ıılPolDem

PolDem – Globalization Issue

Debate Dataset

- Version 1 -

poldem-debate_glob

Please cite as:

Kriesi, Hanspeter, Grande, Edgar, Dolezal, Martin, Helbing, Marc, Höglinger, Dominic, Hutter, Swen, and Wüest, Bruno. 2020. *PolDem-Globalization Issue Debate Dataset*, Version 1.

Short version for in-text citations & references: Kriesi, Hanspeter et al. 2020. *PolDem-Globalization Issue Debate Dataset*, Version 1.

www.poldem.eu

Introduction

The codebook lists the variables in the PolDem Globalization Issue Debate dataset and explains our strategy of data collection (also in case, you want to update the dataset yourself). This media-based dataset on debates over European integration, immigration, and economic liberalization has been collected in the framework of the project "National Political Change in a Globalizing World", financed by the German Research Council DFG and the Swiss National Science Foundation SNF. The user of the dataset should check out the book *Political Conflict in Western Europe* by Kriesi et al. (https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139169219). It shows what can be done with the dataset.

The countries covered are Austria, Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands.

The debates cover the years 2004 to 2006 – for the immigration debate, we also coded content from the years 1999-2001.

Variables in the Dataset

Variable name	Values
core_ID	43,060 unique values [1,53686]
cs_art_n	79 unique values [1,79]
cs_art_N	38 unique values [1,79]
debate	1 Europ. Integration 2 Immigration 3 Eco. Liberalization
debate_str	3 unique strings ["ECO", "EU", "I"]
country	1 A 2 UK 3 FR 4 DE 5 NL 6 CH
country_str	6 unique strings ["A", "CH", "DE", "FR", "NL", "UK"]
paper	4 unique strings ["", "LeMonde", "NRCHandelsblad", "NZZ", "The Times"]
dat_art	1,396 unique values [14251,17165]
year	6 unique values [1999; 2000; 2001; 2004; 2005; 2006]
artID_short	6,150 unique values [1,41763]
titel	2,134 unique strings
section	114 unique values [4001,6091]
senID	16,685 unique strings
senTEXT	16,639 unique strings
strx	2 actor-actor 3 actor-issue

sact1	3,155 unique values [1,3325]
sact1_ext	3,978 unique values [1,4227]
sact2	4,103 unique values [1,4330]
sact2_V3	3,456 unique values [2,3518]
sact2_V3_named_speaker	2 unique values [0, 1]
praedikat	14,050 unique strings
all_issue (integrated aggregate issue; for more specific issues, see below)	1 social market Europe 2 neoliberal Europe 3 enlargement 4 deepening 5 immigration 6 integration 7 anti-xenophobia 8 intl. lib. 9 dom. lib.*
all_issue_2	1 Europe_eco 2 Europe_cult 3 immigration 4 integration_xeno 5 intl_lib 6 dom_ lib
all_issue_3	1 Europe_eco 2 Europe_cult 3 immigration 4 eco_lib
qual_all_issue (direction for the above issue categories)	5 unique values [-1; -.5; 0; .5; 1]
all_issue_mds	1 SM_EUROPE 2 NL_EUROPE 3 NO_ENLARGE 4 DEEPENING 5 ANTI_IMMIG 6 INTEGRATION 7 ANTI_XENO 8 INTL_LIB 9 DOM_LIB*
qual_all_issue_mds	5 unique values [-1; -.5; 0; .5; 1]
oact2_V3_named_speaker	2 unique values [0; 1]
quote1	324 unique values [1,3544]
quote1_ext	414 unique values [2,4499]
quote2	518 unique values [10,4403]
quote2_V3	489 unique values [12,3698]
quote2_V3_named_speaker	2 unique values [0; 1]
contextevent (German translation)	1001 parliament:session (*parlament:sitzung*) 1002 parliament:decision (*parlament:beschluss*) 1003 parliament:advance (*parlament:vorstoss*) 1004 government:meeting (*regierung:sitzung*) 1005 government:decision (*regierung:beschluss*) 1006 government:meeting (international, eu council, summits) (*regierung:treffen (international, auch eu-rats- und gipfeltreffen)*) 1007 judicial:legal procedure (*judikative:juristisches vorgehen*) 2001 party (meeting, not protest meeting) (*partei (treffen, keine protestversammlung)*)

	2002 interest groups (private/special interests such as trade unions, workers' organisations etc.) (*interessengruppen (private/special interests wie gewerkschaften, arbeitnehmerorg. etc.)*) 2003 social movements/public interest groups/ngos (meetings, not protest meetings) (*soziale bewegungen/public interest groups/ngos (treffen, keine protestversammlungen)*) 2004 company (meeting/GM/resolution) (*unternehmen (versammlung/gv/beschluss)*) 2005 science (addressed to scientific community) (*wissenschaft (an wissenschaftsgemeinschaft gerichtet)*) 2006 tripartite negotiations (eco only) (*tripartite Verhandlungen (eco only)*) 3001 media:opinion (call/press conference/media release) (*medial:stellungnahme (aufruf/pressekonferenz/medienmitteilung)*) 3002 media:popular science (studies/surveys for the masses) (*medial:populärwissenschaft (studien/umfragen für die masse)*) 3003 consultative:election campaign/results (*konsultativ:wahlkampf/resultate*) 3004 consular:initiative/referenda (*konsulativ:initiative/referenden*) 3005 protest:assimilative-demonstrative (*protest:assimilativ-demonstrativ*) 3006 protest:confrontational-legal (*protest:konfrontativ-legal*) 3007 protest:confrontational-illegal, non-violent (*protest:konfrontativ-illegal, gewaltlos*) 3008 protest:confrontational-illegal, violent (*protest:konfrontativ-illegal, gewalttätig*) 4001 natural disasters (*Naturkatastrophen*) 4002 key dates (of decisions/implementation of law/accession) (*stichdaten (von entscheiden/einführung gesetz/beitritt)*) 4003 criminal act: violence/attack if not protest) (*krimineller akt: gewalttat/anschlag wenn nicht protest)*) 4004 individual fate (unemployment/deportation etc.) (*einzelschicksal (arbeitslosigkeit/ausweisung etc.)*) 4005 criminal act by foreigners (*krimineller akt durch ausländer*) 4006 criminal act against foreigners (*krimineller akt gegen ausländer*) 4007 terrorist attack (*terroristischer anschlag*) 4008 individual fate caused by government action (*einzelschicksal durch staatliches handeln verursacht*) 4009 individual fate caused by migrants (*einzelschicksal durch migranten verursacht*) 5001 other (*andere*)
contextevent_5V3	1 EU/intl. state arena 2 dom. state arena 3 judicial arena 4 parliament.&parties arena 5 direct democratic arena 6 protest arena 7 corporatist arena 8 economy 9 society .a not assignable .b none/unknown
contextevent_5V3b	1 state arenas 2 intermediary arenas 3 arenas exogenous to politics
contextevent_str	2,455 unique strings
action	same as contextevent
action_5V3	same as contextevent_5V3
action_5V3b	same as contextevent_5V3b

