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

Research project ‚Mediated Contestation in Comparative Perspective' – Mannheim Centre for European Social Research

Content

Preliminary note: the following coding steps record whether an <u>explicit reference </u>to

> *(a) an **actor** (actor reference) (**coding step 8**),*

> *(b) a **position** (position reference) (**coding step 9**) and*

> *(c) a **justification** (justification reference) (**coding step 10**)*

> *is given.*

*A reference here represents a unique object–originator constellation. As described above, reference objects may be **actors** (coding step 8), **positions** (coding step 9), or **justifications** (coding step 10). By contrast, originators of references are <u>always</u> actors.*

References to actors, positions, or justifications may be neutral, positive (e.g. approving), or negative (e.g. offensive) depending on the dominant overall impression of the reference.

Important*: when identifying references, consider the entire article that is currently coded. This means, you should include the **entire presentation of the actor, position, or justification** in the article (and not only at its first mention) as a basis for your coding decisions.*

9. CODING STEP: POSITION REFERENCES

In this coding step, the position references are coded. A position reference represents a unique object-originator constellation. For each of these constellations, the coding steps 9.4 through 9.9 must be performed.

Caution: here, all positions in the article are coded that are referred to by at least one actor who does **not** themselves represent the position!

Coding steps 9.1 to 9.3 record whether an actor (reference originator) refers to a **position** (reference object) and in which passage the reference is made. Coding steps 9.4 to 9.9 contain characteristics of each individual reference.

Caution: if position references are purely implicit, they are <u>not</u> coded.

9.1. POSITION REFERENCES: REFERENCE OBJECT POSITION [POSREF_REFOBJ_POSITION]

A reference is defined here as a communicative act (linguistic or non-linguistic) which in its content is contingent upon another communicative act. Note that the communicative act referred to does <u>not</u> need to appear in the article. It must only be recognisable as a necessary prerequisite for the referring communicative act.

A position can be referred to in various forms:

1) by **directly quoting** another position,

2) by **indirectly quoting** another position,

3) by performing **acts** that are directly aimed at another position (e.g. attacks, demonstrations, etc.)

4) by **characterizing** another position (e.g. in order to degrade them),

5) by **commenting** on or **evaluating** other positions.

Such a reference to another position may be neutral, positive (e.g. approving) or negative (e.g. offensive).

Coding instruction:

From the displayed list, in turn select **one of the positions to which at least one actor who does *not themselves represent* this position explicitly refers in the main text of the article**. This applies to both positions that are regarded as **negative** and positions that are regarded as **neutral** or **positive** by the originator of the reference.
In doing so, adhere to the order in which the positions appear on the position list. That is, you first code all references to the first position, then those references made to the positions listed second, third, fourth, etc. Finally, code the position references that are made by unlisted actors.

If no position is referred to or if the reference is only implicit, code 'No, no other position reference'.

Example: the following positions are available for an article:

1. *For a strict regulation of Muslim mixed marriages*
2. *For a stricter treatment of traditionalist Muslims*

With the sentence: 'Anyone who sets up and propagates such rules should not be surprised if Muslims are encouraged to enforce these according to their home tradition.' reference is made to position 1.
→ *Select position 1 as the reference object.*

9.2. POSITION REFERENCES: REFERENCE POSITION OTHER [POSREF_REFERENCE_POSITION_TEXT]

For each position reference, copy the passage in which the reference is made to the text box provided by marking it in Angrist and clicking on 'Get selection'. If an actor refers to the same position several times in the text, select the passage in which the reference becomes particularly clear. If you code an article in PDF format, enter the text manually.

Example: an article contains the following section: 'Anyone who sets up and propagates such rules should not be surprised if Muslims are encouraged to enforce these according to their home tradition. Who curries favour with and even financially supports those who design these rules, support the mind behind such acts of violence against a non-Islamic couple.' → Here, select 'Anyone who sets up and propagates such rules should not be surprised if Muslims are encouraged to enforce these according to their home tradition.' and copy it to the text box provided for this purpose by clicking on 'Get selection'.

