

MERCI

MOBILISATION ON ETHNIC RELATIONS, CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

+ PIM FORTUYN

CODEBOOK

FOR THE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL CLAIMS-MAKING

Final Version

By

Ruud Koopmans, Paul Statham,
Marco Giugni, Florence Passy, Thom Duyvené de Wit

NOTE: Non-MERCI members are allowed to draw on this codebook for their own research purposes, provided that they make appropriate reference to this source. This applies to the general structure of claims coding as well as to individual variables and category systems. Please also refer to: Ruud Koopmans and Paul Statham 1999. "Political Claims Analysis: Integrating Protest Event and Public Discourse Approaches". Mobilization 4(2): 203-222.

A note on the structure of claims

An instance of claim-making (shorthand: a claim) is a unit of strategic action in the public sphere. It consists of the expression of a political opinion by some form of physical or verbal action, regardless of the form this expression takes (statement, violence, repression, decision, demonstration, court ruling, etc. etc.) and regardless of the nature of the actor (governments, social movements, NGO's, individuals, anonymous actors, etc. etc.). Note that decisions and policy implementation are defined as special forms of claim-making, namely ones that have direct effects on the objects of the claim.

Inspired by Franzosi's idea to use the structure of linguistic grammar to code contentious events, we have broken down the structure of the summary codes into five claim elements, for each of which a number of summary variables has been constructed:

1. Claimants: the actor or actors making the claim (WHO makes the claim?)
2. Form of the claim (HOW, by which action is the claim inserted in the public sphere?)
3. The addressee of the claim (AT WHOM is the claim directed?)
4. The substantive content of the claim (WHAT action is to be undertaken?)
5. The object of the claim (TO WHOM is this action directed?)
6. Frame: The justification for the claim (WHY should this action be undertaken?)

The ideal-typical claim in the public sphere has all these five elements, for instance:

WHO	HOW	AT WHOM	WHAT	TO WHOM	WHY
The Turkish Community	Issues a statement	asking the government	to introduce Turkish as a second foreign language in schools	(for the benefit of pupils of Turkish origin)	because this improves integration
The CDU	Issues a statement	urging the SPD	to agree to a constitutional change	in the rights of asylum seekers	because otherwise the population will support the extreme right

In grammatical terms, we may write such claims as a SUBJECT-ACTION-INDIRECT OBJECT-ACTION-OBJECT sequence: an actor, the subject, undertakes some sort of action in the public sphere to get another actor, the addressee, to do something regarding a third actor, the object. Many claims are not as differentiated as this type. The only information we always need for coding is information on HOW (some sort of act in the public sphere has to be identifiable) and the TO WHOM. All other elements may be missing. The brackets in the final column of the first example indicate that the "to whom" part is sometimes implicitly implied in the what. We have coded only political claims (not statements like "last month, numbers of asylum seekers increased by 50 percent") and, thus, by definition they must affect somebody's interests. Second, the definition of our thematic field demands that claims are related to the regulation of immigration, ethnic relations, xenophobia, etc., and thus claims must necessarily affect either some migrant or minority group, or some racist or xenophobic group. This implies that the "to whom" part must, at least for claims in the thematic field be identifiable (for other claims, we will not code object actors).

WHO	HOW	AT WHOM	WHAT	TO WHOM	WHY
	sets fire			to an asylum seeker centre	
The government	decides		to deport	Kurdish refugees	
The Jewish Council	issues a statement		to reject	anti-Semitism (i.e., against xenophobes)	

The first row of the second table gives the common example of many acts of xenophobic violence, where we know the act (arson) and the target (an asylum seeker centre), but do not know who did it, nor have explicit substantive information on the claim. The second example is common for state actors, who do not have to make claims on others to do something, but can directly make binding claims. Addressees may, however, as in the third example, also be absent when actors simply venture an opinion, without proposing any concrete policies, let alone who should implement them (in a wider sense, even such claims have an addressee, namely “the public”, if the claimant would not want to address anybody, he would not have bothered to venture his opinion in public).

Note that, while inspired by the idea of linguistic grammar, the way we code claims does not usually literally coincide with the grammatical structure of the media text. In the case of "John hits Peter" such coincidence is given: John is subject actor/nominative case, Peter is object actor/accusative case. However, in: "John gives the book to Peter", the book is in accusative case, but we would still code Peter as the object actor because he benefits from John's action. In trying to identify who is subject actor, addressee and object actor, it is perhaps helpful to use the following sentence as a model, and try to translate your media text in a similar form: "John asks Jim to give the book to Peter": John is subject actor, Jim is addressee, Peter is object actor, 'to give the book' is the issue, and 'asks' is the form. Examples with similar structures: "George Bush (John) demanded from (asks) the Taliban government (Jim) to extradite (to give the book to) Osama Bin Laden (Peter)"; "Schröder (John) assured (asks) Bush (Jim) of his full support for military action against (to give the book to) the Afghan regime (Peter)"; "Chirac (John) criticized (asks) Blair (Jim) for blocking the decision-making process (to give the book to) in the European Union (Peter)".

In the following, the summary variables have been grouped according to these five elements.

Units of analysis and their delineation

The unit of analysis are instances of claim-making. Above, we have defined an instance of claim-making (shorthand: a claim) as the expression of a political opinion by physical or verbal action in the public sphere. This definition implies two important delimitations: (1) instances of claim-making must be the result of purposive strategic action of the claimant and (2) they must be political in nature.

Ad (1) To qualify as an instance of claim-making, the text must include a reference to an ongoing or concluded physical or verbal action in the public sphere, i.e. simple attributions of attitudes or opinions to actors by the media or by other actors do not count as claim-making. Examples: “The Greens, who want to extend recognition to people persecuted by non-state organizations...”, or “Mr. Blair’s pro-European course may have cost him votes in the last elections”. Both do not qualify as claim-making by the Greens or Mr. Blair, respectively (nor are they claims by the journalist). [Note that, by contrast, the sentences "The Greens, who said they wanted to extend recognition to people persecuted by non-state organizations..." and "Mr. Blair's pro-European speech a week before the election may have cost him

votes" would have qualified as instances of claim-making because they contain references to actual verbal action by these actors].

Verbs indicating action include, e.g., said, stated, demanded, criticized, decided, demonstrated, published, voted, wrote, arrested. Nouns directly referring to such action include, e.g., statement, letter, speech, report, blockade, deportation, decision. In short: anything that fits into one of the categories in the FORM variable. The occurrence in the report of such verbs or nouns is a precondition for the coding of a claim. Reports that only refer to 'states of mind' or motivations should not be coded (e.g., references such as want, are in favour of, oppose, are reluctant to, are divided over). However, if 'state of mind' references of the latter type are part of the coverage of a claim according to the action criterion they may be taken into account in coding the claim variables. Example: "The Greens said they wanted to extend recognition to people persecuted by non-state organizations. They feel this follows from Germany's obligations under the Geneva Convention". Although 'feel' is a state of mind verb, the sentence here clearly is a further specification of the first sentence, which does contain an action verb. Therefore the reference to the Geneva Convention can be coded as part of the claim.

Speculations about opinions or actions of others do not count as claim-making. I.e., an analyst's statement that the European Central Bank will probably soon cut its interest rates is neither a claim by the ECB (after all, it hasn't done anything yet), nor by the analyst, because statements about what other actors will do and why are NOT claims (statements about what other actors SHOULD do, are, however).

Also not coded as claims are verbal statements by anonymous actors for which neither the name, nor the institutional affiliation, nor the social group to which they belong is mentioned, e.g. "reform-minded voices in Europe are calling for...", or "critics of a federal Europe argue that...". In contrast "reform-minded voices within the European Commission..." or "social scientists critical of a federal Europe ..." would be coded. Easily formulated, the rule implies that ACT1S may not be missing (999) in the case of verbal statements. The reason is that such references reflect the journalist's construction of the story more than they are a coverage of actually made claims.

An example of lack of purposive action are presentations of survey results. The people interviewed here are NOT considered as claimants, aggregate results such as "70% of the population are against ..." are not the result of purposive action. Surveys may be coded, however, when the persons or institutions responsible for the survey or the interviews use the results to formulate demands, to criticize other actors, etc., or when they explicitly state their (dis)agreement with the survey results. In that case, however, the organizers of the survey are the claimant, not the respondents! Interviews with random people in the streets by journalists are treated like surveys: statements, even if directly quoted, by random citizens are not regarded as instances of strategic claim-making (e.g., the sentence 'a Japanese housewife said she did not trust the government and would not buy beef anymore' would not be coded as a claim by the housewife).

Ad (2) Claims must also be political, in the sense that they relate to collective social problems and solutions to them, and not to purely individual strategies of coping with problems. I.e., if a parent complains about her child's treatment in school, this is not an instance of claim-making on education politics, unless the case refers to a problem of wider collective social relevance (e.g., if the complaint relates to the child being forbidden to wear the Islamic headscarf in class). Corruption or criminal evasion does not constitute claim-making, either. E.g., if a farmer tries to cover up BSE cases among his cattle, this does not constitute an act of claim-making, and nor does an asylum seeker's attempt to illegally enter the country (legal action against such evasion may however constitute claim-making if the argument is couched in terms that go beyond the individual case).

Statements or actions by different actors are considered to be part of one single instance of claim-making

if they take place at the same location in time (the same day) and place (the same locality) and if the actors can be assumed to act 'in concert' (i.e. they can be considered as strategic allies). Examples:

- Two substantively identical statements by the same actor on two different days, or on one day in two different localities are two separate claims.
- Statements by different speakers during a parliamentary debate or a conference are considered part of one instance of claim-making as long as they are substantively and strategically compatible. Thus, different speakers may be taken together if they all express a similar point of view. However, if the speakers take positions that are substantially different enough to reject the zero hypothesis that they are 'acting in concert', you should code the statements as separate claims.
- If an identifiable part of a peaceful demonstration (e.g., a 'black block') breaks away from a march and turns violent, the assumption of acting in concert is no longer warranted and a separate claim is coded.
- If two negotiation partners present a compromise package at a press conference, the two's statements are coded as one instance of claim-making, even if the two may emphasize different elements of the compromise.

Exceptions to this rule are cases where there is temporal or spatial continuity between actions. An example of temporal continuity would be a hunger strike, which may last several weeks. However, as long as the actors and aims remain the same, this is counted as one instance of claim-making, and not every day as a new claim. An example of spatial continuity would be a listing of actions by exactly the same actors and aims on the same day in different localities, where it is plausible that these actions were co-ordinated. E.g., "Greek border guards yesterday arrested fifteen illegal immigrants who had landed on the Island of Samos. Another group of refugees was taken into custody in the waters around the island of Kos". The actions in the different Greek islands are taken together as one instance of (geographically dispersed) claim-making. As soon as, however, there would be additional information indicating differences in the actors or timing of these actions, we would separate them into different instances of claim-making. The article where the above example is drawn from also included references to the Turkish border guards taking a group of refugees into custody in Turkey on the same day, and to the Greeks already having captured illegal immigrants on Rhodes island a week ago. While the Samos and Kos actions can be taken together, the Turkish (another actor) and Rhodes (another time) actions should be coded as separate claims.

To sum up again, an instance of claim-making is a unit of strategic action in the public sphere. Such a unit of strategic action may involve several actors acting in concert, it may extend over several days or even longer, and it may involve co-ordinated action over a larger geographical area simultaneously. An instance of claim-making is NOT identical with individual statements. E.g., at a press conference a speaker may make several statements, perhaps even on completely different topics. Nevertheless, this is one instance of claim-making because both statements are made in the context of one strategic action in the public sphere.

Sample

1. Claims are coded from all issues of the newspaper.
2. Four categories of claims are coded: a) claims on the issues of immigration, integration and xenophobia/racism, regardless of the actor; b) claims by immigrants and ethnic minorities, regardless of the issue; c) claims by extreme right and xenophobic groups, regardless of the issue (Pim Fortuyn, LPF, Leefbaren gelden als extreme rechts); d) claims about Pim Fortuyn, regardless of the issue. For the recent Dutch case, Pim Fortuyn, the LPF, and Groep Wilders will count as xenophobic groups.
3. Where relevant, separate regional and local sections of the newspaper (in practice this rule is relevant only in Switzerland and Germany), as well as sports, business and other separate sections are disregarded, unless there is a reference to a specific claim already given in the national news

section of the paper. In this case, only that particular claim or claims may be coded. Any others that are encountered in the separate sections should be disregarded.

4. Only claims that have occurred within a time frame of two weeks or less before the publication of the coded newspaper issue are included. I.e., „historic“ claims that occurred more than two weeks ago are disregarded.
5. (rule used for the coding of NL, CH, F for the whole period, and for D and UK up to 1996) To be included, a claim must either be made in the country of coding or be addressed at an actor or institution in the country of coding. This rule will no longer hold for the Dutch case from July 1999 onward.
6. (extension of rule 4 for the coding of D and UK from 1997 onward) Claims are also included if they are made by or addressed at a supranational actor of which the country of coding is a member (e.g., the UN, the EU, the International Organisation for Migration), on the condition that the claim is substantively (also) relevant for the country of coding (e.g., a statement by the UNHCR criticising the Belgian government is not included in the British or German data, but an EU decision on common asylum rules is included because it affects all member states, including Germany and the UK). This rule will also apply to the Dutch case from July 1999 onward.
7. One and the same claim is only coded once the first time it is encountered. Subsequent repetitions of the coverage of the claim in follow-up articles are not separately coded, but that information may be used to complete the information on the original claim.

