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1 Summary**:** *Describe the main goals of the project, what is the scientific question you are trying to answer, and how will you go about it in no more than 300 words.*

The project aims to understand how educational attainment influences the complexity and deviation of individuals' definitions of hate speech. Hate speech, a growing phenomenon amplified by the Internet, raises questions about digital governance of social media. This study will analyze whether the discourse around hate speech regulation is confined to the academic world or extends to non-academics. Using survey data, this research will measure the level of complexity in hate speech definitions and examine the ideological deviation in these definitions considering formal education. The study seeks to contribute to the broader understanding of how education influences political knowledge and opinions, specifically in the context of defining and regulating hate speech.

2 Motivation and background**:** *Why is this research question interesting to you, how does your background align with the topic, and what skills or knowledge do you want to acquire by doing the work that is valuable for your future career?*

**Die Stichpunkte hier einfach für alles verwenden. Unbedingt mal sortieren nach PAP-Abgabe und damit dann Intro / Discussion / Conclusion füllen.**

## In General

*- Why is this research question interesting (can also includes facts from Munzert et al., einfach hier hinschieben…*

after “normal” school life (which varies between countries and career paths quite a lot), society seems to be parted in an academic and non-academic world, which is probably mirrored in the labor market concerning salaries (SOURCE?) as well as in public opinion and discourse (SOURCE?). The problem of pure academic discourses is widely discussed (SOURCE?) and contributes to a less common ground in societies (SOURCE?). With this study I want to contribute to the question if the existence and the understanding of hate speech is actually perceived in both groups. -> Ziel: analysieren, ob sich der Diskurs um Hate Speech Regulierung aktuell eigentlich nur in der akademischen Bubble abspielt, weil Nicht-Akademiker\*innen vielleicht nicht mal abgrenzen können, was mit HS gemeint ist. „Elfenbein-Diskurs“?

**FIRST PART (motivating measuring differentiation-level of HS-definition)**

„the political discourse is increasingly characterized by hate speech, which affects not only the reputation of individual politicians but also the functioning of society at large.“ (Solovev & Pröllochs, 2022)

Hate Speech, meaning XY, is a growing phenomenom. -> izqui.., Guillen.. as sources

The topic of hate speech gets even bigger nowadays, especially for questions of digital governance, seen that generative AI generates content based on already existent content from the internet and is able to reproduce violent content up to a huge scale. (find this or similar content in izqui..)

The role of formal education on political attitudes

/ is very ambivalently discussed. Für **allgemein political knowledge** und **political Opinion / engagement in politics** scheiden sich allerdings die Geister / es gibt sehr gemischte Erkenntnisse, ob akademische Bildung hier eine Rolle spielt oder nicht (Bobo & Licari, 1989; J. Chan, 2019; Highton, 2009; Witschge et al., 2019)

The role of formal education on political views is part of an ongoing discussion. While it is shown that more education leads to more political sophistication, …

“Political inclinations of individuals (liberal vs. conservative) largely shape their opinions on several issues such as abortion, gun control, nuclear power, etc” (Akoglu, 2014) -> This fact is also supported by Hejdecken. But is it true also for the topic of hate speech??? This should be found out.

“Strong evidence has been emerging that major democracies have become more politically polarized, at least according to measures based on the ideological positions of political elites.” (Draca & Schwarz, 2021) -> supports Hejdecken that more education creates greater polarization in certain political issues

There are contradictory findings on the relationship between formal education and political knowledge. And still, even though evidence of the role of education (especially formal education) for political knowledge is unclear, quite many papers propose to confront the issue of hate speech with more education on the topic (Keen et al., 2020; Estellés and Castellví, 2020; Jubany, Olga, 2016). This could be due to the good evidence that more knowledge also makes people more tolerant.

“The effects of education on tolerance are strong even when a person has negative feelings toward the target group (…) A substantial fraction of the education effect on tolerance is **mediated by cognitive sophistication**. (…) This paper helps identify why and when (e.g., cognitive sophistication and dislike of a target group) education enhances political tolerance. “ (Bobo & Licari, 1989)

And what ist he status quo with people’s knowledge on hate speech whatsoever? Does formal education make a difference?

Obviously, people already have a different starting point of educational background - in order to find out what people should know or learn about hate speech, we need to know their basis.