9.3. POSITION REFERENCES: REFERENCE ORIGINATOR POSITION [POSREF_REF_POSITION_ACTOR_ID]

Code the actor/s who refer to the position selected in the previous coding step (9.1 REFERENCE OBJECT POSITION):

Coding instruction:

From the displayed list, select the actor who refers to the position selected in the previous coding step (9.1REFERENCE OBJECT POSITION)

If several actors refer to the position selected in the previous coding step (9.1. REFERENCE OBJECT POSITION), code the individual references separately! Do not select more than one reference originator from the list.

For the **author** of an article, the following **special rule** applies: a reference to a position made by the author is not given only by a position being mentioned in the text. Even a direct or indirect quote, taken by itself, is not automatically understood as a reference. However, there may be explicit reactions to or comments on quotes or evaluations of positions that are coded as position reference.

Caution: also unlisted actors (see coding step 6.2), who do not appear on the actor list of the currently coded article, may make a reference (i.e. the reference originator may also be a non-identifiable potential discourse participant)!

Example: an article in the Tages Anzeiger *contains the following sentence: 'The organization demands a separation of church and state, has 200 paying members, and supports Muslims who do not define themselves primarily by religion. "We do not feel represented," Hakimi says".*

Here, the actor Hakimi refers to the position 'for the separation of state and church' → *select 'reference originator: Hakimi'.*

9.4. POSITION REFERENCES: GENUINE CONSTRUCTED RESPONSIVIVENESS POSITION [POSREF_GENUINE_CONSTRUCTED_RESP_POSITION]

Code whether the position reference currently coded is created by the referring actor or the author of the article.

Genuine responsiveness towards a position is given if the referring actor establishes the reference to another position. This can be done either by direct speech (direct quote) or by indirect speech (indirect quote).

Constructed responsiveness towards a position is given if not the referring actor establishes the reference to another position. Instead, the reference between the actor and the position is created **exclusively** by the author of the article.

If it is not clear whether the reference was made by the actor themselves or by the author of the article, code '-99 Unclear'.

0   **Genuine** responsiveness

1   Constructed responsiveness

-99   Unclear

Note: not every reference by the author of an article necessarily is a form of constructed responsiveness. The author, as an independent actor themselves, may themselves refer to other actors. Such references have to be coded as genuine responsiveness. Journalists can also act as positional actors themselves and thus create relationships that then have to be coded as genuine responsiveness.

Example 1: an article in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung contains the following section: 'Federal Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble (CDU) demonstratively supported de Maizière. "I think de Maizière's move is necessary. We have to check individually whether a Syrian refugee is actually persecuted", the CDU politician said in the ARD program "Report from Berlin"'.

Here, Wolfgang Schäuble himself makes a direct reference to a) another actor (de Maizière) and b) a different position (the de Maizières initiative to restrict the family reunification of refugees) → code 1: Genuine responsiveness given

Example 2: an article in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung contains the following passage: 'To make it clear: with us, a change in the fundamental right to asylum, i.e. the amendment of the constitution, will not happen' the CSU chief said on Saturday evening on Bavarian television. By saying so, Seehofer openly distanced himself from his party colleague Söder, who had just brought into discussion fences on the German border.

Seehofer's position does not independently refer to the position of his party colleague. The reference is made by the journalist. → code 2: Constructed responsiveness given

Example 3: an article in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung contains the following passage: 'Atzelmeier emphasizes that religions should not be placed under the general suspicion of incompatibility with guaranteed human rights. Löwenstein sees it completely differently: he believes that religious practices have suppressed humans' and women's rights for centuries. "Therefore, religion must make it clear not to contradict human rights," Löwenstein said.'