GENERAL VARIABLES

Variable **YEAR**

Variable **CID**

Numbered 1-999, start again at 1 in a new year. For Dutch case 1999 from July onward, start with 500

Variable **MONTH**

Variable **DAY**

Variable **ISSUEDAY**

Newspaper issue

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1 | Monday |
| 2 | Tuesday |
| 3 | Wednesday |
| 4 | Thursday |
| 5 | Friday |
| 6 | Saturday |

Variable **CLAIM**

(only to be coded for Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday issues)

Would the claim have been coded on the basis of the Monday, Wednesday, Friday sample?

- | | |
|---|----|
| 0 | no |
|---|----|

1 yes

Variable **COUNTRY**

Country where the claim was made; use categories from EuroPub

Variable **TITLE**

Short description of the claim containing name of person(s) and/or organization(s) making the claim, the name of the addressee, the issue of the claim, and the place (city) where the claim was made

CLAIMANTS: SUBJECT ACTORS

Variable **SACTOR1**

Variable Label 'summary first actor'.

Note: In case of organisation or group identifications that fall into several groups at the same time, the following priority rules apply: 1) minority group identification, 2) extreme right and racist group, 3) antiracist and pro-minority group, 4) general solidarity, human rights and welfare groups, 5) all other groups. This implies that, e.g., the Grey Wolves are coded as a minority group, not an extreme right group; the Front National is coded as an extreme right group, not as a political party; Arbeitskreis Asyl in der Kirche is coded as a pro-minority group, not as a church group, Medico International is coded as a general solidarity etc. group, not as a professional group. The most important secondary identifications (church, professional, and in the case of minority groups also politicians) appear in the respective second level codes (121, 122, etc.).

Value labels

10 'governments'¹

20 'legislatives'²

30 'judiciary'³

40 'police and security agencies'⁴

50 'state executive agencies specifically dealing with migrants'⁵

60 'other state executive agencies'⁶

70 'political parties'⁷

80 'unions and employees'⁸

90 'employers organisations and firms'

100 'churches'⁹

¹ Governments and government representatives (spokespersons, ministers, royalty etc.) irrespective of territorial scope. The EU-Commission and Council of Ministers, the UN General Secretary and Security Council are coded as governments. Other examples: mayor, Landesregierung, ministry of education. Includes vague actors such as „the State“, „the establishment“.

² Legislatives and parliaments (all chambers), including individual members thereof, including parliamentary fractions of political parties. The European Parliament and the General Assembly of the UN are coded as legislatives. Other examples: Bundestag, House of Lords, local councils, parliamentary fraction of the SPD, Labor MPs.

³ E.g., European Court of Justice, openbaar ministerie (public prosecutor), individual judges, juries.

⁴ E.g., police (incl. vreemdelingenpolitie, aliens' police), military, marechaussee, Bundesgrenzschutz, secret service, Verfassungsschutz, Interpol, NATO. Note: the Police Union is coded as a union.

⁵ State here includes the supranational level (e.g., UNHCR). Other examples: Immigratie en Naturalisatiedienst, Ausländerbeauftragter, Bundesamt für die Anerkennung ausländischer Flüchtlinge.

⁶ E.g., ILO, WHO, Einwohnermeldeamt, Sozialamt (sociale dienst), Schulaufsichtsbehörde.

⁷ This category should be used only for parties as parties, e.g., party chairman, party congress, „die SPD“, „a Labor party spokesman“, as well as for sub-organisations of parties (e.g., Junge Sozialisten). Note that the same person may be coded differently according to the way in which her or his position is described: e.g., Bundeskanzler Schröder is coded as government, Mitglied des Bundestages Schröder is coded as legislative, SPD-Parteivorsitzende Schröder is coded as political party.

⁸ Includes the general categories „workers“ and „employees“.

- 110 'media and journalists'
- 120 'professional organisations and groups'¹⁰
- 130 'minority organisations and groups'
 - 131 'minorities: politicians'¹¹
 - 132 'minorities: profession-based'¹²
 - 133 'minorities: religion-based'¹³
 - 134 'minorities: other organisations and groups'
- 140 'antiracist organisations and groups'¹⁴
 - 141 'antiracist: profession-based'
 - 142 'antiracist: church-based'
 - 143 'antiracist: other'
- 150 'pro-minority rights and welfare organisations and groups'¹⁵
 - 151 'pro-minority: profession-based'
 - 152 'pro-minority: church-based'¹⁶
 - 153 'pro-minority: other'
- 160 'general solidarity, human rights and welfare organisations'¹⁷

⁹ Only “native” churches, not those of migrant origin. Islamic, Jewish, Hindu, but also non-western Christian churches (Armenian, Greek and other orthodox, Koptic, Moluccan churches, etc.) are coded as minority organisations. „Churches“ includes, however, the vague actor „Christians“.

¹⁰ E.g., Deutscher Ärztekammer, Berufsverband Deutscher Psychologen, Deutscher Sportbund, doctors, football players, research institutes and individual researchers, universities, schools, teachers, writers, intellectuals, solicitors, musicians, etc. Note: unions are always coded as unions, non-union organisations of police and judges are coded under their respective institution.

¹¹ E.g., ethnic minority MP's and local councillors. Only code here if the person in question is explicitly identified (either by the journalist or by some form of self-identification) as a representative of minority interests: e.g., if the article would say “The black MP Paul Boateng...”, or “Mr Boateng, who represents a primarily black constituency ...”; or if Boateng's claim would include references to his minority background such as “we blacks...”, or “as a black person, I ...”; or if several minority politicians act as a group (e.g., “Black Caucus”). Note that this may also lead to the inclusion of statements by minority politicians not related to the ERCI thematic field: e.g., when a parliamentarian, identified as, or identifying herself as Jewish makes a statement on Israel or the Palestinian question; or if “Mr Boateng, who represents a primarily black constituency...” would say something on South Africa. In cases where no (self) reference is made to the politician's minority background, the respective institutional actor category should be used (e.g., a statement by “Paul Boateng, MP ..“ with no reference to him being black or representing a black constituency is simply coded in the category “legislatives”. For the Dutch case this implies, for instance, that statements by politicians such as Van Thijn, Hirsch Ballin, Rabbæ, Singh Varma, etc. only receive actor code 131 if their ethnic background is explicitly referred to, otherwise they are simply coded as executive, legislative or party representatives. Note that the nature of the claim as such should not be mixed into the actor coding: e.g., a statement by Rabbæ on the situation of Moroccan youth is not coded as 131 if no explicit reference is made to the fact that Rabbæ himself is of Moroccan descent.

¹² E.g., Romani Pen-Club (a writers' association), Türkisch-Deutscher Unternehmer-Verein, Europäischer Verband Türkischer Akademiker, Uitzendbureau Coloured Holland.

¹³ E.g., Islamic and Jewish religious groups. Note that this category also includes Christian denominations that are of migrant origin (e.g., Armenian, Syrian, Russian and Greek Orthodox)

¹⁴ All groups identified as “antiracists” or “antifascists” and organisations whose names (e.g., SOS Racisme, Antidiskriminierungsbüro, Antifaschistische Aktion, Komitee gegen Rechtsradikalismus), or other explicit information (e.g., “In Brandenburg, a committee “Bündnis der Vernunft” was established against extreme right tendencies...) indicates that antiracism is their primary goal. Includes organizations of people persecuted by the Nazi-regime, organizations of former members of the resistance, etc (e.g., Auschwitz Committee, Anne Frank Foundation).

¹⁵ All (semi-) private organisations acting specifically on behalf of migrants and minorities, but not (primarily) carried by these groups themselves (e.g., Pro Asyl). Includes private welfare organisations catering specifically to migrants or minorities, e.g., Ausländerhilfe Siegen, Frankfurter Rechtshilfe-Komitee für Ausländer.

¹⁶ E.g., Evangelische Flüchtlingsseelsorge Berlin.

- 161 'general solidarity: profession-based'¹⁸
- 162 'general solidarity: church-based'¹⁹
- 163 'general solidarity: other'
- 170 'racist and extreme right organisations and groups'²⁰
 - 171 'extreme right political parties'²¹
 - 172 'other racist and extreme right organisations and groups'
- 180 'radical left organisations and groups'²²
- 190 'other civil society organisations and groups'²³
 - 191 'other civil society: students'²⁴
 - 192 'other civil society: new social movements'²⁵
 - 193 'other civil society: vertriebene/repatries/expats'²⁶
 - 199 'other civil society: other'²⁷
- 999 'unknown actors'²⁸

Note: variables **SACTOR2** and **SACTOR3** are constructed likewise. However, a category 0 (zero) has to be added for 'no second actor' respectively 'no third actor'.

¹⁷ This includes only private organisations (Red Cross, Arbeiterwohlfahrt, Amnesty International, Terre des Hommes etc.), not state welfare agencies (these are coded as other state executive agencies). Only organisations whose aims go beyond the ERCI thematic field are coded here, organisations catering specifically to migrants and minorities receive code 150.

¹⁸ E.g., Medecins sans frontieres.

¹⁹ E.g., Arbeitskreis Solidarische Kirche.

²⁰ Includes vague descriptions such as "skinheads" or "right-wing extremists".

²¹ Only those extreme right parties and party spokespersons are coded here that really act as parties in the electoral process (e.g. the Front National in France, the BNP in Britain, CD and CP86 in the Netherlands, Republikaner, DVU, NPD and Deutsche Liga in Germany). Groups that do not, or only very marginally participate in the electoral process, but nevertheless call themselves parties receive code 172 (e.g., in Germany the Freiheitliche Arbeiterpartei).

²² Includes vague descriptions such as "Autonome" or "left-wing groups", as well as organisations such as Red Army Fraction, Vereinigte Sozialisten. Radical left parties should be coded as political party, unless the party label is merely window dressing and does not indicate significant involvement in the electoral process (compare the preceding note on extreme right parties).

²³ Does not include vague categories such as "neighbours", "local citizens", "youth", etc.

²⁴ Includes school pupils.

²⁵ Organisations and groups of the peace, environmental, and women's movements. Squatters and autonomous movement groups are coded among „radical left organisations and groups“.

²⁶ For Germany: German refugees and expellees from the former German territories in the East; for France: repatries from Algeria of French ethnic origin (pieds noirs) etc.; Britain: returned expat British citizens of British ethnic origin; Netherlands: indische Nederlanders if it refers specifically to returning persons or groups of Dutch ethnic origin. In all these cases, if the label is used in a broader sense including persons of a different ethnic origin or of mixed origin, the claim should be coded in „minority organisations and groups“.

²⁷ In principle, there is still the possibility to create new subcategories in „other civil society“ (194-198). This can only be considered, however, if the category would comprise at least ten cases in at least one country.

²⁸ The "unknown" category includes vague groups such as "youth", "neighbours", or "local citizens". Note, however, that youth *organisations*, neighbourhood *associations*, or citizens' *initiatives* are coded as "other civil society organisations and groups". Note that this category should *never* be used for such cases that were included because we suspect that the actors are minorities. Such events always require some specific assumption about the nature of the group. E.g., anonymous arson attacks on Turkish banks will be coded if the assumption is justified that they have been carried out by Kurdish groups. In that case, however, "Kurds" should be coded as ACTOR1, and the SACTOR1 category 134 should be used.

Variable **ACTTYPE1**

Variable label 'Type of first actor'.

Value labels

- 1 'unorganised collectivity (representative)',²⁹
- 2 'organisation or institution (representative)',³⁰
- 9 'unknown actor',³¹.

Note: variables **ACTTYPE2** and **ACTTYPE3** are constructed likewise. However, a category 0 (zero) has to be added for 'no second actor' respectively 'no third actor'.

²⁹ E.g., Turks, skinheads, right-wing extremists, workers, youth, Christians, women, members of the resistance, Holocaust survivors, individual writers and other artists (e.g., Günter Grass). Categories such as "policemen", "judges", "politicians" are not coded here, but are regarded as representatives of their respective institutions.

³⁰ All named organisations and institutions or official representatives thereof. Also coded here are non-specified plurals of organisations (e.g., "antiracist organisations"). See also the remark on "policemen" etc. above.

³¹ Should correspond to the category 999 for SACTOR1.

Variable: **ACTSCOPI**

Variable label 'Scope of first actor'.

This variable is only coded if ACTTYPE1=2. Otherwise, code 9 ("no organisation") is given. The notion of "scope" refers to the organisational extension of the organisation or institution. See further the examples given in the footnotes.

Value labels

- 1 'supra- or transnational: European',³²
- 2 'supra- or transnational: other',³³
- 3 'foreign national: migrant homelands and exile',³⁴
- 4 'foreign national: other',³⁵
- 5 'bilateral',³⁶
- 6 'national',³⁷
- 7 'subnational',³⁸
- 8 'national or subnational',³⁹.
- 9 'unknown: no organisation',⁴⁰.

Note: variables **ACTSCOP2** and **ACTSCOP3** are constructed likewise. However, a category 0 (zero) has to be added for 'no second actor' respectively 'no third actor'.

³² E.g., European Parliament, European Trade Union Federation, Europäischer Verband türkischer Akademiker.

³³ E.g., UNHCR, World Council of Roma and Sinti, Amnesty International, International Council of Voluntary Associations, Helsinki Watch. Includes national branches of transnational organizations: e.g., Deutsches Rotes Kreuz, Deutsche Shell-Gruppe.

