



POLI 727
Framing Public Policies
Tuesdays, 3:30 – 6:30pm, Phillips 301
Spring 2019

Prof. Frank R. Baumgartner

313 Hamilton Hall, phone 962-0414

Office hours: M, W 4-5pm, T 2:30-3:30 pm and by appointment

Email: Frankb@unc.edu

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

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, or even the 2000s; marriage equality was certainly not on the agenda in earlier decades, but it's the law now. So one way of studying framing is how issues and issue-definitions change at the aggregate level over time, what we call macro-framing. (This is what I study, generally.) 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: "micro-framing." 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.

My goals for the course are to introduce you to a range of foundational works from many approaches, subfields of political science, and disciplines. But this cannot be complete and in this particular syllabus I have neglected a lot of important work in journalism and communication studies, not to mention sociology. But I also wanted to make room for the second part of the

course, which is reading case-based examples of framing effects. So, we'll read a lot, as in most graduate seminars.

I also want each of you to write a term paper that will be useful to you, and that means that these might come in many forms. Some might be dry-runs or first-cuts at dissertation or MA thesis ideas. Others might want to do stand-alone research project for possible conference presentation or later publication. Others might want to review the literature and produce a research design that you might or might not later put into practice. I'll work individually with each of you to devise the most appropriate project for you, given your backgrounds and interests, which I expect to be diverse. I don't want to see any pure literature review papers, however. It has to have something new in it, something research-focused.

A seminar depends on regular participation. I will ask each of you ahead of time to come prepared to discuss a particular reading, or chapter of a book, so that each of you knows that in the following week's seminar, I'll expect you to present the gist of what that reading was about and to get the conversation going. That means describe what the person did, first, and then evaluate it or put it in context with other readings from that week or previous weeks.

I will ask you to hand in drafts of your paper throughout the semester: a statement of the topic in Week 4, a bibliography in Week 6, a research design in Week 8, and a full draft in Week 10. This may be the first time you will have made so much progress so fast. It will also give you five weeks at the end to move from a draft to a polished paper. You'll thank me later.

Grades will be calculated according to this formula:

Participation in seminar, including presentations of readings	20
4 Term paper draft assignments, equally weighted	40
Term paper	40
Total	100

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.

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.

Books for purchase:

- 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.
- Henig, Jeffrey R. 2008. *Spin Cycle: How Research Is Used in Policy Debates: The Case of Charter Schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Teles, Steven M. 2008. *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement: The Battle for Control of the Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carpenter, Charli. 2014. *"Lost" Causes: Agenda Vetting in Global Issue Networks and the Shaping of Human Security*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Weekly Calendar

Week 1. Jan 14. Introductions

Week 2. Jan 22. 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 29. 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]
- 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.
- Huntsinger, Jeffrey R. 2013. Anger Enhances Correspondence Between Implicit and Explicit Attitudes. *Emotion* 13, 2: 350–7.
- 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.

Week 4. Feb 5. 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.
- 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.

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.). It is ok to give multiple possible topics so we can choose the best one.

Week 5. Feb 12. Source credibility and competitive reframing

- Riker, William H. 1986. *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, ch. 10, Warren Magnuson and Nerve Gas.
- 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.
- Chaiken, Shelly. 1979. Communicator Physical Attractiveness and Persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37, 8: 1387-97.
- Druckman, James N. 2004. Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects. *American Political Science Review* 98 (4): 761–86.
- Druckman, James N. 2001. On the Limits of Framing Effects: Who Can Frame? *Journal of Politics* 63, 4 (November): 1041–66.
- Druckman, James N. and Dennis Chong. 2013. Counter-Framing Effects. *Journal of Politics* 75: 1–16.
- 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.

Week 6. Feb 19. Race and framing

- 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.
- Henricks, Kasey. 2018. "I'm Principled Against Slavery, but...": Colorblindness and the Three-Fifths Debate. *Social Problems* 2018 65: 285–304.
- 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.
- Kteily, Nour S. and Emile Bruneau. 2017. Darker Demons of Our Nature: The Need to (Re)Focus Attention on Blatant Forms of Dehumanization. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 26, 6: 487–494.

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 7. Feb 26. 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 8. Mar 5. The policy effects of framing

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.

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

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

Note: **Research design statement due.** This means you should have identified the key data source material you are planning to use and provide a plan for the logistics of your empirical project. If this is a qualitative project, explain the cases you will be exploring. If quantitative, explain the data and analytic power you expect to have. Again, you don't have to have done much, but you must have a plan. The more information you can give me, the better.

Spring Break, March 9-17

Week 9. Mar 19. Framing inequality, understanding the politics of the estate tax

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.

Green, Joshua. 2011. Meet Mr. Death. *The American Prospect*. 19 December.

The Case for Death Duties. 2007. *The Economist*. 25 October.

Week 10. Mar 26. 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.

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 11. Apr 2. 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.

Week 12. Apr 9. Charter Schools: why?

Henig, Jeffrey R. 2008. *Spin Cycle: How Research Is Used in Policy Debates: The Case of Charter Schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Week 13. Apr 16. How the Supreme Court was taken over, a long-term view

Teles, Steven M. 2008. *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement: The Battle for Control of the Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Week 14. Apr 23. Why some good ideas never catch on.

Carpenter, Charli. 2014. *"Lost" Causes: Agenda Vetting in Global Issue Networks and the Shaping of Human Security*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Note: **Papers Due**, paper copies in class, also emailed to me before class time.