

4-9-2015

Opinions on Gun Control: Evidence from an Experimental Web Survey

Mallory Treece

Western Kentucky University, mallory.treece126@topper.wku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_hon_theses



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Treece, Mallory, "Opinions on Gun Control: Evidence from an Experimental Web Survey" (2015). *Honors College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects*. Paper 527.

http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_hon_theses/527

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

OPINIONS ON GUN CONTROL:
EVIDENCE FROM AN EXPERIMENTAL ONLINE SURVEY

A Capstone Experience/Thesis Project

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree Bachelor of Arts with

Honors College Graduate Distinction at Western Kentucky University

By

Mallory Treece

Western Kentucky University
2015

CE/T Committee:

Dr. Timothy Rich, Advisor

Dr. Jeffrey Kash

Professor Wolfgang Brauner

Approved by

Advisor
Department of Political Science

Copyright by
Mallory Treece
2015

ABSTRACT

While a sizable literature exists on framing, little research extends this to gun control. In this study I analyze how partisan framing influences support for gun control. Using an experimental web survey, individual level data shows that Democrats in particular respond more favorably when gun control is framed as sponsored by fellow Democrats. In contrast, controlling for partisanship, gun owners more negatively react to gun control framed as Democrat-sponsored. These findings suggest the extent of support for gun control and ways in which parties can frame the issue in their favor.

Keywords: framing, gun control, partisanship, web survey, experiment

Dedicated to my wonderful, crazy, loving family.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are so many people who have played a role in making this possible; so many, in fact, that this acknowledgements section may prove to be inadequate. With that, I would just like to start out by thanking my family. Without my parents and my eleven siblings not only would I not be the person I am today, but I would not have the most amazing support system anyone could ask for.

Next, I would like to thank my awesome first reader, Dr. Timothy Rich. He helped spark my initial interest in research my sophomore year and has been a great mentor and teacher ever since. He has not only helped me with practical aspects of my project such as how to run a regression and how to submit a paper to a journal, but he has also helped me in so many other ways such as encouraging me as I presented at conferences. I truly appreciate all he has done for me.

I would also like to thank the Political Science Department, my second and third readers, Western Kentucky University, and anyone else who has been there for me through this whole process.

VITA

December 30, 1993.....Born – Bowling Green, Kentucky

2011.....Warren East High School,
Bowling Green, Kentucky

2012.....Awarded FUSE Grant

2014.....Presented at the Southern
Political Science Association,
New Orleans, Louisiana

2014.....Presented at the Kentucky
Political Science Association,
Morehead, Kentucky

2014.....Presented at the International
Studies Association Midwest,
St. Louis, Missouri

2015.....Presented at the Southern
Political Science Association,
New Orleans, Louisiana

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Political Science

Minor Field: English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Vita.....	v
List of Figures.....	vii
Chapters:	
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Research Design and Hypotheses.....	5
3. Analysis.....	8
4. Conclusion.....	17
Bibliography.....	20
Appendix.....	21

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1 Association with Firearms by Partisan Identification.....	9
1.2 Support for Gun Control by Partisan ID and By Framing.....	10
1.3 Support for Gun Control by Gun Ownership and By Framing.....	12
1.4 OLS Regression on Support for Gun Control.....	13
1.5 OLS Regression on Support for Gun Control (With Added Controls).....	15

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Recent mass shootings such as at Sandy Hook Elementary School and in Aurora, Colorado have brought attention again to the issue of gun control reform. One side raises concerns regarding the 2nd Amendment. These individuals are worried that gun control will compromise their Constitutional rights. The individuals on the other side of the issue are concerned with public safety and feel that without gun control, lives of innocent people may be at risk. As politicians and the media debate stricter gun laws, what motivates public opinion and whether these opinions are as polarized as politicians suggest on gun control laws are underexplored. In this research, I address how partisanship frames attitudes toward gun control laws through an experimental design, to potentially identify the source and variation of perceptions.

