

HANDBOOK FOR IRAQ WAR DATABASES: PRESS AND TV CODING

This handbook is designed to guide coders on decisions regarding which codes to use for all aspects of the press database. Most of the instructions will also apply for television, though there are precedents which relate to each medium which for obvious reasons do not cross over.

The Codebooks set out the basic form of the database and so there is no need to repeat that information here. Instead, the handbook will hopefully clarify certain codes and refer to precedents already in place for those awkward decisions which don't seem to fit in any one category. This is also meant to be a work-in-progress, and will be updated as the project continues, with the prior knowledge of all coders. For more general instructions on coding, please refer to the relevant Codebook.

Clarification of individual variables and when to use them can be found in the document 'Clarification of meaning for database variables'.

Overview of Key Codebook Features for 2003 Iraq War Press Coverage (plus TV with slight alterations) for use with Microsoft Access Database

The codebooks are designed to provide a comprehensive content analysis of UK TV and press coverage of the 2003 Iraq war and measure the range of debate across media outlets, levels of journalistic autonomy and the extent to which Coalition media management strategies influenced media content. The methodology for this study has its origins in the established methods developed by Semetko et al. (1991) and now employed internationally for the analysis of media coverage at elections. This methodology has been extensively developed to be applicable to coverage of military campaigns and to be broadly compatible with an equivalent US study (Sean Aday and Steve Livingston, George Washington University) and Daniel Hallin's (1986) seminal study of US coverage of the Vietnam War.

Key Features

1) *Story Subjects 'whom'*. Here stories are coded for the presence and prominence of relevant actors ranging from the leaders of the coalition such as George Bush and Tony Blair through to members of the Iraqi regime (e.g. Tariq Aziz and Saddam Hussein) and domestic anti-war protestors. Sources used for quotes and also cited as a source are identified along with the length of any quotes. A tone control (straight/ heavily deflating /deflating /mixed/ reinforcing /heavily reinforcing) provides a measure of how journalists treated relevant actors. This measure provides an assessment of precisely who was focused on and prioritised by different media outlets during the war, how they were treated by journalists and, overall, which sources were most successful at gaining access to media and also effective at securing favourable coverage.

2) *Story Subjects 'what'*. Here we are coding stories in order to identify the scope of subjects appearing across media outlets ranging from stories about the military

campaign itself (battle) through to war casualties, humanitarian matters and the background to the Iraq conflict including rationale and justifications for the war. We are also integrating this analysis with an analysis of coalition media management strategies in order to provide an assessment of the relative prominence of coalition agenda subjects across media outlets. The list of subject 'whats' is designed to ensure that we can identify the overall contours of the media agenda including the extent to which coalition agenda subjects were present (including official war justifications), the relative prominence of Coalition and Iraqi forces and casualties (both military and civilian) through to the presence of alternative subjects such as those related to the anti-war movement or aid agencies. Each subject 'what' is assessed for 'tone' based on how that subject plays for the main actors. We have included a range of actors here to reflect who receives the coverage in regard to the particular subject. The actors are; UK, US, Iraq (leadership), UN, Anti-war, Arab League, Other, Coalition (to be used where UK or US code is not possible to determine, or other coalition). We have included a broad range of actors here to prevent a narrow interpretation based predominantly on the coalition agenda. Where a news item deals primarily with the Iraqi people, the tone code would reflect this with a code for 'other', with the scale ranging from; straight, heavily anti, anti, mixed, pro, heavily pro. In this way, rather than inferring how each subject plays for the coalition, we are looking at which actors received the coverage in relation to the particular subject and the tone used toward them. This is not based solely on reporter's comments but on the intrinsic nature of the subject, who gets to speak, how the reporter approaches the implications of the new development, and any significant visuals. The guidelines used for 'Overall Tone' (see 6 below) of key areas of the study are also appropriate here, where relevant.

3) *Reporters' Comments*. Here we are measuring the way in which journalists reported stories and identifying the extent to which journalists engaged in straight reporting, were deflating or reinforcing towards key actors (e.g UK officials and Iraqi officials) and the number of occurrences of disdain. Each segment of comments by the reporter is given a code ('heavily deflating' through to 'heavily reinforcing') dependent on which of the main actors is generally being referred to, and how their actions/words are treated. Reporting actions is merely 'straight' whilst any evaluation is recorded as deflating/mixed/ reinforcing. This captures how often the reporter is making judgements and to whom they are related. The aim here is to assess the extent to which different media outlets sought to maintain autonomy during the conflict and the extent to which journalists adopted either an adversarial stance or, alternatively, a deferential stance toward subject 'whoms' and subject 'whats'.

4) *Prognosis*. This additional measure assesses how journalists or other sources reported coalition assessments regarding key issues and is related directly to the Leeds analysis of the coalition media management strategies. The extent to which sources were pessimistic or, alternatively, optimistic, when reporting coalition assessments regarding, for example, military progress or the humanitarian situation, will be assessed using a five point scale ranging from explicitly pessimistic through to explicitly optimistic. The aim here is to offer a measure of the relative success of the coalition media management strategy aimed at managing expectations and influencing the speculation of journalists.

5) *New Technology*. There are various ways in which data on new media and technology is recorded in the database. Our 'format' control includes; which

technology is used for all reporter interviews (video phone/satellite/conventional phone), the use of remote anchors for live introductions to field reports, and whether all types of reports and interviews were live recordings. In addition to having extensive media codes in our subject 'whats' and 'whoms' to capture when the media became a story in itself, we note any acknowledged use of alternative sources for visuals, whether Al Jazeera, military footage or the internet. Whilst it is impossible through content analysis alone to know when press agency footage is used, any visual with a credit is noted for its source. By logging the subject of the visual for each of these occurrences, we can examine the nature of the access to alternative media – in which subject areas did the new media play a part and how was their coverage presented?

6) *Coding Frames*. In order to enable the coder to judge overall story tone/frame we have identified a series of key subject areas and developed criteria by which the coder can assess the extent to which reports favoured either the coalition perspective or, instead reflected an alternative perspective. The subject areas are not exhaustive, rather they represent key issues by which the range of media debate during the war can be assessed. The subjects are 'battle', 'strategy', 'civilian casualties', 'humanitarian issues', 'military casualties', 'restoration of law and order', 'justifications for war' incl. 'WMD', 'humanitarian' and 'war on terror'. The aim here is to measure the range of debate across media outlets during the war and precisely how critical of coalition policy different media outlets were. In assessing overall tone the coder will draw upon both the above measures (sources, subject 'whoms', subject 'whats', prognosis, journalists comments and visuals) and the below criteria in order to code media coverage. The criteria set out below are not intended to be used as a strict tick-list – not all stories will fall exactly into each category - but rather they act as verifiable guidelines for making coding decisions.

In addition, we have listed the story subjects, sources, journalists comments and justifications/rationale *expected* to be present in heavily pro-coalition through heavily anti-coalition reports (see below). Whilst the coder's tone judgement is not to be based on these ideal type criteria, they do facilitate empirical verification of the coder's judgement (in addition to the inter-coder reliability test). For example, across a large number of media reports coded as pro-coalition, we would expect to observe a preponderance of pro-coalition subjects (e.g. coalition attack: effective), sources and with journalists comments being reinforcing toward the coalition etc.

Coding Criteria

Whereas the shorthand tone coding options are ‘pro’ or ‘anti’, when deciding the appropriate code, think about whether this is a positive story or negative story for the coalition or Iraq. How much does the item follow the narrative presented by either party? ‘Anti’ or ‘pro’ may have connotations that the report has to actively attack or support a position, but we are more interested in the treatment of the subjects and sources, and the effect on overall tone. A ‘somewhat-pro’ news item may simply present the coalition case on, say, battle progress or minimising of casualties, without alternative views or arguments – the subject itself and its unproblematic selection by the reporter present a ‘good’ story for the coalition.

(1) Battle

When to code: Include all stories which where battle codes are main subjects and which also give a sense of battle progress or prognosis. If the item deals merely with human interest, weapons, supplies, without reference to effects or possible effects re success/failure, do not code according to criteria

Heavily pro-Coalition: Reports dealing with the military situation that are positive for the coalition and emphasizing implicitly or explicitly military **success (in terms of the coalition winning the war)**. Reports might include coalition battle successes, presented in a reinforcing manner by journalist (optimistic prognosis), heavily reliant on coalition sources and unproblematic acceptance of coalition language (i.e. liberation).

Subjects likely to be present

- Coalition battle gains
- Iraqi battle losses
- Coalition attack: effective
- Coalition attack
- Iraqi resistance: ineffective/ lack of
- Coalition troops morale (pro- coalition tone)
- Iraqi troops morale (anti-Iraq tone)
- Coalition troops expertise
- Military technology: air: precision
- Military technology: ground: precision
- Prisoners of war: Iraqi
- Iraqi military casualties, no attribution of responsibility
- Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of coalition
- Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
- Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
- Coalition: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits
- Destruction of homes attributed to Iraqi military
- Destruction of homes attributed to non-regular forces
- Use of human shields/ citizens by Iraq authorities
- Guerrilla tactics

Other Iraqi non-conventional/dubious tactics

Rationale/Justifications

Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change
WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins
Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions
Regional stability as outcome of war
Oil in trust fund for Iraqi people

Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to regional security argument ('safer world') (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror (assumed or reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war

*Reporters' comments
Likely to be present*

Heavily reinforcing UK
Heavily reinforcing US
Heavily reinforcing COALITION
Heavily deflating-IRAQ

Prognosis (re battle)

Optimistic

Somewhat pro coalition: Reports dealing with positive military progress and suggestive implicitly or explicitly of military **success (in terms of the coalition winning the war)**, reliant upon coalition sources but perhaps containing a degree of critical distance (somewhat optimistic prognosis) probably expressed by journalist or interview with expert/commentator.

Subjects likely to be present

Coalition battle gains
Iraqi battle losses
Coalition attack
Coalition attack: effective
Iraqi resistance: ineffective/ lack of
Coalition troops morale (pro- coalition tone)
Iraqi troops morale (anti-Iraq tone)
Coalition troops expertise

Military technology: air: precision
Military technology: ground: non-precision
Prisoners of war: Iraqi
Iraqi military casualties, no attribution of responsibility
Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of coalition
Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces

Coalition: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits
Destruction of homes attributed to Iraqi military
Destruction of homes attributed to non-regular forces
Use of human shields/ citizens by Iraq authorities
Guerrilla tactics
Other Iraqi non-conventional/dubious tactics

<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war
<i>Reporters' comments</i> <i>Likely to be present</i>	reinforcing or straight UK reinforcing or straight US reinforcing or straight COALITION deflating or straight-IRAQ
<i>Prognosis (re battle)</i>	Optimistic

Neutral/Mixed: Reports dealing with progress of combat, that might include problems, but which does not offer any clear assessment of **success** or **failure** of coalition. Coalition sources might be balanced against evaluative reporting by journalists and or other commentators about the uncertainty of the war.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Battle: Ground combat/on going battle/military situation Iraqi troop movements Coalition troop movements Logistics/ supplies Other: battle: no appropriate code
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Expert linked to academic organization Analyst: retired military (paid advisor) Think tank Other expert/ unnamed experts
<i>Reporters' comments</i> <i>Likely to be present</i>	mixed, evaluative, straight.
<i>Likely prognosis</i>	neutral/none or mixed

Or otherwise subjects, sources used and reporters' comments and prognosis may reflect a mixture of pro and anti coalition subjects, sources, reporters' comments and prognoses as set out above and below.

Somewhat anti-coalition/pro-Iraq: Reports dealing with negative military developments and implicitly or explicitly suggestive of military **failure** (in terms of the coalition losing the war). Reports might deal with battle failures that emphasize the problems facing the coalition and remain somewhat pessimistic in terms of progress. Coalition sources will be questioned by journalists and we would expect to see some distancing

from coalition language plus questioning by experts re the progress of the war.

Subjects likely to be present

- Coalition battle losses
- Iraqi battle gains
- Coalition attack: ineffective
- Iraqi resistance: effective
- Iraqi resistance
- Coalition troops morale (anti- coalition tone)
- Iraqi troops morale (pro-Iraq tone)
- Iraqi troops expertise

- Prisoners of war: Coalition
- Coalition military casualties, no attribution of responsibility
- Coalition military casualties, responsibility of coalition
- Coalition, responsibility of Iraqi military
- Coalition, responsibility of non-regular forces
- Iraqis: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits
- Destruction of homes attributed to coalition
- Destruction of infrastructure attributed to coalition
- Depleted Uranium
- Cluster bombs
- Military technology: air: non-precision
- Military technology: ground: non-precision
- Other Coalition non-conventional/dubious tactics

Sources likely to be used Iraqi (political or military) or other anti-war

Reporters' comments reinforcing or straight Iraq
Likely to be present deflating or straight-US
 deflating or straight UK
 deflating or straight coalition

Likely prognosis (re battle) pessimistic

Heavily anti: Reports dealing with military *failures* (in terms of the **coalition losing the war**) with clear disdain/critical distance in *Reporters' comments*. Coalition language is not adopted, or at least not critically, and a pessimistic prognosis is given by journalists/commentators re the likelihood of coalition success. Anti-war sources will be drawn upon and given priority over coalition sources.

Subjects likely to be present

- Coalition battle losses
- Iraqi battle gains
- Coalition attack: ineffective
- Iraqi resistance: effective
- Iraqi resistance
- Coalition troops morale (anti- coalition tone)
- Iraqi troops morale (pro-Iraq tone)
- Iraqi troops expertise

- Prisoners of war: Coalition
- Coalition military casualties, no attribution of responsibility

Coalition military casualties, responsibility of coalition
 Coalition, responsibility of Iraqi military
 Coalition, responsibility of non-regular forces
 Iraqis: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits
 Destruction of homes attributed to coalition
 Destruction of infrastructure attributed to coalition
 Depleted uranium
 Cluster bombs
 Military technology: air: non-precision
 Military technology: ground: non-precision
 Other Coalition non-conventional/dubious tactics

Rationale/justification

Regime change: war will worsen situation
 WMD threat does not exist
 Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate
 Imperialist aims UK
 Imperialist aims US
 Oil rights as reason for war
 Regional instability as outcome of war

Reference to self-interested US power projection (i.e. influence in Middle East) (assumed or reinforcing)
 Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (oil and reconstruction) (assumed or reinforcing)
 Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (assumed or reinforcing)
 Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (assumed or reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Iraqi (political or military) or other anti-war

Reporters' comments likely to be present

heavily reinforcing Iraq
 heavily deflating US
 heavily deflating UK
 heavily deflating coalition

likely Prognosis (re battle)

highly pessimistic

(2) Strategy

When to code: We generally reserve 'strategy' coding for 'high' strategy – MoD or Pentagon, military leaders versus troops on the ground and their progress or tactics. Strategy items can be quite descriptive and offer no real 'outcome' of success or failure. However, unlike battle, the description of strategy may imply superiority or include assessment without any actual combat. Strategy items can be coded according to criteria in these cases.

Heavily Pro coalition/ anti Iraqi: Reports dealing with the success of coalition strategy (*as opposed to question of overall coalition military success*), presented in a reinforcing manner by journalist (optimistic prognosis), heavily reliant on coalition sources and unproblematic acceptance of coalition language (i.e. 'Shock and Awe/surgical strikes).

Subjects likely to be present

Success of UK military strategy
Success of UK military goals
Success of US military strategy
Success of US military goals
Unification/synchronisation of coalition strategy
Failure of Iraqi military strategy
Failure of Iraqi military goals

Rationale/Justifications

Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change
WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins
Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions
Regional stability as outcome of war
Oil in trust fund for Iraqi people

Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (reinforcing)
Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (reinforcing)
Reference to regional security argument ('safer world') (reinforcing)
Reference to Iraq War and 'War on Terror' (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war

Reporters' comments Likely to be present

Heavily reinforcing UK
Heavily reinforcing US
Heavily reinforcing COALITION
Heavily deflating IRAQ

likely prognosis (re strategy)

optimistic.

Somewhat pro coalition/ anti Iraqi: Reports dealing with positive aspects of the military strategy (*as opposed to question of overall coalition military success*), still reliant upon coalition sources but containing a degree of critical distance (somewhat optimistic prognosis) probably expressed by journalist or interview with expert/commentator.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Success of UK military strategy Success of UK military goals Success of US military strategy Success of US military goals Failure of Iraqi military strategy Failure of Iraqi military goals Unification/synchronisation of coalition strategy
--------------------------------------	--

<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war
----------------------------------	--

<i>Reporters' comments</i> <i>Likely to be present</i>	reinforcing or straight UK reinforcing or straight US reinforcing or straight COALITION deflating or straight-IRAQ
---	---

<i>likely prognosis (re strategy)</i>	optimistic
---------------------------------------	------------

Neutral/Mixed: Report dealing with coalition strategy, which might include problems, but which does not offer any clear assessment of success or failure of coalition strategy. Coalition sources might be balanced against evaluative reporting by journalists and or other commentators about the uncertainty of the strategy.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Evaluation of 'Shock and Awe' Description of UK military strategy Description of UK military goals Description of US military strategy Description of US military goals Description of Iraqi military strategy Description of Iraqi military goals Evaluation of coalition strategy, ground and general Evaluation of coalition air attack Evaluation of Iraqi strategy, ground and general Evaluation of Iraqi air attack Deployment of troops/ sufficient numbers
--------------------------------------	--

<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Expert linked to academic organization Analyst: retired military (paid advisor) Think tank Other expert/ unnamed experts
----------------------------------	---

<i>Reporters' comments</i>	mixed, evaluative, straight.
----------------------------	------------------------------

Likely to be present

likely prognosis (re strategy) neutral. mixed, none.

Or otherwise subjects, sources used and reporters' comments and prognosis may reflect a mixture of pro and anti coalition subjects, sources, reporters' comments and prognoses as set out above and below.

Somewhat anti coalition/ pro Iraqi: Reports dealing with failure of strategy (*as opposed to question of overall coalition military failure*). Coalition sources will be questioned by journalists and we would expect to see some distancing from coalition language plus questioning by experts re the strategy adopted by the coalition.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Failure of UK military strategy Failure of UK military goals Failure of US military strategy Failure of US military goals Success of Iraqi military strategy Success of Iraqi military goals
--------------------------------------	---

<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Iraqi (political or military) or other anti-war
----------------------------------	---

<i>Reporters' comments</i> <i>Likely to be present</i>	reinforcing or straight Iraq deflating or straight-US deflating or straight UK deflating or straight coalition
---	---

<i>likely prognosis (re strategy)</i>	pessimistic
---------------------------------------	-------------

Heavily anti coalition/ pro Iraqi: Reports dealing with the failure of coalition strategy (*as opposed to question of overall coalition military failure*) with clear disdain/critical distance in reporter comments. Anti-war sources will be drawn upon and given priority over coalition sources.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Failure of UK military strategy Failure of UK military goals Failure of US military strategy Failure of US military goals Success of Iraqi military strategy Success of Iraqi military goals Distinction made between UK and US strategy Distinction made between UK and US goals Distinction made between UK and US military methods
--------------------------------------	---

<i>Rationale/justification</i>	Regime change: war will worsen situation WMD threat does not exist
--------------------------------	---

Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate
Imperialist aims UK
Imperialist aims US
Oil rights as reason for war
Regional instability as outcome of war

Reference to self-interested US power projection (i.e. influence in Middle East) (reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (oil and reconstruction) (reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Iraqi (political or military) or other anti-war

Reporters' comments

heavily reinforcing Iraq

Likely to be present

heavily deflating US

heavily deflating UK

heavily deflating coalition

Likely prognosis (re strategy) pessimistic

(3) Civilian casualties

When to code: as well as assessments and treatment of actual casualties, apply criteria to coalition **claims** or estimates about casualties, where this is a main subject. This may be linked to the humanitarian justification, but certainly include items which follow the coalition narrative on casualties.

Heavily pro coalition: Unlikely given the subject matter, but reports which attribute responsibility for civilian deaths to Iraqi actions (placing military hardware close to civilian areas), source coalition spokespersons and emphasizing attempts to keep casualties to a minimum through precision bombing and which minimize footage of injured and dead civilians might be code-able as heavily pro-coalition.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Civilian casualties, responsibility of Iraq Coalition claims/estimates/rebuttal Use of human shields/ citizens by Iraq authorities Military technology: air: precision Military technology: ground: precision
<i>Rationale/Justifications</i>	Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions Regional stability as outcome of war Oil in trust fund for Iraqi people Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (reinforcing) Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (reinforcing) Reference to regional security argument ('safer world') (reinforcing) Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror (reinforcing)
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	Heavily reinforcing UK Heavily reinforcing US Heavily reinforcing COALITION Heavily deflating-IRAQ
<i>Prognosis (casualties)</i>	Optimistic
<i>Visuals</i>	140-148 ... 177-181 (Absent) Site of missile attack/ post attack scenes

Somewhat pro: Reports which highlight civilian casualties as unfortunate consequence of war, use pre-dominantly coalition sources and relatively sober language and minimal visuals would still be supportive of coalition.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Civilian casualties, responsibility of Iraq Coalition claims/estimates/rebuttal Use of human shields/ citizens by Iraq authorities Military technology: air: precision Military technology: ground: precision
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	reinforcing or straight UK reinforcing or straight US Reinforcing or straight COALITION Deflating or straight-IRAQ
<i>Prognosis (casualties)</i>	Optimistic
<i>Visuals</i>	140-148 ... 177-181 (Absent) Site of missile attack/ post attack scenes

Mixed/Neutral: Reports that highlight both civilian suffering, with some emotive language and graphic visuals, draws upon Iraqi or non-coalition sources critical of coalition action, but also balances report with coalition perspective (see above).

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Overall body count/ or as an issue Civilian casualties, no attribution of responsibility Civilian casualties: accidental Casualties: other
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	UN, humanitarian Expert linked to academic organization Think tank Other expert/ unnamed experts
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	mixed, evaluative, straight.
<i>Likely prognosis</i>	neutral/none or mixed

Or otherwise subjects, sources used and reporters' comments and prognosis may reflect a mixture of pro and anti coalition subjects, sources, reporters' comments and prognoses as set out above and below.

Somewhat anti-coalition: Reports which prioritise suffering of civilians through dramatic visuals and emotive language, using Iraqi sources over and above coalition sources and questioning the accuracy of coalition targeting.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Civilian casualties, responsibility of coalition Iraqi claims/estimates/rebuttal Destruction of homes attributed to coalition Destruction of homes attributed to coalition Military technology: air: non- precision Depleted Uranium Cluster bombs Other Coalition non-conventional/dubious tactics
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Iraqi (political or military), medical workers, UN or other anti-war
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	straight or deflating UK straight or deflating US straight or deflating COALITION straight or reinforcing IRAQ
<i>Prognosis (casualties)</i>	pessimistic
<i>Visuals</i>	140-148 ... 177-181

Heavily anti: Reports focusing on suffering of Iraqi people, using dramatic language and imagery plus using Iraqi sources and/or critical assessments from experts and commentators who use the event to question the legitimacy of the war.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Civilian casualties, responsibility of coalition Iraqi claims/estimates/rebuttal Destruction of homes attributed to coalition Destruction of homes attributed to coalition Military technology: air: non- precision Depleted Uranium Cluster bombs Other Coalition non-conventional/dubious tactics
<i>Rationale/justification</i>	Regime change: war will worsen situation WMD threat does not exist Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate Imperialist aims UK Imperialist aims US Oil rights as reason for war Regional instability as outcome of war

Reference to self-interested US power projection (i.e. influence in Middle East) (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (oil and reconstruction) (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (assumed or reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Iraqi (political or military), medical workers, UN or other anti-war

*Reporters' comments
Likely to be present*

heavily deflating UK
heavily deflating US
heavily deflating COALITION
heavily reinforcing IRAQ

Prognosis (casualties)

pessimistic

Visuals

140-148 ... 177-181

(4) Humanitarian issues (for coalition): [effective vs ineffective].

When to code: As well as stories about the success or failure to deliver aid, also code stories on the *funds* available or which include prognosis on how the humanitarian effort will proceed.

Heavily Pro-coalition: Reports dealing with coalition efforts to deliver aid, in a reinforcing manner by journalist (optimistic prognosis), heavily reliant on coalition sources and unproblematic acceptance of coalition language ('battle for hearts and minds'). Emphasis on success or likely success of aid efforts.

Subjects likely to be present

successful coalition delivery of aid
attempts by coalition to deliver aid
Hospitals: adequate medicine supplies, treatment
Drinking water/food adequate

Positive potential humanitarian consequences ...

Rationale/justification

Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change
WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins
Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions
Regional stability as outcome of war
Oil in trust fund for Iraqi people

Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (reinforcing)
Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (reinforcing)
Reference to regional security argument ('safer world') (reinforcing)
Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war

Reporters' comments Likely to be present

Heavily reinforcing UK
Heavily reinforcing US
Heavily reinforcing COALITION

Prognosis (humanitarian situation)

Optimistic

Visuals

Aid reaching people

Somewhat pro coalition: Reports dealing with attempts to deliver humanitarian aid, still reliant upon coalition sources but containing a degree of critical distance probably expressed by journalist or interview with expert/commentator. Emphasis on likely success of aid delivery and ability to meet humanitarian needs.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	successful coalition delivery of aid attempts by coalition to deliver aid Hospitals: adequate medical supplies, treatment adequate drinking water/food Positive potential humanitarian consequences ...
--------------------------------------	---

<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war
----------------------------------	--

<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	reinforcing or straight UK reinforcing or straight US reinforcing or straight COALITION
---	---

<i>Prognosis (humanitarian situation)</i>	Optimistic
---	------------

<i>Visuals</i>	Aid reaching people
----------------	---------------------

Mixed/Neutral: Report dealing with issue of humanitarian situation in Iraq including both coalition attempts to deliver aid (without offering clear assessment of success or failure), which might include problems, but which does not offer any clear assessment of success or failure of humanitarian effort. Coalition sources might be balanced against evaluative reporting by journalists and or other commentators about the uncertainty of the humanitarian situation.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	humanitarian, potential humanitarian consequences
--------------------------------------	---

<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Expert linked to academic organization Think tank Other expert/ unnamed experts/
----------------------------------	--

<i>Reporters' comments likely to be present</i>	mixed, evaluative, straight
---	-----------------------------

<i>Likely prognosis</i>	neutral/none or mixed
-------------------------	-----------------------

Or otherwise subjects, sources used and reporters' comments and prognosis may reflect a mixture of pro and anti coalition subjects, sources, reporters' comments and prognoses as set out above and below.

Somewhat anti: Reports dealing with the failure to deliver aid and the humanitarian situation facing Iraq. Reports might emphasize the problems facing coalition aid efforts and be pessimistic as to the likely success of humanitarian efforts. Coalition sources will be questioned by journalists and we would expect to see some distancing from coalition language plus questioning by experts re the humanitarian situation.

Subjects likely to be present

failure of coalition to deliver aid
Hospitals: inadequate medical supplies, treatment
Drinking water/food: inadequate
Negative humanitarian consequences of war

Passing reference (implied or explicit) to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]). (Tone questioned or deflating).

Sources likely to be used

Humanitarian pressure group, Aid/NGO/ Red Cross worker, NGO spokesperson, Medical worker in Iraq, other anti war.

Reporters' comments likely to be present

deflating or straight UK
deflating or straight US
deflating or straight COALITION
straight or reinforcing humanitarian pressure groups etc

Prognosis (humanitarian situation) pessimistic

Visuals

Aid not getting through/unable to deliver
Scarcity of food/water/electricity

Heavily anti: Reports dealing with the failure to respond adequately to the humanitarian situation in Iraq with clear disdain/critical distance in reporter's comments. Coalition sources are not significantly drawn upon and alternative sources such as aid agencies/anti-war commentators will be given extensive air-time. Reports may start to challenge UK claims vis-à-vis this being a humanitarian war.

Subjects likely to be present

failure of coalition to deliver aid
Hospitals: inadequate medicine supplies, treatment
inadequate drinking water (anti-coalition tone)
Negative humanitarian consequences of war

Rationale/justification

Regime change: war will worsen situation
WMD threat does not exist
Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate
Imperialist aims UK
Imperialist aims US
Oil rights as reason for war
Regional instability as outcome of war

Reference to self-interested US power projection (i.e. influence in Middle East) (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (oil and reconstruction) (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (assumed or reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Humanitarian pressure group, Aid/NGO/ Red Cross worker, NGO spokesperson, Medical worker in Iraq, other anti war.

*Reporters' comments
Likely to be present*

heavily deflating UK
heavily deflating US
Heavily deflating COALITION
Heavily reinforcing humanitarian

Prognosis (humanitarian situation) pessimistic

Visuals

Aid not getting through/unable to deliver
Scarcity of food/water/electricity

(5) Military casualties (coalition)

Heavily pro-coalition: report would concentrate on the bravery of the 'heroes' who have died for a just cause, with this view reinforced by the journalist. Coalition sources are heavily relied upon; if any family are included, they are supportive of the war despite their loss. No distressing images.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	UK military casualties: personalization/obituary plus positive tone toward coalition UK military casualties: family reaction supportive US military casualties: personalization/obituary plus positive tone toward coalition US military casualties: family reaction supportive
<i>Rationale/justification</i>	Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions Regional stability as outcome of war Oil in trust fund for Iraqi people Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (reinforcing) Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (reinforcing) Reference to regional security argument ('safer world') (reinforcing) Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror (reinforcing)
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war, Family supportive
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	Heavily reinforcing UK Heavily reinforcing US Heavily reinforcing COALITION
<i>Prognosis (coalition casualties)</i>	Optimistic
<i>Visuals</i>	home footage, omission of distressing images

Somewhat pro-coalition: As above, the bravery of the soldiers would be concentrated upon, while any (non-critical) emotive comments by families are balanced with reassuring soundbites from coalition sources. The reporter would report the deaths in an unquestioning manner, as an

unfortunate consequence of war. Responsibility of deaths is not likely to be attributed to the coalition.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	UK military casualties: personalization/obituary plus positive tone toward coalition UK military casualties: family reaction supportive US military casualties: personalization/obituary plus positive tone toward coalition US military casualties: family reaction supportive
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war Family, supportive
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	reinforcing or straight UK reinforcing or straight US Reinforcing or straight COALITION
<i>Prognosis (coalition casualties)</i>	Optimistic
<i>Visuals</i>	home footage, omission of distressing images

Mixed/Neutral: Coalition deaths could be downplayed, either with very little focus on the deaths, or if they are dealt with in detail, the reporter presents both coalition sources and family/ anti-war sources who are critical of coalition. The report may match the sorrow of the deaths with comments that legitimate the war and support its underlying justifications as presented by the coalition.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	UK military casualties: personalization/obituary US military casualties: personalization/obituary Overall Body Count/ or as an issue Casualties: other UK military casualties: statistical information only US military casualties: statistical information only
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Expert linked to academic organization Think tank Other expert/ unnamed experts/
<i>Reporters' comments likely to be present</i>	mixed, evaluative, straight
<i>Likely prognosis</i>	neutral/none or mixed

Or otherwise subjects, sources used and reporters' comments and prognosis may reflect a mixture of pro and anti coalition subjects, sources, reporters' comments and prognoses as set out above and below.

