AGNIESZKA PLUWAK

Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland
(agnieszka.pluwak@gmail.com)

THE LINGUISTIC ASPECT OF STRATEGIC FRAMING IN MODERN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Abstract

The following article describes the role of semantics in political marketing, emphasizing the mechanism of framing and perspectivising in discourse. The complexity of the framing process is discussed in the introduction, then the linguistic aspect of political framing is debated and the technique of wording formulation in political discourse analyzed. Finally, implications and conclusions for further research are presented. Examples of political framing provided within the paper are based on the analysis of contemporary public discourses.

Keywords: frame, framing, perspective.

Introduction

No article or book on the concept of *framing* begins with an introductory statement other than its categorization as a „*fractured paradigm*" or „*scattered conceptualization*" (e.g. Scheufele, 2003; König 2004). This remark, however difficult to tackle, is not unsubstantiated: the use of the *framing* concept is quite popular within many different scientific fields, which leads to multifarious modifications in its definition. The notion itself was derived from the term coined by Frederic Bartlett in the field of cognitive psychology (1932, see also Head and Piaget as described in Taylor & Crocker, 1981; Scheufele, 2003; Croft, 2002), who investigated *schemas* (*frames*) in order to describe the structure and functions of the human memory (Gleason & Ratner, 2005).

In the psychological sense, *framing* shall be conceived of as a cognitive phenomenon, forming an integral part of the categorization process, in which external stimuli, such as new information, are classified and assigned to the categories of the previously acquired experience (Lakoff, Johnson, 1999). Due to the schematic nature of the human memory, the process influences remembering, comprehension, evaluation and attitudes (as well as behaviours) towards acquired information. It also proofs that the same elements of the preceived reality can be interpreted

and classified differently, depending on the features of an object (actor, or situation) being emphasized by the medium of communication (Croft 2002; Cwalina & Falkowski, 2005). Due to its manipulative character, the concept has gained vast popularity among actors of political discourse, such as politicians or journalists. However, before its transformation occurred, it had first been borrowed by other cognitive sciences and sociology, which is why such terminological abundance flourished in this field (Fischer, 1997).

Nevertheless, a systematic description of the evolution of *framing* throughout the time and disciplines facilitates a wide spectrum of data on the mechanism of *framing*, on one hand, and helps us develop an interdisciplinary approach to its arcana on the other (e.g. Scheufele, 2003; Pluwak 2010). For the purpose of the following paper, in order to avoid confusion, a definition by Entman (1993, s.52) shall be applied, describing the mechanism of *framing* in the field of communication as follows:

> "To *frame* is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described" (quoted as in Scheufele, 2003).

Framing is thus a very general mechanism, applicable to both visual (e.g. image) as well as to textual contents. In both cases, it is characterized by two layers: knowledge and attitudes (values[1]) being referred to (*deep structure*, see Lakoff, 2002, 2004) and wording formulation or image manipulation (*surface framing*, ibidem). A properly chosen *wording* (*framing*) used in political discourse can thus have further implications with respect to the influence exerted on the voters' opinions and their political preferences (*wording effect* see Kahneman, 2003; Stocke, 2002). This particular aspect of *framing*, as related to the field of semantics, shall become the focal point of this paper.

1. The mechanism of political framing

The basic assumption of political campaigns, derived from economic marketing, is that candidates or parties have to be promoted on the public arena and positioned in comparison with other aspirants (Norris, 2004, Cwalina and Falkowski, 2005). However, the new trend in public relations research tends to perceive the ideology standing behind each political wing as a product of promotion, treating candidates solely as potentially successful "packagings" (Norris, 2004). The focal point of the research thus moves towards the ideological background in stead of pure image or impression provided by the media.

In cognitive science, background ideologies are conceived of as coherent systems of values, having both universal and cultural characteristics. Therefore, on one hand, they are easily comprehended across cultures (e.g. the tradition of the leftist and the right-wing politics), but on the other, they frequently form a part of a national political identity (see: Lakoff 2002: *nurturant parent* versus *strict father*

---

[1]The word *particular* in the definition refers to the background ideology promoted.

family models of the Republican and Democratic Party). Such systems of values, acquired from early childhood on, are subconscious cognitive structures used (and useful) in various situations of decision making, such as political voting (Goffman, 1974). It can therefore be stated that political candidates facilitate interpretations of public events and problems within their political discourse as to revoke appropriate cognitive structures used by the voters in the process of decision- making (see Kahnemann and Tversky, 1984, Lakoff, 2002, Cwalina & Falkowski 2005).

