
The Dynamics of Framing in Dialogue

Zlata Kikteva¹, Annette Hautli-Janisz¹, Chris Reed², Steve Oswald³,
Christopher Klamm⁴, Wassiliki Siskou¹, Meghdut Sengupta⁵, Manfred
Stede⁶ & Henning Wachsmuth⁵

¹University of Passau, ²University of Dundee, ³University of Fribourg,
⁴University of Mannheim, ⁵Leibniz University Hannover, ⁶University of
Potsdam

Corresponding author: zлата.kikteva@uni-passau.de

Framing is an appealing and intuitive notion, both academically and in common usage. Pinning down what, precisely, is meant by framing as well as by the types, mechanisms, and rules that govern framing has posed deep challenges for disciplines right across academia for at least half a century (Chong and Druckman (2007); Dewulf et al. (2009); Rocci (2009); Jermini-Martinez Soria (2021)). Our goal, however, is not to try to settle the arguments on what framing is, but to operationalize frames in communication by defining and formalizing a set of reframing moves that allow us to show how framing unfolds and is reacted to in a dialogical setting. We do not attempt to model the exact spell-out of what the text is about but interpret framing as a dynamic process where individual moves between segments allow people to make content more or less salient.

We seek to identify ‘framing moves’, as we call them, i.e., labels that characterize the transitions between speaker moves. To this end, we split the discourse into segments, called ‘frame discourse units’, FDUs, i.e., units that encompass a specific frame move in the dialogue. In order to characterize how the FDUs hang together in the discourse, we identify seven moves: *start*, *take on*, *resume*, *elaborate*, *reframe*, *switch*, and *merge*. In formalizing those moves, we build on a vectorized representation of the FDU, the notion of activated pieces of information, and semantic distance between FDUs as characterizations of frame moves.

What we aim to provide is a framework and a new vocabulary for talking about framing dynamics. A description of just how it is that the dynamics of framing can rest upon the salience of complex semantic juxtapositions can now be made more precise and formal, while at the same time allowing for a natural and straightforward translation into computational settings.

References: • Chong, D., Druckman, J.N. (2007). Framing Theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10 (1), 103–126. • Dewulf, A., Gray, B., Putnam, L., Lewicki, R., Aarts, N., Bouwen, R., van Woerkum, C. (2009). Disentangling approaches to framing in conflict and negotiation research: A meta-paradigmatic perspective. *Human Relations*, 62 (2), 155–193. • Jermini-Martinez Soria, C. (2021). Reframing as an argumentative competence in dispute mediation (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Università della Svizzera Italiana, Lugano. • Rocci, A. (2009). Manoeuvring with voices: The polyphonic framing of arguments in an institutional advertisement. F.H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Argumentation in Context* (Vol. 1, pp. 257–283). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.