

WZB

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin
für Sozialforschung



Pieter de Wilde, Ruud Koopmans and Michael Zürn

The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism: Representative Claims Analysis

Discussion Paper

SP IV 2014-102

April 2014

Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)

Research Area

International Politics and Law

Research Unit

Global Governance

Copyright remains with the author(s).

Discussion papers of the WZB serve to disseminate the research results of work in progress prior to publication to encourage the exchange of ideas and academic debate. Inclusion of a paper in the discussion paper series does not constitute publication and should not limit publication in any other venue. The discussion papers published by the WZB represent the views of the respective author(s) and not of the institute as a whole.

Pieter de Wilde, Ruud Koopmans and Michael Zürn

Email: pieter.dewilde@wzb.eu

The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism: Representative Claims Analysis

Discussion Paper SP IV 2014-102

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (2014)

The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism: Representative Claims Analysis

Pieter de Wilde, Ruud Koopmans and Michael Zürn

Zusammenfassung

Dieses WZB Diskussionspapier befasst sich mit der im Rahmen des Brückenprojekts „Die politische Soziologie des Kosmopolitismus und Kommunitarismus“ durchgeführten representative claims analysis. Es dient als methodologische Grundlage für die Interpretation der hierbei entstandenen Datensammlung sowie den aus ihr folgenden Erkenntnissen. Darüber hinaus beinhaltet das Papier die theoretische Ziele mit dem der representative claims analyse durchgeführt werden ist, im Bezug zu das breitere Forschungsprojekt, Angaben zur Stichprobenziehung, das Codebuch mitsamt deskriptiver Statistiken aus der Datenbank, sowie die Testergebnisse der Intercoder-Reliabilität. Im Anhang befinden sich Beispiele kodierter Claims und eine Anleitung zur Verwendung der Datensammlung sowohl in qualitativer als auch quantitativer Form.

Schlüsselwörter: Kosmopolitismus, Kommunitarismus, representative claims analyse

Abstract

This WZB Discussion Paper documents in detail the representative claims analysis conducted within the WZB bridging project ‘The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism’. It serves as methodological background for interpreting the dataset and findings based upon it. The paper includes the aims of this empirical module in relation to the project, the sampling strategy, the codebook with descriptive statistics from the database, and the results of the intercoder reliability test. The annexes include examples of coded claims and a guide to the database, both in its more qualitative and in its fully quantitative forms.

Keywords: cosmopolitanism, communitarianism, representative claims analysis

Table of Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	- 1 -
<u>Sampling Strategy</u>	- 3 -
<u>Key Word Search Strings</u>	- 3 -
<u>Newspaper Profiles and Stratified Sampling</u>	- 4 -
<u>Newspapers and Years</u>	- 5 -
<u>Codebook</u>	- 7 -
<u>Recognizing a Claim</u>	- 7 -
<u>Aspects and Variables</u>	- 9 -
1. <u>Location</u>	- 9 -
<u>Origin</u>	- 9 -
<u>Year</u>	- 10 -
<u>Source</u>	- 10 -
2. <u>Claimant</u>	- 11 -
<u>Claimant Type</u>	- 12 -
<u>Claimant Scope</u>	- 12 -
<u>Claimant Function</u>	- 13 -
<u>Claimant Nationality</u>	- 17 -
<u>Claimant Party</u>	- 19 -
3. <u>Action</u>	- 21 -
<u>Action</u>	- 22 -
4. <u>Addressee</u>	- 23 -
<u>Addressee Type</u>	- 23 -
<u>Addressee Scope</u>	- 24 -
<u>Addressee Function</u>	- 25 -
<u>Addressee Nationality</u>	- 26 -
<u>Addressee Party</u>	- 28 -
<u>Addressee Evaluation</u>	- 29 -
5. <u>Issue</u>	- 29 -
<u>Issue</u>	- 30 -
<u>Problem Scope</u>	- 33 -
<u>Position</u>	- 34 -
<u>Intervention</u>	- 35 -
6. <u>Object</u>	- 36 -

Object.....	- 37 -
Object Scope.....	- 38 -
Object Evaluation.....	- 38 -
7. Frame.....	- 39 -
Justification.....	- 40 -
Justification Specification.....	- 42 -
Conflict Frame.....	- 44 -
Intercoder Reliability Test.....	- 45 -
References.....	- 49 -
Appendix I: Examples of Claims.....	- 51 -
Example 1 (1 Claim):.....	- 51 -
Example 2 (1 Claim):.....	- 51 -
Example 3 (1 Claim):.....	- 52 -
Example 4 (2 Claims):.....	- 53 -
Example 5 (3 claims):.....	- 54 -
Appendix II: Data Availability.....	- 56 -

Introduction

This is the methodological outline used for the sociological analysis of cosmopolitanism and communitarianism as they come to the fore in debates unfolding in the public sphere. It is part of the larger WZB bridging project on 'The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism' (2011-2016) which investigates whether there is an emerging cleavage as a result of globalization in advanced industrialized societies. This would be the case if we find a) a societal division of 'winners' and 'losers' in objective or subjective terms; b) a structural mobilization by political parties or other organizations of each of the two societal groups and c) a normative underpinning in the sense of two ideological profiles providing coherence to the demands and world views of each side (Bartolini and Mair, 1990).

This outline describes in detail the *representative claims analysis* data gathering enterprise component of this project. Its aims are:

1. To map communicative and strategic actions about globalization made in the public sphere, by:
 - a. Measuring expressed preferences regarding the opening or closing of borders,
 - b. Attributing such preferences to a variety of societal actors,
 - c. Allowing comparison across countries, issues, levels and forums.
2. To measure the degree to which such actions can be labeled as cosmopolitan or communitarian, by:
 - a. Establishing coherence in preferences across issues per actor,
 - b. Mapping patterns of discursive authorization at national, internal or other level of political order,
 - c. Mapping collective identity formation and representation through the articulation and advancement of various constituencies, groups and conflicts
 - d. Mapping patterns in justification of actions in moral, ethical or instrumental terms as well as the normative ontological basis of such justification.
3. To allow the linking of this public sphere data about the 'market place' of cleavage formation to data measuring 'supply' and 'demand', by:
 - a. Incorporating indicators that can subsequently be compared to party manifesto data, public opinion surveys and/or elite surveys.

To facilitate the pursuit of aims 1 to 3, we conceptualized discursive components of cosmopolitanism and communitarianism as potentially used in public sphere debates in four dimensions (see De Wilde and Zürn, 2013). Firstly, whether claims are pro-integration or pro-demarcation are operationalized through the combination of the issue and position variables, capturing desired change of border permeability in rela-

tion to the status quo. Secondly, the allocation of authority is operationalized through the addressee aspect including which authority is called upon to act and/or whether its actions thus far are evaluated positively or negatively. Thirdly, community and identity are operationalized through the object aspect, capturing which constituency is advanced by the claimant as relevant to the claim. Fourthly, justification is operationalized through the frame aspect, where moral, ethical and instrumental justifications capture the thickness of ideology and moral justifications are further specified according to their individualist or collectivist philosophical underpinning.

To meet these aims, we analyze public debates on trade, climate change, migration, human rights and regional integration in USA, Mexico, Germany, Poland and Turkey as well as in plenary sessions in the UN General Assembly and European Parliament. It employs the method of *claims analysis* (Koopmans and Statham, 1999) and extensively builds on earlier projects using this method regarding sampling and codebook design (Berkhout and Sudulich, 2011, De Wilde, 2010, Koopmans, 2002a, Koopmans and Statham, 2010, Koopmans et al., 2005). In a modification of claims analysis, we draw on recent developments in political theory on representation (Saward, 2010) to map dynamics of how 'supply' and 'demand' on the alleged new cleavage meet in the public sphere as a variety of (would-be) representatives compete to advance themselves as the legitimate representatives of certain constituencies. In the process, they contribute to the collective identity formation of said constituencies and draw the lines between opposing societal groups. Hence, the present outline of *representative claims analysis* (De Wilde, 2013, Erzeel, 2011, Severs, 2010) is particularly geared to measure cleavage formation in the public sphere.

As a form of content analysis, this study uses written text in the form of newspaper articles and transcripts of plenary debates as primary data. Although representative claims analysis is not methodologically restricted to written material, claims can be identified as pieces of text ranging from parts of a sentence to several paragraphs long arguments. For this project, claims are units in which the claimant – or central actor – presents a single political demand regarding the openness of nation state borders with regards to key entities that might cross these borders through social interaction:

- 1) *pollutants* and mechanisms to combat or mitigate climate change (manufactured);
- 2) *norms* as reflected in universal human rights;
- 3) *people* in the form of migration;
- 4) *authority* beyond the state as constitutionalized in regional integration projects, and;
- 5) *goods* in the form of international trade.

Globalization refers to the process in which the intensity, extensity, velocity and/or impact of these border crossings increases (Held et al., 1999). Since this is unequal in different countries, it is more apt to talk of denationalization than globalization

(Beisheim et al., 1999). Our claims analysis aims to capture societal contestation about this denationalization in various forms of manifestation in the public sphere.

Sampling Strategy

The sampling of documents for the claims analysis module is a delicate task. Newspapers differ strongly in terms of the number of articles they feature and the organization thereof in pages, but this complexity in the world of newspapers still pales in comparison to the difference between newspapers and parliamentary-like settings in terms of how public debate is organized. A single newspaper issue contains multiple articles, some long, some short, some prominently placed, some not. Parliaments feature long plenary debates, short question times and votes on resolutions.

Daily issues as units of sampling instead of articles/debates are also problematic. One might restrict a newspaper analysis to newspapers that appear on a daily basis, but the inclusion of parliamentary settings disrupts this logic as parliaments do not convene every day. For example, the UN General Assembly only convenes a few months per year (Peterson, 2007). Perhaps most comparable would be year-coverage, but these do not lend themselves as sampling units, because of the huge amount of work of reconstructing and analyzing an entire year's worth of newspaper coverage or parliamentary activity. Furthermore, parliamentary years do not coincide with each other or with newspaper years, making even this level of aggregation imperfect when it comes to sampling. Besides organization, archiving also strongly differs with some archives being complete as far as decades ago, while others only extend a few years back with ambiguity about completeness. Some archives are available in hard copy only – sometimes even exclusively at the headquarters of the organization in question – and others can be accessed online.

Without denying the accompanying variety of forms, we selected newspaper articles and transcripts of plenary debate as 'natural' units, delineated by the organization in question, archived as such, and therefore clearly recognizable and traceable. We chose to sample at the level of articles/debates using online archives and key word search strings. The units sampled would thus be individual articles or transcripts of debate as delineated and archived by the institution in charge. Besides maximizing comparability, this strategy is designed to reduce the labor intensity of sampling to a minimum so that more resources are available for content analysis.

Key Word Search Strings

The construction of a search strings requires careful attention. Different key words result in very different articles, for example. Some key words have a political or temporal connotation, meaning that they are more or less likely to appear in certain out-

lets and times than others. As a result, the type of debate captured could be biased as a result of the words used to sample the data. In addition, key words may not be precise sampling tools, if they are used in a variety of contexts. In such cases, the sampling would result in many false hits, which tell us little about public debates on globalization issues.

Our construction of key word strings therefore combines multiple words, of neutral political connotation if possible or of opposing political connotation if needed. To establish political connotation, we conducted a pilot sampling on German and US newspapers comparing the relative occurrence of key words on all of the five issue areas mentioned above in left-leaning and right-leaning newspapers. We subsequently opted to include words in the search string that occurred more or less equally frequently in left and right newspapers. If such words were not available or imprecise, we added both a leftist and a rightist key word to the string. Table 1 contains the final search string for each of the five issue areas. In using these words, we allowed different language-specific grammatical endings to be included in the search.

