



## **POLI 727 Framing**

**Tuesdays, 3:30–6:20pm, Phillips 220, Spring 2015**

---

Prof. Frank R. Baumgartner

313 Hamilton Hall, phone 962-0414

Office hours: M,T,W, 2:30-3:30 pm and by appointment

Email: [Frankb@unc.edu](mailto:Frankb@unc.edu)

Web site: <http://www.unc.edu/~fbaum/>

---

This class will focus on the study of framing from many different perspectives. Some studies of framing are at the aggregate level, over long periods of time, and seek to understand for example why government policies across the western world, or in a particular state or country, are anti-smoking whereas a generation ago there was so much support for the policy of encouraging smoking. Similarly the quest for equal rights for homosexuals has been transformed by a remarkable shift in how we portray that issue compared to, say, the 1950s. So one way of studying framing is how issues and issue-definitions change at the aggregate level over time. There are several other ways of thinking about it. One is as an individual-level phenomenon, studying what makes a particular argument persuasive to any given individual. Psychologists have done considerable research on the roles of emotions and language; similarly, considerable research focuses on cognitive dissonance and the resistance people have to new ideas or frames that contradict their established beliefs. So there is much to study at the level of individual cognition. A related literature focuses on source credibility: “who can frame.” Media effects on public opinion relate to issue salience (which issues as opposed to others are seen as particularly important), priming (making people receptive to certain arguments), and evaluation (giving information relevant to a choice or opinion). At the elite level, scholars are concerned with the competitive nature of the framing (or spinning) game: no single actor unilaterally sets the collective frame for a political community, but many try to influence it. This is probably the area of framing studies where we know the least.

An unusual characteristic of the literatures on framing is that they are plural, and poorly integrated. Communications studies commonly focus on framing. Public opinion scholars do so as well, as do those in public policy, social movements, social psychology, cognitive psychology, and in other fields. The work also covers the gamut in terms of methodological approach, including formal theories, experimental work, time series dynamics, content analysis, case studies of particular issues, elite interviews, mass surveys, and interpretive / qualitative analysis. Many of these literatures are completely distinct from the others, but there is a lot of room for mutual improvement by cross-pollination. That will be one of the goals here, to see if we can learn by discussing a wide range of studies. Some of the most influential work in many fields has come from the simple importation of ideas widely used in one field to an application in another field where these old but unfamiliar ideas pass as innovations.

Assignments will include short discussion papers due from each student on a rotating basis throughout the semester, with each article or part of a book being assigned to a given student. Class discussions on each reading will start with an assigned student first giving an overview of the reading (the author, topic, theoretical question, methodological approach, findings), and then posing questions or making comments about the quality of the work, unanswered questions, or

comparisons to the other readings from the same week or from previous weeks. These overview statements are due to me by email attachment at 9AM on the day of class, but should not be distributed to the other students. They should cover the descriptive material (summarizing the approach and findings of the article) in one paragraph, then use the remainder of a single-spaced page to pose questions, discuss implications, and suggest future directions. Students must participate actively with regard to discussion of all the readings, but will play a leading role and be prepared to answer questions with regard to their assigned readings on a rotating basis. These short papers will be graded 0 (missing); 1 (ok on the descriptive side but without a compelling new idea) or 2 (presents an interesting idea, connection, or interpretation). Make sure you get a 2 each time, or at least most times.

Discussion and active participation are fundamental to the success of any seminar. Note that it counts for 20 percent of the grade, and I will not necessarily assign participation grades only within a narrow B+ to A range. It is fine to come to class not having understood something, as long as you come with those questions and ask them.

Term papers should focus on the development of a research project for an article-length treatment or a dissertation / NSF grant proposal. You should not simply write a literature review; the term paper must lead to a proposal for original research. Given that students may be at different stages in their graduate programs (and come from many different programs, from political science to public policy, health policy, education, communications, sociology, or visiting students from abroad), your interests may be quite diverse. Your papers therefore may be either very specific, more literature-based, and from a variety of theoretical perspectives. I encourage both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The syllabus below allows for many “taking off points” for term paper projects and I encourage you to think of how a framing approach can be useful for a variety of studies. I will encourage discussion of your term papers in class discussion so that all students can get a feeling for the range of studies being done and the strengths and problems of each approach. That means I may call on you at any time to update the class on your thinking about your project.