The question thus arises, how can politicians influence our choices or — in other words — revoke appropriate cognitive structures to influence our mental processes? The answer has been provided by psycholinguistics (Gleason, Bernstein Ratner, 2005): interpretations (in other words closed *frames of interpretation*) provided within political discourses are expressed throughout *wordings*, which activate cognitive structures in our memory (mental lexicon, see Aitchinson, 2005). This simple fact is derived from the psychological concept of the *mental lexicon* (ibidem), where „*words in the mind*" (as described by the author) are memorized in our long-term memory together with correspoding concepts in an intermodal way (Kiefer, 1999). As a result, the *wording* chosen activates only selected contents to be revoked to the short-term memory to further influence the process of decision-making.

As to find their way towards the border of influence exerted on a decision, the *wording* with its content has to be repeated many times, the same way as our experience does, when the human memory is formed. The pure logic of implementation of TV commercials and political advertisements is thus the best proof of success of repeated linguistic (and visual) contents.

By what has been defined so far, we can thus distinguish between three different dimensions of *framing*:

— shared meanings in a given society and **the socio-cultural aspect** of experience acquisition (e.g. symbols, ideologies, values), recurrent within any public discourse,

— **the psychological mechanism** of specific and selected wording, capable of influencing opinions and decisions, such as voting,

— **a marketing-political** use of culturally relevant symbols in order to influence public choices.

The following graph illustrates different sides to the same *framing* coin:

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY	BACKGROUND (AND PRODUCT)	IDEOLOGY, SETS OF VALUES ACQUIRED IN A GIVEN SOCIETY
POLITICAL MARKETING	GOAL	PROMOTION OF AN IDEOLOGY
LINGUISTICS	MEANS	APPLICATION OF A SELECTED WORDING
PSYCHOLOGY	EFFECT	INFLUENCING CHOICES, PROCESS OF DECISION-MAKING

As previously affirmed, within this paper the greatest stress shall be put on the linguistic and psychological aspects of framing, that is to say:

— the technique of wording selection for political interpretation,

— examples of sufrace framing (*wording*) derived from the latest public discourses on *taxes*, *immigrants, abortion* and *in vitro* with the meaning, interpretation, goal and implications standing behind each wording,

— the psychological reasons for the manipulative character of the framing effect and the ever-recurring question of possible protection against ideological influence.

2. The linguistic aspect of political framing

Lakoff (2002, 2004) in his cognitive approach towards political framing, distinguishes between the *deep* and the *surface framing. Deep framing* refers to cognitive structures being activated, while *surface framing* — corresponds to the specific wording used. From this point of view, it could be stated that the most important aspect (or otherwise: the tool) of *framing* is the *wording*, or to be more precise — the proper selection of *wording*. Therefore, the first significant questions arise:

- How does the *linguistic* or *surface framing* work?

- What examples can we provide from contemporary public discourses?

- How do the politicians/ or PR experts structure the public discourse so as to evoke specific reactions? (in other words: how do they build *frames of interpretation* for specific public topics ?)

The reason why linguistic framing is such a successful tool of public communication is that it is related to the notion of *perspective* (Ensink, Sauer, 2003). Cognitively speaking, its main assumption is that we are unable to adopt two different points of view to the same issue, while performing the process of categorization (although we are able to understand different points of view referring to that issue). As a result, we are in a way doomed to a „monoperspective cognition" (Lakoff, 1987). Even if we are uncertain about how to define an event and feel a temporary cognitive dissonance, we finally tend to adopt one point of view at a time, reaching to the information we have „at hand" (our knowledge) as to assign specific meaning to our new experience (*cognitive dissonance*, Aronson, 1998; Cialdini, 2001).

The very issue of categorization related to public discourse is that in the media-defined world, we have no direct access to information (e.g. we never are direct witnesses of public events), and so, while struggling to stay up to date with important facts, we always follow ready made interpretations prepared either by the media or by the politicians (transmitted by the media, see e.g. Norris, 2004). Together with specific interpretations, we also receive and adopt *perspectives* as transmitted. The main problem of such a form of communication is that we hardly ever question the perspective given, which inevitably results in the adoption of a given interpretation. From this point of view, public discourse can be perceived as a *battlefield of perspectives* (Ensink, Sauer, 2003), where repetition (most frequently of a given wording) often guarantees success in the polls.