I argue that framing plays a major role in perceptions of gun control proposals. Framing is how information is presented and how people receive and interpret that information as it is presented. How information is framed is vital in determining whether individuals are likely to agree with the information. Framing presents complex concepts in a deliberate fashion in order to elicit cognitive or emotional appeals that benefit the interests of the framer, engaging “different psychological processes” (Slothuus 2008) and altering emotions toward certain predispositions (Gross and Ambrosio 2004). For example, Brian Montopoli (2006) shows how influential framing is in that the “Death

Tax” elicits largely negative reactions while the “Estate Tax” does not. Montopoli also gives the example of framing in relation to abortion, referring to someone who is against abortion as “pro-life” as opposed to “anti-choice.” If the goal is to get a group to agree with a concept, the approach and the framing will differ greatly from the approach and framing used if the goal is to create opposition to a concept. The information that is presented is intentionally worded in order to achieve an overall goal of gaining support for or creating opposition against certain issues.

Previous research identifies how the media frames issues and its influence in both how the public receives these messages and how it influences public perceptions (Scheufele 2000; Tuchman 1978). Druckman (2001) looks at the credibility of a source and its influences on framing and finds that the more credible a source is deemed to be, the greater the influence of the framing. This shows that framing can work with other factors in order to change public opinion. Frames must be politically salient; they tap into issues in which the target already has an opinion. Framing on its own does not create as great of a reaction as opposed to when framing is matched with another concept. Brewer finds that “national interest frames in media coverage resonate with ordinary citizens” (2006). Framing is also evident in international news coverage: Nossek (2004) finds that the national identity of a news journalist and the journal’s editors inversely influence professional news values.¹

Appealing to partisanship, in itself, is a form of framing. Furthermore, partisanship as a framing device has already been shown to influence support for immigration in the US. Rural voters agreed with Democrat immigration legislation when

¹ Also see Novias 2007

no party label was present, but when there was one, they agreed with the Republicans (Bishop 2012). Looking at gun law reform from the approach of framing will give insight to why or why not individuals support gun law reform.

Simply put, when basic information is presented in marginally different ways, it can change the way individuals perceive it. The manipulation of framing on influencing public opinion has long been acknowledged but has not been adequately addressed in terms of gun control perceptions. Accordingly, I analyze how the framing of a question can influence whether or not people say they agree with gun control laws. If gun control is presented in a manner that is consistent with previous beliefs (such as a person's partisanship), individuals would be expected to respond more favorably than if it is framed in a manner inconsistent with one's previous beliefs. I captured framing through a web survey with a randomly selected group receiving a question asking whether they would support a particular hypothetical gun control law—a 24 hour waiting period for a firearm—recently proposed by Democrats, while others received the same question framed as proposed by Congress. The goal of this analysis is to test whether perceptions of gun control laws would change in accordance to being told that either Congress or Democrats proposed this legislation.

The contribution of this paper is that it extends our knowledge of what influences gun control by connecting this issue to the broader literature on framing. Rather than simply asking one question about gun control, an experimental web survey allows for controls potentially influencing support or opposition for gun control. Gallup has conducted polls on opinions on gun control since 1959 that ask if the participant has a gun in their home; however, people may feel uncomfortable answering this potentially

intrusive question, especially in person. Nor does Gallup address the respondent's direct ownership of the gun, whereas this anonymous experimental web survey does.²

Experimental web surveys have generated insights in social science, but they have not been extended to gun control research where framing would be expected to be present. Furthermore, the results suggest not only the extent of support for a type of gun control, but how parties can frame this in their favor.

² The difference here is that there may be a gun present in the house as opposed to someone directly owning it.

CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH DESIGN AND HYPOTHESES

For this analysis, I implemented a survey using Survey Monkey's paid option to obtain an approximation of a random sample of the American public in the summer of 2013 with 517 respondents. While this may not be as close of an approximation as phone surveys, it does provide an affordable way to tackle framing. Because internet access is widespread in the U.S., there is no reason to expect that those with internet access would be different than those without in regards to gun control perceptions. The participants were presented with a series of questions regarding demographics and political identification. From there, the survey asked a series of gun related questions including how closely the individual associates guns with certain words in order to identify why partisan framing is likely to be successful as it conjures up these latent differences on how Democrats and Republicans see guns. Next, to test framing, respondents were randomly selected to receive either a question framed as Congress proposing gun control laws or Democrats proposing such laws. Besides just measuring partisanship, this survey also asks an often overlooked question: whether or not the respondent owned a gun.