Somewhat anti-coalition: Deaths are presented in an emotive manner, with families critical of procedural policy that may have led to the deaths of their loved ones. Their view is reinforced by the reporter, with any coalition sources given little space or questioning treatment (of the source itself or language such as 'blue on blue' or 'friendly fire'). Distressing images may be used but are presented critically by the reporter, for example, showing disgust towards an Arab channel for broadcasting the pictures.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	UK military casualties: personalization/obituary plus negative tone toward coalition UK military casualties: family reaction critical US military casualties: personalization/obituary plus negative tone toward coalition US military casualties: family reaction critical
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Family critical of war, other anti-war
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	deflating or straight UK deflating or straight US Deflating or straight COALITION Straight or reinforcing family pressure groups etc
<i>Prognosis (coalition casualties)</i>	pessimistic
<i>Visuals</i>	Injured soldiers, grieving families (codes 158-165, 167-174, 179-180)

Heavily anti-coalition: Military casualties reported with emotive language by both the sources and reporter. Family or anti-war sources heavily relied upon, questioning both the coalition *reasons* for the war, as well as any procedural mistakes that could have caused the deaths. Distressing images may be used uncritically (though this would be rare on British TV news). Coalition sources either not used or treated with disdain by the journalist.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	UK military casualties: personalization/obituary plus negative tone toward coalition UK military casualties: family reaction critical US military casualties: personalization/obituary plus negative tone toward coalition US military casualties: family reaction critical
--------------------------------------	--

Rationale/justification

Regime change: war will worsen situation
WMD threat does not exist
Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate
Imperialist aims UK
Imperialist aims US
Oil rights as reason for war
Regional instability as outcome of war

Reference to self-interested US power projection (i.e. influence in Middle East) (reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (oil and reconstruction) (reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Family critical of war, other anti-war

*Reporters' comments
Likely to be present*

heavily deflating UK
heavily deflating US
Heavily deflating COALITION
Heavily reinforcing humanitarian

Prognosis (coalition casualties)

pessimistic

Visuals

Injured soldiers, grieving families (codes 158-165, 167-174, 179-180)

(6) Restoration of law and order [effective vs ineffective] (FOR POST CONFLICT STAGE)

Heavily pro-coalition: Coalition soldiers shown to be restoring law and order with the co-operation of the Iraqi people and police. Visuals and reporter's comments reinforce this position and show coalition soldiers in control and mingling with Iraqi people in a relaxed manner. Sources used would praise the soldiers or would be the soldiers themselves presented in a positive light.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	restoration of law and order: coalition effective restoration of law and order: Iraqi police effective Iraqi people: human interest; Iraqi civilian profile/daily life. Iraqi people: human interest; co-operation with coalition
<i>Rationale/Justifications</i>	Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions Regional stability as outcome of war Oil in trust fund for Iraqi people Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (reinforcing) Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (reinforcing) Reference to regional security argument ('safer world') (reinforcing) Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror (reinforcing)
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war
<i>Reporters' comments likely to be present</i>	Heavily reinforcing UK Heavily reinforcing US Heavily reinforcing COALITION
<i>Prognosis (law and order)</i>	Optimistic

Somewhat pro-coalition: Report would show efforts to control law and order and stress that coalition soldiers are doing a good job, despite some troubles. Coalition sources would be relied upon and reinforced by the reporter, with few negative sources to balance the coalition position. If any anti-coalition sources are used, they are treated in an off-hand manner. Visuals would emphasise the calm appearance of events.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	restoration of law and order: coalition effective restoration of law and order: coalition attempting Iraqi people: human interest; Iraqi civilian profile/daily life. Iraqi people: human interest; co-operation with coalition
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	straight or reinforcing UK straight or reinforcing US Straight or reinforcing COALITION
<i>Prognosis (law and order)</i>	Optimistic

Mixed/Neutral: Reports would balance scenes of chaos with those of restoring order. Sources used would promote both the coalition position and also those critical of post-conflict management. Alternatively, the role of the coalition may be downplayed, with the emphasis on the Iraqi people and how they are getting back to 'normality' as best they can.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	law and (dis)order: general/other
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Expert linked to academic organization Think tank Other expert/ unnamed experts/
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	mixed, evaluative, straight
<i>Likely prognosis</i>	neutral/none or mixed

Or otherwise subjects, sources used and reporters' comments and prognosis may reflect a mixture of pro and anti coalition subjects, sources, reporters' comments and prognoses as set out above and below.

Somewhat anti-coalition: In these reports the role of the coalition may be downplayed or treated critically for their lack of organisation following the battle period. The report would focus on attempts to restore law and order, but with some deflating comment by the reporter or other sources. Coalition sources would not be used and the prognosis would be pessimistic for order to be regained in the near future. Visuals would

focus on chaotic scenes, looting, awkward encounters between Iraqis and soldiers.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	restoration of law and order: coalition ineffective restoration of law and order: Iraqi police ineffective looting Civil unrest Ethnic violence
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	non-coalition/anti-war
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	deflating or straight UK deflating or straight US deflating or straight COALITION
<i>Prognosis (law and order)</i>	pessimistic

Heavily anti-coalition: The report would focus upon the failure of the coalition to restore law and order, criticising it for not realising its duty under international law to protect the people and their property. Anti-coalition sources (whether angry Iraqis or anti-war) would be heavily relied upon and reinforced by the journalist. Visuals would focus on both chaos and confrontational encounters between soldiers and Iraqis.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	restoration of law and order: coalition ineffective restoration of law and order: Iraqi police ineffective looting Civil unrest Ethnic violence
<i>Rationale/justification</i>	Regime change: war will worsen situation WMD threat does not exist Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate Imperialist aims UK Imperialist aims US Oil rights as reason for war Regional instability as outcome of war Reference to self-interested US power projection (i.e. influence in Middle East) (reinforcing) Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (oil and reconstruction) (reinforcing) Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (reinforcing) Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

non-coalition/anti-war

*Reporters' comments
likely to be present*

heavily deflating UK
heavily deflating US
heavily deflating COALITION

Prognosis (law and order)

pessimistic

**(7) Justifications for War [As major subject]: (see appendix three);
not expected to form significant part of coverage during the war**

1) WMD

When to code: As well as including those items whose main concern is the argument surrounding Saddam's WMD capability, code stories where the main subject is the threatened use of WMDs by Saddam. The unproblematic assumption of their actual use, rather than just 'finds', is central to the coalition narrative on WMDs.

Heavily pro-coalition: Reports which relay in unproblematic terms (perhaps reinforcing coalition claims) pre-war US/UK claims regarding Iraq's WMD capability, using coalition sources and containing clear assumptions that there will be significant WMD finds. Reference might also be made to the legality of the war in terms of existing UN SC resolutions.

Subjects likely to be present

WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins
Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions
WMD: Threat of chemical/biological warfare in Iraq assumed
WMD: speculation/ will be found
WMD: evidence found/ positive developments

Justifications for war

Legal: Iraq not fully complied with resolutions to disarm / deceit and concealment of weapons (reinforcing)
Iraq has the capability to launch weapons of mass destruction (reinforcing)
Iraq has chemical weapons that Saddam has shown he will use (reinforcing)
To remove the potential for Iraq to develop nuclear weapons (reinforcing)

Rationale in passing

Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war

*Reporters' comments
likely to be present*

Heavily reinforcing UK
Heavily reinforcing US
Heavily reinforcing COALITION

Prognosis (re WMD finds)

Optimistic

Somewhat pro-coalition: Reports which relay in generally unproblematic terms (but reporting could be straight rather than reinforcing) pre-war US/UK claims regarding Iraq's WMD capability, using predominantly coalition sources and containing clear assumptions that, in some shape or form WMDs/related material will be found. Reference might also be made to the legality of the War in terms of existing UN SC resolutions.

Subjects likely to be present

WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins
 Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions
 WMD: Threat of chemical/biological warfare in Iraq assumed
 WMD: speculation/ will be found
 WMD: evidence found/ positive developments

Justifications for war

Legal: Iraq not fully complied with resolutions to disarm/deceit and concealment of weapons (assumed or reinforcing)
 Iraq has the capability to launch weapons of mass destruction (assumed or reinforcing)
 Iraq has chemical weapons that Saddam has shown he will use (assumed or reinforcing)
 To remove the potential for Iraq to develop nuclear weapons (assumed or reinforcing)

Rationale in passing

reference to Iraqi WMD capability (assumed or reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war

Reporters' comments likely to be present

reinforcing UK
 reinforcing US
 reinforcing COALITION

Prognosis (re WMD finds)

Optimistic

Mixed/Neutral: Reports which still assume presence of WMD in Iraq but balance coalition claims/assumptions/actions (i.e. searches of potential WMD sites) with clear scepticism from journalist and including possibly assessments by experts and/or anti-war commentators who challenge likelihood of significant WMD finds. Reference might also be made to *debate* over the legality of the War in terms of existing UN SC resolutions.

Subjects likely to be present:

Rationale: WMD general
 WMD: other

<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Expert linked to academic organization Think tank Other expert/ unnamed experts/
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	straight, evaluative or mixed
<i>Prognosis (re WMD finds)</i>	neutral/none or mixed

Or otherwise subjects, sources used and reporters' comments and prognosis may reflect a mixture of pro and anti coalition subjects, sources, reporters' comments and prognoses as set out above and below.

Somewhat anti-coalition: Reports which down play coalition claims by questioning the likelihood of significant WMD finds with journalist possibly being deflating toward coalition claims and/or expressing disdain. Non-coalition sources drawn upon (Iraqi authorities, experts, anti-war commentators) challenging claim that Iraq had an active WMD capability. Reference might also be made to arguments regarding the claimed illegality of the War in terms of existing UN SC resolutions.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	WMD threat does not exist Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate Imperialist aims UK Imperialist aims US Oil rights as reason for war WMD: Threat of chemical/biological warfare in Iraq questioned WMD: not found yet WMD: not likely to find/ negative developments
--------------------------------------	---

<i>Justifications for war</i>	Weapons inspectors/ Iraq Survey Group should continue their search (assumed or reinforcing) The case for Iraq having WMDs has not being proven/ they do not exist (assumed or reinforcing) Intelligence reports are inaccurate/ give no clear indication of the need for an ultimatum (assumed or reinforcing) Other action should be taken against Iraq that does not require military intervention (assumed or reinforcing) To secure oil fields for the West (assumed or reinforcing) War as beneficial to Bush/ rallying for president (assumed or reinforcing)
-------------------------------	--

<i>Passing mentions</i>	Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (questioned or deflating)
-------------------------	---

Reference to self-interested US power projection
(assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq
(assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq
(assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war
explanation for the war (assumed or reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

non-coalition or other anti-war

*Reporters' comments
likely to be present*

deflating or straight-US
deflating or straight UK
deflating or straight coalition

Prognosis (WMD find)

pessimistic

Heavily anti-coalition: Reports that contain little in terms of the coalitions claims re WMD, with journalist openly challenging the claim that Iraq possesses a credible WMD capability. Extensive air time given to anti-war commentators, experts claiming that Iraq could not possess serious WMD capability plus Iraqi authorities rebuttals of coalition claims. Reports may start to challenge the legitimacy of the war and the claimed legal justification.

Subjects likely to be present

WMD threat does not exist
Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate
Imperialist aims UK
Imperialist aims US
Oil rights as reason for war
WMD: Threat of chemical/biological warfare in Iraq
questioned
WMD: not found yet
WMD: not likely to find/ negative developments

Justifications for war

Weapons inspectors/ Iraq Survey Group should
continue their search (assumed or reinforcing)
The case for Iraq having WMDs has not being
proven/ they do not exist (assumed or reinforcing)
Intelligence reports are inaccurate/ give no clear
indication of the need for an ultimatum (assumed or
reinforcing)
Other action should be taken against Iraq that does
not require military intervention (assumed or
reinforcing)
To secure oil fields for the West (assumed or
reinforcing)
War as beneficial to Bush/ rallying for president
(assumed or reinforcing)

Passing mentions

Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (questioned or deflating)
Reference to self-interested US power projection (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (assumed or reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

non-coalition or other anti-war

Reporters' comments

Likely to be present

heavily deflating US
Heavily deflating UK
Heavily deflating coalition

Prognosis (WMD find)

pessimistic

(8) Humanitarian (Blairite argument) (i.e. democracy, freedom [from tyranny])

Heavily pro-coalition: Reports that include unproblematic reference to the official moral justifications for the war (democracy and freedom for the Iraqi people) and presented in a reinforcing manner by journalists. Reports might be heavily reliant on coalition sources and contain unproblematic acceptance of coalition language/claims (freedom, democracy, liberation, regional stability, world peace). Focus on the past crimes of Saddam might be used to reinforce the official rationale for a moral war.

Subjects likely to be present

Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change
Humanitarian consequences of war: positive
Saddam: Saddam's millions/decadence
Historical: Oil for Food hampered by Saddam
Historical: brutality of regime/past atrocities

Justifications for war

Humanitarian argument: Saddam continues to repress the people of Iraq/ malnutrition and disease (reinforcing)
Use of sanctions only hurts the Iraqi people; need for military action (reinforcing)
Outcomes: Democracy in Iraq (reinforcing)
Moral: War is necessary to prevent further suffering and threat to the world

Passing Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war

Reporters' comments Likely to be present

Heavily reinforcing UK
Heavily reinforcing US
Heavily reinforcing COALITION

Prognosis (re-humanitarian)

Optimistic

Somewhat pro-coalition: Reports that include reference to the official moral justifications for the war (democracy and freedom for the Iraqi people) but without any counter arguments seriously addressed ((US imperialism, economic (incl. Oil) gain, regional influence, US domestic political considerations)). Reports might be reliant on coalition sources and contain unproblematic acceptance of coalition language/claims (freedom, democracy, liberation, regional stability, world peace). Focus on the past crimes of Saddam might be used to reinforce the official rationale for a moral war.

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change Humanitarian consequences of war: positive Saddam: Saddam's millions/decadence Historical: Oil for Food hampered by Saddam Historical: brutality of regime/past atrocities
<i>Justifications for war</i>	Humanitarian argument: Saddam continues to repress the people of Iraq/ malnutrition and disease (straight or reinforcing) Use of sanctions only hurts the Iraqi people; need for military action (straight or reinforcing) Outcomes: Democracy in Iraq (straight or reinforcing) Moral: War is necessary to prevent further suffering and threat to the world Passing Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (straight or reinforcing)
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war
<i>Reporters' comments likely to be present</i>	straight or reinforcing UK straight or reinforcing US straight or reinforcing COALITION
<i>Prognosis (humanitarian)</i>	Optimistic

Mixed/Neutral: Reports dealing with the issue of the humanitarian grounds for war that include coalition viewpoints (see above) that are balanced against counter arguments (see below).

<i>Subjects likely to be present:</i>	Rationale: Humanitarian general Humanitarian other Humanitarian consequences of war: general
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Expert linked to academic organization Think tank Other expert/ unnamed experts/
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	straight, evaluative or mixed
<i>Prognosis (humanitarian outcome)</i>	neutral/none or mixed

Or otherwise subjects, sources used and *Reporters'* comments and prognosis may reflect a mixture of pro and anti coalition subjects, sources, *Reporters'* comments and prognoses as set out above and below.

Somewhat anti-coalition: Reports might include reference to the official moral justifications for the war (democracy and freedom for the Iraqi people) and cite coalition sources but these could be challenged through either deflating commentary/ disdain and/or sourcing anti-war commentators who provide counter-narrative to coalition narrative. Alternative explanations for the war (US imperialism, economic (incl. Oil) gain, regional influence, US domestic political considerations) will be presented in a straight or reinforcing manner. Focus on the inhumane consequences or the war might be used to reinforce the anti-humanitarian war analysis.

Subjects likely to be present

Regime change: war will worsen situation
Humanitarian consequences of war: negative
Imperialist aims UK
Imperialist aims US
Oil rights as reason for war
Sanctions as humanitarian disaster: west to blame

Justifications for war

Humanitarian argument: the war will worsen the situation and create a humanitarian crisis (assumed or reinforcing)
Use of sanctions only hurts the Iraqi people; need to reassess but not attack (assumed or reinforcing)
Moral: war is wrong, even if threat is proven (assumed or reinforcing)
To secure oil fields for the West (assumed or reinforcing)
War as beneficial to Bush/ rallying for president (assumed or reinforcing)

Passing References

Passing Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (questioned or deflating)
Reference to self-interested US power projection (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (assumed or reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (assumed or reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used non-coalition or other anti-war

Reporters' comments likely to be present deflating or straight-US
deflating or straight UK
deflating or straight coalition

Prognosis (humanitarian outcome) pessimistic

Heavily anti-coalition: Reports might that include little or no reference to the official moral justifications for the war (democracy and freedom for the Iraqi people) and cite coalition sources and extensive air-time given to anti-war narrative. Alternative explanations for the war (US imperialism, economic (incl. Oil) gain, regional influence, US domestic political considerations) will be presented in reinforcing manner. Focus on the inhumane consequences or the war might be used to reinforce an 'anti-humanitarian war' analysis.

Subjects likely to be present Regime change: war will worsen situation
Humanitarian consequences of war: negative
Imperialist aims UK
Imperialist aims US
Oil rights as reason for war

Justifications for war Humanitarian argument: the war will worsen the situation and create a humanitarian crisis (reinforcing)
Use of sanctions only hurts the Iraqi people; need to reassess but not attack (or reinforcing)
Moral: war is wrong, even if threat is proven (reinforcing)
To secure oil fields for the West (reinforcing)
War as beneficial to Bush/ rallying for president (reinforcing)

Passing references Passing Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (deflating)
Reference to self-interested US power projection (reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

non-coalition or other anti-war

*Reporters' comments
likely to be present*

heavily deflating US
Heavily deflating UK
Heavily deflating coalition

Prognosis (humanitarian outcome)

pessimistic

(9) War on Terror

When to code: Also include items which discuss in detail the link between war in Iraq and a more general 'war on terror' approach. An assumption of a linear and logical approach to 'Muslim fundamentalists' and attacking Iraq supports the coalition justification.

Heavily pro-coalition: Reports that include unproblematic reference to official claims connecting Hussein with Al Qaeda/9-11, the war on terror and presented in a reinforcing manner by journalists. Reports might be heavily reliant on coalition sources and contain unproblematic acceptance of coalition language/claims (e.g. the link between Hussein's regime and Islamic and the alleged possibility of Saddam supplying terrorist groups with WMD).

Subjects likely to be present

War on Terror: war will prevent future attacks
Terrorism: Iraq's links to Al Qaeda
Regional stability as outcome of war

Justifications for war

Terrorism: to destroy an ally/ weapons supplier to Al Qaeda or other extremists
As part of a more stable Middle East, to continue work towards peace

Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror (Coalition perspective) (unofficial/anti-war perspective)

Sources likely to be used

Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war

Reporters' comments likely to be present

Heavily reinforcing UK
Heavily reinforcing US
Heavily reinforcing COALITION

Prognosis (War on terror)

Optimistic

Somewhat pro-coalition: Reports that include unproblematic reference to official claims connecting Hussein with Al Qaeda/9-11 the war on terror although possibly presented in a straight manner by journalists but with no little or no attempt to challenge coalition claims or present counter arguments (e.g. no evidence of link between Al Qaeda and Hussein and or unlikelihood of Saddam supporting Islamic fundamentalists). Reports might be heavily reliant on coalition sources and contain unproblematic acceptance of coalition language/claims (e.g. the link between Hussein's regime and 9/11 and the alleged possibility of Saddam supplying terrorist groups with WMD).

<i>Subjects likely to be present</i>	War on Terror: war will prevent future attacks Terrorism: Iraq's links to Al Qaeda Regional stability as outcome of war
<i>Justifications for war</i>	Terrorism: to destroy an ally/ weapons supplier to Al Qaeda or other extremists (reinforcing) As part of a more stable Middle East, to continue work towards peace Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror (reinforcing)
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	non-coalition or other anti-war
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	straight or deflating UK straight or deflating US straight or deflating COALITION
<i>Prognosis (War on terror)</i>	pessimistic

Mixed/Neutral: Reports dealing with the issue of the War on Terror and the war in Iraq which include coalition viewpoints (see above) that are balanced against counter arguments (see below).

<i>Subjects likely to be present:</i>	Rationale Terrorism: General Terrorism other
<i>Sources likely to be used</i>	Expert linked to academic organization Think tank Other expert/ unnamed experts/
<i>Reporters' comments Likely to be present</i>	straight, evaluative or mixed
<i>Prognosis (War on Terror)</i>	neutral/none or mixed

Somewhat anti-coalition: Reports might include reference to official claims connecting Hussein with Al Qaeda/9-11 the war on terror but these will be challenged through either deflating commentary/disdain and/or straight reporting of anti-war commentators who challenge the validity of the claimed link between the War in Iraq and the 'War on Terrorism'. The lack of evidence for the claimed link will be highlighted

and the ideological/political distance between Saddam and Al Qaeda are likely to be emphasized.

Subjects likely to be present

War on Terror: war will encourage future attacks
Terrorism: no evidence of Iraq's links to Al Qaeda
Regional instability as outcome of war
Imperialist aims UK
Imperialist aims US
Oil rights as reason for war

Justifications for war

Terrorism: no links to Al Qaeda have been proven
(reinforcing)
War will increase terrorist attacks against the US
(reinforcing)
War will increase regional instability

Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror
(questioned or deflating)
To secure oil fields for the West (assumed or
reinforcing)
War as beneficial to Bush/ rallying for president
(assumed or reinforcing)

Passing mentions

Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror
(deflating)
Reference to self-interested US power projection
(reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq
(reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq
(reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war
explanation for the war (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war

Reporters' comments

Likely to be present

straight or deflating UK
straight or deflating US
Straight or deflating COALITION

Prognosis (War on terror)

pessimistic

Heavily anti-coalition: Reports that include little or no reference to official claims connecting Hussein with Al Qaeda/9-11 the war on terror and give extensive and reinforcing coverage to commentators who challenge the validity of the claimed link between the War in Iraq and the 'War on Terrorism'. The lack of evidence for the claimed link will be highlighted and the ideological/political distance between Saddam and Al Qaeda are likely to be prioritized. Reports might problematize the US

War on Terror through reference to its selective nature and avoidance of the issue of US support for terrorism in other circumstances.

Subjects likely to be present

War on Terror: war will encourage future attacks
Terrorism: no evidence of Iraq's links to Al Qaeda
Imperialist aims UK
Imperialist aims US
Oil rights as reason for war
Regional instability as outcome of war

Justifications for war

Terrorism: no links to Al Qaeda have been proven (reinforcing)
War will increase terrorist attacks against the US (reinforcing)
To secure oil fields for the West (reinforcing)
War as beneficial to Bush/ rallying for president (reinforcing)
War will increase regional instability

Passing mentions

Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror (deflating)
Reference to self-interested US power projection (reinforcing)
Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (reinforcing)
Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (reinforcing)
Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war (reinforcing)

Sources likely to be used

Coalition (political or military) or other pro-war

Reporters' comments likely to be present

heavily deflating UK
heavily deflating US
heavily deflating COALITION

Prognosis (War on terror)

pessimistic

Instructions for coders

Guidelines on inclusion of press articles

1. When to include a news item for coding

Keywords: Iraq, conflict, war, Saddam, coalition, Bush, Blair, weapons of mass destruction, humanitarian crisis

Code all stories whose main subject is the war or impending war with Iraq. Also code stories where the Iraq conflict is mentioned as part of another story, e.g. government spending as a domestic issue but where funds for fighting Iraq are considered. Stories on popularity of Labour/Blair may touch on policy in Iraq.

Such decisions for the coder are made easier by the fact that most newspapers have specific 'Iraq War' pages for the bulk of the study period. In addition to 'Iraq news' items, all leader editorials are coded in the newspapers.

There are some exceptions to be above rule, due to the sheer numbers of smaller stories on news pages.

2. Items to be excluded completely:

News in brief

day-to-day battle summary

calendar

stand-alone cartoons

stand-alone graphics (unless a full page or two-page graphic)

'language of war' sections

Broadsheets: comment in the 'Comment' pages and comment on separate pages in tabloids.

Other articles to be excluded BUT which require primary details to be recorded in the database.

- 4th + story. To reduce the number of articles coded, we will not code more than three articles per page. The smallest articles would be excluded. If there are many items of similar size, select articles from the top-left of the page for *inclusion*, with those towards the bottom right being excluded. (Do not exclude any editorials on this basis – treat them as separate to these rules. Also treat 'photo stories' as separate as they do not include any text other than their caption)
- Experts/ politicians. Exclude articles written by experts or non-journalists. For example, at the end of the article it may say 'the author is professor of political science at.../ the author is director of Christian Aid'. In this case, only code the primary details in the database. DO include articles by reporters from other media. The exceptions to this rule are addresses or statements by politicians and opinion poll analysis by an expert (e.g. Anthony King in the Telegraph)
- Political sketch/Commons sketch. These items are not analysis or comment, but regular columns usually of a light nature and dealing with the domestic politics angle of the news.

- Other 'light' or off-subject articles. This may include a gig review of a concert in aid of Iraqi civilians or the anti-war cause. If in doubt, always note the details and mark as a query.

Primary details to be recorded:

1. Story ID
2. Date
3. Newspaper
4. Page Number
5. Headline (text of main headline)
6. Headline Size
7. Text Size
8. Continuation Size
9. No. of Columns
10. Top half of page?

16. Story Type

Option chosen here will determine when to go straight to next record: political sketch/ other/ expert.

Once these details are recorded, click on the box that reads: 'Click if story is not to be fully coded' and fill in the details required in the form which appears (writer's name and small summary on the subject of the article).

General Guidelines and Precedents

Collapsing UK and US into 'Coalition'

In most cases it should be okay to collapse US and UK into 'Coalition' for analysis. It is usually the case that when a story is anti or pro-US it will be respectively implicitly bad or good for the UK, who followed them into war. But sometimes distinctions are made between the two, leading to the possibility that a story will be anti-one but pro-the other. Either we should code such stories as 'Mixed Coalition' or, when we do our analysis, exclude such stories. If we choose to do the latter, stories we exclude can be identified by one of the following codes being principal-to-subsidary.

023	Battle	Relations between coalition troops
084	Battle/ Tactics	Distinction made between UK and US military methods
091	Strategy	Distinction made between UK and US strategy
092	Strategy	Distinction made between UK and US goals
276	Diplomacy	Tensions within coalition

CITATIONS AND ATTRIBUTION

Citations

1. Expressions like "some say" or "many believe" or "it is understood" are NOT to be coded as citations. But DO code "sources say/believe" or "critics argue".

2. DO NOT code future comments – eg. Weapons inspectors will tell the Security Council next week... (Mirror, 17/3/03, p.2)

Reporter's comment? Or their source's?

If unclear on whether loaded language comes from the journalist or the source, code conservatively and attribute it to the source. Examples: "The Prime Minister [Blair] said the Iraqi tyrant could no longer be allowed to deceive the world." (Sun, 17/3/03, p.1) "But he [Franks] warned that more Allied servicemen would die in the fight to liberate Iraq." (Sun, 24/3/03, p.12)

Citations versus Actions

If the report mentions not only that something was said, but details also the content of the statement (ideas and/or statements), it becomes a citation. Actions like "ordering", "urging", "warning", "advising", etc, are not citations unless the content of their statement is also mentioned (as in the below examples from *The Independent*).

Some examples of what is and what is not a citation:

The Independent, 18/3/03, p.7

"Britain and America urged their citizens yesterday to leave Kuwait immediately, claiming Saddam Hussein could attack the country with chemical or biological weapons, or terrorists could strike at Westerners."

The first half of the sentence, mentioning Britain and America urged their citizens to leave Kuwait, is NOT a citation, dealing more with an action than a statement. But the second half, outlining their reasons, IS a citation, dealing with a message advanced by the Coalition leaders.

"Washington...has extended the order to its missions in Syria, Israel, the West Bank and Gaza, citing the 'deteriorating security situation in the region'."

Again, the first half deals with Washington giving an order. The action was achieved mainly by communication (speech or writing), but is more an action than a statement. The second half again gives an actual statement – dealing with the content of their communication. (It is also a quote, but had Washington been paraphrased it would be a citation.)

Quotation marks for fake or non-quotes, and general expressions

1. Watch out for quotation marks surrounding non-quotes – where the reporter has attributed an expression or idea, often satirised, to one of the players. For example, on soldiers taking photographs of themselves wearing gas masks, David Sharrock 'quoted' them as saying: "and this is me and Ginge wearing our respirators in the western desert". (*The Times*, 21 March, p.7) Obviously this is not a quote, but rather the journalist poking fun.

