

THE IMPACT OF FRAMING EFFECT: HOW FRAMING EFFECT AFFECTS STUDENTS IN CHOOSING UNIVERSITY'S MAJOR

Jurnal Analisa Sosiologi
April 2022, 11 (2):167 - 191

Suroyo¹, Bima Maulana Putra²

Abstract

Many students in choosing higher education majors are not in accordance with their abilities and interests. This will have an impact on students in making decisions on the choice of majors. This research is qualitative survey study with all students of the University of Riau as the population in this study, with 556 samples covering eight departments and three faculties using representative sampling technique with criteria for early students (semester 1 and semester 3). The results of the study prove that in terms of practicality and knowledge possessed by students to choose majors, such as motivation, excelling, enjoyable, easiness, preference will affect decision making (thinking process, and ambiguity). The decision to choose a major that is not in accordance with the major can have a negative effect on the student. This is something that students should pay attention to.

Keywords: *Decision-Making, Framing Effect, Major, Students*

Abstrak

Banyak mahasiswa dalam memilih jurusan pendidikan tinggi tidak sesuai dengan kemampuan dan minatnya. Hal ini akan berdampak pada mahasiswa dalam mengambil keputusan pada pemilihan jurusan. Penelitian ini merupakan study qualitative berjenis survey dengan mahasiswa Universitas Riau sebagai populasi dalam penelitian ini, dengan 556 sampel yang meliputi delapan jurusan dan tiga fakultas dengan menggunakan teknik representative sampling dengan kriteria mahasiswa awal (semester 1 dan semester 3). Hasil penelitian membuktikan bahwa dalam hal praktis dan pengetahuan yang dimiliki oleh mahasiswa untuk memilih jurusan, seperti motivasi, exelling, enjoyable, easiness, preference akan berpengaruh terhadap pengambilan keputusan (proses berpikir, dan ambiguitas). Keputusan dalam memilih jurusan yang tidak sesuai dengan jurusan dapat memberikan efek negatif pada mahasiswa tersebut. hal ini yang harus menjadi perhatian oleh mahasiswa.

Kata Kunci: *Framing Effect, Mahasiswa, Jurusan, Pengambilan Keputusan*

INTRODUCTION

Education has a crucial and strategic function, especially when it is linked to initiatives to increase human resource quality (HR). Because it is

¹ Riau University, ² National University of Malaysia

¹ Correspondence email: suroyo11002@lecturer.unri.ac.id

only through the development of high-quality human resources that true human dignity may be realized. Indonesian Higher Education, namely in 2015, a higher education system was established that included healthy universities capable of contributing to the nation's competitiveness by providing access, justice, and autonomy, as well as contributing to the nation's competitiveness by providing quality characteristics. The number of postsecondary institutions in Riau Province, as one of the educational centers in western Indonesia, has increased dramatically, including both government and private universities (van Elk, 2021). The rapid development of higher education in Riau is predicted to contribute significantly to development in a variety of industries, not only in Riau but throughout Western Indonesia. Furthermore, it is envisaged that universities in Riau will be able to participate and demonstrate their quality at a national level in the future (Chen, 2019); (Washo, 2021); (Kathleen et al., 2022). In the notion of life stages, the age of 15-24 years is an individual development stage at the exploration level, with developmental tasks in identifying interests, abilities, and pursuing career objectives, more especially in the choosing of areas to pursue (Sellitto, Neufang, Schweda, Weber, & Kalenscher, 2021); (Tomar et al., 2021); (Zubair, Wang, Iqbal, Awais, & Wang, 2020). It is difficult to choose a major that is right for you, and many students end up choosing the wrong one (Bartikowski & Berens, 2021); (Stanton & Roelich, 2021).

Indicated that the difficulty in deciding on majors stems from a projection of self-ability in identifying the field/department and this uncertainty manifests itself in challenges that cause people to delegate decision-making authority to others or postpone and avoid making judgments (Cravens et al., 2021); (Wischniewski, Alekseichuk, & Schutter, 2021), resulting in suboptimal decision-making (Rucker, Galinsky, & Magee, 2018); (Bolton, Raven, & Mintrom, 2021). One of the determinants of future career success is the significant decisions made. (Gosnell, 2018); (Maehle, Otte, Huijben, & de Vries, 2021); (Tsiga & Emes, 2021). Majoring decision making is a process of selecting from a variety of options related to one's personal growth, from school days through entering the workforce. Exploration of possible alternative decisions is one of the aspects of

specializing in decision making (Hayen, Klein, & Salm, 2021); (Guo, 2022); (Steinel et al., 2022). (Dahani & Abdullah, 2020); (Siebert, Kunz, & Rolf, 2021). The student's perception of information can be influenced by major selection, and the audience will ponder about the information presented. Framing is the process of arranging messages in a logical order (De Beurs et al., 2019); (Ringhand & Vollrath, 2019); (Eberhardt, Brüggem, Post, & Hoet, 2021).

The information focused attention on certain events and then university and/or major the message in the area of meaning, according to framing theory (Wardley & Alberhasky, 2021). Framing is an essential issue since it has a lot of power, and the concept of framing may be applied to businesses. In essence, framing theory proposes a method for students to digest information (referred to as "frames") in order to affect their decisions (Hancock et al., 2022); (Stroe, Sirén, Parida, & Wincent, 2022). A frame is a concept that helps to arrange the structure of a message's meaning (Reitmann, Goedhuys, Grimm, & Nillesen, 2020); (Majer, Zhang, Zhang, Höhne, & Trötschel, 2022) (Masiliūnas & Nax, 2020); (Smedslund, 2021). The reality on the ground reveals that there is an issue with so many students choosing the wrong major (MacFarlane & Rocha, 2020) (Broberg, Daniel, & Persson, 2021); (Li et al., 2022) (Fernández-Llamazares, Western, Galvin, McElwee, & Cabeza, 2020); (Oostdijk, Van Zoonen, Ruijs, & Mollema, 2021). In the notion of life stages, the age of 15-24 years is an individual development stage at the exploration level (Remijn, Kalsbeek, Platteel, & Kindermann, 2022), with developmental tasks in identifying interests, abilities (Lian, Nettleton, Grange, & Dowrick, 2021), and pursuing career objectives (Kolobashkina & Alyushin, 2020), more especially in the choosing of areas to pursue (Fridman et al., 2018); (Rigtering, Weitzel, & Muehlfeld, 2019); (Sett, 2020); (Goukens & Klesse, 2022). It is difficult for students to choose a major that matches them, resulting in many students pursuing the wrong degree (Goodwin, Raffin, Jeffrey, & Smith, 2018); (Chi, Denton, & Gursoy, 2021); (Rodgers, Degbey, Söderbom, & Leijon, 2022). As a result, incorrect majors might influence a student's desire to change majors; an error in professional decision-making is one of the factors that played a significant part in students' decisions to change college majors