To address how framing and partisanship influence support or opposition to gun control laws, hypothetical gun control legislation is presented to respondents in a web survey. There are many advantages to using a web-based survey, especially in terms of time efficiency (e.g. Tourangeau, Rips, & Rasinski 2000). While access to the internet

used to be a major concern in web survey samples (e.g. Fricker & Schonlau 2002; Wilson & Laskey 2003), this is much less a concern now as access expands (Scholl, Mulders, & Drent 2002). In this case, gun law reform is analyzed by asking about hypothetical legislation with 24-hour waiting period for a firearm. This wording was chosen because, on its face, it seems less controversial and fairly straightforward. Previous research suggests broad support for a 24-hour waiting period, whereas longer waits and stricter restrictions on particular weapons have been much more controversial. This wording also avoids potentially loaded terms such as “assault weapons.” It is hypothesized that when Democrats are presented with gun control framed as Democrat-led, they will be more likely to support the question (H1). Likewise, when Republicans are presented a Democrat frame, they will be less likely to support the question. This is expected because Republicans tend to be seen as against gun control, while Democrats are associated with being for stricter gun control laws. In contrast, less of a distinction should be evident when a Congress frame is presented as this is used as a baseline. Respondents were randomly assigned to receive one of the following questions on gun control:

1. Congress Frame: Congress has proposed a 24-hour waiting period for the purchase of a firearm. Ranging from strongly oppose to strongly approve, where would you place yourself on this scale?

2. Democrat Frame: Democrats in Congress have proposed a 24-hour waiting period for the purchase of a firearm. Ranging from strongly oppose to strongly approve, where would you place yourself on this scale?

While there is a strong emphasis on partisan framing in this study, gun ownership should also influence support. It is expected that gun owners will be less likely

to support a waiting period on guns in general, regardless of whether it was framed as Congress or Democrats that proposed the waiting period (H2). This is expected because it makes the issue of gun control more personal. This is that individuals who own guns may believe that gun control is not an issue because they feel that they are responsible with their guns. This personal identification may lead to a split in how individuals believe which particular gun control laws should or should not be implemented.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS

Descriptive Statistics

Of the total surveyed population, 40.8% identified as Democrat, and 28.7% identified as Republican. Only 33.9% of respondents stated they owned a gun, with little distinction between those who later received a Congress or Democrat frame (35.7% and 32.4% respectively). The Pew Research Center finds that “more than a third of Americans say they or someone in their household owns a gun. There are by various estimates anywhere from 270 million to 310 million guns in the United States — close to one firearm for every man, woman and child” (2013). This shows that the results yielded from my survey of the amount of Americans who say they own a gun are representative of the United States. The similarities in gun ownership rates in both groups of the survey suggest that the later results are not driven simply by one group having a disproportional number of gun owners.

Before the experimental question, the web survey also asks “in general, how strongly do you associate the following terms with firearms?” Table 1 reports the percentage of respondents identifying the terms to be closely or very closely associated with firearms, divided by partisan identification and including a Pearson Chi-Square. Only two of the terms, hunting and military service, show no statistically significant

difference between Democrats and Republicans. In particular, Democrats associate firearms more with crime and danger than Republicans, while Republicans view firearms

as closely associated with home security and self-defense.

These distinctions may partially explain the effectiveness of partisan framing if Democrats and Republicans start with a different perception of the role of guns. They also show that certain framing of gun control may not be as effective as others. For example, framing in terms of military service or hunting may not gain as significant a response as using the other terms listed because there is not much of a partisan divide between these two terms.