Why should a wording mean something more than just a plain interpretation? According to Lakoff (2004), once language is adopted, values (ideology) and knowledge standing behind the word are accepted and shape our behaviours and attitude towards a given issue. Thinking of a given problem in a certain way is afterwards translated into acting according to the interpretation accepted. Typically, as prooved by Kahnemann and Tversky in the *prospect theory*, due to a specific wording, our attitude can be either positive or negative and influence our choices. A canonical instance given by Lakoff (2002), taken from G. W. Bush's repetitive speeches, is the example of *tax relief*. The concept of taxes according to American Republicans (from monetary economics applied by Reagan) is different than the understanding of the same concept by the Democrats (inspired by the Keynesian economy). While the Republicans promote the decrease in tax rates, as an impulse for a sluggish economy, the Democrats perceive them as an investment in the common wealth (such as infrastructure). The main goal of the corresponding wording is thus the motivation of a positive attitude towards taxes on the Democratic side and the discouragement towards the same concept on the side of Republicans. The wording of *tax relief* applied by the Republicans, as described by Lakoff in *Moral Politics*, indicates affliction with the concept of *relief*. At the time the book was published, no corresponding pro-democratic vocabulary was used, however, the author himslef suggested *investment*-related phrasings[2].

Another important issue, currently subject to framing in various European and American public discourses is the question of immigration (Santa Ana, 2002). Research conducted by the Rockridge Institute at Berkeley (http://www.rockridgeinstitute.org/) indicated a strong prevalence of Republican vocabulary over Democratic phrasing in the American immigration discourse, framing the incomers as *a national problem, a major problem of the national American economy,*"*illegal aliens, illegals, undocumented workers, undocumented immigrants*"[3]The above quoted vocabulary used in order to describe foreigners crossing the American border indicates that the action performed is strictly against the law. Such terms suggest the audience shall perceive immigrants as criminals, through directing the attention towards the crime and blame, thus *providing the causal interpretation and moral evaluation*, as explained by Entman in his definition of *framing*. However, the question arises, whether the blame shall truly be assigned to immigrants (conceived of people consciously and deliberately acting against the law), the authorities of neighbor states (unable to provide for enough workplaces on the local market; see e.g. the *neo-classical* approach to migration) or even the system (e.g. capitalism as an economic system, in which economies of the rich "core countries" require steady inflows of labor force as in the economic world system

---

[2]It is important to realize that American discourse often sets trends in contemporary political discourses abroad, even in Poland. When the political campaign for a 1% VAT tax raise was prepared by the governing conservative party, Civic Platform, the *tax* example was quoted by the PR experts so as to attract public attention to how the notion of taxes is conceived of in Poland (Daily newpaper *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 4th August, 2010, p. 17, Makowski J., *Jak trwoga to do państwa!*).

[3]http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/15/washington/15text-bush.html.
http://www.voanews.com/english/news/a-13-2008-01-29-voa6-66596442.html.
www.rockridgeinstitute.org.

theory by Imanuel Wallerstein, 2004).

The answer to this question depends on the *deep structure* being either the conservative Republican or the liberal Democratic ideology. The conservative worldview implies an improvement in border protection as a solution to the *immigration problem*, due to the fact that the defined culprits of the situation are the incoming immigrants. It is also interesting to notice, how G.W. Bush in his direct speeches to Mexican immigrants referred to them as to *guests*, a polite but still an expression indicative of the fact that only temporary immigration is welcomed, whereas regular settling down is not "demanded"[4]. The term *guests* (notorious also in this and previous century of the European politics in countries such as e.g. Germany: *Gastarbeiter* or *work-guest* with reference to e.g. Italian, Turkish or Asian temporary workers who settled down in the industrial parts of the country in the second half of the 20$^{\text{th}}$ century), implies important legal provisions, such as the lack of equal rights in comparison with American citizens or a working or residence permit long enough for the immigrants to perform their duties, but short enough for them not to be able to stay.

On the contrary, the liberal Democratic Party stresses other aspects of the immigration issue, which — according to Democrats — are overlooked in the perspective offered by the conservatives. One of the facts emphasized by the Democrats is the lack of medical care (being expensive and private) or social service for the immigrants (even though most of them pay social security). The Democrats warn that immigrants are often used as cheap labor (underpaid in comparison with the locals) and risk their lives while crossing the border, while being compelled to do so due to the poor economic conditions in their home country. According to Lakoff (2004), alternative progressive terms shall be offered by the Democrats, e.g. *economic refugees* or *immigrant tax payers,* emphasizing the fact that if the neighboring economies were provided help from the center, there would be no reason for the immigrant workers to leave their homeland (Lakoff, 2004, Wallerstein, 2004).

