspapers, with most articles appearing in either *The New York Times* ($N = 19,391$) or *The Wall Street Journal* ($N = 12,253$).

Next, following Bail (2014), I use the WCopyFind plagiarism-detection software to identify whether press releases were discussed or reproduced in these newspaper articles (https://plagiarism.bloomfieldmedia.com/software/wcopyfind/). The software generates a hypertext document displaying instances where strings of at least eight words closely or exactly match between two sets of documents (in my case, between press releases and newspaper articles), suggesting possible quotation or close paraphrasing of the source material. Because this is a low threshold for determining instances of plagiarism, the software can consistently identify

cases where the newspaper text may have derived from the press releases (i.e., it is unlikely to miss a "true match"). However, it also generates many false positives, or instances where press releases and newspaper articles use similar or identical phrases, but the nature of these "matches" does not suggest that the article text in fact derived from the press release. For example, any newspaper article that discusses the "United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)" will match several press releases that similarly use the same eight-word phrase, whether or not anything else about the press release is similar to the newspaper article.

I therefore manually inspect each match identified by the software to verify that it represents an instance where the press release text is quoted or paraphrased in the newspaper article. Matches were confirmed as instances of influence if the newspaper article (a) discussed the same event, observation, or topic as the press release, (b) using the same or very similar language, and (c) on a date closely following the distribution of the press release. I generally assumed news coverage would be within a month following the publication of the press release. Therefore, any time lapse longer than a month was held to higher standard of scrutiny than if the news coverage followed the press release publication by a month or less, such that longer time lapses meant that I needed a more direct indication that news content was taken from the press release in terms of the other criteria I used to evaluate potential instances of influence (e.g., by the news story explicitly quoting the organization rather than only using very similar language). In addition, I also considered whether the newspaper article specifically cited the organization or the category of organizations that produced the press release (e.g., "environmental groups"), though I did not consider this strictly necessary if the language of the news article was otherwise very similar to that used in the press release.

Using the above procedure, I code each press release for whether its text appears in any of the three newspapers. This binary variable is the primary dependent variable for the analyses I report here. Robustness analyses that instead use a count variable representing the total number of articles in which press release text appears produce substantively similar results. In addition, some analyses testing for effects of editorial ideology instead use a binary variable specifying that the press release was covered in a specific newspaper (e.g., *The Wall Street Journal* versus *The New York Times*) rather than in any of the three newspapers.

Analytic Strategy. I use logistic regression to examine how organizations' characteristics and the content of their messages affect which messages receive coverage in national newspapers. For each analysis I generate and report between four and six regression models including variables for (a) organizational type, (b) message content, (c) organizational resources, and (d) interactions between organizational type and organizational resources to allow the effects of resources to vary between businesses and civil society organizations. Additional analyses including control variables for time trends and period effects produce substantively similar results. Supplementary Table 7 presents descriptive statistics for all variables used in the analyses. The database of press releases and Stata code for replicating the above analyses have been deposited in the openICPSR Repository (openicpsr-116561).

References for Methods

Bail, Christopher A. 2014. *Terrified: How Anti-Muslim Fringe Organizations Became Mainstream.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Capstick, Stuart Bryce, and Nicholas Frank Pidgeon. 2014. "What is Climate Change Scepticism? Examination of the Concept Using a Mixed Methods Study of the UK Public." *Global Environmental Change* 24: 389-401.

Feinberg, Matthew, and Robb Willer. 2013. "The Moral Roots of Environmental Attitudes." *Psychological Science* 24(1):56-62.

Groseclose, Tim, and Jeffrey Milyo. 2005. "A Measure of Media Bias." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 120(4):1191-1237.

Howarth, Candice C., and Amelia G. Sharman. 2015. "Labeling Opinions in the Climate Debate: A Critical Review." *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 6(2): 239-254.

Landis, J. Richard, and Gary G. Koch. 1977. "The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data." *Biometrics*: 159-174.