Note that it will be impossible to do well in this project by starting at the last minute, so I have a number of interim assignments designed to keep you on track throughout the semester. These also allow me to give you feedback along the way to push your project to a higher level. The grades associated with these interim assignments are not huge, but they do add up, so make sure to hand them in on time and to take them seriously. You will be pleasantly surprised what a good term paper you can do if you work on it regularly rather than all in a rush at the last second. (It may become a habit, who knows!)

Grades will be calculated according to this formula:

Participation	20
Rotating one-page assignments, equally weighted	25
3 Term paper draft assignments, equally weighted	15
Term paper	40

Books for purchase: We will read five books cover to cover, but none before March. Order these on-line right away.

Armstrong, Elizabeth M. 2003. *Conceiving Risk, Bearing Responsibility: Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and the Diagnosis of Moral Disorder*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Baumgartner, Frank R., Suzanna L. De Boef and Amber E. Boydston. 2008. *The Decline of the Death Penalty and the Discovery of Innocence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, Bryan D. 1994. *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCall, Leslie. 2013. *The Undeserving Rich: American Beliefs about Inequality, Opportunity, and Redistribution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schrad, Mark Lawrence. 2010. *The Political Power of Bad Ideas: Networks, Institutions, and the Global Prohibition Wave*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Other than the books above, all the required readings should be on the class web site. If some are missing let me know and I will post them.

**Disabilities:** Please let me know in the first two weeks of class if you need any accommodation for a disability. No problem. But don't delay in letting me know.

**Academic Honesty:** Study together but make sure the work you hand in is your own.

**Effort:** Don't come to class unprepared to participate.

**Intimidation Factor:** I'm the author of some of the work discussed here. That can either be a cause not to critique and discuss, or an opportunity to engage with a person who is active in the field. I have thick skin and welcome criticism, discussion, and challenges. So feel free!

**Diversity of Approach:** Students in this class may be coming from American or comparative politics within our department, from the departments of Public Policy, Sociology, Mass Communications, Health Policy, from universities overseas, or from elsewhere. Therefore you may see a diversity of approaches and backgrounds. Take advantage of that fact and take seriously what you can learn from engaging with unfamiliar approaches. After all, if any one approach could answer every question in this literature, we would be in a different world from the one I see.

**Computers and cell phones:** Turn them off, period. Pay attention to the discussion. Bring paper copies of the readings, and a pad and pen to take notes. If you use an electronic device for reading books and articles, you can bring it to class, but it must not be connected to the internet during class.

## Weekly assignments and calendar

### Week 1. Jan 13

Introductions.

### Week 2. Jan 20

Definitions from public policy, IR, comparative politics, sociology, and communications

Stone, Deborah A. 1989. Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas. *Political Science Quarterly* 104, 2 (Summer): 281–300.

Haas, Peter M. 1992. Introduction. Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization* 46 (1): 1-35.

Hall, Peter A. 1993. Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics* 25: 275–96.

Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. 1993. Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy. *American Political Science Review* 87 (2): 334–47.

Entman, R. M. 1993. Framing: Towards Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 43 (4): 51–58.

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 611-39.

Campbell, John L. 2002. Ideas, Politics, and Public Policy. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 21-38.

### Week 3. Jan 27

Cognitive basics

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1973. Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science* 185 (4157): 1124-31.

Simon, Herbert A. 1985. Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science. *American Political Science Review* 79: 293–304.

Slovic, Paul. 1987. Perception of Risk. *Science* 236 (4799): 280-85.

Quattrone, George A., and Amos Tversky. 1988. Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice. *American Political Science Review* 82, 3 (Sept.): 719–736.

Baumeister, Roy F., Ellen Bratslavsky, Catrin Finkenauer, and Kathleen D. Vohs. 2001. Bad Is Stronger Than Good. *Review of General Psychology* 5: 323-370. [ok to skim this one]

Druckman, James N. 2004. Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects. *American Political Science Review* 98 (4): 761–86.

Dijksterhuis, Ap. 2004. Think Different: The Merits of Unconscious Thought in Preference Development and Decision Making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87 (5): 586–98.

Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian A. Nosek. 2009. Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96, 5: 1029–46.

Note: **One-page memo due** describing your term paper topic in conceptual terms and a general idea of the empirical / theoretical approach, relevant literature, and your goals in it (article project, MA thesis idea, PhD idea, etc.).

