Questions of the Week and Discussion Board Submission for WEEK 3: Issue Framing This week’s discussion board is more of a mini exercise rather than traditional questions of the week. For this week, let’s try analyzing how a major news story is being framed by different parties who are either involved in or interested in the issues at the center of the story. Ideally, you’d pick an issue in the news, but to be honest, you could pick almost any controversial story or incident in politics or even culture where people are arguing about what happened, whether the events of the story are good or bad, and if bad, who is responsible (i.e. who’s to blame?). It could be a political issue, but it also could be a cultural event, a spat between two celebrities, or the outcome of a sports event. Seriously. Framing is everywhere! So here’s what to do in your post. briefly describe the incident or issue you’re analyzing. Describe how at least two different interested parties are characterizing the incident or issue in different ways. Be sure to clarify for us how the parties differ in their description / explanation. Now, for at least one of those parties: analyze their version of the story and try to explain to us how that party is FRAMING the incident or issue. In other words: show us how they are trying to get others to see the issue their way. How are they framing the issue? Why are they framing it that way: in other words WHY do they want us to see the issue or incident a certain way? What is the motive? Why does it matter to them that we see the issue/incident the way they do? What do they have to gain from outsiders adopting their point of view. There's a lot of flexibility in how you approach this discussion post. Here's just one example of how you might approach your post: Think about a problem that you have argued about or people generally argue about For example: you could think about the Jan. 6th 2021 incident at the Capitol in Washington DC (“the insurrection” … or was it “the attempted coup”…. Or was it just a riot… or was it a legitimate and patriotic protest or rebellion against tyranny… OR you could go the other way and think about something in your (micro) life. Any issue or incident or event where a few people (even just two) were in a dispute about the meaning, the facts, the details of some incident or event or issue. What I’m getting at here is your group could just choose to talk about a controversy at the personal level. Describe at least two contending accounts of the event / incident / issue in question. Describe each “side” of the debate Talk about: how did they differ? Where exactly do think the points of difference were that caused the parties’ views to diverge? Finally: think about how your example illustrates some of the points that social constructivists raise. Was the event / incident / issue seen by everyone as a problem? (And if so, what KIND of problem?) How did people differently “code” the meaning of the problem? (maybe ask: was the problem seen as a private matter or not? If not entirely private, was it seen by some as a public problem --- i.e. a problem where the larger public has a responsibility to intervene in some way)? How did people differently assign RESPONSIBILITY for the problem (who caused it? Who should fix it?)?