(McCrudden, Marchand, & Schutz, 2021). It can be demonstrated that decision making on major selection, which is presented negatively, has a considerable influence on decision making in the interplay between framing and influencing the effectiveness of majors (Eitan et al., 2018); (Björstig, Mancheva, Zachrisson, Neumann, & Svensson, 2022).

Previous study which had been written by (Katharine G. Abraham, Emel Filiz-Ozbay, Erkut Y. Ozbay, 2020) about framing effect in student loan repayment schemes showed by connecting loan payments to the borrower's salary, income-driven student loan repayment (IDR) schemes protect against unaffordable loan payments and default. Despite the benefits that IDR would provide to many borrowers, take-up remains limited. When expenses are addressed, however, the choice of IRDR is unrelated to students' predicted labor market performance. According to simulation data, a simple tweak in the framing of IDR might result in significant reductions in loan defaults with relatively minor reductions in long-run federal revenue. This research is similar toward the previous research by (Holmes, Doherty, & Flusberg, 2021) showed that Despite the fact that subject-complement sentences such as "girls are as excellent as boys in arithmetic" appear to represent gender equality, people infer a gender difference: the group in the complement position (boys) is deemed superior. Most participants were aware of this influence, and their framing effects were decreased or even reversed; they were also more likely to openly identify subject-complement syntax as biased. Our findings imply that this syntax only promotes preconceptions when people are unaware of, or unmotivated to question, its consequences.

Previous research by Tabesh, (Tabesh, Tabesh, & Moghaddam, 2019) claimed that when decision makers pick inconsistent solutions for identical issues dependent on how the problems are presented to them, this is referred to as the framing effect. Despite significant scholarly research in this field, the majority of existing work is Western-centric and often ignores the features of decision makers and context. The findings, based on the answers of 62 decision makers to numerous decision scenarios, show that framing has a significant impact on the decisions of Iranian experts. Furthermore, the data suggest that framing influences choice through

interacting with decision makers' overall risk-taking proclivity and domain-specific competence. There is a discussion of both theoretical and practical ramifications. Meanwhile, (Gaurav Jain, Gary J. Gaeth, Dhananjay Nayakankuppam, 2020) explain that The influence of round and non-round numbers in a communication message on student evaluations and judgements about the linked target entity The inclusion of non-round numbers in a message frame, as opposed to round numbers, results in heightened attention to numerical values, which leads to a comparison of the related measurements with ideal reference points. As a result, the non-round numbers condition has a stronger framing impact than the round numbers condition.

(Kaczmarek, Przybyszewski, & Sosnowska, 2018) claimed that Examine if mathematical abilities affect some forms of constrained rationality. The "framing effect," a specific case of constrained rationality, is examined empirically in order to test the hypothesis that mathematical competencies and cognitive effort might diminish the framing effect. Experiments were carried out on samples of Polish students, both mathematically and commercially oriented. As an example of a framing scenario, the "Asian illness" example (the earliest analyzed and most popular example of the framing effect) is explored. The hypothesis that a mathematical background may reduce the frequency of the framing effect has been partially proven. However, based on previous research, the novelty/ newness of this research is to give an overview of framing effect affect student's decision making in choosing major of university. Which means there is nobody has research this topic in last ten years, it is included the methodological novelty that qualitative survey is not common method in Indonesia. However, this research carried qualitative method with survey of interview and the mixed theoretical of variable which is common in psychology and/or education field. It could be done with the method in difference field of analytical study.

METHOD

This is a qualitative survey study with framing effects as the independent variable and decision-making as the dependent variable.

Qualitative surveys employ open-ended questions to elicit long-form written/typed responses. Questions will be designed to elicit perspectives, experiences, narratives, or stories. They are frequently used as a prelude to interviews or focus groups since they assist uncover early themes or concerns to be explored further in the study. The participants in this study were University of Riau students, with a total of 556 responses representing eight majors and three faculties. Purposive sampling was used, in which respondents were chosen based on the desired characteristics, such as freshmen (year 1 or semester 1) and sophomores (year 2 or semester 3). The authors used a Likert scale to create the measuring instrument for both variables. A likert scale is a scale that is used to assess a students of views, and decision making of choosing major. Each scale has been put to the test in order to determine its validity and reliability in terms of decision-making and framing effect. *Procedure*, the participants were given a consent form to read and sign, as well as information about the research purpose and process. After that, participants were given the survey of interview in pairs and asked to rate each one on a 1–5 Likert scale on 15 statements with the factor of framing effect, they are Motivation, Excelling, Enjoyable, Easiness, Preference and factor of decision making (thinking and Ambiguity). To understand the item with the factors, the authors write survey protocol to make viewers easier to understand the research.

