

Questions for week 11, framing and counter-framing

Answer ONE of the following questions. Come to class prepared to discuss ALL of them. Essays should be limited to one page single spaced and should have perhaps one-third of the essay describing the issue and the rest analyzing it. It is preferable to go into detail on a small part of the issue, giving examples or illustrations, than to remain at a general level. The devil is always in the details.

1. Schumann et al. refer to a particular model of persuasion (the Elaboration Likelihood Model). Is their methodology and set of theoretical concerns relevant to political science studies of framing and if so why do we not use it?
2. Last week my article in Governance referred to the power of the status quo as a particular element which varies from issue to issue. Some issues have powerful arguments supporting their continued respect, whereas others face a crisis because the status quo policy obviously does not work well. Is this concept picked up in any of the studies on reframing? How could it be incorporated?
3. Compare Druckman et al. 2003 and 2007. What varies is whether there are multiple conversations among the mass public, or multiple signals coming from the elites. Could these be directly compared? How?
4. In The Real No Spin Zone we make some surprising assertions, based on our large field-work based study. Are those results believable? Why do we focus so much on reframing if reframing occurs so rarely? Compare to Riker from last week.
5. Druckman's 2012 and 2013 articles represent some of the most recent studies on the topic, and among the best. Summarize one of them and discuss.
6. Thinking generally about all the readings this week and last, where do we stand with the study of reframing effects? What simple questions would we *like* to know, but which we do not in fact know? What are the biggest such questions that actually could be studied?