Table 1: Association with Firearms by Partisan Identification

	Republicans	Democrats		
	Pct.	Pct.	Coeff.	Sig.
Hunting	86.2	86.4	2.692	0.062
Sport	62.3	38.4	27.626	0.000
Home Security	73.8	41.6	39.523	0.000
Self-Defense	80.6	48.8	45.954	0.000
Crime	71.5	79.6	11.183	0.000
Danger	47.1	72.4	30.627	0.000
Military Service	88.8	87.5	3.023	0.554
Patriotism	51.4	17.4	74.780	0.000

The mean response for people who received the question with the Congress frame was 4.14 on a five-point scale from strongly oppose (1) to strongly approve (5), while the mean response for people who received the question with the Democrat frame was 4.2. This implies that on average respondents supported a waiting period proposed by either Congress or Democrats.

Moving to perceptions of a waiting period, we again see distinctions by partisanship. Table 2 shows a cross tabulation on whether or not an individual supports a waiting period, broken down by party identification, when presented with the Congress frame. Of those receiving the Congress frame, approximately 26.4% more Democrats than Republicans strongly supported a waiting period, with a Chi-Square test statistically

significant at the .001 level. However, majorities of both Republicans and Democrats held favorable views of the waiting period overall. These results seem to suggest that there is less polarization on this minimalist gun control than one might have assumed. As expected, the evidence in Table 2 also shows that when the question had the Democrat frame, Democrats were much more likely to strongly support a waiting period. There is a 34.6% difference between Democrats and Republicans in terms of strongly agreeing with a waiting period. There is also a 7.6% increase in Democrats who strongly agree, and the percentage of Republicans remains about the same between both cases. This is, with a Chi-Square test, significant at the .001 level. This data implies that when Democrats see the Democrat frame, they respond more positively; however, there is little change in the response of individuals identifying themselves as Republicans in contrast to expectations. This supports the first hypothesis in that Democrats did respond more positively to the Democrat frame than to the baseline, Congress frame.

Table 2: Support for Gun Control by Partisan ID and By Framing

(In Percentages)

Framing Frame	Congress			Democrats		
	Republicans	Democrats	N	Republicans	Democrats	N
Strongly Oppose	6.3	0.9	11	3.6	3	8
Oppose	7.5	2.8	15	8.7	0	12
Neither oppose or support	15.1	7.5	32	18.8	4	30
Support	32.1	23.4	76	30.4	20	62
Strongly support	39	65.4	132	38.4	73	126
Pearson Chi-Square	20.772			34.425		
Sig.	0.00			0.00		
N	266			238		

Table 3 breaks down support by gun ownership. Among those receiving the Congress frame, non-gun owners were much more likely to strongly support a waiting

period. There is an 18.2% difference in the gun owners and non-gun owners for strongly supporting a waiting period, statistically significant at the .01 level. Despite the divergence, both groups are generally receptive to the waiting period. Therefore, merely being a gun owner does not make an individual opposed to at least this form of regulation. However, it does imply that gun-owning individuals may perhaps be more cautious of the reform. This would be consistent with the fear of a slippery slope in that gun owners are cautious of this reform because it could eventually lead to even stricter gun control laws. When presented with the Democrat frame, again a majority of both gun owners and non-gun owners approved of a 24-hour waiting period. Non-gun owners are 26.4% more likely to strongly agree with a waiting period when they received the question with the Democrat frame, statistically significant at the .001 level. There is a 5.6% increase in the amount of non-gun owners in agreement with a waiting period from the question with the Congress tag to the question with the Democrat tag. While this is a significant difference, the Democrat tag had a slightly greater influence on individuals identifying as Democrats. The number of gun owners who strongly agree with a waiting period stays relatively the same between the two questions; however, 6.9% fewer gun owners supported the 24-hour waiting period with the Democrat frame. While majorities are generally supportive of the wait, we see divergent effects between gun and non-gun owners when framed as Congress proposed vs. Democrats proposed, consistent with H2. Tables 2 & 3 suggest a potential connection between gun ownership, partisanship, in terms of the influence of framing, but on their own cannot identify which variable is more influential.

In sum, cross tabulations that use the independent variable of party identification give us useful information in regards to framing. It is supported that a partisan tag does influence whether or not individuals agree with gun law reform when looking at party identification. It is also implied that most individuals are generally supportive of a waiting period; however, Democrat support is stronger.