Discourse on hate speech does not enough take into account which **basis of knowledge people have about hate speech** -> question of (civic) education? Or decided by degree of formal education?

* This is why it is interesting to measure the level of differentiation in HS-definitions.

Munzert et al. and Sellars both cast doubt that hate speech regulation can be automated. According to Sellars, this has also a lot to with unclear or better: too broad definition of the concept

**(motivating the analysis of deviation in people’s definitions, considering their formal education)**

Ist die Abwägung zwischen Freedom of Speech und Protection of all societal groups ein reiner Elfenbein-Diskurs, geführt von der akademischen Welt? Oder erreicht der Diskurs auch alle Teile der Gesellschaft?

* This is why I see the need to analyze the deviation in people’s definitions of hate speech, considering their formal education.

*Elicits Antwort auf die Frage: How defining hate speech becomes political: How polarized are hate speech definitions of individuals?*

Hate speech is a complex and contentious issue, with its definition and regulation often becoming politicized (George, 2014). This is particularly evident in the online political discourse, where hate speech is more likely to be directed at certain groups, such as people of color from the Democratic party, white Republicans, and women (Solovev, 2022). The challenges in defining hate speech, especially in online contexts, are further complicated by the need for a balance between freedom of expression and the protection of vulnerable groups (Hietanen, 2022). Despite the increasing attention to hate speech in the scientific literature, there is a lack of research from the fields of communication and education, which could provide valuable insights into its management and impact (Montero, 2022).

### Why this data is interesting.

Since the impact of formal education on political attitudes and opinion is not easy to measure (see Introduction), it is of big interest to look at this variable in the context of the big study Munzert et al., seen that the survey provides many details on people’s attitudes and characteristics, political views, and even their estimated degree of empathy, allowing to control for many confounding factors.

### Policy Relevance

The Digital Services Act …. Also **country-based design**, that is why it is important how much people know about the phenomenom and hwo this knowledge is distributed across different groups.

Second interesting question: how big is the role of formal education, when we control for the known impacting factors like gender and left-right positioning / partisanship?

From a legal perspective, definitions of phenomena that need to be regulated are very important, especially if we talk about new technologies, which are known for beinhalten große legale Spielräume und Grauzonen. As we have seen in the development of the AI act, the pure definition of AI was one of the main topics discussed.

If formal education plays a big role (as in that a higher education leads to a better understanding of what hate speech is), governments can try to foster this part of civic education in institutions for low and middle education.

If formal education does not play a significant role, policy makers need to find the channels through which society can find a common ground, also to make law about the phenomenom more easy to understand and accept – seen that the DSA is forcing (SOURCE) governments to act on the matter and that hate speech online is probably (SOURCE) contributing to a greater polarization and disruption of democratic discourse (SOURCE), all these developments are a reason for governments to act decisively against it.

### ### how does my background align with this topic

* Previous training as a teacher and former thesis on the implementation of civic education, work in the ministry of labor and social affairs on digital governance during my professional year

### ### what skills/knowledge do I want to get through the project, valuable for my future career?

Write a quantitative thesis, gain statistical knowledge while working with a complex survey arrangement, combining statistical skills with understanding of knowledge and the (quantitative) work with text as data

Integrate Data Science methods (e.g. NLP) in classic statistical analysis

3 Introduction: *Discuss what is the context for the research question and what previous work has been conducted in this area. Please discuss 1-3 key academic papers that are most relevant to your project. You should summarise the papers, the goal and achievement of the papers, data and methods used in the papers, and how they relate to your proposed topic. Also include references to other relevant papers in the introduction as needed.*

The context of my research question encompasses questions of educational attainment effects on political knowledge and attitudes, as well as studies on the phenomenon of hate speech, how it is defined and what this definition (or better these definitions) depend(s) on.

Therefore, the *relevant papers to look at with more detail* can be sorted into two groups: firstly, papers that examine educational effects on political knowledge and opinion, and then papers that look at hate speech definitions and attitudes.

## ## Education and Political Opinion / Knowledge / Attitudes

The question whether education shapes political opinion is discussed on a regular basis.

