Annotation Guide B: Moral Framing in Ingroup/Outgroup Abortion Discourse

Table of Contents

Introduction

This guide outlines the protocol for classifying tweets related to abortion discourse into a five-category framework that captures both the primary stance (pro-life or pro-choice) and whether the tweet references or critiques opposing viewpoints. The goal is to enable analysis of how moral language differs when individuals discuss their own position versus characterizing opposing viewpoints.

Categories for Annotation

Each tweet should be classified into exactly one of the following five categories:

1. Only Pro-life

Tweets that express a pro-life stance without reference to pro-choice positions, arguments, or individuals.

Examples:

- "Every unborn child has a right to life. #prolife"

- "We have to make abortion unthinkable, because it is."

- "Life begins at conception. This is a scientific fact."

2. Pro-life Talking About Pro-choice

Tweets that express a pro-life stance while also referencing, critiquing, or characterizing pro-choice positions, arguments, or individuals.

> **Examples:**
>
> - "We all just want people like you to stop using a very low statistic like child rape as the #1 argument when defending nationwide abortion."
>
> - "Pro-choice advocates claim to support women, but they ignore the trauma abortion causes."
>
> - "How can anyone who values human rights support the killing of babies? #prochoiceisawful"

3. Pro-choice Talking About Pro-life

Tweets that express a pro-choice stance while also referencing, critiquing, or characterizing pro-life positions, arguments, or individuals.

> **Examples:**
>
> - "Whether it is reproductive rights, the economy, or health care Democrats are focused on issues that people care about. Republicans only care about power."
>
> - "Anti-choice extremists don't care about children after they're born."
>
> - "Prolifers want to control women's bodies while claiming moral superiority."

4. Only Pro-choice

Tweets that express a pro-choice stance without reference to pro-life positions, arguments, or individuals.

> **Examples:**
>
> - "Where is freedom of choice? My body, my choice?"

- "Abortion is healthcare. End of discussion."

- "Reproductive rights are human rights. #prochoice"

5. Neither

Tweets that do not clearly fit into any of the four categories above, including tweets that:

- Are neutral or ambiguous about abortion

- Discuss abortion-related topics without taking a clear stance

- Contain insufficient information to determine the stance

- Are unrelated to abortion

Examples:

- "The debate on abortion continues to divide the country."

- "New poll on abortion views released today."

- "HPV vaccines becoming a key part of sexual education on campuses."

Annotation Process

1. Read the entire tweet carefully.

2. Identify the primary stance on abortion (pro-life, pro-choice, or neither).

3. Determine whether the tweet references or critiques opposing viewpoints.

4. Based on steps 2 and 3, assign the tweet to one of the five categories.

5. If uncertain between multiple categories, consider:

- The predominant message of the tweet

- Whether critique of the opposing view is present

Important Considerations

- **Focus on references to opposing views**: Pay careful attention to whether the tweet discusses or characterizes the opposing stance, as this is key to distinguishing between "Only" categories and "Talking About" categories.

- **Implicit references**: Sometimes references to opposing views may be implicit rather than explicit. Look for indicators such as "they," "those people," or other language that suggests reference to an opposing group.

- **Mixed messages**: Some tweets may contain elements of multiple categories. Assign based on the predominant message.

- **Contextual understanding**: Consider the full context, including hashtags and cultural references that may clarify the stance.

- **Rhetorical questions**: Questions posed about opposing viewpoints typically fall into the "Talking About" categories.

Quality Control

- If you're uncertain about a classification, flag it for review.

- Consistency in applying the categories is essential for reliable analysis.

- When in doubt between "Only" and "Talking About" categories, look specifically for any mention, characterization, or critique of the opposing viewpoint.

Final Notes

This annotation scheme is designed to facilitate analysis of moral framing across ideological boundaries in abortion discourse. By distinguishing between how individuals frame their own positions and how they characterize opposing viewpoints, we can identify patterns of moral language use that may contribute to polarization and misunderstanding between groups.