Table 1: Key words included in the search string

Migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immigration • Emigration
Regional integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizenship • Regional integration • European integration OR EU membership OR European Union • NAFTA OR ASEAN OR Organization of American States OR OAS • Sovereignty • Membership
International trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Import • Export • International trade
Human rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human rights • Women OR children OR religion
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change • Global warming • CO2 • Greenhouse gas

Only articles or transcripts containing at least two different key words (indicated with bullet points) per string were selected to avoid false hits.

Newspaper Profiles and Stratified Sampling

Although key words matter, much of the difference in political opinion depends on the newspaper. To avoid political bias as a result of the specific newspaper selected, we sampled articles from newspapers from at least three different newspapers in all

countries, taking both relative left/liberal and right/conservative imprint, even if they are not the most widely read newspapers. In addition, we add a religious newspaper where applicable to reflect salient political dimensions other than (mostly secular) left-right inclination of these newspapers. This captures important societal divisions in countries like the USA, Poland and Turkey, and allows us to investigate reader exposure and the prominence of cosmopolitanism and communitarianism in leftist, rightist, secular and confessional newspapers.

Table 2: Sources

	Newspaper				Plenary
	Leftist	Rightist	Religious	Other	
European Union					European Parliament
Germany	Süddeutsche Zeitung taz	Frankfurter Allgemeine Die Welt			
Mexico	La Jornada	Reforma		El Universal	
Poland	Gazeta Wyborcza	Rzeczpospolita	Nasz Dziennik		
Turkey	Milliyet	Hürriyet	Zaman		
United Nations					UN General Assembly
USA	New York Times	Houston Chronicle	Washington Times		

Newspapers and Years

Besides stratifying the sample based on newspapers per country, we also stratified by year. That is, based on a conservative estimate of archive availability, we divided the total amount of documents to be sampled over the five year period 2007 – 2011. This is the period for which the online archives of all sources above were digitally available. We subsequently sampled approximately 30 newspaper articles per issue area, per country, per year. This avoids bias as a result of unique historical events. For the European Parliament and United Nations, we sampled from a longer timeframe (2004 – 2011) to include two different EP compositions (before and after the 2009 elections) and to include the most extensive debate within the UN on migration, which took place in 2006. Because regional integration as an issue does not play a role of significance in UN General Assembly debates, while it comes to the fore as an issue in almost all European Parliament debates, no separate documents on this issue were sampled in these two forums. In the first coding phase, we only coded every other document sam-

pled. The reason is that documents differ strongly in the amount of claims they generate from source to source. As a result, the time needed to code also differs. In order to code at least a complete sample across time and issues within each case, we coded half the sampled documents in phase 1. Resources permitting, we then continued to code the remaining sample, especially on issues that so far generated rather few claims. The added value of this approach means that temporal deviations from intra-coder reliability are not structural, since variation across time and issues is maintained across the period of coding. The coding process aimed to generate at least 250 claims for each issue area x case cell, with the exception of regional integration in the UN General Assembly. In light of this two-step coding process, the final number of documents coded deviates slightly from the original sampling strategy as different amounts of sampled documents remained uncoded. The coded documents are distributed across origin and issue as visualized in table 3.

Table 3: Stratified sampling by origin and issue

		Climate Change	Human Rights	Migration	Regional integration	Trade	Total
European Parliament	Sampled	15	15	15	.	15	60
	Coded	8	8	14	0	7	37
	Claims	639	321	732	0	452	2144
Germany	Sampled	150	150	150	150	150	750
	Coded	117	87	106	104	93	507
	Claims	367	281	518	385	227	1778
Mexico	Sampled	150	150	150	150	150	750
	Coded	128	134	119	94	63	538
	Claims	373	379	359	218	162	1491
Poland	Sampled	150	150	150	150	150	750
	Coded	76	96	76	96	87	431
	Claims	275	372	287	364	259	1557
Turkey	Sampled	150	150	150	150	150	750
	Coded	64	92	70	70	63	359
	Claims	279	486	297	247	237	1546
UN General Assembly	Sampled	15	15	15	.	15	60
	Coded	13	14	10	0	15	52
	Claims	569	300	551	0	251	1671
United States	Sampled	150	150	150	150	150	750
	Coded	81	67	77	63	63	351
	Claims	340	287	404	290	302	1623
Total	Sampled	780	780	780	750	780	3870
	Coded	487	498	472	427	391	2275
	Claims	2842	2426	3148	1504	1890	11810

The total sample therefore contained 120 transcripts of plenary debate and 3750 newspaper articles. Of this total of 3870 sampled documents, 2274 coded documents contain a total of 11810 claims. Note that claims are not necessarily about the issue on which they are sampled. For example, a document sampled using the key word string for the issue of migration may include claims about human rights. The table above

does not document the issue of the claims, only the issue of the documents and the amount of claims found therein.

Codebook

The following sets out the codebook of the representative claims analysis, including detailed instructions for the coders on how to manually code the claims as well as descriptive statistics indicating occurrence in the final database.

Recognizing a Claim

A claim is defined as a purposive unit of strategic or communicative action in the public sphere: ‘... which articulates] political demands, decisions, implementations, calls to action, proposals, criticisms, or physical attacks, which, actually or potentially, affect the interests or integrity of the claimants and/or other collective actors in a policy field’ (Statham, 2005: 12, Vettters et al., 2006: 8). Each claim has at least four characteristics: a claimant, a form of action through which the opinion is communicated, an issue relating to globalization and a position indicating preference regarding that issue. If any of these is lacking, we do not identify a claim. Furthermore, a change in one or more of these four core characteristics demarcates one claim from the next one. In addition to these variables, there may be several other aspects of a claim, but they are not always present. All in all, claims can consist of WHERE and WHEN (Location), WHO (Claimant) makes a claim, on WHAT (Issue), addressing WHOM (Addressee), for/against WHOSE interests (Object) and WHY (Frame).

In textual terms, a claim can be as short as a few words or as long as several paragraphs, depending on how elaborate the claim is. Claims can also overlap. The main 26 variables of a claim are grouped into seven ‘aspects’. Whereas each group captures a particular aspect of a claim, multiple variables within each group capture different characteristics of that aspect. The four key variable sets are the claimant, the action, an issue relating to globalization, and a position defended by the claimant concerning this issue. Some of the remaining variables are actually sub-variables in that they further specify characteristics of the aspect. Others are optional, separate aspects that may or may not occur in the claim. Table 4 provides an overview of all overarching aspects of claims in columns, core variables in bold and other variables.

Claims can be directly made by the actor or they can be attributed by a journalist to a third party. We code claims made by actors themselves which can be recognized by an action verb in the text - i.e. “the European Commission *urges* the USA and China to agree on a new binding protocol to follow up the Kyoto Protocol when it expires in 2012”; “the US Home Department *deported* 100 illegal immigrants from Mexico yesterday”; “Merkel and Sarkozy *presented* a joint proposal for stronger economic govern-

ance in the European Union in last week’s press conference” or “UN Secretary General Kofi Annan *criticizes* the Syrian government for continued violations of human rights”. All these examples contain an explicit action. In addition, we code some claims attributed to actors, but only if this is done by a journalist who does not him- or herself present a claim in that article. Such claims may look like “the SPD is in favor of ...”, “the position of China has long been ...”, “junior ministers within the AKP party disagree with ...”. We do not code claims attributed by actors other than journalists nor by journalists in op-ed articles.

Table 4: The seven claim aspects and 26 variables (core variables in bold).

Location	Claimant	Action	Addressee	Issue	Object	Frame
Origin	Claimant	Action	Addressee	Issue	Object	Justification
Year	Type		Type	Problem	Object Scope	Conflict
Source	Claimant		Addressee	Scope	Object Eval- uation	Frame
	Scope		Scope	Position		
	Claimant		Addressee	Intervention		
	Function		Function			
	Claimant		Addressee			
	Nationality		Nationality			
	Claimant		Addressee			
	Party		Party			
	Name		Addressee			
			Evaluation			
			Name			

Sometimes, it is difficult to assess whether a claim is a political demand – and should thus be coded – or a description of facts. For example, a scientist who states that climate change is happening and man-made or a UN official reporting that 200 people have died in the Syrian conflict in the last month. Often, such statements are introduced as background for claims by the same or other actor. If it is presented as a description of one of our issues that is portrayed to be a problem, it is coded as such. Note that the claimant defining the issue as problematic is not always the same as the actor presenting the facts. We can recognize such problem definitions by words with a normative connotation (i.e. “the situation is getting worse/out of hand”). If the statement is only a statement of fact without explicit normative connotation, it is not coded as a claim unless a particular fact is explicitly articulated as falling directly into one of our issue areas. Thus, if an actor states that “people are dying”, this is not a claim. If he/she states that “there are violations of human rights”, this is a claim. Similarly, a statement that “this is the warmest summer in the past century” is not a claim, while “recent temperatures are a clear indicator of climate change” is a claim.

To capture the current discourse on globalization, we only code claims made within the last two weeks of the document publication date, or otherwise presented in present tense or on-going form. Annotations were added to documents containing one or more claims specifying the title of the document and a summary of the content in English. In parliamentary documents that contain transcriptions of multiple debates, only the title/summary of the part of the debate that is relevant for our study is annotated.

Some of the different sub-variables measure the same characteristic of different aspects of the claim. So, the actor aspects – Claimant and Addressee – both contain the same group of societal actors that can feature in claims. The four ‘scope’ variables measure the territorial scope of the claimant, addressee, issue and object respectively. In the same way, the two evaluative variables are similar. The variables other than the core variables may or may not occur. In fact, we are interested in the percentage of claims that feature these variables. Whether or not they occur, they should always be coded. Therefore, they contain the value ‘none’ in case it is lacking in the claim.

Aspects and Variables

1. Location

This aspect of a claim captures the location of the claim in terms of time and space. It reflects the stratified sampling strategy taking into account different political systems, a spread over time and a spread across sources. Since these variables do not vary within documents, they are coded in the last instance as all other coding has been finished.

Origin

The variable origin captures the case from which the document was sampled. All claims found in plenary debates of the European parliament are coded ‘EU’ and all claims found in German newspaper articles as ‘Germany’. This variable is therefore a direct derivative of the variable ‘Source’, which specifies the different newspapers within countries.

Table 5: Origin

	Frequency	Percent
EU	2144	18,2
Germany	1778	15,1
Mexico	1491	12,6
Poland	1557	13,2
.		

	Frequency	Percent
Turkey	1546	13,1
UN	1671	14,1
USA	1623	13,7
Total	11810	100,0

Year

Specifies the year in which the claim was made which is almost always the year in which the document in which the claim is found was made. Note that the numbers from 2004 to 2006 are substantially lower than the numbers from 2007 to 2011 as we coded only parliamentary debates from the UN General Assembly and European Parliament for these first three years, whereas the latter five years also contain claims from newspapers in the five countries of our study.

Table 6: Year

	Frequency	Percent
2004	306	2,6
2005	328	2,8
2006	738	6,2
2007	2058	17,4
2008	2365	20,0
2009	2174	18,4
2010	1888	16,0
2011	1953	16,5
Total	11810	100,0

Source

This variable captures the source from which the document comes where claims are located.