³⁴ E.g., Turkish government (except when intervening on behalf of third party, then code as 4), PKK, Dev Sol, FIS, Milli Görüs, homeland political parties. Also includes organisations of political exiles based in the country of residence but directed towards intervention in the politics of the homeland: e.g., Nationaler Widerstandsrat Iran, Verein der Anhänger der Volksmudschahedin, Demokratischer Bund für Kosovo in Deutschland, Exilchinesische Föderation für ein demokratisches China, Tibet-Initiative Deutschland.

³⁵ E.g., American Jewish Committee, Israeli government (except when acting specifically on behalf of Jews, then code as 3), Austrian Caritas, Front National (if not acting in France), foreign firms and investors.

³⁶ Bilateral organizations between countries: e.g., Deutsch-Polnische Gesellschaft, Deutsch-Sowjetische Freundschaft).

³⁷ E.g., Bundesregierung, national political parties, Bundesverfassungsgericht, Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund, national media (incl. local papers in name with national scope such as NZZ, FAZ), Deutsche Telekom, Arbeitsgemeinschaft der mit Ausländern verheirateten Frauen, Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland, Anatolisch-alewitischer Kulturbund, Almanya Demokrat Partisi.

³⁸ All actors with a regional or local scope. E.g., Landesregierungen, Landesversorgungsamt, Norddeutscher Rundfunk, Bund türkischer Einwanderer in Berlin-Brandenburg, Flüchtlingsrat Niedersachsen, purely regional political parties (e.g. Frisian National Party), regional branches of national parties (e.g., Hessian SPD), Direkte Aktion Mitteldeutschland, local governments, local parties and party branches, Braunschweiger Zeitung, Jüdische Gemeinde Berlin, Fürther Komitee gegen Rechtsradikalismus.

³⁹ Code here such cases where the name of the organisation and/or your background knowledge does not allow you to determine whether or not the organisation's scope is nationwide or at some subnational level. Such cases are not coded as „unknown“ because we do know that the organisation is not foreign national, transnational etc. (i.e., code 8 means: *not* codes 1-5).

⁴⁰ This code is used for all claims for which no organisation or institution has been mentioned (i.e., corresponds to the codes 1 and 9 of ACTTYPE1).

Variable **PARTY1 (PARTY2, PARTY3)**

Variable label 'party of actor'

0	No party affiliation
501	PvdA
502	CDA
503	VVD
504	D66
505	Groen Links
506	Centrumdemocraten
507	RPF
508	GPV
509	SGP
510	Unie 55+
511	AOV
512	SP
513	CP86
514	Nederlands Blok
515	NVU
516	KPP
517	Leefbaar Nederland
518	Lijst Pim Fortuyn
519	Groep/Lijst Wilders
520	Christen Unie
521	Leefbaar Rotterdam
522	Leefbaar Hilversum
523	Andere lokale leefbaren
524	Paarse Coalitie
525	Balkenende I
526	Balkenende II
599	Party affiliation unknown

Variable **ACTNAME 1 (ACTNAME2, ACTNAME3) = numerical**

Variable label: name of organizational spokesperson

1	Fortuyn
2	Melkert
3	Kok
4	Rosenmöller
5	Dijkstal
6	Balkenende
7	De Graaf
8	Marijnissen
9	Bolkestein
10	Eenhorn
11	Nagel
12	Opstelten
13	Van Boxtel
14	De Vries
15	Korthals
99	unknown

Variable **ACTNAME 1 (ACTNAME2, ACTNAME3) = string variable**

Note: full name of spokesperson for an organization or institution. Format: Fortuyn, Pim; Melkert, Ad; etc.

Variable **MINACT**

Variable label 'minority or migrant actor involved'.

This variable is defined inclusively and measures migrant or minority involvement as first, second, or third actor.

- 0 No minority or migrant actor
- 1 Minority or migrant actor, organization name mentioned
- 2 Minority or migrant actor, no organization name mentioned

Variable **IDENMIN**⁴¹

Variable label 'Identity of minority or migrant actor'

Gives the identity of the minority actor, corresponding to the MINACT variable (i.e., also for minorities who appear as second or third actors). The identity of the actor can be determined either from the name of the organization making the claim, or from how the actor is described in the newspaper report. If an organization name is mentioned this should be taken as the source to determine the identity of the actor. If several minority actors are involved at the same time, the first mentioned determines IDENMIN. For example, "Turks" receive IDENMIN code 82 (specific ethnic or national group) and are then coded as "Turks" in NATMIN.

For different "mixed identity" categories, the following rule applies: status group, racial or religious identifications have priority in the IDENMIN variable over national and ethnic identification. For instance: "Turkish Muslims" are coded as 62 (Muslims) in the IDENMIN variable, and then as "Turks" in NATMIN; "Bosnian refugees" as 16 (war refugees, see the footnote) in IDENMIN, and then as "Bosnians" in NATMIN; "Afro-Caribbeans" are coded as 45 (african) in IDENMIN, and then as "Caribbeans" in NATMIN; "Rußlanddeutsche" are coded as 18 (Aussiedler) in IDENMIN, and then as "Russians" in NATMIN.

The same also applies for hyphen identities between racial or religious identities and the country of residence. For instance: "British Muslims" are "Muslims" for IDENMIN, "British" for NATMIN; same for "British blacks".⁴²

⁴¹ The category system for this variable is not fixed. New identities or combinations encountered should be given new codes. Note that some categories will be relevant only to the coding of object actors (see below), for which we use the same category system (e.g., „EU citizens“, „quota refugees“).

⁴² A partial identification with the country of residence should only be coded if the respective country appears grammatically as a substantive (as in "Black British"), or as an adjective to the ethnic identification (as in "Deutsche Juden"), not if it just indicates the geographic location of the organization or group. E.g., the *Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland* is coded as a purely ethnic identification (secular Jewish). In fact, this organization explicitly did not call itself *Zentralrat der deutschen Juden*; an organization bearing the latter name would have been coded as a mixed identity. Other examples of mixed identities: *Liberale Türkisch-Deutsche Vereinigung*, *Landesverband Deutscher Sinti und Roma*, *Almanya Demokrat Partisi* (a somewhat different example of a mixed German-Turkish identity: the name refers only to Germany, not to Turkey or Turkish, but it is in the Turkish language). Examples of mere geographic reference to the country of residence: *Kölner Romainitiative* (*Kölner* is here an adjective to initiative, not to Roma, *Initiative der Kölner Roma* would be a mixed identity), *Bund der Einwanderer aus der Türkei in Berlin-Brandenburg* (this is a mixed identity, but nationality-status-group, the reference to Berlin-Brandenburg is purely geographical), *Türkische Gemeinde Deutschland*.

Hyphen-identifications between the country of residence and homeland nationality/ethnicity are treated as follows: they all receive code 91 (specific hyphenated ethnic or national group) in IDENMIN, the homeland ethnicity/nationality is then coded in NATMIN. For instance “Indische Nederlanders” are coded 91 in IDENMIN, then “Indonesian” in NATMIN; “des francais d’origine algerienne” would be coded 91 in IDENMIN, then “Algerian” in NATMIN.

Other types of hyphen identities, which will be very rare anyway, will be ignored, e.g., “black Muslims”, “black asylum seekers” or “Muslim asylum seekers”. In cases where this applies, the priority rule for coding is: status group > religious group > racial group. I.e., the first example is coded as “Muslims”, the second and third as “asylum seekers”.⁴³

Value labels

‘STATUS GROUPS’

- 11 'foreigners/aliens'
- 12 'minorities' (without specification)⁴⁴
- 13 '(im)migrants'⁴⁵
- 14 'allochthonen'
- 15 'asylum seekers' (individual status)⁴⁶
- 16 'war refugees, ontheemden' (collective status)⁴⁷
- 17 'quota refugees, kontingentflüchtlinge' (permanent collective status)⁴⁸
- 18 'illegal aliens/immigrants, sans papiers'
- 19 'aussiedler'
- 20 'labour migrants, contract workers, saisonniers'
- 21 'EU citizens'
- 22 'non-EU citizens, third country nationals'
- 23 'Old Commonwealth immigrants/citizens'⁴⁹
- 24 'New Commonwealth immigrants/citizens'

⁴³ Note that we ignore all other kinds of identification that may appear. E.g., *Bürgerinitiative ausländischer Arbeitnehmer* receives code 11, the reference to ‘workers’ is ignored. Same for *Jugendkongreß des Zentralrats der Juden in Deutschland* (the reference to youth is ignored) or *Europäischer Verband türkischer Akademiker* (the reference to academics is ignored as is the purely geographical reference to Europe).

⁴⁴ See the separate codes below for specified minority labels (racial, religious, ethnic). If more than one adjective to minorities is used (e.g., “racial and ethnic minorities”) than use this category

⁴⁵ Includes for the Netherlands „nieuwkomers“.

⁴⁶ The difference between categories 15 and 16 is in the type of status. Normal “asylum seekers” or “refugees” (the terms tend to be used interchangeably) are those who claim the right to asylum on the basis of *individual* persecution on the grounds of race, religion, ethnicity, political belief or activities, etc. For this group, each case is decided individually and recognition likewise is on an individual basis.

⁴⁷ This group (for which the term “asylum seekers” is not often, and the term “refugees” mostly used) are given a collective right to residence for “humanitarian reasons”. The most important example for us are war refugees from Bosnia, and more recently from Kosovo. At least in Germany and the Netherlands (I do not know the juridical situation in the other countries) these groups were taken up outside of the normal asylum procedures. Their right to stay is in principle temporary for as long as the situation in their country of origin is judged to be too dangerous to return.

⁴⁸ At least in Germany there is still a third category of refugees, the so-called “Kontingentflüchtlinge”. These are also taken up collectively on humanitarian grounds, but the difference is that they immediately get a permanent residence status. For instance, in the framework of a UN humanitarian action, Germany took up several groups of Vietnamese “boat people” in the beginning of the 1980s as Kontingentflüchtlinge. In the 1990s, this juridical status was given to Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union

⁴⁹ Categories 22-24 should only be used for general references to this type of migrants/minorities, not for specific identifications (e.g., “Jamaican”, “(French) Antillean”); these are coded along ethnicity.

- 25 'DOM-TOM immigrants/citizens'⁵⁰
- 26 'DDR-Vertragsarbeiter'
- 27 'Harki'

'RACIAL GROUPS'

- 41 'racial minorities/groups'
- 42 'black'⁵¹
- 43 'asian'
- 44 'coloured'

'RELIGIOUS GROUPS'

- 61 'religious minorities/groups'
- 62 'muslim/islamic'
- 63 'hindu'
- 64 'jewish/israelite'
- 65 'orthodox'⁵²
- 66 'rastafarian'
- 67 'sikh'
- 68 'alevite'
- 69 'catholic'
- 70 'buddhist'⁵³
- 71 'yezidic'

'NATIONAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS: PURE'

- 81 'ethnic minorities/groups'
- 82 'specific national or ethnic group'

'NATIONAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS: HYPHEN HOMELAND-COUNTRY OF RESIDENCE'

- 91 'specific hyphenated national or ethnic group'

95 'UNCLASSIFIABLE MIGRANT OR MINORITY ACTOR'

99 'NOT APPLICABLE: NO MINORITY OR MIGRANT ACTOR'

Variable **NATMIN**

Variable label 'nationality or ethnicity of minority or migrant actor'

For the minority actor coded in IDENMIN, this variable gives, if mentioned, the national or ethnic background of the minority actor.

⁵⁰ "Français des DOM-TOM" or "Français d'origine DOM-TOM" would be coded as a hyphenated identity. I.e., code 25 for IDENMIN, code 100 for NATMIN. Note that specific DOM-TOM identifications (Antillean, Guyanese etc.) are coded as "specific national or ethnic group" and then in NATMIN the respective specific code.

⁵¹ Includes in English the prefix „afro“ as in „afro-caribbean“, which is decomposed into code 42 in IDENMIN and then code 504 in NATMIN. Similarly „black african“ is coded as 42 for IDENMIN and 449 for NATMIN.

⁵² Greek, Armenian, Russian, etc. orthodox. The respective national identifications are then code in NATMIN: e.g., the Greek Orthodox Patriarch is coded as 65 in IDENMIN and 208 in NATMIN.

⁵³ Includes subdivisions such as "shugden".

Value labels

0 'NO SPECIFICATION OF NATIONALITY OR ETHNICITY'

100 'COUNTRY OF RESIDENCE NATIONALITY'⁵⁴

200 'EUROPE: EU'

201 'german'⁵⁵

202 'dutch'

203 'french'

204 'british'

205 'english'

206 'irish'

207 'italian'

208 'greek'

209 'spanish'

210 'portuguese'

211 'scottish'

212 'welsh'

213 'scandinavian'

214 'austrian'

250 'OTHER EUROPE'

251 'swiss'

252 'east european'

253 '(ex-)yugoslav'

254 'serbian'

255 'croatian'

256 'bosnian'

257 'kosovo-albanian'

258 'macedonian'

259 'slovenian'

260 'vojvodina hungarian'

261 'polish'

262 'romanian'

263 'albanian'

264 'russian'⁵⁶

265 'hungarian'

266 'bulgarian'

267 'czech'

268 'estonian'

269 'norwegian'

⁵⁴ This code is used for hyphen identities between country of residence nationality and race or religion. E.g., "British Muslims" were coded as "Muslims" in IDENMIN, and receive code 100 (which in the British case stands for "British") here.

