Tables in 'Nonverbal Communication of Partisan Conflict'

Mathias Rask & Frederik Hjorth

2025-06-19

This file produces all tables generated in the replication script `replication.R` for the manuscript 'Nonverbal Communication of Partisan Conflict'.

Appendix D

Table D1: Distribution of labels for the binary (exercise 1) and continuous (exercise 2) coding and intercoder reliability metrics. For the distribution of the continuous coding, a speech is classified as activated if arousal is labeled as 5 (the midpoint of the 0–10 scale) or larger. The category 'Neither' means that the two agree that the speech is nonactivated, 'One coder' means that one of the two coders have labeled a speech as activated, and 'Both coders' means that the two coders agree that a speech is activated. Note that the binary coding sums to 99 and not 100 because one of the sampled speeches lacked aligned audio. The agreement percentage is computed using the binary representation of the continuous coding also with 5 as the cutoff.

	Coding	
	Binary (Exercise 1)	Continuous (Exercise 2)
Coder agreement		
Neither	71	50
One coder	13	13
Both coders	15	37
Intercoder reliability		
Agreement pct.	0.87	0.87
Krippendorff's α	0.62	0.85
Cohen's κ	0.62	–
ICC	–	0.93

Table D2: Original and translated texts of largest positive and negative residuals.

Residual	**Original text**	**Translated text**
Positive	"Hvis jeg forstår hr. Steen Gade korrekt, går spørgsmålet også på, hvorvidt det med en resolution kan sikres, at der i al fremtid vil kunne opnås enighed om, hvordan FN skal agere. Der må jeg blot konstatere, at hvad angår Kosovo, nåede man jo ikke frem til nogen løsning i FN's Sikkerhedsråd. Der valgte man jo uden et FNmandat og med kraftige advarsler fra Kofi Annan som generalsekretær at foretage en aktion. Det kan også blive nødvendigt fremover. Det er da selvfølgelig, fuldstændig som udenrigsministeren allerede har gjort rede for i dag, vigtigt, at man har en drøftelse i FN's Sikkerhedsråd om de principper og de ting, der ligger til grund, hvis man vil anvende magt. Det er vi da helt enige om. Men derfor er der da stadig væk en forskel på at have en drøftelse om det i Sikkerhedsrådet og så skulle lave en resolution, som vi ved ikke har nogen gang på jorden."	"If I understand Mr Steen Gade correctly, the question is also about whether a resolution can ensure that agreement can be reached on how the UN should act in the future. All I have to say is that, as far as Kosovo is concerned, no solution was reached in the UN Security Council. Without a UN mandate and with strong warnings from Kofi Annan as Secretary-General, it was decided to take action. It may also be necessary in the future. As the Foreign Minister has already explained today, it is of course important to have a discussion in the UN Security Council about the principles and the things that form the basis for the use of force. We are in complete agreement on that. However, there is still a difference between having a discussion about it in the Security Council and then having to draft a resolution, which we know has no effect on the ground."
Negative	"Jeg kunne aldrig drømme om at møde op i EU og så blive gjort til grin. Og derfor vil jeg sige, at hr. Morten Østergaards forslag jo er fuldstændig vanvittigt. Jeg kunne da ikke drømme om at møde op og komme med påstande om noget, som jeg på regeringens vegne mange, mange gange her i Folketinget har hørt er blevet fuldstændig afvist. Jeg synes, det europæiske samarbejde skal bruges til seriøse ting og til ting, hvor der er konkrete sager, man kan tage hånd om, og derfor må jeg sige, at den der slags ideer synes jeg ville være endnu en paradeforestilling, som ikke har noget som helst andet formål end at kaste sig ud i en masse påstande, der slet ikke kan bevises."	"I would never dream of showing up in the EU and then being made a fool of. And that is why I would say that Morten Østergaard's proposal is completely insane. I would never dream of showing up and making claims about something that I, on behalf of the government, have heard completely rejected many, many times here in the Danish Parliament. I think that European cooperation should be used for serious things and for things where there are concrete issues that can be dealt with, and therefore I have to say that I think that this kind of idea would be another parade show that has no purpose whatsoever other than to throw itself into a lot of claims that cannot be proven at all."

Appendix F

Table F1: Summary table for a selected set of variables in the dataset.