Table 1. Survey protocol

No.	Survey Item	Factor1 Motivat ion	Factor2 Excelli ng	Facto r3 Easin ess	Factor4 Prefere nce	Factor 5 Enjoya ble
1.	InterviewQuesti on_1	X				
2.	InterviewQuesti on_2		X			
3.	InterviewQuesti on_3			X		
4.	InterviewQuesti on_4				X	
5.	InterviewQuesti on_5					X
6.	InterviewQuesti on_6	X	X	X		

7.	InterviewQuestion_7		X	X
N		Factor1	Factor2	
o.	Survey Item	Thinking	Ambiguity	
1.	InterviewQuestion_1	X		
2.	InterviewQuestion_2	X		
3.	InterviewQuestion_3	X		
4.	InterviewQuestion_4	X		
5.	InterviewQuestion_5			X
6.	InterviewQuestion_6			X
7.	InterviewQuestion_7			X
8.	InterviewQuestion_8			X

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The way a decision is phrased or presented can have a big impact on how people make decisions. If two different but equivalent forms of the same information are provided and the effects of framing on learning preferences and performance were investigated in this study, especially more precisely, this research looked at how grades are framed in terms of gains or losses, and how that affects students' perceptions and learning. The respondent of this research is active students in Riau University with the total of respondent is 556 students from 8 majors and 3 faculties, the most respondent in this research is students who take education majors, while the least respondent from economy science (Table 1). The students who participated in this research are newcomer (year 1 or semester 1) and sophomore (year 2 or semester 3) (Table 2). The range age of respondent from 17 to 21 with the average respondents is 18 and 19. This decreases the impact of framing effects and improves uniformity across frames in a scenario. Newcomers only analyzed the quantitative differences between the two options offered

Table 2. Sample of participants

No.	Major	Faculty	Students
1.	Administrations	Social and Political Sciences	86
2.	International Relations		98
3.	Education Sciences	Education and Teacher	112
4.	Science Education	Training	73
5.	Social Education		64
6.	Language Education		41
7.	Economy Science	Economy and Business	37
8.	Management		45
Total			556

Table 3. Sample of Participants

No.	Newcomer	Sophomore	Major
1.	49	37	Administrations
2.	51	47	International Relations
3.	64	48	Education Sciences
4.	50	23	Science Education
5.	22	42	Social Education
6.	25	16	Language Education
7.	14	23	Economy Science
8.	36	9	Management

Table 4. Sample of Participants

No.	Gender	Respondent
1.	Male	260
2.	Female	296

Furthermore, participants chose majors with a gained grading system over majors with a negative grading system. This real comparison of loss and gain grading systems indicated how framing any grading system in terms of expenditures might negatively effect main perceptions. Framing influenced students ' motivation, but the data also demonstrated that framing influenced how well individuals expected to do in the major and their recommendation to take the department and/or subject in the faculty, study conducted. Demonstrating that framing the issue in terms of losses has a detrimental influence on results. Although there were main impacts of choice making for contextual variables and adding an additional and/or subject performance, there were no principal determinants of decision

making for overall major and/or topic performance, As a result, while certain may have performed better or worse overall, the loss and gain conditions all followed a similar pattern. These findings, which show that the loss grading system led students to demonstrate worse, are in line with the research on framing effects. Recognizing the presence of framing in a communication, on the other hand, does not guarantee that the message's listener will choose to follow the framing's direction. Higher possibilities of being selected in a student's major, for instance, might well have decided to make them more aware of in between intent in the framed deceptions used in this study, but they could have chosen to ignore those framed cues and analyze the information from the more neutral position under different circumstances. Someone who detects someone else's framing tactics may become enraged by the attempted deception and resolve to react. This is an area where more research would have been really helpful..

Table 5, Item of Survey

No	Item of survey	Answers (percentage %)				
		Very Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Very Agree
1.	The rate of acceptance in this major is 25% bigger than other majors	3%	12%	23%	34%	28%
2.	This major is 25% excelling than other majors	5%	17%	20%	32%	26%
3.	Studying in this major is 25% easies than studying in other majors	10%	21%	27%	28%	14%
4.	Many successful people graduate from this majors	23%	29%	28%	14%	6%
5.	Study in this major is enjoyable (friendly lecturer, and good facilities)	10%	26%	28%	24%	12%
6.	The average of alumni from this major have good GPA	28%	34%	12%	23%	3%
7.	The lecturers and major's staff are friendly	5%	20%	17%	26%	32%
8.	I should think to enroll this					

	major at the first place	6%	11%	18%	21%	44%
9.	There is few alternative way to enroll this major	3%	12%	34%	28%	23%
10.	Before enrolling this major, I should think about course and tuition fees	5%	20%	17%	26%	32%
11.	I should get recommendation from alumni to enroll this major	14%	21%	27%	28%	10%
12.	The subject in this major is less than other major and I should think about it	12%	23%	34%	28%	3%
13.	The rate of acceptance in this major is less than 50% and many people failed in this major	26%	32%	20%	17%	5%
14.	The major is excelling but the tuition fee is so expensive	5%	26%	32%	20%	17%
15.	The facilities are so enjoyable, but the staff is not friendly.	3%	12%	28%	23%	34%

Discussion

Another possibility is that students have considerably fewer resources at their disposal and are hence more prone to choose less cognitively demanding strategies when making major judgments. Students usually rely on easily available understanding, or frames, whether or not such a material is applicable to the situation at hand (King et al., 2018); (Hochachka, 2019); (Grover & Furnham, 2021); (Otterbring & Festila, 2022). The notion aids in the development of a frame analysis understanding among social movements (Columbus, Munich, & Gerpott, 2020); (Tal & Kerret, 2020); (D'Acci, 2021); (Schwartz, 2021), as well as in the construction of educational opinion, where manipulation plays a key part in framing impacts on decision-making in selecting universities major opinion surveys that are framed to produce a positive answer to the group that commissioned the poll (Marchetti, Di Dio, Manzi, & Massaro, 2020); (Reese et al., 2020); (Otterbring, Festila, & Folwarczny, 2021a); (Gollust,

Nelson, & Purtle, 2022). It has been stated that the usage of the approach is tarnishing the credibility of political polls. This framing effect is a psychological phenomenon in which people select items based on if they do have favourable or unfavourable connotations (del Río Carral, Volpato, Michoud, Phan, & Gatica-Pérez, 2021); (Otterbring, Festila, & Folwarczny, 2021b); (Kniestedt, Lefter, Lukosch, & Brazier, 2022). When choosing a university degree, students tend to shun risk when provided with a positive framing, but embrace risks when presented with a negative frame. In the scenario, the terms "gain" and "loss" are used to describe the results. Among the most important decision-making biases has been repeatedly proved to be the framing effect. In general, the vulnerability to framing effects increases with age (Matracchi & Sadeghi habibabad, 2022). When deciding on a university major and disciplines, age differences are very crucial. When confronted with it in a university major, however, the framing effect seems to vanish. Speaking a non-native language, according to one idea, produces more emotional and cognitive distance than speaking one's own tongue.