arena	same as contextevent_5V3
arena_agg	same as contextevent_5V3b
sact_party	1 radical-left 2 greens 3 social-democrats 4 liberals 5 cd-conservatives 6 populist/radical right 7 other-parties 8 EU-protest
sact_party_bk1	1 com 2 gr 3 soc 4 lib 5 con 6 rr
sact_party_affiliated	0 party actor 1 party affiliated actor (mostly executive)
sact_org_cl	2,176 unique values [1,2500]
sact_org_fine	1 UN/other IGOs 2 IFIs/other econ. IGOs 3 Europ. Commission 4 Europ. Council 5 Council of the EU Ministers 6 EU other 7 executive 8 executive subnat. 9 state administration 10 central-bank 11 judiciary 12 parties/legislative 13 parties/legisl. subnat. 14 trade unions 15 empl. & prod. associations 16 companies 17 solidar., h-rights and welfare groups 18 shrw: anti-racist/discrimination groups 19 shrw: pro-migrant groups 20 ethnic minority groups 21 islamic ethnic min. groups 22 extr. left groups and global justice movement 23 pro-european groups 24 extr. right, nationalistic, neo-conservative groups 25 eurosceptic organizations 26 relig. associations & churches 27 islamic relig. associations 28 envir. & animal rights organizations 29 islamic extremist & terrorist groups 30 other public interest groups 31 experts-science 32 former politicians 33 media 34 culture 35 other individuals 36 other indiv: ethnic minority
sact_org_fine3	1 UN/other IGOs 2 IFIs/other econ IGOs 3 Europ Commission 4 Europ Council of the_EU

	5 domestic state
	6 parties/legislat (no party affil)
	7 trade unions
	8 empl&prod assocs
	9 companies
	10 solidar,h-right,welfr,minor groups
	11 global justice&rad left groups
	12 pro-europ groups
	13 extr right groups
	14 eurosceptic groups
	15 relig assocs
	16 other pubint (incl env,fundamentlst)
	17 experts-science
	18 other indiv
	31 radical-left
	32 greens
	33 social-democrats
	34 liberals
	35 cd-conservatives
	36 populist-radical right
	37 other-parties
	38 EU-protest
sact_org_fine4	1 UN/IFIs/oth IGOs
	2 Europ Commission
	3 Europ Council of the EU
	4 domestic state
	5 central bank*
	6 judiciary*
	7 parties/legislat (no party affil)
	8 trade unions
	9 empl&prod assocs
	10 companies
	11 new social mov/global justice groups
	12 pro-europ groups
	13 extr right groups
	14 eurosceptic groups
	15 relig assocs
	16 experts-science
	17 other indiv
	31 radical-left
	32 greens
	33 social-democrats
	34 liberals
	35 cd-conservatives
	36 populist-radical right
	37 other-parties
	38 EU-protest
sact_org_fine4b	1 UN/IFIs/oth IGOs
	2 Europ Commission
	3 Europ Council of the EU
	4 domestic state
	5 central bank*
	6 judiciary*
	7 parties/legislat (no party affil)
	11 new social mov/global justice groups
	12 pro-europ groups
	13 extr right groups
	14 eurosceptic groups
	15 relig assocs
	16 experts-science
	17 other indiv

	31 radical-left
	32 greens
	33 social-democrats
	34 liberals
	35 cd-conservatives
	36 populist-radical right
	37 other-parties
	38 EU-protest
	41 unions_losers
	42 unions_winners
	43 empl_losers
	44 empl_winners
	45 compan_losers
	46 compan_winners
	.a other pubint
	.b other eco-act
sact_org	1 IGOs
	2 European_Council_of_the_EU
	3 EU-other
	4 executives
	5 administrations
	6 central-banks
	7 judiciary
	8 parties_legislative
	9 unions
	10 employers
	11 companies
	12 public-int-SMOs
	13 culture
	14 former-politicans
	15 experts-science
	16 other indiviudals
	17 media
sact_org_bk1	1 EU_igo
	2 f_state
	3 d_state
	4 party
	5 union
	6 bus
	7 smo
	8 exp
	9 indiv
sact_org_bk1a	1 EU_igo
	2 f_state
	3 d_state
	4 party
	5 union
	6 bus
	7 smo
	8 exp
	.a other indiv
sact_org_bk1a_agg	1 state actors
	2 party
	3 other intermediary actors
	4 indiv. experts
sact_org_bk2	1 state acts
	2 intermediary acts
	3 individuals
sact_org_bk4	1 state
	2 parties
	3 other

sact_org_bk10	1 EU_igo 2 d_state 3 com 4 gr 5 soc 6 lib 7 con 8 rr 9 union 10 bus 11 smo 12 exp
sact_org_bk10b	1 EU_igo 2 d_state 3 com 4 gr 5 soc 6 lib 7 con 8 rr 9 union 10 empl 11 firms 12 smo 13 exp
sact_org_mds10	76 unique values [1,78]
sact_country_V2	1 A 2 UK 3 FR 4 DE 5 NL 6 CH 7 third_country 8 european 9 global/transnational
sact_country_V2a	1 A 2 UK 3 FR 4 DE 5 NL 6 CH 7 third_country 8 european/intl.
sact_country_V2_add1	2 unique values [0,1]
sact_country_V2_add2	0 1 EU-member countries (by 2006) 2 european countries (other) 3 non-european countries
sact_eco_sectA	1 mixed 2 private sector 3 public sector 4 unknown
sact_eco_sectB	1 agriculture 2 industry 3 services 4 ind.&services 5 unknown
sact_eco_sectB_fine1	1 agriculture 2 all industry & services 3 all industry

	4 mining
	5 food
	6 textile
	7 wood
	8 paper
	9 chemistry
	10 metal
	11 machinery
	12 transport_eq
	13 electricity
	14 construction
	15 othermanu
	16 all services
	17 retail_gastro
	18 transport & communication
	19 finance
	20 health
	21 education
	22 IT_other
	23 oth_service
	24 unknown
sact_eco_sectB_fine2	6 textile
	7 wood
	9 chemistry
	10 metal
	11 machinery
	12 transport_eq
	13 electricity
	14 construction
	15 othermanu
	17 retail_gastro
	18 transport & communication
	19 finance
	22 IT_other
	23 oth_service
sact_eco_sectB_fine3	5 food
	9 chemistry
	11 machinery
	13 electricity
	15 othermanu
	21 education
	23 oth_service
oact_party	1 radical-left
	2 greens
	3 social-democrats
	4 liberals
	5 cd-conservatives
	6 populist/radical right
	7 other-parties
oact_org_cl	992 unique values [3,2500]
oact_org_fine	1 UN/other IGOs
	2 IFIs/other econ. IGOs
	3 Europ. Commission
	4 Europ. Council
	5 Council of the EU Ministers
	6 EU other
	7 executive
	8 executive subnat.
	9 state administration
	10 central-bank