Table 7: Source

		Frequency	Percent
European Union	European Parliament	2144	18,2
Germany	Die Welt	466	3,9
	FAZ	383	3,2
	Süddeutsche Zeitung	423	3,6
	taz	506	4,3
Mexico	El Universal	411	3,5
	La Jornada	664	5,6
	Reforma	416	3,5
Poland	Gazeta Wyborcza	641	5,4
	Nasz Dziennik	267	2,3
	Rzeczpospolita	649	5,5
Turkey	Hürriyet	450	3,8
	Milliyet	513	4,3
	Zaman	583	4,9
United Nations	UN General Assembly	1671	14,1
USA	Houston Chronicle	470	4,0
	New York Times	789	6,7
	Washington Times	364	3,1
Total		11810	100,0

2. Claimant

The claimant aspect of a claim captures the actor that is communicating an opinion about globalization issues. Together, the six variables in this group tell us WHO is making the claim. This may be an organization such as a government or a trade union. It may refer to some collective such as 'Mexico' or 'Ankara' or 'people' and it may refer to individuals who are either representing some collective (e.g. Obama) or act on their own accord, such as experts, famous intellectuals or journalists. In addition, we are interested in the territorial scope of the actor, the nationality and any political party affiliation if applicable. The aspect Claimant thus consists of six variables – Claimant Type, Claimant Function, Claimant Scope, Claimant Nationality, Migration Background and Claimant Party.

Claimant Type

Whether the claimant is an individual or an organization and whether they are specific claimants or generic ones is captured by this first variable.

Table 8: Claimant Type

		Frequency	Percent
Unorganized	Collective or anonymous representatives thereof (e.g., 'farmers', 'a farmer')	765	6,5
Individual	A person speaking on his or her own behalf (e.g., Gunther Grass)	617	5,2
Organization	Organizaton or institution (e.g., Greenpeace), including PR spokespersons	2221	18,8
Representative	Representative(-s) for organization/institution (e.g., Kumi Naidoo, the Executive Director of Greenpeace) but not PR spokespersons	8207	69,5
Total		11810	100,0

If the claimant is a specific named actor (either individual or collective), we additionally code the name of the claimant. This can be found under the 'X' in Atlas.ti. Note that this is not a closed list multinomial variable, like most others. In cases of both an organization and a representative, we code the name of the organization, not the name of the individual representative. This is only done if the claimant is recurrent in the data. To check this, the software program Atlas.ti in which we code allows a word crunch which lists the frequency of words in the data. If the name occurs more than 10 times in the dataset, we make a specific code for it. In practice, no name is coded when the claimant is 'unorganized'. Individuals are coded as individuals' names as "X. Obama, Barack" and organizations as 'X. Amnesty International'. We use the English name for international claimants and the original name for national claimants. Note: we code the individual names of organization leaders such as Prime Ministers, Presidents etc. but not for PR spokespersons whose specific job it is to talk to the press on behalf of an organization.

Claimant Scope

The second variable in the claimant group is the territorial scope on which the claimant is acting. In case of an official body such as a government or court, the jurisdiction clearly indicates the scope. Thus, the UN, WTO, Amnesty International and Pope have a global scope. Governments of nation-states and other nation-bound organizations (e.g. Confederation of Mexican Workers (CTM)) normally act on a national scope. To be more precise, officials act on the scope of their mandate. If they act on an international

stage (e.g. a government representative speaking within the UN General Assembly) we code 'national'. If a national organization is introduced holding a (temporary) international function, for example the rotating Presidency of the European Union, we code as such (i.e. 'Regional EU/NAFTA'). Similarly, Members of the European Parliament act on regional scope, the Secretary General of the UN acts on a global scope.

If the claimant has no clear mandate or 'reach', for example in the case of individual citizens, we code 'unclear'. Note that, for example, "citizens around the world" have a clear reach although they have no mandate and are coded as 'global' if they are presented as claimants.

Table 9: Claimant Scope

		Frequency	Percent
Global	Claimants acting on a global scale, such as the UN, the Pope, the Occupy Movement.	534	4,5
Regional EU/NAFTA	This scope captures territorial scope directly linked to the European Union or NAFTA. This includes 'the Eurozone' and 'the Schengen Area'.	2663	22,5
Regional Other	Any other territory that encompasses more than two nation-states but not the entire globe. Thus, 'Europe' falls into this category, so does the 'Arab Spring movement' or the 'pacific Island states'.	277	2,3
Bilateral	Capturing any two nation states, but no more or less than two.	26	,2
National	The claimant acts on the national stage.	7021	59,4
Sub-national	Any territorial scope below the national level. This may be 'regional' in the sense of a German Land or American State and it may be local municipalities.	806	6,8
Unclear	If the scope of action of the claimant is unclear, unknown or ambiguous.	483	4,1
Total		11810	100,0

Claimant Function

What kind of function, job or office does the claimant hold? That is captured in this variable, which contains three groups of international, national and societal functions.

Table 10: Claimant Function

			Frequency	Percent
International	International Organization	General references to international organizations such as “the UN”, “the WTO” etc.	284	2,4
	IO Secretariat	The administrative secretariat of an international organization including the UN Secretary General, the European Commission etc.	338	2,9
	IO Council	This captures intergovernmental collective bodies of decision-making, including the UN Security Council, the European Council and the EU Council of Ministers.	111	,9
	IO Assembly	Parliamentary like bodies such as the European Parliament and the UN General Assembly.	2059	17,4
	IO Agency	This captures international agencies that regulate, monitor or implement policy such as the UNFCCC and the IAEA.	62	,5
	IO Court	The European Court of Justice, the International Criminal Court and less formal dispute settlement mechanisms for example.	60	,5
	IO Bank	The European Central Bank, IMF, EBRD etc.	35	,3
	National	Government	This includes national and local governments, individual Ministers or Presidents and their official representatives, such as ambassadors. National executives are sometimes referred to as the name of the capitol (e.g. “Berlin has recently criticized Turkey for hindering the integration of Turkish migrants in Germany”). However, code ‘Polity’ if merely the name of the country is mentioned (e.g., “the USA has become increasingly critical about illegal immigration recently”)	3722
Legislative		This includes parliaments as whole bodies, parties in parliament or individual MPs. For example: “the Republican dominated House of Representatives” or “the European Greens”.	679	5,7

		Frequency	Percent	
	Other Politician(s)	This refers to people acting primarily in partisan function that do not hold an elected office. This may be a ceremonial President in parliamentary systems such as the President of Germany (Not the President of the USA!). It may also refer to political parties that are not represented in parliament (i.e. "the Nationale Partei Deutschland").	170	1,4
	Bureaucracy	This refers to ministries, departments and agencies of government. It includes individual civil servants. Note however that ambassadors speak on behalf of governments and are coded as 'Government'.	347	2,9
	Judiciary	This category includes all actors in the legal system from courts to prosecutors and lawyers presented in the framework of specific cases.	116	1,0
	Police/Military	Any formal state organization with a monopoly on violence, like the police and army.	63	,5
	Central Bank		4	,0
Societal	Private Finance	Private banks, rating agencies, major investors all belong in this 'Private Finance' category.	35	,3
	Business	This category includes both employers' organizations as well as companies themselves. People introduced as CEOs or "business men" also fall into this category.	456	3,9
	Trade Union	A rather self-explanatory category that includes trade unions and their spokespersons.	50	,4
	Farmers	This captures both individual farmers as well as their associations and spokespersons. Large agricultural companies such as "the sugar industry" rather fall under 'Business'.	65	,6
	Religious Actor	Religious actors are churches as well as priests and imams. Voluntary organizations with a religious background such as Milli Gorus or Pax Christi are rather coded as 'Civil Society'.	158	1,3
	Media/Journalist	Any news organization and individual journalists.	826	7,0

		Frequency	Percent	
	Rebels	Insurgent paramilitary groups such as the PKK.	11	,1
	Civil Society	Non-Governmental Organizations like Greenpeace, Amnesty International or Human Rights Watch. This also includes social movements like Occupy and the Tea Party. Name are specified when applicable.	725	6,1
	Citizens/People	This category applies to citizens in a collective or individual, but unorganized, capacity as may come forward in opinion polls or in demonstrations/protests or elections. This includes, for example. It also can refer to a group of people with a shared demographic characteristic, such as migrants or gays or children or Muslims. Finally, it can capture a random individual citizen as long as this person is introduced as a particular example of a larger group or sentiment.	393	3,3
	Public Figure	This captures publically known individuals such as famous authors, comedians, retired politicians, commentators.	157	1,3
	Experts	This category captures individual experts including scientists and economists as well as collective bodies like universities and think tanks.	809	6,9
Polity		This refers to a whole polity like "the EU" (if not referred to the organization specifically), Brazil, the international community', 'the industrialized world', 'the West'. Note that in some case of some specific action, a reference to a country actually captures its government (e.g. "Mexico refuses to sign the Kyoto Protocol", "the EU has imposed sanctions on Iran").	27	,2
Other		Any claimant that does not fall into one of the above categories.	48	,4
Total			11810	100,0

The categorization of actors is partly drawn from previous media content analysis studies, including Europub.com, that highlight prominent actors. It furthermore aims at capturing main actors involved in the 'traditional' cleavages known from the cleav-

age literature (Bartolini, 2000, Flora et al., 1999, Lipset and Rokkan, 1967, Mair, 2005). The list thus includes trade unions and organized business (class cleavage), national and sub-national actors (center-periphery cleavage), secular and religious actors (religious cleavage), farmers (urban – rural cleavage) and, of course, party actors. Furthermore, it includes actors known to be relevant to the political process of globalization including national governments, international organizations and civil society (Held et al., 1999).

Claimant Nationality

This category captures the nationality/citizenship of the claimant. Often, this corresponds closely to the scope of the actor as Mexican government officials tend to have Mexican nationality. However, this is not necessarily the case as migrants acting on a national scope can act in their capacity as foreign nationals, for instance.

Specifically identified countries include the five countries of our case selection, their neighboring countries with more than five million inhabitants as these may be particularly relevant for migratory movements and trade, all countries of NAFTA and the EU that have more than five million inhabitants (e.g. Greece, Portugal), major powers around the globe (e.g. China, India) and countries in which major world events took place in the time of study (e.g. Afghanistan, Libya, Haiti).

Table 11: Claimant Nationality

	Frequency	Percent
Afghanistan	15	,1
Argentina	27	,2
Armenia	5	,0
Austria	16	,1
Azerbaijan	11	,1
Belgium	104	,9
Brazil	52	,4
Bulgaria	48	,4
Canada	38	,3
China	124	1,0
Cuba	31	,3
Czech Republic	59	,5
Denmark	68	,6
Egypt	52	,4
Finland	96	,8

		Frequency	Percent
France		355	3,0
Georgia		8	,1
Germany		1450	12,3
Greece		108	,9
Haiti		6	,1
Hungary		120	1,0
India		57	,5
Indonesia		34	,3
Iran		47	,4
Iraq		8	,1
Ireland		85	,7
Israel		39	,3
Italy		236	2,0
Japan		33	,3
Libya		28	,2
Mexico		1018	8,6
Multinational	(for United Nations, Amnesty International etc., but we coded location of headquarters/stock exchange registration for companies)	690	5,8
Netherlands		190	1,6
Nigeria		15	,1
Oceania		162	1,4
Pakistan		20	,2
Poland		858	7,3
Portugal		127	1,1
Rumania		135	1,1
Russia		108	,9
Slovakia		56	,5
South Africa		46	,4
South Korea		86	,7
Spain		137	1,2
Sweden		143	1,2
Syria		28	,2
Turkey		775	6,6
Ukraine		37	,3
United Kingdom		414	3,5

	Frequency	Percent
USA	1457	12,3
Other Africa	397	3,4
Other Asia	280	2,4
Other Europe	620	5,2
Other Latin America	371	3,1
Other Middle East	95	,8
Unclear	185	1,6
Total	11810	100,0

Additionally, we additionally coded 'Migration Background' for the claimant, when it was a person of clear migratory background (first or second generation), including Turks in Germany and Hispanics in the USA.