Here, responsivenes of Löwenstein's position to that of Atzelmeier is constructed by the journalist. → code 2: Constructed responsiveness given

9.5. POSITION REFERENCES: VALENCE POSITION [POSREF_VALENCE_POSITION]

Code whether the reference to a position contains an **explicit evaluation.** Here, we want to identify whether there is a positive or negative evaluation of the position to which reference is made. Such an evaluation must be **explicitly** mentioned in the text and clearly recognisable, but it does not have to be particularly strong for positive or negative coding.

The evaluation has to refer to the position, not to the actor who represents it or to justifications. Evaluations of justifications, positions and actors often appear together. Here, only code the evaluation of the position, not of the actors or justifications.

Note 1: it is possible that a position is explicitly evaluated positively or negatively <u>due to</u> the actor who represents it. This must be clear from the context of the article. In such cases, code the evaluation of both the actor and the position (see coding step 9.4).

Note 2: if a position is evaluated both positively and negatively in several references in the text (which are produced by the same actor in each case), then the dominant positive or negative overall impression is coded. Code '-99 Unclear' only if there is no tendency towards a positive or negative evaluation and a clearly identifiable balance.

1	No evaluation
2	Positive
3	Negative
-99	Unclear

Example1: *'In the Saxon CDU base, resistance is forming in many places. Blame is on the Chancellor and her refugee policy, many criticize within the Saxon Union. Accordingly, for example, the resignation of Merkel from the party presidency is quite openly demanded in Freiberg.'*

Here, the actor Angela Merkel is evaluated negatively due to her position in refugee policy. → code 2: Negative, for both 8.4. and 9.4.

Example2: *'When CSU chairman Alexander Dobrindt arrives around noon, the activists of the environmental organization Greenpeace are already waiting behind the barriers. "Stop animal factories," they shout to Dobrindt, who will speak for the first time this Wednesday about the government's agricultural policy.'*

Here, the position of the actor Alexander Dobrindt, but not Dobrindt himself, is evaluated negatively by the actor Greenpeace → code 2: Negative

Example 3: *social researcher Prof. Dr. med. Bernd Schmakowski from Bottrop University lectured about the Evangelical Centre as an attack on the city. He pledged an understanding of the position of the city of Bottrop, which is under enormous pressure from the State Ministry.*

Here, the position of the actor 'city of Bottrop' (but not the city of Bottrop itself) is evaluated positively by the actor Prof. Dr. med. Bernd Schmakowski although he does not personally represent the position (at least in the cited passage) → code 1: Positive

9.6. POSITION REFERENCES: RECOGNITION POSITION [POSREF_RECOGNITION_POSITION]

Code whether the reference contains explicit communicative acts (including the description of gestures) that serve to **express recognition** and/or **respect** towards other positions and/or to **legitimize** them as contributions to the debate. Code the dominant overall expression of the reference to the respective position.

Note 1: respect, recognition or legitimation do not necessarily mean acceptance or approval!

Note 2: the explicit recognition of positions <u>always </u>goes along with a positive evaluation of the position (see coding step 9.5.); conversely, not every positive evaluation of a position is an explicit recognition.

Note 3: coding recognition and outrage at the same time is not possible, as these categories exclude each other.

Note 4: code <u>conservatively</u>, i.e. code positively ('1 Yes, explicit recognition given') only if you are sure that this is the case.

> 1   No, no explicit recognition given
>
> 2   Yes, explicit recognition given → copy expression of recognition to text box

Example 1*: an article in the* Süddeutsche Zeitung *contains the following statement: 'Even if the demand for an upper limit may be considered outrageous, it is a legitimate point of view that a democratic society must tolerate.'*
In this passage, the position of claiming an upper limit is explicitly respected → code 1

9.7. POSITION REFERENCES: RECOGNITION POSITION OTHER [POSREF_RECOGNITION_TEXT]

If you have coded the previous variable with 'Yes, explicit recognition given', then transfer the utterance to the provided text box by marking the text in Angrist and clicking on 'Get selection'. If you code an article in PDF format, enter the text manually.