⁵⁵ Note that category 201 is not used for the German case, 202 not for the Dutch, 203 not for the French, 204 not for the British, and 251 not for the Swiss case. Use 100 (country of residence nationality) instead.

⁵⁶ Includes "ex-USSR" if not further specified.

290 'OLD EUROPEAN MINORITIES'

291 'jewish'⁵⁷

292 'roma and sinti/gypsy'

300 'ASIA: MIDDLE EAST'

301 'turkish'⁵⁸

302 'kurdish'

303 'alevite'

304 'iranian'

305 'iraqi'

306 'palestinian'

307 'lebanese'

308 'armenian'⁵⁹

309 'israeli'

310 'azeri'

311 'syrian'

312 'yezidic'

313 'kazach'

350 'ASIA: SOUTH AND EAST'

349 'asian'

351 'pakistani'

352 'afghan'

353 'indian'

354 'sikh'⁶⁰

355 'bengali'

356 'srilankese'

357 'tamil'

358 'singhalese'

359 'bangladeshi'

360 'tibetan'

361 'chinese'

362 'hong kong'

363 'indonesian'

364 'mollucan'

365 'vietnamese'

366 'mongolian'

367 'nepalese'

368 'phillipino'

400 'AFRICA: NORTH'

401 'moroccan'

402 'algerian'

403 'tunisian'

404 'maghrebian'/'north african'

⁵⁷ Jewish religious identifications/organizations are coded as such in IDENMIN *and* as “Jewish” in NATMIN. The coding for secular/ethnic Jewish organizations (and the default) is: code 82 for IDENMIN, code 291 for NATMIN.

⁵⁸ Note that Turkey is considered as part of the Middle East, not Europe.

⁵⁹ Note that the Caucasus region is considered as a part of Asia, not Europe

⁶⁰ Sikh religious identifications/organizations are coded as such in IDENMIN *and* as “Sikh” in NATMIN. The coding for secular/ethnic Sikh organizations (and the default) is: code 82 for IDENMIN, code 354 for NATMIN

405 'arab'⁶¹
406 'saharian' (or harki, still to be settled)

450 'AFRICA: OTHER'

449 'african'
451 'ghanese'
452 'nigerian'
453 'tanzanian'
454 'angolan'
455 'mozambican'
456 'senegalese'
457 'malinese'
458 'réunionnais'
459 'rwandan'
460 'somali'
461 'eritrean'
462 'zairese'
463 'comorean'
464 'congolese'⁶²
465 'ethiopian'
466 'sudanese'
467 'south african'
468 'togolese'
469 'kenyan'
470 'liberian'
471 'sierra leonese'
472 'guinean'
473 'guinea-bissau'

500 'CARIBIC'

501 'surinamese'
502 'dutch antillean/aruban'
503 'french antillean/guadeloupien/martiniqais'
504 'caribbean'
505 'jamaican'
506 'cuban'
507 'guyanese'

550 'LATIN AMERICA'

551 'peruvian'
552 'chilean'
553 '*uruguayan*'

590 'NORTH AMERICA'

591 'US american'
592 'canadian'

⁶¹ Note that as a default "arabs" are considered to be North Africans.

⁶² The old French colony Congo (capital Brazzaville), not the old Belgian Congo (long known as Zaire, but now also called Congo again, I think; capital Kinshasa).

600 'OCEANIA'
601 'australian'
602 'new caledonian/kanak'

999 'NOT APPLICABLE: NO MINORITY OR MIGRANT ACTOR'

ACTION FORMS

Variable **SSFORM1**; Variable label 'summary first form of action'

As the codebook does not allow for multiple coding on action forms, decision rules are needed for classification. The rule is protest > political decision > verbal statement (in newspaper, tv, radio, public etc.) > repressive measure. In other words, protest forms overrule verbal forms: a demonstration with statements is a demonstration. Likewise, a verbal form overrules a repressive measure: a court ruling accompanied by politically relevant statements is a verbal statement. The latter rule follows from the fact that repressive measures have been included in the coding on a selective basis (i.e. against the extreme right and xenophobic actors, in Britain and since 1997 in Germany also against minorities and migrants, but not against any other actors). Therefore, for most analyses repressive measures will be left out of the sample. However, this should not include such repressive measures that are accompanied by statements relevant to the thematic field.

Value labels

10 'repressive measure'
20 'political decision'⁶³
30 'press conference'
31 'newspaper interview'
32 'tv interview'
33 'radio interview'
34 'opinion article/open letter'
35 'editorial'
36 'report, book etc.'
37 'public speech'
38 'statement in parliament/government, organizational meetings'
39 'other press statements/declarations'
40 'meetings'⁶⁴
50 'judicial action'⁶⁵

⁶³ Note that we include here only decisions of organisations and institutions with real political decision-making power, i.e. state representatives and institutions, as well as political parties represented in parliament. Thus, the passing of legislation, administrative decrees, decisions to deport asylum seekers, politically relevant court rulings, but also resolutions and programmatic decisions at party conferences are considered political decisions. "Decisions" in the form of resolutions, etc. by civil society organisations count as verbal statements (even though in the original codebook they appeared under the heading "institutional decisions").

⁶⁴ This refers to conferences, meetings, congresses etc that take place inside. The codebook initially did not include these forms and coded claims made at such meetings as statements or decisions. However, in the case of extreme right organisations in Germany, the report often mentions just that an extreme right group held a "Tagung", without any indication of what was said. Such cases could not be coded as verbal acts and therefore a new category was created. The category is empty for all actors, except the extreme right (in theory, it might apply to other groups, too, in cases where only a meeting is reported, but not its aim).

⁶⁵ Refers to appeals to the judiciary (e.g. filing lawsuits), not actions by the judiciary (the latter appear as repressive measures, statements, or decisions).

60 'direct-democratic action',⁶⁶
70 'petitioning',⁶⁷
80 'demonstrative protests',⁶⁸
90 'confrontational protests',⁶⁹
100 'violent protests'

ADDRESSEES: INDIRECT OBJECT ACTORS

Variable **SADRES**

Variable label 'summary addressee of claim'

Variable **SCRITAC1**

Variable label 'summary first criticised actor'

Variable **SCRITAC2** (for those who have coded a 2nd criticised actor)

Variable label 'summary second criticised actor'

Variable **SSUPPACT**(for those who have coded positive references to actors)

Variable label 'summary supported actor'

All these variables have the same categorisations as the SSACTOR variables, *with the exception of code 0, which here stands for 'no addressee', 'no first criticised actor', 'no second criticised actor', and 'no supported actor'*.⁷⁰ However, as addressees, criticised actors, etc. only organisations or institutions and their representatives are allowed. I.e., all references to unorganised collectivities are ignored. This particularly leads to the exclusion of actors such as "foreigners", "immigrants", "blacks", "Muslims", "racists", "right-wing extremists", etc. who are of course quasi-automatically implied in claims-making in this thematic field. For categories referring to civil society actors, the references to "groups" in the value labels should be deleted and only the reference to "organisations" retained.

Variable **ADRSCOP**

Variable label 'scope of addressee'

Variable **CACSCOPI**

Variable label 'scope of first criticised actor'

Variable **CACSCOP2**

Variable label 'scope of second criticised actor'

Variable **SACSCOP**

Variable label 'scope of supported actor'

These variables have the same categories as the ACTSCOP variables, with the exception of code 9, which here stands for 'no addressee', 'no first criticised actor', 'no second criticised actor', 'no supported actor', and 'no broad addressee'.

Variable **ADRPART**

Variable label 'party affiliation of addressee'

⁶⁶ Probably exclusively relevant to the Swiss context: launching, collection and presentation of signatures in the context of referendum and initiative campaigns.

⁶⁷ Includes petitions, other form of signature collection (outside direct-democratic contexts) and letter campaigns.

⁶⁸ Categories 8-10 follow straightforwardly from the codebook.

⁶⁹ Includes in addition to the legal and illegal confrontational forms listed in the codebook the verbal form "graffiti".

Note that symbolic forms of violence against objects and persons count as confrontational (see codebook).

⁷⁰ Given the strong predominance of institutional actors as addressees, criticised actors, etc., there is not much use for the fine distinctions in the second level of the SACTOR codes.

Variable **CACPART1**

Variable label 'party affiliation of first criticised actor'

Variable **CACPART2**

Variable label 'party affiliation of second criticised actor'

Variable **SACPART**

Variable label 'party affiliation of supported actor'

Variable **ADRNAME 1 (CACNAME1, CACNAME2, SACNAME3) = numerical**

Variable label: name of organizational spokesperson

- 1 Fortuyn
- 2 Melkert
- 3 Kok
- 4 Rosenmöller
- 5 Dijkstal
- 6 Balkenende
- 7 De Graaf
- 8 Marijnissen
- 9 Bolkestein
- 10 Eenhorn
- 11 Nagel
- 12 Opstelten
- 13 Van Boxtel
- 14 De Vries
- 15 Korthals

99 unknown

Variable **ADRNAME 1 (CACNAME1, CACNAME2, SACNAME3) = string variable**

Note: full name of spokesperson for an organization or institution. Format: Fortuyn, Pim; Melkert, Ad; etc.

CONTENT OF CLAIMS

Variable **SISSUE1** (three-digit codes)⁷¹

Variable label 'summary first issue'

Variable **SSISSUE1** (two-digit codes)

Variable label 'summary of SISSUE1'

Variable **FIELD1** (one-digit code)

Variable label 'policy field'

These variables are coded on the basis of the first aim. If no aim has been coded, but a frame is available, then code on the basis of the frame. In a similar fashion (with adapted value labels for 0) code the

⁷¹ Anybody who wishes more detail can further refine the code by introducing a fourth digit. It does not seem possible, however, in a way that would be useful for comparative analyses. If, for the analysis of single-country analyses, you wish to introduce a fourth level, take care to do so in such a way that the fourth level does not change or blur the meaning of the higher level codes.

variables **SISSUE2, SSISSUE2, FIELD2** (on the basis of the 2nd aim, or if there is none, the frame) and **SISSUE3, SSISSUE3, FIELD3** (on the basis of the 3rd aim, if one has been coded). Note that the category system does not distinguish according to different migrant and minority groups (asylum seekers, Jews, illegal aliens, etc.). This element of claims is coded separately in the OBJIDEN en OBJNAT variables (see below).

Value labels

0 'NO VERBAL CLAIM/NO ISSUE'

1 'IMMIGRATION, ASYLUM, AND ALIENS POLITICS',⁷²

10 'immigration, asylum, and aliens politics'

100 'general evaluation or policy direction',⁷³

101 'institutional framework, responsibilities, procedures, costs',⁷⁴

102 'migration prevention in homeland countries',⁷⁵

103 'entry and border controls',⁷⁶

⁷² Includes all policies that pertain to the regulation of entry of migrants (including policies to prevent migration), their residence rights, and their, voluntary or involuntary, return. In this sense, the category is wider than in the original codebook and now includes residence rights, expulsions, etc., which were originally classified under minority integration politics. In addition, it includes issues of access to work and welfare for groups who do not (yet) have full residence rights (non-recognized asylum seekers and refugees, illegal aliens, and temporary labour migrants).

⁷³ E.g., "recognition that Germany is a country of immigration, "solidarity with asylum seekers", "prevent polarization in the asylum debate", "do not instrumentalize the asylum issue for electoral purposes"; (OBJIDEN coded as "aussiedler") "inform the public about the situation and problems of Aussiedler". Note that this category is now defined much more restrictively than in earlier versions. Much of what it originally included is now coded in 103.

⁷⁴ E.g., "create a special ministry of migration", "search for a common European solution to immigration problems", "financial support from the federal government for local communities in order to help them deal with the consequences of immigration", "create a special parliamentary commissioner for refugees", "equal distribution of refugees among EU countries", "limit the costs of the asylum procedure", "more personnel for state agencies dealing with asylum seekers", "speed up asylum procedures", "improve housing conditions in asylum seeker centres", "Aussiedler should await the result of their application in their country of origin", "house Aussiedler in former barracks of the Soviet army", "increase the say of the Bundesländer in matters concerning the reception of Aussiedler".

⁷⁵ E.g., "combat the causes of migration through intensified aid for Eastern Europe and the Third World", "combat the persecution of Roma in Eastern Europe", "combat the causes of refugee flows", "improve the rights and living conditions of ethnic Germans in their countries of origin".

⁷⁶ E.g., "stricter entry requirements for Eastern Europeans", "introduction of a visa for foreign children" "no right to (re-)entry for foreigners who have committed crimes", "prohibit airline companies to transport people without visa to Germany", "intensified combat against Schlepperbanden (organized 'smuggling' of asylum seekers across the border), "exclude asylum seekers without visa from the procedure", "stricter controls to prevent illegal immigration" Now also includes family reunification and formation (formerly 104), as well as general statements about entry (formerly 100) such as "reduce immigration", "introduce an immigration law", "an open Europe", "set levels and forms of immigration as a function of Germany's economic needs"; (OBJIDEN coded as "asylum seekers"), "stop influx of asylum seekers"; (OBJIDEN coded as "labour migrants", OBJNAT as "east europeans") "limit the number of workers from Eastern Europe"; (OBJIDEN coded as "aussiedler") "stop the influx of Aussiedler"; (OBJIDEN CODED as "specific ethnic or national group", NATMIN as "Jewish") "controlled influx of Soviet Jews by way of yearly quota", "no limits on the reception of East European Jews". Unspecified statements on bodies of legislation whose main issue is the regulation of entry (e.g., Schengen, Loi Pasqua) are coded here (e.g., a statement which says nothing more than "against the Loi Pasqua").

