

How Do Frames in the Local Context Influence Participant's Responses

Paul Smoogen & Dr. Andrew Engelhardt

Introduction

Throughout the past couple of years, polls have been seen as a way to measure people's opinions, from politics to sports to daily life. These polls usually have several questions that are asked, and those questions may have a particular type of framing towards them. Many of these questions can have an equivalency frame (which can influence a participant's decision-making based on the phrasing of two equal statements) or an emphasis frame (which affects how a respondent responds either by what subject is emphasized or else words in the frame are emphasized). At the same time, an equivalency frame would likely be more persuasive than an emphasis frame, especially if the person answering the question is less knowledgeable about the subject being discussed. As well as that, while there has been lots of focus on international and national politics in terms of framing in polls, there has not been that much focus on what is going on at the local level. Therefore, we decided to do our survey experiment focusing on how the framing of polls affects students at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Local issues and politics often get overlooked in the focus on national issues and politics, though topics that happen locally can be just as important as those that happen nationally. One of the main reasons why it's important to study local issues and politics is that these often directly affect a person. Local typically relates to the area that is close to where a person lives. At the

same time, local issues tend to be a topic that researchers have not focused on enough when it comes to research on framing and how framing affects people's responses to the survey question. Therefore, it could be that certain types of framing are more influential when it comes to local issues. It is likely that people know more about national issues but may not know a lot about local issues, especially if these people are not from the local area and just attending a university. Also, different groups of people may pay attention to different types of topics, and therefore someone who pays attention to local sports most of the time may not pay attention to local politics consistently. There have been limitations on what research has been done on how local frames influence responses, with only two studies being done on the influence of local frames, one was on how party/nonparty newspapers in China frame issues based on whether its national or local (Kuang and Wei 2017), and the other study was on neighborhood disorder and whether it affected voting for law-and-order parties or not (which counts as a local issue frame influencing voting patterns) (van Noord et al. 2018). This is especially important when discussing the research that was conducted at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro since it deals with local issues that are relevant to the author(s) of this study.

Most of this research will focus on how the framing of polls, specifically regarding which questions are asked, affects how people respond to those questions, especially when it comes to local issues that affect the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. There is a literature review that discusses what research has been done on framing in polls, as well as the types of framing that are used. Our method of conducting our research was by issuing a survey to students enrolled in political science classes that asked several questions about the university and Greensboro. The analysis will focus on the results that we got for our survey, and whether or not equivalency frames were more influential than emphasis frames. There will also be a conclusion

that summarizes everything that was discussed in this paper.

Literature Review

Many people do not pay attention to politics constantly, and therefore may not be likely to have strong opinions on issues. This makes frames (which offer definitions of issues people can use) potentially influential on people. Understanding the opinions that people have on certain issues requires us to pay attention to what is considered to be salient for these issues, as well as understand what type of frames (whether it be positive/negative, equivalency, emphasis, etc.) would have the most impact on with weak opinions on issues. In terms of local politics, local issues are seen as having a direct impact on people's lives. Importantly, there has not been that much information that has been done on frames when it comes to local politics, which makes framing in local issues ripe for studying.

Framing is seen as how people perceive the world around them, and these events are presented to individuals. In the subject of framing and how it affects people, many frames are used in questions, such as positive and negative frames. There have been discussions about how the framing of specific problems, whether it is in a positive or negative light, can have a major impact on how people answer those questions. One of the most famous examples is the Outbreak Question, and how people respond to the question of whether it's framed as saving people or else a set amount of people die (which correlates to risk aversion and risk-taking). This type of risk-taking vs risk aversion framing in problems has also been applied to money and research has found that framing the question in terms of loss of human lives and money tends to promote great changes in subjects' answers (Tversky and Kahneman 1981).

Framing is also often seen as how someone conceptualizes an issue, and the framing of

political issues can influence how the public views them. Usually framing focuses on the attitude that someone has towards an object or subject, and in this view, is seen as the weighted sum of a series of evaluative beliefs about that object or subject (Chong and Druckman 2007). There is also a frame of thought, which is a set of dimensions that affect an individual's evaluation of a subject, which in turn has a big impact on the individual's opinion (Chong and Druckman 2007).