Example 1*: an article in the* Süddeutsche Zeitung *contains the following statement: 'Even if the demand for an upper limit may be considered outrageous, it is a legitimate point of view that a democratic society must tolerate.'*
→ This statement is copied to the text box provided

9.8. POSITION REFERENCES: OUTRAGE POSITION (adapted from (Berry & Sobieraj, 2014)[1]) [POSREF_OUTRAGE_POSITION]

Code whether the reference contains explicit communicative acts (including the description of gestures) that are recognizable to a generally educated reader as an attempt to provoke an **emotional response** from the audience, usually in the form of anger, fear, or moral righteousness. Outrage is often, but not always, accomplished through the use of categorical statements, exaggerations, and partial truths about opponents which may take the form of individuals, organizations, or entire communities of interest (e.g., progressives or conservatives) or circumstance (e.g., immigrants). Outrage sidesteps the messy nuances of complex political issues in favor of ad hominem attacks, overgeneralizations, mockery, and dire forecasts of impending doom.

---

[1] Berry, J. M., & Sobieraj, S. (2014). *The outrage industry: Political opinion media and the new incivility*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Outrage is given if the currently coded reference to a position makes use of <u>at least one of the following rhetorical means</u>:

(1) insulting language,
(2) name calling,
(3) emotional display,
(4) emotional language,
(5) verbal fighting/sparring,
(6) character assassination,
(7) misrepresentative exaggeration,
(8) mockery,
(9) conflagration,
(10) ideologically extremizing language,
(11) 'slippery slope' arguments,
(12) belittling,
(13) obscene language.

A brief description of each of these forms of outrage can be found in Appendix 3. For coding, refer exclusively to the descriptions available there.

Note 1: explicit outrage towards a position <u>mostly but not always</u> goes along with outrage towards the actor who represents the position. Only code '1 Yes, explicit outrage given', if outrage is explicitly aimed at the position!

Note 2: coding recognition and outrage at the same time is not possible, as these categories exclude each other.

Note 3: code <u>conservatively</u>, i.e. code positively ('1 Yes, explicit outrage given' only if you are sure that this is the case.

0   No, no explicit outrage given

1   Yes, explicit outrage given → copy expression of outrage in text box

Example: *an opinion article contains the following position: 'The demand for a ban on niqab has triggered a hysterical, opportunistic pseudo-debate about a non-existent problem.'*

This passage contains intense emotional language (4) (the position of politicians is termed 'hysterical') and a misleading exaggeration (7) (the resulting debate is termed a 'pseudo-debate') → code 1

9.9. POSITION REFERENCES: OUTRAGE POSITION OTHER [POSREF_OUTRAGE_TEXT]

If you have coded the previous variable with 'Yes, explicit outrage given', then transfer the utterance to the provided text box by marking the text in Angrist and clicking on 'Get selection'. If you code an article in PDF format, enter the text manually.

Example*: an opinion article contains the following position: 'The demand for a ban on niqab has triggered a hysterical, opportunistic pseudo-debate about a non-existent problem.'*

→ *Copy the statement to the text box*

Appendix 3: forms of outrage (adapted from Berry & Sobieraj, 2014) (coding steps 8.8 & 9.8)

1. *Insulting language*

   This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker uses insulting words in reference to a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party, or other organization or their behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views. This variable should specifically capture insulting words (stupid, pompous, idiot), not all insults more generally speaking. For example, describing someone as "a child" is insulting, but does not use insulting words so should not be counted as insulting language. For example, "asinine" in reference to a person or group's behavior is "insulting language," but if the person or group is called "asinine," reserve this for the "name calling" variable.
   Examples:
   - "He needs to shut up."
   - "The whole idea was asinine."
   - "The policy was stupid, plain and simple."

2. *Name calling*

   This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker engages in name calling in reference to a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization. Affectionate, light-hearted teasing should be weeded out. Instead, look for name-calling that is used to make the subject look foolish/inept, hypocritical, deceitful, or dangerous.
   Examples:
   - "He's asinine."
   - "You are a lunatic."