The academic performance of a university is also reviewed more manually than the academic performance of a student. This leads to increased introspection, which can affect decision-making and lead to more systematic choices, particularly when choosing a university major (Takagaki & Krug, 2020); (Bollini, Campus, & Gori, 2021). As a newcomer to university, framing effects in decision-making become greater and this is partly due to the fact that qualitative reasoning improves with age (Markanday & Galarraga, 2021); (Svensson et al., 2022). While sophomores are more inclined to make judgments based on quantitative qualities, Newcomer students are more likely to reason qualitatively, picking a certain choice in a win frame and a hazardous one in a failure frame regardless of probabilities, such as the possibility of a result (Mesa-Vázquez, Rodriguez-Lara, & Urbano, 2021); (Wilson & van der Velden, 2022). However, adolescents' qualitative thinking, and hence their vulnerability to framing effects, is still stronger than adults', and teenagers are more prone to take the risky choice both in the gain or loss frames of something like a given scenario than adults (Jeno, Dettweiler, & Grytnes,

2020); (LaMere, Mäntyniemi, & Haapasaari, 2020). One explanation for students' proclivity for dangerous decisions is that they possess actual knowledge with negative consequences and hence depend too much on conscious risk and benefit assessments, focusing on minute details and quantitative analysis. However, these findings show that people's responses to framing differ significantly. According to recent studies, a student's major may be able to explain a little of that difference (van Esch, Cui, & Jain, 2021); (van der Westhuizen, Arens, Greiff, Fischbach, & Niepel, 2022). Unfortunately, at least from the perspective of employers, The data might not always reflect the ideal relationship between GPA and attribute framing sensitivity. As previously stated, companies use GPA as a predictor of many of the positive attributes they seek in a candidate (Mızrak, Bouffard, Libby, Boorman, & Ranganath, 2021); (Pluchinotta, Salvia, & Zimmermann, 2022). Employers assess candidates for interviews by using decision-making in picking a university major. They reward new recruits who have a higher major and are more involved in decision-making (Valzolgher et al., 2020); (Wang, Zhang, & Tong, 2022)

Framing Effect on Decision-Making in Psychology Perspective

People's opinions of psychology courses were influenced by a loss-framed majoring system, which resulted in lower performance in the actual psychology discipline. This study adds to the body of knowledge on the effects of framing on educational decision-making by demonstrating that frames can have a variety of consequences for people's views and actions (Julian, Keinath, Marchette, & Epstein, 2018); (Ngo, Poortvliet, & Klerkx, 2022). Findings and ideas from decision-making literature are seldom applied to education, particularly when it comes to the best educational methods and variables that might influence students' preferences and frames while choosing a major (Bökman, Andersson, Sörqvist, & Ahonen-Jonnarth, 2021); (Hukkinen et al., 2022). In addition to improvements, it's conceivable that the present study's findings are explained by students' experience with a certain degree. While this is possible, 10 undergraduate students were questioned to test their understanding of various grading systems (Greijdanus et al., 2020); (Muths & Hossack, 2022).

Students were questioned about their familiarity with and to various majoring methods, and although everyone had taken classes that used pure gain majoring systems, 80percent of the total had taken classes that used framing effect evaluation method or a combination of the two. As a result, the vast majority of our sample was familiar with both types of framing when it came to university selection(Lucas, Rosenbaum, Isenberg, Martin, & Schreyer, 2021); (Benschop, Nuijten, Hilhorst, & Keil, 2022). Findings and ideas from decision-making research are seldom applied to education, particularly when it comes to the best instructional practices and elements that impact students' decisions and performance at university. The framing effects examined in this research were influenced by personal concepts and ideas that were being taught and learnt at the time. While comparable framing effects may occur in other fields though too, some areas that employ different teaching methodologies, such as hands-on education in laboratories, are more susceptible to framing effects. or a focus on remembering formulae and methods, may provide distinct outcomes (Ashwell & Murray, 2020). This is something that needs to be looked at more. In line with the study's aim, the review reveals our results in 2 different ways. Students with better major choice and decision-making scores were When utilizing a positive framing, pupils who are far less academically skilled were more receptive and responsive to fundamental informational cues (Riva, 2020). On the other hand, a negative interpretation of the findings suggests that students with stronger decision-making abilities were more sensitive to framing's biasing effects(Reyna, Broniatowski, & Edelson, 2021). Although it may be upsetting to some, It's strangely comforting to know that both kids who excel and students who struggle in the classroom may benefit from these ideas.

Framing Effect on Decision-Making in Sociological Perspective

The capacity of anything to impact people's views and behaviors by tiny changes in how they report on a problem is described by framing effects theory, which has been proposed in both psychology and sociology. It asks how strong these effects are likely to be, framing research in the context of a rapidly and fundamentally changing news and information

market, in which technologies, platforms, and shifting consumption patterns are forcing assumptions at the heart of framing effects theory to be re-evaluated, particularly when it comes to choosing a major in university. However, because substantial framing effect of information introduces confounding variables, it is difficult for students to attribute the effect on the audience to the change of frames. For example, when students want to choose a major in university, they feel like their decision making is low because they are getting framing from their high school teachers and/or family. In Riau University, this technique has relatively poor internal validity and is difficult to distinguish from other cognitive bias effects theories, such as agenda setting and priming. Thus, the bias toward emphasis framing must be addressed by administering equivalence frames to students in order to show a more clear causal link between message framing and its consequences. Furthermore, images have received little attention in framing effects study thus far.