Many framings on topics come from either communication and/or political science. Some studies have shown that the polarization of partisan political elites can influence how people react toward certain issues. For example, in 2013, a study found that with the subject of supporting the DREAM Act and drilling, partisans were more likely to follow cues from the party elites in a nonpolarized competitive environment than in a polarized environment (Druckman, Peterson, and Slothuus 2013). A polarized and competitive environment tends to look sharply divided between two sets of ideologies (liberal-conservative spectrum) with an equal amount of support (meaning it's competitive) and this can end up being quite frequent in local politics, especially if divisive issues are going on that affect the local community. At the same time, a non-polarized competitive environment would be an environment where there is equal support for both ideas, but because there is less polarization going around, people may be more susceptible to certain types of framing given that the issue has not become polarized. So therefore, we could probably see similar effects of party/ideological elites influencing people's decisions in local politics since as long as there is no polarization going around, people are more likely to be influenced by cues from elites. As well as that, partisans in a polarized environment were likely to follow the party they are part of regardless of the argument (pro/against a political topic) (Druckman, Peterson, and Slothuus 2013), such as in the case that is cited here, which focused on either drilling or the DREAM act (and the arguments were either supportive or

opposed to either topic).

There has also been discussion on how political framing can affect people's views on scientific topics such as nuclear energy and climate change. A study on how the politicization of science can affect people's opinions regarding nuclear science found that politicizing science can reduce support for scientific adaptation, especially with negative frames (Bolson, Druckman, and Cook 2014). The politicization of science was defined as when political interests shape the presentation of facts to fit their definition of "the truth" and people will often use selected scientific evidence to back their claims (Bolson, Druckman, and Cook 2014). As well as that, the study found that the politicization of science (nuclear energy) caused people to hold on to the status quo and oppose the expansion of nuclear energy (Bolson, Druckman, and Cook 2014). This focus on how negative frames can reduce support for specific subjects can be applied to national and local issues.

There are many differences between national and local issues, with one of the main differences being certain types of issues are seen as more salient nationally than locally depending on the person, and vice versa. Local issues might include a new building (like a sports center) that is being built in the area or else parking enforcement, while national issues could include abortion and police brutality. Some party cues are likely associated with local issues, though a number of these issues may be nonpartisan unless the party cues come from important people in the local community.

In terms of whether equivalency or emphasis frames are more likely to be found in local issues, it would likely seem that equivalency frames would be found more prominently in local issues, just like in national issues. The reason is that equivalency frames are often seen as having more of an impact on individuals, and often changing the wording on two similar questions will

likely be the same regarding local issues. Granted, emphasis frames might also be found in local issues as depending on what is emphasized, people may be more likely to answer in a certain manner.

The media can also have an impact when it comes to framing, as a study on media framing in regards to the labels “climate change/global warming” found that depending on one's political beliefs, the warming of the earth might be associated with one, both, or neither of the labels (Schuldt and Roh 2014). Using several regression tests, Schuldt and Roh (2014), found that the frame of global warming was connected more to “delayed impacts” than “climate change” and that heat-related thought when it comes to “global warming”, was more pronounced among conservatives/Republicans than liberals/Democrats. At the same time, another study that focused on the labeling of the refugee/migrant crisis that is going on in Europe found that the tone/framing of the video (whether it focused on the issues of refugees or migrants) affected how people viewed the issue (Lee and Nerghes 2018). The researchers found that using either refugee or migrant to describe the crisis would evoke specific connotations that would either be positive in terms of refugee (which would lead to comments of peace and an open world) and negative in terms of migrant (which would lead to comments of racism and fears of crime) (Lee and Nerghes 2018). Overall, frames have been seen as essential for understanding how people respond to problems involving political science.

Many situations can happen for framing to occur, as well as there are many effects of framing. According to Druckman (2004), framing can happen under competition between competing groups and rationality can affect framing. Competing groups are often defined as groups that compete against one another to have the strongest frame, and are usually seen being either equivalency (having a frame being written differently but having the same frame) or

emphasis (one type of frame is emphasized a lot); while rationality is defined as when people make the most rational choice when making a political decision (though most of the time people are irrational when making decisions, which is where framing effects come in) (Druckman 2004). When it comes to the topic of local politics, the focus on competition and rationality would probably be the same, as local politics often involve competing groups trying to have the strongest frame to convince people, and people can often act irrationally when making decisions locally. As well as that, a study found that counter-framing, heterogeneous, and to a certain extent homogenous conversations can sometimes minimize the framing that is going on (Druckman 2004).