	11 judiciary
	12 parties/legislative
	13 parties/legisl. subnat.
	14 trade unions
	15 empl. & prod. associations
	16 companies
	17 solidar., h-rights and welfare groups
	18 shrw: anti-racist/discrimination groups
	19 shrw: pro-migrant groups
	20 ethnic minority groups
	21 islamic ethnic min. groups
	22 extr. left groups and global justice movement
	23 pro-european groups
	24 extr. right, nationalistic, neo-conservative groups
	25 eurosceptic organizations
	26 relig. associations & churches
	27 islamic relig. associations
	29 islamic extremist & terrorist groups
	30 other public interest groups
	31 experts-science
	32 former politicians
	33 media
	34 culture
	35 other individuals
	36 other indiv: ethnic minority
oact_org	1 IGOs
	2 European_Council_of_the_EU
	3 EU-other
	4 executives
	5 administrations
	6 central-banks
	7 judiciary
	8 parties_legislative
	9 unions
	10 employers
	11 companies
	12 public-int-SMOs
	13 culture
	14 former-politicans
	15 experts-science
	16 other indiviudals
	17 media
oact_country_V2	1 A
	2 UK
	3 FR
	4 DE
	5 NL
	6 CH
	7 third_country
	8 european
	9 global/transnational
oact_country_V2_add1	2 unique values [0,1]
oact_country_V2_add2	0
	1 EU-member countries (by 2006)
	2 european countries (other)
	3 non-european countries
oact_eco_sectA	1 mixed
	2 private sector
	3 public sector
	4 unknown

oact_eco_sectB	1 agriculture 2 industry 3 services 4 ind.&services 5 unknown
oact_eco_sectB_fine1	1 agriculture 2 all industry & services 3 all industry 5 food 6 textile 8 paper 9 chemistry 10 metal 11 machinery 12 transport_eq 13 electricity 14 construction 15 othermanu 16 all services 17 retail_gastro 18 transport & communication 19 finance 20 health 21 education 22 IT_other 23 oth_service 24 unknown
oact_eco_sectB_fine2	9 chemistry 11 machinery 12 transport_eq 13 electricity 14 construction 15 othermanu 22 IT_other
oact_eco_sectB_fine3	11 machinery 15 othermanu
quote_party	1 radical-left 2 greens 3 social-democrats 4 liberals 5 cd-conservatives 6 populist/radical right
quote_org_cl	265 unique values [10,2409]
quote_org_fine	1 UN/other IGOs 2 IFIs/other econ. IGOs 3 Europ. Commission 4 Europ. Council 6 EU other 7 executive 8 executive subnat. 9 state administration 10 central-bank 11 judiciary 12 parties/legislative 14 trade unions 15 empl. & prod. associations 16 companies 17 solidar., h-rights and welfare groups 18 shrw: anti-racist/discrimination groups 19 shrw: pro-migrant groups

	20 ethnic minority groups
	21 islamic ethnic min. groups
	22 extr. left groups and global justice movement
	26 relig. associations & churches
	27 islamic relig. associations
	30 other public interest groups
	31 experts-science
	32 former politicians
	33 media
	34 culture
	35 other individuals
	36 other indiv: ethnic minority
quote_org	1 IGOs
	2 European_Council_of_the_EU
	3 EU-other
	4 executives
	5 administrations
	6 central-banks
	7 judiciary
	8 parties_legislative
	9 unions
	10 employers
	11 companies
	12 public-int-SMOs
	13 culture
	14 former-politicans
	15 experts-science
	16 other indiviudals
	17 media
quote_country_V2	1 A
	2 UK
	3 FR
	4 DE
	5 NL
	6 CH
	7 third_country
	8 european
	9 global/transnational
quote_country_V2_add1	2 unique values [0,1]
quote_country_V2_add2	0
	1 EU-member countries (by 2006)
	2 european countries (other)
	3 non-european countries
quote_eco_sectA	1 mixed
	2 private sector
	3 public sector
	4 unknown
quote_eco_sectB	1 agriculture
	2 industry
	3 services
	4 ind.&services
	5 unknown
quote_eco_sectB_fine1	1 agriculture
	2 all industry & services
	3 all industry
	5 food
	6 textile
	8 paper
	9 chemistry
	10 metal

	11 machinery
	12 transport_eq
	13 electricity
	14 construction
	15 othermanu
	16 all services
	17 retail_gastro
	18 transport & communication
	19 finance
	20 health
	21 education
	22 IT_other
	23 oth_service
	24 unknown
quote_eco_sectB_fine2	12 transport_eq
	14 construction
	17 retail_gastro
	22 IT_other
quote_eco_sectB_fine3	15 othermanu
eu_issue_D1V2	1 social protection & sharing
	2 social market regulation
	3 fiscal regulation
	4 environm. regulation
	5 (macro-)econom. policy
	6 industrial policy
	7 macro-social redistribution (reg./struct. funds)
	8 CAP
	9 budgetary framework
	10 c. market/liberalization
	11 c. market f. services
	12 free mov. of persons
	13 monetary union
	14 no/restrictive enlargment (priv. partship, against accession)
	15 restrictive neighbourhood policy
	16 Christian heritage
	17 fortress Europe
	18 bilateral treaties CH-EU
	19 bilateralism (CH)
	20 EU integration i. g.
	21 more power EU-institutions
	22 constit. treaty
	23 reform treaty
	24 fundamental rights
	25 police and judiciary cooperation
	26 Schengen/Dublin (CH)
	27 c. foreign, security & defense policy
	28 infrastructure
	29 educ/R&D/culture
	30 participation (incl. calls for enlarg. refs.
	31 other/not assignable
	.a y_irrelevant
qual_eu_issue_D1V2	5 unique values [-1; -.5; 0; .5; 1]
eu_issue_D2V2	1 social protection & sharing
	2 fiscal, env. & other market regulation
	3 (macro-)econom. & industrial policy
	4 macro-social redistribution (reg./struct. funds)
	5 CAP
	6 budgetary framework
	7 c. market/liberalization
	8 free mov. of persons

	9 monetary union 10 no/restrictive enlargment (priv. partship, against accession) 11 Christian heritage 12 fortress Europe 13 bilateral treaties CH-EU 14 EU-integration i.g. 15 more power EU-institutions 16 constit. treaty 17 police and jud. cooperation 18 c. foreign, security & defense policy 19 educ/R&D/culture/infra 20 participation 21 other/not assignable .a y_irrelevant
eu_issue_D6V2	1 social market Europe (Europ. boundary building) 2 neoliberal Europe (nat. boundary lowering) 3 pro enlargement* (Europ. boundary extension vs. building) 4 pol-cult deepening (nat. boundary lowering) 5 CAP 6 budg. framework 7 other/not assignable .a y_irrelevant
eu_issue_D6V2b	1 social market Europe 2 neoliberal Europe 3 enlargement 4 pol-cult deepening 5 other .a
qual_eu_issue_D6V2	5 unique values [-1; -.5; 0; .5; 1]
qual_eu_issue_D6V2_bin	2 unique values [-1,1]
eu_issue_D6V2c	1 social market Europe 2 neoliberal Europe 3 enlargement 4 pol-cult deepening .a
qual_eu_issue_D6V2c	5 unique values [-1; -.5; 0; .5; 1]
eu_issue_D6V2c_bin	1 economic 2 pol-cultural
eu_issue_D6V2_mds	1 SM_EUROPE 2 NL_EUROPE 3 NO_ENLARGE 4 DEEPENING
qual_eu_issue_D6V2_mds	5 unique values [-1; -.5; 0; .5; 1]
pweight_euV2_CS	6 unique values [.60187735,1.5009363]
immiissue	1 immigration 2 integration 3 citizenship 4 asylum_refugees 5 eu_migration 6 muslims 7 xenophobia 8 groups_of_foreigners
immiissue2_V2	1 immigration 2 integration 3 anti-xenophobia_groups
islam	0 no islam issue 1 islam issue
qual_immiissue2_V2	5 unique values [-1; -.5; 0; .5; 1]

