Framing

April 26, 2020

General
- Design moral and unmoral frames and pretest both on MTurk, then use the 'proven' frames for the survey experiment. This is a chapter on framing where I apply both methods in the experiment, analyze the methods' performances, and analyze the substantive results in terms of moral frames (the latter is where I produce/add some nuance in our understanding of framing)
- Using the experiment as the application for both papers
  - Paper I: One half of the sample gets the ordinal probit education categories, the other gets the original ones without giving respondents `Don't Know/Refuse` options. Compare the differences between the ordered probit and the original results whilst knowing which one is closer to the truth based on the simulation results
  - Paper II: Use the resulting completely observed data, introduce random missing data, and show how the ordinal affinity score method performs on ordinal variables compared with other method . Assess the performance of the ordinal affinity score method because we know the true values of the completely observed data

Order
- Pre-poll #1
- Design gap-filling frames
- Pre-poll #2
- Design questionnaire
- New IRB approval
- Pre-analysis plan and pre-registration
- Field experiment
- Analysis of the results

Pre-poll #1
- After paper II is done
- 300 respondents, $0.20 each

Design gap-filling frames
- After pre-poll #1 is done

Pre-poll #2
- After gap-filling frames are designed
- 300 respondents, $0.20 each

Design questionnaire
- After pre-poll #2 is done
- Feedback from MPMC
  - The treatment is too weak, not powerful enough
    * You have to go big, hit them with a sledgehammer
    * Have them read newspaper articles, bigger things, longer, more; not just one sentence
  - Morality is in stories, pragmatism is in numbers – incorporate that into frames
- Feedback from Rune Slothuus, APSA, 9/2/2018
  - He says what I do is emphasis framing (other papers use different versions)
  - Emphasis framing: Communication that puts emphasis on a salient aspect of an issue
  - Leading opinion in a certain direction is different from providing an argument
  - Confounding framing and arguments could be troublesome (Slothuus wrote a paper on this)
  - Important step: What is my concept of framing? The opposing frame weren't really frames here, but arguments

New IRB approval
- After questionnaire is designed

Pre-analysis plan and pre-registration (from RT2 training)
- After IRB approval is done
- Articles about invisible null fundings in research community: Franco et al. 2014, Rosenthal 1979
- Read Miguel et al. 2014 "Promoting transparency in social science research" (in the BITSS /readings folder)
- Just because you have a pre-analysis plan doesn't mean that's all you can do with your data (and it doesn't mean exploratory analysis is now forbidden). Just be careful why you're doing it. If it's to improve the p-value, obviously don't do it. If there is a good theoretical motivation that you can defend, then it might be a different story
- Pre-registration can help with publication bias and improve meta-analysis

Field experiment
- After pre-analysis and pre-registration are done
- Before I launch anything:
  - What variables am I blocking on?
  - Correct OPM education categories?
  - Be INCREDIBLY careful with any randomization of response options. Many things in the code use the corresponding number for respondents' response selections, not the actual words, so messing with the order is a very delicate thing
  - Anything I might have missed somewhere?
- Lucid will wait for my go-ahead to launch the actual project whenever I'm ready. Then we'll schedule a kick-off call and talk about project details/logistics

Analysis of the results
- Most straightforward is to use the method I use to block
- But I also have lots of good resources how to analyze ordinal variables as EVs, instead of turning them into intervals for a normal regression, including a Bayesian way

Rework theory
- I have sent Liz an email with my current framing chapter and the questionnaire from the previous experiment
- I recall that she had various input on the chapter setup, the experiment design, and the questionnaire, so I thought it best to start out from these documents
- She emailed back with general instructions to sharpen up the theoretical part
- Think and read more systematically about my argument and what my test(s) would look like (don't rewrite chapter just yet):
  - Sharpen up the explanation of what morality is (Kinder on the "primary ingredients" of public opinion (one of which is "matters of principle"), Feldman on values, Milton Rokeach on values)
  - Incorporate Stoker that nearly all persuading frames are value-laden
  - Incorporate differences between equivalency and emphasis frames (I'm looking at emphasis)
  - Incorporate differences between emphasis frames and new information (Leeper, Slothuus)
  - More thorough canvassing of the frames literature to make my case that there is a "moral frame" category frequently showing up that is different from an "amoral frame" category
- For future write-ups: Clearly express that we do know why frames work (Zaller: Frames move persuasive information to the top of one's mind) but that we don't know why some frames are successful at moving persuasive information to the top of one's mind and others aren't. This was not clear to Liz