The Habsburg Manifesto Project
Coding Manual

Philip J. Howe, Edina Szöcsik and Christina Isabel Zuber

October 2017 [Revised November 2017]

Context:

The coding system described here is used for a project that studies electoral mobilization in the Western ('Austrian') part of the multinational Austro-Hungarian Empire between 1897 and 1911.

This project will eventually address the question: "Under what circumstances does ethno-nationalist mobilization prevail over class-based mobilization in legislative elections?"

Goal of the coding:

We want to know what parties said to their potential voters in Imperial Austria. More precisely, we want to know what they said about political *issues* and societal *groups*, and how they linked issue positions to their appeal to a range of societal groups.

Technicalities:

To do the coding, we equip you with the following:

1. this **coding manual** that guides you through your task;
2. a **coding protocol** to record your coding of the entire document, keep track of the coding progress, suggestions, and eventual problems (posted to googledocs);
3. a **coding scheme** with all the categories to be applied to the documents; and
4. a **MAXQDA project** that contains the documents to be coded as well as the coding scheme.
5. **miscellaneous documents** providing background on the history and politics of Imperial Austria.

Note on terminology:

- **Sampling unit** refers to the document you are coding. You will be coding two types of documents: (1) longer "**party programs**" (PP), which were published only occasionally; and (2) shorter "**electoral announcements**" (EA), which were issued by parties for each election. (The term for the latter in German is "*Wahlaufrufe*").
- **Coding unit** refers to the natural sentences within the document (to which you apply the codes in MAXQDA).[1]

[1] This distinction between sampling unit and coding unit follows Krippendorf (2004: 98-101)

Outline of this coding manual:

We begin by explaining how to identify up to two "core issues," up to two "core groups," and up to two "core enemies" for the party at the level of the sampling unit (see section A).

We then proceed to explain how to code the individual sentences in a manifesto, explaining both *what* to code (see section B) and *how* to code (see section C).

A) Coding the entire document: Core issues, core groups and core enemies

As a first step, you should classify each document you find in your MAXQDA project, whether PP or EA, in a rather general way before you proceed to the more fine-grained sentence-by-sentence coding.

For this overall coding of the entire document, please use the "coding protocol" that is available on *googledocs*, allowing all coders to enter information *simultaneously* online.

Please start working on each document by reading through the *entire* document with three questions in mind:

1. Are one or more *issues* that are central to the party's programmatic statement outlined in this document, that is, issues the party says are more important than others (e.g. the status of Hungary within the monarchy)?
2. Are there a *group* or groups that the party primarily appeals to, such as groups of which the party claims to be the true defender/representative (e.g. Poles, workers etc.)?
3. Are a key *enemy* or enemies singled out by the party, such as societal groups, ideological groups, or other parties that the party sees as especially dangerous (e.g. aristocrats, socialists, the Christian Socials, etc.)?

If the answer to all of these questions is no, note this in the coding protocol and proceed directly to coding the individual sentences in the manifesto in MAXQDA (section B below).

However, if you think that one to two issues, one to two groups, and/or one to two enemies are central to the party, based on your overall understanding of the document, then please note them in the coding protocol.

Please copy and paste passages from the manifesto that made you think that each issue or group is central to the party into the coding protocol. Please use the categories from the coding scheme to name core issues, groups, and enemies, unless no appropriate category exists. In the latter case, use your own wording to describe that issue, group, or enemy.

Core groups should be entered as positive. Core enemies should be entered as negative. The directionality of core issues depends on a given party's position on that issues. Please enter the chosen issues, groups, and enemies exactly the way the categories are called in the coding scheme in MAXQDA. This is important because it allows us later to combine the overall coding and the more detailed sentence-by-sentence coding into a single dataset.

Examples:

Core issue: The program of a German-speaking party, the Christian Socials (christlich-soziale Partei), states on several occasions that the relationship with Hungary is the "most important political task" and that it is the dominant concern of the party.

"Die wichtigste politische Aufgabe der nächsten Zeit ist die Neugestaltung des jetzigen unhaltbaren Verhältnisses zu den Ländern der ungarischen Krone" (CSRP 1907).

→ A core issue of this party is thus "special status Hungary". We have this category in the coding scheme, so write down "special status Hungary - neg" (This core issue is coded as negative, because the current relationship to Hungary is described as unsustainable ["unhaltbar"]).

Core group: In the same program, the party defines itself explicitly as a German party, a party that will "always push for the protection of the ideal and material values of the German people":

"Die christlich-soziale Partei ist eine deutsche Partei und sie wird allezeit für den Schutz des ideellen und materiellen Besitzstandes des deutschen Volkes eintreten. Sie wird wie bisher einer parlamentarischen Organisation zum Schutze des deutschen Volkes ihre volle Unterstützung leihen" (CSRP 1907).