2. DO NOT count as quotes military expressions like "Do it in five and stay alive" (US military). DO NOT even count as a citation here. They are essentially meaningless and, since the point of counting quotations and citations is to identify who gets to speak, they contribute nothing to the study.

Weak attributions

We were told...

..has been described as..

sources here say....

If such 'weak' attributions are made, it sometimes follows on directly from another quote and can be clearly connected to a military or government source. Use coding 'Other UK Government unnamed source' or 'Other UK Military unnamed source' as appropriate. If no link or previous quote, or obvious location of journalist at a briefing, then code as 'Other: no clear attribution'

SUBJECT WHATS

RATIONALE

Rationale: general codes

"General" codes for Rationales ("Rationale: WMD: general") refer to either a mixed or unclear discussion of, for instance, WMDs as a justification for war. (Same for humanitarian justification and regional stability.)

Using 148 as an umbrella code

"148 – Rationale: other" should be used as if "Rationale: general", like "001 – ongoing battle", as an 'umbrella' to pick up mixed and detailed reports including various rationales. (Thus instead of having 4 or 5 rationales as subsidiary subjects, have "Rationale: other" as a Principle/Main – with the specific rationales listed as subsidiary/ peripherals.)

PROTEST

Protest and Rationale

Problems can arise when coding anti- or pro-war activity. Are pronouncements for or against the war protest, or just rationales? Statements or public addresses are *not* to be coded as protest, unless accompanied by marching, civil disobedience, resignation or some other kind of extraordinary activity. The only exception here is parliamentary dissent. When MPs take action against the war – voting against it or speaking out inside parliament – we code under the "Protest: Antiwar activity within the executive/legislature" codes.

Subjects: TONE CONTROL

Military casualty or POW stories

Stories of military casualties are inherently problematic for the coalition. But consider particularly how these events are spun when deciding on a tone code. Go for a mixed code if the negativity of the event is downplayed in the story. This does not mean it has to be wildly spun ala *The Sun*. Don't judge casualty or POW stories as *necessarily* problem stories, focus instead on how these emotive events are framed. If they are reported straight or, more likely, slightly sympathetically to the coalition (coalition sources downplaying the tragedy), code as "mixed" rather than "somewhat anti". News of these events will be problematic regardless of spin, but we are interested in

such cases to see whether the media cooperates in coalition attempts at damage control.

JUSTIFICATIONS FOR WAR

After a change in coding method after the pilot study, all “Justifications for War”, whether ‘explicit’ or ‘in passing’, must clearly be arguments / statements / pronouncements for or against the war. Hence, though there are some topics which, when evoked, support or undermine the war cause, they are not to be coded under the justifications unless raised in the context of an explicit argument. Someone needs to be explicitly making a case for or against the war, such as in a politician or interest group’s press statement, or at a protest march or other kinds of pro or anti-war activity. This means references to troops ‘liberating’ civilians, Saddam’s ‘tyranny’ or his WMD capability are NOT passing justifications for the war. They are only to be counted if someone – whether the journalist or a source – links them to the war’s legitimacy. Such topics will be picked up anyway in the Subject Whats and, less commonly, in reporter’s comments and tone codes.

Not explicit enough for justifications

“...more marines were preparing...to cross into the unknown – battle, or a cruise to a liberators’ welcome.” (James Meek, *The Guardian*, March 21, p.3) This relates to humanitarian / liberation perspective but no actual argument has been made here.

For stories about parliamentary or diplomatic disagreements over the war, mentions of someone being opposed to the war for whatever reason are NOT to be coded as Justifications. Only if that person is quoted or cited as making an argument for the war is it to be coded as a justification. A good example is the story, “MP wobblers back off” in *The Sun*, 17 March 2003, p.4 (ID3). Labour MPs and Chirac are reported as opposing or supporting the war, but none is even cited as advancing an argument for or against it. One guideline which follows is this: No quote or citation, no Justification.

Justifications for War – Assumed versus Reinforcing

As mentioned above, our coding does not account for passing references to several key anti-war discourses (such as the legal/UN argument). But we may still be able to capture such instances through the selection of tone code in the more explicit Justifications for War frame. If a reference to one of the specific arguments is made ‘in passing’, we can code this as “Assumed” rather than “Reinforcing”. So claims in passing that weapons inspections should continue, or that UN approval is needed, can be coded as Justifications for War (not Justifications in Passing), with the tone code selected as “Assumed”. “Reinforcing” can cover more explicit and clear enunciations of each argument. It may follow that we must collapse these two categories for analysis.

Counting separate justifications:

1. Acknowledgement of argument, followed by rebuttal

Many anti-war statements begin: “Saddam is a tyrant but...”. DO NOT code the tyranny reference as a separate passing reference to the humanitarian / liberation

argument. Thus, “Saddam *is* a tyrant, but America just wants Iraq’s oil” is *not* an explicit Self-Interest argument *and* a passing reference to the humanitarian / liberation argument. It is only the former. And, besides, calling Saddam a tyrant is not enough to be even a passing justification anymore: it needs to be followed by something along the lines of “he needs to be removed” or “the Iraqi people deserve to be liberated”.

2. Separate justification, same code

In a change to coding method, matching codes for justifications are NOT to be collapsed. Thus if, for instance, three different Islamic leaders (710) make three separate arguments, all of which are only covered by the “33 – Other anti-war argument” code, we are to count three different justifications.

3. Interrelated justifications

Some justifications are closely linked and can be interrelated. One common instance is the interrelatedness of ‘War on Terror’ and ‘Regional Security/Stability’ arguments. One anti-war justification which appears occasionally is the claim that the Iraq War will create regional instability which will in turn breed terrorism. In this instance, best to code just as the one rationale: “War will increase terrorist attacks on the West” even though there is also the idea that the war will destabilise the region.

JUSTIFICATIONS: FURTHER NOTES

Justifications: WMDs

Comment on a story with experts discussing Iraq’s WMD capability: Entire story is about whether or not Saddam has WMDs – or more accurately, which WMDs he has and how many. No actual justifications for or against the war though. Not one of the experts consulted expresses support or opposition to the war based on Iraq’s supposed WMDs.

Soldiers in the field or reports from the field: In the context of battle soldiers must be prepared for any eventuality, so fears of or preparations for WMD attacks are not necessarily arguments or justifications for or against the war. DO NOT code mentions of WMDs in the field, though assumptions of WMD capability obviously support the Coalition narrative. “Threat of WMD capability: assumed” is captured in subject whats, and even though this will often come up peripherally, it is one code that will get high reliability even peripherally.

(Such stories would also be coded under the WMD Coding Frame)

PROGNOSES

Future events are often evoked in the coverage, but to be coded as prognoses they must be speculated on: the journalist or the source must offer a prediction, and it must be explicit. Comments which are implicitly pessimistic about the future but which offer no clear prediction are therefore to be overlooked.

Also overlooked are predictions predicated on possibilities. “If the coalition uses cluster bombs many civilians will be killed or maimed”, for instance, is too indirect

and dependent on a possibility. It says not that many civilians will die or be injured because of the war, but that this will happen if cluster bombs are used (which before the war was uncertain). It *would* be a prognosis however if the source was to say, “Now that the use of cluster bombs has been confirmed there are likely to be many civilian casualties.”

One actual example: “A revolt by more than 205 Labour MPs...would mark the end of the most popular Prime Minister in history.” (Trevor Kavanagh, *The Sun*, March 17, p.4, ID3)

Promises of success or failure, though rhetorical, ARE to be counted as prognoses. “We will create democracy in Iraq” is a prognosis.

Example of prognoses:

Perhaps yes

“The stiff resistance (if there is stiff resistance) will come when the ‘giant wave of steel’ hits Baghdad, where Saddam Hussein’s troops are waiting.” (Rupert Cornwell, *The Independent*, March 22, p.10)

Definite no

“For that reason, the Bush administration undoubtedly reckons, the patriotic factor will loom large if the coalition assault does get bogged down or meets heavy opposition.” (Rupert Cornwell, *The Independent*, March 22, p.10)

Iraqi military casualties prognoses

This is a hard prognosis to code. On the one hand Iraqi military casualties suggest the coalition is winning the war. On the other it could be a negative development since (a) it is killing and (b) many or most Iraqi soldiers are conscripts, and (c) because the coalition states occasionally that it wants to keep the security forces intact to preside over the transition to democracy.

For the last three reasons prognoses for Iraqi military casualties are to be coded similarly to civilian casualties: reduced Iraqi military casualties receives an optimistic prognosis while many casualties is pessimistic.

Example: Implicitly optimistic prognosis on Iraqi military casualties for: “It [technological superiority] should allow the allies to fight a new kind of war – crippling Saddam’s war machine, crushing his defences and terrifying his troops into submission without killing them in vast numbers or leaving Iraq unable to function in the months ahead.” (*Daily Mail*, 19 March 2003, p.9, ID301)

REPORTER’S COMMENTS

1. **Only code full sentences.** Problems can arise when coders have to decide whether a half-sentence is long enough to be coded. E.g. At a summit last week UN Secretary General Kofi Annan stated, “QUOTE”. Reliability would be improved if the evaluative element is reduced. Coding only full sentences means we will inevitably miss some short reporter’s comments on Subject Whoms (like that above), but it

should improve reliability. One would hope that these things would even themselves out in the long run anyway. And since we capture reporter tone to Whoms anyway, we are not completely overlooking the treatment of story actors.

2. Only divide blocks of reporter comment into separate codes in exceptional circumstances – such as when the subject changes completely or where a dot point, subheading or switch to italics signifies a clear change of subject.

3. In stories with no quotes and no clear changes of subject, only use one reporter's comment. It is tempting to split a chunk of comment when, for instance, an otherwise straight report focusing on one actor is suddenly deflating towards another. However, doing so should be avoided because it risks capturing a disproportionate number of evaluative comments. Because we do not add a new reporter's comment for every new actor mentioned, separating them instead by quotes, splitting comments in order to capture deflating or reinforcing commentary would inevitably cause us to be overly inclusive of evaluative comment. Commentary will appear more evaluative than it actually was. Remember that the tone towards this one person will be captured in the tone control for 'Subject Whoms'.

Further points on reporter's comments:

We have noticed problems in deciding when a comment is 'straight' or one of the directional codes in articles where either 'tabloidese' or 'postcard from the edge/experience' style writing is the predominant style. In tabloid articles it can be difficult to distinguish between bold or trivialising language and that indicating evaluation or opinion. The informal or rather gung-ho language contributes to a sense of the reporter's approach to the war but without providing other indicators, it is difficult to determine when this should be treated as evaluative reporting. For example, expressions such as 'topple Saddam', 'slap down', 'torch the oil fields' 'watch the bombs fall' could be interpreted as reinforcing or deflating due to their connotations of power relations and bullish language. A more interpretive study or discourse analysis may concentrate on these factors, but the extensive nature of our content analysis means that such subtleties are considered too marginal to consider as directional language when deciding the reporter comment code. It would be easy for the reporter to deny that there was any intention of partiality in using this language; that it is merely the style used in tabloid newspapers to spice up the story and show enthusiasm for the subject. For this reason, use of such language alone would not be considered enough for a directional code, however, it may contribute to a 'deflating' or 'reinforcing' comment when used with other obvious indicators.

Likewise, the 'postcard from the edge' style articles may use a novelistic style writing which does not fit into our perceived ideas about journalistic language – this is not straight reporting of events taking place in the usual style of 'what, who, where, how, etc' or analysis/comment, but offers an experiential view of the war from embeds and unilaterals in the field. Again, the guidelines are to act with caution – there may be implied sympathy with the soldiers or civilians present, but unless there are clear loaded adjectives, *repeated* use of first person plural to enhance not only the sense of shared experience but also the reporter's role as combined with that of the military, and clear opinion, then code as straight.

This may result in an overestimation of straight reporting but it is unlikely to really impact on the level of loaded reporting in tabloids – their stance is clear enough. With 'postcard/experience' style articles, we are already noting this as a separate 'story type' and so can pick out instances of this for further analysis. This is preferable to

making claims of deflating/reinforcing language in marginal cases which may be difficult to defend.

DISDAIN

As with the election study, cases of disdain should be very clear to be recorded here. Marginal cases may include references to ‘spin’ or ‘propaganda’ but this alone would not make them examples of disdain. Obviously, such cases can always be queried and a decision reached together but true disdain is usually unmissable.

A borderline case: “Seven Cabinet loyalists...went on TV and radio yesterday to deliver the same spin doctors’ line.” (17/03/03 Mirror p2) Decided not to include. “Gordon Brown, an ally of Mr Morris, was wheeled out again to put the Government case...” (17/03/03 Mail p4)

For inclusion: “Paroting(sic) words stitched together by a raft of aides the cod-Shakespearean language did not hide the reality. He droned...” (19/03/03 Mirror p12 ID 285)

OVERALL TONE

To arrive at a judgement on overall tone of story, the coder must rely on various aspects of the news item, as recorded in the database. As with the coding frames on main subject areas, there are various factors which we consider important:

1. Subject ‘what’s
2. Sources cited/quotes
3. Tone towards the actors (see ‘subject whoms’)
4. Reporter comments
5. Are any justifications for war referred to?
6. Are any prognoses (pessimistic/optimistic for coalition) made?

Where articles/items are relatively compact in their subject matter, the task of deciding overall tone may be quite straightforward. For example, a diplomacy story may focus on efforts by Blair to repair rifts between US and Europe, stressing the importance of UN involvement in post-war Iraq. Our coding may look as follows;

Cited	Quoted	Secs	Subjects	Tone	Reporter
Bush	Blair	36	UN role in	Pro UK	Straight UK
Chirac	Expert	9	reconstruction		Straight UK
Kofi Annan			EU/US relations	Mix UK	Reinforcing UK
					Straight US

Prognosis	Justification in Passing
Implicitly optimistic	Assumed ref to humanitarian argument (liberation)

The item is clearly a diplomacy story, is reported mostly straight by the reporter, and the subject is one which we know from press briefings (see political frames) that Blair was keen to push. Blair is given the most space to speak, with others being cited but not quoted. Obviously the coder would need to look at what was said by the expert

and all the speakers to see how supportive or deflating they were towards Blair. In this case, Blair is the main initiator and subject of the news item. From the above information alone, the overall tone is likely to be somewhat-pro UK (though it could be 'mixed' if Blair's position was challenged by all the other speakers). The prognosis and justification reference are also supportive of the coalition, further guiding the coder towards a 'somewhat-pro' judgement.

It is important to stress that the coder may use these factors as a guideline, to aid consistency, but the judgement on tone is a qualitative one, informed by the overall content of the item, not merely a 'box ticking' exercise.

The above example is an ideal type in that there are few contradictory factors (of subject or approach) in the item. It becomes more complicated where items contain many disparate subjects, actors, reporter comments; or summarise the day's news, switching quickly from one subject to the next, with no real focus to the story. In this case it becomes more difficult to follow the level of criticism or reinforcement across the subject areas. We can use the coding frames to help in this situation. The main subjects may fall into the headings of 'battle' and 'humanitarian'. The coder would need to separate each subject and judge the treatment by recording the appropriate variables (for the six controls above) in the database.

For those subjects which fall into our main coding frames, there are clear guidelines on judging frame, should the coder need to double check when disentangling, say, battle codes from other subjects which come up in the story. A news item may focus on positive battle developments for the coalition, with effective attack and low resistance, but then give equal time to failure to deliver aid (coded according to humanitarian criteria) – in this case the overall tone is 'mixed', as the two areas are given equal attention. However, if the humanitarian story was merely a subsidiary subject, overshadowed by the battle story in length of time spent, use of sources, visuals; it would impact less on the overall tone.

Overall tone does then work as an 'aggregate' of the individual subject tone ratings, though with 'main' subjects weighted positively over 'subsidiary' subjects. Again, this is a qualitative judgement; the coder does not simply 'add up' the codes, but uses them as a guide to disentangle complex news stories. If a news item contains rolling news of on-going action, offering little evaluation or prognosis, it is likely to be coded as mixed. In this sense, the coder errs on the side of caution when making judgements on tone, though our system of recording tone for each subject means that the content of these hodgepodge-type stories can be broken down and examined for treatment of individual subjects – was it a principal, main or subsidiary subject? How often did it appear across time or media outlets? How did it play for the main actor involved?

Individual subject tone decisions

Perhaps a more basic question here is how the initial or 'micro' tone coding is made for each subject – the building block for our overall tone judgement. A simple guideline for this is to think about how the treatment of that particular subject affects the main actor involved. Many of our variables, especially in our principal areas of interest, are already split between positive or negative, for example 'successful delivery of coalition aid/failure of coalition to deliver aid'; whilst others are more open to interpretation, 'coalition attempts to deliver aid'. Our decision is guided by the clarity given to marked progress or failure, and informed by detailed research on

the coalition agenda throughout the conflict period. That knowledge means that we are, to some degree, measuring the media content against briefings.

We believe that we have included in our variables a broad range of subjects and justifications for the war and have the ability to capture levels of reinforcement or criticism, whether procedural or fundamental. The five-point scale used to gauge those levels (not including 'straight') allow us to distinguish between news considered 'bad' or 'good' for the main actors, and that which shows a reinforcing or deflating stance by the reporter, backed up perhaps with visuals and explicit arguments about the nature of the war. Only when an intensely one-sided view is given would we use our 'heavily...' codes. As well as sources used, the language used by the reporter is a good indicator. An editorial in the Daily Telegraph contained the following loaded terms: 'suppressed with the utmost savagery', 'Saddam's machinery of terror', 'a disastrous miscalculation', 'vicious attempts'. Of course, such language is more readily found in editorials, though the coder should always be aware of reporter evaluation and lexical choice. This language was used in the context of reports of a Basra uprising, British effective attacks and a concluding comment saying the 'British should be proud indeed'. The subject matter, with Tony Blair used as a source, and heavily reinforcing comments supporting the humanitarian cause for the war, indicate clear tone codings for both individual subjects and overall.

Deciding tone:

How does the subject come up? Is it a positive or negative development for the main actor involved (if there are various actors involved *prioritise* the coalition or Iraqi representatives)? In battle stories, think about who has initiated the action, or the actor mostly affected by the development. A looting story may have negative references to Iraqi civilians, but if blame is placed on the coalition for the situation, code as anti-coalition, rather than 'other'. If the coalition is not mentioned, code as 'anti-other'. This will indicate the omission of the coalition, and the focus on Iraqi people as the prime actors.

Do not make assumptions about how a subject may play for the coalition if they are not referred to, and that assumption is not based on a known and well documented coalition perspective.

Codebook for 2003 Iraq War Television Coverage for use with Microsoft Access Database

1. ID: (automatic number)
2. Date:
3. Programme:
4. Item number: (where in the running order the story occurs. Introductions by anchors will not be coded as separate stories, unless they are stand-alone pieces with no following field report. Each segment of a story by a separate reporter in a new location will be coded as a new story. See predominant format codes for more information)
5. Headline Story?
6. First Head?
7. Length: seconds on TV/ (lines in newspaper?)
8. Gender of reporter. a.) Gender of anchor? M/F/N (N for not applicable)
b.) Gender of secondary anchor? M/F/N (in studio)
c.) Gender of primary reporter? M/F/N
d.) Gender of secondary reporter? M/F/N

Each question allows for the absence of someone in that role, e.g. there is no anchor if the item is a stand-alone report. Where anchors introduce news stories with more than one field report, the follow-on reports should be coded as separate news items. There may be occasions where an anchor goes to a reporter who acts as remote anchor, with a follow-on report. For this reason, and for interviews with two reporters at the same time, the fourth question is included. However, if the remote anchor is introducing a report by him/herself, code only once for that person.

8a. Is an embedded reporter used? Yes/No/Can't determine/Not applicable

We have decided that all embeds should be coded as such, not only when specifically mentioned. This requires prior knowledge on behalf of the coder, and the need to be vigilant in those cases where embeds left their unit or unilaterals temporarily joined – but it provides the opportunity to distinguish between explicit mentions of embeds (noted in 'reporting restrictions') and stories where we know its primary origin is with an embed but no mention is made.

9. Predominant format: For items where the outside reporter merely rounds up what other people have seen/ heard, or is used as a remote anchor, use 'anchor + anchor on location' codes. However, if they are introducing a field report, use 'Field report with live introduction in the field'

#	Format
1	Anchor only
2	Anchor + stills/ graphic
3	Anchor + film
4	Anchor + live film
5	Anchor + anchor on location (live)
6	Anchor + anchor on location (not live)
7	Anchor + reporter in studio + graphics
8	Reporter in studio + graphics
9	Field Report with live introduction in the field
11	Live Field Report with intro
12	Non-live Field Report with intro
13	Live Stand-alone Field Report
14	Non-live Stand-alone Field Report
15	Live Field Report with intro: reporter from other media
16	Non-live Field Report with intro: reporter from other media
17	Live Stand-alone Field Report: reporter from other media
18	Non-live Stand-alone Field Report: reporter from other media
19	Live Field Report with intro: with Iraqi unit
20	Live Stand-alone Field Report: with Iraqi unit
21	Non-live Field Report with intro: with Iraqi unit
22	Non-live Stand-alone Field Report: with Iraqi unit
30	Interview with UK politician
31	Interview with US politician
32	Interview with Iraqi politician
33	Interview with Iraqi politician in exile
34	Interview with international politician (not US)
35	Interview with UK military personnel
36	Interview with US/ coalition military personnel
37	Interview with Iraqi military personnel
41	Interview with anti-war spokesperson (aligned)
42	Interview with UN representative
43	Interview with NGO/ aid worker
44	Interview with Academic Expert
45	Interview with Military Expert
46	Interview with Other Expert
51	Interview with Reporter(s) (in studio)
61	Interview with Outside Reporter(s): live: satellite link
62	Interview with Outside Reporter(s): live: video phone
63	Interview with Outside Reporter(s): live: phone with graphics
64	Interview with Outside Reporter(s): not live: satellite link
65	Interview with Outside Reporter(s): not live: video phone
66	Interview with Outside Reporter(s): not live: phone with graphics
71	Interview with Reporter(s) from other media (explicit mention): studio
72	Interview with Reporter(s) from other media: live: satellite link
73	Interview with Reporter(s) from other media: live: video phone
74	Interview with Reporter(s) from other media: live: phone with graphics
75	Interview with Reporter(s) from other media: not live: satellite link
76	Interview with Reporter(s) from other media: not live: video phone
77	Interview with Reporter(s) from other media: not live: phone with graphics

81	Round-table discussion
91	Editorial/ Commentary
99	Other

10. Primary location of reporter: Use the caption as a guideline, or where the reporter says they are if a location is given. Only use 'battle: non specific/ desert' if no other codes are appropriate.

Reporter location
Baghdad
Basra
Karbala
Nasiriya
Umm Qasr
Najaf
Iraq port
Southern Iraq
Northern Iraq
Central Iraq
Western Iraq
Kuwaiti desert
Battle non specific/ desert
Iraq: various locations
Aircraft carrier/ Military ship
Israel
Turkey
Iran
Syria
Saudi Arabia
Other Middle East location (not Qatar/
Other world (if no other category fits)
CentCom/Qatar/ Kuwait
Parliament
Downing Street
London: other (not in the street)
UK 'street'
Other UK location
Other UK assembly/parliament
Labour Central Office
Conservative Central Office
Lib Dem Central Office
Other political party headquarters
White House
Pentagon
US State Department
New York
Other US location
US 'street' (vox pops)

Other European assembly (including Summit of International leaders)
Other European location
Analysis: not applicable
Can't determine
Anchor on location
No location: In studio
Interview with more than one reporter

11. Reporting restrictions:

Is any reference made to the embedding of the reporter or any other restrictions, for example, whether there has been 'monitoring' of the report? There will also be a variable here for whether the report is preceded by a warning of 'disturbing images'. More than one code can be used.

Restrictions
None mentioned
'Embedded' reporter
Monitoring from Baghdad
Monitoring from Coalition
Warning of disturbing images
Location sensitive
Other

12. Story Type:

Story Type
Straight: events over last 24 hours
Analysis: info from different points in time
Feature: profile, interview
Other: reporter evaluation, editorial

13. What has given rise to the story?

(Note the occasion that gave rise to the story, immediate stimulus for the action or events.) If the anchor goes over to the correspondent in the field but it is not in response to a military event, code as 'media: journalist report'.

Occasion/ setting
Political: Legislative
Political: Government

Political: Interest Group/ Anti-war protest
Political: Press conference
Political: Planned Media opportunity
Political: Unplanned Media opportunity
Political: International Event/ Summit
Political: Other political actions
Conflict zone: Report from battle/action
Conflict zone: Mil briefing/ rpt. from Centcom
Conflict zone: Aid delivery/ humanitarian
Conflict zone: Restore order/ post-conflict unrest
Conflict zone: Reconstruction
Conflict zone: Other/ human interest
Media: interviews
Media: Journalist rpt./ News analysis
Media: public opinion poll
Media: other media actions
Other causes or occasions
No identifiable setting

14. Story subjects ‘whom’:

1. Each variable coded is coded as Main (M), Subsidiary (S), or Peripheral (P) to show order of prominence.
2. Whom? List actors using the following variables. **Only use each code once, even if it refers to more than one person.**
3. Also add ‘tone’ control. Straight/heavily reinforcing/reinforcing/, mixed/deflating/heavily deflating towards the ‘whom’ in question. **Tone only applies to the reporter’s stance, not the approach of other sources.**

Sources/ Whom

Subject	Label
500	Tony Blair
501	Geoff Hoon
502	Gordon Brown
503	Jack Straw
504	David Blunkett
505	John Reid
506	Peter Hain
507	Alistair Campbell
508	Simon Wren (in Qatar)
509	Clare Short
510	Robin Cook (pre-resignation)
511	Ann Clywd
512	Other (Cabinet) Minister
513	Downing Street named source
514	Downing Street unnamed source
515	Downing Street anonymous source
516	Downing Street leaked source
517	Foreign Office named source

518	Foreign Office unnamed source
519	Foreign Office anonymous source
520	Foreign Office leaked source
521	MoD named source
522	MoD unnamed source
523	MoD anonymous source
524	MoD leaked source
525	Other UK Government named source
526	Other UK Government unnamed
527	Other Labour MP/Lord (not anti-war)
528	Other Labour supporter (not anti-war)
529	Labour unnamed source (not anti-war)
530	Leaked government source
531	Government document/ figures
532	UK diplomat
533	Police/ spokesperson
534	UK intelligence sources
540	Robin Cook (post-resignation)
541	George Galloway
542	Ken Livingstone
543	Other Labour MP/Lord (anti-war)
544	Other Labour supporter (anti-war)
545	Labour unnamed source (anti-war)
550	Ian Duncan Smith
551	Michael Howard
552	Oliver Letwin
553	Michael Ancram: shadow foreign
554	Other Shadow Cabinet pro-war
555	Other Con MP/Lord (not anti-war)
556	Conservative unnamed source (not
557	Other Conservative supporter (not anti-
570	Other Shadow Cabinet anti-war
571	Kenneth Clarke
572	Michael Portillo
573	Other Con MP/Lord (anti-war)
574	Conservative unnamed source (anti-
575	Other Conservative supporter (anti-
580	Charles Kennedy
581	Menzies Campbell
582	Other Lib Dem leadership
583	Other Lib Dem MP/Lord
584	Lib Dem unnamed source
585	Other Lib Dem supporter
590	Other Political Party MP/ supporter (not
591	Other Political Party MP/ supporter
600	President Bush
601	Colin Powell: Secretary of State
602	Donald Rumsfeld: Defence Secretary
603	Dick Cheney: Vice President
604	Victoria Clarke
605	Condoleezza Rice

606	Karen Hughes
607	White House named source
608	White House unnamed source
609	White House anonymous source
610	White House leaked source
611	DoD named source
612	DoD unnamed source
613	DoD anonymous source
614	DoD leaked source
615	State Dept named source
616	State Dept unnamed source
617	State Dept anonymous source
618	State Dept leaked source
619	Other US Government named source
620	Other US Government unnamed
621	US diplomat
622	George Bush snr.
623	US intelligence sources
630	Other Democrat politician (not anti-war)
631	Other Republican politician (not anti-
635	Other Democrat politician (anti-war)
636	Other Republican politician (anti-war)
640	Saddam Hussein
641	Tariq Aziz (Deputy Prime Minister)
642	Ali Hassan al-Majid (chemical Ali)
643	Muhammad Said al-Sahaf (Information
644	Naji Sabri (foreign minister)
645	Other Iraqi leadership
646	Other Baath Party supporter
647	General Rawi (Iraq)
648	Other Iraq military spokesman
649	Iraqi soldier
650	Iraqi dissenting military voice
651	Fedayeen/ militia
652	Iraqi police/security
653	Iraqi intelligence sources
654	Iraqi Military intelligence sources
655	Other Iraqi authorities named source
656	Other Iraqi authorities unnamed source
657	Iraqi leadership: US playing card
658	Saddam's family
659	Foreign militia supportive of Saddam
660	Iraqi opposition leaders
661	Ahmed Chalabi
662	Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani
663	Other Iraqi Religious leader
664	Kurdish representative
665	Kurdish forces
666	Other militia against Saddam
667	Iraqi exile
670	Coalition military: Tommy Franks

671	US military spokesman: Frank Thorp
672	Al Lockwood
673	Major General McChrystal
674	General Myers
675	General Brooks
676	Other US Military named source
677	Other US Military unnamed source
678	US Military anonymous source
679	US Military leaked source
680	US Military intelligence source
681	US soldier(s)
682	Jessica Lynch
683	US dissenting military voice
690	UK military spokesman: Air Marshall
691	Chief of Defence Staff: Admiral Sir
692	Other UK Military named source
693	Other UK Military unnamed source
694	UK Military anonymous source
695	Other UK Military leaked source
696	UK Military intelligence source
697	UK soldier(s)
698	UK dissenting military voice
699	"Our Troops"
700	Other coalition forces/ source (not
701	Other private security forces
702	Coalition military religious figure
703	Coalition military medical worker
710	UK Islamic leader
711	Other Islamic Religious leader (not
720	Arch Bishop of Canterbury
721	Pope John Paul II
722	Other Non-Islamic Religious leader
730	UK Anti-war protester
731	UK Anti-war spokesperson
732	UK Voluntary human shield
733	US Anti-war protester
734	US Anti-war spokesperson
735	US Voluntary human shield
736	Coalition Anti-war protester
737	Coalition Anti-war spokesperson
738	Voluntary human shield Coalition
739	Non-Coalition Anti-war protester
740	Non-Coalition Anti-war spokesperson
741	Voluntary human shield Non-Coalition
750	UK Pro-war protester
751	UK Pro-war spokesperson
752	US Pro-war protester
753	US Pro-war spokesperson
760	Refugee interest group
761	Humanitarian pressure group
762	Geneva Convention

763	Aid/NGO/ Red Cross worker
764	NGO spokesperson
765	Medical worker in Iraq
766	Other pressure group
770	Expert linked to Academic organisation
771	Expert: Iraqi
772	Analyst: retired military (paid advisor)
773	Think tank
774	Other expert/ unnamed experts/
780	Kofi Annan
781	Hans Blix
782	Iraq Survey Group/ weapons inspector
783	The UN/ UN representative
784	UN document/resolution
790	Jose Maria Aznar: Spanish PM
791	Other coalition political
792	Israeli representative
793	Unspecified Coalition allies
800	EU representative/ organisation
801	Jaques Chirac/ French rep
802	Gerhard Schroeder/ German rep
803	Vladimir Putin/ Russian rep
804	Other world leaders
805	Turkish politician/ representative/
810	Gulf Co-operation Council/ Arab
811	Syrian representative
812	Palestinian representative
813	Saudi representative
814	Iranian representative
815	Kuwaiti representative
816	Egyptian representative
817	Jordanian representative
818	Other Arab political representative
820	Al Qaeda/ Osama bin Laden
821	Other terrorist group
830	Vox pops: UK
831	UK soldier family member/friend
832	UK Opinion poll: media source
833	UK Opinion poll: other source
834	"The UK Public"
840	Vox pops: US
841	US soldier family member/friend
842	US opinion poll: media source
843	US opinion poll: other source
844	"The American People"
845	"The US Public"
846	Non UK/US/Iraq opinion poll: media
847	Non UK/US/Iraq opinion poll: other
848	"The International Public"
849	International vox pops
850	Iraqi civilian(s)

851	Iraqi soldier family member/friend
852	Iraq opinion poll: media source
853	Iraq opinion poll: other source
854	Ali Ismail Abbas
855	Iraqi civilian: non-interview/chanting
856	"The Iraqi People"
860	Richard Sambrook/ BBC
861	Steve Anderson/ ITV spokes/executive
862	Own reporter (as initiator of story)
863	UK reporter from other media source
864	UK media (not specific)
865	UK unidentified media
866	UK TV (general)
867	BBC
868	UK newspaper
869	The Times
870	UK radio
871	Media personality
872	Specific journalist (named but not
873	Embedded reporter
874	Interlocutor (NB. For use in press
880	US reporter from other media source
881	US media (not specific)
882	US unidentified media
883	US TV (general)
884	ABC
885	CBS
886	NBC
887	CNN
888	FOX
889	US newspaper
890	The New York Times
891	The Washington Post
892	US radio
900	Freedom TV/coalition controlled media
901	Iraqi State television/newspaper
902	Arab reporter from other media source
903	Al Jazeera
904	Abu Dhabi
905	Other Arab media (not specific
906	Other foreign reporter
907	International Media
908	International unidentified Media
909	Internet source
910	Other media source: non-specific/
920	TU representative anti-war
921	TU representative pro-war
922	Business representative anti-war
923	Business representative pro-war
924	Bill Clinton
925	Other: celebrities anti-war

926	Other: celebrities pro-war
927	Other: God
928	Other: Allah
929	Other: "The International Community"
998	Other: no clear attribution
999	Other: no applicable code

15. Sources for quotes

Length in seconds and 'source' coded. See previous list of variables for whom/source. If translated, use the English translation time. Subtitles don't tend to be used on evening news.