issue_el_low	99 not_rel 300 location_promotion(gen) 301 deregulation(gen) 302 labor 303 tax competition 304 service_public 305 economic_liberalization(gen) 306 trade 307 financial market 308 bus_pol 309 corporate_governance 310 industry sheltering 312 competition policy 313 protectionism 314 location_promotion(spec) 315 export promotion 316 intl. re-regulation 317 jobs 318 social_partnership
dir_issue_el_low	5 unique values [-1; -.5; 0; .5; 1]
issue_el	1 international liberalization 2 domestic liberalization .a not relevant
dir_issue_el	5 unique values [-1; -.5; 0; .5; 1]
frame variables	as used in the book, see https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139169219
pweight_country_EU	6 unique values [.59410742,1.7231953]
pweight_country_I	6 unique values [.7495391,1.331205]
pweight_country_ECO	6 unique values [.75507654,1.8003724]
pweight_debate_country	18 unique values [.46946961,1.9109249]
pweight_ctxtevent	18 unique values [.42529134,2.3628205]
pweight_action	18 unique values [.43876543,2.5979532]
pweight_arena	18 unique values [.42023598,2.3773802]

Coding instructions

The coding instructions for the project have been written in German. You can find a good summary of the approach in the methods' chapter of Kriesi et al. (2012). *Political Conflict in Western Europe.* Cambridge University Press, see
https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139169219.004

Below we quickly translated the coding instructions for key variables; note that most of the variables listed above are recoded from the initial list of variables.

Article-level variables
Context event[1]

The context event is the event or action that triggered the communication activities of the actors (not the reporting, although this can often coincide) and can be considered as the general context for the core sentences to be coded. It drives the debate and is responsible for its dynamics. It can therefore also be understood as the "original stimulus" (Ferree et al. 2002) for the statements we encode. It is responsible for communication condensations, for the peaks in the media resonance. These are events that lead to other actors taking action and/or taking a position. On the other hand, it can also happen that a contextual event is instrumentalized by a political actor in order to put himself in the limelight. The context event can be, for example, a ministerial meeting, a demonstration, the date of an EU enlargement round, a murder or a speech in parliament.[2]

Usually the context event is already clearly visible after reading the title, lead and first section.[3] The context event can be explicitly named by the acting actors by placing their positioning in the context of an event.[4] Often the context event will also be delivered by the newspaper. But it also happens quite often that there is no clearly recognizable context event in an article, in this case simply "no context event" is encoded.

The contextual event must not be confused or equated with the immediate cause, which we encode as a form of action at the core set level (see below for this and for an example), even if these two variables may at times coincide. The immediate form of action that has led to an actor being mentioned can be a press conference, counter-demonstration or the like. However, it is then merely a reaction to a contextual event.

In order to simplify the identification of the context event, we use the 1-month rule for pragmatic reasons: i.e. the context event must not have occurred more than one month ago. If an event is more than one month ago[5], the next more recent event is coded as a context event. Reason: We assume that events that are very long ago no longer directly trigger an action form or reaction. Instead, new events have led to a topic being taken up again. Furthermore, in rare cases the context event can also be in the future, which is then coded in the normal way (e.g. the approaching date of the eastern enlargement or a conference).

Example 1:[6] In June 2007 there was a G8 summit in Heiligendamm, Germany, which led to demonstrations by anti-globalization activists. If a newspaper reports about these demonstrations, the G8

---

[1] Both the variable and the 1-month rule are based on the reporting event and arena variables of Ferree et al (2002).

[2] More generally, the contextual events should help us to see how a debate is structured. It will be interesting to find out to what extent debates are triggered and conducted in different arenas. For example, when non-institutionalized actors demonstrate against decisions in parliament or when a party uses a murder case by a foreigner to mobilize against immigrants.

[3] So the point here is not to research or to show off with background knowledge, the reporting reason must be obvious and "catch the eye" when reading the article, otherwise it will not be coded. We have to rely on the journalist/article here to inform us truthfully.

[4] However, a context event should not be confused with a *topic position*. Let us take the example of a representative of a consumer organisation who, at a press conference, responds to a speech in Parliament in which a politician speaks out in favour of the liberalisation of the postal service. The subject is therefore 'postal liberalisation' and the context event is 'speech in Parliament'.

[5] Of course, you don't have to check the calendar to see if the event really happened exactly 31 days ago, this is a rule of thumb.

[6] Further examples specifically for the differentiation from the variable "action form" can be found in the section "Action form".

summit in Heiligendamm is the contextual event, because this triggered the demonstrations and also led to the fact that there was a reporting at all. Conversely, it can be said that if this had not taken place, there would not have been any demonstrations and therefore no reporting on them.

One could now also argue, following the same logic, that the demos are a (late) reaction to the repression and use of force by the police during the previous G8 summit in Genoa or follow the tradition of the riots in Seattle in 1999. Regardless of whether this is true or not, the 1-month rule applies here, which in turn leads to the G8 summit (which took place within a period of 1 month). Seattle' or 'Genoa' should not be coded as a contextual event, because it took another event (Heiligendamm) for the globalisation critics to become active again.

In the context of the G8 summit, there were also demonstrations in Rostock, which took place a few days *before* the meeting in Heiligendamm. In this case, too, the G8 summit is the context event.

Example 2: In Zurich, a minor girl is raped by naturalised youths. One year later there are court cases. In the run-up to the court decisions and also afterwards, fierce debates about the possibilities of depriving naturalised criminals of their Swiss citizenship flare up (as happened immediately after the rape). If these debates before and after the court decisions are now coded, the court decision represents the contextual event, since only then does the debate flare up again.

A categorical variable and a string variable are available for coding. The categorial variable contains the values listed in Table 3 in column 3 (Specific Context). The first two columns only serve for localization and later aggregation, but also help for understanding.

The context events in Table 3 are subdivided according to the following principles: The first type of arena (state) includes arenas that are an institutional part of the state. The second type of arena (non-state) comprises events in political actors that are not an institutionalized part of the state. These first two types comprise contexts in which something takes place that is *primarily* directed at the members of the respective arenas (internal). Of course, a parliamentarian assumes that his speech in parliament will be recorded outside (and it certainly will, because it will be in the newspaper and we will code the event). Even a court decision is primarily addressed to the defendants and not to the general public. A decision of a partyassembly to conduct a particular election campaign is also primarily addressed to its own members. These events are different from those that are grouped together in the third type of arenas (public). They are directly addressed to the broad masses or include them. To distinguish the different forms of protest, the list in the appendix should be consulted, which is based on the protest event analysis. Statements by social movements[7] will often take place in the protest arena and not in the (internal) arena of social movements/public interest groups/NGOs.