- 104 'registration and internal control'⁷⁷
- 105 'recognition, residence rights, legal status and permits'⁷⁸
- 106 'access to welfare services and the labour market'⁷⁹
- 107 'expulsions/deportations'⁸⁰
- 108 'voluntary return'⁸¹
- 109 'other specific issues'

2 'MINORITY INTEGRATION POLITICS'

- 20 'minority integration general'
 - 200 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁸²
 - 201 'institutional framework, responsibilities, procedures, costs'⁸³
- 21 'minority rights and participation'
 - 210 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁸⁴
 - 211 'naturalization and citizenship'⁸⁵
 - 212 'political rights and participation'⁸⁶
 - 213 'social rights and participation: labour market'⁸⁷
 - 214 'social rights and participation: education'⁸⁸

⁷⁷ E.g., "against the central registration of data on foreigners", "extend police competences to control the identity of aliens", "take measures against the misuse of the right to asylum".

⁷⁸ E.g., "regulate foreign women's residence rights independent from their husbands", "right to stay for women who are the victim of forced prostitution", "softening of the criteria to obtain unlimited residence permits", "limit the constitutional right to asylum", "limit rights to appeal for asylum seekers", "right to stay for asylum seekers who have been longer than three years in Germany", "freedom of movement for EU citizens", "abolish the special immigration rights for Aussiedler", "freedom for Aussiedler to choose where to live in Germany", "give Soviet Jews the same rights as Aussiedler", "legalisation of illegal aliens".

⁷⁹ E.g., "special assistance for children of refugees", "limit social welfare payments to asylum seekers", "allow asylum seekers to work", "limit access of illegal aliens to medical services", "no access for children of illegal aliens to education".

⁸⁰ E.g., "expulsion of foreign extremists", "expulsion of criminal foreigners", "send back asylum seekers who have arrived from save third countries", "draw up a list of countries to which asylum seekers cannot be sent back", "deportation treaty between Germany and Turkey", "no violence against asylum seekers in the course of deportations", "improve conditions of detention of asylum seekers waiting for deportation".

⁸¹ E.g., "homeland governments should motivate foreigners to return", "set up re-integration programs for asylum seekers willing to return".

⁸² E.g., "strive for the integration of foreigners", "prevent polarization in the debate on minority issues", "strive for a multicultural society", "the multicultural society leads to a racial hotchpot". Note that such general references to "multicultural society" are not coded as "cultural participation and rights" because the term is often used as a broad catchword in calls for the acceptance of people with different cultural backgrounds. If it is used in referring to the more specific issue of cultural rights, then the more specific code should be used.

⁸³ E.g., "more resources for state agencies dealing with foreigners", "creation of a federal office for foreigners' questions".

⁸⁴ E.g., "equal rights and chances for foreigners".

⁸⁵ E.g., "allow dual nationality", "German citizenship for children born in Germany", "naturalization conditional upon sufficient knowledge of the German language" (note that this claim is not coded as "social rights and participation: language acquisition").

⁸⁶ E.g., "local voting rights for foreigners", "stimulate migrant political participation", "consult migrant organisations in decisions concerning them", "limit foreigners' right to demonstrate"; (OBJIDEN coded as "EU citizens"), "right to participate in local and regional initiatives and referenda for EU citizens"; (OBJIDEN coded as "Aussiedler) "reduce subventions for organizations of Aussiedler and Vertriebene".

⁸⁷ E.g., "introduce quotas for foreigners in certain professions". See also the footnotes to "education" and "police and judiciary".

- 215 'social rights and participation: health and welfare'
- 216 'social rights and participation: language acquisition'⁸⁹
- 217 'social rights and participation: housing and segregation'⁹⁰
- 218 'social rights and participation: police and judiciary'⁹¹
- 219 'social rights and participation: other/general'
- 220 'cultural rights and participation: education'⁹²
- 221 'cultural rights and participation: religion'⁹³
- 222 'cultural rights and participation: (recognition of) group identity/differences'⁹⁴
- 223 'cultural rights and participation: other/general'⁹⁵
- 224 'other rights and participation'
- 23 'discrimination and unequal treatment'⁹⁶

⁸⁸ E.g., “improve the education opportunities of young foreigners”. Note that demands for a better representation of minorities among teaching personnel, or for a quorum for minorities in that regard are coded here, not in “labour market”.

⁸⁹ Refers to acquisition of the language of the country of residence. E.g., “reduction of special German language programs for Aussiedler”. Claims pertaining to education in homeland languages should be coded as “cultural rights and participation: education”.

⁹⁰ E.g., “set limits to the percentage of foreigners in city districts”.

⁹¹ Note that demands for a better representation of minorities in the police force, or for a quorum of minorities in the police force are coded here, not in “labour market”.

⁹² E.g., (OBJIDEN as “specific ethnic or national group, OBJNAT as “Turks”) “introduction of Turkish as a second foreign language next to English”.

⁹³ E.g., (OBJIDEN coded as “Muslim/Islamic”) “stimulate the construction of mosks”, “recognition of Islam on an equal footing with Christian churches”, “creation of possibilities for ritual slaughtering for Muslims”, “creation of Islamic graveyards”, “introduce Islamic religious education organized in Germany, not directed from the homeland countries”, “integrate Islamic religious education in the normal school curriculum” (note that the later two claims are coded here, not as “cultural rights and participation: education”); (OBJIDEN coded as “Jewish/Israelite”, OBJNAT as “Jewish”) “support for Jewish religious organizations”, “allow polygamy”. This category includes claims relating to Islamic fundamentalism as an ideology/religious current, i.e. such claims are NOT coded in 253 'political extremism and violence'. However, claims relating to Islamic-inspired violence such as that of the GIA will be coded in 253 (i.e. if it is the content of Islamic fundamentalism that is central, code here, if illegal/violent forms of action are central, code in 253).

⁹⁴ E.g., “protect the cultural identity of foreigners”, (OBJIDEN is “specific national or ethnic group, OBJNAT is “Kurdish”) “recognize Kurds as a group separate from the Turks”, (OBJIDEN is “specific national or ethnic group”, OBJNAT is “Roma and Sinti”) “official minority status for Roma and Sinti”.

⁹⁵ E.g., “involve additional external experts in court cases against foreigners in order to judge cultural differences in behavioural patterns”. Note that this claim is coded here and not in “social rights and participation: police and judiciary”. The decision rule is that the distinction between social and cultural rights is the first criterion of classification, the substantive domain (labour market, education, etc.) the second criterion. The claim cited here asks for special provisions on the basis of cultural difference. Social rights demands are claims for equality and compensation of inequalities, regardless of cultural difference.

⁹⁶ The difference with the “rights and participation” category is that “discrimination and unequal treatment” claims focus on the majority society and its institutions as the cause of unequal participation of minorities. In that sense they are in between “rights and participation” claims and “antiracist” claims. Thus, a claim to improve the housing conditions for minorities is a “rights and participation” claim, a claim that calls for the creation of a possibility for members of minority groups to file complaints if they feel they have been refused housing because of their racial or cultural background is an antidiscrimination claim. Thus, “rights and participation” claims refer to demands relating to (proactive) positive minority rights, whereas “discrimination and unequal treatment claims” refers to (reactive) protection against infringements on these rights by the majority society. The difference between discrimination claims and antiracist claims is that the latter refer to overt abuse or violence, while discrimination claims refer to “hidden” or structural sources of unequal treatment. If in the housing example a complaint would be filed against a landlord who had refused someone, saying “we don’t want blacks here” the claim would be coded in antiracism. If the complaint is based only on the feeling that the landlord refuses people because they are black, or if the complaint

- 231 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁹⁷
- 232 'discrimination in politics'
- 233 'discrimination in the labour market'
- 234 'discrimination in the education system'
- 235 'discrimination in health and welfare services'⁹⁸
- 236 'discrimination regarding housing'
- 237 'discrimination in the police and judiciary system'⁹⁹
- 238 'discrimination: other specific issues'¹⁰⁰
- 25 'minority social problems'
 - 252 'crime'¹⁰¹
 - 253 'political extremism and violence'¹⁰²
 - 254 'Islamic extremism and violence'
 - 255 'Position of women in Islam'
 - 256 'Position of women in other minority groups'
 - 257 'Anti-Semitism'
 - 258 'Homophobia'
 - 256 'other'
- 26 'interethnic, inter- and intraorganizational relations'¹⁰³
 - 261 'inter/intraethnic relations'¹⁰⁴
 - 262 'inter/intraorganizational relations'¹⁰⁵

3 'ANTI-RACISM'

- 30 'racism in institutional contexts'¹⁰⁶

refers to a structural phenomenon, e.g., that a housing corporation tends to give blacks housing only in certain neighbourhoods, then we are dealing with an antidiscrimination claim. Note that the language is not decisive here: claims-makers may refer to both types as instances of (institutional) "racism". Our use of the term racism is more narrowly circumscribed.

⁹⁷ E.g., "combat discrimination of foreigners", "introduce and anti-discrimination law".

⁹⁸ E.g., "abolish special enquiries when foreigners apply for social welfare".

⁹⁹ E.g., "abolish registration of foreigners in a special police register".

¹⁰⁰ E.g., "abolish church regulations that discriminate against non-Christians, for instance the impossibility of church marriage when one of the partners is non-Christian".

¹⁰¹ E.g., "tougher line with criminal foreigners". Note that demands for expulsion of criminal foreigners are coded in "immigration and aliens politics".

¹⁰² E.g., "tougher measures against foreign extremists", (OBJIDEN is "specific national or ethnic group, OBJNAT is "Kurdish") "lifting of the ban on the PKK". Also includes demands related to policies and evaluation regarding ethnic and race riots. Note that demands for expulsion of foreign extremists are coded in "immigration and aliens politics".

¹⁰³ Interethnic here refers to relations between different minority groups, not between minorities and the majority group.

¹⁰⁴ Included here are conflicts among different ethnic minority groups that are *not* related to homeland but derive from their political, religious or economic competition in the country of residence. In Britain, examples include both verbal and physical conflicts between moderate and fundamentalist Muslims or between Muslims and Jews. Note that this category should only be used if such claims cannot be coded in a substantive policy field in immigration, integration, or antiracism. I.e., if in the British example the conflict between different Muslim groups is on whether or not to strive for separate Muslim schools, this is not coded here, but in 221.

¹⁰⁵ Only if not related to a substantive issue. E.g., the claim by a rival Muslim organization that "the Islamic Federation does not represent the Muslim community", or claims referring to conflicts among the leadership of ethnic organizations..

- 300 'general evaluation or policy direction'
- 301 'racist and extreme right language in politics'¹⁰⁷
- 302 'police racism and violence against minorities'¹⁰⁸
- 303 'racism in other state institutions'¹⁰⁹
- 304 'racism in non-state institutions'
- 31 'non-institutional racism, xenophobia and extreme right tendencies in society'¹¹⁰
 - 310 'general evaluation or policy direction'¹¹¹
 - 311 'moral appeals'¹¹²
 - 312 'social and educational responses'¹¹³
 - 313 'countermobilization'¹¹⁴
 - 314 'protection of minorities against violence'¹¹⁵
 - 315 'extreme right parties: alliances and exclusion'¹¹⁶
 - 316 'repression: political responses'¹¹⁷
 - 317 'repression: judicial responses'¹¹⁸
 - 318 'repression: police responses'¹¹⁹
 - 319 'repression: other'¹²⁰

¹⁰⁶ Note that this does not include all appeals against "institutional racism". This term, in fact, often refers to "hidden" and structural forms of discrimination, which we code in minority integration politics.

¹⁰⁷ E.g., "fight the use of racist language by politicians which paves the road for the extreme right".

¹⁰⁸ E.g., "dismantle the voluntary police reserve because of its repeated involvement in racist and extreme right incidents".

¹⁰⁹ E.g., "combat extreme right tendencies in the Bundeswehr".

¹¹⁰ Any references to xenophobia (including antisemitism) are included here, as well as unspecific references to the extreme right. Claims which explicitly refer to aspects of the extreme right which are not, or only marginally related to immigration and minorities are not included, however. See below under 5.

¹¹¹ E.g., "against xenophobia and the extreme right", "formation of a common front against the extreme right". Note that such claims may occasionally be made by extreme right organizations, e.g., the Republikaner distancing themselves from xenophobic violence.

¹¹² E.g., "tolerance", "dialogue between Germans and foreigners", "solidarity with foreigners".

¹¹³ E.g., "a better social politics", "civil education and information of the public".

¹¹⁴ E.g., "organize a countermovement", "German citizens should protect asylum seeker centers", "counterdemonstrations only help the extreme right to get the media attention it wants". Also includes claims by extreme right and xenophobic groups against such countermobilization.

¹¹⁵ E.g., "police should protect asylum seeker centers better against attacks".

¹¹⁶ Claims that refer to how one should politically deal with extreme right parties. E.g., "no cooperation with extreme right parties". Not included are claims on political strategy with regard to the extreme right that are purely tactical (these are coded in 760) or relate to topics other than immigration and minorities. I.e., if a call is made to boycott the Front National because of Le Pen's statement on the Holocaust as a detail in history, this claim is coded in 720. The present category is, however, the default. I.e., unless there is explicit evidence that the claim is inspired by something else than the extreme right's xenophobia, we code the claim in antiracism. Note that this category, too, includes claims by the extreme right itself against its political exclusion (unless again this exclusion is explicitly related to something else than xenophobia).