One of the main conditions for structure in framing has been argued to be attitudes, which is the psychological tendency to view a subject as favorable or unfavorable and can impact framing effects on people (Bartels, Rabinowitz, and MacKeun 2006). According to Bartels (2006), attitudes are seen as a way to understand how the brain processes/visualizes the psychological tendency to view something favorably or unfavorably, while preferences (which citizens were seen as having and that the government should respond to those preferences) end up being difficult to specify completely and coherently that is understandable (Bartels, Rabinowitz, and Mackuen 2006). To add on, political parties are seen as having framing effects on their citizens, and those who are part of a political party tend to strongly respond to issue frames that are sponsored by the party they support (Slothuus and de Vreese 2010). A study by Slothuss and de Vreese (2010) found that in terms of people responding favorably to political/topical frames of trade and welfare policy, people tend to endorse the frames that are endorsed by the party they vote for, rather than another party. At the same time, Slothuss and de Vreese (2010) found that frames with a partisan/party source had more impact on politically

aware people.

People also seem to be unable to ignore their prior beliefs when processing arguments, as a survey found that arguments that are congruent with people's priors tend to be seen as stronger than arguments that are not congruent with those priors (i.e. motivated reasoning) (Taber Cann and Kuscova 2009). With that in mind, motivated reasoning, while usually about national issues, could be used in local issues, especially if there are arguments that have already been made about a local issue that the person has already had priors on. However, given that most studies of motivated reasoning tend to be focused on national issues, it would be more relevant to look at the local level and focus on framing effects there.

The results of the survey by Taber, Cann, and Kuscova (2009) also showed that some political attitudes are actively defended by individuals when they are processing information that has been given to them. This leads to the individual forming counter-arguments that allow for the attitudes to persist even after counter-evidence has been made on the topic. Finally, when people are exposed to competing frames, they tend to be more likely to choose the frame that is consistent with their values (Chong and Druckman 2007). Chong and Druckman (2007) also state that exposure to competing frames can lead to one faction using frames for its positions that could appeal to the other faction's voters, and in turn, create alternative positions for voters. Overall, the conditions for framing and the effects that framing can have on individuals directly correlate to emphasis and equivalency frames, as well as the idea that knowledge can cause someone to be less influenced by frames.

In political science, framing research tends to distinguish between emphasis framing and equivalency framing and how strong frames tend to be more influential than weak frames (Druckman and Gideon 2011). Strong frames are often defined as frames that have a major

impact on an individual, are often used frequently, and make that individual more likely to be influenced by that frame; meanwhile, weak frames are defined as frames that have little to no impact on individuals and are unpersuasive in general. James Druckman (2011) has also stated that equivalency frames allow individuals to recognize alternative ways of viewing a problem, and therefore be more influential on less knowledgeable people, while an emphasis frame would have a more profound effect on a knowledgeable person.

In the focus on knowledge and how it relates to framing, Chong and Druckman (2007) have discussed that the more knowledge that someone has, the more likely they are to express a preference that is consistent with their values when confronted with competing frames. Therefore, a knowledgeable person will be less likely to be swayed by competing frames since they have already made up their mind when it comes to what they believe on the issue. When it comes to local politics, having a lot of knowledge on an issue that has competing frames (like whether or not some building should be built in the local area) will make it that someone would stick with the frame that is consistent with their values (since it is likely that person may have had those values about their community their entire life, and may be more knowledgeable about local issues rather than national issues).

As well as that, knowledge may be able to enhance framing effects if prior attitudes (that are often developed by knowledgeable individuals and reduce the likelihood of framing) are kept in control, and therefore the considerations in the frame would become more comprehensible towards the person (Chong and Druckman 2007). This means that knowledge will make a frame more comprehensible for a person, and a person needs to understand what a frame is saying for them to accept it. In the focus of local politics, if a person understands a local issue and the frames that come with it, they are more likely to comprehend the frames that are coming to them,

as well as stick with the frame that is aligned with their values.

