

*(Annotation is conducted using the Chinese-language guidelines; English version is provided below for reference only.)*

## 身份认同逻辑标注手册

**1. 任务概述** 本任务旨在识别社交媒体文本中，作者表达对某人、某群体或某区域产生认同或归属感的标准与逻辑。标注员需分析作者明确或隐含表达的认同依据，并标记所有适用的身份认同逻辑（RL）类别。每段文本可能对应一个或多个RL标签。

**核心限定：** 仅在文本明确传达作者用于表达身份认同或归属感的标准时进行标注。仅讨论财富、生活方式、房产或社会地位的内容，如未与“认同”或“归属”逻辑强相关，不予标注。

## 2. 核心标注原则

- **聚焦作者立场：** 标注应反映作者本人表达认同或归属的逻辑，而非他人观点或泛泛讨论。
- **推理认同逻辑功能：** 分析该认同逻辑在作者建构归属感、正当性或共享身份时所起的社会功能。
- **需要语境推理：** 既要考虑显性表达，也要推断其潜在逻辑。
- **排除抵触/他人标准：** 对于作者明确否定或归因于他人且未认同的标准不予标注。

## 3. 身份认同逻辑类别（Recognition Logic Categories）

- **RL1：社会习惯性区域认知**  
基于历史或习惯沉淀形成的城市空间认知逻辑。如“某地不算真正的xx”，反映象征性区域归属。
- **RL2：行政归属合法性**  
依据户籍、区划、法律归属等进行认同界定。线索如“划进来”、“行政上属于”、“身份证开头”。
- **RL3：家族历史根基**  
基于祖辈、父辈、本人长期生活经验的认同逻辑。表达如“祖辈一直在这里”、“我从小就在这”。
- **RL4：文化语言识别性**  
方言、口音或习俗作为判断“圈内人”的线索。如“讲我们这的方言”、“懂我们这的规矩”。
- **RL5：生活功能便利性作为身份认同逻辑**  
通过提及交通、配套、教育、宜居性等生活条件，表达对某区域或群体的归属认同、身份区隔或空间正当性判断。表达如“我们这边学区好”。
- **RL6：社会根基与经济象征**  
以社会关系网络或房产等资产来判断归属或象征身份稳固。表达如“人脉多”、“有几套房”、“老街坊”。

- **RL7: 职业类型所承载的群体象征**  
通过职业群体与特定区域或社区的象征性关联建构身份认同，职业类型被用作划定归属、阶层认知或圈内/圈外界限的标志。表达如“那里都是种地的”。

#### 4. 标注流程

- 通读全文：理解作者语气与意图，判断其是否表达了身份认同或归属态度。
- 识别涉及的对象：找出文中被评价的人群、区域、职业、文化特征等对象。
- 判断认同逻辑：问自己：作者是基于什么逻辑表达认同或归属感？参考 RL 类别与特征判断。
- 选择所有适用的 **RL** 标签：一段文本可包含多种认同逻辑。根据作者立场判断所有适用类别，而非机械匹配关键词。
- 如有疑问，请写下注释：如有争议性判断，请简要写明理由，便于核对与协作修订。

#### 5. 注意事项与常见错误

- 仅当作者表达自己对某人、群体或区域的身份认同、归属感或象征性接纳/排斥，且所用标准具备实际身份判断功能时，方可标注。不要仅因出现关键词或客观描述即判断为认同逻辑。
- 作者仅表达生活喜好（如“这边绿化好”）时不标注；但如表达“这片配套太差，不是‘我们’会住的地方”，则可标注为 RL5。
- 作者明确否定、质疑、讽刺某种标准时，不应将其作为认同逻辑标注。
- 一段话可能同时包含多个认同逻辑（如语言+家族+社会关系），可多标签标注，但需确保每个逻辑均有明确支持。
- 如有不确定情况，请在备注栏说明理由，并向团队提问或查阅边界案例。

### Identity Recognition Logic Annotation Manual

**1. Task Overview** This annotation task focuses on identifying the standards and reasoning that the author of a social media post uses to express recognition or affiliation with a person, group, or region. Annotators must analyze both explicit and implicit expressions of alignment or inclusion, and label all applicable Recognition Logic (RL) categories. Each text may receive one or multiple RL labels.