The cross tabulations regarding gun ownership yield interesting conclusions as well, implying that having a partisan tag does influence gun owners' and non-gun owners' support of a waiting period. This also suggests that there is a connection between whether or not an individual owns a gun and an individual's party identification. It is supported that individuals respond positively to their own party identification, consistent with the partisan hypothesis.

Table 3: Support for Gun Control by Gun Ownership and By Framing

(In Percentages)

Framing Frame	Congress			Democrats		
	Non-Gun Owner	Gun Owner	N	Non-Gun Owner	Gun Owner	N
Strongly Oppose	2.3	7.4	11	2.5	5.2	8
Oppose	4.1	8.4	15	3.1	9.1	12
Neither oppose or support	13.5	9.5	32	8.7	20.8	30
Support	24.0	36.8	76	24.2	29.9	62
Strongly support	56.1	37.9	132	61.5	35.1	126
Pearson Chi-Square	14.201			18.381		
Sig.	0.007			0.001		
N	266			238		

Regressions

For a more rigorous analysis, Table 4 presents OLS regressions under each frame (Congress or Democrat) with a five-point dependent variable measuring whether or not an individual supports a waiting period. The independent variables include party

identification (a dummy variable for Democrats) and whether or not an individual is a gun owner. The results show that when presented with the question with the Congress frame, being a Democrat is associated with a 0.53 point increase in support for a 24-hour waiting period, statistically significant at the .001 level. Being a gun owner is associated with a 0.22 point decrease in support for the waiting period. This approaches but does not reach statistical significance (.118). Identifying as a Democrat has a greater relative influence on an individual agreeing with a waiting period than being a gun owner does when an individual is presented with the question with the Congress frame. When presented with the question with the Democrat frame, Democrats are associated with a 0.57 point increase in support for the waiting period, statistically significant at the .001 level. Meanwhile, gun owners are associated with a 0.42 point decrease in support for the waiting period, statistically significant at the .01 level. The Democrat frame model has a much higher R2, suggesting again the importance of framing differences. Also, gun ownership only seems to matter when the partisan frame is present even after controlling for partisanship. This implies that when the waiting period is Democrat-sponsored, gun owners appear suspect regardless of partisanship. This finding shows that it is not just partisanship that matters regarding support of gun control laws, but it is partisanship as well as gun ownership working together that creates these perceptions.

Table 4: OLS Regression on Support for Gun Control

	Congress			Democrat		
	Coeff.	SE	sig.	Coeff.	SE	sig.
Democrat	0.533	0.138	0.000	0.577	0.135	0.000
Gun Owner	-0.221	0.141	0.118	-0.416	0.143	0.004
Constant	4.004	0.107	0.000	4.094	0.105	0.000
N	266			238		
Adjusted R2	0.073			0.127		

Table 5 shows expanded OLS regressions with added controls of gender (female), age, education, and the South (determined by Census classification of regions). Even with these added variables, gun owners are still much less likely to support the waiting period when the Democrat frame is presented, and this is still statistically significant. When looking at the control variables, women and individuals with more education respond positively to the waiting period with both frames; however, both of these groups respond more positively when the Democrat frame is present, and the findings are only significant with the Democrat frame. It is unclear why this is so, but it may be partially explained by partisanship, in that both women and individuals with more education tend to be Democrat. Between the expanded regressions, it is seen that the Democrat frame, while still positive, does not have as much influence on people who identify as Democrats as the earlier models. In contrast, the difference in the two regressions is clear when looking at gun owners. Gun owners appear much more likely to respond negatively when presented with the question with the Democrat frame which supports H2. These models control for Democrats, leaving other parties as a baseline. Most of the individuals are Republican, however, some were not; therefore, I ran the models with only Democrats and Republicans, and the results are consistent with my original models.³

³ These models can be found in the appendix.