Table 11a: Claimant Nationality

	Frequency	Percent
Migration Background	257	2,2

Claimant Party

This variable captures the political party affiliation of the claimant, if applicable. Claimants in official elected function at national level will most likely have a party affiliation in all democratic countries. International claimants will likely have no (relevant) party affiliation. There are exceptions: Members of the European Parliament and Members of the European Commission, for example. For the five countries in our case study, the most important parties are listed. If the specific party is not in this list, we use the party family. The party families are based on recognized international affiliation. Thus, members of parties that belong to the Global Greens are coded as 'green', for instance. The most important parties of the countries in our case study are listed here.

Table 12: Claimant Party

		Frequency	Percent
Germany	CDU/CSU	336	2,8
	Die Grünen	88	,7
	Die Linke	46	,4

		Frequency	Percent
	FDP	47	,4
	NPD	5	,0
	SPD	162	1,4
Mexico	Convergencia	4	,0
	PAN	188	1,6
	PRD	70	,6
	PRI	37	,3
	PT	7	,1
	PVEM	5	,0
Poland	LPR	21	,2
	PiS	135	1,1
	PJN	13	,1
	PO	119	1,0
	PSL	28	,2
	RP	1	,0
	SLD	14	,1
	SP	5	,0
	SRP	16	,1
Turkey	AKP	207	1,8
	BDP	4	,0
	CHP	23	,2
	MHP	3	,0
USA	Democrats	317	2,7
	Republicans	281	2,4
General	Conservative	1053	8,9
	Far Right	251	2,1
	Green	148	1,3
	Liberal	337	2,9

		Frequency	Percent
	Other	This value is further used for other specific parties that do not fit any of the families.	1515 12,8
	Social Democrat		768 6,5
	Socialist		278 2,4
	General Partisan	We use this value for claimants that are clearly partisan in nature, but do not belong to a single family. This might be the case for a coalition government. Also, this applies to partisan claimants that have long upheld certain claims irrespective of the incumbent. For instance “the American Government has criticized China for years on the status of its human rights”.	734 6,2
None		Use this value for claimants that do not hold elected office and have no clear party membership. They might still be a member of a party, but it is not presented as something relevant to the claim.	4544 38,5
Total			11810 100,0

3. Action

Making a claim assumes a form of action on the part of the claimant. In order to be able to communicate a position regarding globalization issues to the wider audience, some form of behavior is required. The action aspect only contains one variable that captures this claimant behavior. The extent to which claimants engage in a variety of social behavior shows us key information about the existence of a possible cleavage and the salience – in terms of mobilization power – of globalization issues. Whether a civil society actor like Human Rights Watch only writes a letter to the Chinese government to object to human rights situations in China or whether it also actively sup-

ports Chinese dissidents in organizing and mobilizing protest tells us something about how seriously they feel about the subject, how much priority it has for them expressed in the amount of resources spent and, thus, in general, how 'important' and 'contested' human rights violations are.

Action

Table 12: Action

		Frequency	Percent
Verbal Statement	This refers to statements presented in quotation marks within newspaper articles and any directly communicated opinion in plenary debates. Also, claims that include speech verbs like 'X said ...', 'X stated that ...', 'X asked ...'.	8402	71,1
Written Statement	This includes claims presented in reports, opinion articles in newspapers etc.	1922	16,3
Executive Action	This captures largely government action. It includes among others ratifying Treaties, deporting migrants, arresting citizens, creating or removing tariffs, starting formal inquiries etc.	494	4,2
Judicial Action	Any action involved in court cases like indictments, prosecutions, court rulings, lawsuits, infringement procedures etc.	196	1,7
Legislative Action	Creating laws, from initial legislative proposals to parliamentary voting to the adoption of resolutions (but not a parliamentary speech, this is a 'Verbal Statement'). It may also include budgetary actions like making government money available for a particular action or research project.	161	1,4
Protest/Violence	This refers to anything happening in the streets, ranging from peaceful protests to civil war. It also includes newer forms of protest such as petitions/mobilization on the internet. It may be targeted at governments or at individuals. Note, however, that we only code actions directed at individuals if these individuals are presented as representatives of a certain group or movement that is relevant to our substantial focus on globalization issues. Thus, murdering a criminal or random bystander is not a claim for our purposes but beating up migrants is, because it is a form of protest against immigration.	308	2,6
Other	Any form of action that does not meet one of the above values or is unclear about action.	327	2,8
Total		11810	100,0

The action variable is one of four core variables. That means that if the same actor engages in two different actions to make otherwise the same substantial claim, we code this as two different claims.

4. Addressee

This aspect refers again to some type of actors. It is similar to the claimant aspects. A detailed description of the meaning of each value can be found in the discussion of the claimant aspect. An addressee is coded whenever the main claimant wants someone else to do something for him or her. The verb 'do' should be interpreted liberally here. For instance, an addressee is coded when a claimant calls upon another actor to change his or her position on a certain topic. This is even done when this reference is a form of criticism, without an explicit call for change of position. An example in a US newspaper: Obama argues that China is inconsistent regarding its trade policy, sometimes giving positive signals on free trade and sometimes giving negative signals. Here, the Chinese government would be coded as addressee, since Obama implicitly calls upon China to present a clear and coherent position regarding free trade and thus to 'do' something for him. However, if Obama were to enact sanctions or trade barriers to Chinese products, the Chinese would rather be the Object than the Addressee. They might be implicitly asked to change their ways, but are primarily on the recipient end of a unilateral action. In practice, it is often a sign of limited power to feature an addressee in a claim. When the claimant is an executive actor, there tends to be no addressee. This is because governments often have the power to do themselves what they want done. It is therefore no surprise to find that governments and other powerful actors are regularly addressees themselves. Other claimants want them to do something for them, because they have the power that the claimant herself lacks. Because of this, the addressee aspect is our operationalization of the allocation of authority that is of theoretical interest to the project. By addressing a particular actor in a claim, the claimant attributes a form of discursive authority to this particular actor as this actor's power is recognized as relevant to achieving what the claimant wants.

Addressees also frequently feature in parliamentary debates and international diplomacy. Here claimants appeal on addressees to join them or agree with them in a particular course of action: "I want you to agree with me" is also a claim with an addressee. Still, many claims do not have addressees. Simple demands for a particular policy often lack addressees. If there is no addressee, we code 'none' on all variables of this aspect.

Addressee Type

Whether the addressee is an individual or an organization and whether they are specific addressees or generic ones is captured by this variable.

Table 14: Addressee Type

		Frequency	Percent
Unorganized	collective or anonymous representatives thereof (e.g., 'farmers', 'a farmer')	982	8,3
Individual	A person speaking on his or her own behalf (e.g., Gunther Grass)	44	,4
Organization	or institution (e.g., the 'National Union of Farmers – NUF') including PR spokespersons.	3512	29,7
Representative	(s) for organization/institution (e.g., 'X, the President of the NUF') but not PR spokespersons.	618	5,2
None	There is no addressee. This automatically means that the values for all other addressee variables should also be 'None'.	6654	56,3
Total		11810	100,0

If the addressee is a specific named actor (either individual or collective), we code the name of the addressee (in Atlas.ti as 'Y. ...'). In practice, we skip this step when we have coded 'unorganized' in the previous variable. Individuals' names are written as "Y. Obama, Barack" and organizations as 'Y. Amnesty International'. We use the English name for international addressees and the original name for national addressees. Note: we code the individual names of organization leaders such as Prime Ministers, Presidents etc. but not for PR spokespersons whose specific job it is to talk to the press on behalf of an organization. Note further that these are the same coding rules as for the claimant name.

Addressee Scope

The coding logic this variable is the same as for the variable claimant scope, with the exception of the added 'none' value.

Table 15: Addressee Scope

	Frequency	Percent
Global	639	5,4
Regional EU/NAFTA	1108	9,4
Regional Other	414	3,5
Bilateral	10	,1
National	2646	22,4
Sub-national	301	2,5

Unclear	50	,4
None	6642	56,2
Total	11810	100,0

Addressee Function

The coding logic is the same as for claimant function, with the exception of the added 'none' value.

Table 16: Addressee Function

		Frequency	Percent
International	International Organization	671	5,7
	IO Secretariat	234	2,0
	IO Council	89	,8
	IO Assembly	170	1,4
	IO Agency	178	1,5
	IO Court	42	,4
	IO Bank	10	,1
National	Government	2483	21,0
	Legislative	318	2,7
	Other Politician(s)	49	,4
	Bureaucracy	88	,7
	Judiciary	97	,8
	Police/Military	120	1,0
	Central Bank	1	,0
Societal	Private Finance	5	,0
	Business	102	,9
	Trade Union	3	,0
	Farmers	10	,1
	Religious Actor	30	,3
	Media/Journalist	26	,2
	Rebels	17	,1
	Civil Society	40	,3
	Citizens/People	130	1,1
	Public Figure	16	,1
Experts	28	,2	

	Frequency	Percent
Polity	176	1,5
Other	24	,2
None	6653	56,3
Total	11810	100,0

Addressee Nationality

Coding logic is the same as for claimant nationality, with the exception of the added 'none' value.

Table 17: Addressee Nationality

	Frequency	Percent
Afghanistan	11	,1
Argentina	5	,0
Austria	2	,0
Azerbaijan	11	,1
Belgium	15	,1
Brazil	13	,1
Bulgaria	22	,2
Canada	9	,1
China	127	1,1
Cuba	15	,1
Czech Republic	3	,0
Denmark	3	,0
Egypt	11	,1
Finland	5	,0
France	75	,6
Georgia	3	,0
Germany	301	2,5
Greece	9	,1
Haiti	2	,0
Hungary	4	,0
India	19	,2
Indonesia	8	,1
Iran	22	,2

	Frequency	Percent
Iraq	5	,0
Ireland	12	,1
Israel	44	,4
Italy	36	,3
Japan	10	,1
Libya	23	,2
Mexico	528	4,5
Multinational	2087	17,7
Netherlands	10	,1
Nigeria	1	,0
Oceania	7	,1
Pakistan	15	,1
Poland	150	1,3
Portugal	2	,0
Rumania	36	,3
Russia	51	,4
Slovakia	2	,0
South Africa	2	,0
South Korea	32	,3
Spain	10	,1
Sweden	12	,1
Syria	33	,3
Turkey	271	2,3
Ukraine	16	,1
United Kingdom	74	,6
USA	706	6,0
Other Africa	40	,3
Other Asia	50	,4
Other Europe	97	,8
Other Latin America	66	,6
Other Middle East	16	,1
Unclear	25	,2
None	6646	56,3
Total	11810	100,0

If there was an addressee and he or she had an explicit migration background, we coded as such.