Under 'external events' we have listed those that take place outside the above arenas. By individual fates we mean, for example, when it is reported that someone loses their job due to the restructuring of a company, or when it becomes known that a foreign family is being deported. Such events can then lead to debates on economic liberalisation or asylum policy. Similarly, when criminal acts lead to debates about security or criminal foreigners. Although key dates of decisions (i.e. when a law or decision comes into force) can be allocated to the legislative or executive arena in the broadest sense, we consider such decisions to be external, as they usually occur some time after the decisions have been made and automatically. Finally, there are the expressions "none / unknown" and "other".

The string variable is used to record extraordinary singular events with high resonance[8], which are insufficiently characterized by the keywords, with a unique name. This additional information helps us in the later (qualitative) evaluation of our data. The government meeting in Heiligendamm, for example, will no longer be coded with 'Government: Meeting', but will be supplemented with 'G8 Meeting Heiligendamm'.

---

[7] "SMOs are distinguished from the other types of formal organizations by two criteria: (1) they mobilize their constituency for collective action and (2) they do so with a political goal, that is, to obtain some collective good (avoid some collective ill) from authorities." Kriesi (1996)

[8] But only this one, since we're responsible analysis we are only interested in the big "key events". The string variable should therefore only be used sparingly.

Table 3: Category scheme for context events

Type of Arena	Arena	Specific context
State arenas: institutional <u>internal</u>	Legislative	Parliament: Sessions (meetings, including commissions)
		Parliament: Decision
		Parliament: initiative (requests/questions/initiatives)
	Executive/Admin. (incl. EU Commission)	Government: Meeting
		Government: Decision
		Government: meetings (international such as G8, EU (ministerial) council etc.)
	Judiciary	Legal procedure (lawsuit/judgement/trial)
Non-governmental arenas: non-institutional <u>internal</u>	Parties	Party (meeting, but no protest meeting)
	Interest groups	special/private interest groups (e.g. business, industry, employee associations)[9] (assemblies, but not protest meetings)
	Social movement-arena/Public Interest Groups	Social Movement / Public Interest Groups/NGOs (meetings/events but not protest meetings)
	Company	Company (meeting / AGM / resolution)
	Science	Science (studies addressed to scientific community)
Public arenas	media arena	Statement (call/press conference/ press release)
		Popular science (studies, surveys for the masses)
	Consultative Arena	Elections (election campaign/results)
		Initiative/referendum (launch/submission)
	Protest Arena	Protest: Assimilative-demonstrative
		Protest: Confrontational-legal
		Protest: confrontational-illegal, non-violent
		Protest: confrontational-illegal, violent
External events		Key data (of decisions/implementation of a law/accession)
		Natural disasters
		Criminal act (act of violence/attack if not protest event)
		Individual fate (unemployment/deportation etc.)
Residuals		none / unknown
		Other

Types of core sets and core set elements

The most important unit of analysis for coding is not the articles as a whole, but *nuclear sentences*. In each sentence, any statements about *relevant issues or political actors* should be identified. These core sentences are our observations. In a sentence there can be none, one or more of these core sentences. For pragmatic reasons, a **maximum of 15 core sentences are** coded **per article.**

Actor-actor core sets (AA) and actor-issue core sets (AT)

These are our two most important core set types. They correspond to the following schematic structure:

Subject / positive or negative relationship / object.

Inall core types of sentence, the subject is always a political actor, but each type of sentence corresponds to a different object. The predicate is the element that expresses the quality of the relationship.

To correctly recognize the structure of a core sentence, it is important to distinguish between the *grammatical* and *semantic* structure of the sentence. For our content analysis, subjects and objects are semantically defined. The difference can be illustrated by a simple example:

1.   "Cottier criticized Blocher"

2)   "Blocher was criticized by Cottier"

---

[9] A good distinction between public vs. private interest groups can be found here:
http://texaspolitics.laits.utexas.edu/html/ig/0200.html

The grammatical subject is Cottier in the first sentence and Blocher in the second sentence. But in both cases Cottier is the semantic subject. The problem arises especially (but not only!) in passively formulated sentences. The semantic subject is always the actor who makes a statement.

Actor-actor core set: Relationships between actors (**AA set**): Actor / relationship / actor

- "SVP nominates Bortoluzzi"

SVP / nominated (+) / Bortoluzzi

Actor-theme-core set: Statements by actors on a political issue (**AT sentence**): Actor / relationship / issue

> *-"The SVP rejects EU accession"*

SVP / rejects (-) / EU accession

Further core set types[10]

An evaluative core set (AI core set) has no object. It is a statement about the *qualities and characteristics of* a political actor. Here is an example:

> -"Micheline Calmy-Rey is the iron lady of Geneva and that's praise there"

This sentence is a statement about the qualities of Calmy-Rey. The Federal Councillor is the subject of the sentence here. But there is no object. Nothing is said about her thematic position or her position in relation to other actors. In such a case, the (missing) object is called the "ideal":

> -Micheline Calmy-Rey / Iron Lady (+) / Ideal

The evaluative sentences *cited* form a special case. They are merely differently formulated actor-actor sentences with the same *semantic* content. Therefore they are coded <u>as normal actor-actor-sentences:</u>

> -"Jaqueline Fehr says Micheline Calmy-Rey is the iron lady of Geneva, which is meant as praise"

...is semantically equivalent to, "Jaqueline Fehr praises the 'Iron Lady of Geneva', Micheline Calmy-Rey."

...is encoded as: Jaqueline Fehr / Iron Lady (+) / Micheline Calmy-Rey

Optional elements of a core sentence: quotations and thematic reference

Quotes:

"Citing" actors occur when the relationship of the core statement represents the point of view of an actor and not the reporting.

> *-"SP President Bodenmann said Blocher wants to cut back on social services"*

Quote: Bodenmann / Blocher / dismantling (-) / social services

However, if explicit criticism is also expressed here, an AA sentence must also be coded.

Subject reference: (for AA core sentences)

The second element that can complete the basic structure of the Core Sentences concerns relationships that are topic-specific. These are sentences where a relationship between actors or a statement about an actor is explicitly related to a specific political issue. Logically, this can only be the case if the object of the sentence is not a topic.

> "-"The FDP has sharply criticized SVP National Councillor Christoph Blocher after his anti-Europe rally.

---

[10] Actor-reality and actor-target group core sentences are not coded in debates.

FDP / sharply criticized (-) / Christoph Blocher / Topic reference: European integration

It is important here that an A-T record is always additionally coded if a position can be derived from such a record!

In the above example we would therefore also code an additional A-T record:

Christoph Blocher / Anti (-) / Europe

Miscellaneous

Symmetrical relationships:

A relationship between two actors is called symmetrical if the subject and the object can be exchanged without changing the meaning of the sentence. Symmetrical relationships are *coded twice*, see example below.