McCright, Aaron M. and Riley E. Dunlap. 2000. "Challenging Global Warming as a Social Problem: An Analysis of the Conservative Movement's Counter-Claims." *Social Problems* 47:499-522

Oreskes, Naomi, and Erik M. Conway. 2011. *Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Van Rensburg, Willem. 2015. "Climate Change Scepticism: A Conceptual Re-evaluation." *SAGE Open* 5(2): 2158244015579723.

Wetts, Rachel. 2020. "Models and Morals: Elite-Oriented and Value-Neutral Discourse

Dominates American Organizations' Framings of Climate Change." *Social

Forces* 98(3):1339-1369.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1: Logistic Regression of Newspaper Coverage: Effects of General Organization Type, Organization Resources, and Message Characteristics

Model Number	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent Variable	Press release picked up in major newspaper					
Goods, Wholesale Trade, Transportation and Warehousing	.105 (.216)	.111 (.216)	-.003 (.265)	-.757* (.386)	-.051 (.273)	-.803† (.414)
Services and Retail Trade, Except Advocacy Associations	-.175 (.217)	-.133 (.217)	-.182 (.249)	-.764* (.328)	-.196 (.250)	-.874* (.360)
Other Businesses	-.075 (.416)	-.020 (.417)	.497 (.451)	.090 (.575)	.503 (.457)	-.088 (.615)
Social and Political Advocacy Organizations	.380* (.183)	.336† (.184)	.414† (.218)	.801** (.266)	.457* (.224)	.909** (.284)
Business, Professional or Trade Associations and Coalitions	.763*** (.210)	.634** (.218)	.505† (.272)	.855** (.308)	.528† (.277)	.942** (.324)
Other Civil Society	-1.643** (.618)	-1.622** (.618)	-2.022* (.868)	-1.601† (.885)	-2.003* (.869)	-1.520† (.891)
Message Against Climate Action		.598** (.226)	.836** (.253)	.800** (.254)	.836** (.253)	.806** (.254)
Organizational Resources Data Unavailable			-.710* (.360)	-1.109** (.411)	-.859* (.435)	-1.295* (.515)
Employees (ln)			.017 (.034)	-.092† (.0511)	-.001 (.047)	-.111† (.062)
Assets (in millions) (ln)					.018 (.025)	.012 (.038)
Revenue (in millions) (ln)					.010 (.039)	.022 (.050)
Business X Organizational Data Unavailable				.853 (.922)		1.412 (1.100)
Business X Employees				.201** (.070)		.281* (.120)
Business X Assets						.015 (.059)
Business X Revenue						-.101 (.108)
Intercept	-2.443*** (.136)	-2.510*** (.139)	-2.567*** (.247)	-2.561*** (.255)	-2.610*** (.258)	-2.675*** (.274)
N	1,768	1,768	1,666	1,666	1,666	1,666

Note: Organizational type variables are effect-coded; omitted category is governmental organizations. "Other Businesses" are those businesses whose NAICS code is 'Other' or whose NAICS code I could not locate. "Other Civil Society" organizations include religious grant-making and civic organizations; labor unions; individuals, events, or blogs; and political candidates and campaigns. Models 5 and 6 use multiple imputation to impute missing values for assets and revenue. Table entries are coefficients and standard errors.
†$p < .10$, *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table S2: Logistic Regression of Newspaper Coverage: Effects of Specific Organization Type, Organization Resources, and Message Characteristics

