



POLI 891
Framing
Mondays, 5:00–7:30pm, Hamilton 351, Spring 2011

Prof. Frank R. Baumgartner
313 Hamilton Hall, phone 962-0414
Frankb@unc.edu
Web site: <http://www.unc.edu/~fbaum/>
Office hours: M, 3-5 pm and by appointment

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 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 noon 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.

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. Note that 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, the focus may be either very specific (for more advanced students), or more literature-based (for first year students). 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.

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
4 Term paper draft assignments, equally weighted	20
Term paper	35

Books for purchase: We will read three books cover to cover, but none before February 21. Order these on line. Note we will also be reading some parts of other books, and each of you will be doing a book in the last two weeks of class, but it will be a different book for each student.

Marcus, George E., W. Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kellstedt, Paul M. 2003. *The Mass Media and the Dynamics of American Racial Attitudes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Winter, Nicholas J. G. 2008. *Dangerous Frames: How Ideas about Race and Gender Shape Public Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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!

Weekly assignments and calendar

Week 1. Jan 10

Week 2. Jan 17 (no class, happy MLK day!)

Week 3. Jan 24

Definitions from public policy, social movements, 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. 1997. An Insider's Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective. *Sociological Inquiry* 67 (4): 407-30.

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

Sikkink, Kathryn A. and Carrie Booth Walling. 2007. The Justice Cascade and the Impact of Human Rights Trials in Latin America. *Journal of Peace Research* 44, 4 (July): 427–45.

Week 4. Jan 31

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.

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.

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 what your goals in it (article project, MA thesis idea, PhD idea).

Week 5. Feb 7

Motivated Reasoning (or why people believe things that are wrong)

- 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.

Week 6. Feb 14

Applications of Motivating Reasoning Theories to 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.
- 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: **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 21

Emotion, Affect, and Opinion

- Marcus, George E., W. Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Week 8. Feb 28

Public Opinion

- 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.

- 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.
- 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.
- Druckman, James N., Lawrence R. Jacobs, and Eric Ostermeier. 2004. Candidate Strategies to Prime Issues and Image. *Journal of Politics* 66 (4): 1180-1202.

Mar 7-11, spring break

Week 9. Mar 14

A Special Issue on Framing in Communications

- Scheufele, Dietram A. and David Tewksbury. 2007. Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models. *Journal of Communication* 57: 9–20.
- Sheafer, Tamir. 2007. How to Evaluate It: The Role of Story-Evaluative Tone in Agenda Setting and Priming. *Journal of Communication* 57: 21–39.
- Hwang, Hyunseo, Melissa R. Gotlieb, Seungahn Nah, and Douglas M. McLeod. 2007. Applying a Cognitive-Processing Model to Presidential Debate Effects: Postdebate News Analysis and Primed Reflection. *Journal of Communication* 57: 40–59.
- Van Gorp, Baldwin. 2007. The Constructionist Approach to Framing: Bringing Culture Back In. *Journal of Communication* 57: 60–78.
- Zhou, Yuqiong and Patricia Moy. 2007. Parsing Framing Processes: The Interplay Between Online Public Opinion and Media Coverage. *Journal of Communication* 57: 79–98.
- Chong, Dennis and James N. Druckman. 2007. A Theory of Framing and Opinion Formation in Competitive Elite Environments. *Journal of Communication* 57: 99–118.
- Edy, Jill A. and Patrick C. Meirick. 2007. Wanted, Dead or Alive: Media Frames, Frame Adoption, and Support for the War in Afghanistan. *Journal of Communication* 57: 119–41.
- Weaver, David H. 2007. Thoughts on Agenda Setting, Framing, and Priming. *Journal of Communication* 57: 142–47.
- Reese, Stephen D. 2007. The Framing Project: A Bridging Model for Media Research Revisited. *Journal of Communication* 57: 148–54

Week 10. Mar 21

Sources and Credibility (or why is it so hard to reframe an issue)

- 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.
- Chong, Dennis and James N. Druckman. 2007. Framing Public Opinion in Competitive Democracies. *American Political Science Review* 101(4): 637-55.
- 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 Kjersten R. Nelson. 2003. Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens' Conversations Limit Elite Influence. *American Journal of Political Science* 47, 4 (October): 729–45.

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.

Riker, William H. 1986. *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, ch. 10, Warren Magnuson and Nerve Gas.

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. Mar 28

How Policy Frames Evolve Over Time

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. Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7.

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

Week 12. April 4

Dissertation projects

Winter, Nicholas J. G. 2008. *Dangerous Frames: How Ideas about Race and Gender Shape Public Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Week 13. April 11

Kellstedt, Paul M. 2003. *The Mass Media and the Dynamics of American Racial Attitudes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Week 14. April 18

Pick *one* of the following and we will discuss all of them based on student presentations. Each represents a dissertation-type project. Part I

Bosso, Christopher J. 1987. *Pesticides and Politics: The Life Cycle of a Public Issue*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Jacob, Herbert. 1988. *Silent Revolution: The Transformation of Divorce Law in the United States*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Zahariadis, Nikolaos. 1995. *Markets, States and Public Policy: Privatization in Britain and France*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Mossberger, Karen. 2000. *The Politics of Ideas and the Spread of Enterprise Zones*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Week 15. April 25 (last day of class)

Part II

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

Crowley, Jocelyn Elise. 2003. *The Politics of Child Support in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Esterling, Kevin. 2004. *The Political Economy of Expertise: Information and Efficiency in American National Politics*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Crowley, Jocelyn Elise. 2008. *Defiant Dads: Fathers' Rights Activists in America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

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