A theory that was developed in 2007 by Dennis Chong and James Druckman on competitive frames found that: opinions formed by competitive frames are often amplified by the frame's repetition and the frame's strength. In further discussion of the theory, those who are less knowledgeable about the issues are more likely to be impacted by the repetition of frames while those who are more knowledgeable tend to be able to compare the strength of alternative frames in a competitive situation (i.e. more likely to be motivated by strong frames); though there are situations where a weak frame could backfire and cause someone to support the opposite of the frame (Chong and Druckman 2007-2). With this in mind for local politics, individuals will most likely be impacted by frames depending on if they are less knowledgeable about the local issues, and therefore, the strength of the frame will have an impact on less knowledgeable individuals.

In terms of framing effects, there was a study that discussed how persuasive information could influence how citizens form their opinions on topics, though the emphasis on framing did not seem to have that major of an effect (Slothuus and Leeper 2018). This focus on persuasive information being more consistent than emphasis frames seems to help give support to how equivalency frames tend to be more useful than emphasis frames, which means that emphasis frames, while necessary for politicians at times, might not be that useful when trying to use frames to influence someone's view. When it comes to local politics, emphasis frames can be seen as emphasizing certain phrases in questions. While this may be effective to a certain extent on national issues, it may not be as effective on local issues. At the same time though, equivalency frames in local politics can be seen as being more influential because they use questions that are similar in issue/belief but are differently worded. They could thus resonate more with people depending on how locally relevant the issue framing is. While there has been

research that was done on emphasis/equivalency frames and knowledge and frames, the focus on whether emphasis or equivalency frames will be more impactful, and how knowledge would make the framing of questions less impactful is the focus of this research paper.

Experiment

The experiment that we conducted was an online questionnaire (that was contained in a broader questionnaire overall), with there being about twenty-four three-to-five-point questions. A questionnaire would be efficient in gauging whether equivalency or emphasis frames are more effective, and does knowledge have a role in how someone answers a question. The sample was around ninety-nine students who answered an email that would give the students extra credit if they answered the assignment. Several of the questions were either control or else knowledge questions. A majority of the questions though were either equivalency or emphasis questions. The questions were divided into several categories, such as esports, classes, views on the chancellor and mayor, police, parking issues, views on NCAT, the Greensboro Massacre, and where someone lives about UNCG. The non-base questions were assigned randomly to the students, to get the most accurate results.

Analysis

When discussing the results of the questionnaire, the first section of questions were the esports arena questions. The base question was: *Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the UNCG Esports arena?* The esports center costs money question was: *UNCG recently opened an Esports arena which cost \$2.4 million to build. Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the UNCG Esports arena?;* while the other question (esports center had a grant) was: *UNCG recently opened an Esports arena paid for by a \$2.4 million grant from the state government. Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the UNCG Esports arena?*

There were also two questions that either focused on the esports relation to the community (*Some view the UNCG Esports arena as a place to meet new people and build a community with other students who share similar interests. Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the UNCG Esports arena?*), or the esports detriment to mental health funding (*Some view the UNCG Esports arena as a distraction from student support services like mental health. Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the UNCG Esports arena?*).

All responses were recorded on 5-point scales ranging from “very unfavorable” (1) to “very favorable” (5). The average for the base question was 2.9 (neither positive nor negative, but leaning towards negative). The average for the esports center cost was 2.8 (neither positive/negative, but leaning more towards negative now) while the average for the esports center grant was 3.4 (neither, but leaning more towards positive now). The average for the esports community was 3.2 (i.e. in the middle of positive and negative), and the average for the esports is detrimental for mental health was 3.1 (in the middle as well). What the averages show is that using an emphasis frame (i.e. talking about community or mental health), had a small difference in reactions. However, using an equivalency question for this frame (i.e. cost or grant), lead to a major difference in the averages for the questions, with the grant having a much more positive average.

The following grouping of questions discussed how students viewed their overall experience at UNCG/classes. One question asked was: *How do you like attending UNC Greensboro?*; the other question that was asked was: *How do you like taking classes at UNC Greensboro?* Responses range from 1-5, “do not like at all” to “like a lot”. The average for the attending UNCG question was 4.1 (like it); while the average for the like taking classes was 4.03

(like it but lower). This form of equivalency framing did not have that much difference on participants who responded, given that it was just by 0.1 points or so.