On the one hand, research on characteristics of voters shows that Trump voters (Rothwell & Diego-Rosell, 2016) and those who voted for Great Britain to leave the EU (Becker et al., 2017) were less likely to have a postsecondary education. Political campaigns like Brexit or the phenomenon Trump have in common that they encouraged intolerant attitudes towards minorities – drawing a connection to the topic of hate speech and raising the question how it might be associated with educational attainment.

**Education is one of the fundamental forces shaping people's political knowledge (Weinschenk & Dawes, 2019)and opinions** (J. M. Chan et al., 2002; Weakliem, 2002) (… add more sources that support this statement) -> this might also be true for the **opinion on hate speech regulation on social media**, since it is strongly connected to political views on concepts like freedom of speech and discrimination (the question how to deal with it), making a connection to liberal views versus strong protection of vulnerable groups etc.

### Discourse about the role of formal education for political attitudes

The role of formal education for political attitudes / is very ambivalently discussed. Für **allgemein political knowledge** und **political Opinion / engagement in politics** scheiden sich allerdings die Geister / es gibt sehr gemischte Erkenntnisse, ob akademische Bildung hier eine Rolle spielt oder nicht:

Edu -> Political Opinion

* Chan 2019: “I find that there is a negative correlation between a region's college-educated population share and that region's search activity for **intolerance**-related terms.”
* Bobo 1989: “The effects of education on **tolerance** are strong even when a person has negative feelings toward the target group”
* Van Heijden & Verkuyten did only find a low correlation of educational level with political orientation
* At the same time: Hall (2018): long recognized relationship between political knowledge and tolerance toward unpopular groups -> knowledge about HS could raise awareness for vulnerable groups. But does the knowledge come from more formal education?! Knowledge about the constitution and human rights education might now be higher for those who have acquired a higher level of formal education. (Hall, 2018)

Edu -> Political Knowledge

* Contribution to this question: “In many studies, education is the strongest predictor of **political knowledge**. However, some studies have found that education has no effect on knowledge once confounding variables are taken into account.” (Munzert et al., to be published)
* “The relationship between education and political knowledge is highly confounded by genes and/or familial environment” Weinschenk
* Munzert summarized this question wie folgt: “In many studies, education is the strongest predictor of **political knowledge**. However, some studies have found that education has no effect on knowledge once confounding variables are taken into account.” (Munzert et al., to be published)

Edu -> Political Interest/ Engagement

* Witschge et al. 2019: “The findings demonstrate that transitions in the type of education have little effect on **intention to vote**, trust in institutions or ethnic tolerance. However, students making transitions in general/academic education develop higher levels of **interest in politics** **and generalised trust** than do students in vocational education or people outside the education system. This point suggests that **general/academic education fosters** **civic and political participation**.”
* Students on a track to higher education develop a greater level of interest in politics (Witschge)
* Highton 2009: no significant effect of attending and graduating from college on **political awareness** (Highton, 2009)
* But studies on the relationship between type of education and political engagement have led to mixed findings. (Witschge)

### ### Van der Heijden & Verkuyten 2020

The Supplementary Materials contain: (a) fit indices of confirmatory factor analyses, (b) fit indices for measurement invariance test for level of education, (c) Standardized regression coefficients for predicting negative outcomes, excluding educational level, (d) Standardized regression coefficients for predicting negative outcomes, including educational levels, (e) Wald test findings for difference testing of the path from political orientation to social conformity and group-based inequality, (f) The moderating role of education (for access see Index of Supplementary Materials below).

Summary:

The paper titled "Educational Attainment, Political Sophistication and Anti-Immigrant Attitudes" by Eva van der Heijden and Maykel Verkuyten investigates the relationship between education level, political orientation, and attitudes toward immigrants and refugee policies. The study was conducted in the Netherlands, with a sample of 1,155 Dutch respondents.

Goal and Achievement:

The goal of the study was to find out whether two core ideological aspects of political orientation (endorsement of social conformity and acceptance of inequality) are more present within the views of higher than of lower educated individuals, assumed that the former would have a more sophisticated set of political attitudes.

Following this goal, van der Heijden and Verkuyten could show that the impact of political orientation on people’s attitudes towards immigrants and refugee policies differs for higher and lower educated individuals. The authors found a notable association between right-wing political orientation and negative attitudes towards immigrants and restrictive refugee policies, while political orientation is more ideologically defined for individuals with higher education compared to those with lower education.