Model Number Dependent Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Press release picked up in major newspaper					
Goods: Utilities	.328	.373	.316	-.265	.255	-.254
	(.294)	(.295)	(.327)	(.412)	(.337)	(.435)
Goods: Manufacturing	.238	.239	.121	-.447	.089	-.458
	(.293)	(.293)	(.328)	(.423)	(.333)	(.430)
Goods: Other	-1.099	-1.112	-1.136†	-1.454*	-1.181†	-1.531*
	(.676)	(.677)	(.681)	(.698)	(.684)	(.713)
Services: Professional, Scientific, and Technical	-1.100*	-1.046*	-1.078*	-1.386**	-1.085*	-1.454**
	(.484)	(.485)	(.489)	(.510)	(.490)	(.517)
Services: Education	-.099	-.037	-.088	-.607	-.084	-.815
	(.496)	(.497)	(.510)	(558)	(.511)	(.622)
Services: Information	.347	.358	.272	-.115	.253	-.189
	(.330)	(.331)	(.352)	(.392)	(.355)	(.414)
Services: Other	-.020	.056	.067	-.261	.037	-.369
	(.341)	(.343)	(.350)	(.382)	(.353)	(.405)
Other Businesses	-.091	-.026	.481	.273	.486	.104
	(.446)	(.447)	(.476)	(.591)	(.483)	(.626)
Advocacy: Environmental	-.005	.072	.081	.578	.113	.679†
	(.265)	(.269)	(.277)	(.356)	(.280)	(.378)
Advocacy: Other Climate Action	.591†	.667*	.650†	1.088**	.702*	1.216**
	(.321)	(.323)	(.346)	(.401)	(.353)	(.420)
Advocacy: Conservative	.817**	.329	.559	.941*	.616	1.076*
	(.303)	(.384)	(.427)	(.468)	(.433)	(.484)
Advocacy: Other	.375	.445	.522†	.937**	.560†	1.051**
	(.285)	(.288)	(.301)	(.358)	(.306)	(.379)
Business, Professional or Trade Associations and Coalitions	.747***	.625**	.485†	.899**	.509†	.991**
	(.207)	(.218)	(.264)	(.328)	(.268)	(.352)
Other Civil Society	-1.659*	-1.629*	-2.035*	-1.566	-2.017*	-1.483
	(.672)	(.673)	(.945)	(.971)	(.946)	(.981)
Message Against Climate Action		.603*	.752*	.752*	.743*	.749*
		(.291)	(.338)	(.339)	(.339)	(.341)
Organizational Resources Data Unavailable			-.825*	-1.114**	-.969*	-1.326*
			(.364)	(.414)	(.440)	(.524)
Employees (ln)			.001	-.083	-.016	-.103†
			(.036)	(.052)	(.048)	(.062)
Assets (in millions) (ln)					.018	.014
					(.026)	(.038)
Revenue (in millions) (ln)					.009	.025
					(.040)	(.050)
Business X Organizational Data Unavailable				.696		1.362
				(.919)		(1.119)
Business X Employees				.168*		.268*
				(.073)		(.132)
Business X Assets						.006
						(.062)
Business X Revenue						-.118
						(.116)
Intercept	-2.427***	-2.503***	-2.465***	-2.614***	-2.505***	-2.738***
	(.108)	(.115)	(.227)	(.245)	.238	(.275)
N	1,768	1,768	1,666	1,666	1,666	1,666

Note: Organizational type variables are effect-coded; omitted category is governmental organizations. "Other Businesses" are those businesses whose NAICS code is 'Other' or whose NAICS code I could not locate. "Other Civil Society" organizations include religious grant-making and civic organizations; labor unions; individuals, events, or blogs; and political candidates and campaigns. Models 5 and 6 use multiple imputation to impute missing values for assets and revenue. Table entries are coefficients and standard errors.

$\dagger p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$

Table S3: Logistic Regression of Newspaper Coverage: No Significant Effects of Message Originating from Extractive or Polluting Industries

Model Number Dependent Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Press release picked up in major newspaper			
Goods Sector: Extractive or Polluting Industries	.397 (.333)	.347 (.335)	.268 (.371)	-.443 (.463)
Goods Sector: Other	-.059 (.243)	-.029 (.244)	-.130 (.277)	-.745* (.362)
Services and Retail Trade, Except Advocacy Associations	-.214 (.215)	-.169 (.216)	-.203 (.240)	-.674* (.298)
Other Businesses	-.114 (.423)	-.056 (.423)	.467 (.458)	.167 (.577)
Social and Political Advocacy Organizations	.341† (.179)	.303† (.180)	.392† (.210)	.867** (.281)
Business, Professional or Trade Associations and Coalitions	.724** (.208)	.603** (.215)	.483† (.270)	.924** (.322)
Other Civil Society	-1.682** (.631)	-1.657** (.631)	-2.046* (.887)	-1.536† (.910)
Message Against Climate Action		.582* (.227)	.810** (.254)	.779** (.256)
Organizational Resources Data Unavailable			-.715* (.360)	-1.106** (.411)
Employees (ln)			.014 (.034)	-.092† (.051)
Business X Organizational Data Unavailable				.837 (.922)
Business X Employees				.197** (.070)
Intercept	-2.404*** (.128)	-2.473*** (.132)	-2.530*** (.247)	-2.623*** (.261)
N	1,768	1,768	1,666	1,666