Another example, recurrent within contemporary political discourses is the FETUS/UNBORN CHILD frame described by the scientists such as Kahnemann, Tversky (1984) or Fillmore (1977 a and b) as the effect of *evaluative framing*. Here, alternative terms reflecting the same concept, attract our attention to two different aspects of PREGNANCY, influencing our attitude towards the issue. The term *fetus* activates the MAMMAL schema in our memory, so that the phenomenon of abortion seems less repulsive (of a more biological nature), wheras *unborn baby* evokes the CHILD frame (where *unborn* is an augury of a future life). According to Croft (2002), the difference in meaning between these two terms reflects the difference in attitude and political stance of the speaker. The later term evokes stronger negative feelings towards the act of abortion also due to the fact that it seems less abstract than the first.

A similar framing was applied during a recent parliamentary debate in Poland in October 2010, when several bills of amendment to the in vitro act were presented by both conservative and liberal parties[5]. The focal point of the debate was defined

---

[4]`http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/15/washington/15text-bush.html`

[5]`http://wyborcza.pl/1,75478,8552140,Eugenika__handel__laboratoryjne_stoly__W_` `Sejmie_debata.html#ixzz13MtqOLeo`.

by Jarosław Gowin (Platforma Obywatelska, central-conservative Civic Platform), who indicated in his speech that the key question of the debate was the matter of "(...) *what or who the human fetus is*" (ibidem) as related to the ethical issue of commencement of the human life (the LIFE/ DEATH frame). According to the conservative worldview, with reference to its catholic convictions, the embryos shall be conceived of as potential human beings. Such a categorization makes the in vitro treatment method become morally repulsive due to the accusation of eugenics performed[6]. In support of their arguments, the right-wing parties apply the following wordings:

> Bolesław Piecha (Prawo i Sprawiedliwość — Law and Justice*)"(... gdy stosuje się metodę in vitro...) model życia ludzkiego powstaje na stole"* [*(...with the application of the in vitro method...) the model of the human life is created on the laboratory table*, tłum. A.P.]

> Piotr Polak (Law and Justice): *"(...) życie to dar Stwórcy"* [*life is the Creator's gift*, tłum. A.P.]

> Andrzej Ćwierz (Law and Justice*)*[*as a comment to the bill on the easier access to abortion rejected by the Council of Europe*]:*"Przedstawiciele 47 państw Europy zagłosowali za życiem"*[*The representatives of 47 European countries voted for life,* tłum. A.P.]

In reply to the conservative point of view, the liberal left wing party (SLD — Democratic Left Alliance) proclaims the notion of a *neutral state* and *pro-choice* position (Marek Balicki). Attention is directed from the KILLING of "the children to become" (MURDER frame) towards the natural DEATH of the embryos (as in the organism of any woman in a natural biological cycle; agent — neutral NATURE frame) in the comments e.g. by Professor Marek Balicki. Apart from the response to the conservative frame, the left wing has its own wording of the in vitro issue as an INFERTILITY TREATMENT related to the creation of new life (LIFE frame, e.g. Marek Balicki):

> Marek Borowski (Socjaldemokracja Polska — The Social Democratic Party of Poland): *"Zarodek człowiekiem nie jest"* [*An embryo is not a human being*, tłum. A.P.]

> Marek Balicki (SLD, Democratic Left Alliance)

> *„Trzeba dostrzegać różnicę między zabijaniem embrionów a ich obumieraniem. Umieszczonych w macicy embrionów nikt nie zabija, niektóre rozwijają się dalej, inne obumierają. W naturalnym rozrodzie tylko 25-30 proc. zarodków zagnieżdża się i rozwija dalej. Pozostałe obumierają. Tej biologicznej prawdy nikt nie kwestionuje. A zatem, czy ktokolwiek może powiedzieć, że w rozrodzie naturalnym urodzenie dziecka jest ''zawsze okupione śmiercią jego sióstr i*

---

http://wiadomosci.gazeta.pl/Wiadomosci/1,80271,8551568,Debata_w_Sejmie_o_in_vitro_
_RELACJA_NA_ZYWO_.html?bo=1

[6]Eugenics — embryo selection and hereditary improvement.

braci?"[One has to see the difference between the killing and the dying of the embryos. Nobody kills the embryos in the uterus, some of them keep on growing, other die naturally. In the natural process of procreation only 25-30% of the embryos nestle and keep on growing. The rest simply dies. Nobody questions this biological rule, so how can anyone say that in the process of natural procreation giving birth to a child is „always atoned for by the death of his brothers and sisters"? tłum. A.P.]