3. *Emotional display*

   This variable is unlikely to appear in printed text (e.g., blog posts, webpages), but would most likely be communicated through "shouting" via the deliberate use of all caps, multiple exclamation points, enlarged text, etc. Emotional display is about the FORM of expression, see Emotional language for emotional content, although the two will often present concurrently and each should be noted.
   Example:
   - Use of all capital letters in a written document (for dramatic emphasis)

4. *Emotional language*

   This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker engages in verbal or written expressions of emotion in reference to a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization. Emotion words related to anger, fear, and sadness are the key indicators. Emotional language is about the literal content of what is said/written, rather than how it is communicated. Emotional display, on the other hand, is about the way something is said/written of expression.
   Examples:

- "I'm furious!"
- "I'm infuriated!"
- "This is an outrage!"
- "This makes me sick!"

5. *Verbal fighting/sparring*
This variable is intended to capture aggressive jousting between speakers. In interviews it may take the form of dismissive interruptions or rude exchanges between the interviewer and the interviewed characterized by a lack of civility.
Examples:
- Dismissive interruptions
- Talking over someone in an aggressive manner
- Saying things like "give me a break" or "come on" while someone else is speaking

6. *Character assassination*
These are ad hominem attacks. This variable is intended to measure whether the author attempts to damage the reputation of a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party, or other organization by attacking their character. In politics, questioning the veracity of a statement is common, and should not be confused with character assassination, which is more extreme. Saying someone was not honest in a reply to a journalist is not character assassination, but saying that someone is a liar who cannot be trusted is character assassination.
Examples:
- "He is corrupt."
- "McCain is a pure lying bastard! If he had a red tie on, he'd look you straight in the eye and insist it was blue."

7. *Misrepresentative exaggeration*
This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker engages in very dramatic negative exaggeration in reference to the behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views of a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party, or other organization, such that it significantly misrepresents or obscures the truth.
Examples:
- "Obama is 'Left of Lenin'."
- "Democrats have designs on planting the seeds of socialism in the US."
- "Obama backs a freedom of choice act to abolish every restriction on abortion in every state."

8. *Mockery*
This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker makes fun of the behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views of a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization to make the subject look bad or to rally others in criticism of the subject. Affectionate, light-hearted teasing should be weeded out. Instead, look for humor that is

used to make the subject look foolish/inept, hypocritical, deceitful, or dangerous. It might also come in the form of a physical impersonation intended to make others laugh at the expense of the subject.

Examples:
- "Funny idea: that a politician is declared crazy when he talks about the state of the schools, the New Year's Eve in Cologne, or the traffic jam. The traffic jam, the great, misunderstood niche topic of our time that nobody else dares to talk about. Except Christian Lindner. Which is why he is tired. Very attractively tired."
- "When Charlie Gibson asked about her foreign policy credentials, Sarah Palin said-- with a straight face--she lives near Russia. Yesterday, the McCain campaign said-- with a straight face--that by sitting next to foreigners for a few minutes while paparazzi took pictures, Palin was "boosting her foreign policy credentials" and giving herself "experience with foreign leaders…I think this new proximity approach to building a resume is brilliant! We should all do it; it saves so much time and effort. Why go to school and struggle with learning stuff and then have to spend years working your way up a career when you can simply plop yourself down next to something and get the same results? I could become a pediatric surgeon by having a latte in the Children's Hospital coffee shop. I could watch the Space Shuttle take off from that viewing spot across the water and become an astronaut." (ridiculous/inept person)
- "If the subject matter weren't so serious and dire, this would be a comedy. This is a bunch of Senator Blowhards and Foghorns all giving their opening statements. We're looking at a Bunch of Colonel Sanders telling the chickens that they shouldn't have come into the coop. I mean these are the guys that screwed this up in many cases." (ridiculous/hypocritical group)
- "Our illustrious leader reads from his teleprompter to tell us how our economy reached this point. It has nothing to do with policy over the last 7 years. It is because of "investors from abroad." He's so sweet. Just read or listen and make your own assumptions about these "justifications." Isn't our leader so sweet? I just want to pinch him on the cheeks and ask, "you do have Scotch nearby?" (note: also belittling)