	Unique (#)	Missing (%)	Mean	SD	Min	Median	Max
Outbloc	2	0	0.59	0.49	0.00	1.00	1.00
Out-vote	3	79	0.36	0.48	0.00	0.00	1.00
Vote difference	120	79	47.74	39.25	0.00	34.00	122.00
CIP	82	0	0.28	0.23	0.03	0.20	0.72
Sentiment	143939	0	0.32	0.29	−2.50	0.33	3.48
Emotionality	146973	2	1.00	0.13	0.52	1.00	1.46
Std. Pitch (average)	150212	0	0.03	0.98	−4.98	−0.02	4.93
Pitch (average)	150212	0	166.53	43.89	81.45	153.43	326.16
Pitch (modulation)	150212	0	34.56	9.33	1.16	34.04	87.25
Pitch change (average)	150212	0	−1.03	0.48	−5.01	−0.97	1.94
Loudness (average)	150212	0	60.77	6.96	34.94	62.60	84.49
Loudness (modulation)	150212	0	5.84	0.79	1.19	5.87	11.49

Appendix H

Table H1: Correlation between textual measures and pitch.

	Sentiment	Emotionality
Estimate	-0.064^{***}	0.040^{***}
	(0.003)	(0.003)
N	147 148	147 148
R^2	0.00	0.00

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Table H2: Mean and rank of pitch, sentiment, and emotionality by topic. Values are z-standardized to have zero mean and unit variance. Table is sorted by pitch rank.

	Mean			Rank		
	Pitch	Sentiment	Emotionality	Pitch	Sentiment	Emotionality
Immigration	1.674	0.485	0.998	1	8	9
Social benefits	1.640	0.399	-0.080	2	10	18
Party politics	1.444	-0.061	1.258	3	18	5
Public spending	1.110	-0.318	0.029	4	22	16
EU	1.031	-0.102	0.052	5	19	15
Childcare	0.931	-0.627	-0.664	6	26	27
Iraq war	0.806	1.837	1.522	7	3	2
Culture	0.756	-0.406	1.232	8	24	7
Housing	0.718	0.080	-0.854	9	14	29
Religion	0.617	0.651	1.723	10	6	1
Finance	0.544	0.091	-0.386	11	13	20
Health	0.490	0.472	-0.451	12	9	21
Biodiversity	0.459	-0.659	-0.540	13	28	24
Energy	0.202	-1.217	-0.618	14	30	25
Gender and family	0.169	-0.150	1.412	15	21	3
Schools	0.034	-1.263	0.222	16	31	12
Union and wages	0.028	0.172	-1.024	17	12	31
Urban-rural divide	-0.058	-0.912	-0.281	18	29	19
Public transport	-0.099	-0.021	0.001	19	16	17
Education	-0.154	-1.367	-0.535	20	32	23
Drug regulation	-0.157	2.351	0.716	21	2	10
Animals	-0.239	0.644	-0.465	22	7	22
International conflict	-0.241	0.798	1.372	23	5	4
Disability	-0.293	-0.149	0.093	24	20	14
Taxes and subsidies	-0.366	0.043	-0.787	25	15	28
Crime	-0.429	2.906	1.242	26	1	6
Transnational crime	-0.441	0.823	0.129	27	4	13
Water and sea pollution	-0.570	0.190	-1.546	28	11	33
Community and associations	-0.658	-1.459	-0.894	29	33	30
Greenland	-0.688	-0.336	1.053	30	23	8
Procedural	-1.854	-0.642	-0.623	31	27	26
Commonwealth	-1.928	-1.725	0.466	32	34	11
Digitization	-1.977	-0.497	-2.639	33	25	34
Investigation	-2.501	-0.032	-1.133	34	17	32

Appendix I

Table I1: Regression table for I1

	Dependent Variable: Standardized Pitch				
	A	B	C	D	E
Intercept	−0.0481***	0.0248+	−0.2178**		
	(0.0139)	(0.0136)	(0.0796)		
Text sentiment		−0.2085***			−0.2134***
		(0.0160)			(0.0160)
Emotionality			0.1772*		0.0822
			(0.0711)		(0.0835)
Outbloc target	0.1537***	0.1440***	0.1420***	0.1141***	0.0997***
	(0.0205)	(0.0213)	(0.0196)	(0.0204)	(0.0194)
Topic FE	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
N	147 273	147 273	147 252	122 469	122 448
R^2	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Standard errors clustered at the dyad level.