Table 17a: Addressee Nationality

	Frequency	Percent
Migration Background	4	,0

Addressee Party

Table 18: Addressee Party

		Frequency	Percent
Germany	CDU/CSU	57	,5
	Die Grünen	1	,0
	Die Linke	7	,1
	FDP	6	,1
	NPD	1	,0
	SPD	25	,2
Mexico	PAN	184	1,6
	PRD	12	,1
	PRI	23	,2
Poland	PiS	12	,1
	PO	11	,1
	PSL	1	,0
	SLD	1	,0
	SRP	2	,0
Turkey	AKP	220	1,9
	CHP	4	,0
	MHP	2	,0
USA	Democrats	241	2,0
	Republicans	191	1,6
	Conservative	202	1,7
General	Far Right	20	,2
	Green	1	,0
	Liberal	35	,3
	Social Democrat	75	,6
	Socialist	103	,9
	General Partisan	2008	17,0

	Other	311	2,6
None		8054	68,2
Total		11810	100,0

Addressee Evaluation

This variable captures the opinion of the claimant about the addressee. So, if the addressee is called upon to keep doing what they are doing, this would be 'Positive'. If, on the other hand, the addressee is criticized by the claimant for (not) doing something, we coded 'Negative'. If there is an addressee, but no clear opinion about him/her, the coding is neutral. If there is no addressee: we code 'None'.

Table 19: Addressee Evaluation

		Frequency	Percent
Positive		1091	9,2
Neutral	In case there is an addressee, but no clear evaluation by the claimant.	1247	10,6
Negative		2803	23,7
None	In case there is no addressee.	6669	56,5
Total		11810	100,0

5. Issue

This claim aspect contains two out of four core variables: 'Issue' and 'Position'. Together with 'Claimant' and 'Action' they form the skeleton of every claim. Thus, there has to be an issue in the claim falling into the five issues we analyze in order for it to be coded at all. This makes sense as the claim would otherwise not be interesting to our project.

Any change in the issue and/or the position signifies a new claim. For instance, a change of issue during a speech of a Member of the European Parliament (MEP) demarcates two different claims. This change of issue can even be in the same issue field. But, if the MEP demands a ban on oil imports from Iran to the EU and an EU ban on products from Syria, this is one single claim as the claimant (MEP), the action (Verbal Statement), the issue (Trade - Import) and the position (Demarcate) remain the same. For the sake of convenience, the range of different issues has been divided into five groups representing the five issues: climate change, human rights, migration, regional integration and trade.

Issue

Table 20: Issue

		Frequency	Percent
Climate Change	This issue concerns the unilateral or collaborative combating or mitigation of climate change. It includes claims about direct reduction of greenhouse gasses, carbon tax, cap-and-trade schemes. It can refer to the main international instruments for dealing with climate change: the UNFCCC, the Treaty on Climate Change or the Kyoto Protocol. A claim in favor of collectively binding decisions to address climate change is coded as 'Integrate' because it implies an integration of the social/political/economic system in the global ecology. Claims against adaptations in light of climate change are coded as 'Demarcate'. Note that statements that climate change is or is not happening or man-made are also coded, with the 'Problem' and 'No problem' codes on the position variable. This issue is about the border crossing of pollutants and mechanisms (including financial mechanisms) to combat pollution or avoid its effects. We use this category for general statements and the categories following for specific ones.	921	7,8
	- Effects	464	3,9
	- Emissions	910	7,7
Human Rights	This issue concerns the respect for human rights across the globe, understood as a value regime or global value community. Human rights are probably the most globalized policy field, through the UN declaration of human rights for example. Any violation of human rights such as arbitrary killing or imprisonment of people is considered an attempt to extract a certain country or area from this global value community. This is thus coded as 'Demarcate'. Any protest to uphold or improve human rights is coded as 'Keep Integrated' or 'Integrate'. This issue captures the border crossing of norms. We use this category for general claims if any of the following specific categories does not apply.	964	8,2

		Frequency	Percent
- Due Process	Rights to a fair trial, a lawyer, rule of law, transparent procedures	255	2,2
- Freedom	Freedom of speech, of assembly, of religion, of family life etc.	439	3,7
- Integrity	Right to live, freedom from torture, genocide and inhumane treatment.	632	5,4
- Non-Discrimination	women's rights, children's rights, gay rights, minority rights etc.	861	7,3
Migration	This concerns people crossing borders for political or economic reasons, such as asylum seekers, political refugees and seasonal workers. We also code claims concerning the integration of racial/ethnic/religious minorities (if that group migrated predominantly after World War II). For example, claims about social benefits or integration requirements (language classes etc.) as we assume this either is an indirect claim about migration or may have an effect on it. The claims are directly related to people crossing nation state borders and political instruments related to regulating this. Examples are border patrols, refugee rights, naturalization, individual cases of deportation/extradition. This issue thus concerns the border crossing of people. We use this category for general claims if any of the following specific categories does not apply.	557	4,7
- Citizenship	This concerns the formal rights of migrants to citizenship, asylum, residence permit, voting rights etc.	344	2,9
- Emigration	People leaving the country in question.	181	1,5
- Immigration	People coming into the country in question on temporary or permanent basis.	777	6,6
- Integration	This concerns the participation or social integration of migrants into society. For example through the support or requirement of language courses or limitation of cultural expressions such as head scarfs. Note that claims in favor of assimilation (denying rights to express cultural uniqueness) are coded as 'Demarcate' as it separates the national community from global diversity.	505	4,3

		Frequency	Percent
Regional Integration	This category captures claims about the authority of regional integration regimes. It concerns general questions such as the existence of and participation in governance beyond the state. Also, it includes specific questions such as the powers of supranational institutions, membership of the EU and NAFTA. This issue captures the border crossing of political authority. We use this category for general claims if any of the following specific categories does not apply.	625	5,3
- Membership	These are claims about the membership of one's own or other countries in regional integration schemes.	488	4,1
- Participation	This concerns the balance of power between member states or other groups within the regional integration schemes.	171	1,4
- Power	This concerns claims about the powers of institutions at regional level vis-à-vis the member states.	229	1,9
- Scope	This concerns the different policy fields in which regional institutions have a say.	458	3,9
Trade	This concerns the border crossing of goods and direct governing instruments affecting this: import/export tariffs, subsidies, quotas. It does not concern side effects of trade, such as (re)employment of workers in non-competitive sectors or reduction of company taxes to maintain competitiveness. Claims aimed at freeing up trade, removing barriers etc. are coded as 'Integrate'. Anything from installing protectionist measures to trade sanctions are coded as 'Demarcate' as they aim to restrict the border crossing of goods. We do not code claims concerning the transfer of money. For example, money claims would be claims concerning attracting foreign direct investment or limiting personal transfers. This issue concerns the border crossing of goods. We use this category if claims are about trade in general, if they concern more specific aspects; we use any of the categories below instead.	853	7,2
- Export		244	2,1
- Import		278	2,4
- Specific Sector	For example, claims concerning subsidies for the automobile industry or green energy.	503	4,3

		Frequency	Percent
Globalization	This final, very general code, is only applied when a claim can be identified that clearly concerns integration/demarcation but remains vague about a particular policy field or directly talks of “globalization”, “international interdependence” and similar general terms.	151	1,3
Total		11810	100,0

Problem Scope

Since we conceptualize a difference between cosmopolitanism and communitarianism to include the cognitive reach of the claimants, we also want to measure the scope of the issue. For example, a claim by an American blogger that climate change is a myth fostered by American scientists to keep the government funding their research, is saying that climate change is a national problem. Those that claim migration should be limited for the adverse effects of brain drain on third world countries portray migration as a regional problem. It is not global because it does not specify consequences for the first world. Claims that the human rights situation in Iraq is deteriorating have ‘Foreign’ as problem scope. If the problem is claimed as not affecting the origin polity, we code ‘Foreign’ (also when, for example the problem is regional but does not include the origin country). If the origin country is somehow involved, we chose one of the other codes.

Table 21: Problem Scope

		Frequency	Percent
Global		2278	19,3
Regional EU/NAFTA		2566	21,7
Regional Other		1082	9,2
Foreign	Every issue that is discussed as not affecting the political system where the claim originates. So, claims in US newspapers about problems in the EU are Foreign (not Regional EU/NAFTA). Issues raised in the European Parliament about Libya are foreign, unless it is about migration from Libya to the EU, in which case it would be Regional Other. This category does not apply in UN General Assembly debates.	2260	19,1
Bilateral		529	4,5
National		2554	21,6
Subnational		419	3,5

	Frequency	Percent
Unclear	122	1,0
Total	11810	100,0

Position

This variable concerns the key question of a possible globalization cleavage concerning the openness or permeability of nation-state borders. 'Position' is the fourth core variable of a claim, meaning that a change of position on an issue by a claimant separates one claim from another. The question of integration or demarcation is broadly understood here. Any call for more international collaboration among sovereign states that might be understood as multilateralism, multiculturalism, interventionism or internationalism falls under this, including support for supranational governance. This might concern the acknowledgement of international law, ad hoc cooperation among two or more sovereign states or the membership and powers of international organizations. Calls for increased freedom of movement across nation-state borders of people, goods, capital, services or communication likewise qualify. In contrast, any calls for safeguarding national sovereignty, isolationism, autarky and independence would fall under the demarcation argument.

The variable consists of six values because it is unlikely to find a debate between two actors advocating alternative alterations of the status quo in discursive practice. Rather, a typical debate centers on the question of keeping the status quo as it is or altering it in a certain direction. In practice a debate is thus likely to be between those advocating integration versus those advocating to keep the situation demarcated as it is or between those advocating a move towards further demarcation versus those advocating to keep levels of interaction constant.

The values 'problem' and 'no problem' are only coded if the information provided about the claim does not allow the coding of one of the other four values.

Table 22: Position

		Frequency	Percent
Integrate	Claims to increase multilateralism, international cooperation, intervention and cross border exchange of goods, people, services, influence, pollutants etc.	6024	51,0
Keep integrated	Claims in defense of the status quo where this is portrayed as relatively open or directly in contrast to claims arguing for a change in the status quo towards further demarcation.	1261	10,7
Keep demarcated	Claims in defense of the status quo where this is portrayed as relatively closed or directly in contrast to claims arguing for a change in status quo towards further integration.	766	6,5
Demarcate	Claims in favor of increasing national sovereignty, closing borders, extraction from international obligations or limiting social/political/economic/cultural exchange.	1128	9,6
Problem	We use this code if the claimant clearly communicates that a particular situation is problematic without making clear what should be done about it. Arguments that trade generates inequalities or that climate change is happening and man-made, for example, indicate a certain topic that requires our collective attention without specifying what needs to be done about it.	2132	18,1
No Problem	Here the claimant communicates that there is no problem. This could be a government stating that there are no human rights violations in its country or someone denying that climate change is either happening or man-made. It also applies to someone who is claiming that a particular issue is simply not a priority. For instance, the Indian ambassador to the UN stating that “the real threat to sustainable development is not climate change, but poverty” is – in terms of our codebook – claiming that climate change is not a problem.	499	4,2
Total		11810	100,0

Intervention

This variable captures whether the claim – if realized – means more or less government intervention in society. ‘Government’ is here understood as including international organizations. More intervention can take the form of new policies that contain rules concerning border crossings (stronger border patrols, import levies, CO2 emission limits etc). Less intervention means a removal of government interference in favor of letting markets, individuals, families or other societal actors freely behave as they please. This includes, for example, the removal of obstacles to border crossings and the removal of subsidies.