¹¹⁷ E.g., "a better coordination of the fight against the extreme right", "politicians should resign if they do not adequately respond to racist incidents", "ban extreme right organisations", "ban extreme right demonstrations", "tougher legislation". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

¹¹⁸ E.g., "judges do not sentence the perpetrators of extreme right violence harshly enough". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

¹¹⁹ E.g., "police do not sufficiently interfere when xenophobic acts are committed", "organization X should be put under observation of the internal security agencies", "police should avoid spectacular clashes with extreme right groups, since that only gives these groups the publicity they want". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

¹²⁰ E.g., "exclude members of extreme right organizations from the civil service". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

- 320 'other specific issues'
- 4 'GENERAL XENOPHOBIC CLAIMS'¹²¹
 - 40 'xenophobic claims'
 - 400 'xenophobic claims'¹²²
- 6 'ACTOR CLAIMS MINORITIES'
 - 61 'homeland politics'
 - 610 'pure homeland politics'¹²³
 - 611 'politics of country of residence with regard to homeland issues'¹²⁴
 - 62 'transnational politics'¹²⁵
 - 621 'Palestine-Israeli conflict'
 - 622 'Iraq war'
 - 623 'Afghanistan war'
 - 624 'other Islamic solidarity'
 - 625 'other transnational politics'
 - 63 'other'
 - 621 'World War II/Holocaust'¹²⁶
 - 622 'other'
- 7 'OTHER CLAIMS RE: EXTREME RIGHT'¹²⁷
 - 71 'general, unspecific claims'¹²⁸
 - 710 'general, unspecific claims'
 - 72 'World War II, Third Reich, etc.'¹²⁹
 - 720 'World War II, Third Reich, etc.'
 - 73 'nationalist and revanchist claims'¹³⁰

¹²¹ Xenophobic politics is defined by undifferentiated rejection of migrants and minorities. By definition, it includes claims that cannot be conveyed adequately in any of the above more specific codes. Thus "Ausländer 'raus" is neither a call for a restrictive immigration and aliens politics, nor a call for a tough politics of integration, it simply rejects these two phenomena altogether. All demands in this field should have position code - 1. Demands against xenophobia are coded in "anti-racism".

¹²² E.g., "Deutschland den Deutschen, Ausländer 'raus!", also antisemitic claims (which then get OBJIDEN "specific ethnic or national group" and OBJNAT "Jewish").

¹²³ E.g., "stop repression of Kurds in Turkey", "against Kurdish attacks on Turkish targets in Germany".

¹²⁴ E.g., "against military support by the German government for the Turkish regime", "better protection for Turks against Kurdish attacks in Germany", "lift ban on the PKK in Germany", "boycott of Turkey by German tourists", "admit Turkey to the EU", "the German media give a false picture of the situation in Turkey".

¹²⁵ Claims made by actors about transnational politics when it does not consider their own homeland. If an Iraqi migrant claims that the Dutch government should not cooperate in the war on Iraq, code under 61.

¹²⁶ E.g., "remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust" (without any reference to present-day extreme right, otherwise code as 312).

¹²⁷ Includes all claims by extreme right groups and organisations on issues other than migration, minorities and xenophobia, as well as claims by other actors in reaction to such claims by the extreme right (where such claims have been coded; the Dutch case study does not include them).

¹²⁸ E.g., "the national right should unite", "the Republikaner will challenge the established parties in the upcoming elections".

¹²⁹ E.g., denial of the Holocaust, "Sieg Heil", "Heil Hitler", "against the enduring stigmatization of Germany because of the Holocaust", "the Holocaust is a detail in the history of the Second World War".

- 730 'nationalist and revanchist claims'
- 74 '*extreme right opposition against political opponents*'
 - 741 'anti-left claims'¹³¹
 - 742 'claims against the established right'
 - 743 'general anti-establishment claims'¹³²
 - 744 'other'
- 75 'mainstream political issues'¹³³
 - 750 crime, justice, public order
 - 751 bureaucracy, officialdom
 - 752 welfare state, social security
 - 753 welfare
 - 754 health care
 - 755 defence
 - 756 Iraq
 - 757 Afghanistan
 - 758 other foreign policy issues
 - 759 European integration
 - 760 economic policy
 - 761 Monetary policy, euro, inflation
 - 762 unemployment
 - 763 technology, science policy
 - 764 education
 - 765 gay rights
 - 766 women's emancipation
 - 767 environment policy, nature
 - 768 agriculture & fishery
 - 769 traffic
 - 770 cultural & media policy
 - 779 other specific issues
- 78 'electoral competition: non-substantive claims'¹³⁴
 - 781 'inclusion of Pim Fortuyn'
 - 782 'exclusion of Pim Fortuyn'
 - 783 'other coalition formation'
 - 784 'Personnel issues'
 - 785 'other'
- 79 'Personal characteristics of opponents'
 - 790 'personal characteristics of opponents'

Variable **ISSCOPI**

¹³⁰ E.g., "against the recognition of the Oder-Neiße line" (i.e., the postwar German borders), "hand back property in Eastern Europe to Germans who were expelled or fled after the war", "establish a New German Reich", "Germany should become an independent European power, outside of NATO and the EU".

¹³¹ E.g., "down with the Red front!".

¹³² E.g., "against Politbuzen", "fight the corrupt political system".

¹³³ Statements by extreme right parties on 'mainstream' political issues, e.g., unemployment, environment, law and order (provided of course that the statement does not have an explicit xenophobic twist, then code under 4. For obvious reasons, we will not code claims relating to such mainstream issues by other than the extreme right.

¹³⁴ If there is both a 'mainstream political' and an 'electoral competition' claim, code the mainstream claim as ISSUE1 and the competition one as ISSUE2

Variable label 'scope of first issue'

Refers to the geographical and/or political scope of the claim. Scope here refers to the actors, actions, legislation or conventions that are implied in the claim. I.e., a claim has a scope beyond the national context (codes 1-5) if it refers to actors (e.g., the EU, foreign investors), and/or actions (e.g., improving conditions in homelands, economic aid to countries of origin), and/or legislation and conventions (e.g., the UN Children's Rights Convention, the European Charta on Minority Languages). The scope always refers to the widest scope geographical/political dimension implied in the claim. I.e., when the issue has both a national and a European dimension, "European" is coded. See further the examples given in the footnotes. The categories used are similar to those used for the ACTSCOP variables, except that here there is no differentiation between national and subnational scope.

Value labels

0 'no verbal claim'¹³⁵

1 'supra- or transnational: European'¹³⁶

2 'supra- or transnational: other'¹³⁷

3 'foreign national: migrant homelands'¹³⁸

4 'foreign national: other'

5 'bilateral'¹³⁹

8 'national or subnational'¹⁴⁰

Note: Similarly code **ISSCOP2** and **ISSCOP3** (with adapted variable labels for 0)

Variable **FOCUS1**

Variable label 'first thematic focus: verbal and physical combined'

For verbal claims, this variable is equal to SSISSUE1 (the two-digit code). For physical claims (e.g., acts of violence), the value of the variable is determined on the basis of the (assumed) actor and the nature of the target. The most common examples are probably:

- attacks by xenophobic groups against migrants or minorities (incl. Jewish targets) : code 40
- attacks by extreme right groups against WWII related targets (e.g., monuments): code 72

¹³⁵ The number of cases here should be identical to that for the zero category of SSISSUE1. I.e., every verbal claim should have a score on scope.

¹³⁶ E.g., "The German government should strive for a common European solution of immigration problems" (claim has both a European and a national dimension, "European" is coded).

¹³⁷ E.g., "The UNHCR should determine which countries can be regarded as 'safe countries of origin'", "the UN Convention on the Rights of Children should prevail over the German Aliens' Law", "Create an international commission to investigate right-wing violence in Germany", "Right-wing violence is harmful to Germany's image abroad and may deter foreign investors" (frame). In order to give postnational hypotheses the benefit of doubt, all claims which refer generally to "human rights" will be coded here.

¹³⁸ E.g., "Improve the rights of ethnic Germans in their countries of origin", "Measures against the persecution of Roma in Eastern Europe".

¹³⁹ E.g., "Increase economic aid to Eastern European countries to prevent migration to Germany", "set up reintegration programs in Bosnia to stimulate refugees to return", the conclusion of a treaty between Germany and Turkey regarding the deportation of Kurdish refugees, "Conclude city partnerships with Eastern European cities as a gesture of reconciliation".

¹⁴⁰ E.g., "The federal government should increase support for local communities to help them cope with increased immigration", "limit the constitutional right to asylum", "Aussiedler should await the result of their application in their country of origin (the reference to the country of origin is not substantive here: the application procedure is a purely German national-level affair), "Reception of Aussiedler directly by local communities, not first in large reception centres".

- attacks by extreme right groups against political opponents (e.g., politicians, left-wing groups): code 74
- physical confrontations between ethnic minority groups related to homeland politics: code 61
- other physical confrontations between ethnic minority groups: code 26
- attacks against xenophobic and extreme right groups: code 31

All claims should get a code for FOCUS1, except for repressive measures with no verbal claim attached (i.e., those repressive measures that have a missing value on SSISSUE1); these get the value 99:

99 '*repressive measure*'

There is no use for equivalents for 2nd and 3rd focus. Indirect information on the thematic focus drawn from actor-target combinations is only added where no aim or frame has been coded.

Variable **POSIT1**

Variable label '*Position of claim towards issue*'

Value labels

- 1 'anti-minority/xenophobic/extreme right'¹⁴¹
- 0 'neutral/ambivalent'¹⁴²
- 1 'pro-minority/antiracist/anti-extreme right'¹⁴³
- 9 'unclassifiable'

This variable should provide a general indicator of the position of claims with regard to the rights, position and evaluation of migrants and minorities (and, conversely, of those who mobilise against them). All claims whose realisation implies a deterioration in the rights or position of migrants or minorities receive code -1, no matter if the reduction is minor or large. The -1 also goes to claims which express a negative attitude with regard to migrants or minorities (both verbal and physical) or a positive attitude with regard to xenophobic and extreme right groups or aims. All claims whose realisation implies an improvement in the rights and position of migrants (minor or major) receive code 1. This code also goes to claims expressing (verbally or physically) a positive attitude with regard to migrants, or a negative attitude with regard to xenophobic and extreme right groups or aims. Neutral or ambivalent claims, which are not necessarily related to any deterioration or improvement in migrants' position or rights and do not express a clear attitude with regard to migrants and minorities or their opponents receive code 0. Repressive measures without verbal claims should also be categorised on this variable: -1 goes to repressive measures directed against minorities, +1 to repressive measures directed against xenophobic and extreme right

¹⁴¹ E.g., all physical attacks on migrants or minorities, "give social benefits to asylum seekers in kind rather than cash", "stop the misuse of asylum laws", "stricter measures against minority crime", "address the issue of Kurdish extremism", "punish airline companies who transport asylum seekers without a visa", "improve border controls", "create programs to stimulate the voluntary return of refugees".

¹⁴² E.g. neutral, "create larger centres for the reception of asylum seekers", "distribute the costs related to the reception of asylum seekers more evenly among the federal, regional and local levels", "house Aussiedler in former Soviet army barracks", "strive for a common European solution to immigration problems". E.g. Ambivalent: "xenophobic attacks are the work of 'blind criminals'" (ambivalent since it expresses a negative attitude with regard to the perpetrators but simultaneously refuses to take the matter seriously), "even right-wing extremists have the right to free speech" (refuses to curtail the freedom of speech of racists, but not from an anti-minority point of view). The latter example implies that claims against bans on the freedom of speech, demonstration and organisation of the extreme right should generally receive code 0, not -1. Claims in favour of such measures are coded 1.

¹⁴³ E.g., all statements against xenophobia, all physical attacks on right-wing extremists, "provide more information to the public on the situation of Aussiedler", "do not criminalise foreigners", "keep the constitutional right to asylum as it is".

individuals and groups. The following categories of claims are coded as missing (9) because they cannot be positioned on the -1/+1 scale: actor claims of minorities (FOCUS1 61 and 62) and of antiracists (FOCUS1 80); claims by the extreme right against political opponents, on mainstream political issues, and on tactical electoral issues (FOCUS1 74-76).

Note: Similarly code **POSIT2** and **POSIT3**. Add code 8 'no claim' (Define as MISSING) for those cases where no second or third claim has been coded. Rules for combining aims and frames, see the remarks above relating to the ISSUE variables.

OBJECT ACTORS

Variable **OBJIDEN1**

Variable label 'identity of object of claim'

Value labels

5 'extreme right parties'

6 'other concrete xenophobic or extreme right organizations or groups'

7 'the extreme right, racists, xenophobes unspecified'

95 'migrants and minorities unspecified'

98 '*not applicable: repressive measure*'

99 'not applicable: claim outside the thematic field'

All other labels, same as IDENMIN.