After that, two questions focused on people's opinions of UNCG Chancellor Frank Gilliam, and Greensboro Mayor Nancy Vaughan. The questions were worded: *Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of UNCG Chancellor Gilliam/Mayor Vaughan?* The average for the favorability of Chancellor Gilliam was 3.5 (neither favorable nor unfavorable), while the average for Mayor Vaughan was 3.1 (neither favorable nor unfavorable, but closer to unfavorable). These responses show that the averages seemed to show a mixed response regarding what people think about Chancellor Gilliam and Mayor Vaughan, though more people like the former. As well as that, in the focus of knowledge, the participants seemed who had neither positive nor negative responses for both individuals tended to either not know about NCAT that much and/or the Greensboro Massacre. As well as that, these differences show that students at UNC Greensboro seem to know a bit more about the university than they do the town itself, given that Chancellor Gilliam seems to have a higher average than Mayor Vaughan, though it could also mean that the averages are different as people who have lots of knowledge about Greensboro may have more negative opinions about Mayor Vaughan than they do Chancellor Gilliam.

Next, three questions focused on the UNCG police, with one of them being a control/base question and two of them emphasizing different parts about the police. The control/base question was: *Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of campus police?* The campus safety question was: *UNC Greensboro campus police are responsible for keeping the campus safe from crime. Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the campus police?;* while the parking enforcement question was: *UNC Greensboro campus police are in charge of parking*

enforcement. Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the campus police? The average for the base police question was 3.1 (around neither favorable nor unfavorable). Meanwhile, the average for campus safety was 3.6 (around the middle) and the average for parking enforcement was 2.8 (leaning towards unfavorable). These emphasis questions show a major difference in how people perceived police depending on what was emphasized, with parking enforcement evoking a more negative average than the base average, and campus safety eliciting a more positive average.

The questions then lead to two questions about the parking situation, which were done with equivalency frames in mind. One question focused on: *If UNC Greensboro were to increase the amount of parking available, 90% of people wanting to park would be able to find parking. Do you agree or disagree that the amount of parking should be increased?*; however, the other question focused on the reverse: *If UNC Greensboro were to increase the amount of parking available, 10% of people wanting to park would be unable to find parking. Do you agree or disagree that the amount of parking should be increased?* Each question recorded answers on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The first question (positive-framed) had an average of about 4.2 (Agree); while the opposite-worded question (negative-framed) had an average of about 3.7 (Neither Agree nor Disagree, though leaning towards agreement). These equivalency questions show that the positive-framed question had a much more positive average than the negative-framed question (though the average on that question was more in the middle).

Three questions focused on NCAT. One was a general knowledge question and two were either positive or negative frames of NCAT. The knowledge question was: *How familiar are you with NC A&T?* Responses ranged from “not at all familiar” (1) to “very familiar” (4). The

positive-framed question was: *NC A&T is located in Greensboro. Among historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) in the U.S., A&T is the largest. It has a prestigious athletics program and its homecoming brings thousands to Greensboro. Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of NC A&T?*; while the negatively framed question was: *NC A&T is located in Greensboro. It is UNCG's primary sports rival. A&T's men's basketball team leads its series against UNCG 12-10 and won their last meeting 73-57. UNCG's baseball team leads its series against A&T 46-10 and won their last meeting 13-1. Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of NC A&T?* The average for the knowledge question was 2.52 (somewhat familiar). The average for the positive frame question was 4.2 (Somewhat favorable); meanwhile, the average for the negative frame question was 3.4 (Neither favorable nor unfavorable). This means that what is emphasized about NCAT would affect the average of the responses to the questions, with the positive emphasis having a higher average that leaned towards favorable, compared to the negative emphasis, which had a mixed-view average, and the difference was rather tight by around 0.7 points. As well as that, given that the initial question is knowledge-based, those who knew NCAT well tended to have overall-positive views of the school regardless of the question for most of the time, while those who had little-to-no knowledge of the university were more likely to be influenced by the framing of the question in terms of responding positively or negatively.