To sum up, speaking in terms of Kahneman and Tversky's *prospect theory*, one can state that the conservative party focuses on the *lives lost* (negative frame), whereas the liberal party — on the *lives saved* (positive frame) in the application of in vitro. The negative frame is the so called risk- aversion frame (in contrast with the other risk-seeking frame) that stresses the negative aspects of the problem together with the possible threats, providing for its negative evaluation and promoting the NO decision. The other, risk-seeking frame, stresses the positive aspects of the possible (prospective) outcome, trying to convince the decision-maker to the YES-vote.

Last but not least, it cannot be overlooked, that framing and prespectivizing is present also in the interpretation of daily news and events. One of the famous examples in the framing literature is the categorization of the flight crashes during the Cold War by the American media as quoted by Entman (2004). Although both of the accidents were similar, one of them was covered as a deliberate command to shoot the plane down (when the American plane got crashed on the Sovietic territory — the CONFLICT frame used to present the Soviet Union as a ruthless opponent), whereas some other time a simmilar accident was deemed a technical problem (A TECHNICAL PROBLEM frame), so as to diminish President Reagan's responsability for the crash.

There are countless examples of framing to quote from various public discourses, however, there are only a few general rules of frame — building. The provision for the above provided instances enables a proper elaboration of the general technique of frame creation.

3. Surface frame building

According to Lakoff (2004), for the selected wording (*surface framing*) to be successful, it has to comply with specific rules. First of all, it shall stress specific values of a given ideology, focusing the whole attention on these merits („by closing them in an attentive frame"). In his linguistic guide for the Democrats, George Lakoff (2004) explains that for the framing to be successful, it is essential to first enlist the values to be conveyed and only afterwards, to match the corresponding vocabulary promoting them. Apart from that, it is important for the speakers not to use the opponent's vocabulary during political debates, thus emphasizing the adverse values he/she attempts to promote.

Secondly, for any frame of interpretation to be built, it has to contain all the elements described by Entman (1999), so that the message is clear enough to reach the audience. The indispendable are a *problem definition* and *its solution*, due to the fact that they determine all other frame elements by stressing the position taken (*for*

or *against*). The sociological research of public actors (such as social movements) indicates that the typical frame elements are *frame focus* (issues, events, actors) and *frame functions,* which serve the purpose of „(...) defining problematic effects, identifying cause and agent, endorsing remedy and conveying moral judgment" (Entman, 1999). Obviously, different kinds of framing may require or stress different elements, depending on the function of framing. Rivas (Lopez, 2003) illustrates the typical frame elements together with the corresponding marketing strategies and public actors as follows:

Frame Elements (themes)	*Framing* Strategies (Interpretation techniques corresponding to the themes)
1.- Focus on a specific problem within the public debate	a) Matching of a concept or a slogan to the chosen problem b) Its authentication by exemplification c) Exemplification of the problem by referrence to daily experience
2a.- Problem definition with the implication of a contrast between the status quo and the recommended	a) Dramatizing: forecast of future problems as a result of the application of the wrong solution b) Presentation of a wider context and background of the problem (script building)
2b.- Blame attribution	a) Choice of a represented ideology (e.g. stalinism, etc.) b) Blame and responsability attribution for the situation or problem to other collective actors of the public discourse
3a.- Definition of the culprit	a) Personification of actors responsible for the problem b) Blaming them for deliberate causing of the problem c) Blaming them for acting for their individual merit and being against the common wealth d) Moralism: defining opponents as actors of the public discourse
3b.- Goal Framing	a) Matching of a concept or slogan to the chosen problem b) Exemplification of the concept by enlisting possible benefits for the participants and media c) Generalization and exagerrated presentation of the situation, attribution of additional and higher values to one's own goals

4.- Framing of chances for success	a) Exemplification of previous simmilar successes of antecedents b) Definition of the role of possible participants in the success: the greater the role, the greater the chance for success
5.- Autopresentation of social actors	a) Proof that both personal and common interests are represented b) Identification with one of the central social values, such as e.g. freedom c) Gaining supporters among famous and respected people d) Provision for credibility of the presented problems and their *framing* e) Forecasting, presentation of a political forecast.