16. Cited as source but not quoted

Use variables from whom/source, as above. **If the same person is cited as well as quoted, do not record here. However, if the code used is more general and applies to different people, it can be repeated here, e.g. 'US government named official'.**

17. Main story subjects (What)

1. Ranking given to show order of importance/ prominence, where **1.** is highest for Principal Subject (s), **(M)** Main subject(s) and **(S)** for subsidiary subjects. Detailed instructions for this on separate sheet. **SEE APPENDIX ONE**
2. Story subject selected from 'subject what' variables, listed below (a).
3. Who initiated the event? (from 'event or visual initiator' variables which include planned/unplanned distinction) (b).
4. **Code for 'tone' towards main actors.** Detailed instructions for this on separate sheet. (c). **SEE APPENDIX TWO**

Further instructions:

Record the major subjects covered in the story

Each subject is ranked according to its prominence in the news item;

Principal Subject(s)

This is reserved for subjects which are given most prominence in the article. There may be one overriding message of the article, or it may treat two or three subject areas as equally important entities – in each case these subject variables are given a 'principal' code. The difficulty arises in those stories which deal with various subjects, providing no in-depth coverage of any one subject. In this case, for example, if the principal subject could only be described as 'ongoing battle', use this as the principal code, and gauge the importance of the lesser codes depending on the amount of space devoted to them – how many column inches? Is the subject repeatedly returned to? Is a source quoted on this subject at length? For example, an on-going battle story may be about Iraqi resistance, coalition attack, use of human shields, air attack, with no one variable offering an answer to the question; what is this report

really **about**? However, once an ‘ongoing battle’ code is awarded for the principal subject, a decision is made on the prominence of other subjects.

Main subject(s)

In our above example, we may find that ‘Iraqi resistance’ receives much more attention than the other subjects, though it is arguably not the principal subject due to the rolling nature of the story. Due to space devoted to it, it may be given a ‘main’ subject ranking, with an appropriate ‘tone’ code. A main subject would have a substantial part of the news items dedicated to it, though may not stand out as what the story is principally about.

Subsidiary (S) subject(s)

Often, reports will begin with a main focus, and then offer a ‘round-up’ of other events, without detailed focus. For example a battle story may include a short clip on the delivery of water supplies, with a comment by the reporter or another source. It is not a main subject in the sense that particular attention is paid to it, but it is also not peripheral, because of a visual, comment, etc. places it as part of that news item, though somewhere down the line in order of prominence. You may not find you use this category very much, though it is useful for when a subject is not dealt with at length but a significant point is made about it, especially if it has implications for the tone of the article.

(a).

Subject	Main Category	Sub Category
001	Battle	Ground combat/ ongoing battle/ military situation
002	Battle	Air attack
003	Battle	Coalition aircraft losses
004	Battle	Iraqi aircraft losses (relevant?)
005	Battle	Coalition battle gains
006	Battle	Coalition battle losses
007	Battle	Iraqi battle gains
008	Battle	Iraqi battle losses
009	Battle	Death/ capture of Iraqi leadership (not Saddam)
010	Battle	Coalition attack: general
011	Battle	Coalition attack: effective
012	Battle	Coalition attack: ineffective
013	Battle	Coalition attack: delay/ bad weather
014	Battle	Iraqi resistance: general
015	Battle	Iraqi resistance: fierce/ effective
016	Battle	Iraqi resistance: ineffective/ lack of/ surrender
017	Battle	Coalition troops morale
018	Battle	Iraqi troops morale
019	Battle	Coalition troops expertise
020	Battle	Iraqi troops expertise
021	Battle	Coalition military intelligence
022	Battle	Iraqi military intelligence
023	Battle	Relations between coalition troops
024	Battle	Relations between coalition and Iraqi troops
025	Battle	Relations between Iraqi troops
026	Battle	Daily life of UK troops/human interest
027	Battle	Daily life of US troops/human interest
028	Battle	Daily life of Iraqi troops/human interest

029	Battle	Coalition: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits
030	Battle	Iraqis: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits
031	Battle	Destruction of homes attributed to coalition
032	Battle	Destruction of homes attributed to Iraqi military
033	Battle	Destruction of homes attributed to non-regular forces
034	Battle	Destruction of infrastructure attributed to coalition
035	Battle	Destruction of infrastructure attributed to Iraqi military
036	Battle	Destruction of infrastructure attributed to non-regular forces
037	Battle	Burning oil fields
038	Battle	Protection of oil fields/ ministry
039	Battle	Removal of mines
040	Battle	Delay: danger of mines
041	Battle	Dolphins or other animals for military purposes
042	Battle	Encounters with civilians: Iraqi troops
043	Battle	Encounters with civilians: coalition troops (UK/US)
044	Battle	Iraqi troop movements
045	Battle	Coalition troop movements
046	Battle	Logistics/ supplies
047	Battle	Post attack/ devastation (emergency workers)
048	Battle	Collapse of regime
049	Battle	War crimes
050	Battle	Length of war
051	Battle	Other: battle: no appropriate code
060	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: air: precision
061	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: air: non-precision
062	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: ground: precision
063	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: ground: non-precision
064	Battle/Weapons	Weapons/technology: other/general
070	Battle/ Tactics	Suicide bomb/ attacks
071	Battle/ Tactics	Car bomb
072	Battle/ Tactics	Psych-ops Coalition (leaflets/radio broadcasts)
073	Battle/ Tactics	Psych-ops Coalition: playing cards
074	Battle/ Tactics	Psych-ops Iraqi
075	Battle/ Tactics	Attack on media outlet attributed to coalition
076	Battle/ Tactics	Attack on media outlet attributed to Iraqi military
077	Battle/ Tactics	Attack on media outlet attributed to non-regular forces
078	Battle/ Tactics	Depleted Uranium
079	Battle/ Tactics	Cluster bombs
080	Battle/ Tactics	Use of human shields/ citizens by Iraq authorities
081	Battle/ Tactics	Guerrilla tactics
082	Battle/ Tactics	Other Iraqi non-conventional/dubious tactics
083	Battle/ Tactics	Other Coalition non-conventional/dubious tactics
084	Battle/ Tactics	Distinction made between UK and US military methods
085	Battle/ Tactics	Battle/ Tactics: other/general
090	Strategy	Deadlines for action/war
091	Strategy	Distinction made between UK and US strategy
092	Strategy	Distinction made between UK and US goals
093	Strategy	Unification/synchronisation of coalition strategy
094	Strategy	Description of 'Shock and Awe' (explicit mention)
095	Strategy	Evaluation of 'Shock and Awe'
096	Strategy	Description of Coalition military strategy

097	Strategy	Description of Coalition military goals
098	Strategy	Description of UK military strategy
099	Strategy	Description of UK military goals
100	Strategy	Description of US military strategy
101	Strategy	Description of US military goals
102	Strategy	Description of Iraqi military strategy
103	Strategy	Description of Iraqi military goals
104	Strategy	Success of Coalition military strategy
105	Strategy	Failure of Coalition military strategy
106	Strategy	Success of Coalition military goals
107	Strategy	Failure of Coalition military goals
108	Strategy	Success of UK military strategy
109	Strategy	Failure of UK military strategy
110	Strategy	Success of UK military goals
111	Strategy	Failure of UK military goals
112	Strategy	Success of US military strategy
113	Strategy	Failure of US military strategy
114	Strategy	Success of US military goals
115	Strategy	Failure of US military goals
116	Strategy	Success of Iraqi military strategy
117	Strategy	Failure of Iraqi military strategy
118	Strategy	Success of Iraqi military goals
119	Strategy	Failure of Iraqi military goals
120	Strategy	Evaluation of coalition strategy, ground and general
121	Strategy	Evaluation of coalition air attack
122	Strategy	Evaluation of Iraqi strategy, ground and general
123	Strategy	Evaluation of Iraqi air attack (relevant?)
124	Strategy	Deployment of troops/ sufficient numbers
125	Strategy	Strategy: other/general
130	Rationale	Rationale: humanitarian general
131	Rationale	Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change
132	Rationale	Regime change: war will worsen situation
133	Rationale	Rationale: WMDs general
134	Rationale	WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins
135	Rationale	WMD threat does not exist
136	Rationale	Rationale: Legal argument general/ UN
137	Rationale	Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions
138	Rationale	Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate
139	Rationale	Rationale: Coalition self interest general
140	Rationale	Self Interest/ imperialist aims UK
141	Rationale	Self Interest/ imperialist aims US
142	Rationale	Rationale: oil rights general
143	Rationale	Oil rights as reason for war
144	Rationale	Oil in trust fund for Iraqi people
145	Rationale	Rationale: regional stability general
146	Rationale	Regional stability as outcome of war
147	Rationale	Regional instability as outcome of war
148	Rationale	Rationale: other/general
160	Media	Embedded reporter(s) as subject
163	Media	UK media strategy (spin, briefings)
164	Media	US media strategy

165	Media	Coalition media strategy
166	Media	Iraqi media strategy
167	Media	Media technology
168	Media	Internet
169	Media	Censorship by Iraqi leadership
170	Media	Censorship by coalition
171	Media	Inaccuracy of media report
172	Media	UK media coverage
173	Media	US media coverage
174	Media	Arab media coverage
175	Media	Iraqi media coverage
176	Media	About other international coverage
177	Media	24/7 media coverage - mechanisms
178	Media	24/7 media coverage: effects on perceptions of events
179	Media	24/7 media coverage: effects on perception of length of war
180	Media	Media story
181	Media	Government's sensitivity to media coverage
182	Media	Media casualties, no attribution of responsibility
183	Media	Media casualties, responsibility of coalition
184	Media	Media casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
185	Media	Media casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
186	Media	Media: other/general
187	Media	Media support/campaign for troops
190	POW	Prisoners of war/ MIA: coalition
191	POW	Prisoners of war/ MIA: Iraqi
192	POW	Kidnapping/ murder of civilians
193	POW	Kidnapping/ murder of coalition military
194	POW	Kidnapping/ murder of Iraqi military
195	POW	Torture or abuse: coalition POWs
196	POW	Torture or abuse: Iraqi POWs
197	POW	Torture or abuse: civilians
198	POW	POWs/ MIAs: other/general
200	Casualties	Overall Body Count/ or as an issue
201	Casualties	UK military casualties, no attribution of responsibility
202	Casualties	UK military casualties, responsibility of coalition
203	Casualties	UK military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
204	Casualties	UK military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
205	Casualties	UK military casualties: personalization/obituary
206	Casualties	UK military casualties: statistical information only
207	Casualties	UK military casualties: family reaction supportive of war
208	Casualties	UK military casualties: family reaction critical of war
209	Casualties	US military casualties, no attribution of responsibility
210	Casualties	US military casualties, responsibility of coalition
211	Casualties	US military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
212	Casualties	US military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
213	Casualties	US military casualties: personalization/obituary
214	Casualties	US military casualties: statistical information only
215	Casualties	US military casualties: family reaction supportive of war
216	Casualties	US military casualties: family reaction critical of war
217	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, no attribution of responsibility
218	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of coalition

219	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
220	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
221	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: personalization/obituary
222	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: statistical information only
223	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: family reaction supportive of war
224	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: family reaction critical of war
225	Casualties	Civilian casualties, no attribution of responsibility
226	Casualties	Civilian casualties, responsibility of coalition
227	Casualties	Civilian casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
228	Casualties	Civilian casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
229	Casualties	Civilian casualties: accidental
230	Casualties	Other casualties: non-Iraqi, international
231	Casualties	Casualties: Coalition claims/ estimates/ rebuttal
232	Casualties	Casualties: Iraqi claims/ estimates/ rebuttal
233	Casualties	Friendly fire/ blue on blue
234	Casualties	Casualties: other/general
240	Protest	Antiwar movement as an issue: UK
241	Protest	Antiwar activity: within legislature: UK
242	Protest	Antiwar activity: within executive: UK
243	Protest	Antiwar activity: peaceful demonstration: UK
244	Protest	Antiwar activity: violent demonstration: UK
245	Protest	Antiwar activity: individual demonstration: UK
246	Protest	Antiwar activity: voluntary human shields: UK
247	Protest	Antiwar activity: in UK military
248	Protest	Police tactics vis-à-vis antiwar movement: UK
249	Protest	Counter protests: UK
250	Protest	Balance between antiwar and counter protests: UK
251	Protest	Antiwar movement as an issue: US
252	Protest	Antiwar activity: within legislature: US
253	Protest	Antiwar activity: within executive: US
254	Protest	Antiwar activity: peaceful demonstration: US
255	Protest	Antiwar activity: violent demonstration: US
256	Protest	Antiwar activity: individual demonstration: US
257	Protest	Antiwar activity: voluntary human shields: US
258	Protest	Antiwar activity: in US military
259	Protest	Police tactics vis-à-vis antiwar movement: US
260	Protest	Counter protests: US
261	Protest	Balance between antiwar and counter protests: US
262	Protest	Antiwar protest in Europe
263	Protest	Antiwar protest in Iraq
264	Protest	Antiwar protest in other Arab or Muslim countries
265	Protest	Antiwar protest: other
266	Protest	Pro-war rally/demonstration
267	Protest	Protests: other/general
270	Diplomacy	Summit of world leaders
271	Diplomacy	Peace initiative: war seen as failure of negotiations/diplomacy
272	Diplomacy	Peace initiative: peaceful settlement with Iraq impossible
273	Diplomacy	Impact on UK/Europe relations
274	Diplomacy	Impact on US/ Europe relations
275	Diplomacy	Impact on US/ UK relations
276	Diplomacy	Tensions within coalition

277	Diplomacy	International Relations general
278	Diplomacy	UK foreign policy - Europe
279	Diplomacy	UK foreign policy - Middle East
280	Diplomacy	UK foreign policy - Other
281	Diplomacy	US foreign policy - Europe
282	Diplomacy	US foreign policy - Middle East
283	Diplomacy	US foreign policy - Other
284	Diplomacy	EU skepticism/ opposition to military intervention
285	Diplomacy	Middle East: Israel/Palestine tension
286	Diplomacy	World Security
287	Diplomacy	Regional political stability
288	Diplomacy	International law
289	Diplomacy	Iraq territorial integrity
290	Diplomacy	International support for military action
291	Diplomacy	International disagreements about military action
292	Diplomacy	Diplomacy: other/general
300	Public opinion	Public opinion: UK
301	Public opinion	Public opinion: US
302	Public opinion	Public opinion: international
303	Public opinion	'Islamophobia'
304	Public opinion	Public opinion: other/general
310	Religion	Religion and the war: Islam vs. Christianity as issue
311	Religion	Religion and the war: Islam not the enemy, religiosity downplayed
312	Religion	Religion and the war: other/general
320	Reconstruction/Fut	Cost of reconstruction
321	Reconstruction/Fut	Strategy for reconstruction general
322	Reconstruction/Fut	Role of businesses/ commercial operation
323	Reconstruction/Fut	Coalition's length of stay in Iraq
324	Reconstruction/Fut	Representative democracy in Iraq/ post-war governance
325	Reconstruction/Fut	UN role in reconstruction
326	Reconstruction/Fut	Peace (the challenge)
327	Reconstruction/Fut	Iraqi exiles' role in reconstruction
328	Reconstruction/Fut	Future developments of operations
329	Reconstruction/Fut	Future conflicts
330	Reconstruction/Fut	Reconstruction/future: other/general
340	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: coalition effective
341	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: coalition ineffective
342	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: coalition attempts
343	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: Iraqi police effective
344	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: Iraqi police ineffective
345	Law and (dis)order	Ethnic violence
346	Law and (dis)order	Looting
347	Law and (dis)order	Civil unrest/ disorder
348	Law and (dis)order	Law and (dis)order: other/general
350	Domestic	Debate in Parliament/ domestic policy matters
351	Domestic	UK domestic politics
352	Domestic	Debate in Congress/ Senate
353	Domestic	US domestic politics
354	Domestic	Cost of war
355	Domestic	Domestic: other/general
356	Domestic	Support for coalition troops (not media/families of casualties)

357	Domestic	Support for Iraqi troops
360	Blair	Blair: focus on
370	Bush	Bush: focus on
380	WMD	WMD: speculation/ will be found
381	WMD	WMD: evidence found/ positive developments
382	WMD	WMD: not found yet
383	WMD	WMD: not likely to find/ negative developments
384	WMD	Threat of chemical/ biological warfare in Iraq: assumed
385	WMD	Threat of chemical/ biological warfare in Iraq: questioned
386	WMD	WMDs: other/general
390	Terrorism	Terrorism: Iraq's links to Al Qaeda
391	Terrorism	Terrorism: No evidence of links to Al Qaeda
392	Terrorism	War on Terror: war will prevent future attacks (inc on US/UK)
393	Terrorism	War on Terror: war will encourage future attacks (inc on US/UK)
394	Terrorism	War on Terror: general/other
395	Terrorism	Terrorism: in other Middle East country
396	Terrorism	Terrorism: Other/general
400	Historical	Brutality of regime/ past atrocities
401	Historical	Demonisation of Saddam
402	Historical	Sanctions as humanitarian disaster: West to blame
403	Historical	Sanctions/ Oil for Food effectiveness hampered by Saddam
404	Historical	Western involvement in supplying WMD materials
405	Historical	Comparison/reference to 1991 Gulf war
406	Historical	Previous uprisings by Iraqi people
407	Historical	Comparison to past conflict (Vietnam/ WW2/Afghanistan)
408	Historical	9/11 reference
409	Historical	Iraqi support for Palestinians
410	Historical	Western/ US support for Israel
411	Historical	Historical: other/general
420	Family Life	Families of UK soldiers
421	Family Life	Families of US soldiers
422	Family Life	Families of Iraqi soldiers
423	Family Life	Soldiers' Families: Other/general
430	Saddam	Death of Saddam/ speculation on whereabouts
431	Saddam	Destruction/ defacing/ mocking of image/statue
432	Saddam	Celebration of image
433	Saddam	Saddam's family/ fleeing the country
434	Saddam	Saddam's millions/ decadence
435	Saddam	Saddam: other/general/focus
440	Humanitarian	Success of/funds for coalition/UN aid delivery to Iraqi people
441	Humanitarian	Failure of/lack of funds for coalition/UN aid delivery to Iraqi people
442	Humanitarian	Coalition/UN attempts to deliver aid
443	Humanitarian	Non-coalition/NGO aid delivery to Iraqi people
444	Humanitarian	Hospitals: shortage of medicine supplies, treatment
445	Humanitarian	Hospitals: adequate medicine supplies, treatment
446	Humanitarian	Water/food shortage
447	Humanitarian	Water/food supplies adequate
448	Humanitarian	Humanitarian consequences of war: general
449	Humanitarian	Humanitarian consequences of war: positive
450	Humanitarian	Humanitarian consequences of war: negative
451	Humanitarian	Refugees

452	Humanitarian	Geneva Convention
453	Humanitarian	Humanitarian: other/general
460	Iraqi People	Celebration in Iraq (pro-coalition)
461	Iraqi People	Hostility/ civil unrest in Iraq (anti-coalition)
462	Iraqi People	Loyalty to Saddam portrayed as genuine
463	Iraqi People	Loyalty to Saddam portrayed as not genuine / fearful
464	Iraqi People	Wariness toward coalition/ feelings of betrayal
465	Iraqi People	Welcoming to coalition/ troops
466	Iraqi People	Human interest: Iraqi civilian profile/ daily life
467	Iraqi People	Hostility/ civil unrest/ uprising in Iraq (not anti-coalition)
468	Iraqi People	Co-operation with Coalition
469	Iraqi People	Iraqi people: other/general
480	Other	Environmental disaster
483	Other	Reaction to war in other neighboring/ Mid East country (not public
484	Other	Reaction to war in other locale
485	Other	Human interest: other
486	Other	Price of oil
487	Other	UK stock market
488	Other	US stock market
489	Other	Question/comment by interlocutor (for press briefings only)
490	Other	Own statement (for press briefings only)
491	Other	Statement by other (for press briefings only)
999	Other	Other: no appropriate code

(b). Event initiator. This refers to the actual event, i.e. the military attack, or anti-war demonstration.

#	Event initiator
01	US Military: planned
02	US Military: unplanned
03	UK Military: planned
04	UK Military: unplanned
05	Iraqi Military: planned
06	Iraqi Military: unplanned
07	Other Military: planned
08	Other Military: unplanned
09	USA political officials: planned
10	USA political officials: unplanned
11	UK political officials: planned
12	UK political officials: unplanned
13	Iraqi political officials: planned
14	Iraqi political officials: unplanned
15	Other official: UN: planned
16	Other official: UN: unplanned
17	Other official: European leader: planned
18	Other official: European leader: unplanned
19	Other official: Middle East: planned
20	Other official: Middle East: unplanned
21	Coalition soldiers/ Front line: planned
22	Coalition soldiers/ Front line: unplanned

23	Iraqi soldiers/ Front line: planned
24	Iraqi soldiers/ Front line: unplanned
25	Terrorist/ non-regular forces: planned
26	Terrorist/ non-regular forces: unplanned
27	Analysts/ Experts: planned
28	Analysts/ Experts: unplanned
29	Muslim community: UK or US: planned
30	Muslim community: UK or US: unplanned
31	Muslim community: other locale: planned
32	Muslim community: other locale: unplanned
33	Think Tank: planned
34	Think Tank: unplanned
35	Religious leader: planned
36	Religious leader: unplanned
37	Protesters: antiwar UK: planned
38	Protesters: antiwar UK: unplanned
39	Protesters: antiwar US: planned
40	Protesters: antiwar US: unplanned
41	Protesters: antiwar other: planned
42	Protesters: antiwar other: unplanned
43	Protesters: pro-war UK: planned
44	Protesters: pro-war UK: unplanned
45	Protesters: pro-war US: planned
46	Protesters: pro-war US: unplanned
47	Protesters: pro-war other: planned
48	Protesters: pro-war other: unplanned
49	Police: planned
50	Police: unplanned
51	Iraqi civilians: planned
52	Iraqi civilians: unplanned
53	UK media: planned
54	UK media: unplanned
55	US media: planned
56	US media: unplanned
57	Iraqi media: planned
58	Iraqi media: unplanned
59	Arab media: planned
60	Arab media: unplanned
61	Internet: planned
62	Internet: unplanned
63	Other World Reporter: planned
64	Other World Reporter: unplanned
65	Family of coalition soldier: planned
66	Family of coalition soldier: unplanned
67	Family of Iraqi soldier: planned
68	Family of Iraqi soldier: unplanned
69	Aid agency/ NGO: planned
70	Aid agency/ NGO: unplanned
71	Coalition general: planned
72	Coalition general: unplanned
73	Opinion Poll

74	No clear initiator
75	Other/ no code

(c). Tone control.

#	Tone
01	Straight UK
02	Straight US
03	Straight IRAQ
04	Straight UN
05	Straight ANTIWAR
06	Straight ARAB LEAGUE
07	Straight OTHER
08	Straight COALITION
09	Heavily anti-UK
10	Heavily anti-US
11	Heavily anti-IRAQ
12	Heavily anti-UN
13	Heavily anti-ANTI WAR
14	Heavily anti-ARAB LEAGUE
15	Heavily anti-OTHER
16	Heavily anti-COALITION
17	Somewhat anti-UK
18	Somewhat anti-US
19	Somewhat anti-IRAQ
20	Somewhat anti-UN
21	Somewhat anti-ANTI WAR
22	Somewhat anti-ARAB
23	Somewhat anti-OTHER
24	Somewhat anti-COALITION
25	Mixed UK
26	Mixed US
27	Mixed IRAQ
28	Mixed UN
29	Mixed ANTIWAR
30	Mixed ARAB LEAGUE
31	Mixed OTHER
32	Mixed COALITION
33	Somewhat pro-UK
34	Somewhat pro-US
35	Somewhat pro-IRAQ
36	Somewhat pro-UN
37	Somewhat pro-ANTI WAR
38	Somewhat pro-ARAB
39	Somewhat pro-OTHER
40	Somewhat pro-COALITION
41	Heavily pro-UK
42	Heavily pro-US
43	Heavily pro-IRAQ
44	Heavily pro-UN
45	Heavily pro-ANTI WAR

46	Heavily pro-ARAB LEAGUE
47	Heavily pro-OTHER
48	Heavily pro-COALITION
98	Can't determine
99	Not applicable

18. Peripheral subject(s) (separate control/box)

Use the above list of variables (a.) to record 'peripheral' subjects. These do not require an 'initiator' or 'tone' coding. Peripheral subjects are still considered an important part of the analysis. This is where a subject is referred to 'in passing' with no considerable time devoted to its explanation. In this category we are noting the 'occurrence' or 'mention' of any subject not considered in detail.

Overall, there is likely to be some leeway between these lower subject categories as regards coder reliability. The line between a peripheral and subsidiary subject may be quite hard to distinguish. The important point is to achieve reliability on the principal subject and for the database to accurately represent the subjects which are prioritised in the news item. This ranking system gives a clear representation, without forcing the coder into a decision about whether an item is number four or number six in a numerical classification. It also has advantages in not compelling the coder to say that one subject only is the principal subject, as many other studies do.

19. Coding frame used?

There are detailed instructions on 'coding frames' in the introduction to the codebook. In this control we are interested in how certain frames are represented with regards to key themes, for example, 'battle' or 'humanitarian issues'. The coder must only consider the relevant subjects, reporter comments, prognoses and visuals when considering the tone relating to the specific theme. A news item may include both battle subjects and diplomacy – when considering the overall 'battle' code here, any diplomacy subjects would be disregarded.

Coding frame
Not applicable
Battle
Strategy
Civilian casualties
Humanitarian issues (aid delivery)
Coalition military casualties
Iraqi military casualties
Restoration of law and order (post-conflict)
Justification: WMDs
Justification: Humanitarian (Blairite)
Justification: War on Terror

a.) Where relevant subjects feature as a main part of the story, code according to the appropriate coding frame. More than one coding frame may be used. For more information on relevant subjects, please see the instructions set out in the introduction to the codebook.

b.) Each 'coding frame' is awarded a 'tone' coding. See 17 (c.) for variables.