**Table 5: OLS Regression on Support for Gun Control
(With Added Controls)**

	Congress			Democrat		
	Coeff.	SE	sig.	Coeff.	SE	sig.
Democrat	0.438	0.144	0.003	0.384	0.138	0.006
Gun Owner	-0.267	0.149	0.075	-0.387	0.142	0.007
Female	0.154	0.140	0.272	0.448	0.130	0.001
Age	0.194	0.079	0.015	0.099	0.074	0.184
Education	0.106	0.067	0.712	0.186	0.065	0.005
South	0.056	0.152	0.116	-0.116	0.137	0.397
Constant	2.605	0.495	0.000	2.442	0.437	0
N	258			233		
Adjusted R2	0.095			0.186		

The regressions show similar findings to the cross tabulations. When presented with the Democrat frame, Democrats responded more positively; however, there is a significant difference in the response of gun owners. When presented with the Democrat frame, gun owners respond much more negatively. This implies that gun owners are less likely to support gun law reform, even after controlling for partisanship, if framed as Democrat-initiated. However, party identification still has a greater relative influence in all but one model, and that is consistent with the findings presented in the cross tabulations.

In sum, the first hypothesis (Democrats will be more likely to support a waiting period when it is presented by Democrats) finds support. Both the cross tabulations and the regressions show that when the Democrat frame is included, individuals identifying as Democrats strongly support the waiting period at a higher rate. However, Republicans surprisingly did not respond more negatively. In fact, the responses of Republicans stayed very similar in all of the tests. This could possibly be explained by the 24-hour waiting period not being a controversial reform. As far as partisanship goes, Republicans

may have seen the waiting period as unthreatening even with the Democrat frame. The second hypothesis says that gun owners will be less likely to support a waiting period regardless of the framing. This hypothesis is somewhat supported. The gun owners strongly supported a waiting period much less frequently than non-gun owners; however, they did tend to be generally supportive. In contrast, gun owners responded more negatively with the Democrat frame, and non-gun owners responded more positively with the Democrat frame. Gun owners, even after controlling for partisanship, respond more negatively to the Democrat frame. This suggests something beyond just mobilizing partisan feelings. One potential explanation is that references to Congress are interpreted as more abstract than a party label, although this requires further testing. It could also be that while Democrats are supportive in general, the framing of the waiting period as a Democratic initiative concerns gun owners in a negative way and might lead them to feel that the Democratic Party may be selling them out. The abstractness versus concreteness of a party label might be explaining this just as Fenno's Paradox partially explains high evaluations of one's own legislator versus low evaluations of Congress in general (Fenno 1978).

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

The study addresses the influence of both partisanship and gun ownership on framing gun control support. First, there are clear, perceptual differences regarding guns. Democrats and Republicans have predisposed attitudes towards guns which influences their perceptions of them. Second, the majority supports the 24-hour waiting period. Between all of the models, no one group was overwhelmingly opposed to this type of regulation. Third, there are clear differences in support based on framing. The Democrat tag yielded positive reactions from Democrats and negative reactions from gun owners regardless of partisanship.

One issue to consider is how much of the findings are actually based upon the 24-hour waiting period. I also collected data on the regulation of different types of weapons such as single shot, semiautomatic, shotguns, and pistols. These regulations yielded more opposition than the 24-hour waiting period with the same general patterns between Democrats versus Republicans and gun owners versus non-gun owners enduring. This implies that the type of firearm might matter when it comes to perceptions on gun control laws.

Another point worth mentioning is the decision not to use the term “assault weapon.” It was not used because it was thought to have been a potentially loaded word. When considering what terms would be less loaded, the argument of framing would seem

to work in this case as well. My survey asked about a ban on “assault weapons” with an even more polarized response by partisanship and gun ownership. However, it may be that the two sides may be defining “assault weapon” very differently.

A clear implication of this research is how parties should frame gun control for their benefit. For example, for the Democratic Party leadership, the results here suggest that one should frame 24-hour waiting periods as bi-partisan and not try to take ownership of the measure as it appears to drive gun owners away at the same time it encourages support among co-partisans. For the Republican Party leadership, one should frame it as something other than a 24-hour waiting period as this has broad support regardless of partisanship or gun ownership. Ultimately, this research identifies not only the influence of framing on gun control perceptions but the limits of the polarization on the issue as well.