The dimenions of frames of interpretation and strategies of social movements by Alvarez Lopez (2003).

As we can see in the table, Rivas distinguishes between different kinds of framing depending on the elements of each frame being emphasized (e.g. goal, feature of an actor) and the starting point of the frame building (the program of the party, an event requiring interpretation)[7]. For instance, frame building for the issue of poverty can either belong to agenda-setting of a political campaign or an immediate reaction to the news covering an event, such as a death of a homeless person in winter. In the first case, poverty could initially be described as a social problem and then the fault assigned to a person (e.g. poverty as a personal problem resulting from bad previous choices made), a social group (poverty as a social problem caused by bad economy) or to external factors[8]. Regardless of the type of framing, regular elements such as problem definition, blame attribution, causal evaluation and recommendation of a solution are always provided.

4. The manipulative aspect of framing

In view of the previously discussed mechanism of framing, one last question requires answering: *is there any escape from the manipulative aspect of framing?* George Lakoff (2004), one of the world-wide known experts on political discourse, claims there is no such a thing as an escape from this cognitive mechanism of interpretation: there is only good or bad framing. Therefore, the question has to be reformulated: *is there any public discourse without perspective or interpretation?* Due to the fact that no experience is free from perspective and hardly any statement is free from judgement, we can assume that hardly any discourse can be free from interpretation (ibidem), excluding public discourse understood as a battlefield of ideas.

The clue of the framing process thus revolves around the choice of perspective one shall adopt to a given issue or — in other words — an active choice of one's own

---

[7]ibidem.
[8]vgl. Alvarez Lopez (2003).

opinion among perspectives offered by the media. As discussed within the paper, the main problems of framing in the public discourse are the monoperspectivism and the lack of alternative language. In the first case, the concentration on the values and aspects of a given problem results in other aspects being omitted due to the limitation in perception. While making a decision, there is hardly ever enough time for a profound analysis of all of the aspects and thus often popular wordings are accepted without giving their content much thought. The latter problem refers to the possible change in perspective provided by a new language of interpretation. It is the wording that allows for various perspectives, and thus also a variety of values and schemas to choose from. Ample interpretations enrich any public debate, providing for a multiperspective discourse.

5. Conclusions

The core of the framing process in political discourse, as we have seen throughout the paper, is the multifariousness of its mechanism starting with the values of an adopted ideology, through the language selected to express these values up to the influence exerted on the public attitudes and reaction towards a framed issue. In order to build successful frames of reference for issues such as in vitro, politicians use different strategies named by Alvarez Lopez (2003), all of them based on a common framing demonimator of the *problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described*, as indicated by Entman in his previously quoted definition of framing. On one hand, framing thus seems to be a sophisticated method of discourse manipulation, on the other, however, it constitutes a general mechanism of discourse formation, where interests of different public groups become uttered.

As prooved within the paper, the linguistic aspect of framing, the so called *surface framing* plays a significant role in this mechanism, forming a special linker between the values, ideologies and the public reaction. For this particular reason, it shall be granted special scientific attention. For the time being, however, within the framing studies little attention has been devoted to the mechanims of framing as such and to the role the surface framing plays in it (except for the writings by Lakoff), as well as to the primary political rather than secondary media framing, the major stress being put on the practical studies of media coverage (see e.g. Entman, 1993; Scheufele, 2003).

References

Aitchinson (2003). *Words in the mind.* Blackwell Publishing.

Alvarez Lopez I. (2003). *Los Usos Estrategicos del Framing. La Campania Electoral Municipal de Madrid 2003.* Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Aronson E. (1998). *Człowiek — Istota Społeczna* (org. *The Social Animal*). PWN, Warszawa.

Ciadlini R.B. (2001). *Wywieranie wpływu na ludzi (*org. *Influence. Science and Practice).* Drukarnia Naukowo-Techniczna S.A. Warszawa.

Croft W. (2002). *Cognitive Linguistics.* Cambridge.

Cwalina W., Falkowski A. (2005). *Marketing polityczny — Perspektywa Psychologiczna.* Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Entman R.M. (2004). *Projections of Power. Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy.* University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London.