Given that individuals consume information online in a multimedia context, visual frames and verbal-visual interactions must be researched further. Although they are sometimes grouped together, equivalence framing and focus framing are theoretically and practically distinct. As a result, the two traditions must be separated carefully in terms of their origins, conception, and operationalization of frames. "Public discourse, that is, the interface of media discourse and interpersonal interaction; persuasive communication during mobilization campaigns by movement organizations, their opponents, and countermovement organizations, and consciousness raising during episodes of collective action" are all part of the "social construction of collective action frames." based on a random pre-interview with Riau University students, the framing effect of decision making on them utilized to affect their key choice. For example, a family member of a student who is a university alumni would advise them to pick the same major as their siblings and/or family member. This is plainly the framing of picking a major, while the students are framing themselves to choose a major. The presented draft incorporates psychological and social elements that were mostly ignored by the framing technique.

Framing effects that occur immediately following the introduction of the stimuli. However, this does not result in any objective assessment or conclusion. It would be more appropriate to. Furthermore, all other forms of framing effects (formation, transformation, and attitudinal effects) are rather intermediate or long term and require sequential stimulus exposure, particularly when selecting a university major. In conclusion, because practically all research focus on temporal activation effects, one-time presentation of the experimental frame stimulus is adequate in most circumstances. The framing strategy focuses on achieving attitudinal changes such as university major selection. Students anticipate an object to have particular characteristics (cognitive component), with expectations represented as weights in this case. Furthermore, each attribute is assessed (affective component). The product total of all attribute weights and evaluations yields the overall attitude toward the thing. However, if the framing impact in university major selection continually reports on disposal concerns, the affect that is developed on disposal problems grows in significance as well, and attitudes tend to become more unfavorable.

CONCLUSION

The notion of framing is regarded as one of the most important characteristics within the subject of communication science; similarly, the concept of 'fractured paradigm' is seen as one of the most prominent elements within the area of communication science. In terms of practical, applicable knowledge, our findings demonstrate that students with better academic qualifications should not anticipate more objective, impartial conclusions, at particular not just when the decisions include framed attributes. This information is also valuable because it demonstrates that employers should develop decision-making methods that account for and defend against framed signal biases. Given all of the positive characteristics linked having better major standing, it seems from the result of this research that one thing companies cannot expect from these students is that they are less sensitive to framing effects. Furthermore, from an academic sense, these findings offer significant knowledge for the classroom. When educating kids about making decisions and the qualities necessary to make

appropriate and desired judgment, we should not presume that the best and brightest are automatically the most prejudiced or impartial. This article does not examine all techniques to framing, but rather the implications of framing on decision making in selecting a major institution.

REFERENCES

- Ashwell, D., & Murray, N. (2020). When being positive might be negative: An analysis of Australian and New Zealand newspaper framing of vaccination post Australia's No Jab No Pay legislation. *Vaccine*, 38(35), 5627–5633. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.06.070>
- Bartikowski, B., & Berens, G. (2021). Attribute framing in CSR communication: Doing good and spreading the word – But how? *Journal of Business Research*, 131, 700–708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.12.059>
- Benschop, N., Nuijten, A. L. P., Hilhorst, C. A. R., & Keil, M. (2022). Undesirable framing effects in information systems projects: Analysis of adjective usage in IS project business cases. *Information and Management*, 59(3), 103615. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2022.103615>
- Bjärstig, T., Mancheva, I., Zachrisson, A., Neumann, W., & Svensson, J. (2022). Is large-scale wind power a problem, solution, or victim? A frame analysis of the debate in Swedish media. *Energy Research and Social Science*, 83(1–11). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102337>
- Bökman, F., Andersson, H., Sörqvist, P., & Ahonen-Jonnarth, U. (2021). The psychology of balancing gains and losses for self and the environment: Evidence from a carbon emission versus travel time tradeoff task. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 74(February), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2021.101574>
- Bollini, A., Campus, C., & Gori, M. (2021). The development of allocentric spatial frame in the auditory system. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 211, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2021.105228>
- Bolton, M., Raven, R., & Mintrom, M. (2021). Can AI transform public decision-making for sustainable development? An exploration of critical earth system governance questions. *Earth System Governance*, 9, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2021.100116>
- Broberg, T., Daniel, A. M., & Persson, L. (2021). Household preferences for load restrictions: Is there an effect of pro-environmental framing? *Energy Economics*, 97, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105188>
- Chen, C. C. (2019). A cross-country study of leisure constraints and option framing effect in Chinese and Taiwanese package tour market. *Asia*

- Pacific Management Review*, 24(3), 223–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.06.001>
- Chi, O. H., Denton, G., & Gursoy, D. (2021). Interactive effects of message framing and information content on carbon offsetting behaviors. *Tourism Management*, 83, 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104244>
- Columbus, S., Munich, J., & Gerpott, F. H. (2020). Playing a different game: Situation perception mediates framing effects on cooperative behaviour. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 90, 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104006>
- Cravens, A. E., Henderson, J., Friedman, J., Burkardt, N., Cooper, A. E., Haigh, T., ... Wilmer, H. (2021). A typology of drought decision making: Synthesizing across cases to understand drought preparedness and response actions. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, 33, 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2021.100362>
- D'Acci, L. S. (2021). Preferring or Needing Cities? (Evolutionary) psychology, utility and life satisfaction of urban living. *City, Culture and Society*, 24, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2021.100375>
- Dahani, D., & Abdullah, S. M. (2020). Pengambilan Keputusan Jurusan Ditinjau Dari Dukungan Sosial Orangtua Pada Mahasiswa. *Seminar Nasional Hasil Penelitian Dan Pengabdian Pada Masyarakat V Tahun 2020*, 386–391.
- De Beurs, D., Fried, E. I., Wetherall, K., Cleare, S., O' Connor, D. B., Ferguson, E., ... O' Connor, R. C. (2019). Exploring the psychology of suicidal ideation: A theory driven network analysis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 120, 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2019.103419>
- del Río Carral, M., Volpato, L., Michoud, C., Phan, T.-T., & Gatica-Pérez, D. (2021). Professional YouTubers' health videos as research material: Formulating a multi-method design in health psychology. *Methods in Psychology*, 5, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metip.2021.100051>
- Eberhardt, W., Brüggem, E., Post, T., & Hoet, C. (2021). Engagement behavior and financial well-being: The effect of message framing in online pension communication. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 38(2), 448–471.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2020.11.002>
- Eitan, O., Viganola, D., Inbar, Y., Dreber, A., Johannesson, M., Pfeiffer, T., ... Uhlmann, E. L. (2018). Is research in social psychology politically biased? Systematic empirical tests and a forecasting survey to address the controversy. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 79, 188–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2018.06.004>
- Fernández-Llamazares, Á., Western, D., Galvin, K. A., McElwee, P., & Cabeza, M. (2020). Historical shifts in local attitudes towards wildlife