Data/Methods:

The study employed a variety of measures including feeling thermometers towards different immigrant groups, Likert scales for attitudes towards refugee policies, and scales for political orientation, social conformity, and acceptance of inequality. The data were analyzed using structural equation modeling.

Relation to my project:

* Also puts in relation educational attainment and political knowledge and opinion
* highlights the role of ideological sophistication, showing that higher education leads to a more nuanced and coherent political orientation, which in turn influences attitudes towards socially and politically contentious issues like immigration and refugee policies
* Suggests that higher eduational attainment could contribute to less tolerant views towards minorities (?)
* Motivates the question whether higher education contributes to a differentiated understanding of what hate speech is, or in the opposite direction, if the existence of hate speech might even be doubted more, expanding the span of possible answers to what hate speech actually is, because of a more polarized view on the matter.
* Sets foundation for H1 and H2

## ## Hate Speech - definition and attitudes

Definition of HS look at resources, e.g. (Izquierdo Montero et al., 2022) und Notes siehe Zotero Note – oder Lieber direct Sellars? Oder Dusche? Solovev?

### ### Most Relevant paper: Citizen Preferences for Online Hate Speech Regulation (Munzert et al., to be published)

Contributes to **Hate Speech Definition and Attitudes**

Summary: With their vignette study, (Munzert et al., to be published) are analyzing citizen’s preferences for online hate speech regulation (sample size: 2,622 German and U.S. citizens. Respondents were asked to judge artificial but realistic cases of hate speech in terms of offensiveness, hatefulness and actions that should be taken against these posts. The experiment includes a framing and exposure experiment and is embedded in a survey, allowing the authors to examine the experimental findings in the context of basic sociodemographic information like gender and educational background, as well as political views, media usage and questions on empathy, as former research has shown that those characteristics influence people’s attitudes towards hate speech.

A main finding is that type and severity of the messages are most important for people’s evaluations, while contextual factors about the content seem to be less relevant. Respondents generally prefer less extreme measures like deleting hateful messages, but overall there are substantial differences in opinion between gender and ideological subgroups. Tolerance of unpopular opinions is reduced by primer exposure to hateful content.

Goal and achievement: The study contributes to the debate over content moderation and regulation of online speech – fostering dialogue about the concrete design and implementation of regulatory frameworks like the Digital Services Act (DSA) in the European Union.

Data and methods -> noch schreiben, see PDF Ende vom eigentlichen Paper, especially Study 1 and 3 and education measurement

Relation to my proposed topic

In retrospect, “Citizen Preferences for Online Hate Speech Regulation” (Munzert et al., to be published) can be seen as a preliminary study to the new big survey experiment on “Global Preferences for Hate Speech Moderation”, from which the data will be used in this study. The new vignette experiment embedded in a cross-sectional survey expands a very similar approach to more countries. Therefore, findings from the first paper in the U.S. and Germany can be taken as an anker for follow-up research with the new data.

Rest see PDF marking on iPad!!! Stichwörter:

* Control variables
* Comment on existing hate speech definitions
* Perceived harm of speech varies per person -> knowledge of the concept may influence the perception
* Exposure influences opinion? **It does not**, says the study when controlling for if people were exposed before. at the same time, in study 3, it does influence opinions.. Then it would probably also influences knowledge!!? Is confounding my variable…
* Edu attainment plays a slightly different role in US and GER -> interesting to look at this in the global south as well
* A question of norms? Transportation of norms exists also in educational institutions and differently in the countries
* Respondents = untrained, but still able to judge in a similar way – does edu on the topic even matter?
* Since the study casts doubt on potential automation, to achieve more common views it is probably good to look at instruments that states have to achieve thath – one are educational insitutions -> it is important to examine their role and potential impact.

### ### Kansok-Dusche: A Systematic Review on Hate Speech among Children and Adolescents: Definitions, Prevalence, and Overlap with Related Phenomena

This paper is interesting for my study not only because its observation of different hate speech definitions, but also proposes a categorization of broadness / narrowness of these definitions, which I will use, among other things, to measure differentiation.

