

Important

Please annotate for **explicit indicators**. Try to avoid making inferences. For example, if an article is about an internal conflict among Republicans do not infer that Democrats would be winner *unless it is explicitly mentioned in the article*.

Please annotate the articles in line with the **writer's intention**. For example,

- Article 75 (*"Gender-based justice, Reparations, Universal income, Medicare for All..."*) is critiquing AOC's New Deal, **not** presenting it as a viable solution
- Article 77 (*"Beware the Bern...Bernie Sanders Wants to Tax Your Meat"*) is critiquing Bernie Sanders' opinions on climate change mitigation, **not** presenting strategies for climate change mitigation

ID	Question	Annotation rules	Examples
AR1	1. Does this article predominantly (>70%) discuss a problem/issue related to climate change?	--	
AR2	2. Does the story suggest a solution(s) to the issue/problem?	Mark 'yes' if (a) solution(s), or a strategy to mitigate the problem, is explicitly mentioned. A "solution" can also be a "strategy to mitigate the problem" (i.e., doesn't need to be perfect)	
AR3	3. Is this problem/issue resolved in the story?	Mark 'yes' if the story explicitly mentions that the problem has been resolved.	
AR4	4. Is there any hope in the story for future resolution of the problem/issue?	Mark 'no' if the story is about a failed attempt to tackle the issue under discussion.	
AR5	5. Does the story suggest that the issue/problem requires urgent action?	Mark 'yes' if an article explicitly mentions that a problem is either very important, becoming more acute and/or needs immediate attention.	

		Mark 'no' if a story mentions climate change as an ongoing problem or a problem that needs to be solved at some (unspecified) time in the future, but not immediately.	
AR6	<p>6. Does the story suggest that some entity could alleviate the problem?</p> <p>If your answer is "yes", please select the most appropriate entity.</p>	<p>Mark 'yes' if at least one entity in the story is described as actively alleviating, or planning to alleviate, the problem.</p> <p>If multiple options: select the one that's most central/prevalent in the article (in terms of #mentions / mentions in the central parts like title and opening.)</p>	
AR7	<p>7. Does the story suggest that some entity is responsible for the issue/problem?</p> <p>If your answer is "yes", please select the most responsible entity.</p>	<p>Mark 'yes' if at least one entity in the story is described as actively causing, or having caused, the problem.</p> <p>If multiple options: select the one that's most central/prevalent in the article (in terms of the number of mentions / mentions in the central parts like title and lead paragraphs).</p>	
HI1	<p>1. Does the story provide a human example or a "human face" on the problem/issue?</p>	<p>Select 'yes' if the story uses "dramatization" (i.e., explicitly refers to how the issue impacts the personal life of living entities, including animals) <u>to draw reader's attention to/'make' the reader care about the problem/issue.</u></p>	<p>Ex1: "[The protestors] don't earn enough to be part of the elite unconcerned with fuel taxes, but they work hard enough that they don't qualify for the generous welfare benefits handed out to the nation's poor and to newly arrived immigrants from Africa and the Middle East." -></p>

		Note that this is not about putting a 'human face' on responsibility (which is covered separately by the AR question set)	<p>annotate as "yes": higher taxes would severely impact these people's lives and the article triggers compassion with the protestors.</p> <p><i>Ex2: "This is why deniers exist. They don't want to spend their own money to solve a problem that might affect their grandkids and not themselves. It's pure, unadulterated selfishness." --> annotate as "no": the story mentions people but the focus of the story is on the deniers who are selfish, not their grandkids who might be affected.</i></p>
HI2	2. Does the story employ adjectives or personal vignettes that generate feelings of outrage, empathy-caring, sympathy, or compassion?	Mark 'yes' if the story uses emotional language <u>to describe entities affected by the issue.</u>	
HI3	<p>3. Does the story emphasize how one or more entities are NEGATIVELY affected by issue/problem?</p> <p>If your answer is "yes", please select the most negatively affected entity.</p>	<p>Select 'yes' if the story explicitly refers to how one or more entity/ies suffer from the problem/issue.</p> <p><u>Note that in some stories the same entity/ies can be affected both positively and negatively by the issue/problem.</u></p>	
HI4	<p>4. Does the story emphasize how one or more entities are POSITIVELY affected by the issue/problem?</p> <p>If your answer is "yes", please select the most positively affected entity.</p>	<p>Select 'yes' if the story explicitly refers to how one or more entity/ies benefit from the problem/issue.</p> <p><u>Note that in some stories the same entity/ies can be affected both positively and negatively by the issue/problem.</u></p>	<p><i>Ex1: An article about how the Trump government excluded climate scientists from an EPA panel discussion. -> It might be tempting to select "Trump govt" as beneficiary, but unless there is an explicit mention of these benefits, it should be annotated as "no". Very often there will</i></p>