- by Maasai pastoralists of the Amboseli Ecosystem (Kenya): Insights from three conservation psychology theories. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 53, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2019.125763>
- Fridman, I., Glare, P. A., Stabler, S. M., Epstein, A. S., Wiesenthal, A., Leblanc, T. W., & Higgins, E. T. (2018). Information Framing Reduces Initial Negative Attitudes in Cancer Patients' Decisions About Hospice Care. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 55(6), 1540–1545. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2018.02.010>
- Gaurav Jain, Gary J. Gaeth, Dhananjay Nayakankuppam, I. P. L. (2020). Revisiting attribute framing: The impact of number roundedness on framing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 161, 109–119. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.04.006>.
- Gollust, S. E., Nelson, K. L., & Purtle, J. (2022). Selecting evidence to frame the consequences of adverse childhood experiences: testing effects on public support for policy action, multi-sector responsibility, and stigma. *Preventive Medicine*, 154, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106912>
- Goodwin, D., Raffin, M., Jeffrey, P., & Smith, H. M. (2018). Informing public attitudes to non-potable water reuse – The impact of message framing. *Water Research*, 145, 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.08.006>
- Gosnell, G. K. (2018). Communicating Resourcefully: A Natural Field Experiment on Environmental Framing and Cognitive Dissonance in Going Paperless. *Ecological Economics*, 154(July), 128–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.07.020>
- Goukens, C., & Klesse, A. K. (2022). Internal and External Forces that Prevent (vs. Facilitate) Healthy Eating: Review and Outlook within Consumer Psychology. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2022.101328>
- Greijdanus, H., de Matos Fernandes, C. A., Turner-Zwinkels, F., Honari, A., Roos, C. A., Rosenbusch, H., & Postmes, T. (2020). The psychology of online activism and social movements: relations between online and offline collective action. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 35, 49–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.03.003>
- Grover, S., & Furnham, A. (2021). Personality at home vs. work: Does framing for work increase predictive validity of the Dark Triad on work outcomes? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 169, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.109848>
- Guo, P. (2022). Dynamic focus programming: A new approach to sequential decision problems under uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2022.02.044>
- Hancock, P. I., Klotz, L., Shealy, T., Johnson, E. J., Weber, E. U., Stenger,

- K., & Vuppuluri, R. (2022). Framing to reduce present bias in infrastructure design intentions. *IScience*, 25(3), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2022.103954>
- Hayen, A. P., Klein, T. J., & Salm, M. (2021). Does the framing of patient cost-sharing incentives matter? the effects of deductibles vs. no-claim refunds. *Journal of Health Economics*, 80, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2021.102520>
- Hochachka, G. (2019). On matryoshkas and meaning-making: Understanding the plasticity of climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 57, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.05.001>
- Holmes, K. J., Doherty, E. M., & Flusberg, S. J. (2021). How and when does syntax perpetuate stereotypes? Probing the framing effects of subject-complement statements of equality. *Thinking & Reasoning*, 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2021.1963841>
- Hukkinen, J. I., Eronen, J. T., Janasik, N., Kuikka, S., Lehikoinen, A., Lund, P. D., ... Virtanen, M. J. (2022). The policy operations room: Analyzing path-dependent decision-making in wicked socio-ecological disruptions. *Safety Science*, 146(1–10). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2021.105567>
- Jeno, L. M., Dettweiler, U., & Grytnes, J. A. (2020). The effects of a goal-framing and need-supportive app on undergraduates' intentions, effort, and achievement in mobile science learning. *Computers and Education*, 159, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104022>
- Julian, J. B., Keinath, A. T., Marchette, S. A., & Epstein, R. A. (2018). The Neurocognitive Basis of Spatial Reorientation. *Current Biology*, 28(17), 1059–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2018.04.057>
- Kaczmarek, A., Przybyszewski, K., & Sosnowska, H. (2018). The Impact of Mathematical Competences and Cognitive Effort on the Appearance of the Framing Effect. *Economics and Business Review*, 4(18)(2), 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.18559/eb.2018.2.4>
- Katharine G. Abraham, Emel Filiz-Ozbay, Erkut Y. Ozbay, L. J. T. (2020). Framing effects, earnings expectations, and the design of student loan repayment schemes. *Journal of Public Economics*, 183.
- Kathleen, B., Víctor, F. C., Amandine, M., Aurélie, C., Elisabeth, P., Michèle, G., ... Hélène, C. (2022). Addressing joint action challenges in HRI: Insights from psychology and philosophy. *Acta Psychologica*, 222, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2021.103476>
- King, K. M., Littlefield, A. K., McCabe, C. J., Mills, K. L., Flournoy, J., & Chassin, L. (2018). Longitudinal modeling in developmental neuroimaging research: Common challenges, and solutions from developmental psychology. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 33, 54–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2017.11.009>