*(Kansok-Dusche et al., 2023)*

* *„evidence suggests that definitional ambiguities of hate speech are prevalent in academic research (as shown for Germany by Sponholz, 2020)“*
* *“Without a precise theoretical definition of hate speech and the ability to soundly differentiate it from related phenomena, empirical research may lack validity“ -> limitation of my research?*
* *“a* ***text-based detection approach was applied to identify general terms and descriptive features of hate speech definitions*** *(see Appendix 2). This approach was followed for 15 publications for which the full-text coding process revealed that definitions existed.”*
* *“****This process created a typology of definitions that referred to the total number of descriptive features required to decide on whether a given definition was broad, medium, or narrow in scope****.” -> total wichtig für meine Operationalisierung von Differenziertheit (differentiation)!!! ☺*
* Forms: e.g., derogatory words, pictures, videos, graffiti. Targets: e.g. marginalized groups, in-/out-groups, individuals. Effects: e.g. harm or benefits for individuals, in-/out-groups, society. Perpetrator: e.g., aims/purpose/intent to harm, hate, prejudice, toxic online disinhibition. Context: e.g., online/offline modus; locations. Publicity: publicly, privately. Directness: absence/presence of targeted individual or group
* 2Scope based on the total number of descriptive terms: broad: 1–3, medium 4–5, narrow: >6.

*Das als ein Paper zur Definition politischer Konzepte? Z.B. Kansok-Dusche, weil es eine* ***riesige Review zu HS-Definitionen*** *ist, zwar von Kindern/Jugendlichen, aber da die auch die Hauptuser\*innen auf Social Media sind (Keen et al., 2020), ist das wahrscheinlich nicht so schlimm..*

OR (chose who has a more fruitful method for my work. Probably Dusche because of broadness measurement (the “types” described by Hietanen look more philosophical.. but the examples of definitions also from platform providers are very interesting in Hietanen).

### ### Hietanen 2022 - Towards a Definition of Hate Speech—With a Focus on Online Contexts

* What are the main challenges encountered when defining hate speech? What alternatives are there for the definition of hate speech? What is the relationship between the nature and scope of the definition and its operationability?
* Contains example legal definitions of various countries!! ☺
* Describes difficulties of definition
* “Baseline definition” of European Comission is described here ☺: “definition of hate speech as the incitement to violence or hatred against a group, defined in relation to race, religion or ethnicity.”
* Auf jeden Fall **im Methodenteil nutzen**!!!
* **Contains legal definitions, platform definitions**… richtig gut!
* **🡪 suggests four general definition modes for hate speech: a teleological, a pure consequentialist, a formal (in Platonic or Aristotelian terms), and a consensus or relativist mode.**

4 Research question**:** *What research question will you try to answer with the thesis and what is the main approach to address the question? If you are testing hypotheses, specify them here as well*

**Add later:** Genauere Herleitung der Fragestellung und Hypothesen (siehe Markierungen in Hejden Verkuyten.)

## Research Question

**"How does educational attainment influence the understanding of individuals' definitions of hate speech and their opinion of what should not be allowed to be said on the internet?"**

Is the discourse on hate speech purely academic?

* Does an academic degree influence people’s knowledge what hate speech is?
* Do personal hate speech definitions differ stronger from those more educated?

"How does educational attainment influence the understanding (complexity and deviation?) of individuals' definitions of hate speech?"

Subquestions:

* How does this effect differ between countries?
* How does this effect differ for ideological subgroups?

## Hypotheses

Herleitung der Hypthesen (hauptsächlich Heijden Paper siehe Markierungen auf iPad)

Research suggests that people with higher educational attainment have a more sophisticated understanding of political concepts in general. This leads to H1:

**(H1): People with higher educational attainment (academics) provide more differentiated/complex definitions of hate speech compared to those with lower educational attainment (non-academics).**

* From Heijdecken and Verkuyten’s findings I draw the assumptions that polarization in people’s understanding of what hate speech is could vary more in the academic sphere. This leads me to H2:

**(H2):** Definitions of hate speech from respondents with academic education show greater political polarization than those from non-academic respondents.

**(H2): Answers from academic respondents on what should not be allowed to be said on social media show greater polarization than those from non-academics**

\*\* Polarization in what should not be allowed to be said on social media\*\*

**Oder.** More differentiated definitions of hate speech show greater (political?) variations between individual definitions of the phenomenon.