20. Justifications for war

Are reasons for and against the war, or objectives, discussed by anyone? Please record the nature of the argument (a.), the source (b.), and the tone towards the argument presented (c.).

This control is for specific statements made on justifications, not those alluded to in passing. There are plenty of variables in 'subject what' to pick up on passing mentions that may reinforce arguments used by the main actors. For example, soldiers searching for WMDs or donning chemical protection suits would be recorded in 'visuals' or 'subject whats' but would not require a separate coding in this section. Do include arguments made by reporters, but only credit to them when they give no other attribution and make the claim as their own evaluative judgement or 'fact'. If 'weak' attribution is made, such as 'it is claimed' or 'we are hearing', record the appropriate variable under 'whom' as the source, e.g. 'no clear attribution'.

#	Justification
00	Not applicable
01	Legal: Iraq not fully complied with resolutions to disarm / deceit and concealment of weapons
02	Humanitarian argument: Saddam continues to repress the people of Iraq/ malnutrition and disease
03	Iraq has the capability to launch weapons of mass destruction
04	Iraq has chemical weapons that Saddam has shown he will use
05	To remove the potential for Iraq to develop nuclear weapons (?)
06	Use of sanctions only hurts the Iraqi people; need for military action
07	Terrorism: to destroy an ally/ weapons supplier to Al Qaeda or other extremists
08	Intelligence reports support the need for an ultimatum and are accurate
09	Military force is necessary as Iraq has failed to comply with demands
10	World role: As example to other states against tyranny and dictatorships
11	Moral: War is necessary to prevent further suffering and threat to the world
12	Legal: Military action is in breach of international law and UN Charter
13	Humanitarian argument: the war will worsen the situation and create a humanitarian crisis
14	Weapons inspectors/ Iraq Survey Group should continue their search
15	The case for Iraq having WMDs has not being proven/ they do not exist
16	Use of sanctions only hurts the Iraqi people; need to reassess but not attack
17	Terrorism: no links to Al Qaeda have been proven
18	Intelligence reports are inaccurate/ give no clear indication of the need for an ultimatum
19	Other action should be taken against Iraq that does not require military intervention
20	World role: Western states are wrong to interfere in Arab affairs
21	Moral: war is wrong, even if threat is proven
22	Legal: middle ground: war should be considered, but only when authority given by UN
23	Outcomes: Democracy in Iraq
24	To protect Iraq's territorial integrity (Blair 25/3/03)
25	Oil trust fund for Iraqi people
26	Remove Saddam from power
27	Destroy weapons of mass destruction
28	As part of a more stable Middle East, to continue work towards peace
29	To secure oil fields for the West
30	War will increase regional instability
31	War will increase terrorist attacks against the US/ West
32	War will lead to civil unrest once Saddam is removed

33	Other anti-war argument (self-interest, revenge, US aggression)
34	Other pro-war argument

(b.) For source use ‘whom’ variables.

(c.) for ‘tone’. Remember that this ‘tone’ control refers to the treatment of the **argument**, not the person speaking.

Tone towards rationale
Deflating
Questioned
Mixed
Assumed
Reinforcing

21. Justifications in passing

Please note general assumptions made about the reasons for war. There should still be a clear link to the rationale, not merely references to events which may support or deflate the justification. Source and tone controls to be used as above.

#	Justifications in passing
01	Reference to Iraqi WMD capability (Coalition perspective)
02	Reference to humanitarian argument for war (democracy, freedom [from tyranny]) (Coalition perspective)
03	Reference to regional security argument ('safer world') (Coalition perspective)
04	Reference to Iraqi War and War on Terror (Coalition perspective) (unofficial/anti-war perspective)
05	Reference to self-interested US power projection (i.e. influence in Middle East) (unofficial/anti-war perspective)
06	Reference to US economic interests in Iraq (oil and reconstruction) (unofficial/anti-war perspective)
07	Reference to domestic sources of US policy in Iraq (unofficial/anti-war perspective)
08	Reference to any other non-coalition/anti-war explanation for the war

22. Reporter's Comments

Directional codes, i.e. reinforcing/deflating/mixed should only be used if a clear slant or interpretation is given by the journalist. The reporting of a successful battle or aid getting through to Iraqi people is not coded as ‘reinforcing’ for the coalition, though repetition of such terms as ‘crack teams’, ‘elite’, ‘stormed’, ‘Our Boys’ may tip towards reinforcing. Stories where there is a clear evaluation or interpretation are often the easier ones to code. It is more difficult to code marginal cases – the guide here is to err on the conservative side. Clear expressions of opinion by journalists are rare on television news or the front pages of the quality newspapers. Where there is no explicit favourability, it is also important to look for loaded word choice, for example: brutal, vicious, murder, fanatical, brave, butchery; which is not attributed to another source. Only where loaded words are used repetitively in a clearly evaluative way would a directional code be used.

Also be aware of first person plural use by the reporters (‘our troops’, ‘we are winning’) and value-laden critiques of a ‘subject whom/what’ that aren’t countered. (Guidelines are adapted from Hallin’s and Livingston’s codebooks)

Code once for overall tone of each sequence of comments bounded by quotes. Reporting actions is coded 'straight'. Two codes may be used if radically different comments are included in same block. In editorials particularly the tone may switch with any quotes inserted.

#	Reporter's Comments
01	Straight UK
02	Straight US
03	Straight IRAQ
04	Straight UN
05	Straight ANTIWAR
06	Straight ARAB LEAGUE
07	Straight OTHER
08	Straight COALITION
09	Heavily deflating-UK
10	Heavily deflating-US
11	Heavily deflating-IRAQ
12	Heavily deflating-UN
13	Heavily deflating-ANTI WAR
14	Heavily deflating-ARAB LEAGUE
15	Heavily deflating-OTHER
16	Heavily deflating-COALITION
17	Deflating-UK
18	Deflating-US
19	Deflating-IRAQ
20	Deflating-UN
21	Deflating-ANTI WAR
22	Deflating-ARAB LEAGUE
23	Deflating-OTHER
24	Deflating-COALITION
25	Evaluative / Mixed UK
26	Evaluative / Mixed US
27	Evaluative / Mixed IRAQ
28	Evaluative / Mixed UN
29	Evaluative / Mixed ANTIWAR
30	Evaluative / Mixed ARAB LEAGUE
31	Evaluative / Mixed OTHER
32	Evaluative / Mixed COALITION
33	Reinforcing UK
34	Reinforcing US
35	Reinforcing IRAQ
36	Reinforcing UN
37	Reinforcing ANTI WAR
38	Reinforcing ARAB LEAGUE
39	Reinforcing OTHER
40	Reinforcing COALITION
41	Heavily reinforcing UK
42	Heavily reinforcing US
43	Heavily reinforcing IRAQ
44	Heavily reinforcing UN

45	Heavily reinforcing ANTI WAR
46	Heavily reinforcing ARAB LEAGUE
47	Heavily reinforcing OTHER
48	Heavily reinforcing COALITION
98	Can't determine
99	Not applicable

23. Reporter Disdain

(Box to record main instances of disdain)

Did the reporter express disdain, to whom?

Did they refer to pseudo-event, distance themselves from photo opps or openly put down/ display disdain towards justifications/strategy/goals expressed by the sources. This is not about rebuttal of claims or straight criticism. This category is quite specialised and is only ticked for examples listed above – it is not the same as deflating comments.

Reporter's Approach
No/ N/A
UK administration
UK military
US administration
US military
Iraq administration
Iraq military
UK media
US media
Arab media
Other world media
UN representative
Other Arab leader
Other world leader
Anti-war movement
Other
Mixture

24. Reporter Correction

Did the reporter correct statements or information provided by a source?

If so what source? Variables as above. (23)

25. Overall Tone of Story

This refers to the overall tone of the story. This may be the same as the principal subject, if that subject dominates the report. However, the overall tone may be more of an aggregate of all the subjects, if they impact equally on how the main actors are treated. While the 'tone' control connected to the 'subject what's may refer to minor actors in the war, the overall tone should consider how the story plays for the US/UK/Iraqi authorities. The approach to the *main* actors is given more weight with this control. This differs from our 'coding frame' control, in that all subjects are considered here. Use the list from 'tone' in 'subject what's (17c.)

26. Prognoses

The tone control is about the way particular agents/actors are described. A lot of what the media management strategy was about was expectations or speculation. Each area for 'prognosis' would be recorded on a five-point scale, or N/A if that subject is not speculated on. Only include where there is clear speculation or prediction made, not just where future events are referred to.

- i. Prognosis – Ongoing battle/ military situation
 1. Explicitly pessimistic
 2. Implicitly pessimistic
 3. Neutral
 4. Implicitly optimistic
 5. Explicitly optimistic
 - ii. Prognosis – Strategy
 1. explicitly pessimistic etc.
 - iii. Prognosis – Civilian casualties
 - iv. Prognosis – Humanitarian (aid/hospitals)
 - v. Prognosis – Coalition military casualties
 - vi. Prognosis – Iraqi military casualties
 - vii. Prognosis – Law and order issues
 - viii. Prognosis – Media casualties
 - ix. Prognosis – Regional political stability
 - x. Prognosis – Reconstruction/democracy
 - xi. Prognosis – UK Foreign Policy – Europe
 - xii. Prognosis – UK Foreign Policy – Middle East
 - xiii. Prognosis – UK Foreign Policy – Other
 - xiv. Prognosis – US Foreign Policy- Europe
 - xv. Prognosis- US Foreign Policy – Middle East
 - xvi. Prognosis- US Foreign Policy – Other
- b. Highly pessimistic would be indicated by the use of language such as 'disaster', 'anarchy', 'chaos', heavy, quagmire, extended.
 - c. Somewhat pessimistic would be indicated by use of language such as poor, significant, uncertain, confused
 - d. Neutral would be mixed or balanced speculation about future events.
 - e. Somewhat positive would be indicated by language such as optimistic, progressing, limited, low, light,
 - f. Highly optimistic would be indicated by language such as good, rapid, insignificant, irrelevant, success, decisive, victory, short term

27. Visuals

1. What was the subject of the visual? (a.)
2. Who initiated the content of the visual (planned or unplanned)? Use 'event or visual initiator' variables. 21 (b.)
3. Was there an alternative source given for the image? (c.)

(a.) Code all visuals but do not repeat subject codes, unless an alternative news source is used. We are interested in the type of visuals used, but cannot record each visual with time.

#	Main Category	Sub Category
001	Battle	Live: air attack
002	Battle	Not live: air attack
003	Battle	Live footage: battlefield Baghdad: incoming fire
004	Battle	Live footage: battlefield Baghdad: outgoing fire
005	Battle	Live footage: battlefield Baghdad: mix of firing
006	Battle	Live footage: Baghdad: no firing/ soldiers patrolling
007	Battle	Not live/unclear: battlefield Baghdad: incoming fire
008	Battle	Not live/unclear: battlefield Baghdad: outgoing fire
009	Battle	Not live/unclear: battlefield Baghdad: mix of firing
010	Battle	Not Live: Baghdad: no firing/ soldiers patrolling
011	Battle	Live: battlefield Basra: incoming fire
012	Battle	Live: battlefield Basra: outgoing fire
013	Battle	Live: battlefield Basra: mix of firing
014	Battle	Live: battlefield Basra: no firing/ soldiers patrolling
015	Battle	Not live: battlefield Basra: incoming fire
016	Battle	Not live: battlefield Basra: outgoing fire
017	Battle	Not live: battlefield Basra: mix of firing
018	Battle	Not live: Basra: no firing/ soldiers patrolling
019	Battle	Live: battlefield desert: incoming fire
020	Battle	Live: battlefield desert: outgoing fire
021	Battle	Live: battlefield desert: mix of firing
022	Battle	Live: battlefield desert: no firing/ soldiers patrolling
023	Battle	Not live: battlefield desert: incoming fire
024	Battle	Not live: battlefield desert: outgoing fire
025	Battle	Not live: battlefield desert: mix of firing
026	Battle	Not live: battlefield desert: no firing/ soldiers patrolling
027	Battle	Live: battlefield other: incoming fire
028	Battle	Live: battlefield other: outgoing fire
029	Battle	Live: battlefield other: mix of firing
030	Battle	Live: battlefield other: no firing/ soldiers patrolling
031	Battle	Not live: battlefield other: incoming fire
032	Battle	Not live: battlefield other: outgoing fire
033	Battle	Not live: battlefield other: mix of firing
034	Battle	Not live: battlefield other: no firing/ soldiers patrolling
035	Battle	Live: Aircraft carrier/ship
036	Battle	Not live: Aircraft carrier/ship
037	Battle	Battlefield: bad weather/ no advance
038	Battle	UK troops/ interview/daily life/focus
039	Battle	US troops/ interview/daily life/focus
040	Battle	Iraqi troops/ interview/daily life/focus
041	Battle	Psych-ops (leaflet distribution/ radio broadcasts/cards)
042	Battle	Guerrilla tactics/Fedayeen
043	Battle	Suicide bombing
044	Battle	Car bomb
045	Battle	Damage to infrastructure by Iraqis
046	Battle	Damage to infrastructure by Coalition
047	Battle	Damage to media outlet by Iraqis
048	Battle	Damage to media outlet by Coalition

049	Battle	Body armour/chemical protection: coalition soldiers wearing
050	Battle	Body armour/chemical protection: Iraqi soldiers wearing
051	Battle	Body armour/ chemical protection: lack of/ concern
052	Battle	Dolphins or other animals for military purposes
053	Battle	Airplanes/helicopters taking off/landing
054	Battle	Site of missile attack/ post attack scenes
055	Battle	Encounters between Iraqi troops and civilians
056	Battle	Encounters between Coalition troops and civilians
057	Battle	Soldiers searching property
058	Battle	Downed aircraft
059	Battle	Battle: other
060	Battle/Weapons	Visuals focusing on precision bombing
061	Battle/Weapons	Coalition footage/slides of bomb targets
062	Battle/Weapons	Military hardware/ tanks
063	Battle/Weapons	Weapons: other
070	Strategy	Coalition civilian leader on military policy/ goals
071	Strategy	Coalition military leader on military policy/ goals
072	Strategy	Iraqi civilian leader on military policy/ goals
073	Strategy	Iraqi military leader on military policy/ goals
074	Strategy	Visuals/Maps used to demonstrate tactics (not weapons)
075	Strategy	UK military leader as focus
076	Strategy	US military leader as focus
077	Strategy	Iraqi military leader as focus
078	Strategy	Strategy: other
090	Rationale/Histor	Library footage of WMDs
091	Rationale/Histor	Library footage of past Gulf War/ other conflict
092	Rationale/Histor	Library footage of past humanitarian crises
093	Rationale/Histor	Torture chambers/ prisons
094	Rationale/Histor	Weapons inspectors/ interview
095	Rationale/Histor	Rationale/Historical: other
110	Media	Reporter under fire
111	Media	Own reporter as main subject
112	Media	Other UK reporter/media as main subject
113	Media	Other US reporter/media as main subject
114	Media	Other Iraqi reporter/media as main subject
115	Media	Arab reporter/media outlet as subject
116	Media	Other world reporter/media outlet as subject
117	Media	Internet
118	Media	Media casualties
119	Media	Media casualties: home footage/ mug shot/ still
120	Media	Media: other
130	POW	US POWs: close-up on individual
131	POW	US POWs: shown as a group
132	POW	UK POWs: close-up on individual
133	POW	UK POWs: shown as a group
134	POW	Iraqi POWs: close-up on individual
135	POW	Iraqi POWs: shown as a group
136	POW	POWs: other
137	POW	POW/MIA: home footage/mug shot
138	POW	Rescue of POWs
140	Casualties	Civilian casualties: bodies faces not visible (coffins, body

141	Casualties	Civilian casualties: bodies, faces shown
142	Casualties	Civilian casualties: Body, isolation on single individual, face
143	Casualties	Civilian casualties: Wounded, faces not shown
144	Casualties	Civilian casualties: Wounded, faces shown
145	Casualties	Civilian: Wounded, isolation on single individual, face shown
146	Casualties	Civilian: Person wounded or killed on camera, face not
147	Casualties	Civilian: Person wounded or killed on camera, face shown
148	Casualties	Civilian casualties: home footage/ mug shot/ still
149	Casualties	Iraqi troop casualties: bodies faces not visible (coffins, body
150	Casualties	Iraqi troop casualties: bodies, faces shown
151	Casualties	Iraqi troop casualties: Body, isolation on single individual,
152	Casualties	Iraqi troop casualties: Wounded, faces not shown
153	Casualties	Iraqi troop casualties: Wounded, faces shown
154	Casualties	Iraqi troop: Wounded, isolation on single individual, face
155	Casualties	Iraqi troop: Person wounded or killed on camera, face not
158	Casualties	UK casualties: bodies faces not visible (coffins, body bags)
159	Casualties	UK casualties: bodies, faces shown
160	Casualties	UK casualties: Body, isolation on single individual, face
161	Casualties	UK casualties: Wounded, faces not shown
162	Casualties	UK casualties: Wounded, faces shown
163	Casualties	UK: Wounded, isolation on single individual, face shown
164	Casualties	UK: Person wounded or killed on camera, face not shown
165	Casualties	UK: Person wounded or killed on camera, face shown
166	Casualties	UK casualties: home footage/ mug shot/ still
167	Casualties	US/other coalition casualties: bodies faces not visible
168	Casualties	US/other casualties: bodies, faces shown
169	Casualties	US/other casualties: Body, isolation on single individual,
170	Casualties	US/other casualties: Wounded, faces not shown
171	Casualties	US/other casualties: Wounded, faces shown
172	Casualties	US/other: Wounded, isolation on single individual, face
173	Casualties	US/other: Person wounded or killed on camera, face not
174	Casualties	US other: Person wounded or killed on camera, face shown
175	Casualties	US casualties: home footage/ mug shot/ still
176	Casualties	Mass graves/ desiccated remains
177	Casualties	Grieving family/ hysteria, Iraq
178	Casualties	Grieving family/ muted emotional response, Iraq
179	Casualties	Grieving family/ hysteria, coalition
180	Casualties	Grieving family/ muted emotional response, coalition
181	Casualties	Hospital scenes
182	Casualties	Casualties: other
200	Protest	Anti-war protest in UK
201	Protest	Anti-war protest in US
202	Protest	Anti-war protest in Arab or Muslim countries
203	Protest	Anti-war protest in other locale
204	Protest	Voluntary human shield
205	Protest	Protest: other
230	Diplomacy	Summit/meeting of world leaders
231	Diplomacy	UN meeting/ spokesman
232	Diplomacy	Diplomacy: other
240	Opinion/Graphic	Opinion polls
241	Opinion/Graphic	Maps (media initiated, not military/ govt)

242	Opinion/Graphic	Other graphics
250	Religion	Iraqi religious leaders
251	Religion	UK religious leaders - all faiths
252	Religion	US religious leaders
253	Religion	Other religious leaders
254	Religion	Ceremonies
255	Religion	Religion: other
260	Reconstruction	Meeting of potential Iraqi leaders/ government
261	Reconstruction	Repair to infrastructure
262	Reconstruction	Restoration of law and order
263	Reconstruction	Reconstruction: other
270	Looting	Looting
271	Looting	Crowd scenes/ social disorder (in Iraq)
278	Domestic UK	UK Press conference
279	Domestic US	US Press conference
280	Domestic UK	Parliament debate
281	Domestic UK	Other UK Labour politician
282	Domestic UK	Other UK opposition politician
283	Domestic UK	Other UK interest group (not anti-war protester)
284	Domestic US	Debate in Congress/Senate
285	Domestic US	Other US Republican politician
286	Domestic US	Other US Democrat/opposition politician
287	Domestic US	Other US interest group (not anti-war protester)
288	Domestic Iraq	Other Iraqi leadership
289	Domestic Iraq	Other Iraqi opposition leader
290	Blair	BLAIR as main subject
300	Bush	BUSH
310	WMD	Soldiers searching/possible finds/evidence
311	WMD	Soldiers searching/ evidence questionable/ frustration
312	WMD	WMD: other
320	Terrorism	Al Qaeda suspects/evidence of linkage
321	Terrorism	Terrorism: other
340	Family Life	UK soldier's family (not grieving/ with casualties)
341	Family Life	US soldier's family
342	Family Life	Iraqi soldier's family
343	Family Life	Family life: other
350	Saddam	SADDAM (profile)
351	Saddam	Footage of address to Iraqi people
352	Saddam	Possible sighting/question of authenticity/ use of doubles
353	Saddam	Destruction/ mocking of image/statue
354	Saddam	Image of Saddam celebrated
355	Saddam	Saddam's riches/ palaces
356	Saddam	Saddam's family
360	Humanitarian	Aid reaching people
361	Humanitarian	Aid not getting through/unable to deliver
362	Humanitarian	Scarcity of food/water/electricity
363	Humanitarian	Refugees, in crowds
364	Humanitarian	Refugees, tight shots
365	Humanitarian	Humanitarian: other
370	Iraqi People	Jubilant scenes/crowds waving to troops
371	Iraqi People	Hostile/ indifferent crowds

372	Iraqi People	Daily life of Iraqi civilians
400	Other	Other Middle Eastern country/ leader
401	Other	Photo/video montage
402	Other	Celebrities
403	Other	Cartoon
999	Other	Other/ no appropriate code

(b.) Use ‘event or visual initiator’ as in control 17 for ‘subject what’.

Each visual has a ‘subject initiator’. This category applies to the event itself. Where the subject has no clear initiator, use one of the final codes in ‘event or visual initiator’, which is most fitting, e.g. ‘no clear initiator’, ‘not applicable’. Remember this control is for the initiator of the event or subject matter, not the image.

(c.) Is any source, other than a name, given for the picture. This may be a press agency, other media outlet or military/government source. Use the following variables.

Alternative source for visual
UK reporter from other media source
US reporter from other media source
Arab reporter from other media source
Other foreign reporter
Internet source
Other UK media source
Other US media source
Iraqi State TV/ media
Al Jazeera
Abu Dhabi
Freedom TV (coalition channel in Iraq)
Other Arab media (not specific reporter)
Other named commercial satellite
Other media source: non-specific/ unclear
US Military/ Government
UK Military/ Government
Iraqi Military/ Government
N/A no other source
Can't determine
Videophone used
News agency (AP, Reuters)

28. Box to record visuals of particular interest. Please give a description of any striking or otherwise noteworthy photos – are they filmic in nature, how are protesters depicted, how are casualties depicted? Also use for clarification if the code used isn't very specific. We are also interested in how certain visuals are repeated across media outlets – make note of images which appear in more than one newspaper/across channels.

(Introduction and Appendices are included with Press Codebook)

COALITION NEWS MANAGEMENT CODEBOOK

The codebook is designed to: 1) identify the frames advanced by political actors about the 2003 Iraq conflict, 2) map the politicians' interactions with the media and other political actors, 3) reconstruct the media management activities by authorities.

SAMPLE

The sample includes all public statements made by politicians directly dealing with the war issue, by their collaborators and official spokespersons, as well as messages released to the public by their respective institutions during the time span under study (March 17 to April 18 2003) in the US, UK and the war theatre (Iraqi officials, CENTCOM headquarters in Qatar). The relevant political institutions and corresponding figures, more specifically, are the following:

In the UK:

10 Downing Street: PM Tony Blair, the PMOS.

The Foreign and Commonwealth Office: Foreign Minister J. Straw.

The MoD: Defense Ministers G. Hoon, A. Ingram .

The House of Commons: politicians participating to the debates about the war.

The Department of International Development: Secretary C. Short.

In the US:

The White House: President G. W. Bush, his official spokesperson, the Office of Global Communications.

The Department of State: Secretary C. Powell and his spokesperson.

The DoD: Secretary D. Rumsfeld and his deputies, the military officials briefing the media about the war.

In the war theatre:

CENTCOM headquarters: General T. Franks, all military officials briefing the media about the war.

All of the material has been retrieved from official websites. Here is their list, with the specification of the documents available for the analysis:

10 Downing Street, <http://www.number-10.gov.uk>: PM T. Blair: speeches, press conferences, PM official spokesperson' press conferences, TV addresses)

The Foreign and Commonwealth Office, <http://www.fco.gov.uk>: speeches and statements by Minister J. Straw.

The MoD, <http://www.mod.uk>: speeches and statements by Minister G. Hoon.

The Houses of Parliament, <http://www.parliament.uk>: Hansard transcripts (<http://www.parliament.uk/hansard/hansard.cfm>) of interventions by T. Blair, G. Hoon, J. Straw and C. Short, including debates that followed the speeches.

The Department of International Development, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>, (C. Short's statements. No press releases available)

The White House, <http://www.whitehouse.gov>: President's speeches, press conferences, TV addresses, press conferences by the official spokesperson, Office of Global Communications' "messages of the day".

The Department of State, <http://www.state.gov>: speeches and press releases by Secretary C. Powell, press conferences by his spokesperson.

The DoD, <http://www.defenselink.mil>: Speeches, statements by Secretary D. Rumsfeld and military authorities involved in the war, all press releases.

CENTCOM headquarters, <http://www.centcom.mil>: press releases and press conferences.

The analysis involves text sources only. Some video recordings, such as TV addresses by President Bush and PM T. Blair, PM Blair's parliamentary interventions, all press conferences by official spokespersons at the White House and State Department, were available. The DoD news releases also contained slide presentations, pictures and videos that were shown to reporters attending the press conferences. The video material, however, neither constitutes a comprehensive sample for the whole period of study, nor provides supplementary information for all institutional actors. That is why video sources are not part of the analysis.

CODING

The data will be entered into a Microsoft Access Database database through a single form containing two different subforms. The forms represent two progressive levels of analysis. The first form stores the information about politicians' statements as unilateral declarations. The second records the interaction with other actors (media or other political actors). All records will have at least an entry into Form 1. Form 2 is filled only when the statement is followed by an exchange of views with other actors such as a debate or Q&A session.

The order of the actors (whether, for example, the UK actors should be entered before the Iraqi actors or the other way around) is irrelevant, since the records will be later retrieved for analysis according to location, identity of the actor, date or alternative criteria and it will be possible to distinguish the statements made by different political actors.

1. CODING OF POLITICIANS' STATEMENTS

Form 1 contains all the information about a public statement by one or more briefers during the same event. A communication "event" consists in any expression of opinion about the war in Iraq by a relevant political actor (see list: p. 1-2). This can take the form of a speech, a press conference, a TV address, a press release or a "message of the day", a debate etc.... The statement does not have to be made in official circumstances and can be represented by an informal comment as long as, of course, is related to the Iraq war and it is made by a relevant political actor. For parliamentary debates the unit of analysis is represented by a politician's intervention and the debate that follows it until a change of topic occurs. The information about the debate, however, will be stored in Form 2. Form1 contains the "unilateral" side of statements only.

EVENT ID: Unique number identifying every communication event under analysis.

DAY of the week: It could be useful to record it to detect whether the politicians adapt to the media reporting routine. Politicians choose a convenient timing for releasing their messages.

DATE: day of the month when the communication event takes place.

MONTH: Given the time span of the analysis (March 17 to April 18 2003) the available options are either March or April.

TIME: String variable. The time when the communication event started. For events occurring outside the UK, the time is converted into GMT to allow compiling a chronology of the events and making comparisons between the timing of different events more manageable.

TIME AIRED: String variable. This applies to interviews that could have been pre-recorded. The time to be entered here is when the message was actually broadcast.

CHANNEL: String variable. The channel on which the message was aired. Write name of the channel and country.

LENGTH: String variable. Length of the statement in minutes, seconds. If the statement precedes an exchange with the media or other politicians indicate just the length of the “unilateral” side of the event.

LOCATION:

This variable indicates where the communication event takes place.

Use the general variables (UK, US, IRAQ) only if no more specific location is given.

Location ID	Area	Location
10	UK	Downing Street
11	UK	Westminster
12	UK	Foreign Office
13	UK	MoD
14	UK	London (other)
15	UK	UK
20	US	White House
21	US	State Department
22	US	Pentagon
23	US	Washington (other)
24	US	New York
25	US	US (other)
30	Theatre of war	CENTCOM (Qatar)
31	Theatre of war	Baghdad
32	Theatre of war	IRAQ (other)
33	Theatre of war	Middle East
40	Not applicable	en route to other destination

BRIEFER1: Identity of the main briefier

The list of variables is based on the names of the briefiers who were actually giving speeches and attending the press conferences. All names appearing in at least two occasions have been entered as variables.

Briefer data list ID	Nationality	Institution	Briefer
10	UK	Govt	Tony Blair

Briefer data list ID	Nationality	Institution	Briefer
11	UK	MoD	Geoff Hoon
12	UK	Foreign Office	Jack Straw
13	UK	Dept of Int. Dev.	Clare Short
16	UK	Govt	David Blunkett
21	UK	Parliament	Charles Kennedy
30	US	White House	George Bush
31	US	State Dept.	Colin Powell
32	US	Pentagon	Donald Rumsfeld
33	US	White House	Ari Fleischer (White House spokesperson)
34	US	White House	Other White House spokesperson
35	US	State Dept.	Richard Boucher (State Department spokesperson)
36	US	State Dept.	Other State Department spokesperson
37	US	Pentagon	Paul Wolfowitz
38	US	Pentagon	Victoria Clark
39	US	Pentagon	Maj. Gen Mc Chrystal
40	US	Pentagon	Gen. Myers
41	US	Pentagon	Brian Whitman , DASD PA (Media Operations)
42	US	Pentagon	Senior defence official
43	US	Pentagon	Other military briefer
44	US	CENTCOM	Gen. Tommy Franks
45	US	CENTCOM	Brig. Gen. Vincent Brooks
46	US	CENTCOM	CENTCOM (general: to be applied to press releases)
47	US	CENTCOM	Other briefer
48	UK	CENTCOM	Other briefer
50	Iraq	Iraqi official	Saddam Hussein
51	Iraq	Iraqi official	Tariq Aziz (Deputy Prime Minister)
52	Iraq	Iraqi official	Muhammad Said al-Sahaf (Information Minister)
53	Iraq	Iraqi official	Other Iraqi Minister
54	UK	MoD	Brian Burridge (UK National Contingent Commander)
55	UK	MoD	Adam Ingram (Minister of State for Armed Forces)

BRIEFER2: Second briefer. Select from the list of variables.