- Kniestedt, I., Lefter, I., Lukosch, S., & Brazier, F. M. (2022). Re-framing engagement for applied games: A conceptual framework. *Entertainment Computing*, *41*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcom.2021.100475>
- Kolobashkina, L., & Alyushin, V. (2020). Increasing the informativeness content of human face vibraimage through application principles of cognitive psychology. *Procedia Computer Science*, *169*(2019), 876–880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.02.149>
- LaMere, K., Mäntyniemi, S., & Haapasaari, P. (2020). The effects of climate change on Baltic salmon: Framing the problem in collaboration with expert stakeholders. *Science of the Total Environment*, *738*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140068>
- Li, P., Abbasi, A., El-Zahar, E. R., Farooq, W., Hussain, Z., Khan, S. U., ... Wang, F. (2022). Hall effects and viscous dissipation applications in peristaltic transport of Jeffrey nanofluid due to wave frame. *Colloids and Interface Science Communications*, *47*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colcom.2022.100593>
- Lian, O. S., Nettleton, S., Grange, H., & Dowrick, C. (2021). “I’m not the doctor; I’m just the patient”: Patient agency and shared decision-making in naturally occurring primary care consultations. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2021.10.031>
- Lucas, N. V., Rosenbaum, J., Isenberg, D. L., Martin, R., & Schreyer, K. E. (2021). Upgrades to intensive care: The effects of COVID-19 on decision-making in the emergency department. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *49*, 100–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2021.05.078>
- MacFarlane, D., & Rocha, R. (2020). Guidelines for communicating about bats to prevent persecution in the time of COVID-19. *Biological Conservation*, *248*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108650>
- Maehle, N., Otte, P. P., Huijben, B., & de Vries, J. (2021). Crowdfunding for climate change: Exploring the use of climate frames by environmental entrepreneurs. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *314*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128040>
- Majer, J. M., Zhang, K., Zhang, H., Höhne, B. P., & Trötschel, R. (2022). Give and take frames in shared-resource negotiations. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *90*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2022.102492>
- Marchetti, A., Di Dio, C., Manzi, F., & Massaro, D. (2020). Robotics in Clinical and Developmental Psychology. In *Reference Module in Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology* (Second Edn). <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-818697-8.00005-4>
- Markanday, A., & Galarraga, I. (2021). The cognitive and experiential

- effects of flood risk framings and experience, and their influence on adaptation investment behaviour. *Climate Risk Management*, 34, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2021.100359>
- Masiliūnas, A., & Nax, H. H. (2020). Framing and repeated competition. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 124, 604–619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geb.2020.10.002>
- Matracchi, P., & Sadeghi habibabad, A. (2022). Prioritizing the effect of “Light” in the religious places and environments with an emphasis on the sense of spirituality. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, 13(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2021.05.028>
- McCrudden, M. T., Marchand, G., & Schutz, P. A. (2021). Joint displays for mixed methods research in psychology. *Methods in Psychology*, 5, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metip.2021.100067>
- Mesa-Vázquez, E., Rodriguez-Lara, I., & Urbano, A. (2021). Standard vs random dictator games: On the effects of role uncertainty and framing on generosity. *Economics Letters*, 206, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2021.109981>
- Mizrak, E., Bouffard, N. R., Libby, L. A., Boorman, E. D., & Ranganath, C. (2021). The hippocampus and orbitofrontal cortex jointly represent task structure during memory-guided decision making. *Cell Reports*, 37(9), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2021.110065>
- Muths, E., & Hossack, B. R. (2022). The role of monitoring and research in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem in framing our understanding of the effects of disease on amphibians. *Ecological Indicators*, 136, 108577. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2022.108577>
- Ngo, C. C., Poortvliet, P. M., & Klerkx, L. (2022). The persuasiveness of gain vs. loss framed messages on farmers’ perceptions and decisions to climate change: A case study in coastal communities of Vietnam. *Climate Risk Management*, 35, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2022.100409>
- Oostdijk, C., Van Zoonen, K., Ruijs, W. L. M., & Mollema, L. (2021). Household decision-making for the MenACWY vaccination: How parents and adolescents deal with an adolescent vaccination decision. *Vaccine*, 39(31), 4283–4290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.06.036>
- Otterbring, T., & Festila, A. (2022). Pandemic prevention and personality psychology: Gender differences in preventive health behaviors during COVID-19 and the roles of agreeableness and conscientiousness. *Journal of Safety Science and Resilience*, 3(1), 87–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnlssr.2021.11.003>
- Otterbring, T., Festila, A., & Folwarczny, M. (2021a). Replication and extension of framing effects to compliance with health behaviors during pandemics. *Safety Science*, 134, 1–6.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2020.105065>

- Otterbring, T., Festila, A., & Folwarczny, M. (2021b). Selfless or Selfish? The impact of message framing and egoistic motivation on narcissists' compliance with preventive health behaviors during COVID-19. *Current Research in Ecological and Social Psychology*, 2, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cresp.2021.100023>
- Pluchinotta, I., Salvia, G., & Zimmermann, N. (2022). The importance of eliciting stakeholders' system boundary perceptions for problem structuring and decision-making. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 14, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2021.12.029>
- Reese, G., Hamann, K. R. S., Heidbreder, L. M., Loy, L. S., Menzel, C., Neubert, S., ... Wullenkord, M. C. (2020). SARS-Cov-2 and environmental protection: A collective psychology agenda for environmental psychology research. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 70, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101444>
- Reitmann, A. K., Goedhuys, M., Grimm, M., & Nillesen, E. E. M. (2020). Gender attitudes in the Arab region – The role of framing and priming effects. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 80, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2020.102288>
- Remijn, L., Kalsbeek, C. J. C., Platteel, V., & Kindermann, A. (2022). How to support parents and healthcare professionals in the decision-making process of tube feeding in children? *Disability and Health Journal*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dhjo.2021.101261>
- Reyna, V. F., Broniatowski, D. A., & Edelson, S. M. (2021). Viruses, Vaccines, and COVID-19: Explaining and Improving Risky Decision-making. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 10(4), 491–509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2021.08.004>
- Rigtering, J. P. C. (Coen., Weitzel, G. U. (Utz., & Muehlfeld, K. (Katrin). (2019). Increasing quantity without compromising quality: How managerial framing affects intrapreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(2), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2018.11.002>
- Ringhand, M., & Vollrath, M. (2019). Faster or slower? Valence framing of car drivers' urban route choices. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 37, 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2018.12.174>
- Riva, G. (2020). Virtual Reality in Clinical Psychology. In *Reference Module in Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology* (Second Edi). <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-818697-8.00006-6>
- Rodgers, W., Degbey, W. Y., Söderbom, A., & Leijon, S. (2022). Leveraging international R&D teams of portfolio entrepreneurs and management controllers to innovate: Implications of algorithmic decision-making. *Journal of Business Research*, 140(November 2021), 232–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.10.053>

