

February 22, 2012

Chris Weible & Peter deLeon
policystudiesjournal@gmail.com
Policy Studies Journal

Dear Chris and Peter

Thanks for your invitation to revise and resubmit our article MS 719, Framing the Poor. We're glad to take up the challenge offered by the reviewers and believe they have made a number of interesting and important observations and suggestions. Let us start by reviewing what we take out of the reviews, roughly in order of importance. Then we will lay out our revisions, which are attached.

Comments from the reviewers:

1. The two biggest comments relate to the theory and they ask us, first, to develop an explanation of what caused the framing shifts we have observed. Second and more importantly, they request a more explicit theoretical statement about the causal mechanisms that have led from the shift in frame to the shift in public policy that we document. In particular, they demand some attention of the role of public opinion in this process.
2. The next relatively substantive comment is to clarify our point, or to decide more clearly on the single driving theme here. Is it the new measure of government generosity? Is it the new measure of framing? Or is it the impact of framing on generosity?
3. Related to this question were a number of smaller points asking for: a) more clarity in explanation of the GGI (Government Generosity Index), and moving this discussion forward in the text; and b) reduce various repetitions, writing infelicities, the number of tables and figures, and generally tightening and shortening the presentation.
4. Several asked for more information on our coding: reliability scores, discussion of the choice of newspapers, discussion of changes in terminology over the many decades our analysis covers, and more reassurance about the validity of our media coding.
5. One reviewer asked for clarification of time-series diagnostics and some discussion of alternative specifications. Two asked for discussion of the dynamics in government spending unrelated to poverty that may have reduced the relative amount of spending on poverty, compared to other spending priorities.
6. We should note that Reader 3 was overall negative on publication but noted that our development of the GGI and our extension of the Poverty Gap indicator were themselves significant contributions and he urged us to think of a paper only on that element of the analysis. While this reviewer had some general comments about our literature review that justified a negative reaction, we found some similar but more specific comments or suggestions in the other reviews and we hope that by taking into account all of the specific suggestions by the other

reviewers we will go some way to mollify the criticism of Reader 3. However, in that reader's opinion the paper does not do enough beyond the existing literature to merit publication. We disagree: a new indicator of the extent of governmental effort on poverty, a newly extended measure on the depth of poverty, a new measure of framing, and a theory and statistical test that links these things together we believe is a significant contribution. We do agree with this reader that particular elements of our story have been described in the past. But we put them together, expand them in time, and provide new statistical measures of what had been handled in a more qualitative manner in the past.

7. The readers made a number of smaller points but those above are the most important substantive ones. While we will address each of the small points (e.g., new citations), let us explain the revisions we have made in addressing these larger issues.

Changes:

First, let us say we have completely revised the manuscript including its very structure. We have redone much of the statistical analysis with no impact on the findings. We believe the paper has been substantially improved by the comments of the reviewers and we thank them for their time. In order of the summary we made above of the comments, here is what we have done.

1. As we explain under point 2, we have completely restructured the paper in a way that we think makes much more clear the theoretical point, which is that shifts in frames caused a shift in policy direction. We are also sensitive to the preliminary nature of this finding and the lack of causal proof (a philosophical issue, not a flaw in our analysis). Nonetheless, we think that our paper makes a substantial methodological innovation in developing new techniques of measuring framing, a new measure of frames applied to poverty, new measures of the depths of poverty, new measures of government spending, and an entirely new concept of the generosity of government spending toward the poor, controlling for the depth of poverty. So we feel that we make a clear theoretical argument but that the main contribution of the paper is more methodological and substantive rather than theoretical. Others have previously argued that frames drive policy. We confirm these findings. In any case, our revised paper is much clearer now on its theoretical focus.

We have also been clearer on the role of public opinion here and have added some discussion of it. However, we have not included it statistically in the model because, as we point out, the only long-term statistical series is one that is not sensitive at all to the shifting frames we have identified. We discuss in the paper and in a footnote the difficulty of associating systematic evidence on public opinion on this topic because of question wording effects and of the thermostatic nature of public opinion based on control of the White House, not based on shifting policy activities themselves.

2. We have made the biggest changes in the manuscript in reorganizing it completely to focus first on the new framing data, then on the new measures of government spending and how these can be predicted by the framing data, and then only finally to introduce our summary measure of "government generosity." We agree that there is much here. In the newly revised version we make clear that our point is to show how framing drives policy change. This is by far the largest

improvement in the paper and as the readers will see it involved a wholesale re-organization of the paper.

3. Given the reorganization that we have done, the Government Generosity Index now comes at the end. It is treated as a summary of our findings, which are presented in a standard time-series regression format with total spending as the dependent variable. We believe that this makes it easier to understand the impact of the different independent variables (since the scale of the dependent variable is more obvious). Our reorganized manuscript also reduces redundancy and we have taken the readers' points on writing clarity to heart with a line-by-line edit throughout. We have included a large number of appendices and we assume that these may not appear in the printed paper but may remain either on a personal web site, or on a supplementary materials page at the PSJ web site if that is possible. Much of this is in an attempt to demonstrate to reviewers that we have extremely robust findings. We agree that some is redundant and welcome suggestions when the review process is complete about what may safely be relegated to a web site.

4. Related to the coding, we have attempted to clarify our procedures. But we want to be clear: we use key-word searches, so there is no issue about the "reliability" of these searches; they are entirely reliable. Rather, there should be concern about the "validity" of this technique, and we have attempted to convince the reader that they are, indeed, valid searches that do capture the substance of the debate. We urge the editors and reviewers to understand that inter-coder reliability scores, which are appropriate for the typical content analysis, are not relevant here, as we are using a computer search algorithm.

5. We have revised the statistical model so that it is now more clearly a time-series model including a lagged dependent variable, and have included the relevant diagnostics. Findings are robust to multiple specifications and the revised model presented, with a lagged dependent variable (spending), retains all the significant coefficients of the previous model. We have not substantially addressed the issue of what other spending categories have increased as this is well beyond the scope of our focus on poverty. This has little impact on the analysis.

6 and 7. We have made multiple edits throughout the paper, adding citations where appropriate, clarifying throughout, and generally tightening the text.

In sum, we want to thank the reviewers for some very good comments and to express our gratitude; we think the extensive revisions we have made to each part of this paper have improved it substantially and we look forward to seeing your reactions.