* da gab es doch was in der Literatur, dass mit höherem Bildungsgrad auch die left-right Ausrichtung extremer wird!!? Das würde perfekt passen, um H2 zu motivieren. Außerdem: “definitions of hate speech might be influenced by political orientation” (Kansok-Dusche et al., 2023) -> beides zusammen motiviert perfekt H2!

5 Data and methods**:** *What data and methods are you planning to use? Please be as specific as possible in what you want to approach to achieve to facilitate further discussion whether it is appropriate for answering the research question. Also mention alternative methods, especially if you are unsure about which method is best. This is the core part of the PAP!* -> look at the manual how to write a PAP <file:///Users/Jo/Zotero/storage/WFH2RREA/a-pre-analysis-plan-checklist.html>

Siehe auch Witschge für gute Formulierungen und table für secriptive Statistik im Data Teil !

## ## Data

The data used was obtained for the study “Global Preferences for Hate Speech Moderation” (Munzert et al., to be published).

## ### Data Description

**Survey conducted for study XY,**

**In countries XY because … (see PAP from Simon)**

**Check all relevant items in the survey that I want to use and why**

I will use survey items that were asked before the vignette experiment (demographic info, political views etc.) as well as as the open text outcome variable what definition people have of hate speech and what, in their opinion, should not be allowed to say on the internet.

The manipulated variables belonging to the vignette and framing experiment will not be considered for this analysis.

### Data Description: The data contains info on

* **Basic sociodemographic information** (like gender, year of birth, race, being part of a minority)
* **Speech Traits** (feelings if there is free speech, opinion if there should be regulation, empathy)
* **Political preferences and behavior**
* **Online behavior** (media usage that is relevant to the issue, how often people share their opinion on the internet etc.)
* **Speech governance preferences** (should there be regulation on expressing opinion? Who is responsible?)

## ### Outcome Variable

Open text survey item: „People have different ideas about what constitutes "hate speech." What about you - how would you personally define hate speech?“.

Within the original study, the open text answers were already classified and quantitatively explored regarding common themes in hate speech definitions. The coding scheme for this task contains items on content, sender features / motivation, target scope features, specified target features, and other features of the statement (like, e.g., if the answer provides an example or no definition at all). It is provided as a basis for this work by the scientists carrying out the main study.

## ### Independent Variable

### Usage of educational attainment variable in different countries

encoded in three categories (low = [did not finish school (yet), or finished school but holds no qualification to pursue education to satisfy university entrance requirements], intermediate = [finished school with qualification to pursue further education to satisfy university entrance requirements], high = [finished school achieving university entrance requirements, and/or holds university degree and/or post-graduate degree] (Munzert et al., to be published)

DAG of what I want to measure: Edu (Background) -> Opinion <- Def (Knowledge) <- Edu ??

First measure effect **Edu -> Def**

Second measure the effect **Def -> Op**

## ### Control Variables

### Dealing with educational attainment and political knowledge / opinions, literature suggests to control for

* **Gender**, **empathy** (Cowan & Khatchadourian, 2003)
* **GENDER** maybe also in Wilhelm and Joeckel 2019, (Wojatzki et al., 2018) + (Costello et al., 2019)
* **Political interest**
* **Social media usage (Costello et al., 2019)**
* **Political ideology** (Munzert: „ideological subgroups“) (Costello et al., 2019)
* **Experience with HS** (Munzert) (Costello et al., 2019)
* belonging to a minority? Or Hate speech exposure?
* -> laut Munzert et al. keinen Einfluss auf Regulierungspreferenzen, aber vllt. Hat es einen Einfluss darauf, ob Menschen etwas zu HS wissen… -> check also in missingness, if especially minority people don’t give a definition or the other way around
* **Perceptions of free speech norms** (Munzert)
* …
* … add from notes on iPad

## ## Proposed statistical method (and alternative) / Analysis Plan?

### Variable Construction

To test my hypotheses, I plan to create two outcome variables (constructed indicators) that both draw their information from the open text survey item on hate speech definition.