Fillmore Ch. (1977a). *Scenes-and-Frames Semantics.* W Divren R., Radden G., *Studies in Descriptive Linguistics. Fillmore's Case Grammar.* Tom 16. J.G. Verlag (1987). Heidelberg.

Fillmore Ch. (1977b). *Schemata and Prototypes.* W Divren R., Radden G., *Studies in Descriptive Linguistics. Fillmore's Case Grammar.* Tom 16. J.G. Verlag (1987). Heidelberg.

Fischer K. (1997). *Locating Frames in the Discursive Universe.* Sociological Research Online, tom 2, nr.3.

Gleason J.B., Bernstein Ratner N. (2005). *Psycholingwistyka* (org. *Psycholinguistics*). Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne. Gdańsk.

Goffman I. (1974). *Rahmen-Analyse. Ein Versuch über die Alltagserfahrungen.* Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main.

Kahneman D. (2003). *A Perspective on Judgment and Choice.* American Psychologist, 58, 697-720.

Kahneman D., Tversky A. (1984). *Choices, Values and Frames.* American Psychologist, 39, 341-350.

Kiefer M. (1999). *Die Organisation des Semantischen Gedächtnisses.* Hans Hüber Verlag, Bern.

König T. (2004). *Frame Analysis: A Primer.* Loughborough University, Department of Social Sciences, *New Methods for the Analysis of Media Content:*
 http://www.lboro.ac.uk/research/mmethods/resources/links/*Frame*s_primer.html

Lakoff G. (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things.* The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff G. (1991). *Metaphor in Politics. An open letter to the Internet from George Lakoff.*

Lakoff G., Johnson M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought.* University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff G. (2002). *Moral Politics.* University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff G., Johnson M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by.* The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff G. (2004). *Don't think of an Elephant.* Chelsea Green Publishing, Vermont.

Norris P. (2004). *Tuned out Voters.* John Jon. Kennedy School of Government; Harvard University: `http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~pnorris/Acrobat/TunedOut.pdf`

Pluwak A. (2010). *Geneza i ewolucja pojęcia framingu w naukach społecznych.* Global Media Journal (1, 2010).

Santa Ana O. (2002). *Brown Tide Rising. Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse.* University of Texas Press, Austin.

Scheufele B. (2003). *Frames, Framing und Framing-Effekte; Theoretische und Methodische Grundlegung des Framing-Ansatzes sowie Empirische Befunde zur Nachrichtenproduktion.* Westdeutscher Verlag.

Stocke V. (2002). *Framing und Rationalität — Die Bedeutung der Informationsdarstellung für das Entscheidungsverhalten.* Scientia Novia, Oldenburg Verlag, München.

Wallerstein (2004). *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction.* Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

www.rockridgeinstitute.org

Lakoff G., Ferguson S. *Crucial Issues Not Addressed in the Immigration Debate: Why Deep Framing Matters.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Lakoff G., Ferguson S. *Framing Versus Spin: Rockridge as Opposed to Luntz.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Lakoff G., Ferguson S. *The Framing of Immigration.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Lakoff G., Frisch E. *Five Years After 9/11: Drop the War Metaphor.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Lakoff G., Patent J. *C onceptual Levels: Bringing It Home to Values.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Lakoff G. Metaphor, *Morality, and Politics Or, Why Conservatives Have Left Liberals in the Dust.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Lakoff G. *Simple Framing.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Lakoff G. *Thinking Points.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Lakoff G. *When Cognitive Science Enters Politics.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Rockridge Institute. *The Strategic Framing Overview.* University of California. Berkeley, California.

Lakoff G. DVD: *How Democrats and Progressives Can Win: Solutions from George Lakoff.* Educate the Base, LLC 2004.

Media sources:

Makowski J. (2010). *Jak trwoga to do państwa!* Gazeta Wyborcza, 4th August, 2010, pp. 17.

http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/15/washington/15text-bush.html

http://www.voanews.com/english/news/a-13-2008-01-29-voa6-66596442.html

http://wyborcza.pl/1,75478,8552140,Eugenika__handel__laboratoryjne_stoly__W_
Sejmie_debata.html#ixzz13MtqOLeo.

http://wiadomosci.gazeta.pl/Wiadomosci/1,80271,8551568,Debata_w_Sejmie_o_in_
vitro__RELACJA_NA_ZYWO_.html?bo=1