"PdA and Solidarités could not agree on a common candidate"

1st   key sentence: PdA / - / Solidarités

2.   key sentence: Solidarités / - / PdA

Multiple relationships:

A set can relate several subjects to a single object. Or, multiple objects can have the same subject. In such cases, a core sentence is encoded for each subject or object:

"The FDP and CVP are committed to an immediate tax cut"

1.   core sentence: FDP / is committed to (+) / tax reduction

2.   key sentence: CVP / committed to (+) / tax reduction

Interpretations of the sentences:

As a basic rule one should not interpret the core sentences when coding, i.e. one should not code more than is literally written in the article. In some cases, however, it is necessary to derive certain information that remains unclear in a sentence from the rest of the article. An example is pronouns that refer to an actor. But you should also not code more than is explicitly stated in the article. In the above example, a third and fourth core sentence is conceivable to the extent that the two parties are of the same opinion (FDP / + / CVP and CVP / + / FDP). *But this is not to be done.* This relationship is implicitly recognizable, but not explicitly formulated in this sentence. Therefore it is not coded. On the other hand, the new variables in debate analysis, especially the frame variable, usually require a greater degree of interpretation (see below).

Past:

Previous positions, proposals etc. of actors (for example, in previous elections) should not be coded unless they are the subject of a current political debate or otherwise relevant to the current election.

Determination of the coding relevant core sentences

All **core sentences that have a thematic reference to the overall topic (e.g. EU integration) or to one of its sub-issues are relevant for coding. All other core sentences are not coded!**[11]

For A-T sentences, this **"upper-theme criterion"** is obvious, for other types of sentences perhaps somewhat less so. These other core sentence types must be in the context of the topic, i.e. they must refer to the topic in order to be relevant for coding. For example, a criticism of another actor (AA sentence) must refer to their position on a relevant topic. In case of doubt, however, a <u>generous</u> approach is taken, since such a connection is not made continuously and explicitly by the author/speaker in an article, but is usually made comprehensible by the context.

Example:

Because of Turkey's criticism of the Pope, CSU leader Stoiber wants a halt to accession negotiations with the Mediterranean country. Green member of parliament X therefore vilified the Bavarian Prime Minister as a "Bavarian crusader" in a round of discussions the day before. Mr. Müntefering complained at a PC about the "lack of political reason" of the CSU leader. The SPD has been criticizing the smaller sister party of the CDU for a long time now for its lack of loyalty to the coalition.

The AT sentence here deals with a sub-Issue of EU integration and is therefore relevant for coding: "Stoiber / will stop (-) / accession negotiations with Turkey". The A-A sentence "Green MEP X / denigrates (-) / Bavarian Prime Minister / reference topic: Turkey accession" clearly refers to this, therefore it is also coded. The following A-A sentence "Müntefering / laments lack of reason (-) / of the CSU leader" also implicitly refers to it. This is no longer the case with the last A-A sentence "SPD / criticizes (-) / sister party of the CDU / reference topic: loyalty to the coalition", therefore it is not coded.

2. narrowing the range of topics is accompanied by an **expansion of the field of actors. Not only certain national actors, but all actors are now relevant for coding, as** long as they express themselves within the framework of the overall theme and its sub-issues: Government, parties, social movements, interest groups, NGOs, IGOs, think tanks, scientists, experts, companies, individuals, etc. "Political actor" is thus to be understood here in the broadest sense as someone who expresses himself politically. The only thing we are still not interested in is the journalists who write for newspapers.

Now we do not make any restriction on the origin. Coding relevant are **national, international, supranational and those from other countries.**

Coresentence level variables

After the relevance of the article has been checked in a first step, and in a second step a certain core sentence has proven to be relevant for coding, it can be coded. The following variables must be taken into account.

Actors (subject, object, citation)

Actors are always coded in the same way, regardless of whether they have the function of subject, object or "citation". The following three variables are coded:

(a)   Name (if it is a single person)

b)   Membership of the organization

(c)   Level/reach of the organisation

Variable (c) indicates the level at which the organisation should be located. The following specifications are possible here (the default is national, as this is the most common).

National (including regional/local)

Second country

European

Global

---

[11] Which sub-issue is addressed is irrelevant, it only has to fall under the overall topic (in contrast to the article selection, where "key subissues" were the criterion, see above).

unknown

Examples of actor coding:

"French MEP Daniel Cohn-Bendit criticises the Commission's action on behalf of the European Greens". Here the subject is coded in this way:

       -Name: Daniel Cohn-Bendit (Verts)

       - Organizational affiliation: Greens

       - Level: European

"The Green Member of the Bundestag Cem Özdemir, who is also a member of the Integration Advisory Council, is in favour of Turkey's accession, but continues to stress the importance of a "critical dialogue". FAZ.

       -Name: Cem Özdemir (Green)

       - Organizational affiliation: Greens

       - Level: national

Let us assume that the last example was published in a Swiss newspaper: The plain would then no longer be national, but a second country.

Coding guidelines:

- In the case of <u>double organizational affiliation,</u> the more prominent, more important one in the article is coded. If <u>several levels are</u> mentioned, the highest one is coded (see examples above).

- For <u>individuals</u> without organisational links (celebrities, writers, "man in the street") the organisation is coded as "individual"; for scientists "science". The exact name is nevertheless coded.

- For foreign actors, the country is always indicated ("GB: Executive/Administration")

Theme/"sub-issue"[12]

Since the overall topic for a particular debate is already given (e.g. EU integration, other topics are not relevant for coding, see above), only the finer sub-issues are coded here. **It is important here that no justifications are coded as sub-topics (these are coded separately, see below), but only positions on specific (possibly also vague) policies.**

Sub-issues should always be named as unambiguously as possible[13] and should start with a meaningful noun ("Schengen/Dublin" and not "for Schengen/Dublin"). In principle, the same superordinate categories can be used as for the coding of elections (foreign relations, asylum/foreigners policy, etc.). However, it should be added that all topics of a debate are already sub-issues of the same overall topic (e.g. EU integration).

Examples of sub-issues in the EU integration debate can be found in Tab. 1 (Schengen/Dublin, Eastern enlargement Bulgaria/Romania, accession of Turkey, Bolkestein Directive, EU Constitution, stronger democratisation EU, independence of the Central Bank, Lisbon Strategy, reduction of bureaucracy etc.)

---

[12] Clarification of the terminology: The 12 aggregated topic categories, of which we have selected 3 for the debate analysis, are now called overarching themes or issues. The underlying coded units, which were also called issues in the first phase, are now more precisely called sub-issues.

[13] As a test to prevent later assignment problems and fuzziness, we should also try to clearly assign the topic to one of our 12 categories: ecolib, welfare, budget, infra, immigration, security, army, iref, culture, eco, europe, cultlib.

Quality

The variable ("quality") is used to record the direction of the relationship between subject and object. This variable can have five values:

-1.0 negative relationship

-0.5 weakened negative relationship

 0 ambivalent relationship

0.5 weakened positive relationship

1.0 positive relationship

To interpret the direction of the relationship correctly, one should always ask oneself what the relationship looks like from the point of view of the object. If a party is "committed to a reduction of taxes" and the subject category is "increase of taxes", the quality of the relationship is coded as negative, since such a commitment is negative in terms of tax increase. To avoid such mistakes, it can be useful to code the direction of the relationship *only after* the object, in order to first find out the correct direction of the category.