Table 23: Intervention

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	More Intervention	3004	25,4
	Less Intervention	2004	17,0
	Unclear/Stable	6802	57,6
	Total	11810	100,0

6. Object

This variable concerns the object of a claim or the constituency the claimant is claiming to represent. It answers the question: for whom or in relation to whose interests does the claimant make the claim? It always refers to a group of people (so not 'the environment' for example) that is attributed a shared characteristic in the claim (like gender, nationality, race, age, occupation etc.). If the claim refers to some non-human purpose like 'the environment', this is captured in the justification variable below. Note also that an object is always passive. If a particular group of people is called to action as in "workers around the world: unite!" it would be coded as addressee rather than object.

An object is only coded when the claimant explicitly mentioned a constituency as intended beneficiary of the claim, other than him- or herself. A national government can claim to represent the nation and a trade union can claim to represent workers, a politician can claim to represent her party, but a single farmer cannot claim to represent himself as, in this case, the object is not different from the claimant. The object can be both positively or negatively affected. For instance, arguments that asylum seekers do not have rights and should therefore be deported have 'Ethnic Migrants' as object. If, however, there are two different objects mentioned in the claim, code the one which is most positively mentioned by the claimant. The methodological difference in terms of coding, therefore, between this project and the Europub.com project (Koopmans, 2002a) is three fold: 1) we only code an object if it is explicitly mentioned, 2) we do not code an object if the claimant defends his or her own interests, 3) we prioritize positively evaluated objects over negatively evaluated ones.

The different possible objects listed below correspond to major groups involved in the classic four Rokkanian cleavages as well as broader societal groups involved in the issue fields and in cosmopolitan and communitarian theory.

If there is no Object, all Object variables are coded as 'None'.

Object

Table 24: Object

		Frequency	Percent
Polity	The object of the claim is a polity such as China, the EU.	1248	10,6
Territorial Group	Territorial groups not referred to as a polity such as Latin America, the West, the Middle East, humanity. The scope of that territorial group is specified in the next variable. Thus, this value captures both humanity (global scope), Europeans (regional scope), Germans (national scope) and Bavarians (sub-national scope).	555	4,7
Ethnic Majority	This group is characterized by a common ethnicity forming the majority or dominant group in the polity discussed (e.g. Whites in the USA and Germany)	9	,1
Ethnic Minority	Ethnic group that is either native in the polity in question or migrated predominantly before World War II (e.g. blacks and native Americans in the US)	208	1,8
Ethnic Migrants	Ethnic group having migrated after WWII. Turks in Germany or Hispanics in the US, for example.	1648	14,0
Religious Majority	Group defined primarily by their religion (Catholics, Christians, Muslims etc.) See the discussion on Ethnic groups above for the distinction between majority, minority and migrants.	39	,3
Religious Minority		125	1,1
Religious Migrants		26	,2
Elites	This refers to political or cultural elites. Often portrayed as the opposite of ordinary people. May also be referred to as those in power, for example.	17	,1
Citizens	This captures all references to ordinary people, Joe Shmoe, Otto Normalverbraucher.	862	7,3
Workers	A group of people united by lower socio-economic class, like workers, the poor.	144	1,2
Owners	This captures capitalists, bankers, companies, CEOs and otherwise rich people with money or private sector activity as key characteristic. Thus: the economic elites. Political or cultural elites, however, are captured by 'Elites' instead.	245	2,1
Farmers	Farmers and those working in the agricultural sector plus people living in the countryside or villages.	171	1,4
Other Sectoral	Group sharing a certain occupation other than capitalists, workers and farmers. For example: scientists or renewable energy industry.	206	1,7

		Frequency	Percent
Specific Organization	The group is a specific, named, organization. Examples are: parliament, General Motors, the Turkish Army etc.	87	,7
Gender	Men, women, transgenders and people defined by sexual orientation.	495	4,2
Generation	Children, future generations, pensioners etc.	237	2,0
Individual	This value is used for individually named persons such as a particular asylum seeker or human rights activist. If a few people are specifically named, this value also applies, but not to such generalizations as “the man in the streets” (this is coded as ‘Citizens’).	160	1,4
Criminals	This includes organized and unorganized criminals, outlaws and terrorists.	81	,7
Other		68	,6
None		5179	43,9
Total		11810	100,0

Object Scope

This variable captures the territorial scope of the affected group of people. See the problem scope variable for a specification of the meaning of the different values.

Table 25: Object Scope

	Frequency	Percent
Global	637	5,4
Regional EU/NAFTA	998	8,5
Regional Other	850	7,2
Foreign	1612	13,6
Bilateral	151	1,3
National	1964	16,6
Subnational	300	2,5
Unclear	121	1,0
None	5177	43,8
Total	11810	100,0

Object Evaluation

Does the claimant have the specified object’s best interests in mind? That is the question answered by this variable. If yes: we code ‘Positive’, if no: we code ‘Negative’. If

there is an object but no clear evaluation: we code 'Neutral'. The 'None' code is used when there is no object.

Table 25: Object Evaluation

	Frequency	Percent
Positive	4939	41,8
Neutral	1079	9,1
Negative	596	5,0
None	5196	44,0
Total	11810	100,0

7. Frame

Framing as understood by this study refers to an act of sense-making by the claimant or reporting journalist. Basically, it provides an answer to the question: which organizing idea underlies the claim and/or the wider policy-formulation process it relates to? In other words, how claimants or reporters of claims organize *'[...] an apparently diverse array of symbols, images and arguments, linking them through an underlying organizing idea that suggests what is at stake on the issue'* (Gamson, 2004: 245). Framing may be either cognitive or normative (Surel, 2000). Cognitive framing gives the audience of the claim an indication of how to understand the claim in general and the issue addressed in specific, whereas normative framing provides the audience with a specific reason or justification why the claim is legitimate in the judgment of the claimant. Framing may be explicitly linked by the claimant to the claim. For instance, if a claimant makes an argument like "I want X, because of Y", Y would in this case be the explicit framing. However, framing can take more subtle forms when it is either implicit or external. In implicit framing, the claimant articulates a demand as well as goal or value, but does not clearly link the two through a construction like "... because ..." or "... that is why ...". For example, if a claimant states: "We should all be concerned with preserving our national culture. That is why I care about the education of our children and the preservation of our language. Of particular concern to me is the high number of non-Western immigrants in our country", then she does not literally say that she wants less immigration to preserve national culture, yet we would still code 'culture' as justification. Explicit framing occurs when someone other than the claimant frames the claim. This often happens in newspaper articles, where claims are framed by the journalist reporting on them. For example, if a journalist writes: "In response to the challenge by the social democrats last week, Liberal politician X clarified today, that "my party clearly supports efforts to provide immigrants with a road to citizenship"', then the journalist portrays the claim as occurring as part of partisan conflict, and we code it as such even if the liberal politician does not explicitly state –

or is not quoted as saying – that he responds to the social democrats. There are thus a total of six types of framing as indicated in Table 26.

Table 26: Types of Framing included in the analysis

	Normative	Cognitive
Explicit	Type 1	Type 2
Implicit	Type 3	Type 4
External	Type 5	Type 6

While conducting the frame analysis, preference is given to frames in the order of types as indicated. Thus, preference would be given to a frame of type 1 (a classic justification) while a type 6 frame would only be coded as frame if no other type of frame is present.

Claims in the public sphere can be accompanied by two types of framing: justification and conflict framing. Justifications attempt to further a particular public good for everyone involved as the claimant not only addresses a direct opponent in a debate, but the wider audience as well (Habermas, 1993). This type of framing serves the purpose of sense-making and consensus formation. The claim is presented as an attempt at maximizing benefits for everyone with reference to a political good that few people oppose.

However, claims may also serve the purpose of accentuating difference thus contributing to identity politics in establishing ‘in-groups’ and ‘out-groups’ (Tajfel and Turner, 2004). It is inherent in human nature to seek to distinguish oneself from others, create dichotomous opposing camps like ‘good’ and ‘bad’, ‘government’ and ‘opposition’, ‘left’ and ‘right’. Thereby, they follow the “law of group polarization” (Sunstein, 2002). In these cases, the claim is presented as a case of conflict or ‘zero-sum game’ where the realization of a claim automatically means victory or gain for some and defeat or loss for others. This is here referred to as ‘conflict framing’. As a rule of thumb, claims containing an addressee that is negatively evaluated also have a conflict framing. A particular claim can have a justification and/or conflict frame but it does not necessarily do so.

Justification

We follow Table 27 below to identify possible justifications. If there is more than one justification present, we code the one of the ‘lowest’ type (Type 1 has priority over Type 2 etc.). If there is more than one justification present of the same type, we code the one that is considered the ultimate goal. The claim: “the most efficient way to

wealth goes through free trade” has both the ‘efficiency’ and the ‘economic prosperity’ frame, but the latter is the ultimate goal, so we code only the latter.

Following the distinction by Habermas (1993), we separate ‘moral’ justifications which state a general universal value, ‘ethical’ justifications which articulate group-specific values and ‘instrumental’ justifications, which serve a not always mentioned higher purpose (Forst, 2007: 68).

Table 27: Justification

			Frequency	Percent
Moral	Equality	This refers to equal chances, equal wealth, equal human value or equal treatment in either the political or the economic sense of equality.	610	5,2
	Freedom	Removing obstacles in economic, political or other form to human self-fulfillment.	392	3,3
	Justice	Rule of law, transparent or predictable procedures, getting one’s due, ‘fairness’ etc.	560	4,7
	Democracy	Reference to procedural legitimacy like voting, accountability, transparency, elections, one person – one vote, majority rule, executing the will of the people etc.	341	2,9
Ethical	Tolerance	Respect for others, allowing difference	180	1,5
	Solidarity	Help others in need or an appeal to others to help oneself in need. Always as voluntary action. If solidarity is mandatory through some formal agreement, we code either necessity or justice.	215	1,8
	Culture	Upholding traditions, acting in accordance with habits etc.	296	2,5
	Patriotism	This refers to justifications such as ‘serving your country’, ‘being a good citizen’ etc.	55	,5
	Human Dignity	Justifications about preservation and establishment of human dignity, humane conditions, basic living conditions.	162	1,4
	Sovereignty	Justifications on the importance of state or collective sovereignty, and conditions for challenging this.	197	1,7
Instrumental	Necessity	Following some kind of obligation, legal or otherwise or presenting an action as ‘without alternatives’.	761	6,4

		Frequency	Percent
Safety	This refers to the integrity of persons, states or other bodies from threats like war, violence, terrorism, extinction. This captures most 'security' concerns and survival arguments.	1005	8,5
Economic Prosperity	All claims presented to foster wealth, prosperity, richness, economic growth.	1481	12,5
Efficiency/ Effectiveness	Justification in terms of the quickest or cheapest way to achieve a particular goal, without specifying what that ultimate goal is in terms of any other justification.	472	4,0
Consistency	Agreement between promise and action. Doing what was said. Claimants often challenge each other for not being consistent even if they do not agree with the original positions. Criticism of 'flip-floppers' or 'lying' fall into this justification.	455	3,9
Sustainable Development	This refers to safeguarding the environment. If talking about eliminating poverty, code 'Equality' instead. If talking about economic progress without the loss of cultural distinctiveness, code 'Culture'.	545	4,6
Progress	General references to 'moving forward', not being backwards, modernization etc., but not justifications of economic progress (they are under 'Economic Prosperity')	265	2,2
Other Justification		233	2,0
None		3585	30,4
Total		11810	100,0

Justification Specification

To separate when cosmopolitans and communitarians use similar justification in different ways or meanings, we further specify moral justifications in terms of two dimensions. First, we code whether the justification refers to a right or a need or desire. Second, we code whether the entity which possesses a right or a need/desire is an individual/individuals or a collective/community.