Variable **OBJNAT1**

Variable label 'nationality or ethnicity of object of claim'

value labels same as NATMIN, *except*:

997 '*not applicable: object is extreme right*'

998 '*not applicable: repressive measure*'

999 '*not applicable: claim outside thematic field*'

Variable **OBJEVAL1 (OBJEVAL2, OBJEVAL3)**

Variable label 'evaluation of object actor'

Value labels

-1 'negative'

0 'neutral'

1 'positive'

9 'ambivalent'

These variables are coded only for claims in the thematic field (ERCICLA1-3 = 1). The object is the group whose interests, position or physical integrity are, or would be affected by the realization of the claim. This includes direct physical objects (e.g., of violent attacks), as well as objects of verbal claims. Only minority or migrant groups, or xenophobic and extreme right groups can be coded as objects (all other actors, when mentioned, are indirect objects, i.e., are coded in the addressee variables). For migrant and minority objects, the categories used are exactly the same as those for IDENMIN and NATMIN. Only

OBJIDEN1 gets an additional category 95 labelled “migrants and minorities unspecified” for claims that do not specify any particular object group or label. For xenophobic and extreme right groups, we only make a very simple distinction between three types (see above, codes 5-7). If claims both have a minority or migrant object *and* a xenophobic or extreme right object, the priority rule is that the migrant or minority object is coded.

Depending on the level of detail at which the language of claims has been retained, it may not always be possible to retrieve whether a claim pertains to “foreigners”, “immigrants” or “minorities”. These are coded in a residual category 95. Proceed as follows: first give all claims code 95, then recode those for which you can identify a specific group label (e.g., illegal aliens, asylum seekers, Soviet Jews, Antilleans, Muslims, blacks). Probably, the 95 category will remain relatively large because our coding has not been detailed enough in this respect and/or because claims are stated in vague terms. This will be the case to an even larger extent for the OBJNAT variables, because nationality has often not been coded and/or claims do not refer to specific nationalities, but to a general status group (e.g., asylum seekers). Nevertheless, it is important to be able to select cases according to specific identity or national groups (e.g., all claims on Antillians, on war refugees, on Jews, or on Muslims).

The object is coded on the basis of the language of the claim, not some notion of ours of how the object should be properly classified. For instance, claims pertaining to a group of asylum seekers who have been refused recognition, and thus are now illegal, may be framed in terms of asylum politics or as a problem of illegal aliens. Or, the claim to stop immigration may also be framed as “stop the influx of foreigners”. In the latter case, we code OBJIDEN1 as “foreigners”, in the former case as “immigrants”.

Examples:

- A call for a change in asylum legislation: OBJIDEN1 is “asylum seekers”, OBJNAT1 is zero.
- A protest against the deportation of Kurdish refugees: OBJIDEN1 is “asylum seekers”, OBJNAT1 is “Kurdish”.
- A xenophobic arson attack against a Turkish family’s house: OBJIDEN1 is “specific national or ethnic group”, OBJNAT1 is “Turkish”.
- An attack against a Nigerian asylum seeker: OBJIDEN1 is “asylum seekers”, OBJNAT1 is “Nigerian”.
- Skinheads beat up a “black man”: OBJIDEN1 is “blacks”, OBJNAT1 is zero.
- Demand to allow the Islamic call to prayer: OBJIDEN1 is “Muslims”, OBJNAT1 is zero.
- Demand for easier naturalization (it does not say “for foreigners”, but it is obvious that the claim is relevant for foreign residents only): OBJIDEN1 is “foreigners”, OBJNAT1 is zero.
- Recognize Roma and Sinti as a minority: OBJIDEN1 is “specific national or ethnic group”, OBJNAT1 is “Roma and Sinti” (the reference to minority is irrelevant here, the claim affects the interests of Roma and Sinti, not those of minorities in general).
- Ban the PKK: OBJIDEN1 is “specific national or ethnic group”, OBJNAT1 is “Kurdish”.
- Demand for a better training of the police in how to deal with the extreme right: OBJIDEN1 is “the extreme right, racists, xenophobes unspecified”, OBJNAT1 is 99 (not applicable).
- Stimulate a dialogue between Germans and foreigners: OBJIDEN1 is “foreigners”, OBJNAT1 is zero.
- Set up vigils to protect asylum seeker centres against racist attacks: OBJIDEN1 is “asylum seekers”, OBJNAT1 is zero (i.e., according to the priority rule, asylum seekers are coded as object, not racists).

In combination with the ISSUE variables, these variables allow us to reconstruct policy and issue fields for specific migrant or minority groups. E.g., all claims dealing with asylum and asylum seekers, all claims relating to Muslims, all claims referring to “foreigners”, Antilleans, blacks, minorities, etc.

Note: Variables **OBJIDEN2**, **OBJIDEN3**, **OBJNAT2** and **OBJNAT3** should be coded likewise, with adapted labels for zero.

FRAMES: INTEGRATION AND IMMIGRATION

In case a claim contains more than one frame, the following priority rules should be followed. As far as frames on causes and consequences are concerned (i.e. causes of integration problems, fundamentalism and the rise of Pim Fortuyn; consequences of immigration, fundamentalism and the rise of Pim Fortuyn), ultimate causes and consequences precede proximate ones. Moreover, claims, which are stated positively, precede claims which are stated negatively. Once all priority rules have been taken account of, frames are coded according to the order they are mentioned in in the article.

CONSIM

Variable label 'Frames on the consequences of immigration'

Note: variable **CONSIM2** is constructed likewise

0 No CONSIM frame

100 Demographics

- 101 Overpopulation/overcrowding
- 102 Compensation for aging population
- 103 Environmental pressure
- 104 Housing shortages
- 109 Other demographics

200 Economic

- 201 Contribution to the economy
- 202 International competitiveness
- 203 Higher innovation potential
- 204 Unemployment / competition for jobs
- 205 Good for exports / transnational economic linkages
- 206 Economic advantages of multilingualism / multiculturalism
- 219 Other economic

300 Social and political

- 301 Crime
- 302 Welfare expenditures
- 303 Social security and welfare system
- 304 Securing future pensions and other elements of the welfare state
- 305 National security (terrorism/extremism)
- 306 Social cohesion (self-segregation, parallel societies)
- 307 Solidarity
- 308 Neighbourhood deterioration
- 319 Other social and political

400 Cultural

- 401 Cultural Diversity
- 402 Dutch national Identity
- 403 Alienation of native population
- 409 Other cultural

CAUSEIN¹⁴⁴

Variable label 'Frames on causes of integration problems'

¹⁴⁴ Only causes of integration problems that are not about islamic fundamentalism are coded here. Those are coded in CAUSFUND.

Note: variable **CAUSEIN2** is constructed likewise

0 No CAUSIN frame

100 Demographic

- 101 Immigration
- 102 Unskilled immigrants
- 103 Family reunification
- 104 Dutch borders more open compared to other EU countries
- 109 Other demographic

200 Economic

- 201 Decline
- 202 Restructuring
- 203 Incompatibility between type of immigrants and demands of the economy
- 204 Poverty / Deprivation.
- 209 Other economic

300 Social and political

- 301 Lack of skills/low education level of immigrants (as a cause of other problems)
- 302 Insufficient language skills of immigrants
- 303 Discrimination
- 304 Racism
- 305 Intolerance of Dutch
- 306 Indifference of Dutch
- 307 Intolerance/racism/anti-Semitism on the side of immigrants
- 308 Insufficient adaptation/openness of institutions to cultural diversity
- 309 Media image (“beeldvorming”), public debate on immigration (“toon van het debat”)
- 310 Anti-immigrant statements by politicians and opinion leaders
- 311 Tough/inhumane immigration/integration policies
- 312 Outside agitators (e.g., foreign Islamic fundamentalist recruiters)
- 313 White flight (segregation mainly due to autochtonous Dutch)
- 314 Self-segregation
- 315 Segregation unspecified
- 316 Dutch tradition of pillarization
- 317 Too much emphasis in integration policies on assimilation
- 318 Too much emphasis in integration policies on multiculturalism / own culture of immigrants
- 319 Lack of funds/budget cuts for integration policies
- 329 Other social and political

400 Religious

- 401 Nature of Islam
- 402 Literal interpretation of Koran/Sharia.
- 403 Misinterpretation of Islam
- 404 Incompatibility of Islam with Western/Dutch society
- 405 Position of women in Islam
- 406 Position of individual in Islam
- 407 Intolerant/violent nature of Islam
- 408 Backwardness of Islam
- 409 Refusal of Islam to recognize separation of church and state
- 410 Undemocratic nature of Islam
- 419 Other characteristics of Islam

- 429 Characteristics of other religions than Islam
- 500 Cultural
 - 501 Unwillingness of immigrants to assimilate
 - 502 Insufficient sense of national identity/national pride of the Dutch
 - 509 Other cultural
- 600 Psychological explanations.
 - 601 Psycho-pathology.
 - 602 Identity problems
 - 603 other social-psychological problems
 - 604 Non-specifies characteristics of individuals or small groups
 - 609 Other psychological explanations

CAUSFUN

Variable label 'Causes of Fundamentalism'

Note: variable CAUSFUN2 is constructed likewise

- 0 No CAUSFUN frame
- 100 Demographic
 - 101 Immigration
 - 102 Unskilled immigrants
 - 103 Family reunification
 - 109 Other demographic
- 200 Economic
 - 201 Declining economy
 - 202 Restructuring
 - 203 Incompatibility between type of immigrants and demands of the economy
 - 204 Poverty / Deprivation.
 - 209 Other economic
- 300 Social and political
 - 301 Lack of skills/low education level of immigrants (as cause of other problems)
 - 302 Insufficient language skills of immigrants
 - 303 Discrimination
 - 304 Racism
 - 305 Intolerance of Dutch
 - 306 Indifference of Dutch
 - 307 Intolerance/racism/anti-Semitism on the side of immigrants
 - 308 Insufficient adaptation/openness of institutions to cultural diversity
 - 309 Media image ("beeldvorming"), public debate on immigration ("toon van het debat")
 - 310 Anti-immigrant statements by politicians and opinion leaders
 - 311 Tough/inhumane immigration/integration policies
 - 312 Outside agitators (e.g., foreign Islamic fundamentalist recruiters)
 - 313 White flight (segregation mainly due to autochtonous Dutch)
 - 314 Self-segregation
 - 315 Segregation unspecified
 - 316 Dutch tradition of pillarization
 - 317 Too much emphasis in integration policies on assimilation
 - 318 Identity problems Muslims
 - 329 Other social and political
- 400 Religious

- 401 Nature of Islam
- 402 Literal interpretation of koran / sharia.
- 403 Misinterpretation of Islam
- 404 Incompatibility of Islam with Western/Dutch society
- 405 Position of women in Islam
- 406 Position of individual in Islam
- 407 Intolerant/violent nature of Islam
- 408 Backwardness of Islam
- 409 Refusal of Islam to recognize separation of church and state
- 410 Undemocratic nature of Islam
- 419 Other characteristics of Islam
- 429 characteristics of other religions than Islam
- 500 Cultural
 - 501 Unwillingness of immigrants to assimilate
 - 502 Insufficient sense of national identity/national pride of the Dutch
 - 509 Other cultural
- 600 Psychological explanations.
 - 601 Psycho-pathology.
 - 602 Identity problems
 - 603 other social-psychological problems
 - 604 Non-specifies characteristics of individuals or small groups
 - 609 Other psychological explanations
- 700 Integration
 - 701 Social
 - 702 Economic
 - 703 Cultural
 - 709 Other integration
- 800 Foreign / International trends
 - 801 September 11
 - 802 Foreign interference in Afghanistan
 - 803 Foreign interference in Iraq
 - 804 Israel / Palestinian conflict
 - 805 Other Middle Eastern conflicts
 - 806 Westernization (spread of democracy / consumerism / imperialism)
 - 819 Other foreign / international trends

CONSFUN

Variable label 'Consequences of Fundamentalism'
 Note: variable **CONSFUN2** is constructed likewise

- 0 No CONSFUN frame
- 100 Political
 - 110 General
 - 111 Electoral changes
 - 112 Extreme right parties
 - 113 Discontent electorate
 - 114 Political chaos / insecurity
 - 119 Other general
 - 120 Agenda
 - 121 Agenda setting: safety
 - 122 Agenda setting: integration

- 123 Agenda setting: immigration
- 124 Agenda setting: norms and values
- 125 Agenda setting: incompatibility Dutch norms and Islam
- 129 Other Agenda-setting
- 130 Policy
 - 131 Stricter integration policy
 - 132 Budget cuts integration policy
 - 133 Stricter immigration policy
 - 134 Measures to increase safety
 - 135 Measures to enhance Dutch norms and values
 - 139 Other policy
- 140 Climate
 - 141 Democratic norms and values
 - 142 Intimidation/threatening of politicians
 - 143 Harshening political debate
 - 144 Political engagement
 - 145 Intimidation of opinion leaders
 - 146 Stereotyping Muslims by politicians
 - 159 Other climate
- 200 Social
 - 201 General discontent citizens
 - 202 Loss of innocence Dutch society
 - 203 Feelings of insecurity
 - 204 Solidarity
 - 205 Fear
 - 206 Polarization of society
 - 207 Stereotyping Muslims by Dutch citizens
 - 219 Other social
- 300 Cultural
 - 301 Awareness of ethnic identity
 - 302 Violence towards ethnic minorities
 - 303 Intolerance towards ethnic minorities
 - 304 Discrimination
 - 305 Self-segregation ethnic minorities
 - 306 Alienation among natives
 - 307 Alienation among ethnic minorities
 - 308 Perceived incompatibility Dutch norms and Islamic norms
 - 319 Other cultural
- 400 No consequences at all

ATTRISL

Variable label 'Characteristics attributed to Islam'

Note: variable **ATTRISL2** is constructed likewise

When more characteristics are attributed to Islam by an actor in one claim, the priority rule is 150 > all others.