Note: Organizational type variables are effect-coded; omitted category is governmental organizations. "Other Businesses" are those businesses whose NAICS code is 'Other' or whose NAICS code I could not locate. "Other Civil Society" organizations include religious grant-making and civic organizations; labor unions; individuals, events, or blogs; and political candidates and campaigns. Table entries are coefficients and standard errors.
†$p < .10$, *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table S4: Logistic Regression of Newspaper Coverage: Effect of Message Characteristics
Among Businesses and Civil Society Organizations Separately

Model Number	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Organization Type	Businesses	Businesses	Civil Society	Civil Society
Dependent Variable	Press release picked up in major newspaper			
Goods, Wholesale Trade, Transportation and Warehousing	-.869 (.690)	-.736 (.719)		
Services and Retail Trade, Except Advocacy Associations	-.866 (.658)	-.797 (.678)		
Social and Political Advocacy Organizations			2.449* (1.019)	2.467* (1.022)
Business, Professional or Trade Associations and Coalitions			2.508* (1.036)	2.517* (1.038)
Message Against Climate Action	.904† (.482)	.922† (.484)	.613* (.309)	.618* (.310)
Organizational Resources Data Unavailable	-.271 (.827)	.104 (.955)	-.946† (.442)	-1.084 (.679)
Employees (ln)	.109* (.048)	.171† (.100)	-.108 (.072)	-.121 (.103)
Assets (in millions) (ln)		.027 (.040)		.021 (.048)
Revenue (in millions) (ln)		-.079 (.089)		-.004 (.089)
Intercept	-2.466*** (.657)	-2.761*** (.719)	-4.142*** (1.042)	-4.153*** (1.044)
N	762	762	740	740

Note: Organizational type variables are effect-coded; omitted category is "Other Businesses" in Models 1 and 2, and "Other Civil Society" in Models 3 and 4. "Other Businesses" are those businesses whose NAICS code is 'Other' or whose NAICS code I could not locate. "Other Civil Society" organizations include religious grant-making and civic organizations; labor unions; individuals, events, or blogs; and political candidates and campaigns. Models 2 and 4 use multiple imputation to impute missing values for assets and revenue. Table entries are coefficients and standard errors.

†$p < .10$, *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table S5: Logistic Regression of Newspaper Coverage: Robustness Analysis Examining Whether Effect of Message Characteristics Driven by Messages Released by Businesses

Model Number Dependent Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Press release picked up in major newspaper			
Goods, Wholesale Trade, Transportation and Warehousing	-.009 (.271)	-.776* (.394)	-.057 (.279)	-.823† (.420)
Services and Retail Trade, Except Advocacy Associations	-.185 (.250)	-.773* (.330)	-.199 (.251)	-.884* (.361)
Other Businesses	.496 (.451)	.094 (.574)	.501 (.457)	-.087 (.614)
Social and Political Advocacy Organizations	.418† (.219)	.808** (.267)	.460* (.226)	.918** (.285)
Business, Professional or Trade Associations and Coalitions	.510† (.275)	.866** (.311)	.532† (.280)	.954** (.326)
Other Civil Society	-2.020* (.868)	-1.597† (.885)	-2.001* (.869)	-1.516† (.891)
Message Against Climate Action	.820** (.296)	.762* (.297)	.819** (.297)	.763* (.298)
Organizational Resources Data Unavailable	-.709* (.360)	-1.104** (.411)	-.858* (.436)	-1.290* (.515)
Employees (ln)	.016 (.034)	-.093† (.051)	-.001 (.047)	-.112† (.062)
Assets (in millions) (ln)			.018 (.025)	.012 (.038)
Revenue (in millions) (ln)			.010 (.039)	.022 (.050)
Business X Organizational Data Unavailable		.833 (.924)		1.394 (1.100)
Business X Employees		.202** (.070)		.283* (.120)
Business X Assets				.015 (.059)
Business X Revenue				-.101 (.108)
Business X Message Against Climate Action	.058 (.558)	.142 (.566)	.059 (.559)	.158 (.569)
Intercept	-2.567*** (.247)	-2.559*** (.254)	-2.610*** (.258)	-2.674*** (.274)
N	1,666	1,666	1,666	1,666