We add this code – possibly – only to claims that have been coded to contain 'moral' justifications. This specification is done 'conservatively'. That is, we only code one of

the six categories if the justification in question clearly rules out the other five as possibilities.

In cases where the claimant is an organized collective actor, additional rules apply. Some claimants, like a company, a trade union or a government make individual justifications if they refer to their own (or generic) needs and rights or collective justifications if they refer to a constituency.

We code individual if the justification concerns either a specific individual or an aggregation of individuals that are not presented in the statement as a collective (e.g. the poorest in the country; the security of those who work in old buildings etc.) having rights or needs. We code own collective if the justification refers to a group/or a set of individuals that is presented as a community with the ability to act collectively where the claimant is a part of, or a direct representative of (e.g. the Kurds, the working class etc.) We code other collective if the justification (also) recognizes the rights or needs of a group or collective to which the claimant does not belong. We code rights if the justification explicitly refers to a right of an individual or a group to get something. “Any other procedure would violate her right to free speech”. We code a need/desire if the justification refers to an articulated need or desire, e.g. “We need a space for open debate” or “The workers want to have their fair share of the growth”. The two examples show that we look at what is explicitly said.

Table 27: Justification Specification

		Frequency	Percent
Individual - Needs	Individual needs (e.g. my company needs export subsidies to survive, creating a level playing field)	51	,4
Individual - Rights	Individual Rights (e.g. free speech, citizens’ right to vote)	490	4,1
Other Collective - Needs	Recognition of the needs of others (e.g. US President Bush claiming that NAFTA is good for both the US and Mexico)	161	1,4
Other Collective - Rights	Recognition of the rights of others (e.g. an ethnic Turk claiming Kurds have a right to legal counsel in their own language)	242	2,0
Own Collective - Needs	Collective needs of the claimants group (e.g. there is need to protect our national culture)	106	,9
Own Collective - Rights	Collective Rights for the claimants group (e.g. we have a right to collective self-determination)	89	,8
None		10671	90,4
Total		11810	100,0

Conflict Frame

Our interest in conflict framing is particularly driven by the question of whether a globalization cleavage is linked to previously existing global and national societal conflicts. This variable captures the extent to which claims on globalization issues are related to such conflicts either by identifying a certain ‘good guys’ group or a ‘bad guys’ group or by simply spelling out the opposing factions on a particular issue. We only code conflict framing if it involves societal groups. Conflicts between individuals like a single migrant against another, the state against one of its citizens, or two would-be leaders trying to become party leader are not coded as conflict framing. Note that, in comparison to the original variable used for the intercoder reliability test, the code ‘center – periphery’ was split into three to indicate whether this occurred at global, regional or national scale. Also, for subsequent quantitative analysis, the ‘class conflict’ and ‘partisan conflict’ codes should be combined because of reliability issues.

Table 28: Conflict Frame

		Frequency	Percent
International Conflict	Sovereign states against each other, either individually or in groups like ‘US vs. Iraq’ or ‘industrialized countries vs. G77’.	1056	8,9
Center - Periphery Global	Global North against global south or ‘West vs. Rest’ in economic terms. Also, permanent Security Council members against others.	300	2,5
Center - Periphery Regional	Core regional powers against peripheral countries, like large EU member states against small ones.	98	,8
Transnational Conflict	Conflict involving groups that act across state borders like ‘EU citizens vs. The financial sector’ or ‘Kurds from Iraq, Iran and Turkey vs. the Turkish state’. Also conflict involving International Organizations like the WTO vs. USA.	682	5,8
Institutional Conflict	Pitting institutions against one another with unclear or less dominant partisan division. Example: US President against Congress	146	1,2
Class Conflict	Workers vs. Capital. Economic winners vs. Economic losers etc.	176	1,5
Partisan Conflict	Conflicts centering around political parties, like Government vs. Opposition, Left vs. Right or intra-party conflict involving different factions within a party.	536	4,5
Center - Periphery National	Conflicts involving territorial state sub-units against the central government or against each other.	136	1,2
Elites vs. Citizens	Main protagonists are portrayed to be citizens or ‘the people’ versus those in power.	658	5,6

		Frequency	Percent
Ethnic Conflict	Conflict within a single state pitching different ethnic groups against each other.	474	4,0
Gender Conflict	Men vs. women, battle of the sexes or emancipation based justification with clear conflictual undertone.	300	2,5
Generational Conflict	Pitting elderly against young or current generations against future ones.	19	,2
Religious Conflict	Secular vs. Religious, Orthodox vs. Liberal religious groups, Christians vs. Islam etc.	309	2,6
Crime Fighting	Main dividing line portrayed as between those operating within the law against those outside it	411	3,5
Extremism	Pragmatic forces of compromise against extremists or radicals and extremist thought	13	,1
Other Conflict		287	2,4
None		6209	52,6
Total		11810	100,0

Intercoder Reliability Test

The intercoder reliability test was conducted as in the Europub.com project (Koopmans, 2002b). First, we analyze the correlation coefficient of *unitizing*. That is, the selection of claims in documents. A random sample of seven articles from the Washington Post was drawn in which all our five issue areas were represented using the same sampling criteria and search string as used for the research in general. Within these articles a total of 114 claims were identified by one or more coders.

Seven coders participated in the test representing all of our five country case studies as well as the EU and UN levels. For each of the potential claims, the majority was taken as the norm and the minority as deviation. Of the total 637 decisions, 146 were minority decisions. This corresponds to a unitizing reliability correlation of .88 which we take to clearly meet reliability requirements.

Table 29: Intercoder reliability test results – Unitizing

Coders		7
Total nr of claims		91
Decisions to be made:	Σ decisions per coder	637
Minority decisions:		146
Match:	(637-146)/637	77%

Correlation:

Sqrt .77

.88

Subsequently, the claims that a majority of coders recognized as a claim (a total of 27) were coded in the second step of the intercoder reliability test. All the variables that contain closed list multinomial categories were included in the test. A total of 189 decisions are made per variable (27 claims times 7 coders). Again, the majority is taken as the norm and minority decisions as deviations. In case there was no majority for a single code, all decisions would be counted as minority decisions. Because a substantial number of variables contain a large number of categories, it presents a fairly tough test. Since chance agreements are relatively low in multinomial variables with large numbers of categories, coefficients that compensate for chance such as Krippendorff's alpha or Fleiss' Kappa are unnecessary. These are even problematic in this case since they do not encompass categories not used by any of the coders in the test nor do they acknowledge the theoretically relevant inclusion of 'absent' or 'non-applicable' categories in variables such as the addressee, object and justification variables that may or may not be present in a claim where absence is a theoretically meaningful finding (Krippendorff, 2011). We therefore report percentage agreement and correlation as reliability indicators (cf. Koopmans, 2002b).

Table 30: Intercoder reliability test results – Variables

Variable	Total Decisions	Minority Decisions	Match	Agreement Correlation
Origin	189	0	1.00	1.00
Year	189	0	1.00	1.00
Source	189	0	1.00	1.00
Claimant Type	189	21	.89	.94
Claimant Scope	189	23	.88	.94
Claimant Function	189	21	.89	.94
Claimant Nationality	189	5	.97	.99
Claimant Party	189	41	.78	.88
Action	189	15	.92	.96
Addressee Type	189	54	.71	.85
Addressee Scope	189	48	.75	.86
Addressee Function	189	38	.80	.89
Addressee Nationality	189	47	.75	.87

Variable	Total Decisions	Minority Decisions	Match	Agreement Correlation
Addressee Party	189	49	.74	.86
Addressee Evaluation	189	44	.77	.88
Issue	189	59	.69	.83
(Issue regrouped)	189	7	.96	.98
Issue Scope	189	25	.87	.93
Position	189	50	.74	.86
Intervention	189	62	.67	.82
Object	189	50	.74	.86
Object Scope	189	41	.78	.88
Object Evaluation	189	50	.74	.86
Justification	189	108	.43	.65
(Justification regrouped)	189	57	.70	.84
Conflict Frame	189	81	.57	.76
(Conflict Frame regrouped)	189	51	.73	.85

As can be seen in the results, the majority of variables directly meet generally accepted reliability standards of the dual threshold of correlation at or above .80 and agreement at or above .70 (Lombard et al., 2002: 593). The variables *O. Issue*, *V. Justification* and *W. Conflict Frame* do not meet this requirement. We attribute this to the fact that each contains several categories that may be conceptually distinct, yet in practice quite close to each other. For example, there was a discussion containing several claims on the naturalization of immigrants in the US which some coders identified as concerning the issue of citizenship while others identified them as concerning the issue of immigration. However, all coders agreed the claims in this discussion fall into the issue area of migration. Similarly, claims regarding the expansion of US human rights policy to include promotion of democracy and development were variously identified by coders to contain justifications of democracy, freedom or equality. Yet, there was agreement that these claims were justified using the core set of moral values common to both cosmopolitanism and communitarianism: equality, freedom, justice and democracy. Note that the regrouping of these variables is done without loss of theoretical conceptual meaning or rigor. The agreement at the aggregate level is reflected in the significantly improved reliability of the regrouped variables *O.*, *V.* and *W.*

in comparison to the original categories of these variables. For the purposes of analysis, it is therefore suggested to interpret the original categories only for qualitative analysis, while relying on the regrouped variables for quantitative analysis.

This leaves open one variable that does not meet reliability standards and which cannot be regrouped in a theoretically meaningful way: *R. Intervention*. We suggest to use caution and modesty in the interpretation of this variable. Although we did not conduct intercoder reliability tests for each issue separately, the experience of coding teaches that the reliability of this variable greatly fluctuates across issues. Since *Intervention* largely captures the desired extent of state intervention in society and the market, it is more easily applicable to economic issues than to non-economic ones. Thus, it can be meaningfully interpreted for claims on trade and climate change, while we advise against using it for the claims on human rights. Migration and regional integration fall in between these categories, as some of these claims are closer to economics than others.

References

- Bartolini, S. (2000) *The Political Mobilization of the European Left, 1860–1980: The Class Cleavage*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Bartolini, S. & Mair, P. (1990) *Identity, Competition and Electoral Availability. The Stabilisation of European Electorates, 1885–1985*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Beisheim, M., Dreher, S., Walter, G., Zangl, B. & Zürn, M. (1999) *Im Zeitalter der Globalisierung? Thesen und Daten zur gesellschaftlichen und politischen Denationalisierung*, Baden-Baden, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Berkhout, J. & Sudulich, L. (2011) Codebook for Political Claims Analysis. *SOM Working Papers*. Neuchatel, University of Neuchatel.
- De Wilde, P. (2010) *How Politicisation Affects European Integration. Contesting the EU Budget in the Media and Parliaments of the Netherlands, Denmark and Ireland*, Oslo, Unipub.
- De Wilde, P. (2013) Representative Claims Analysis: Theory Meets Method. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20, 278–294.
- De Wilde, P. & Zürn, M. (2013) Debating Globalization: Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism as Political Ideologies. *unpublished manuscript, WZB*.
- Erzeel, S. (2011) Vertegenwoordigende Claims en de Substantiële Vertegenwoordiging van Vrouwen in de Kamer. *Res Publica*, 53, 429–450.
- Flora, P., Kuhnle, S. & Urwin, D. W. (Eds.) (1999) *State Formation, Nation-Building, and Mass Politics in Europe. The Theory of Stein Rokkan*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Forst, R. (2007) *Das Recht auf Rechtfertigung. Elemente einer Konstruktivistischen Theorie der Gerechtigkeit*, Frankfurt a. M., Suhrkamp.
- Gamson, W. A. (2004) Bystanders, Public Opinion, and the Media. IN Snow, D. A., Soule, S. A. & Kriesi, H. (Eds.) *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing.
- Habermas, J. (1993) *Justification and Application. Remarks on Discourse Ethics*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Gloldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations. Politics, Economics and Culture*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press.
- Koopmans, R. (2002a) Codebook for the Analysis of Political Mobilisation and Communication in European Public Spheres. *Europub.com Project*.
- Koopmans, R. (2002b) *Europub.com WP2 Reliability Test*.
- Koopmans, R. & Statham, P. (1999) Political Claims Analysis: Integrating Protest Event and Political Discourse Approaches. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, 4, 203–221.
- Koopmans, R. & Statham, P. (Eds.) (2010) *The Making of a European Public Sphere. Media Discourse and Political Contention*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Koopmans, R., Statham, P., Giugni, M. & Passy, F. (2005) *Contested Citizenship. Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (2011) Agreement and Information in the Reliability of Coding. *Annenberg School for Communication, Departmental Papers (ASC)*. University of Pennsylvania.