Another important aspect is the distinction between 'normal' (1, 01), attenuated (0.5, -0.5) and ambivalent (0) relationships: No distinction is made between a party that "favours a tax reduction" and another actor that is "strongly committed" to such a reduction. Both relations are coded as positive (+1.0). Weakened relations are used in predicates where a tendency to a positive or negative statement or development is expressed but the latter is still uncertain. (e.g. "...vague yes to...", "...is sceptical about...")

Regulatory level (only for A-T core sets)

This variable is collected to cover additional aspects of transnationalisation. It has the following characteristics:

-global

-European

-bilateral/multilateral

-national

-local/regional

-•   Field empty] (if no required level of regulation)

The regulatory level refers to the level chosen by the speaker to address or resolve an issue or conflict, both explicit and implicit. The regulatory level always refers to a policy and the institutional level at which it should be located. Precisely, the regulatory level is the required regulatory level (and not simply the level at which the mentioned/critical issue is located). In coding, therefore, the following question must be asked:

"At what level does the political actor demand state (legislative or regulatory) activity? To which institutional level does he direct his demand for a law, a programme, a regulation, a measure, where should it be located?

The answer does not necessarily have to be explicitly stated in the text, often it is perhaps not even mentioned because the level is tacitly taken for granted (e.g. national level). In some cases it is already clear from the sub-issue (e.g. EU Constitution) and is therefore no longer specifically named by the speaker. If this becomes clear from the context, the regulatory level is also coded in such cases. If it is unknown, the field is left blank.

A further difficulty arises when a regulation is rejected at a certain level. Logically, this level is then not the (required) regulatory level. Often then, implicitly or explicitly, regulation at a deeper (especially national) level is simultaneously demanded. If this can be seen in the text, this level is coded. However, no regulation can be demanded, or another regulation at the same level. This is coded accordingly.

Examples:

"Britain has always been sceptical about the euro because of its financial centre in London."

"The Polish government would welcome an EU constitution if the decision-making process were not changed."

In the first example, it becomes clear that Great Britain prefers to continue to regulate currency matters nationally (national level of regulation). In the second example, however, the Polish government would like to regulate the issue at EU level, but simply does not agree with the concrete proposal (regulatory level European).

Justifications/Frames (only for A-T core sets)

Frames als "(patterns of) justifications":

Here, the concept of frame is understood to mean <u>specific justifications for the position taken on a subissue (within an A-T core sentence)</u>. The German translations "Argumentationsmuster" and "Justifikationkontext" or "(pattern of) justification" are more precise. Frames can thus be assigned to both an actor and a position. <u>An actor-theme-core sentence (on a specific topic such as EU integration) is the necessary prerequisite and thus the "anchor" for the frames that may be further scattered or only latently present in the article text. If there is</u> no such reference to an A-T sentence, the relevant frame is not coded.[14]

The assignment of a frame to a position is not always easy. Often frames are latent, implicit[15] and more or less distributed over a text. It is important to take these special properties of frames into account. A frame therefore does not necessarily have to be present in exactly the same sentence as the position reference (AT core sentence), but may be revealed only through the further context of the article (some sentences before and after, the same section, the same thematic block, in rare cases the whole article).

Example: An actor calls for stronger regulation of the European internal market. The discussion is about the fight against unemployment. Although the link is not made explicit, the frame "combating unemployment (economically)" is used to justify the policy of "stronger regulation of the European internal market", as this is clear from the text as a whole.

As a guideline, the coder should start from the article context - and not only from the sentence to be coded, which is why the <u>article</u> should <u>be read through completely before coding begins</u> - and answer the following question for the core sentence in question: *"What justification, what arguments does the actor provide (explicitly or implicitly) to support the position of this A-T-Sate? What is the context of the justification?"* The arguments are not always logically exact, and associations, images, etc. are also often used by political actors. It is also quite possible that a position is expressed by one actor several times in quick succession, and then in a further sentence the justification for these several A-T-phrases is provided. In such a case the frame - although it occurs only once - is coded several times, for each of these A-T-phrases. Because we do not encode the framing "per se", but the framing of certain positions. The core sentence thus remains at the heart of our coding.

Example: "[Title] SVP against EU accession. [Lead] At their General Assembly the SVP delegates unanimously rejected the start of accession negotiations with the European Union. They argued that accession was incompatible with Switzerland's direct democratic tradition and that in financial terms it was a "bottomless pit". "

Here we have an A-T core set in both the first and second sets. In both, the frames that follow are coded "direct democracy" as well as "costs", since this justification refers to both core sentences.

A-T core sentence no.1: SVP/ against (-)/ EU accession/ Frame1: "direct democracy"; Frame2: "costs

---

[14]   This distinguishes us from other conceptualizations, such as frames referring to an entire article. Finally,   the necessary condition of a position leads to the fact that numerous frames are not encoded. However, we are less interested in framing per se than in framing specific positions.

[15]   As the English term frame itself already implies: frame, scaffolding, truss.

A-T core sentence no.2: SVP delegates/ rejected (-)/ accession treaty EU/ Frame1: "Direct dem."; Frame2: "Costs

Often several justifications are provided for a position, as shown in the example above, therefore up to 5 frames/justifications can be assigned per core set. If more than 5 frames occur, the pragmatic criterion of prominence/importance (in the article) decides before the order of appearance. still open: In addition, the article is then marked or an additional A-T sentence is coded].

Categorization:

For the justifications/frames a three-step procedure is chosen, which is run through (at least mentally) one after the other during the coding:

1) The starting point for the top level is the distinction of the **three argumentationtypes according to Habermas** (so also Sjursen 2002:495, Lerch/Schwellnus 2006 for the qualitative analysis of government documents on EU enlargement; Trenz 2005:262-268 for a quantitative content analysis of the EU integration debate in 6 European countries):

(a) pragmatic (utility)

This category includes rational, interest-driven motives for achieving objectives, cost-benefit considerations, and efficiency and effectiveness arguments:: „*Utility* refers to an effort to find efficient solutions to concrete problems or dilemmas. Policy-makers seek legitimization by achieving an output that could be seen as beneficial to given interests and preferences." (Sjursen 2002: 495)

b) ethical-political (identity, values)

Reasons put forward fall into this category if they are based on a collective (usually national) identity, a particular "we" context: "*Values* refer to a particular idea of the „good life" that is grounded in the identity of a specific community. Policy would be legitimized through reference to what is considered appropriate given in a particular group's conception of itself and of what it represents." (Sjursen 2002: 495)

c) moral universalism (rights)

Here one argues with moral principles and normative princes of universal validity (see Trenz 2005:262): "Rights refer to a set of priniciples that are mutually recognized. In other words, policy would be legitimized with reference to principles that, all things considered, can be recognized as „just" by all parties, irrespective of their particular interests, perceptions of the „good life" or cultural identity." (Sjursen 2002: 495). It is not up to us to assess whether the statement of an actor can actually claim universal validity, the only decisive factor is how the actor argues.

2) A second level of **justifications/frames** then concretizes these abstract types of argumentation thematically. These are listed and underlined in the second column of Table 4. The further keywords under the respective justifications/frames serve only to clarify and concretise them. This level is both *country and issue-independent*, thus ensuring comparability between the individual debates. For this reason, new categories may only be opened at this level during the coding process after consultation; if possible, it should be fixed at the beginning. In actual coding, this is the level which is first accessed by the coder.