9. *Conflagration*
This variable is intended to capture attempts made to escalate non-scandals into scandals. In this variable, record speech that overstates or dramatizes the importance or implications of minor gaffes, oversights, or improprieties. By non-scandal we refer to an episode, event, or trend that a learned, dispassionate observer would not consider significant or scandalous.

Examples:
- The relationship between Ayers and Obama, which was discussed during the 2008 election campaign. Ayers is a pedagogue and the founder of a left-wing radical organization. Later, it came out that they had no close relationship with each other, but knew each other only fleetingly because they lived in the same neighbourhood.
- In 2015, Syrian refugee Anas Modamani took a selfie with German Chancellor Angela Merkel. Shortly thereafter, several photomontages are published showing Modamani as a terrorist. In the attacks in Brussels or in Berlin, these images were

published on social networks again and again, although the man cannot be associated with any of these attacks.

10. *Ideologically extremizing language*

This variable is intended to capture extremist language used to critically describe a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization or their behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views. Usually the descriptive language will be used as an implicit slur rather than as a simple description.

Examples:
- Left-wing
- Right-wing
- Far right
- Far left
- Radical
- Extreme
- Reactionary

11. *,Slippery slope' arguments*

This variable is intended to capture fatalistic arguments, which suggest that some behavior, policy, or decision is a small step that will inevitably pave the way for much more extreme behaviors, policies, or decisions. Slippery slope arguments make dire forecasts about the future. When in doubt, do not use this code. True slippery slope arguments should be easy to identify.

Example:
- "…the far Left couldn't care less about gay "marriage." They want to see the abolition of marriage as an institution and radical social change to redefine the human experience itself. This is precisely what we see in Scandinavian countries where this nonsense has played out to its logical extension: The rates of cohabitation are skyrocketing, and the institution of marriage is rapidly dying off. Girls and boys grow up in a culture and see no picture of marriage to emulate or aspire to. There is really no end to the aberrant forms of human sexuality that will come to the courthouse also demanding "marriage." And when marriage can mean anything, marriage means nothing."

12. *Belittling*

This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker demeans a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization (or their behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views). Belittling generally attempts to deflate or undercut a person's status. For example, the speaker/author may suggest that an adult is childlike/immature, suggest someone fairly accomplished is of low class status, or imply that a man is in some way feminine. This may be done in the context of mockery or exaggeration.

Example:

- Dave Letterman's joke, "So John McCain calls up and says I'm not going to be there kids, because everything is going to hell, but the funny thing is that no one told his vice presidential candidate, Sarah Palin, and honest to God, right now she's still circling the theater in a white minivan. She's gonna pick him up later..."

13. *Obscene language*

This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker uses obscene language in reference to a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization (or their behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views). For the purposes of this study, obscenities include:

- **F-word derivatives**: Words based on, or incorporating, the F-word. Examples include fucker and motherfucker.
- **Scatological terms**: Words that have to do with feces, urine and defecation. Examples include "shit," "bullshit," "shithead," and piss.
- **Anatomical terms**: Words referring to parts of the human anatomy, mostly the private parts, and are considered crude. Examples include "ass," "asshole," "dick," "dickhead," and "tits."
- **Mild obscenities**: Words used in everyday language, but that may be offensive to some. Examples include "damn," "hell," as well as milder forms of anatomical terms like "boobs."
- **Derogatory terms**: Words or expressions that are used to denigrate and insult one's racial or ethnic background, gender or sexual orientation: Examples include the N-word, whore/ho/slut, various anti-Semitic terms, and anti-homosexual terms like faggot.