Table I2: Regression table for I2

	Dependent Variable: Standardized Pitch				
	A	B	C	D	E
Intercept	−0.0392+	0.0639**	−0.3920***		
	(0.0207)	(0.0219)	(0.1046)		
Text sentiment		−0.2809***			−0.2788***
		(0.0236)			(0.0255)
Emotionality			0.3748***		0.1557
			(0.0956)		(0.1090)
Out-vote	0.2693***	0.2496***	0.2430***	0.2289***	0.2025***
	(0.0355)	(0.0364)	(0.0346)	(0.0330)	(0.0330)
Topic FE	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
N	31 181	31 181	31 180	26 962	26 961
R^2	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.04

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Standard errors clustered at the dyad level.

Table I3: Regression table for I3

	Dependent Variable: Standardized Pitch				
	A	B	C	D	E
Intercept	0.0089	0.0875***	−0.2451***		
	(0.0168)	(0.0173)	(0.0676)		
Text sentiment		−0.2483***			−0.2482***
		(0.0141)			(0.0156)
Emotionality			0.2544***		0.1823*
			(0.0676)		(0.0859)
High-publicity debate	0.5922***	0.5980***	0.5773***	0.5326***	0.5285***
	(0.0279)	(0.0273)	(0.0280)	(0.0284)	(0.0281)
Topic FE	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
N	118 767	118 767	118 748	98 531	98 512
R^2	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Standard errors clustered at the dyad level.

Table I4: Regression table for I4

	Dependent Variable: Standardized Pitch				
	A	B	C	D	E
Intercept	−0.0062	0.0674**	−0.3409***		
	(0.0208)	(0.0205)	(0.0378)		
Text sentiment		−0.2292***			−0.2234***
		(0.0155)			(0.0193)
Emotionality			0.3327***		0.2035***
			(0.0288)		(0.0418)
Target bargaining	0.1735**	0.1742**	0.1850***	0.1655***	0.1683***
	(0.0374)	(0.0372)	(0.0349)	(0.0345)	(0.0330)
Topic FE	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
N	147 219	147 219	147 198	122 420	122 399
R^2	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.02

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Standard errors clustered at the dyad level.

Appendix J

Table J1: Regression table for H2 with dyad FE

	Dependent Variable: Standardized Pitch				
	A	B	C	D	E
Text sentiment		−0.2714***			−0.2847***
		(0.0234)			(0.0254)
Emotionality			0.3582***		0.2143*
			(0.0701)		(0.0845)
Out-vote	0.2129***	0.2047***	0.2143***	0.2089***	0.2021***
	(0.0346)	(0.0346)	(0.0346)	(0.0319)	(0.0320)
Topic FE	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Dyad FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
N	31 181	31 181	31 180	26 962	26 961
R^2	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.06

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Standard errors clustered at the dyad level.

Table J2: Regression table for log-transformed vote difference.

	Dependent Variable: Standardized Pitch				
	A	B	C	D	E
Intercept	0.4745***	0.5462***	0.0536		
	(0.0323)	(0.0335)	(0.1028)		
Text sentiment		−0.2717***			−0.2780***
		(0.0248)			(0.0245)
Emotionality			0.4111***		0.2205+
			(0.1052)		(0.1145)
Topic FE	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Dyad FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Vote difference (log)	−0.1258***	−0.1193***	−0.1187***	−0.1089***	−0.1016***
	(0.0076)	(0.0077)	(0.0071)	(0.0075)	(0.0074)
N	30 655	30 655	30 654	26 522	26 521
R^2	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.05

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Standard errors clustered at the dyad level.

Table J3: Regression table for log-transformed vote difference without dyad fixed effects.

	Dependent Variable: Standardized Pitch				
	A	B	C	D	E
Text sentiment		−0.2464***			−0.2724***
		(0.0239)			(0.0236)
Emotionality			0.2691**		0.1563
			(0.0852)		(0.0950)
Vote difference (log)	−0.1074***	−0.1031***	−0.1056***	−0.0969***	−0.0930***
	(0.0060)	(0.0060)	(0.0060)	(0.0065)	(0.0065)
Topic FE	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Dyad FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
N	30 655	30 655	30 654	26 522	26 521
R^2	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.07

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Standard errors clustered at the dyad level.