- Rucker, D. D., Galinsky, A. D., & Magee, J. C. (2018). The Agentic–Communal Model of Advantage and Disadvantage: How Inequality Produces Similarities in the Psychology of Power, Social Class, Gender, and Race. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (1st ed., Vol. 58). <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aesp.2018.04.001>
- Schwartz, S. A. (2021). Politics, consciousness, psychology, psychiatry, and brain behavior. *Explore*, *17*(2), 106–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.explore.2020.12.011>
- Sellitto, M., Neufang, S., Schweda, A., Weber, B., & Kalenscher, T. (2021). Arbitration between insula and temporoparietal junction subserves framing-induced boosts in generosity during social discounting. *NeuroImage*, *238*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.118211>
- Sett, R. K. (2020). Inflexible microcredit contracts and their discontents: A theoretical perspective based on consumer psychology: Inflexible microcredit contracts and their discontents. *IIMB Management Review*, *32*(1), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2019.07.009>
- Siebert, J. U., Kunz, R. E., & Rolf, P. (2021). Effects of decision training on individuals' decision-making proactivity. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *294*(1), 264–282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2021.01.010>
- Smedslund, J. (2021). From statistics to trust: Psychology in transition. *New Ideas in Psychology*, *61*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2020.100848>
- Stanton, M. C. B., & Roelich, K. (2021). Decision making under deep uncertainties: A review of the applicability of methods in practice. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *171*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120939>
- Steinel, W., Valtcheva, K., Gross, J., Celse, J., Max, S., & Shalvi, S. (2022). (Dis)honesty in the face of uncertain gains or losses. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *90*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2022.102487>
- Stroe, S., Sirén, C., Parida, V., & Wincent, J. (2022). Framing ideas for new venture resources acquisition in crises: An fsQCA analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *17*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2022.e00307>
- Svensson, O., Andiné, P., Bromander, S., Ask, K., Lindqvist Bagge, A. S., & Hildebrand Karlén, M. (2022). The decision-making process in Swedish forensic psychiatric investigations. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, *80*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2021.101709>
- Tabesh, P., Tabesh, P., & Moghaddam, K. (2019). Individual and contextual influences on framing effect: Evidence from the Middle East. *Journal*

- of *General Management*, 45(1), 30–39.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306307019851337>
- Takagaki, K., & Krug, K. (2020). The effects of reward and social context on visual processing for perceptual decision-making. *Current Opinion in Physiology*, 16, 109–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cophys.2020.08.006>
- Tal, A., & Kerret, D. (2020). Positive psychology as a strategy for promoting sustainable population policies. *Heliyon*, 6(4), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03696>
- Tomar, S., Johns, N., Challa, S., Brooks, M. I., Aliou, S., Abdoul-Moumouni, N., ... Silverman, J. (2021). Associations of Age at Marriage With Marital Decision-Making Agency Among Adolescent Wives in Rural Niger. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 69(6), S74–S80.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2021.08.007>
- Tsiga, Z., & Emes, M. (2021). Decision making in Engineering Projects. *Procedia Computer Science*, 196, 927–937.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.12.094>
- Valzolgher, C., Alzhaler, M., Gessa, E., Todeschini, M., Nieto, P., Verdelet, G., ... Pavani, F. (2020). The impact of a visual spatial frame on real sound-source localization in virtual reality. *Current Research in Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crbeha.2020.100003>
- van der Westhuizen, L., Arens, A. K., Greiff, S., Fischbach, A., & Niepel, C. (2022). The generalized internal/external frame of reference model with academic self-concepts, interests, and anxieties in students from different language backgrounds. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 68, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2021.102037>
- van Elk, M. (2021). A predictive processing framework of tool use. *Cortex*, 139, 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2021.03.014>
- van Esch, P., Cui, Y. (Gina), & Jain, S. P. (2021). The effect of political ideology and message frame on donation intent during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Business Research*, 125, 201–213.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.12.040>
- Wang, X., Zhang, X., & Tong, A. (2022). The impact of linguistic style of medical crowdfunding philanthropic appeals on individual giving. *Procedia Computer Science*, 199, 293–300.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2022.01.036>
- Wardley, M., & Alberhasky, M. (2021). Framing zero: Why losing nothing is better than gaining nothing. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 90, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2020.101641>
- Washo, A. H. (2021). An interdisciplinary view of social engineering: A call to action for research. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 4, 1–8.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2021.100126>

- Wilson, C., & van der Velden, M. (2022). Sustainable AI: An integrated model to guide public sector decision-making. *Technology in Society*, 68, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101926>
- Wischnewski, M., Alekseichuk, I., & Schutter, D. J. L. G. (2021). Behavioral and electrocortical effects of transcranial alternating current stimulation during advice-guided decision-making. *Neuroimage: Reports*, 1(4), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ynirp.2021.100052>
- Zubair, M., Wang, X., Iqbal, S., Awais, M., & Wang, R. (2020). Attentional and emotional brain response to message framing in context of green marketing. *Heliyon*, 6(9), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04912>