“Mad as Hell, but Still Going to Take It? Media Frames, Affective Response, and the Limits of Public Opinion on Financial Regulation in the United States”

Can public opinion counter the political power of finance? The Dodd-Frank Act of 2010 is cited as a case where public outrage drove legislation against bank interests. This article first presents qualitative evidence of the media’s role in facilitating passage of Dodd-Frank and survey evidence from 2008-9 to motivate our focus on media coverage. We then present experimental results from a 2016 online survey of the American public. Subjects read variants of a stylized news item on Goldman Sachs and its CEO, Lloyd Blankfein. Results showed a marked affective response to exposure to these media accounts of bankers and banking, but weaker and less consistent effects on policy preferences. We also find no consistent differences in whether and how episodic (personalized) and thematic (contextual) media framing shapes public opinion. Both frames move public opinion in more or less the same way, and episodic framing usually trumps thematic narrative. This is part of a larger six-country study of public opinion as a countervailing force to business power in the domain of financial regulation. The talk will also present some comparative findings from a parallel 2016 survey of the UK public and the most recent findings from a 2018 online survey of the Australian public.

The related paper will be available on October 8th.