There is more we do not understand about why individuals support or oppose gun law reform. Future research should address how party identification and gun ownership interact. One way to look into this would be to analyze the feelings of gun owners toward Democrats in order to identify why gun owners seem to respond more negatively to the Democrat frame. Also, it would be valuable to see if other forms of gun control yield a similar pattern. Clearly, other variables beyond region should be considered as well, although Carlson cautions that “relying too much on the rural/urban divide across states obscures how this plays out within states” (2013). I would have like to have controlled for National Rifle Association membership and the amount of exposure to guns an individual has had. Nonetheless, this initial analysis suggests the extent in which framing influences public opinion on gun control.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bishop, Bill. 2012. "Party Labels Rule Rural Opinions on Immigration." *The Daily Yonder* Retrieved from <http://www.dailyyonder.com/party-labels-rule-rural-opinions-immigration/2012/09/24/4457>.
- Brewer, P.R. 2006. "National Interest Frames and Public Opinion About World Affairs." *Press/Politics* 11 (4): 89-102.
- Carlson, Jennifer. 2013. "Is Gun Control a City Vs. Country Debate?." *The Society Pages* Retrieved from <http://thesocietypages.org/socimages/2013/06/22/is-gun-control-a-city-vs-country-debate/>.
- Desilver, Drew. 2013. "A minority of Americans own guns, but just how many is unclear." *Pew Research Center* Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/06/04/a-minority-of-americans-own-guns-but-just-how-many-is-unclear/>
- Druckman, James N. 2001. "On the Limits of Framing Effects: Who Can Frame?." *The Journal of Politics* 63(4): 1041-1066.
- Fenno, Richard F. 1978. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Boston: Little, Brown.)
- Fricke, R.D. and M. Schonlau. 2002. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Internet Research Surveys: Evidence From the Literature." *Field Methods* 14(4): 347-367.
- Gallup. 2014. "Guns." Web. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1645/guns.aspx#4>
- Gross, Kimberly and Lisa D'Ambrosio. 2004. "Framing Emotional Response." *Political Psychology* 25(1): 1-29.

- Montopoli, Brian. 2006. "Framing the Debate 'Estate' Vs. 'Death' Tax." *CBS News*
Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/framing-the-debate-estate-vs-death-tax/>.
- Nossek, H. 2004. "Our News and Their News: The Role of National Identity in the Coverage of Foreign News." *Journalism* 5, 3: 343-368
- Novais, R.A. 2007. "National Influences in Foreign News." *The International Communication Gazette* 69, 6: 553-573.
- Scholl, N., S. Mulders and R. Drent. 2002. "Online Qualitative Market Research: Interviewing the World at a Fingertip." *Qualitative Market Research* 5(3): 210-213.
- Scheufele, Dietram. A. 2000. "Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political Communication." *Mass Communication and Society* 3, 2/3: 297-316.
- Slothuus, Rune. 2008. "More than Weighting Cognitive Importance: A Dual-Process Model of Issue Framing Effects." *Political Psychology* 29 (1): 1-28.
- Tourangeau, Roger, Lance J. Rips & Kenneth Rasinski. 2000. *The Psychology of Survey Response*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuchman, G. 1978. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Wilson, A. and N. Laskey. 2003. "Internet-Based Marketing Research: A Serious Alternative to Traditional Research Methods?" *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* 21(2): 79-84.

APPENDIX

Models with Only Democrats and Republicans

	Congress				Democrat		
	Coeff.	SE	sig.		Coeff.	SE	sig.
Democrat	0.509	0.149	0.001		0.497	0.150	0.001
Gun Owner	-0.267	0.156	0.088		-0.478	0.162	0.004
Constant	4.036	0.132	0		4.184	0.128	0
N	200				185		
Adjusted R2	0.091				0.127		
	Congress				Democrat		
	Coeff.	SE	sig.		Coeff.	SE	sig.
Democrat	0.452	0.153	0.004		0.313	0.154	0.044
Gun Owner	-0.254	0.165	0.124		-0.401	0.163	0.015
Female	0.305	0.153	0.047		0.448	0.145	0.002
Age	0.204	0.089	0.023		0.028	0.088	0.754
Education	0.051	0.076	0.5		0.173	0.073	0.019
South	0.030	0.166	0.858		-0.251	0.152	0.099
Constant	2.527	0.581	0		2.893	0.492	0
N	194				182		
Adjusted R2	0.112				0.185		