**Week 4. Feb 3**

## Motivated reasoning

- Lord, Charles G., Lee Ross, and Mark R. Lepper. 1979. Biased Assimilation and Attitude Polarization: The Effects of Prior Theories on Subsequently Considered Evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37 (11): 2098-2109.
- Kunda, Ziva. 1990. The Case for Motivated Reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin* 108(3): 480-98.
- Ditto, Peter H. and David F. Lopez. 1992. Motivated Skepticism: Use of Differential Decision Criteria for Preferred and Nonpreferred Conclusions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 63 (4): 568-84.
- Edwards, Kari, and Edward E. Smith. 1996. A Disconfirmation Bias in the Evaluation of Arguments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 71 (1): 5-24.
- Schumann, David W., Richard E. Petty, and D. Scott Clemons. 1990. Predicting the Effectiveness of Different Strategies of Advertising Variation: A Test of the Repetition-Variation Hypotheses. *Journal of Consumer Research* 17: 192-202.

**Week 5. Feb 10**

## Motivating reasoning and political opinions

- Kuklinski, James H., Paul J. Quirk, Jennifer Jerit, David Schweider, and Robert F. Rich. 2000. Misinformation and the Currency of Democratic Citizenship. *Journal of Politics* 62 (3): 790-816.
- Redlawsk, David P. 2002. Hot Cognition or Cool Consideration? Testing the Effects of Motivated Reasoning on Political Decision Making. *Journal of Politics* 64, 4: 1021-1044.
- Taber, Charles S. and Milton Lodge. 2006. Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (3): 755-69.
- Gaines, Brian J., James H. Kuklinski, Paul J. Quirk, Buddy Peyton and Jay Verkuilen. 2007. Interpreting Iraq: Partisanship and the Meaning of Facts. *Journal of Politics* 69 (4): 957-74.
- Peffley, Mark and Jon Hurwitz. 2007. Persuasion and Resistance: Race and the Death Penalty in America. *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 996-1012.
- Nyhan, Brendan and Jason Reifler. 2010. When Corrections Fail: The Persistence of Political Misperceptions. *Political Behavior* 32: 303-30.

**Week 6. Feb 17**

## Source credibility and competitive reframing

- Chaiken, Shelly. 1979. Communicator Physical Attractiveness and Persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37, 8: 1387-97.
- Chaiken, Shelly. 1980. Heuristic Versus Systematic Information Processing and the Use of Source Versus Message Cues in Persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39, 5: 752-66.
- Druckman, James N. 2001. On the Limits of Framing Effects: Who Can Frame? *Journal of Politics* 63, 4 (November): 1041-66.

- Riker, William H. 1986. *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, ch. 10, Warren Magnuson and Nerve Gas.
- Druckman, James N., and Kjersten R. Nelson. 2003. Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens' Conversations Limit Elite Influence. *American Journal of Political Science* 47, 4 (October): 729–45.
- Slothuus, Rune, and Claes H. de Vreese. 2010. Political Parties, Motivated Reasoning, and Issue-Framing Effects. *Journal of Politics* 72, 3: 630–45.
- Chong, Dennis and James N. Druckman. 2007. Framing Public Opinion in Competitive Democracies. *American Political Science Review* 101, 4: 637-55.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., Jeffrey M. Berry, Marie Hojnacki, David C. Kimball, and Beth L. Leech. 2009. *Lobbying and Policy Change: Who Wins, Who Loses, and Why*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, chapter 9, Washington: The Real No-Spin Zone, pp. 166-89.
- Druckman, James N. and Dennis Chong. 2013. Counter-Framing Effects. *Journal of Politics* 75: 1–16.
- Clifford, Scott, and Jennifer Jerit. 2013. How Words Do the Work of Politics: Moral Foundations Theory and the Debate over Stem Cell Research. *Journal of Politics* 75, 3: 659-71.

### **Week 7. Feb 24**

Media effects and public opinion studies

- McCombs, Maxwell and Donald Shaw. 1972. The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36, 2 (Summer): 176–87.
- Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. 1997. Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance. *American Political Science Review* 91, 3 (Sept.): 567–583.
- Tormala, Zakary L., and Richard E. Petty. 2001. On-Line Versus Memory-Based Processing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27, 12: 1599-1612.
- Conover, Pamela Johnston and Stanley Feldman. 1984. How People Organize the Political World: A Schematic Model. *American Journal of Political Science* 28 (1): 95-126.
- Druckman, James N., Lawrence R. Jacobs, and Eric Ostermeier. 2004. Candidate Strategies to Prime Issues and Image. *Journal of Politics* 66 (4): 1180-1202.
- Bizer, George Y., Zakary L. Tormala, Derek D. Rucker, and Richard E. Petty. 2006. Memory-Based Versus On-Line Processing: Implications for Attitude Strength. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 42: 646-653.
- Berinsky, Adam J., and Donald R. Kinder. 2006. Making Sense of Issues through Media Frames: Understanding the Kosovo Crisis. *Journal of Politics* 68, 3 (August): 640–56.