To be filled in case there is a second briefer (usually the case in Pentagon's and CENTCOM's press briefings).

OTHER BRIEFERS: Record the name and nationality of the second briefer in case his/her name is not on the variables' list and any additional briefer.

FORMAT:

Choose either “unilateral” or “dialogue”.

Unilateral: a one-way communication event from the politician to the public. A statement not followed by a comment/question by other political or media actor.

Dialogue: an event involving a confrontation with another actor (the media or other political actors). All statements recorded as “dialogue” are coded in Form2, where the possible challenges to the politician’s message are explored more in depth.

TYPE OF ACTIVITY:

Choose from the list

Activity ID	Type of Activity
10	speech
20	TV address
30	press release
40	political debate
50	press conference
60	TV interview
70	Message of the day

OCCASION/STIMULUS:

Choose from the list

Variable #	Stimulus
20	routine
30	request by other actor
40	respond to event
50	respond to media story
51	own initiative
60	Media opportunity: planned (ex.interview)
70	Media opportunity: unplanned

The “OCCASION/STIMULUS” control refers to the reasons why the public statement was made. The purpose of recording this information consists in understanding which factors affect the communication strategy of the political authorities. Do other actors, such as other politicians or the media, exert any pressure on the way the politicians communicate with the public? To what extent is the communication activity agenda of the politician drafted by the politician himself, rather than being a reaction to external circumstances?

Routine: the activity belongs to the normal communication routine or what can reasonably be considered “ordinary” in the given circumstances.

Request by other actor: the communication event would not have occurred without the explicit request by another (political) actor. This applies to the statements made by the PM to the Commons.

Respond to event: the politician is sending a message to the public as a reaction to a specific event. An event has occurred and the politician is trying to spin it by proposing his interpretation (framing) of it. The politician is constructing the interpretation of an event, which has not yet been framed by the media.

Respond to media story: the politician is reacting to a specific media story. The politician is trying to change/rectify the interpretation of an event already framed by the media.

Own initiative: The politician is carrying out his own political agenda through an information activity. This could apply to the TV address by PM Blair and G. Bush to the Iraqi people. There is no evident reaction to an immediate and specific event. The authority is just pursuing the objectives of the war.

Media opportunity: planned: This applies to interviews, for example. The politician conveys his message directly to the media. In this case the media and politicians come into contact as a result of an arrangement.

Media opportunity: unplanned: The politician statement is being recorded by the media, but is not the result of a formal interview attendance or media opportunity. This could apply to statements made by politicians while entering or leaving a building. This information can provide some data on the extent to which informal comments are picked up by the media (comparison with data collected by the Liverpool team) and how this kind of statements can affect the content of media coverage). This variable is a possible indicator of the transparency of the information space. It could be argued that comments made by politicians, even outside official situations, are made for a reason. The politician knows that the media is always watching. At this point it could be interesting to see to what extent the politician exploits such unofficial circumstances to spin his message.

All of the alternatives cover the relationship between politicians and the media, but they portray different scenarios. In some cases politicians are more independent. For example the “routine” option indicates that the normal communication strategy, at least in its form, has not changed. The variable “own initiative” shows that the politician, despite the unusual situation, is in control and actually uses the media to pursue his own objectives. Also “respond to event” shows that the politician is taking the initiative, but additionally underlines the fact that the official thinks it is important to frame an event in a certain way before the media does. So the media exerts an indirect pressure. “Media opportunity: planned” sees a balance between media and political actors. “Media opportunity: unplanned” could point to a situation in which the media exploit the political actor by surprising him in an unstructured/unforeseen situation. As already highlighted, however, the same scenario could play in favour of the politician, who picks up one more chance to reiterate his message. “Respond to media story” highlights the power of the media in proposing alternatives to the politician’s frames and the need felt by authorities to counter them.

SOURCE:

The source of the material being analysed

Variable #	Source of material
10	official
20	media

[Again: all we are analysing at the moment comes from official sources, but the second option, “media”, could be applied later to additional data coming from the analysis of TV coverage done by the Liverpool team]

HEADLINE: String variable

Enter the headline for the statement, in case this is provided by the source's transcript.

The headline is recorded only if it is provided by an official source. The purpose, in fact, is finding evidence of techniques deployed by politicians to focus public/media attention on certain issues/aspects rather than others as part of their framing of the war. Recording the title is useful for observing the rhetorical aspects of the media management effort.

TITLE SUBJECT: Select from the SUBJECT variables' list.

The subject of the title is made here more explicit to check whether it reflects the actual contents of the politician's statement. Identifying the subject also facilitates the comparison with the TV/press coverage's contents (Liverpool team's data) to see whether the emphasis placed by the politicians on a certain theme was picked up by the media.

SUBJECT:

This is the subject of the statement. List all of the subjects covered by selecting them from the variables' list.

The comparison between the subjects identified in politicians' statements and those present in media coverage will reveal the extent to which politicians were able to set the media agenda.

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
001	Battle	Ground combat/ ongoing battle/ military situation
002	Battle	Air attack
003	Battle	Coalition aircraft losses
004	Battle	Iraqi aircraft losses (relevant?)
005	Battle	Coalition battle gains
006	Battle	Coalition battle losses
007	Battle	Iraqi battle gains

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
008	Battle	Iraqi battle losses
009	Battle	Death/ capture of Iraqi leadership (not Saddam)
010	Battle	Coalition attack: general
011	Battle	Coalition attack: effective
012	Battle	Coalition attack: ineffective/ bad weather
013	Battle	Coalition attack: delay
014	Battle	Iraqi resistance: general
015	Battle	Iraqi resistance: fierce/ effective
016	Battle	Iraqi resistance: ineffective/ lack of/ surrender
017	Battle	Coalition troops morale
018	Battle	Iraqi troops morale
019	Battle	Coalition troops expertise
020	Battle	Iraqi troops expertise
021	Battle	Coalition military intelligence
022	Battle	Iraqi military intelligence
023	Battle	Relations between coalition troops
024	Battle	Relations between coalition and Iraqi troops
025	Battle	Relations between Iraqi troops
026	Battle	Daily life of UK troops/human interest
027	Battle	Daily life of US troops/human interest
028	Battle	Daily life of Iraqi troops/human interest
029	Battle	Coalition: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits
030	Battle	Iraqis: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits
031	Battle	Destruction of homes attributed to coalition
032	Battle	Destruction of homes attributed to Iraqi military
033	Battle	Destruction of homes attributed to non-regular forces
034	Battle	Destruction of infrastructure attributed to coalition
035	Battle	Destruction of infrastructure attributed to Iraqi military
036	Battle	Destruction of infrastructure attributed to non-regular forces
037	Battle	Burning oil fields
038	Battle	Protection of oil fields/ ministry
039	Battle	Removal of mines
040	Battle	Delay: danger of mines
041	Battle	Dolphins or other animals for military purposes
042	Battle	Encounters with civilians: Iraqi troops
043	Battle	Encounters with civilians: coalition troops (UK/US)
044	Battle	Iraqi troop movements
045	Battle	Coalition troop movements
046	Battle	Logistics/ supplies
047	Battle	Post attack/ devastation (emergency workers)
048	Battle	Collapse of regime
049	Battle	War crimes
050	Battle	Length of war
051	Battle	Other: battle: no appropriate code

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
060	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: air: precision
061	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: air: non-precision
062	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: ground: precision
063	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: ground: non-precision
064	Battle/Weapons	Weapons/technology: other
070	Battle/ Tactics	Suicide bomb/ attacks
071	Battle/ Tactics	Car bomb
072	Battle/ Tactics	Psych-ops Coalition (leaflets/radio broadcasts)
073	Battle/ Tactics	Psych-ops Coalition: playing cards
074	Battle/ Tactics	Psych-ops Iraqi
075	Battle/ Tactics	Attack on media outlet attributed to coalition
076	Battle/ Tactics	Attack on media outlet attributed to Iraqi military
077	Battle/ Tactics	Attack on media outlet attributed to non-regular forces
078	Battle/ Tactics	Depleted Uranium
079	Battle/ Tactics	Cluster bombs
080	Battle/ Tactics	Use of human shields/ citizens by Iraq authorities
081	Battle/ Tactics	Guerrilla tactics
082	Battle/ Tactics	Other Iraqi non-conventional/dubious tactics
083	Battle/ Tactics	Other Coalition non-conventional/dubious tactics
084	Battle/ Tactics	Distinction made between UK and US military methods
085	Battle/ Tactics	Battle/ Tactics: other
090	Strategy	Deadlines for action/war
091	Strategy	Distinction made between UK and US strategy
092	Strategy	Distinction made between UK and US goals
093	Strategy	Unification/synchronisation of coalition strategy
094	Strategy	Description of 'Shock and Awe' (explicit mention)
095	Strategy	Evaluation of 'Shock and Awe'
096	Strategy	Description of Coalition military strategy
097	Strategy	Description of Coalition military goals
098	Strategy	Description of UK military strategy
099	Strategy	Description of UK military goals
100	Strategy	Description of US military strategy
101	Strategy	Description of US military goals
102	Strategy	Description of Iraqi military strategy
103	Strategy	Description of Iraqi military goals
104	Strategy	Success of Coalition military strategy
105	Strategy	Failure of Coalition military strategy
106	Strategy	Success of Coalition military goals
107	Strategy	Failure of Coalition military goals
108	Strategy	Success of UK military strategy
109	Strategy	Failure of UK military strategy
110	Strategy	Success of UK military goals
111	Strategy	Failure of UK military goals
112	Strategy	Success of US military strategy

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
113	Strategy	Failure of US military strategy
114	Strategy	Success of US military goals
115	Strategy	Failure of US military goals
116	Strategy	Success of Iraqi military strategy
117	Strategy	Failure of Iraqi military strategy
118	Strategy	Success of Iraqi military goals
119	Strategy	Failure of Iraqi military goals
120	Strategy	Evaluation of coalition strategy, ground and general
121	Strategy	Evaluation of coalition air attack
122	Strategy	Evaluation of Iraqi strategy, ground and general
123	Strategy	Evaluation of Iraqi air attack (relevant?)
124	Strategy	Deployment of troops/ sufficient numbers
125	Strategy	Strategy: other
130	Rationale	Rationale: humanitarian general
131	Rationale	Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change
132	Rationale	Regime change: war will worsen situation
133	Rationale	Rationale: WMDs general
134	Rationale	WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins
135	Rationale	WMD threat does not exist
136	Rationale	Rationale: Legal argument general/ UN
137	Rationale	Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions
138	Rationale	Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate
139	Rationale	Rationale: Coalition self interest general
140	Rationale	Self Interest/ imperialist aims UK
141	Rationale	Self Interest/ imperialist aims US
142	Rationale	Rationale: oil rights general
143	Rationale	Oil rights as reason for war
144	Rationale	Oil in trust fund for Iraqi people
145	Rationale	Rationale: regional stability general
146	Rationale	Regional stability as outcome of war
147	Rationale	Regional instability as outcome of war
148	Rationale	Rationale: other
160	Media	Embedded reporter(s) as subject
163	Media	UK media strategy (spin, briefings)
164	Media	US media strategy
165	Media	Coalition media strategy
166	Media	Iraqi media strategy
167	Media	Media technology
168	Media	Internet
169	Media	Censorship by Iraqi leadership
170	Media	Censorship by coalition
171	Media	Inaccuracy of media report
172	Media	UK media coverage
173	Media	US media coverage

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
174	Media	Arab media coverage
175	Media	Iraqi media coverage
176	Media	About other international coverage
177	Media	24/7 media coverage - mechanisms
178	Media	24/7 media coverage: effects on perceptions of events
179	Media	24/7 media coverage: effects on perception of length of war
180	Media	Media story
181	Media	Government's sensitivity to media coverage
182	Media	Media casualties, no attribution of responsibility
183	Media	Media casualties, responsibility of coalition
184	Media	Media casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
185	Media	Media casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
186	Media	Media: other
190	POW	Prisoners of war/ MIA: coalition
191	POW	Prisoners of war/ MIA: Iraqi
192	POW	Kidnapping/ murder of civilians
193	POW	Kidnapping/ murder of coalition military
194	POW	Kidnapping/ murder of Iraqi military
195	POW	Torture or abuse: coalition POWs
196	POW	Torture or abuse: Iraqi POWs
197	POW	Torture or abuse: civilians
198	POW	POWs/ MIAs: other
200	Casualties	Overall Body Count/ or as an issue
201	Casualties	UK military casualties, no attribution of responsibility
202	Casualties	UK military casualties, responsibility of coalition
203	Casualties	UK military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
204	Casualties	UK military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
205	Casualties	UK military casualties: personalization/obituary
206	Casualties	UK military casualties: statistical information only
207	Casualties	UK military casualties: family reaction supportive
208	Casualties	UK military casualties: family reaction critical
209	Casualties	US military casualties, no attribution of responsibility
210	Casualties	US military casualties, responsibility of coalition
211	Casualties	US military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
212	Casualties	US military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
213	Casualties	US military casualties: personalization/obituary
214	Casualties	US military casualties: statistical information only
215	Casualties	US military casualties: family reaction supportive
216	Casualties	US military casualties: family reaction critical
217	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, no attribution of responsibility
218	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of coalition
219	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
220	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
221	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: personalization/obituary

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
222	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: statistical information only
223	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: family reaction supportive
224	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: family reaction critical
225	Casualties	Civilian casualties, no attribution of responsibility
226	Casualties	Civilian casualties, responsibility of coalition
227	Casualties	Civilian casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military
228	Casualties	Civilian casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces
229	Casualties	Civilian casualties: accidental
230	Casualties	Other casualties: non-Iraqi, international
231	Casualties	Casualties: Coalition claims/ estimates/ rebuttal
232	Casualties	Casualties: Iraqi claims/ estimates/ rebuttal
233	Casualties	Friendly fire/ blue on blue
234	Casualties	Casualties: other
240	Protest	Antiwar movement as an issue: UK
241	Protest	Antiwar activity: within legislature: UK
242	Protest	Antiwar activity: within executive: UK
243	Protest	Antiwar activity: peaceful demonstration: UK
244	Protest	Antiwar activity: violent demonstration: UK
245	Protest	Antiwar activity: individual demonstration: UK
246	Protest	Antiwar activity: voluntary human shields: UK
247	Protest	Antiwar activity: in UK military
248	Protest	Police tactics vis-à-vis antiwar movement: UK
249	Protest	Counter protests: UK
250	Protest	Balance between antiwar and counter protests: UK
251	Protest	Antiwar movement as an issue: US
252	Protest	Antiwar activity: within legislature: US
253	Protest	Antiwar activity: within executive: US
254	Protest	Antiwar activity: peaceful demonstration: US
255	Protest	Antiwar activity: violent demonstration: US
256	Protest	Antiwar activity: individual demonstration: US
257	Protest	Antiwar activity: voluntary human shields: US
258	Protest	Antiwar activity: in US military
259	Protest	Police tactics vis-à-vis antiwar movement: US
260	Protest	Counter protests: US
261	Protest	Balance between antiwar and counter protests: US
262	Protest	Antiwar protest in Europe
263	Protest	Antiwar protest in Iraq
264	Protest	Antiwar protest in other Arab or Muslim countries
265	Protest	Antiwar protest: other
266	Protest	Pro-war rally/demonstration
267	Protest	Protests: other
270	Diplomacy	Summit of world leaders
271	Diplomacy	Peace initiative: war seen as failure of negotiations/diplomacy

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
272	Diplomacy	Peace initiative: peaceful settlement with Iraq impossible
273	Diplomacy	Impact on UK/Europe relations
274	Diplomacy	Impact on US/ Europe relations
275	Diplomacy	Impact on US/ UK relations
276	Diplomacy	Tensions within coalition
277	Diplomacy	International Relations general
278	Diplomacy	UK foreign policy - Europe
279	Diplomacy	UK foreign policy - Middle East
280	Diplomacy	UK foreign policy - Other
281	Diplomacy	US foreign policy - Europe
282	Diplomacy	US foreign policy - Middle East
283	Diplomacy	US foreign policy - Other
284	Diplomacy	EU skepticism/ opposition to military intervention
285	Diplomacy	Middle East: Israel/Palestine tension
286	Diplomacy	World Security
287	Diplomacy	Regional political stability
288	Diplomacy	International law
289	Diplomacy	Iraq territorial integrity
290	Diplomacy	International support for military action
291	Diplomacy	International disagreements about military action
292	Diplomacy	Diplomacy: other
300	Public opinion	Public opinion: UK
301	Public opinion	Public opinion: US
302	Public opinion	Public opinion: international
303	Public opinion	'Islamophobia'
304	Public opinion	Public opinion: other
310	Religion	Religion and the war: Islam vs. Christianity as issue
311	Religion	Religion and the war: Islam not the enemy, religiosity downplayed
312	Religion	Religion and the war: other
320	Reconstruction/Future	Cost of reconstruction
321	Reconstruction/Future	Strategy for reconstruction general
322	Reconstruction/Future	Role of businesses/ commercial operation
323	Reconstruction/Future	Coalition's length of stay in Iraq
324	Reconstruction/Future	Representative democracy in Iraq/ post-war governance
325	Reconstruction/Future	UN role in reconstruction
326	Reconstruction/Future	Peace (the challenge)
327	Reconstruction/Future	Iraqi exiles' role in reconstruction
328	Reconstruction/Future	Future developments of operations
329	Reconstruction/Future	Future conflicts
330	Reconstruction/Future	Reconstruction/future: other
340	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: coalition effective
341	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: coalition ineffective
342	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: coalition attempts

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
343	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: Iraqi police effective
344	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: Iraqi police ineffective
345	Law and (dis)order	Ethnic violence
346	Law and (dis)order	Looting
347	Law and (dis)order	Civil unrest/ disorder
348	Law and (dis)order	Law and (dis)order: other
350	Domestic	Debate in Parliament/ domestic policy matters
351	Domestic	UK domestic politics
352	Domestic	Debate in Congress/ Senate
353	Domestic	US domestic politics
354	Domestic	Cost of war
355	Domestic	Domestic: other
360	Blair	Blair: focus on
370	Bush	Bush: focus on
380	WMD	WMD: speculation/ will be found
381	WMD	WMD: evidence found/ positive developments
382	WMD	WMD: not found yet
383	WMD	WMD: not likely to find/ negative developments
384	WMD	Threat of chemical/ biological warfare in Iraq: assumed
385	WMD	Threat of chemical/ biological warfare in Iraq: questioned
386	WMD	WMDs: other
390	Terrorism	Terrorism: Iraq's links to Al Qaeda
391	Terrorism	Terrorism: No evidence of links to Al Qaeda
392	Terrorism	War on Terror: war will prevent future attacks (inc on US/UK)
393	Terrorism	War on Terror: war will encourage future attacks (inc on US/UK)
394	Terrorism	War on Terror: general/other
395	Terrorism	Terrorism: in other Middle East country
396	Terrorism	Terrorism: Other
400	Historical	Brutality of regime/ past atrocities
401	Historical	Demonisation of Saddam
402	Historical	Sanctions as humanitarian disaster: West to blame
403	Historical	Sanctions/ Oil for Food effectiveness hampered by Saddam
404	Historical	Western involvement in supplying WMD materials
405	Historical	Comparison/reference to 1991 Gulf war
406	Historical	Previous uprisings by Iraqi people
407	Historical	Comparison to past conflict (Vietnam/ WW2/Afghanistan)
408	Historical	9/11 reference
409	Historical	Iraqi support for Palestinians
410	Historical	Western/ US support for Israel
411	Historical	Historical: other
420	Family Life	Families of UK soldiers
421	Family Life	Families of US soldiers

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
422	Family Life	Families of Iraqi soldiers
423	Family Life	Soldiers' Families: Other
430	Saddam	Death of Saddam/ speculation on whereabouts
431	Saddam	Destruction/ defacing/ mocking of image/statue
432	Saddam	Celebration of image
433	Saddam	Saddam's family/ fleeing the country
434	Saddam	Saddam's millions/ decadence
435	Saddam	Saddam: other
440	Humanitarian	Success of/funds for coalition/UN aid delivery to Iraqi people
441	Humanitarian	Failure of/lack of funds for coalition/UN aid delivery to Iraqi people
442	Humanitarian	Coalition/UN attempts to deliver aid
443	Humanitarian	Non-coalition/NGO aid delivery to Iraqi people
444	Humanitarian	Hospitals: shortage of medicine supplies, treatment
445	Humanitarian	Hospitals: adequate medicine supplies, treatment
446	Humanitarian	Water/food shortage
447	Humanitarian	Water/food supplies adequate
448	Humanitarian	Humanitarian consequences of war: general
449	Humanitarian	Humanitarian consequences of war: positive
450	Humanitarian	Humanitarian consequences of war: negative
451	Humanitarian	Refugees
452	Humanitarian	Geneva Convention
453	Humanitarian	Humanitarian: other
460	Iraqi People	Celebration in Iraq (pro-coalition)
461	Iraqi People	Hostility/ civil unrest in Iraq (anti-coalition)
462	Iraqi People	Loyalty to Saddam portrayed as genuine
463	Iraqi People	Loyalty to Saddam portrayed as not genuine / fearful
464	Iraqi People	Wariness toward coalition/ feelings of betrayal
465	Iraqi People	Welcoming to coalition/ troops
466	Iraqi People	Human interest: Iraqi civilian profile/ daily life
467	Iraqi People	Hostility/ civil unrest/ uprising in Iraq (not anti-coalition)
468	Iraqi People	Co-operation with Coalition
469	Iraqi People	Iraqi people: other
480	Other	Environmental disaster
483	Other	Reaction to war in other neighboring/ Mid East country (not public opinion)
484	Other	Reaction to war in other locale
485	Other	Human interest: other
486	Other	Price of oil
487	Other	UK stock market
488	Other	US stock market
489	Other	Question/comment by interlocutor (for press briefings only)
490	Other	Own statement (for press briefings only)
491	Other	Statement by other (for press briefings only)

Subject (What)	Main Category	Sub Category
999	Other	Other: no appropriate code

PROGNOSIS: “Prognosis” refers to the expectations expressed by the political actor about the future in relation, where applicable, to each SUBJECT covered by the statement. The prognosis is recorded on a five points scale (Highly pessimistic, Somewhat pessimistic, Neutral, Somewhat optimistic, Highly Optimistic).

#	Prognosis variables
1	highly pessimistic
2	somewhat pessimistic
3	neutral
4	somewhat optimistic
5	highly optimistic
6	not applicable

The main criteria for selecting the applicable variable could be the use of the following terms:

Highly pessimistic: eg. ‘disaster’, ‘anarchy’, ‘chaos’, ‘heavy’, ‘quagmire’, ‘extended’

Somewhat pessimistic: eg. ‘poor’, ‘significant’, ‘uncertain’, ‘confused’

Neutral: future events referred to but not characterised

Somewhat optimistic: ‘optimistic’, ‘progressing’, ‘limited’, ‘low’, ‘light’

Highly optimistic: eg. ‘good’, ‘rapid’, ‘insignificant’, ‘irrelevant’, ‘success’, ‘decisive’, ‘victory’, ‘short term’

“Prognosis”, i.e. the expectations about the future in relation to a certain subject is different from “future” as a proper subject of the statement. In fact the prognosis could just be implied by the phrasing of the statement or by rhetorical choices. An example could be a statement like “Everything is going to plan, but for how long?”. The sentence contains an implicit “somewhat pessimistic” prognosis about the future. The statement “Everything is going to plan, but there will be tough fight ahead”, instead, is explicitly talking about the future developments of the military operations.

SELF-REFERENCE: (tick box). The self-reference variable is important because politicians often refer to themselves as a way of emphasizing the consistency of their policies and frames over time. This variable refers to the politician simply

mentioning himself/herself and must be distinguished/integrated by the politician talking about his own statements (own statement as SUBJECT).

REFERENCE TO OTHER ACTOR:

Record any reference made during the statement to any “other actor”. An “other actor” is any person different from the one who makes the statement.

Recording this information gives a clear idea of who quotes whom and who is quoted most often by which politician. It helps identifying the network of contacts among politicians as well as their sources of information. This control is completed by “reason for reference” (see p. 21) dealing with the reasons why the politician quotes a specific actor.

Subject (Whom)	Label
500	Tony Blair
501	Geoff Hoon
502	Gordon Brown
503	Jack Straw
504	David Blunkett
505	John Reid
506	Peter Hain
507	Alistair Campbell
508	Simon Wren (in Qatar)
509	Clare Short
510	Robin Cook (pre-resignation)
511	Ann Clywd
512	Other (Cabinet) Minister
513	Downing Street named source
514	Downing Street unnamed source
515	Downing Street anonymous source
516	Downing Street leaked source
517	Foreign Office named source
518	Foreign Office unnamed source
519	Foreign Office anonymous source
520	Foreign Office leaked source
521	MoD named source
522	MoD unnamed source
523	MoD anonymous source
524	MoD leaked source
525	Other UK Government named source
526	Other UK Government unnamed source
527	Other Labour MP/Lord (not anti-war)
528	Other Labour supporter (not anti-war)
529	Labour unnamed source (not anti-war)

Subject (Whom)	Label
530	Leaked government source
531	Government document/ figures
532	UK diplomat
533	Police spokesperson
534	UK intelligence sources
540	Robin Cook (post-resignation)
541	George Galloway
542	Ken Livingstone
543	Other Labour MP/Lord (anti-war)
544	Other Labour supporter (anti-war)
545	Labour unnamed source (anti-war)
550	Ian Duncan Smith
551	Michael Howard
552	Oliver Letwin
553	Michael Ancram: shadow foreign secretary
554	Other Shadow Cabinet pro-war
555	Other Con MP/Lord (not anti-war)
556	Conservative unnamed source (not anti-war)
557	Other Conservative supporter (not anti-war)
570	Other Shadow Cabinet anti-war
571	Kenneth Clarke
572	Michael Portillo
573	Other Con MP/Lord (anti-war)
574	Conservative unnamed source (anti-war)
575	Other Conservative supporter (anti-war)
580	Charles Kennedy
581	Menzies Campbell
582	Other Lib Dem leadership
583	Other Lib Dem MP/Lord
584	Lib Dem unnamed source
585	Other Lib Dem supporter
590	Other Political Party MP/ supporter (not anti-war)
591	Other Political Party MP/ supporter (anti-war)
600	President Bush
601	Colin Powell: Secretary of State
602	Donald Rumsfeld: Defence Secretary
603	Dick Cheney: Vice President
604	Victoria Clarke
605	Condoleezza Rice
606	Karen Hughes
607	White House named source
608	White House unnamed source
609	White House anonymous source
610	White House leaked source

Subject (Whom)	Label
611	DoD named source
612	DoD unnamed source
613	DoD anonymous source
614	DoD leaked source
615	State Dept named source
616	State Dept unnamed source
617	State Dept anonymous source
618	State Dept leaked source
619	Other US Government named source
620	Other US Government unnamed source
621	US diplomat
622	George Bush snr.
623	US intelligence sources
630	Other Democrat politician (not anti-war)
631	Other Republican politician (not anti-war)
635	Other Democrat politician (anti-war)
636	Other Republican politician (anti-war)
640	Saddam Hussein
641	Tariq Aziz (Deputy Prime Minister)
642	Ali Hassan al-Majid (chemical Ali)
643	Muhammad Said al-Sahaf (Information Minister)
644	Naji Sabri (foreign minister)
645	Other Iraqi leadership
646	Other Baath Party supporter
647	General Rawi (Iraq)
648	Other Iraq military spokesman
649	Iraqi soldier
650	Iraqi dissenting military voice
651	Fedayeen/ militia
652	Iraqi police/security
653	Iraqi intelligence sources
654	Iraqi Military intelligence sources
655	Other Iraqi authorities named source
656	Other Iraqi authorities unnamed source
657	Iraqi leadership: US playing card reference
658	Saddam's family
659	Foreign militia supportive of Saddam
660	Iraqi opposition leaders
661	Ahmed Chalabi
662	Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani
663	Other Iraqi Religious leader
664	Kurdish representative
665	Kurdish forces
666	Other militia against Saddam

Subject (Whom)	Label
667	Iraqi exile
670	Coalition military: Tommy Franks
671	US military spokesman: Frank Thorp
672	Al Lockwood
673	Major General McChrystal
674	General Myers
675	General Brooks
676	Other US Military named source
677	Other US Military unnamed source
678	US Military anonymous source
679	US Military leaked source
680	US Military intelligence source
681	US soldier(s)
682	Jessica Lynch
683	US dissenting military voice
690	UK military spokesman: Air Marshall Brian Burridge
691	Chief of Defence Staff: Admiral Sir Michael Boyce
692	Other UK Military named source
693	Other UK Military unnamed source
694	UK Military anonymous source
695	Other UK Military leaked source
696	UK Military intelligence source
697	UK soldier(s)
698	UK dissenting military voice
699	"Our Troops"
700	Other coalition forces/ source (not Kurdish)
701	Other private security forces
702	Coalition military religious figure
703	Coalition military medical worker
710	UK Islamic leader
711	Other Islamic Religious leader (not Iraq)
720	Arch Bishop of Canterbury
721	Pope John Paul II
722	Other Non-Islamic Religious leader (not Iraq)
730	UK Anti-war protester
731	UK Anti-war spokesperson
732	UK Voluntary human shield
733	US Anti-war protester
734	US Anti-war spokesperson
735	US Voluntary human shield
736	Coalition Anti-war protester
737	Coalition Anti-war spokesperson
738	Voluntary human shield Coalition
739	Non-Coalition Anti-war protester

Subject (Whom)	Label
740	Non-Coalition Anti-war spokesperson
741	Voluntary human shield Non-Coalition
750	UK Pro-war protester
751	UK Pro-war spokesperson
752	US Pro-war protester
753	US Pro-war spokesperson
760	Refugee interest group
761	Humanitarian pressure group
762	Geneva Convention
763	Aid/NGO/ Red Cross worker
764	NGO spokesperson
765	Medical worker in Iraq
766	Other pressure group
770	Expert linked to Academic organisation
771	Expert: Iraqi
772	Analyst: retired military (paid advisor)
773	Think tank
774	Other expert/ unnamed experts/ analysts
780	Kofi Annan
781	Hans Blix
782	Iraq Survey Group/ weapons inspector
783	The UN/ UN representative
784	UN document/resolution
790	Jose Maria Aznar: Spanish PM
791	Other coalition political
792	Israeli representative
793	Unspecified Coalition allies
800	EU representative/ organisation
801	Jaques Chirac/ French rep
802	Gerhard Schroeder/ German rep
803	Vladimir Putin/ Russian rep
804	Other world leaders
805	Turkish politician/ representative/ parliament
810	Gulf Co-operation Council/ Arab League
811	Syrian representative
812	Palestinian representative
813	Saudi representative
814	Iranian representative
815	Kuwaiti representative
816	Egyptian representative
817	Jordanian representative
818	Other Arab political representative
820	Al Qaeda/ Osama bin Laden
821	Other terrorist group

Subject (Whom)	Label
830	Vox pops: UK
831	UK soldier family member
832	UK Opinion poll: media source
833	UK Opinion poll: other source
834	"The UK Public"
840	Vox pops: US
841	US soldier family member
842	US opinion poll: media source
843	US opinion poll: other source
844	"The American People"
845	"The US Public"
846	Non UK/US/Iraq opinion poll: media source
847	Non UK/US/Iraq opinion poll: other source
848	"The International Public"
850	Iraqi civilian(s)
851	Iraqi soldier family member
852	Iraq opinion poll: media source
853	Iraq opinion poll: other source
854	Ali Ismail Abbas
855	Iraqi civilian: non-interview/chanting
856	"The Iraqi People"
860	Richard Sambrook (BBC)
861	Steve Anderson (ITV)
862	Own reporter (as initiator of story)
863	UK reporter from other media source
864	UK media (not specific)
865	UK unidentified media
866	UK TV (general)
867	BBC
868	UK newspaper
869	The Times
870	UK radio
871	Media personality
872	Specific journalist (named but not 'personality')
873	Embedded reporter
874	Interlocutor (NB. For use in press briefings)
880	US reporter from other media source
881	US media (not specific)
882	US unidentified media
883	US TV (general)
884	ABC
885	CBS
886	NBC
887	CNN

Subject (Whom)	Label
888	FOX
889	US newspaper
890	The New York Times
891	The Washington Post
892	US radio
900	Freedom TV (coalition channel in Iraq)
901	Iraqi State television/newspaper
902	Arab reporter from other media source
903	Al Jazeera
904	Abu Dhabi
905	Other Arab media (not specific reporter)
906	Other foreign reporter
907	International Media
908	International unidentified Media
909	Internet source
910	Other media source: non-specific/ unclear
920	TU representative anti-war
921	TU representative pro-war
922	Business representative anti-war
923	Business representative pro-war
924	Bill Clinton
925	Other: celebrities anti-war
926	Other: celebrities pro-war
927	Other: God
928	Other: Allah
929	Other: "The International Community"
998	Other: no clear attribution
999	Other: no applicable code

GENDER: M/F. Choose the gender of the actor the politician refers to in his/her speech.