1. **Differentiation of individuals’ Definition of hate speech = basis of knowledge** people have about hate speech, classified and summarized in an instrumented variable “degree of differentiation” 0 (“don’t know”), 1 (“broad”), 2 (“middle”), 3 (“narrow” understanding), whereas a more narrow understanding points to a better knowledge of the public discourse and shows the ability to delimit (abgrenzen) hate speech from other concepts like bullying (cite literature Kansok-Dusche and Sellars here)

Considering these items of the coding scheme:

* M
* M
* m

1. **Degree of polarization / “politicalness” / “Politicization” of individuals’ definition**

Ideas for methods here:

* Look for typical left/right vocabulary and compare the amount of “political” speech between the group of academics and non-academics
* ALTERNATIVE APPROACH: Look for typical left-right vocabulary in answers (not using the coding scheme) and thus measure the amount of “political speech”
* While the first variable should measure the amount of differentiation/complexity, the next should explore the dimension of political opinion being integrated.

ODER LIEBER MIT VARIABLEN ARBEITEN LEFT-RIGHT Z.B. DIE ICH BEREITS HABE????

High Education und left (0-3) and right () anschauen, Low Edu anschauen, beide Gruppen vergleichen, indem Unterschiede in Definitionen gemessen werden

* Aber wie Unterschiede in Definitionen messen????
* Vielleicht als Open Text lieber „open\_allow“ nehmen????

This binary variable will rely mostly on the section “Other features of the statement” from the coding scheme, being determined by whether the given definition

* Questions/denies existence of hate speech
* Questions its importance/relevance
* Advocates for free speech
* Emphasizes the subjectivity of hate speech

If several of these items apply, the statement points to a more critical view of the phenomenon itself. Definitions which carry one or more of these properties will be allocated to a critical view on the objective existence of hate speech (“1”), while the others will be assigned a more supportive understanding of the concept (“0”).

**Educational Attainment – academic vs. non-academics ?**

* Idea/Argument to take **only two educational categories, “the academic” and “the non-academic” part of society** (there are assumingly no school students, because the coungest respondent is 18 years old): Idea: people are already “on the straight path” to become academics but just did not finish their degree yet? I filter this age and drop them. Then we are left with people who are probably not change thei r degree anymore.

Solution to use academic / non-academic education as a common ground that can be assumed to be feasible and comparable upon in all school systems ☺ (it is still necessary to look at e.g. (Schneider, 2022) for more details on this matter).

### Testen von H1:

* Operationalisierung von KOMPLEXITÄT der Hate Speech Definitionen (nach Kansok-Dusche? Diskussion mit Hietanen? Hietanen davor zumindest lesen, auch für Limitations dieser Messung…) + Sellars 2016 auch lesen, zumindest, wenn Hietanen nicht ganz klar. Denn darauf bezieht sich Hietanen.

Idee: Items aus der Klassifizierung den Kategorien von Kansok-Dusche zuordnen.

### Testen von H2:

* Operationalisierung von POLITISCHER AUSRICHTUNG der Hate Speech Definitionen (left-right? Abgleich mit eigener Angabe von left-right der Personen? ->

**Analysis Plan**

Specify the treatment effect equation to be estimated: for example, is a difference-in-differences, ancova, or post specification to be used? What controls will be included in the regression? How will standard errors be calculated? The exact equation to be estimated should be written out.

**Relationship Educational Background <-> knowledge what hate speech is, ability to give a definition**

Method:

* Rank answers to the question of what is hate speech (complexity of definition?) and look at the relationship between this score and educational level (per country?)
* Try to find types of answers (= groups of people) through ML cluster algorithm and compare the average educational background of the groups

Two parts of my analysis:

1. Descriptive: How does educational background relate to the existence and kind of opinion about hate speech? Controlled for political views in general, age etc. through matching
2. Causal: ? maybe interpret results ..

Regressionsgleichung hier auch rein…

Logistic Regression for Hate Speech Definition Complexity:

Linear or Ordinal Logistic Regression for Polarization Score:

### In diesem Abschnitt zu klären:

* Umgang mit Klassifizierung der offenen Textantworten. Idee, diese vllt zu Clustern in mehrere „Typen“ von Antworten, aber weniger differenziert als das aufwändige Codierschema, um leichter mit Bildungshintergrund vergleichen zu können
* methodische Idee: mit ML „typische“ Personen heraussuchen pro Bildungsgrad (Methode aus Greenpeace Projekt) -> doof, weil nur zwei Bildungsgrade.
* Difficult: die Frage nach Def Hate Speech impliziert einen common sense, dass es Hate Speech gibt. Manche Respondents antworten aber sogar hier, dass sie finden, dass alles gesagt werden dürfe – das entspricht gefühlt einer Überzeugung, dass es das Phenomen gar nicht gibt.

