DFG research project

Mediated Contestation in Comparative Perspective

CODEBOOK (version 7.7)

Authors: Eike Mark Rinke, Charlotte Löb, Julia Winkler

Project director: Hartmut Wessler

Date : 07.02.2018

Content

3. CODING STEP: CREATION OF THE JUSTIFICATION LIST [JUSTIFICATION_NAME]

A position is a claim that something should be done (or not done) or is desirable (or undesirable) for the society/community. A justification, on the other hand, is an **explicit argument used to justify a position**. A justification gives a specific answer to

- **why** something should be done or not be done for the society/community or

- **why** something is desirable or not for the society/community.

Justifications can be expressed by referring to

1. the consequences of actions (e.g. 'Strategy X has been successful in the past, so we should follow it again,' or 'Measure X has proven ineffective at solving issue Y, and it will do so again'),

2. certain values (e.g. 'For the protection of human dignity', 'To fulfil our moral responsibility'), and/or

3. interests (e.g. 'To secure our prosperity in the long run').

Step 1: identification of justifications

Coding instruction:
Look for specific passages in the article in which justifications or arguments for the previously identified positions occur. Mark the text in the article in Angrist (max 20 words) and then click on the red button 'Justification'. You can make corrections by marking the text again and clicking on the empty, white button. If you code an article in PDF or paper format, mark the text in the PDF editor or highlight it with a pen, respectively.

Possible signal words for the presence of a justification are 'thus', 'because', 'therefore', 'hence', 'due to', 'consequently', 'as a result', 'for this reason'. This list of so-called causal conjunctions serves only as an aid; these words are **neither necessary nor sufficient** for the presence of a justification! This means that 1) a justification does not always have to be introduced by such a conjunction, and 2) not every statement that contains such a conjunction is a justification. What is important is that an issue is used as a clearly identifiable argument or a reason for or against a position with regard to the central issue of the project. Such an argumentative support for a position may also remain **implicit**– but, in any case, **the generally educated reader** must be able to **clearly identify it in the article**. Implicit justifications may occur in the form of statistics (e.g. surveys), narratives, and stories (e.g. experience reports).

> *Example: an article contains the following section 'We do not care if our teachers wear turban or burqa—as long as they prepare us well for the Abitur'. This is an implicit justification, expressed by the subordinate clause 'as long as they prepare us well for the Abitur'. Made explicit, this justification would correspond to: 'The religion of our teachers does not matter to us, because it is not important for whether or not they can prepare us well for the Abitur exam.'*

Code justifications as <u>detailed</u> as possible. Record all justifications to a position that (a) can be clearly recognised as such by a generally educated reader and (b) are not identical in content. The quality, completeness and truthfulness of the argument does **not** play a role here. Similar to positions, justifications may occur several times, in different forms and in different places in an article - as long as these passages <u>express the same content</u>, they must be coded only as a <u>single</u> justification.

Justifications must be **independent of each other** and able to **stand alone**. A chain of logical arguments (**chain/line of reasoning**) is counted as a **single justification**, while a **list** of several independent arguments, even if mentioned in one sentence, are considered as **several independent justifications** (list of arguments). You can test whether the justification is a list of arguments or a chain of reasoning by checking whether a justification still meaningfully supports a position with regard to the project's central issue and is understandable as such **when preceding and/or subsequent parts of one potential chain of reasoning in an article are omitted**. If this is the case, it is a list of arguments. If the meaning changes or it becomes more difficult to understand a justification when omitting parts of a potential line of reasoning contained in an article, it is a chain of reasoning.