REASON FOR REFERENCE:

It indicates why the political authority is mentioning the "other actor".

Reason for Reference ID	Reason for Reference
1	retorical support
2	send a message (to the actor mentioned)
3	contact
4	source of information
5	source for question
6	Report/repeat what other actor has said

Rhetorical support: the politician quotes another actor to support his own message. This could be a way to strengthen a frame the authority is proposing.

Send a message: the politician is addressing the actor mentioned. This applies, for example, to PM T. Blair addressing the Iraqi people, or CENTCOM's officials sending a message to the Iraqi army through the press. The media, in this case, by adding more resonance to authorities' messages, is used by politicians for reaching out to other relevant actors. This variable illustrates the nature of the relationship between media and politicians.

Contact: the mention of the other actor indicates the existence of a contact between him/her and the politician who is making the statement. This information adds to the mapping of exchanges among the actors and the understanding of how such interactions can affect the circulation of information.

Source of information: the politician quotes another actor as a source of information. Recording this aspect gives an idea of where politicians get their information from and whether they rely on media reports as a basis on which taking their decisions.

Source for question: the mention of another actor constitutes the ground for raising a question or is the basis for a talking point.

Report/repeat what other actor has said: the speaker refers to a statement by another actor for the purpose of reiterating the message.

TONE TOWARDS ACTOR:

The "Tone towards actor" refers to the attitude towards the actors mentioned. This piece of information is significant because the expressions of support or disdain towards actors affect the narrative being built around the conflict.

The "tone towards actor" is to be recorded on a 5-points scale (highly critical, somewhat critical, neutral, somewhat supportive, highly supportive) and is the tone with which the politician refers to the actor. The tone is revealed by the phrasing/rhetoric of the reference.

#	Tone towards actor
1	highly critical
2	somewhat critical
3	neutral
4	somewhat supportive
5	highly supportive
6	not applicable

REFERENCE TO ACTOR2:

Second reference to actor, in case more than one mention is made. The actor can be the same as ACTOR1 as long as the reason for quoting him/her a second time is different from the previous one.

List all other references to other actors.

SOUNDBITES: String variable.

Write the soundbites. They are the most repeated expressions, keywords, or ideas which constitute the “message of the day”. A soundbite can be recognized by the fact that it is repeated with similar words throughout the statement. Also recurrent ideas can be recorded.

2. CODING OF THE CHALLENGES TO POLITICIANS’ FRAMES

Form 2 allows exploring the challenges to the politicians’ frames by recording information about political debates, press conferences and interviews in which media or other political actors engage in a “dialogue” with the authorities.

The unit of analysis for this second form is the “intervention”. This can be a comment or a question made by the same actor at a given moment. Each intervention is coded individually. So if a politician has made two comments at two different times, even during the same parliamentary debate, they will be coded as two different interventions. The same applies, as an example, to a reporter asking three questions at 3 different times during a press conference. As far as questions are concerned, every question is coded as a different intervention. So if a reporter asks 3 questions in a row, they will be coded as 3 different entries. The coding of the question/comment includes also the politician’s response.

INTERVENTION ID: unique entry number for each intervention (question/comment) entered into the form

EVENT ID: same numbering as in FORM 1. It tells in which event the question was asked. Through this entry it will be possible to link the data saved on Form2 to the data stored in Form1. If, for example, in event 5 (a press conference in Downing Street) there are 30 questions asked, the number 5 (event ID) will be repeated 30 times in this field.

QUESTION #: Number of the question within each event. With reference to the previous example, this field will contain the progressive numbering from 1 to 30.

NAME of interlocutor: String variable. Name of the reporter/other politician.

PARTY AFFILIATION: Political affiliation in case the interlocutor is a politician.

COUNTRY: Country where the media organization comes from.

ORGANISATION: Name of the media organisation the reporter belongs to, in case the interlocutor is a member of the press or media personality.

Organisation ID	Country	Organisation
10	UK	newspaper
11	UK	TV
12	UK	other media
20	EU	newspaper
21	EU	TV
22	EU	other media
30	US	newspaper
31	US	TV
32	US	other media
40	Arab	newspaper
41	Arab	TV
42	Arab	other media
50	Asian	newspaper
51	Asian	TV
52	Asian	other media
60	International	newspaper
61	International	TV
62	International	other media

GENDER: M/F

KIND OF INTERVENTION

This control broadly refers to the purpose of the intervention. The choice of the applicable variable is made on the basis of the intervention's content. By looking at the content it is possible to get an idea of the extent to which the intervention reproduces the politician's framing.

Variable #	Kind of intervention
1	supportive
2	straight

Variable #	Kind of intervention
3	skeptical
4	alternative

Supportive: Expression of support towards the politician's message. This could be a positive comment or compliment.

Straight: Genuine request for information, not expressing a critique. Does not contain irony or biases suggested by the phrasing. Neutral stance towards the politician's message.

Skeptical: Pointing out a contradiction between what has been said/done and what is currently occurring. Raising doubts. As the name of the variable suggests, expressing skepticism about the politician's interpretation of event/issue. In this case there is a juxtaposition between the politician's message and another piece of information.

Alternative: The question/comment could be again pointing out a contradiction, but this time there is a proposal of a different interpretation of an issue/event than the one given by the political actor. This could suggest the capacity of the media/other political actors to propose alternative frames than the official ones.

NOTE: the "skeptical" or "alternative" variables do not necessarily refer to the expression of a negative opinion about the politician's frame, although this will be the most recurrent case. Especially the "alternative" option simply points to the fact that a different interpretation/frame is presented than the one contained in the politician's message.

CHECK BOXES

These check boxes have been introduced after having done some research on conversation analysis's study of press conferences. I am particularly referring to Clayman and Heritage (2000), "Questioning Presidents: Journalistic Deference and Adversarialness in the Press Conferences of Eisenhower and Reagan", <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/groups/ccsa/claymanheritage.PDF>.

- Multiple question (the question is part of a series of questions asked by the reporter within the same turn). This can be a measure of the initiative of interlocutors, particularly their adversarialness rather than deference (Clayman and Heritage 2000, p.6-8)
- prefatory statement: this is a preliminary statement that provides contextual "background information". The statement can be used to make the question intelligible to the audience, but also to introduce information that is hostile to the politician and exert pressure for a response (p.9). It is through such statements that the interlocutor could be able to present an alternative frame or counterframe.
- follow-up question (a follow-up question is a question asked by the interlocutor after he/she has already received an answer by the politician. This is a breach of the turn-taking system that organises press conference

interaction and it may indicate the refusal by the interlocutor to accept as adequate a response that the politician has offered (p. 11-12).

- Preface tilt: this is about the expression of an 'expectation about the type of answer that would be correct or preferable' (p. 17), usually "yes" or "no". Through this rhetorical device the interlocutor 'manages to suggest or imply or push for a particular viewpoint in the course of asking a question' (p.16). A 'viewpoint', in our study is a "frame".
Negatively formulated question: the preface tilt is usually expressed by a negatively formulated question. Common expressions are: "isn't it", "aren't you" or "don't you think that" (Clayman and Heritage 2000, p.19). The negatively formulated questions embody far more than a question to be answered, but a whole point to be disagreed with. They can be particularly challenging for a politician.

Accountability question: this is a question that asks the politician to explain why he has adopted a given policy or taken some course of action. As Clayman and Heritage say 'Such questions are by no means commonplace – presidents are often asked to characterize their policies and actions, but they are rarely asked to provide a rationale for a given policy/action' (p. 24), 'accountability questions cast the president's conduct as at least potentially improper, while placing the president in the position of having to defend himself' (p.24-25). They are expressed in the form of "Why did you do X", or "Would you explain why you did X." (p. 25).

'How could you question': this is a more hostile variant of the accountability question: 'embedded within the question is an assumption that the president cannot provide a proper or acceptable account' (p. 25).

I thought these aspects could be particularly relevant to the debate surrounding the Iraq War. This control could be useful for the comparison of current US/UK press conferences or more recent exchanges between media/politicians with debates about past conflicts.

SUBJECT: Choose from subjects list.

PROGNOSIS: Again recorded at the subject level on a 5-points scale.

Prognosis variables	
#	
1	highly pessimistic
2	somewhat pessimistic
3	neutral
4	somewhat optimistic
5	highly optimistic
6	not applicable

TONE OF INTERVENTION

In the “kind of intervention” control, on the basis of content, we have started recording to what extent the politicians’ frame was reproduced. This control tries to “measure” the extent of the difference from the official frame by looking at the phrasing and the rhetorical aspects of the intervention. It also defines in which direction, whether supportive or negative, the intervention is going to.

#	Tone of intervention
1	highly critical
2	somewhat critical
3	neutral
4	somewhat supportive
5	highly supportive
6	not applicable

The choice of the applicable variable could be suggested by the phrasing of the intervention:

Highly critical: eg. ‘disaster’, ‘anarchy’, ‘chaos’, ‘heavy’, ‘quagmire’, ‘extended’

Somewhat critical: eg. ‘poor’, ‘significant’, ‘uncertain’, ‘confused’

Neutral: no detectable biases or irony

Somewhat supportive: ‘optimistic’, ‘progressing’, ‘limited’, ‘low’, ‘light’

Highly supportive: eg. ‘good’, ‘rapid’, ‘insignificant’, ‘irrelevant’, ‘success’, ‘decisive’, ‘victory’, ‘short term’

FOCUS OF INTERVENTION:

This control builds on S. Althaus’s distinction between media’s “procedural” and “substantial” critique. A “procedural” critique, applying the category to the study of the Iraq conflict, would be directed at the way military operations are carried out and political decisions implemented. A “Substantial” criticism, instead, would be addressed to the objectives of the war or to the very reasons for the conflict. Here we keep Althaus’s distinction between the two categories, but we want to apply them to both expressions of criticism and support in order to understand which aspects the attention of the media focuses on. This allows establishing the nature of either support or antagonism that was expressed by the media for the official frame. Couldn’t it be, for example, that the media was somehow supportive of the reasons for war (a “substantial” aspect, such as disarming a brutal regime from WMD), but against the way it was conducted (a “procedural” aspect, such as the high number of civilian casualties)?

This variable is therefore a further way of refining the information already recorded as far as content and tone are concerned.

Focus of Intervention ID	Focus of Intervention
1	Procedural
2	Substantive
3	Neither
4	Not Applicable

Procedural: criticism directed at the way war plans are being implemented, not addressing the very reasons for the war or its very objectives

Substantive: the comment/question challenges the very reasons for the war or its very objectives

Neither: the intervention is not focusing on either aspects. Cases in which this variable should be selected are represented by “empty” statements like “This war is a joke”, “This war rocks”.

Not applicable

REFERENCE TO ACTOR: mention of other actor (see list of ACTORS in FORM1)

REASON FOR REFERENCE

Reason for Reference ID	Reason for Reference
1	rhetorical support
2	send a message (to the actor mentioned)
3	contact
4	source of information
5	source for question
6	Report/repeat what other actor has said

TONE TOWARDS ACTOR

#	Tone towards actor
1	highly critical
2	somewhat critical
3	neutral
4	somewhat supportive
5	highly supportive
6	not applicable

3. CODING OF THE RESPONSE to INTERVENTION

DOES THE BRIEFER/POLITICIAN ANSWER THE QUESTION?

Options: Yes/No/In part/Cannot say

This is about the politician's response as a whole: does he/she really address the question? The option "cannot say" is for cases in which the question is inaudible or has not been transcribed.

RESPONSE ORDER This control is to be applied when multiple questions were asked by the interlocutor within the same turn.

Check box: Not answered in order (the question does not receive an answer by the politician following the question order. The order of the reply is significant because it may reflect the politician's attempt to either shift attention to different aspects or even avoid the issue (Clayman and Heritage 2000, p. 8). This information is completed by the recording of the SUBJECT. Such details are significant in reconstructing the steps adopted by politicians to circumvent a question and are an integral part of their media management tactics.]

[order asked...../order answered.....] String variables

Check box: reformulates the question: this is another technique worth recording as far as the information management is concerned

SUBJECT: Record all the subjects covered by the politician's response.

PROGNOSIS: To be recorded at subject level on a 5-points scale.

#	Prognosis variables
1	highly pessimistic
2	somewhat pessimistic
3	neutral
4	somewhat optimistic
5	highly optimistic
6	not applicable

REFERENCE TO OTHER ACTOR: Record references to other actors (use ACTORS list)

REASON FOR REFERENCE:

Reason for Reference ID	Reason for Reference
1	rhretorical support
2	send a message (to the actor mentioned)
3	contact
4	source of information
5	source for question
6	Report/repeat what other actor has said

TONE TOWARDS ACTOR: To be recorded on a 5-points scale

#	Tone towards actor
1	highly critical
2	somewhat critical
3	neutral
4	somewhat supportive
5	highly supportive
6	not applicable

RELATIONSHIP RESPONSE-QUESTION

From the SUBJECT point of view the response:

RRQ ID	RRQ Response
1	Evades the question
2	Expands on the question
3	Sticks to the same subject

- evades the question: change of subject
- expands on the question: adds more subjects
- sticks to the same subject

This should give as an idea about the politician's effectiveness in agenda setting.

FUNCTION OF ANSWER

Function of Answer ID	Function of Answer
1	Provide more details
2	Rebuttal
3	Reinforce
4	Questioning

- provide more details or information (straight)
- rebuttal: counter an alternative frame proposed by the media. The politician is, effectively, defending his/her own frame.
- Reinforce: repetition of politician's own points.
- Questioning: the politician is raising doubts about the point made by the interlocutor.

TONE OF RESPONSE

#	Tone of response
1	highly critical
2	somewhat critical
3	neutral
4	somewhat supportive
5	highly supportive
6	not applicable

Highly critical: (attacking the interlocutor, for example)

Somewhat critical: irony

Neutral:

Somewhat supportive:

Highly supportive:

SOUNDBITES: string variable. It is possible that the politician repeats the message of the day or proposes a new soundbite as a reaction to the interlocutor's question/comment.

CHANGE OF RHETORIC: String variable. Record any significant change in rhetoric resulting from the interaction with the media/other politicians.

Clarification of meaning for database variables

What is the occasion/setting of the main impetus/event for the news item?

Occasion/ setting	
Political: Legislative	Where the main event takes place in any legislature
Political: Government	Government action which cannot necessarily be linked to a press conference/briefing
Political: Interest Group/ Anti-war protest	Any protest or action initiated by an interest group
Political: Press conference	Where info has explicitly been obtained from a press conference or briefing (not Qatar)
Political: Planned Media opportunity	A television address or other staged event, not press conference
Political: Unplanned Media opportunity	A soundbite or info obtained by more informal or spontaneous means, not planned in advance
Political: International Event/ Summit	Any EU, UN or other meeting between politicians from more than one country
Political: Other political actions	Can't fit into above categories, resignations, gaffes
Conflict zone: Report from battle/action	Any report from the field which deals with battle preparations, combat, consequences of attack
Conflict zone: Mil briefing/ rpt. from Centcom	Reports from Qatar, centcom
Conflict zone: Aid delivery/ humanitarian	Aid delivery, hospitals
Conflict zone: Restore order/ post-conflict unrest	Attempts to restore order, looting (at the end of the conflict or where this is main subject as future concern)
Conflict zone: Reconstruction	Efforts or reconstruction, creation of government, or talked about as future concern
Conflict zone: Other/ human interest	Light stories about troops, or more often civilian profiles (casualties where there is personal angle)
Media: interviews	Impetus is interview by the reporter, feature on individual
Media: Journalist rpt./ News analysis	Use for any analysis, comment or editorial where there is no single event or reporter initiates comment
Media: public opinion poll	Opinion polls or reports which focus on vox pops
Media: other media actions	Where media are focus for some other reason, media casualties, other actions
Other causes or occasions	None of the above appropriate, may involve country other than Iraq
No identifiable setting	Impossible to tell origin of the story

Whoms (for use as subjects, sources and cited)

Subject	Label	
500	Tony Blair	
501	Geoff Hoon	
502	Gordon Brown	
503	Jack Straw	
504	David Blunkett	
505	John Reid	
506	Peter Hain	
507	Alistair Campbell	
508	Simon Wren (in Qatar)	
509	Clare Short	
510	Robin Cook (pre-resignation)	
511	Ann Clywd	
512	Other (Cabinet) Minister	Can be named or unnamed
513	Downing Street named source	
514	Downing Street unnamed source	'Downing Street have said', 'reports from No. 10'
515	Downing Street anonymous source	Has to mention secrecy or anonymity
516	Downing Street leaked source	Specifically leaked
517	Foreign Office named source	
518	Foreign Office unnamed source	
519	Foreign Office anonymous source	
520	Foreign Office leaked source	
521	MoD named source	
522	MoD unnamed source	
523	MoD anonymous source	
524	MoD leaked source	
525	Other UK Government named source	Eg. Lord Goldsmith, other departments
526	Other UK Government unnamed source	Any which don't fit the above departments, government whips
527	Other Labour MP/Lord (not anti-war)	
528	Other Labour supporter (not anti-war)	Cherie Blair coded as this

529	Labour unnamed source (not anti-war)	
530	Leaked government source	
531	Government document/ figures	Any government document, website, legislation not attributed to a person
532	UK diplomat	
533	Police/ spokesperson	Or just for any UK police mentioned, use '999' for other foreign police
534	UK intelligence sources	Not military, also use for 'security sources'
540	Robin Cook (post-resignation)	
541	George Galloway	
542	Ken Livingstone	
543	Other Labour MP/Lord (anti-war)	Any Labour MP openly anti-war, including those who have resigned from government
544	Other Labour supporter (anti-war)	
545	Labour unnamed source (anti-war)	
550	Ian Duncan Smith	
551	Michael Howard	
552	Oliver Letwin	
553	Michael Ancram: shadow foreign secretary	
554	Other Shadow Cabinet pro-war	
555	Other Con MP/Lord (not anti-war)	
556	Conservative unnamed source (not anti-war)	
557	Other Conservative supporter (not anti-war)	
570	Other Shadow Cabinet anti-war	
571	Kenneth Clarke	
572	Michael Portillo	
573	Other Con MP/Lord (anti-war)	
574	Conservative unnamed source (anti-war)	
575	Other Conservative supporter (anti-war)	
580	Charles Kennedy	
581	Menzies Campbell	
582	Other Lib Dem leadership	
583	Other Lib Dem MP/Lord	

584	Lib Dem unnamed source	
585	Other Lib Dem supporter	
590	Other Political Party MP/ supporter (not anti-war)	
591	Other Political Party MP/ supporter (anti-war)	
600	President Bush	
601	Colin Powell: Secretary of State	
602	Donald Rumsfeld: Defence Secretary	
603	Dick Cheney: Vice President	
604	Victoria Clarke	
605	Condoleezza Rice	
606	Karen Hughes	
607	White House named source	Eg. Ari Fleischer
608	White House unnamed source	
609	White House anonymous source	
610	White House leaked source	
611	DoD named source	Use for 'Pentagon' also
612	DoD unnamed source	
613	DoD anonymous source	
614	DoD leaked source	
615	State Dept named source	
616	State Dept unnamed source	
617	State Dept anonymous source	
618	State Dept leaked source	
619	Other US Government named source	
620	Other US Government unnamed source	
621	US diplomat	
622	George Bush snr.	
623	US intelligence sources	Not military
630	Other Democrat politician (not anti-war)	
631	Other Republican politician (not anti-war)	

635	Other Democrat politician (anti-war)	
636	Other Republican politician (anti-war)	
640	Saddam Hussein	
641	Tariq Aziz (Deputy Prime Minister)	
642	Ali Hassan al-Majid (chemical Ali)	
643	Muhammad Said al-Sahaf (Information Minister)	
644	Naji Sabri (foreign minister)	
645	Other Iraqi leadership	Named or unnamed, any senior figure
646	Other Baath Party supporter	Use for Iraqi faithful politicians, government minders, people organizing demos
647	General Rawi (Iraq)	
648	Other Iraq military spokesman	
649	Iraqi soldier	Use for republican guard and conscripts
650	Iraqi dissenting military voice	
651	Fedayeen/ militia	Any Iraqi militia (not foreign) supportive of Saddam
652	Iraqi police/security	Use for secret police
653	Iraqi intelligence sources	
654	Iraqi Military intelligence sources	
655	Other Iraqi authorities named source	Government officials (not senior figures)
656	Other Iraqi authorities unnamed source	
657	Iraqi leadership: US playing card reference	Where leadership referred to by their playing card number
658	Saddam's family	Use for Uday and Quasay, immediate family, not other ruling cousins
659	Foreign militia supportive of Saddam	Specific mention of foreign fighters
660	Iraqi opposition leaders	Any critical organized opposition to Saddam, in or out of Iraq
661	Ahmed Chalabi	
662	Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani	
663	Other Iraqi Religious leader	
664	Kurdish representative	Political representative
665	Kurdish forces	
666	Other militia against Saddam	Other militia groups against Saddam – Islamic group in northern Iraq
667	Iraqi exile	Also use for Iraqi asylum seekers

670	Coalition military: Tommy Franks	
671	US military spokesman: Frank Thorp	
672	Al Lockwood	
673	Major General McChrystal	
674	General Myers	
675	General Brooks	
676	Other US Military named source	Not captains or other soldiers on the ground, only spokesmen, high commanders
677	Other US Military unnamed source	
678	US Military anonymous source	
679	US Military leaked source	
680	US Military intelligence source	
681	US soldier(s)	
682	Jessica Lynch	
683	US dissenting military voice	Any <u>current serving</u> soldier speaking against the aims of the coalition
690	UK military spokesman: Air Marshall Brian Burridge	
691	Chief of Defence Staff: Admiral Sir Michael Boyce	
692	Other UK Military named source	
693	Other UK Military unnamed source	
694	UK Military anonymous source	
695	Other UK Military leaked source	
696	UK Military intelligence source	
697	UK soldier(s)	
698	UK dissenting military voice	Any current serving soldier speaking against the aims of the coalition
699	"Our Troops"	
700	Other coalition forces/ source (not Kurdish)	Australian, Polish
701	Other private security forces	Pro-coalition security, mercenaries (unlikely to be referred to as this!)
702	Coalition military religious figure	Padres, chaplains working with the coalition
703	Coalition military medical worker	Medical workers attached to military, not civilian hospitals
710	UK Islamic leader	
711	Other Islamic Religious leader (not Iraq)	

720	Arch Bishop of Canterbury	
721	Pope John Paul II	
722	Other Non-Islamic Religious leader (not Iraq)	
730	UK Anti-war protester	
731	UK Anti-war spokesperson	
732	UK Voluntary human shield	
733	US Anti-war protester	
734	US Anti-war spokesperson	
735	US Voluntary human shield	
736	Coalition Anti-war protester	
737	Coalition Anti-war spokesperson	
738	Voluntary human shield Coalition	
739	Non-Coalition Anti-war protester	
740	Non-Coalition Anti-war spokesperson	
741	Voluntary human shield Non-Coalition	
750	UK Pro-war protester	
751	UK Pro-war spokesperson	
752	US Pro-war protester	
753	US Pro-war spokesperson	
760	Refugee interest group	
761	Humanitarian pressure group	
762	Geneva Convention	
763	Aid/NGO/ Red Cross worker	
764	NGO spokesperson	
765	Medical worker in Iraq	
766	Other pressure group	
770	Expert linked to Academic organisation	
771	Expert: Iraqi	
772	Analyst: retired military (paid advisor)	
773	Think tank	

774	Other expert/ unnamed experts/ analysts	
780	Kofi Annan	
781	Hans Blix	
782	Iraq Survey Group/ weapons inspector	
783	The UN/ UN representative	
784	UN document/resolution	
790	Jose Maria Aznar: Spanish PM	
791	Other coalition political	
792	Israeli representative	
793	Unspecified Coalition allies	
800	EU representative/ organisation	
801	Jaques Chirac/ French rep	
802	Gerhard Schroeder/ German rep	
803	Vladimir Putin/ Russian rep	
804	Other world leaders	
805	Turkish politician/ representative/ parliament	
810	Gulf Co-operation Council/ Arab League	
811	Syrian representative	
812	Palestinian representative	
813	Saudi representative	
814	Iranian representative	
815	Kuwaiti representative	
816	Egyptian representative	
817	Jordanian representative	
818	Other Arab political representative	
820	Al Qaeda/ Osama bin Laden	
821	Other terrorist group	
830	Vox pops: UK	
831	UK soldier family member/friend	
832	UK Opinion poll: media source	

833	UK Opinion poll: other source	
834	"The UK Public"	
840	Vox pops: US	
841	US soldier family member/friend	
842	US opinion poll: media source	
843	US opinion poll: other source	
844	"The American People"	
845	"The US Public"	
846	Non UK/US/Iraq opinion poll: media source	
847	Non UK/US/Iraq opinion poll: other source	
848	"The International Public"	
849	International vox pops	Any other country general public (interviewed), often those neighbouring Iraq
850	Iraqi civilian(s)	Also use for Iraqi Kurdish civilians
851	Iraqi soldier family member	
852	Iraq opinion poll: media source	
853	Iraq opinion poll: other source	
854	Ali Ismail Abbas	
855	Iraqi civilian: non-interview/chanting	
856	"The Iraqi People"	
860	Richard Sambrook (BBC)	
861	Steve Anderson (ITV)	
862	Own reporter (as initiator of story)	
863	UK reporter from other media source	
864	UK media (not specific)	
865	UK unidentified media	
866	UK TV (general)	
867	BBC	
868	UK newspaper	
869	The Times	
870	UK radio	

871	Media personality	
872	Specific journalist (named but not 'personality')	
873	Embedded reporter	
874	Interlocutor (NB. For use in press briefings)	
880	US reporter from other media source	
881	US media (not specific)	
882	US unidentified media	
883	US TV (general)	
884	ABC	
885	CBS	
886	NBC	
887	CNN	
888	FOX	
889	US newspaper	
890	The New York Times	
891	The Washington Post	
892	US radio	
900	Freedom TV/coalition controlled radio	Any coalition controlled media in Iraq (may overlap with psy-ops)
901	Iraqi State television/newspaper	Any Iraqi controlled media
902	Arab reporter from other media source	
903	Al Jazeera	
904	Abu Dhabi	
905	Other Arab media (not specific reporter)	
906	Other foreign reporter	
907	International Media	
908	International unidentified Media	
909	Internet source	
910	Other media source: non-specific/ unclear	
920	TU representative anti-war	
921	TU representative pro-war	