- Lipset, S. M. & Rokkan, S. (1967) Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: an Introduction. IN Lipset, S. M. & Rokkan, S. (Eds.) *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*. New York, Free Press.
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J. & Bracken, C. C. (2002) Content Analysis in Mass Communication. Assessment and Reporting of Intercoder Reliability. *Human Communication Research*, 28, 587-604.
- Mair, P. (2005) Cleavages. IN Katz, R. S. (Ed.) *Handbook of Party Politics*. London, Sage.
- Peterson, M. J. (2007) General Assembly. IN Weiss, T. G. & Daws, S. (Eds.) *Oxford Handbook on the United Nations*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Saward, M. (2010) *The Representative Claim*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Severs, E. (2010) Representation as Claims-making: Quid Responsiveness? *Representation*, 46, 411-423.
- Statham, P. (2005) Forging Divergent and 'Path Dependent' Ways to Europe?: Political Communication over European Integration in the British and French Public Spheres. *European Political Communication Working Paper Series*. EurPolCom, University of Leeds.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2002) The Law of Group Polarization. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 10, 175-195.
- Surel, Y. (2000) The Role of Cognitive and Normative Frames in Policy-Making. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7, 495-512.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (2004) An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. IN Hatch, M. J. & Schultz, M. (Eds.) *Organizational Identity. A Reader*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Vetters, R., Jentgens, E. & Trenz, H.-J. (2006) Exploring the EU's Social Constituency: Patterns of Public Claims-making in Constitutional Debates in France and Germany. *ARENA Working Paper Series*. Oslo, ARENA, University of Oslo.

Appendix I: Examples of Claims

To illustrate our codebook in practice, we here list a few examples of how parts of texts are coded. Each example is drawn from a different piece of original text, indicating the number of claims it contains in brackets. The original text is placed within quotation marks (« ... »). Following the original text is the source listed from which it is drawn. Subsequently, the contained claims are listed in terms of their codes following the order of the codebook. Names of claimant and addressee are indicated within brackets if they have been coded.

Example 1 (1 Claim):

«Mr. Kohona (Sri Lanka) called for the early establishment of a fund to address the impacts of climate change. His Government also endorsed the establishment of a global partnership to synergize investment in climate change mitigation, as the private sector could be a major catalyst in addressing global warming through corporate social responsibility.»

UN General Assembly Debate – 8 December 2010

Claim by Kohona:

Location: UN |2010|General Assembly
Claimant: Representative|National|Government|Other Asia|General Partisan|(Sri Lanka)
Action: Verbal Statement
Addressee: None|None|None|None|None|None
Issue: Climate Change - Effects|Global|Integrate|More Intervention
Object: Owners|Unclear|Positive|
Frame: Solidarity|None

Example 2 (1 Claim):

«Since winning her asylum case in 2009 with the help of the Whitman-Walker Health clinic in the District, Villalta (transgender US immigrant from San Salvador) has dedicated much of her life to providing guidance to gay and transgender Latino immigrants who find themselves in a foreign land with little or no knowledge of the language, the culture or the services that can help them find peace with who they really are. »

The Washington Post – 19 December 2011

Claim by Villalta:

Location: USA|2011|Washington Post
Claimant: Individual|Unclear|Citizens/People|Other Latin America|None
Action: Other
Addressee: None|None|None|None|None|None
Issue: Migration - Integration|National|Integrate|Unclear
Object: Ethnic - Migrants|National|Positive
Frame: Equality|None

Example 3 (1 Claim):

«The "global economy" is not based on the "harmony of interests" once envisioned by 19th century classical liberals, but on cut-throat competition. Winners and losers in these commercial contests impact the national societies in which they operate. Where factories and research labs are located, where high-skilled jobs and workers reside, where income is earned, spent and invested and where education and enterprise are fostered make all the difference in the world. There is no world community in any meaningful sense. Energetic nations rise, complacent ones decline. If globalization is anything more than a catch phrase, it means the age-old struggle for wealth and power is now waged worldwide. It matters more than ever who comes out ahead.»

Commentary by William Hawkins, The Washington Times – 30 July 2007

Claim by Hawkins:

Location: USA|2007|Washington Times
Claimant: Individual|Unclear|Media/Journalist|USA|None|(Hawkins, William)
Action: Written Statement
Addressee: None|None|None|None|None|None
Issue: Globalization|Global|Problem|Unclear
Object: Polity|National|Positive
Frame: None|International Conflict

Example 4 (2 Claims):

«David Martin, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, let me add my congratulations to Daniel Caspary for his report and for his cooperation. I welcome the report and the Commission's communication on the future of EU trade policy. As the rapporteur points out, the harsh reality is that the EU share of global trade is declining, and without action it will continue to decline. Thirty-six million jobs in the European Union depend on external trade. Unless we boost our exports, there will be no economic recovery. Job creation and poverty alleviation at home and abroad must be at the core of our global trade strategy.

The report acknowledges, as Mrs Saïfi has just said, that trade is not an end in itself. It can, of course, be a driver for growth, which, in turn, fuels prosperity and rising living standards, but trade is also influenced by, and can influence, human rights standards, labour standards, environmental standards, and they must be key components of our trade policy, not as an alternative to trade liberalisation, but as a key component of it. We need policy coherence between our trade policy, our development policy, our environmental, social and labour policies. The promotion of fair trade is already benefiting around 7.5 million people across 58 developing countries. I hope the Commission will listen to Parliament and continue to promote fair-trade policies. »

European Parliament – 27 September 2011

1st claim by Martin:

Location: EU|2011|European Parliament
Claimant: Representative|Regional EU/NAFTA|IO Assembly|United Kingdom|Social Democrat| (S&D)
Action: Verbal Statement
Addressee: None|None|None|None|None|None
Issue: Trade – Export|Global|Integrate|Unclear
Object: Polity|Regional EU/NAFTA|Positive
Frame: Economic Prosperity|None

2nd claim by Martin:

Location: EU|2011|European Parliament
Claimant: Representative|Regional EU/NAFTA|IO Assembly|United Kingdom|Social Democrat|(S&D)
Action: Verbal Statement
Addressee: Organization|Regional EU/NAFTA|IO Secretariat|Multinational|General Partisan|Positive|(European Commission)
Issue: Trade|Global|Keep Integrated|Unclear

Object: Workers|Global|Positive
Frame: Justice| None

Example 5 (3 claims):

«In Abbeville, a city of 25,000 on the Somme River, numerous jobless workers who say they feel betrayed by the European Union, globalization and deindustrialization are turning not to the Socialist Party, but to the National Front, which promises a kind of patriotic focus on French jobs, French pride and French money. Some who once voted Communist now join others who are traditionally on the right -- like the hunting and fishing lovers who abound here -- to support Ms. Le Pen.

The leftist newspaper Liberation caused a fuss here last month with a long article about Abbeville, describing it as a prototypical French town, white, peaceful and provincial, embracing the National Front. A front-page headline in the local newspaper, Le Journal d'Abbeville, asked "Abbeville, City of Racists and Rednecks?"

Local leaders of the National Front think the article was exaggerated. Michel Chevalier, 63, is the party's treasurer for the Somme district. "It's a very Parisian view," he said. "There are very few rednecks and racists here." People are turning to his party "because they are disappointed with both the politicians and the unions," he said. Workers "are sick of paying for people who aren't working, and I'm not speaking just of immigrants," he said.

But immigration is an issue, said his colleague, Christian Mandosse, 51, who runs a party Web site. People are tired of "France importing the unemployed and their families," he said, especially those who do not share French "culture, values and religion".»

The New York Times – 6 February 2012

Claim by numerous jobless workers:

Location: USA|2012|New York Times
Claimant: Unorganized|Sub-national|Citizens/People|France|None
Action: Other
Addressee: Organization|National|France|Far Right|Positive| (Front National)
Issue: Globalization|Foreign|Demarcate|More Intervention
Object: None|None|None
Frame: Consistency|Elites vs. Citizens

Claim by National Front:

Location: USA|2012|New York Times
Claimant: Organization|National|Legislative|France|Far Right|(Front National)
Action: Verbal Statement
Addressee: None|None|None|None|None|None
Issue: Globalization|Foreign|Demarcate|More Intervention
Object: Polity|Foreign|Positive
Frame: Patriotism|Partisan Conflict

Claim by Mandosse:

Location: USA|2012|New York Times
Claimant: Representative|National|Legislative|France|Far Right|(Front National)
Action: Verbal Statement
Addressee: None|None|None|None|None|None
Issue: Migration – Immigration|Foreign|Demarcate|More Intervention
Object: Citizens|Foreign|Positive
Frame: Culture|Ethnic Conflict

Appendix II: Data Availability

To facilitate the coding process, we used the software program Atlas.ti. All the original documents are included in there and the claims are found as so called 'quotations'. To facilitate this coding, each of the variables were attributed a letter, which then also applied to all the categories within that variable. The correspondence between code-book variables and their letters in Atlas.ti is contained in the table below.

Table 31: Variables and coding in Atlas.ti

Variable	Atlas.ti
Origin	Z
Year	A
Source	B (and B1)
Claimant Type	C
Claimant Scope	D
Claimant Function	E
Claimant Nationality	F
Claimant Migration Background	F.M
Claimant Party	G
Claimant Name	X
Action	H
Addressee Type	I
Addressee Scope	J
Addressee Function	K
Addressee Nationality	L
Addressee Migration Background	L.M
Addressee Party	M
Addressee Evaluation	N
Addressee Name	Y
Issue	O
Problem Scope	P
Position	Q
Intervention	R
Object	S
Object Scope	T
Object Evaluation	U
Justification	V
Justification Specification	VII
Conflict Frame	W

The Atlas.ti file allows tracing individual claims to their original context through Boolean search operators. It also contains brief summaries of each coded document in English, including the title of the document and its basic content.

The data is also available in standard spreadsheet format to enable quantitative analysis through SPSS or STATA software, with variables in columns and claims in rows.

Discussion Papers of the Research Area International Politics and Law
2014

Research Unit: **Global Governance**

Jens Steffek

SP IV 2014-101

The Democratic Output Legitimacy of International Organizations

Pieter de Wilde, Ruud Koopmans and Michael Zürn

SP IV 2014-102

The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitan-ism and Communitarianism:
Representative Claims Analysis

All discussion papers are downloadable:

www.wzb.eu/en/publications/discussion-papers/international-politics-and-law