			<p>be implicit beneficiaries, but you shouldn't base your annotations on your own inferences that are not explicit in the article.</p> <p>We expect that most articles will not explicitly discuss beneficiaries of a problem.</p>
HI5	5. Does the story go into the private or personal lives of the entities involved?	<p>Mark 'yes' if the story explicitly refers to the personal life of at least one entity. <u>For a "yes" answer, there should be reference to the personal impact of one or more concrete, individual entities. If impact is discussed in more general terms (e.g., on groups of people) this would be covered by HI1 (human face).</u></p>	
CO1	1. Does the story reflect disagreement between political parties/individuals/groups/countries?	<p>Select 'yes' if the story describes a difference in opinion, disagreement or a conflict between two or more entities..</p>	<p>Ex1: <i>"Those who see climate change as a dire and urgent threat have some work to do to convince voters in the Western democracies to give up their way of life in exchange for unspecified benefits of a slightly less warm world"</i> -> annotate as "yes" because there's a fundamental disagreement between voters and climate activists</p> <p>Ex2: <i>An article describing the impact of climate change on our environment (and perhaps society), e.g., by quantifying the melting of sea ice and downstream effects.</i> -> annotate as "no" because</p>

			there's no conflict here, just a description of events.
CO2	2. Does one party/individual/group/country reproach another?	Select 'yes' if the story explicitly refers to entities blaming, condemning or disapproving of each other's opinions or actions.	<p>Ex1: <i>Much like the new bipartisan bill, Curbelo's was doomed to fail from the beginning — and he endured attack ads from the right for even introducing it. -> annotate as “yes” because of an explicit mention of attacks.</i></p> <p>Ex2: Same as Ex 2 for CO1</p>
CO3	3. Does the story refer to two sides or more than two sides of the problem or issue?	Select 'yes' if the story explicitly mentions at least two viewpoints on the current issue (even if they're not presented in a balanced, objective manner or no specific entities are mentioned).	<p>Ex1: <i>“While the report seeks to link wildfire to climate change, it glosses over the real reason fires have grown in intensity and size: the 30 years of increased environmental restrictions on logging” -> annotate as “yes” because the article presents arguments and counter arguments.</i></p> <p>Ex2: <i>“Two Republican House members have signed their name onto bipartisan carbon tax legislation, a bill that stands virtually zero chance of passing during the lame duck session.” The article then goes on describing the bill and how other Republicans have lost their seats supporting similar bills. -> annotate as “no” because the article only describes progressive Republicans but not (explicitly) the position/arguments of</i></p>

			conservative Republicans who oppose such legislation.
CO4	<p>4. Does the story refer to winners and losers?</p> <p>If your answer is "yes", please select the most appropriate winner/loser entity.</p>	<p>Select 'yes' if the story explicitly refers to one or more 'winners' and/or 'losers' which emerged from an active conflict/argument/war.</p> <p><u>Note that in some stories an entity can be both a winner and a loser.</u></p>	<p>Ex1: <i>An article attacking "radical environmentalists" who criticize modern burials as disastrous for the environment.</i> -> annotate as "no" because the argument is not framed in terms of winning or losing parties.</p> <p>Ex 2: <i>"The violent protests in France were fueled by intense frustration felt by a middle class that sees itself squeezed. They don't earn enough to be part of the elite unconcerned with fuel taxes."</i> -> annotate as "yes" with loser=middle class, but do not annotate any winner entity.</p>
MO1	1. Does the story contain any moral message?	Select 'yes' if the story explicitly applies standards or judgments of right or wrong to entities, actions or events.	
MO2	2. Does the story make reference to morality, God, and other religious tenets?	Select 'yes' if the story explicitly refers to religious tenets or moral obligations framed through the lens of obligations to a spiritual community. Select 'yes' also if the mention is indirect e.g., through a quote or a metaphor.	
MO3	3. Does the story offer specific social prescriptions about how to behave?	Select 'yes' if the story explicitly mentions expectations around norms of conduct, limitations or prohibitions on actions or events.	
EC1	1. Is there a mention of financial losses or gains now or in the future?	Select 'yes' if the story explicitly refers to the financial impacts of the issue.	Ex 1: <i>"this plan would not only need to be financed by taxpayers, but also the</i>

			<p><i>Federal Reserve and other institutions the government can create" --> annotate as "yes"</i></p> <p>Ex 2: <i>"I'm sure farmers will be very excited for your " help " which will be tantamount to them giving up their land , their livestock and their livelihood" --> annotate as "no"" as the financial impacts are not mentioned explicitly.</i></p>
EC2	2. Is there a mention of the costs/degree of the expense involved?	Select 'yes' if the story explicitly refers to the amount of loss or gain	<i>"\$100,000", or "enormous cost" should be annotated as "yes"</i>
EC3	3. Is there a reference to the economic consequences of pursuing or not pursuing a course of action?	Select 'yes' if the story explicitly mentions the impacts of action or inaction on the economy.	<p>Ex1: <i>"The research Trump officials are trying to keep hidden could help farmers deal with the impact of climate change" --> annotate as "no" because there is no explicit mention of economic consequences.</i></p>