922	Business representative anti-war	
923	Business representative pro-war	
924	Bill Clinton	
925	Other: celebrities anti-war	
926	Other: celebrities pro-war	
927	Other: God	
928	Other: Allah	
929	Other: "The International Community"	
998	Other: no clear attribution	
999	Other: no applicable code	

Reporter's Comments/ Tone

#	Tone	
01	Straight/ heavily deflating/deflating/mixed/reinforcing/heavily reinforcing UK	Any UK govt or military officials (not opposition MPs)
02	Straight etc. US	Any US govt or military officials
03	Straight etc. IRAQ	Any Iraqi govt or military officials
04	Straight etc. UN	Any UN officials including weapons inspectors and humanitarian
05	Straight etc. ANTIWAR	Any protesters, spokespeople for protests, any UK/US antiwar politicians
06	Straight etc. ARAB LEAGUE	Any Arab League/Gulf Council ALSO any Arab leaders (not Turkey)
07	Straight etc. OTHER	None of the above: eg. media, other world leaders, other public opinion
08	Straight etc. COALITION	Where no distinction is made UK or US, or where other coalition members

Event Initiator

#	Event initiator	
01	US Military: planned	
02	US Military: unplanned	

03	UK Military: planned	
04	UK Military: unplanned	
05	Iraqi Military: planned	
06	Iraqi Military: unplanned	
07	Other Military: planned	
08	Other Military: unplanned	
09	USA political officials: planned	
10	USA political officials: unplanned	
11	UK political officials: planned	
12	UK political officials: unplanned	
13	Iraqi political officials: planned	
14	Iraqi political officials: unplanned	
15	Other official: UN: planned	
16	Other official: UN: unplanned	
17	Other official: European leader: planned	Use for European leader or EU
18	Other official: European leader: unplanned	
19	Other official: Middle East: planned	Use for Turkey
20	Other official: Middle East: unplanned	
21	Coalition soldiers/ Front line: planned	For non-official events, not connected to orders
22	Coalition soldiers/ Front line: unplanned	
23	Iraqi soldiers/ Front line: planned	
24	Iraqi soldiers/ Front line: unplanned	
25	Terrorist/ non-regular forces: planned	
26	Terrorist/ non-regular forces: unplanned	
27	Analysts/ Experts: planned	
28	Analysts/ Experts: unplanned	
29	Muslim community: UK or US: planned	Don't use for individual, unless representing Muslim community
30	Muslim community: UK or US: unplanned	
31	Muslim community: other locale: planned	
32	Muslim community: other locale: unplanned	

33	Think Tank: planned	
34	Think Tank: unplanned	
35	Religious leader: planned	
36	Religious leader: unplanned	
37	Protesters: antiwar UK: planned	
38	Protesters: antiwar UK: unplanned	
39	Protesters: antiwar US: planned	
40	Protesters: antiwar US: unplanned	
41	Protesters: antiwar other: planned	
42	Protesters: antiwar other: unplanned	
43	Protesters: pro-war UK: planned	
44	Protesters: pro-war UK: unplanned	
45	Protesters: pro-war US: planned	
46	Protesters: pro-war US: unplanned	
47	Protesters: pro-war other: planned	
48	Protesters: pro-war other: unplanned	
49	Police: planned	
50	Police: unplanned	
51	Iraqi civilians: planned	
52	Iraqi civilians: unplanned	
53	UK media: planned	
54	UK media: unplanned	
55	US media: planned	
56	US media: unplanned	
57	Iraqi media: planned	
58	Iraqi media: unplanned	
59	Arab media: planned	
60	Arab media: unplanned	
61	Internet: planned	
62	Internet: unplanned	

63	Other World Reporter: planned	
64	Other World Reporter: unplanned	
65	Family of coalition soldier: planned	
66	Family of coalition soldier: unplanned	
67	Family of Iraqi soldier: planned	
68	Family of Iraqi soldier: unplanned	
69	Aid agency/ NGO: planned	
70	Aid agency/ NGO: unplanned	
71	Coalition general: planned	
72	Coalition general: unplanned	
73	Opinion Poll	
74	No clear initiator	
75	Other/ no code	

Coding frames – see detailed instruction for general rules on inclusion

Coding frame	
Not applicable	Default option
Battle	
Strategy	
Civilian casualties	Include coalition or Iraqi claims about casualties as well as stories on actual casualties
Humanitarian issues (aid delivery)	
Coalition military casualties	
Iraqi military casualties	
Restoration of law and order (post-conflict)	
Justification: WMDs	
Justification: Humanitarian (Blairite)	
Justification: War on Terror	

Subject whats

Subject	Main Category	Sub Category	
001	Battle	Ground combat/ ongoing battle/ military situation	Can be used as umbrella code, or general battle
002	Battle	Air attack	
003	Battle	Coalition aircraft losses	Use for battle losses, Include claims as well as 'actual'
004	Battle	Iraqi aircraft losses (relevant?)	
005	Battle	Coalition battle gains	Only use where significant gains are made, such as a town
006	Battle	Coalition battle losses	
007	Battle	Iraqi battle gains	
008	Battle	Iraqi battle losses	
009	Battle	Death/ capture of Iraqi leadership (not Saddam)	
010	Battle	Coalition attack: general	This could be umbrella code, or where mix of below battle codes
011	Battle	Coalition attack: effective	
012	Battle	Coalition attack: ineffective	
013	Battle	Coalition attack: delay/ bad weather	
014	Battle	Iraqi resistance: general	This could be umbrella code, or where mix of below codes
015	Battle	Iraqi resistance: fierce/ effective	
016	Battle	Iraqi resistance: ineffective/ lack of/ surrender	
017	Battle	Coalition troops morale	Tone code will determine whether this is 'pro' or 'anti'
018	Battle	Iraqi troops morale	As above
019	Battle	Coalition troops expertise	
020	Battle	Iraqi troops expertise	
021	Battle	Coalition military intelligence	
022	Battle	Iraqi military intelligence	
023	Battle	Relations between coalition troops	
024	Battle	Relations between coalition and Iraqi troops	
025	Battle	Relations between Iraqi troops	
026	Battle	Daily life of UK troops/human interest	Also use for profile
027	Battle	Daily life of US troops/human interest	Also use for profile

028	Battle	Daily life of Iraqi troops/human interest	Also use for profile
029	Battle	Coalition: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits	
030	Battle	Iraqis: specialist equipment/body armour, chemical suits	
031	Battle	Destruction of homes attributed to coalition	
032	Battle	Destruction of homes attributed to Iraqi military	
033	Battle	Destruction of homes attributed to non-regular forces	
034	Battle	Destruction of infrastructure attributed to coalition	
035	Battle	Destruction of infrastructure attributed to Iraqi military	
036	Battle	Destruction of infrastructure attributed to non-regular forces	
037	Battle	Burning oil fields	Also use if intent is mentioned, <u>not</u> for use with oil trenches as anti-aircraft device
038	Battle	Protection of oil fields/ ministry	This is generally positive at start of war, though could be critical post-war
039	Battle	Removal of mines	
040	Battle	Delay: danger of mines	
041	Battle	Dolphins or other animals for military purposes	
042	Battle	Encounters with civilians: Iraqi troops	Use for face-to-face encounters, not military attack
043	Battle	Encounters with civilians: coalition troops (UK/US)	As above
044	Battle	Iraqi troop movements	
045	Battle	Coalition troop movements	
046	Battle	Logistics/ supplies	
047	Battle	Post attack/ devastation (emergency workers)	Where focus is on rescue, recovery
048	Battle	Collapse of regime	Can combine with senior surrender and code 009
049	Battle	War crimes	
050	Battle	Length of war	
051	Battle	Other: battle: no appropriate code	Peripheral battle stories, Turkish troops v Kurds, battle in Afghanistan
060	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: air: precision	Include refs to 'pinpoint targeting'
061	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: air: non-precision	Include weapons which aren't 'smart' and where supposedly precision bombs miss
062	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: ground: precision	May focus on Patriot missile, or others which are characterized as 'precision'
063	Battle/Weapons	Military technology: ground: non-precision	General artillery as focus, where precision goes wrong
064	Battle/Weapons	Weapons/technology: other/ general	Can be used as umbrella code
070	Battle/ Tactics	Suicide bomb/ attacks	Can be discussed as well as actual

071	Battle/ Tactics	Car bomb	This can overlap with previous code, just choose most appropriate
072	Battle/ Tactics	Psych-ops Coalition (leaflets/radio broadcasts)	Include all efforts to communicate with enemy (email, etc.) as well as general psy-
073	Battle/ Tactics	Psych-ops Coalition: playing cards	
074	Battle/ Tactics	Psych-ops Iraqi	
075	Battle/ Tactics	Attack on media outlet attributed to coalition	Include for attack, even if not successful
076	Battle/ Tactics	Attack on media outlet attributed to Iraqi military	
077	Battle/ Tactics	Attack on media outlet attributed to non-regular forces	
078	Battle/ Tactics	Depleted Uranium	Include discussion of use.
079	Battle/ Tactics	Cluster bombs	As above
080	Battle/ Tactics	Use of human shields/ citizens by Iraq authorities	
081	Battle/ Tactics	Guerrilla tactics	Tactics may be characterized as 'guerrilla' even if they are not so, strictly speaking.
082	Battle/ Tactics	Other Iraqi non-conventional/dubious tactics	This implies criticism whereas the code above may not.
083	Battle/ Tactics	Other Coalition non-conventional/dubious tactics	
084	Battle/ Tactics	Distinction made between UK and US military methods	For divergence of military tactics, ie. We know how to do this but they don't
085	Battle/ Tactics	Battle/ Tactics: other/general	Can be used as umbrella code
090	Strategy	Deadlines for action/war	Not really strategy, may be re-categorised as 'diplomacy'.
091	Strategy	Distinction made between UK and US strategy	For disagreement/divergence at a high level
092	Strategy	Distinction made between UK and US goals	
093	Strategy	Unification/synchronisation of coalition strategy	Only use where focus is <i>specifically</i> on unification or where divergence is rebutted
094	Strategy	Description of 'Shock and Awe' (explicit mention)	For any mention, note peripherally. (keyword code) Otherwise, as labeled.
095	Strategy	Evaluation of 'Shock and Awe'	
096	Strategy	Description of Coalition military strategy	
097	Strategy	Description of Coalition military goals	
098	Strategy	Description of UK military strategy	
099	Strategy	Description of UK military goals	
100	Strategy	Description of US military strategy	
101	Strategy	Description of US military goals	
102	Strategy	Description of Iraqi military strategy	
103	Strategy	Description of Iraqi military goals	
104	Strategy	Success of Coalition military strategy	

105	Strategy	Failure of Coalition military strategy	
106	Strategy	Success of Coalition military goals	
107	Strategy	Failure of Coalition military goals	
108	Strategy	Success of UK military strategy	
109	Strategy	Failure of UK military strategy	
110	Strategy	Success of UK military goals	
111	Strategy	Failure of UK military goals	
112	Strategy	Success of US military strategy	
113	Strategy	Failure of US military strategy	
114	Strategy	Success of US military goals	
115	Strategy	Failure of US military goals	
116	Strategy	Success of Iraqi military strategy	
117	Strategy	Failure of Iraqi military strategy	
118	Strategy	Success of Iraqi military goals	
119	Strategy	Failure of Iraqi military goals	
120	Strategy	Evaluation of coalition strategy, ground and general	
121	Strategy	Evaluation of coalition air attack	
122	Strategy	Evaluation of Iraqi strategy, ground and general	
123	Strategy	Evaluation of Iraqi air attack (relevant?)	
124	Strategy	Deployment of troops/ sufficient numbers	Use where focus is on numbers (maybe peripheral) even if no judgement.
125	Strategy	Strategy: other/general	Can be used as umbrella code
130	Rationale	Rationale: humanitarian general	Mixed or general used of humanitarian/liberation/tyranny <i>argument</i>
131	Rationale	Regime change: Humanitarian argument for change	Case made for humanitarian argument
132	Rationale	Regime change: war will worsen situation	
133	Rationale	Rationale: WMDs general	
134	Rationale	WMD as justification/ threat to UK/ 45 mins	WMDs as a rationale, in any form, not just as a threat to the west
135	Rationale	WMD threat does not exist	
136	Rationale	Rationale: Legal argument general/ UN	Discussion on general legality, may include 'international law' with ref to the war
137	Rationale	Legal basis: Iraq's failure to comply with UN resolutions	
138	Rationale	Legal basis: no UN or legal mandate	Includes middle ground assumption (War ok <i>if</i> UN backed) and anti-war argument

139	Rationale	Rationale: Coalition self interest general	With pro-coalition tone could be used for rebuttal, as no 'pro' option here
140	Rationale	Self Interest/ imperialist aims UK	
141	Rationale	Self Interest/ imperialist aims US	
142	Rationale	Rationale: oil rights general	
143	Rationale	Oil rights as reason for war	
144	Rationale	Oil in trust fund for Iraqi people	Can be specific or more general, that <i>their</i> oil heritage is being protected
145	Rationale	Rationale: regional stability general	General discussion of dangers or benefits to the region as an argument for/against
146	Rationale	Regional stability as outcome of war	As a move towards Middle East peace
147	Rationale	Regional instability as outcome of war	Destabilising (could move into terrorism increase argument)
148	Rationale	Rationale: other/general	Umbrella code or to represent rationales not covered above
160	Media	Embedded reporter(s) as subject	Reporters themselves or embedding as a strategy
163	Media	UK media strategy (spin, briefings)	Covers both strategy at home and in the field, government relations with the media
164	Media	US media strategy	
165	Media	Coalition media strategy	
166	Media	Iraqi media strategy	
167	Media	Media technology	Video phones, other equipment as focus
168	Media	Internet	Role as a source
169	Media	Censorship by Iraqi leadership	
170	Media	Censorship by coalition	
171	Media	Inaccuracy of media report	Could be a claim, not necessarily verified
172	Media	UK media coverage	Focus on media output
173	Media	US media coverage	
174	Media	Arab media coverage	
175	Media	Iraqi media coverage	
176	Media	About other international coverage	
177	Media	24/7 media coverage - mechanisms	Used as general code for 24/7, rolling news, where 178 & 179 don't apply
178	Media	24/7 media coverage: effects on perceptions of events	
179	Media	24/7 media coverage: effects on perception of length of war	
180	Media	Media story	Focus on how the media have treated or covered a certain story
181	Media	Government's sensitivity to media coverage	Govt claims of bias in coverage reflecting on them, not attacks on Al Jazeera, etc.

182	Media	Media casualties, no attribution of responsibility	
183	Media	Media casualties, responsibility of coalition	
184	Media	Media casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military	
185	Media	Media casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces	
186	Media	Media: other/general	Can be used as umbrella code
187	Media	Media support/campaign for troops	Editorial or media actions which express support for troops
190	POW	Prisoners of war/ MIA: coalition	PoWs generally, unless more detailed codes are more appropriate
191	POW	Prisoners of war/ MIA: Iraqi	As above
192	POW	Kidnapping/ murder of civilians	Where claims of 'execution'
193	POW	Kidnapping/ murder of coalition military	Where claims of 'execution'
194	POW	Kidnapping/ murder of Iraqi military	Where claims of 'execution'
195	POW	Torture or abuse: coalition POWs	Focus is on treatment which is <i>described</i> as abuse or torture
196	POW	Torture or abuse: Iraqi POWs	
197	POW	Torture or abuse: civilians	
198	POW	POWs/ MIAs: other/general	
200	Casualties	Overall Body Count/ or as an issue	Items which summarise body count, overall deaths over a period of time
201	Casualties	UK military casualties, no attribution of responsibility	Includes accidents
202	Casualties	UK military casualties, responsibility of coalition	
203	Casualties	UK military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military	
204	Casualties	UK military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces	
205	Casualties	UK military casualties: personalization/obituary	Where names and background are introduced in some detail
206	Casualties	UK military casualties: statistical information only	
207	Casualties	UK military casualties: family reaction supportive	Supportive of the <u>war</u> , not just of their family member
208	Casualties	UK military casualties: family reaction critical	Critical of the <u>war</u> , not just of their family member
209	Casualties	US military casualties, no attribution of responsibility	
210	Casualties	US military casualties, responsibility of coalition	
211	Casualties	US military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military	
212	Casualties	US military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces	
213	Casualties	US military casualties: personalization/obituary	See above 205
214	Casualties	US military casualties: statistical information only	

215	Casualties	US military casualties: family reaction supportive	See above 207
216	Casualties	US military casualties: family reaction critical	See above 208
217	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, no attribution of responsibility	
218	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of coalition	
219	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military	
220	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces	
221	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: personalization/obituary	See above 205 (unlikely!)
222	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: statistical information only	
223	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: family reaction supportive	See above 207
224	Casualties	Iraqi military casualties: family reaction critical	See above 208
225	Casualties	Civilian casualties, no attribution of responsibility	
226	Casualties	Civilian casualties, responsibility of coalition	
227	Casualties	Civilian casualties, responsibility of Iraqi military	
228	Casualties	Civilian casualties, responsibility of non-regular forces	
229	Casualties	Civilian casualties: accidental	May refer to buildings falling down, car crash, not nec. part of war
230	Casualties	Other casualties: non-Iraqi, international	
231	Casualties	Casualties: Coalition claims/ estimates/ rebuttal	
232	Casualties	Casualties: Iraqi claims/ estimates/ rebuttal	
233	Casualties	Friendly fire/ blue on blue	Use 202, 210 or 219 primarily – use this code as a keyword mention, or if focus
234	Casualties	Casualties: other/general	May refer to previous Gulf war, or as umbrella code
240	Protest	Antiwar movement as an issue: UK	Where the movement itself is the focus, eg. Hard left, manipulation of children
241	Protest	Antiwar activity: within legislature: UK	May overlap with ‘debate in parl’
242	Protest	Antiwar activity: within executive: UK	For resignations or non-resignations, government member speaking out
243	Protest	Antiwar activity: peaceful demonstration: UK	
244	Protest	Antiwar activity: violent demonstration: UK	
245	Protest	Antiwar activity: individual demonstration: UK	An individual’s campaign, eg. Man chained to parliament gates
246	Protest	Antiwar activity: voluntary human shields: UK	Also use this code if no nationality is given
247	Protest	Antiwar activity: in UK military	Spoken dissent or activity
248	Protest	Police tactics vis-à-vis antiwar movement: UK	
249	Protest	Counter protests: UK	

250	Protest	Balance between antiwar and counter protests: UK	May be umbrella code where both given equal time
251	Protest	Antiwar movement as an issue: US	
252	Protest	Antiwar activity: within legislature: US	
253	Protest	Antiwar activity: within executive: US	
254	Protest	Antiwar activity: peaceful demonstration: US	
255	Protest	Antiwar activity: violent demonstration: US	
256	Protest	Antiwar activity: individual demonstration: US	
257	Protest	Antiwar activity: voluntary human shields: US	
258	Protest	Antiwar activity: in US military	
259	Protest	Police tactics vis-à-vis antiwar movement: US	
260	Protest	Counter protests: US	
261	Protest	Balance between antiwar and counter protests: US	
262	Protest	Antiwar protest in Europe	
263	Protest	Antiwar protest in Iraq	Not voluntary human shields
264	Protest	Antiwar protest in other Arab or Muslim countries	
265	Protest	Antiwar protest: other	Could be umbrella code or for other country
266	Protest	Pro-war rally/demonstration	Rather than 'counter protest' which implies reaction, this is an organized rally
267	Protest	Protests: other/general	Use as umbrella code, inclusive of all kinds of protest
270	Diplomacy	Summit of world leaders	Problem code: not really analytically significant. Include where summit is main focus
271	Diplomacy	Peace initiative: war seen as failure of	Use specifically where presented as peace initiative, not 'international disagreement'
272	Diplomacy	Peace initiative: peaceful settlement with Iraq impossible	As response to above, coalition claim peace initiative impossible, blame Saddam
273	Diplomacy	Impact on UK/Europe relations	How the war will impact on future relations
274	Diplomacy	Impact on US/ Europe relations	
275	Diplomacy	Impact on US/ UK relations	
276	Diplomacy	Tensions within coalition	Differences between Blair and Bush highlighted, could be linked to specific area, UN
277	Diplomacy	International Relations general	Umbrella code for above, or to use where non-specific
278	Diplomacy	UK foreign policy - Europe	Very similar to 'UK/EU relations', may focus on future 'EU defence policy'
279	Diplomacy	UK foreign policy - Middle East	Focus on UK role in peace 'roadmap' or other actual policy
280	Diplomacy	UK foreign policy - Other	
281	Diplomacy	US foreign policy - Europe	Very similar to 'US/EU relations'

282	Diplomacy	US foreign policy - Middle East	Focus on US role in peace 'roadmap' or other actual policy
283	Diplomacy	US foreign policy - Other	
284	Diplomacy	EU skepticism/ opposition to military intervention	Use where it is actually the EU opposed, or only EU countries are opposed
285	Diplomacy	Middle East: Israel/Palestine tension	May overlap with foreign policy codes and regional stability rationale
286	Diplomacy	World Security	Problem code, keyword, linked to regional stability rationale
287	Diplomacy	Regional political stability	Problem code, keyword, linked to regional stability rationale
288	Diplomacy	International law	Problem code, keyword, linked to legal rationale and Geneva Convention
289	Diplomacy	Iraq territorial integrity	Linked to Blair's rationale, promise to protect territory
290	Diplomacy	International support for military action	Use for focus on coalition of the willing, how a country is helping the war effort
291	Diplomacy	International disagreements about military action	Opposition to military action
292	Diplomacy	Diplomacy: other/general	Use as umbrella code or for actions not covered above
300	Public opinion	Public opinion: UK	Opinion poll or vox pops
301	Public opinion	Public opinion: US	
302	Public opinion	Public opinion: international	
303	Public opinion	'Islamophobia'	Specifically named or where public opinion against Islam, not government policy
304	Public opinion	Public opinion: other/general	Use as umbrella code
310	Religion	Religion and the war: Islam vs. Christianity as issue	
311	Religion	Religion and the war: Islam not the enemy, religiosity	
312	Religion	Religion and the war: other	Appeals by church leaders, religion is an issue but not specified as above
320	Reconstruction/Fut	Cost of reconstruction	
321	Reconstruction/Fut	Strategy for reconstruction general	Could be umbrella for below – all overlap. V difficult to separate
322	Reconstruction/Fut	Role of businesses/ commercial operation	
323	Reconstruction/Fut	Coalition's length of stay in Iraq	
324	Reconstruction/Fut	Representative democracy in Iraq/ post-war governance	
325	Reconstruction/Fut	UN role in reconstruction	
326	Reconstruction/Fut	Peace (the challenge)	
327	Reconstruction/Fut	Iraqi exiles' role in reconstruction	Could overlap with democracy
328	Reconstruction/Fut	Future developments of operations	
329	Reconstruction/Fut	Future conflicts	Both in the region and in Iraq.
330	Reconstruction/Fut	Reconstruction/future: other/general	

340	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: coalition effective	
341	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: coalition ineffective	
342	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: coalition attempts	Mix of the above or neither pro or anti
343	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: Iraqi police effective	
344	Law and (dis)order	Restoration of law and order: Iraqi police ineffective	(no attempts code but unlikely to be under as much focus)
345	Law and (dis)order	Ethnic violence	Focus on Sunni/ Shia/ Kurd tension or violence
346	Law and (dis)order	Looting	
347	Law and (dis)order	Civil unrest/ disorder	Generally use for post-battle
348	Law and (dis)order	Law and (dis)order: other/general	Use as umbrella code
350	Domestic	Debate in Parliament/ domestic policy matters	Problem code, not analytically significant. Use of legislative, party political
351	Domestic	UK domestic politics	Other political issues, may not be linked to legislature
352	Domestic	Debate in Congress/ Senate	
353	Domestic	US domestic politics	
354	Domestic	Cost of war	May be linked to 'cost of reconstruction'. Use for military costs
355	Domestic	Domestic: other/general	Use as umbrella code or other domestic matters (UK or US)
356	Domestic	Support for coalition troops (not media/families of	Any call to support troops (not media, family reaction to casualty)
357	Domestic	Support for Iraqi troops	As above
360	Blair	Blair: focus on	Focus on leadership qualities, trust, family, as a person, future as leader
370	Bush	Bush: focus on	As above
380	WMD	WMD: speculation/ will be found	Use for discussion of <i>finds</i> , <i>evidence</i> , etc. not rationale itself
381	WMD	WMD: evidence found/ positive developments	
382	WMD	WMD: not found yet	
383	WMD	WMD: not likely to find/ negative developments	
384	WMD	Threat of chemical/ biological warfare in Iraq: assumed	Again this is not necessarily the same as rationale, threat on the ground
385	WMD	Threat of chemical/ biological warfare in Iraq: questioned	
386	WMD	WMDs: other/general	Use as umbrella code or for other WMDs, maybe use by other terrorists
390	Terrorism	Terrorism: Iraq's links to Al Qaeda	Use for specific Al Qaeda links, even if through another group
391	Terrorism	Terrorism: No evidence of links to Al Qaeda	
392	Terrorism	War on Terror: war will prevent future attacks (inc on	
393	Terrorism	War on Terror: war will encourage future attacks (inc on	Anti-coalition argument, not for use where terror alerts occur during the war

394	Terrorism	War on Terror: general/other	
395	Terrorism	Terrorism: in other Middle East country	
396	Terrorism	Terrorism: Other/general	Umbrella code for all the above, or in another country, esp. UK or US
400	Historical	Brutality of regime/ past atrocities	Links to 131, are events detailed or put across as part of argument?
401	Historical	Demonisation of Saddam	Not where Saddam defined as 'brutal' but discussion of his demonisation in past
402	Historical	Sanctions as humanitarian disaster: West to blame	
403	Historical	Sanctions/ Oil for Food effectiveness hampered by Saddam	
404	Historical	Western involvement in supplying WMD materials	For coalition members
405	Historical	Comparison/reference to 1991 Gulf war	
406	Historical	Previous uprisings by Iraqi people	
407	Historical	Comparison to past conflict (Vietnam/ WW2/Afghanistan)	Also use for any references
408	Historical	9/11 reference	
409	Historical	Iraqi support for Palestinians	Or Palestinian support for Iraq
410	Historical	Western/ US support for Israel	Or vice versa – use for general argument of complicity
411	Historical	Historical: other/general	Historical but which relates to Iraq in some way. Use 'other' if other subject
420	Family Life	Families of UK soldiers	
421	Family Life	Families of US soldiers	
422	Family Life	Families of Iraqi soldiers	
423	Family Life	Soldiers' Families: Other/general	Use as umbrella code
430	Saddam	Death of Saddam/ speculation on whereabouts	Include for assassination attempts and speculation on death
431	Saddam	Destruction/ defacing/ mocking of image/statue	
432	Saddam	Celebration of image	
433	Saddam	Saddam's family/ fleeing the country	
434	Saddam	Saddam's millions/ decadence	Include for palaces, needs to be focus on decadence not bombing
435	Saddam	Saddam: other/general/focus	For focus or umbrella code
440	Humanitarian	Success of/funds for coalition/UN aid delivery to Iraqi	
441	Humanitarian	Failure of/lack of funds for coalition/UN aid delivery to Iraqi	
442	Humanitarian	Coalition/UN attempts to deliver aid	
443	Humanitarian	Non-coalition/NGO aid delivery to Iraqi people	
444	Humanitarian	Hospitals: shortage of medicine supplies, treatment	

445	Humanitarian	Hospitals: adequate medicine supplies, treatment	
446	Humanitarian	Water/food shortage	
447	Humanitarian	Water/food supplies adequate	
448	Humanitarian	Humanitarian consequences of war: general	
449	Humanitarian	Humanitarian consequences of war: positive	
450	Humanitarian	Humanitarian consequences of war: negative	
451	Humanitarian	Refugees	In Iraq, not past wars
452	Humanitarian	Geneva Convention	
453	Humanitarian	Humanitarian: other/general	Use as umbrella code
460	Iraqi People	Celebration in Iraq (pro-coalition)	Use for actual celebration/jubilation rather than just welcoming
461	Iraqi People	Hostility/ civil unrest in Iraq (anti-coalition)	Violent or openly hostile reaction to coalition
462	Iraqi People	Loyalty to Saddam portrayed as genuine	
463	Iraqi People	Loyalty to Saddam portrayed as not genuine / fearful	
464	Iraqi People	Wariness toward coalition/ feelings of betrayal	
465	Iraqi People	Welcoming to coalition/ troops	
466	Iraqi People	Human interest: Iraqi civilian profile/ daily life	
467	Iraqi People	Hostility/ civil unrest/ uprising in Iraq (not anti-coalition)	Use for new uprising against Saddam/Iraq, not general disagreement over time
468	Iraqi People	Co-operation with Coalition	Overlaps with welcoming coalition, use where civilians provide help to coalition
469	Iraqi People	Iraqi people: other/general	Use as umbrella code
480	Other	Environmental disaster	Use for mentions, as well as actual disaster, environmental disaster prevented
483	Other	Reaction to war in other neighboring/ Mid East country (not	May be moved to diplomacy, similar to 290/291 but for neighbouring countries
484	Other	Reaction to war in other locale	This is probably covered in other diplomacy codes
485	Other	Human interest: other	
486	Other	Price of oil	
487	Other	UK stock market	
488	Other	US stock market	
489	Other	Question/comment by interlocutor (for press briefings only)	Not for use in our database
490	Other	Own statement (for press briefings only)	Not for use in our database
491	Other	Statement by other (for press briefings only)	Not for use in our database
999	Other	Other: no appropriate code	Where the war in Iraq is not the main focus.