### Comment

If H1 emerges as true: Using a polarization score to measure whether the group of academics has a higher average or the non-academics, also look at the distribution of scores for both groups. High polarization would be reflected in a bimodal or multimodal distribution, indicating that respondents are sharply divided in their opinions.

If H1 emerges as false: Instead of comparing academics/non-academics, I would suggest comparing two groups where Group A has no or only a broad understanding of the concept (0 or 1), and Group B having a middle or narrow understanding (2 or 3), using the operationalization for H1.

Additional ideas to explore this relationship if it is found to be unfeasible to create a sensemaking polarization score:

1. Analyze the differences in the higher and lower educated group in these items on speech governance preferences
   1. People should be able to speak their minds freely online/People should be able to feel welcome and safe online
   2. Online services should not be responsible for the content users post on their site, even when it’s harassing./ Online services have a responsibility to step in when harassing behavior occurs on their site.
2. Find users that seem to be “anti-hate-speech”, if their definition contains one of these items of the coding scheme:
   1. Questions/denies existence of hate speech
   2. Questions its importance/relevance
   3. Advocates for free speech
   4. Emphasizes the subjectivity of hate speech   
        
      If several of these items apply, the statement points to a more critical view of the phenomenon itself. Definitions that carry one or more of these properties will be allocated to a critical view on the objective existence of hate speech (“1”), while the others will be assigned a more supportive understanding of the concept (“0”). Then look at the distribution of academics/non-academics in both groups.

### ### Additional Analyses ideas

* persons of color from the Democratic party, (ii) white Republicans, and (iii) women. SOLOVEV -> interesting to look at how these groups can define HS – as a control if the exposure DOES matter for my question?

## ### Methodological Limitations

* Survey-based measures can have bias

# Data report notes

In addition to the pre-analysis plan, I ask you to prepare a data report. That can be very hands-on and the content might vary depending on the data you're working with and your plans for analysis. Overall, the report should give me a good sense of the data you'll be working with, such as the **variation of the outcome variable(s), the covariate setup, missingness issues**, etc. This report can be very hands-on, i.e. you import and process the data and present insights with figures, tables, and regular R output (whatever fits best), and provide your take.

Data Report:

For now, I take only the three education levels for a first overview? Except of if it is possible to conglomerate it directly to academic vs. non-academic (and if this makes sense – read source about it!!) -> it is!!!

Missingness: check those people who have answered everything else but not this question or what is the ration between higher and lower educated people?

From the people who answered the question: what is the ration of… (SOLOVEV -> interesting to look at how these groups can define HS – as a control if the exposure DOES matter for my question?)

1. persons of color from the Democratic party,
2. white Republicans, and
3. women.

# LATER: This could be helpful for Discussion / Policy Implications of my findings

In lower und middle educational institutes gibt es die große Chance und vor allem auch Verantwortung, etwas gegen Hate Speech zu tun. Denn:

* HS spielt hier schon eine große Rolle und ist sehr präsent: „Young people are directly concerned as agents and victims of online abuse of human rights.“ (Keen et al., 2020)
* die Polarisierung zu dem Phänomen wird nach den Ergebnissen (wenn H2 wahr) später in higher education noch verstärkt, wenn nicht früh eine gemeinsame Basis gelegt wird.
* Limitation of this approach: „One feature of the education system that can lead to differential civic outcomes is tracking, that is, the sorting of students into different types of education.“(Witschge et al., 2019) – as e.g. in Germany…
* Promoting an understanding of hate speech phenomenom in lower / middle education could also contribute to reduce the polarization in that happens in higher education (?)

The study seeks to contribute to the broader understanding of how education influences political knowledge and opinions, specifically in defining and regulating hate speech. Insights could be offered to inform the design of educational interventions and policy regulations regarding online hate speech, contributing to the ongoing discourse on hate speech and its regulation.