**Key Limitation:** Only annotate when the text conveys reasoning behind identity recognition or alignment. Do not annotate content that merely discusses wealth, lifestyle, property, or social status unless it is clearly or strongly associated with the author's expression of identity, belonging, or group affiliation.

#### 2. Core Annotation Principles

- **Focus on Authorial Position:** Annotations must reflect the standards the author uses to express who they identify with—not general discussion or other people's views.
- **Infer Recognition Function:** Analyze what social function the recognition logic serves in constructing inclusion, legitimacy, or shared identity.
- **Contextual Reasoning Required:** Consider both explicit wording and underlying

implications.

- **Exclude Rejected or External Standards:** Do not annotate criteria the author rejects or attributes to others without endorsement.

### 3. Recognition Logic (RL) Categories

- **RL1: Vernacular Spatial Authority**  
Recognition based on culturally sedimented understandings of intra-city space. Expressions like “X place doesn’t feel like part of us” reflect symbolic spatial belonging.
- **RL2: Administrative Legitimacy**  
Recognition grounded in formal administrative inclusion. Common clues include phrases like “administratively incorporated,” “legally belongs to,” or references to ID numbers as evidence of official affiliation.
- **RL3: Family Rootedness**  
Identity grounded in ancestral or generational ties. “My family has been here for three generations,” “I grew up here.”
- **RL4: Linguistic-Cultural Recognition**  
Shared dialects, accents, or customs serve as group identity cues. “Speaks our dialect,” “familiar with our rules.”
- **RL5: Functional Liveability**  
Identity is expressed or implied through references to urban infrastructure or environmental comfort, where such traits serve as symbolic markers of group belonging, boundary maintenance, or spatial legitimacy. Examples include associating certain areas with “our kind of people” due to comfort, or rejecting others as “not for us” due to lack of amenities.
- **RL6: Social Embeddedness**  
Recognition tied to social networks and economic embeddedness. “Knows everyone,” “owns several apartments here,” “receives community dividends.”
- **RL7: Occupational Typification**  
Identity is constructed through the symbolic association between occupational groups and specific places or communities, where professions serve as proxies for group belonging, class identity, or insider/outsider boundaries. Examples include associating migrant laborers or farmers with certain areas to imply social rank or outsider status.

### 4. Annotation Procedure

- **Read the full text carefully:** Understand the author’s tone, intention, and whether they are expressing any form of identity recognition or affiliation.
- **Identify entities and groups involved:** Highlight any mentioned people, groups, places, or occupations that the author evaluates or comments on.
- **Determine the recognition logic:** Ask: What basis is the author using to express recognition or alignment with a group or space? Refer to the RL categories and their indicators.
- **Select all applicable RL labels:** Multiple logics may coexist. Mark all RL categories that reasonably apply based on the author’s stance, not just surface keywords.
- **Write down your rationale if in doubt:** Briefly note why you believe a particular logic applies. This helps consistency checks and collaborative revision.

### 5. Reminders and Common Mistakes

- Only annotate when the author expresses their own stance of identity recognition or affiliation, and the logic meaningfully supports such a stance. Do not annotate just because a keyword or general description is present.
- Do not annotate personal lifestyle preferences unless clearly linked to identity. For example, “I like the greenery here” is not valid, but “This area is too poorly equipped, not for people like us” can be tagged as RL5.
- Do not annotate logics that the author explicitly rejects, mocks, or resists.
- Multiple recognition logics may coexist—label all that apply, ensuring each is reasonably supported.
- When uncertain, write your reasoning briefly in the note column and consult the team.