Note: Organizational type variables are effect-coded; omitted category is governmental organizations. "Other Businesses" are those businesses whose NAICS code is 'Other' or whose NAICS code I could not locate. "Other Civil Society" organizations include religious grant-making and civic organizations; labor unions; individuals, events, or blogs; and political candidates and campaigns. Models 3 and 4 use multiple imputation to impute missing values for assets and revenue. Table entries are coefficients and standard errors.

†$p < .10$, *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table S6. Robustness Analysis Comparing Political Valence of Statements Cited in Newspapers to Political Valence of Press Release from Which Statements Originate

Political Valence of Matching Statement			
Political Valence of Press Release	For Climate Action	Against Climate Action	Ambiguous	**Total (N)**
For Climate Action	157 (95.7%)	0 (0%)	7 (4.3%)	**164 (79.2%)**
Against Climate Action	1 (2.7%)	35 (94.6%)	1 (2.7%)	**37 (17.9%)**
Ambiguous	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (50.0%)	**6 (2.9%)**
Total (N)	**159 (76.8%)**	**37 (17.9%)**	**11 (5.3%)**	**207 (100%)**

Note: Unit of analysis in this table is the "matching statement," or an instance where press release content appears in newspapers. When press releases are cited in multiple newspaper articles, they appear more than once in this table.

Table S7: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	N
General Organizational Type					
Goods, Wholesale Trade, Transportation and Warehousing	.180	.384	0	1	1,768
Services and Retail Trade, Except Advocacy Associations	.225	.417	0	1	1,768
Other Businesses	.038	.191	0	1	1,768
Social and Political Advocacy Organizations	.271	.445	0	1	1,768
Business, Professional or Trade Associations and Coalitions	.119	.324	0	1	1,768
Other Civil Society	.068	.253	0	1	1,768
Government Agencies	.100	.299	0	1	1,768
Specific Organizational Type					
Goods: Utilities	.067	.251	0	1	1,768
Goods: Manufacturing	.073	.260	0	1	1,768
Goods: Other	.040	.195	0	1	1,768
Services: Professional, Scientific, and Technical	.079	.270	0	1	1,768
Services: Education	.031	.172	0	1	1,768
Services: Information	.051	.220	0	1	1,768
Services: Other	.064	.245	0	1	1,768
Advocacy: Environmental	.112	.315	0	1	1,768
Advocacy: Other Climate Action	.045	.208	0	1	1,768
Advocacy: Conservative	.044	.205	0	1	1,768
Advocacy: Other	.070	.254	0	1	1,768
Message Content					
Message Against Climate Action	.104	.305	0	1	1,768
Message For Climate Action	.831	.375	0	1	1,768
Message Ambiguous	.064	.245	0	1	1,768
Organizational Resources					
Organizational Resources Data Unavailable	.123	.329	0	1	1,768
Employees (ln)	4.588	3.384	0	14.604	1,666
Assets (in millions) (ln)	3.309	4.110	-5.809	14.560	1,075
Revenue (in millions) (ln)	3.100	3.486	-7.601	13.168	1,530
News Coverage					
Coverage in Any News Source	.098	.298	0	1	1,768