0 No ATTRISL frame

100 Political / religious localization of Islam

101 Radical / extreme

102 Fundamental

- 103 Liberal
- 104 Moderate
- 105 Conservative
- 106 Political
- 107 Terrorist / militant
- 109 Other Political / religious localization of Islam
- 110 Islam / Muslims in relation to Western society
 - 111 Arrears of Muslims groups
 - 112 Islam as threat to Western society
 - 113 Failure of Muslims to discourage ill treatment of women
 - 114 Cultural separatism
 - 115 Spreading of Islam
 - 116 Incompatibility between Muslims and Dutch natives
 - 117 Incompatibility Islam and liberalism
 - 118 Incompatibility Islam and democracy
 - 119 Incompatibility Islam and Judeo-Christianity
 - 129 Other Islam / Muslims in relation to Western society
- 130 Characteristics of Islam
 - 131 Refusal of Islam to recognize separation of church and state
 - 132 Liberal nature
 - 133 Democratic nature
 - 134 Patriarchal nature
 - 135 Tolerant nature
 - 136 Progressive nature
 - 137 Violent nature
 - 138 Religious fanaticism
 - 139 Immovability/uniformity
 - 140 Flexibility/ diversity
 - 141 Philanthropic nature
 - 142 Pacifistic nature Islam
 - 143 Mobilizing capacities
 - 144 Civilized nature
 - 145 Stimulating integration
 - 149 Other Characteristics of Islam
- 150 Counter frames
 - 151 Demonization of Islam
 - 152 Concept of an enemy
 - 153 Islamophobia
 - 154 Crusade against Islam
 - 155 Generalization
 - 156 Stigmatization
 - 169 Other counter frames

FRAMES: PIM FORTUYN

CAUSFOR

Variable label 'Frames on the causes of the rise of Pim Fortuyn'¹⁴⁵.

Note: variable CAUSFOR2 is constructed likewise

- 100 External factors
 - 110 Political
 - 111 Decay of democracy
 - 112 Bureaucracy problems
 - 113 Liberalism
 - 114 Tolerance
 - 115 Asylum policy
 - 116 Political elitism
 - 117 Gap between politics and citizen
 - 118 Floating electorate
 - 129 Other political
 - 130 Economic
 - 131 Economic consequences of globalization
 - 132 Unemployment
 - 133 Labor shortages
 - 139 Other economic
 - 140 Social
 - 141 Safety
 - 142 Insecurity
 - 143 Deterioration of public services
 - 144 Housing shortages
 - 145 Crime
 - 146 Gap between media and citizen
 - 149 Other social
 - 150 Demographic
 - 151 Immigration problems
 - 152 Concentration of minorities
 - 159 Other demographic
 - 160 Cultural
 - 161 Multiculturalism
 - 162 Failing integration of minorities
 - 163 Intolerance towards minorities
 - 164 September 11
 - 165 Rushdie affair
 - 166 Attacks on US embassy
 - 169 Other cultural
- 200 Feelings among citizens
 - 210 General discontent / perceived need for change
 - 220 Perceived political
 - 221 Decay of democracy
 - 222 Bureaucracy problems
 - 223 Liberalism

¹⁴⁵ Coded here are frames on Pim Fortuyn himself as well as frames on the LPF and Leefbaar Nederland during the period that Fortuyn was involved in those parties.

- 224 Tolerance
- 225 Asylum policy
- 226 Political elitism
- 227 Distance to political actors
- 239 Other perceived political
- 240 Perceived economic
 - 241 Economic consequences of globalization
 - 242 Labor shortages
 - 243 Unemployment
 - 249 Other perceived economic
- 250 Perceived social
 - 251 Safety issues (insecurity)
 - 252 Deterioration of public services
 - 253 Housing shortages
 - 254 Crime
 - 255 Gap between media and citizen
 - 259 Other perceived social
- 260 Perceived demographic
 - 261 Immigration problems
 - 262 Concentration of minorities
 - 269 Other perceived demographic
- 270 Perceived cultural
 - 271 Multiculturalism
 - 272 Alienation
 - 273 Failing integration of minorities
 - 274 Intolerance towards minorities
 - 279 Other perceived cultural
- 280 Perceived needs
 - 281 Need of strong leader
 - 282 Need to shake up establishment / for something new
 - 283 Need for sensation
 - 289 Other perceived needs
- 300 Inherent characteristics Fortuyn
- 400 Catalyst factors
 - 410 Specific events
 - 411 Death Fortuyn
 - 412 Success local Leefbaren
 - 413 Debate Fortuyn / Melkert
 - 414 Local election day
 - 415 Debate Erasmus university (R: U gaat meneer Fortuyn?)
 - 416 Fortuyn breaks with Leefbaar Nederland
 - 417 Interview with Van Scherrenburg (Mens, ga toch koken)
 - 418 Cake event
 - 419 Volkskrant interview
 - 420 Fortuyn becomes leader of Leefbaar Nederland
 - 429 Other specific events
 - 430 Actions by Fortuyn
 - 431 Self-presentation Fortuyn
 - 439 Other actions by Pim Fortuyn
 - 440 Actions by other actors
 - 441 Media attention for Fortuyn

- 442 Media attention for opponents Fortuyn
- 443 Political attention for Fortuyn
- 444 Political attention for opponents Fortuyn
- 445 Media framing Fortuyn
- 446 Media framing opponents Fortuyn
- 447 Framing Fortuyn by politicians
- 448 Framing opponents Fortuyn by politicians
- 449 Internal struggles paarse coalition
- 450 Strategic errors opponents Fortuyn
- 451 Insufficient capacities opponents Fortuyn
- 459 Other actions by other actors.

CONSFOR

Variable label 'Frames on the consequences of the rise of Pim Fortuyn'.

Note: variable **CONSFOR2** is constructed likewise

0 No CONSFOR frame

100 Demographics

- 101 Influx economic refugees
- 102 Influx political refugees
- 103 Family reunification / marriage immigration
- 104 Expat immigration
- 105 Dutch emigration
- 109 Other demographics

200 Economic

- 201 Innovation potential
- 202 Strict economic regulation
- 203 Settlement climate for firms
- 204 Welfare of citizens
- 205 State finances.
- 209 Other economic

300 Political

310 General

- 311 Incorporation ideas Fortuyn by mainstream political parties
- 312 Internal crisis/introspection political establishment
- 313 Electoral changes
- 314 Personnel changes
- 315 Arrival of inexperienced politicians
- 316 Transparency
- 317 Extreme right parties
- 318 Political renewal
- 319 Politics becomes more interesting
- 320 Cleavage politics and electorate
- 321 Discontent electorate
- 322 Political chaos / insecurity
- 323 Change in relationship between government and parliament
- 324 Anti-European sentiment
- 329 Other general

330 Agenda

- 331 Agenda setting: safety
- 332 Agenda setting: integration

- 333 Agenda setting: immigration
- 334 Agenda setting: administrative renewal
- 335 Agenda setting: social security
- 336 Agenda setting: health care system
- 337 Agenda setting: economic regulation
- 338 Agenda setting: dualism
- 339 Agenda setting: norms and values
- 340 Agenda setting: incompatibility Dutch norms and Islam
- 349 Other Agenda-setting
- 350 Policy
 - 351 Stricter integration policy
 - 352 Budget cuts integration policy
 - 353 Stricter immigration policy
 - 354 Stricter social security policy
 - 355 Budget cuts social security policy
 - 356 Budget cuts defense
 - 357 Organizational reform health care policy
 - 358 Organizational reform cultural policy
 - 359 Measures to increase democracy
 - 360 Measures to fight bureaucracy
 - 361 Measures to increase transparency
 - 362 Measures to increase safety
 - 363 Measures to enhance Dutch norms and values
 - 269 Other policy
- 370 Climate
 - 371 Democratic norms and values
 - 372 Personalization of politics
 - 373 Role emotions in politics
 - 374 Intimidation/threatening of politicians
 - 375 Harshening political debate
 - 376 Simplification political debate
 - 377 Influence TV on politics
 - 278 Political engagement
 - 379 Space to criticize politicians
 - 380 Disappearance of political taboo's
 - 381 Change in campaigning style political parties
 - 382 Room for expressing opinions
 - 383 Internal crisis/ introspection media
 - 384 Intimidation of opinion leaders
 - 389 Other climate
- 390 Social
 - 391 General discontent citizens
 - 392 Loss of innocence Dutch society
 - 393 Feelings of insecurity
 - 394 Solidarity
 - 395 Fear
 - 396 Polarization of society
 - 399 Other social
- 400 Cultural
 - 401 Awareness of ethnic identity
 - 402 Violence towards ethnic minorities

- 403 Intolerance towards ethnic minorities
- 404 Discrimination
- 405 Self-segregation ethnic minorities
- 406 Alienation among natives
- 407 Alienation among ethnic minorities
- 408 Fundamentalism
- 409 Extremism
- 410 Perceived incompatibility Dutch norms and Islamic norms
- 419 Other cultural
- 420 Image
 - 421 Self-image Dutch society
 - 422 Perception Dutch society abroad
 - 423 Image Rotterdam
 - 429 Other image
- 430 No consequences at all

ATTRFOR

Variable label 'Characteristics attributed to Fortuyn'.

Note: variable **ATTRFOR2** is constructed likewise

When more characteristics are attributed to Fortuyn by an actor in one claim, the priority rule is 100 and 200 > 300.

0 No ATTRFOR frame

100 Political localization

- 101 Extreme-right
- 102 Fascist
- 103 Racist
- 104 (Right-wing) populist
- 105 Liberal
- 106 Communist
- 107 Progressive
- 108 Socialist
- 109 Like Paars
- 119 Other political localization

200 Fortuyn as politician

- 201 Good debater
- 202 Understandable
- 203 Charismatic
- 204 Well-groomed appearance
- 205 Eloquent
- 206 Open
- 207 Honest
- 208 Provocative
- 209 Personal
- 210 Listens to electorate
- 211 Leader
- 212 Addresses problems ignored by others
- 213 Capable of mobilizing inactives
- 214 Amateurish / incapable
- 215 Taboo breaker

- 216 Consistent thinker
- 217 Constructive thinker
- 218 Original thinker
- 219 Outsider
- 220 Power-craving
- 221 Dangerous
- 229 Other Fortuyn as politician
- 300 Fortuyn as non-politician
 - 301 Homosexual
 - 302 Drug user
 - 303 Catholic
 - 304 Professor
 - 305 Sociologist
 - 306 Baby boomer
 - 307 Eccentric
 - 308 Narcissist
 - 309 Hedonist
 - 310 Megalomaniac
 - 311 Self-pitiful
 - 312 Comedian
 - 313 Dandyish
 - 319 Other Fortuyn as non-politician

ATTREST

Variable label 'Characteristics attributed by Pim Fortuyn to others'

Note: variable **ATTREST2** is constructed likewise

- 0 No ATTREST frame
- 100 Non-substantive/ presentation
 - 101 Language usage
 - 102 Uninspiring appearance
 - 103 Humorless
 - 104 Elitist
 - 105 Incomprehensible
 - 109 Other Non-substantive/ presentation
- 200 Substantive
 - 201 Achterkamertjespolitiek
 - 202 Regentesk
 - 203 Old boys network
 - 204 Intransparent
 - 205 Bureaucratic
 - 206 Inefficient
 - 207 Inaccessible
 - 208 Place-hunters
 - 209 Being political correct
 - 210 Avoiding conflict
 - 211 Not addressing political problems
 - 212 Lacking long term vision
 - 213 Not listening to electorate
 - 219 Other Substantive
- 220 Dealing with Fortuyn

- 221 Stigmatizing Fortuyn
- 222 Not taking Fortuyn serious
- 223 Copying Fortuyn
- 229 Other Dealing with Fortuyn

Variable **FRAPOS**

Variable label 'frame position'

Value labels

- 1 negative
- 0 neutral
- 1 positive
- 9 ambiguous/ambivalent

CROSS-REFERENCES BETWEEN CLAIMS

CREFAID

'AID of coded claim to which claimant refers'

CREFCID

'CID of coded claim to which claimant refers'

Note: Only claims that were already coded for the same newspaper and which are not further than two weeks back in time should be coded here. This includes, of course, claims that occur in the same newspaper issue. Only explicit and clearly identifiable references to other claims should be coded here. I.e., not coded are vague references such as "Referring to recent statements by Pim Fortuyn, Melkert said...". Coded are references such as "Greens praise Fortuyn's proposal to pardon 26.000 illegal immigrants": Fortuyn's proposal being a coded claim, you would enter the AID and CID of that claim in the CREFAID and CREFCID variables for the claim by the Greens. Another example would be: "Rachida Azough despises Fortuyn's utterances on freedom of speech in the Volkskrant"

Note that in direct verbal confrontations such as parliamentary debates, claims may refer to each other mutually. E.g., when the discursive structure is such that the government proposes a law, the opposition criticizes it in parliament and the government reacts to the opposition's criticism. Both would then be coded as each other's referred-to claim.

In case a claim refers to several claims, you should choose the most important one. If they seem equally important, take the most recent one.

CREFPOS

Position of claimant with regard to referred-to claim

- 1 'negative'
- 0 'neutral'
- 1 'positive'
- 9 'ambiguous/ambivalent'

Note: evaluation of the referred-to claim by the claimant. E.g., in the above examples the reference to the proposal to pardon illegal immigrants would get CREFPOS = 1 and the reference to the utterances in the Volkskrant would get CREFPOS = -1. The coding of these claim evaluations does of course not replace the coding of opponent and supported actors. I.e., in the given examples you should also code Fortuyn.