3) at the third, issue- and country-specific level, the appropriate categories are continuously opened during the coding, analogous to the issues. It is important that when creating such a **subframe,** the classification in the superordinate category grid is always considered. However, since the coding mask is hierarchically structured (as with issues), there is no other way to do this. Table 4 shows this category scheme using the EU integration debate as an example.

Examples: "The SVP decides on a referendum against the extension of the free movement of persons. The SVP consistently supports an independent Switzerland and the protection of Swiss jobs.

A-T core sentence SVP / decides on a referendum against (-) / the free movement of persons /

Frame1 ethical-political*political-institutional*independence

Frame2 pragmatic*economic*unemployment

Coding guidelines:

1) it is sometimes difficult to <u>distinguish subissues from frames/justifications</u>, especially because is-sues are often raised to justify other sub-issues. This is irrelevant as long as it is a "non-topic-related" potential sub-issue (e.g. "combating unemployment" in the EU integration debate), as it would not be coded anyway. In this case, the term is therefore only coded as frame/justification.

However, if a possible sub-issue falls under the overall theme, it is of course relevant for coding. We then encode the expression both as a sub-issue in its own A-T sentence, and also as a frame/justificationfor another A-T sentence (if it is used for justification). An expression can then be coded both as a sub-issue and as a frame:

 "The Front National is against the EU Constitution to send a signal against the threat of Turkey's ac-cession":

    1st FN / EU Constitution (-) / Turkey accession

    2nd FN / Turkey accession (-) / no frame

2) if an argument/frame is <u>denied,</u> the frame is encoded normally:

"Federal Council: EU accession does not violate neutrality"

    Federal Council / EU accession (+) / frame neutrality

"Law professor X: A teacher wearing a headscarf does not question the secular foundation of the state"

     science / permission of religious symbols in public function (+) / frame secularism

3) if a particular reasoning topos is based <u>on two differenttypes of argumentation</u>, it will become the "dominant type of argumentation". In determining the frames, the article context and the political actor will be taken into account. It is quite possible that a certain subframe/keyword is assigned to different superordinate categories depending on the context. However, when naming the sub-frame, the term should be described so precisely that the ambiguity is retained (for possible later recoding)

Example: "Calmy-Rey: Switzerland must preserve its humanitarian tradition."

The subframe "humane tradition" combines the ethical-political with the moral-universalist type of ar-gumentation. Nevertheless, tradition and thus the ethical-political argumentation predominate here. Therefore we would code the subframe under this frame category. But the ambiguity is still evident in the subframe.

Form of action

The form of action is the <u>action/action of the actor who makes a statement, with which he crosses the media attention threshold and achieves publicity. From</u> the perspective of debate, it is a <u>means of communication.</u> We assume that, depending on the actor, it is very different actions which give him access to the media public and which means they use. This is what we need to find out. Logically, the variable is coded at the core sentence level, since it can vary within an article and depending on the actor. Whether a form of action is deliberately used for this purpose (such as a PF) or whether publici-ty is rather an unintended side effect (e.g. in a meeting) is irrelevant.[16] The question which one should ask oneself when coding is the following: *Which action of the actor has led to the fact that he can ex-press himself in the newspaper article? How did he manage to gain the attention of the media?* Of course, it is not a question of proving exactly that the speaking person took part in the action itself. It is sufficient if (co-)authorship of the organisation concerned is suggested or suggested in the article.

---

[16] Cf. the, in our opinion, not very useful distinction between real vs. pseudo events.

A variable with the same characteristics as for the reporting event is available for the form of action (see Table 3).[17] The value "other" is coded relatively often, since it is often not mentioned why the spokesperson is quoted in the newspaper ("The Chancellor is quoted in the FAZ...", "Kohl affirmed his innocence" - we do not know here to which form of action we owe the respective statements). With the expression "medial statement" it is important that it is only coded if there is an active action of the speaker (e.g. a press release). An interview or a quote clearly does not fulfil this condition, we want to capture the *active* efforts of the actors to be present in the media. In such cases, therefore, "none / unknown" is coded.

Examples
1) On the distinction between reporting occasion and form of action: One article reports primarily on the counter-demonstration in Rostock, which took place in response to the G8 meeting in Heiligendamm, and allows its participants to have their say. In addition, there is also a report on a press conference at which the CDU condemns the violent riots of the demonstrators. Tony Blair is also quoted, who described the debt relief of the third world as the primary goal of the summit in Heiligendamm. The reporting occasion here is the G-8 meeting in Heiligendamm. This is the general context, the "original stimulus", on the basis of which the reactions described in the article took place in the first place. Possible forms of action at the core sentence level (which political actors use to achieve media resonance) are, however, the demonstration (for the demonstrators) and the PC (for the CDU). Heiligendamm, the reporting event itself, can also be a form of action at a core statement level (for Blair).
2 Attac explains its political demands at a press conference after the demonstration. She sends a press release to journalists who were not present there. Which is the form of action, the demonstration or the PK/press release here?
The "main action" of the actor in which he was involved at the time of the speaker's statement is always coded as the form of action. So we would code "demo" as the action form for the Attac statement, although the statement was precisely made on a PC during the demo, or on a press release. But we want to know which self-induced actions bring actors into the media, and here this is clearly the demo. It doesn't matter that it is not explicitly made clear that Attac was actually there, because this is at least suggested by the article.
In the same way, at the G8 summit we do not code PF, but IGC, although most of the statements were made by PFs organised in this context. The Greenpeace rubber dinghy incident - as a further example - is also coded as a form of action, although Greenpeace may have expressed itself on this in the form of a press release. However, we are not interested in who organizes the most press conferences or who prefers to send out press releases, but in the means by which political actors use to gain media attention at all. And a press release or a press conference without any other action is usually not sufficient for this.

---

[17] Software implementation: Since the form of action in an article is often always the same, the software always makes a proposal. By default, the first core statement is the same as the reporting event, after which the action form from the previous core statement is proposed.

Bibliography

Ferree, Myra Marx, William Anthony Gamson, Jürgen Gerhards Dieter Rucht. 2002. *Shaping Abortion Discourse. Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge: University Press.

Gerhards, Jürgen, Friedhelm Neidhardt Dieter Rucht. 1998: Between Palaver and Discourse: Structures and Public Opinion Formation using the Example of the German Discussion on Abortion. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Lerch, Marika und Guido Schwellnus (2006): „Normative by nature? The role of coherence in justifying the EUs external human rights policy" *Journal of European Public Policy* 13(2): 304–321.

Sjursen, Helene (2002): „Why Expand? The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU's Enlargment Policy" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40(3): 491–513.

Trenz, Hans Jörg 2005. Europe in the media. European integration in the mirror of national public opinion. Frankfurt/New York: Campus

Tresch, Daniela Anke. 2007. publicity and linguistic diversity. Media-mediated communication on European policy in German and French-speaking Switzerland. Dissertation University of Zurich.

De Vreese, Claes H. (2005): *Framing Europe. Television News and European Integration*. AmsterdamHet Spinhuis.