Note: **Annotated bibliography due.** This means you should have identified the key source material you are planning to use. You don't have to have read it all yet but you should have identified the likely suspects. A longer bibliography is better than a short one. No need for extensive annotations, but rather just a list of readings organized by the topics that you plan to cover.

### **Week 8. Mar 3**

Race and framing

- Williams, Melissa J., and Jennifer L. Eberhardt. 2008. Biological Conceptions of Race and the Motivation to Cross Racial Boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94, 6: 1033–1047.
- Eberhardt, Jennifer L., Phillip Atiba Goff, Valerie J. Purdie, and Paul G. Davies. 2004. Seeing Black: Race, Crime, and Visual Processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87, 6: 876–93.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, Amanda Lewis, and David G. Embrick. 2004. I Did Not Get That Job Because of a Black Man...: The Story Lines and Testimonies of Color-Blind Racism. *Sociological Forum* 19, 4 (December): 555-81.
- Hetey, Rebecca C., and Jennifer L. Eberhardt. 2014. Racial Disparities in Incarceration Increase Acceptance of Punitive Policies. *Psychological Science* 25, 10 (October): 1949-54.
- Rattan A, Levine CS, Dweck CS, Eberhardt JL. 2012. Race and the Fragility of the Legal Distinction between Juveniles and Adults. *PLoS ONE* 7, 5: e36680.
- Eberhardt, Jennifer L., Paul G. Davies, Valerie J. Purdie-Vaughns, and Sheri Lynn Johnson. 2005/06. Looking Deathworthy: Perceived Stereotypicality of Black Defendants Predicts Capital-Sentencing Outcomes. *Psychological Science* 17, 5: 383-6.
- Eberhardt, Jennifer L., Nilanjana Dasgupta, and Tracy L. Banaszynski. 2003. Believing is Seeing: The Effects of Racial Labels and Implicit Beliefs on Face Perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 29, 3 (March): 360-70.
- Gilliam, Franklin D., Jr., and Shanto Iyengar. 2000. Prime Suspects: The Influence of Local Television News on the Viewing Public. *American Journal of Political Science* 44, 3 (July): 560–573.

March 10, spring break, no class

### **Week 9. Mar 17**

Framing as attention-shifting

Jones, Bryan D. 1994. *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

### **Week 10. Mar 24**

The policy effects of framing

Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 1991. Agenda Dynamics and Policy Subsystems. *Journal of Politics* 53 (November): 1044–74.

Baumgartner, Frank R., Suzanna L. De Boef and Amber E. Boydston. 2008. *The Decline of the Death Penalty and the Discovery of Innocence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, Max, and Frank R. Baumgartner. 2013. Framing the Poor: Media Coverage and US Poverty Policy, 1960–2008. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41, 1: 22–53.

### **Week 11. Mar 31**

**Week of progress on your paper, no class**

### **Week 12. Apr 7**

## Framing inequality

McCall, Leslie. 2013. *The Undeserving Rich: American Beliefs about Inequality, Opportunity, and Redistribution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scheve, Kenneth, and David Stasavage. 2012. Democracy, War, and Wealth: Lessons from Two Centuries of Inheritance Taxation. *American Political Science Review* 106, 1 (February): 81-102.

Note: **Detailed outline of paper due.** This should include a full structure, planned cites, methods, etc. The text need not be written but the structure should be complete, in outline form. You'll be surprised how easy it is to complete the paper if you have a complete outline in the proper order.

**Week 13. Apr 14**

Policy change by a single professional entrepreneur based on very little data.

Armstrong, Elizabeth M. 2003. *Conceiving Risk, Bearing Responsibility: Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and the Diagnosis of Moral Disorder*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Jones, Kenneth L., David W. Smith, Christy N. Ulleland, and Ann Pytkowicz Streissguth. 1973. Pattern of Malformation in Offspring of Chronic Alcoholic Mothers. *The Lancet* 1, 7815 (9 June): 1267-71.

**Week 14. Apr 21, last class**

Policy change that makes no sense: The worldwide craze for abolition of alcohol sales.

Schrad, Mark Lawrence. 2010. *The Political Power of Bad Ideas: Networks, Institutions, and the Global Prohibition Wave*. New York: Oxford University Press.

**Term papers due**