The following four questions were focused on the Greensboro Massacre, with the focus either being vague/explicit knowledge about the issue, and either a positive or negative-leaning frame of the question about a proposed memorial for the massacre site. The vague knowledge question was: *How familiar are you with the Greensboro Massacre, which was a shootout between two different groups over civil rights in the late 1970s?*; and the explicit knowledge

question was: *How familiar are you with the Greensboro Massacre, in which a group of Neo-Nazis killed five civil rights protestors on a single day in 1979?*. The average for the knowledge questions was 1.7 (Not at all familiar) for the vaguely-worded question; and 1.9 (Not at all familiar leaning towards somewhat familiar) for the explicitly-worded question.

The positive frame of the memorial was: *In 1979 Klansmen shot and killed 5 civil rights/Communist Party members. Currently, there is debate over building a memorial for this event. Some say the memorial emphasizes the event's continued importance, especially in recent years. Do you support or oppose the construction of a Greensboro Massacre memorial?*; while the negative-leaning frame of the memorial was: *In 1979 Klansmen shot and killed 5 civil rights/Communist Party members. Currently, there is debate over building a memorial for this event. Some say the memorial is unnecessary since the event is in the past and could valorize the people doing the killing. Do you support or oppose the construction of a Greensboro Massacre memorial?* The average for the positively-framed/present question was 3.5 (Neither support nor oppose, but leaning towards support); while the average for the negatively-framed question/past was 3.1 (neither support nor oppose). There did seem to be a small difference in averages for the responses to the wording for the knowledge questions (equivalency-style), with most people not knowing about the event that much. Though when it came to the positive vs. negative-framed questions (emphasis-style), while the averages to both leaned more towards the middle, there was a higher average for responses to the positive-frame questions rather than the negatively-framed question. In terms of equivalency vs. emphasis framing, there is a more profound difference in the emphasis style of the frame in terms of larger differences in the averages.

The final set of questions discussed whether or not the participant lived on UNC Greensboro's campus or not. The first question was: *Did you live in Greensboro before enrolling at UNCG?* The second question was: *Where do you currently live?* The final question was: *Other than coming to campus, how often do you visit Greensboro in a typical year?* The average for the first question was 1.9 (leaning towards no); the second question's average was 1.98 (leaning towards not being on campus in Greensboro); the final question's average was 2.8 (less than once a month). In terms of the results, this means that a good number of people who took the survey are mainly people who haven't been to Greensboro before going to UNCG, and also mostly live off campus in Greensboro. In our focus on knowledge, it seems like those who had previously lived in the city had more knowledge (i.e. mayor, NCAT, the massacre) about the city than those who were not in the city.

In testing this experiment we sought to see whether the less knowledge a student has on a local topic, the more influence a frame would have on them; and we focused on if equivalency frames would be more effective on local issues than emphasis frames. For the first hypothesis, we found that knowledge seemed to affect how people would respond to the questions in terms of whether they would be swayed by the wording of the question. However, there was a major surprise with the second hypothesis in that instead of only equivalency frames having a major impact on the participants, there were emphasis frames that had a more major impact on the participants depending on the question (i.e. emphasis having a major impact on questions about policing, while equivalency having an impact on questions like the esports center grant/cost).

Conclusion

In the end, the hypotheses that were tested in this survey experiment were either proven to be correct by the results (in the case of knowledge), or else the results were surprisingly

opposite at points (in the case of equivalency vs. emphasis). In terms of knowledge, we found several pieces of evidence through our survey results that knowledge matters in the focus of local issues when it came to being influenced by frames, as more knowledgeable people seemed to be less influenced by the framing of the question. When it came to equivalency vs. emphasis frames, there were some surprises, as while certain questions (like the esports center) showed that equivalency frames were more influential in influencing participants, though several questions (such as the questions about the police and the Greensboro Massacre) showed that emphasis questions had a more influential impact in terms of how participants responded.