> *Example 1: an article deals with the pros and cons of the public recognition of Muslim communities in Switzerland. The position 'For the recognition of Muslim religious communities' is supported by the following statement: 'It would give them the right to raise taxes as well as improved access to religious instruction in schools or to pastoral care in hospitals.'*
>
> *These are <u>three justifications</u>, because each of the three aspects could be removed from the statement without changing the general understanding of the statement:*
>
> 1) *because Muslim religious communities would then have the right to raise taxes,*
>
> 2) *because Muslim religious communities would then have improved access to religious education, and*
>
> 3) *because Muslim religious communities would then have improved access to pastoral care in hospitals.*
>
> *Example 2: an article on the pros and cons of a prayer room for Muslims at universities says: 'In a statement, they write that 'there are no mosques in the vicinity of the university'. To commute several times a day between the university and the mosque is unacceptable.' The statement that there is no mosque near the university serves to build up the argument that commuting between the university and the mosque is unacceptable. Without this statement, it would be difficult to understand the argument. Therefore, it is only <u>one justification</u>.*

In case of doubt - rule 1: if you are unsure whether the justification is a chain of reasoning (that is, a <u>single</u> justification) or a list of arguments (that is, <u>several</u> independent justifications), always <u>separate</u> them and <u>code the justifications individually</u>. This also applies to reports of individual fates/experiences, provided they are **clearly distinguished** from each other and do **not** build on each other according to the above-mentioned definition of a chain of reasoning.

In case of doubt - rule 2: if you are unsure whether it is actually a justification for one of the positions, code <u>liberally</u> (that is, be 'generous' and, if in doubt, include the justification in your list).

Note 1: make sure that the justification **actually** refers to **exactly the position** you are currently coding - and not to any other position that may be related to, but must be distinguished from the position to be coded (e.g. because it is less general):

> ***Example****: an article in the* Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung *contains the following section: 'A first boarding school with uniform duty is opened in September in Beaumont-en-Véron near the village of Chinon. A week ago, hundreds of residents protested against the school, which is said to endanger their village life. They also told the prime minister in a petition that they did not want to live in the neighbourhood of radical Islamists'.*
>
> *There is no justification for the position 'rejecting deradicalisation through a collective approach'. In this case, the villagers justify their refusal to establish a boarding school in their vicinity. However, it is not clear whether they also reject deradicalisation through a collective approach per se. The position justified here thus is: 'Rejection of a boarding school for the deradicalisation in Beaumont-en-Véron'.*

Note 2: not every position is justified! Therefore, in principle it is also possible that you do not find any justification for a position in an article.

Note 3: the coding of justifications is independent from the coding of actors! This means that you should record any justification used to argue for a position, regardless of the actor who supports it or whether there even is an actor who supports it (or the position connected to it).

Step 2: formulation of justifications

Similar to the formulation of positions, you should also phrase justifications on the basis of a causal scheme to (a) ensure intersubjective traceability, (b) facilitate the work with Angrist, and (c) verify whether a justification can actually be understood as a supporting argument of a position.

Coding instruction:

Enter the justifications in Angrist in the same field in which you also listed the positions. Mark the justification with R1, R2, etc. The order of the justifications' occurrence in the main text of the article defines their order of listing.

If the description of a justification in the article does not already meet these criteria, reformulate the contents of the marked passage according to the following rules (maximum 20 words):

1) use causal conjunctions to introduce a justification: because, since, in order to, thus, to…

2) avoid sentence fragments or phrases that consist only of ambiguous keywords. A justification should include at least one object and one statement related to the object.

> ***Example:****'For the purpose of neutrality' or 'Oppression of women' are not comprehensible as justifications, but 'Because the principle of neutrality is otherwise violated in public institutions' or 'Because the niqab is a symbol for the oppression of women' are.*

3) Stay as close to the text as possible in describing the justification (for example, by using similar vocabulary as in the text passage) so that the justification can be easily assigned and retrieved.

4) Together with the corresponding position, the justification must form a meaningful statement.

> ***Example***: *the position 'For banning niqab' and the justification 'Because the niqab is a symbol for the oppression of women   ' together make a meaningful statement.*

Caution: 'meaningful' here means 'meaningful according to the grammatical rules and the argumentation of the article. It is about whether a justification as such (!) is mentioned to support a position, not whether an argument is meaningful in content, true, logical, morally good or complete. That means: even bad justifications are justifications!

Step 3: final review of the justification list

Coding instruction:

Finally, review your justification list carefully. Make sure that

1) every justification can be assigned to a position,
2) the descriptions of the justifications are short, but comprehensible, clear and factually correct, and
3) justifications do not appear twice on the list (for example, because they appear in different parts of the text in different versions or wording).