However, certain changes may be needed the next time this is tested. One change is that there might be some sort of impact on how students respond to local issues at the university level depending on which majors people are part of (and in fact how people from one major view another major). Another part that may need expanding on is that college students might end up responding to framing differently if they are asked different questions that could evoke different thoughts on an issue. One more part that needs more focus is that this was done with an online survey that was exclusively taken by email, and there might be different results if it was taken in person (with the consent of the participants). Finally, there may be other historical events that could be focused on (like the Greensboro sit-in), as well as questions that related to Greensboro being a tournament town (with the NCAA). The Greensboro sit-in is similar to the Greensboro Massacre since both deal with protesting in some sort of way that is significant to the history of Greensboro. Greensboro being a tournament town would be a different question than what has been previously covered since it specializes in sports, which was not discussed in this paper except with NCAT.

Bibliography

- Bolsen, Toby, James N. Druckman, and Fay Lomax Cook. 2014. "How Frames Can Undermine Support for Scientific Adaptations: Politicization and the Status-Quo Bias." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(1): 1–26. doi: 10.1093/poq/nft044 (November 20, 2022).
- Borah, Porismita. 2011. "Conceptual Issues in Framing Theory: A Systematic Examination of a Decade's Literature." *Journal of Communication* 61(2): 246–63. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01539.x (November 20, 2022).
- Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. "Framing Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10(1): 103–26. doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.072805.103054 (October 25, 2022).
- Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. "A Theory of Framing and Opinion Formation in Competitive Elite Environments." *Journal of Communication* 57(1): 99–118. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00331.x (November 9, 2022).
- DRUCKMAN, JAMES N. 2004. "Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (IR)Relevance of Framing Effects." *American Political Science Review* 98(4): 671–86. doi: 10.1017/s0003055404041413 (November 2, 2022).
- DRUCKMAN, JAMES N., ERIK PETERSON, and RUNE SLOTHUUS. 2013. "How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation." *American Political Science Review* 107(1): 57–79. doi: 10.1017/s0003055412000500 (November 16, 2022).

Keren, Gideon, and James Druckman. 2011. "What's It All About?: Framing in Political Science." In *Perspectives on Framing*, New York, NY: Psychology Press. essay, 279–301.

Kuang, Xianwen, and Rining Wei. 2017. "How Framing of Nationally and Locally Sensitive Issues Varies? A Content Analysis of News from Party and Nonparty Newspapers in China." *Journalism* 19(9-10): 1435–51.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1464884917731179> (April 26, 2023).

Lee, Ju-Sung, and Adina Nerghes. 2018. "Refugee or Migrant Crisis? Labels, Perceived Agency, and Sentiment Polarity in Online Discussions." *Social Media + Society* 4(3): 205630511878563. doi: 10.1177/2056305118785638 (November 20, 2022).

Leeper, Thomas, and Rune Slothuus. 2018. "Can Citizens Be Framed? How Persuasive Information More than Emphasis Framing Changes Political Opinions." *Amazon AWS*.
<https://s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/tjl-sharing/assets/CanCitizensBeFramed.pdf>
(November 7, 2022).

MacKuen, Michael, George Rabinowitz, and Larry M Bartels. 2006. "Democracy with Attitudes." In *Electoral Democracy*, Ann Arbor, MI: Univ. of Michigan Press. essay, 48–82.

Schuldt, Jonathon P., and Sungjong Roh. 2014. "Media Frames and Cognitive Accessibility: What Do 'Global Warming' and 'Climate Change' Evoke in Partisan Minds?" *Environmental Communication* 8(4): 529–48. doi: 10.1080/17524032.2014.909510 (November 17, 2022).

Slothuus, Rune, and Claes H. de Vreese. 2010. "Political Parties, Motivated Reasoning, and Issue Framing Effects." *The Journal of Politics* 72(3): 630–45. doi: 10.1017/s002238161000006x (November 18, 2022).

Taber, Charles S., Damon Cann, and Simona Kucsova. 2009. "The Motivated Processing of Political Arguments." *Political Behavior* 31(2): 137–55. doi: 10.1007/s11109-008-9075-8 (November 19, 2022).

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1981. "The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice." *Science* 211(4481): 453–58. doi: 10.1126/science.7455683 (October 31, 2022).

van Noord, Jochem, Willem de Koster, and Jeroen van der Waal. 2018. "Order Please! How Cultural Framing Shapes the Impact of Neighborhood Disorder on Law-and-Order Voting." *Political Geography* 64: 73–82. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0962629817302135> (April 25, 2023).