→ A core group of this party is thus Germans, coded as "Germans - pos."

Core enemy: An electoral announcement of the German Peoples Party (Deutsche Volkspartei) begins by denouncing two ideological opponents, the "reactionaries" on the right and "revolutionaries" on the left:

"Der deutsche Mittelstand, soweit er zur Fahne der Freiheit steht, und alle, in deren Brust ein deutsches Herz hämmert, werden von zwei rücksichtslosen Gegnern bedrängt. Rechts drohen die Reaktionäre, links die Revolutionäre. Beide sind international, beiden ist das aufgeklärte Bürgertum ein Dorn in der Ferse" (GraTB 1907.04.14).

→ Several later passages make it clear that this refers specifically to "[t]onsurierte und gescheitelte Klerikale" ["tonsured clericals"] (!) and "die Roten" ["the reds"]. Two core ideological enemies of the Deutsche Volkspartei are therefore clericals and socialists, coded as "clericals - neg" and "socialists – neg."

B) What to code: natural sentences

A simple first rule is that every single word that is visible in the document should be coded. That is, nothing should remain unmarked after coding. The only exception is text denoting sources of document or other comments on the document in square brackets: "[ ]". Titles and section headings of party programs and electoral announcements, as well as occasional pieces of stray text, will generally be coded as "junk" claims, as described below. (Think of this as the "code down to the bitter end" rule. Even if a piece of text only consists of the word "page" at the bottom of the page, code it as "Junk (no issue)" and "No group.)"

N**atural sentences** are the *coding units*, i.e. the units of text to which we apply individual codes from the coding scheme in MAXQDA.[2] A sentence begins with a capital letter and ends with a period. Make sure you mark the entire sentence, including the full-stop (.), in MAXQDA, then apply the chosen code to the entire marked sentence.

If a heading does not have a full stop (.) between lines, code the entire heading as one sentence.

Numbers followed by a full stop or other punctuation ("1.", "5)", etc.) should be treated as part of the sentence that follows them. (For example: "3. Taxes are too high." should be treated as one natural sentence.)

[2] Our coding units are thus defined based on a *syntactic distinction* (Krippendorf 2004: 104-105).

If several issues are addressed in the same sentence, code the **first issue mentioned** and ignore any issues raised after the first one. However, the meaning of the rest of the sentence may be taken into account, as needed, in order to interpret the meaning of the first issue that is mentioned.

Several issues in one sentence might look like this:

> "We need to promote the status of the German language and foster state unity."
>
> → Here you would mark the whole sentence and then apply the issue code "language rights - pos" (the first issue mentioned). (You would not add a second code for the second issue, which otherwise could be coded as "federalism/decentralization, neg")

Or like this:

> „Wir wollen, verharrend auf unserem Eggenburger Programme, ein Gesamtreich, in dem kein Volk unter fremdem Joche zu seufzen braucht, ein Reich, in dem Freiheit und Gerechtigkeit walten" (CSRP 1907). ["We want, abiding by our Eggenburger Program, a unified empire, in which no people needs to sigh under a foreign yoke, an empire in which freedom and justice rule."]
>
> Again, although this sentence actually includes several distinct issue claims, only the first one is coded ("We want … a unified empire, in which no people needs to sigh under a foreign yoke", which could be coded as "nationalism – neg"). The remaining issue claims, which are about justice and freedom, are ignored.

One important exception to this rule:

If a party enumerates several policy goals in the form of **bullet points**, or in a long sentence where **semi-colons** (;) are used to separate the enumerated items, each goal is coded individually.

More than one coding unit, indicated by bullet points, might look like this:

„Our party sets out to:

- promote the status of the German language
- foster state unity."

→ Here you would mark the first bullet point in MAXQDA coding "language rights - pos", and then you would mark the second bullet point and apply the code "federalism/decentralization - neg."

Enumerated items in a single long sentence are occasionally separated by **colons** (:) or other kinds of punctuation, rather than by semi-colons. Treat these as you would sentences subdivided by semi-colons.

Junk / No issue

Every sentence in every document needs to be coded, so that we know the total number of coding units, can compute the relative shares of each applied code as a percentage of total coding units, and can account for the varying length of documents.

However, there may be sentences that do not address any political issues at all. These still have to be coded. For such sentences, there is a "junk (no issue)" category among the issue categories. The following is an example of a sentence without an issue claim:

"Der Parteitag ist in voller Schönheit verlaufen" (CSRP 1907)

["The party congress has passed in all its elegance."]

Sentences that merely describe the world, criticize the condition of the world, or describe past events should be coded as "junk (no issue)."

Sentences that describe the past, present, or future position of the party on an issue should be coded as making a specific issue claim.

C) How to code: applying the issue and group categories

This project uses the method of qualitative content analysis. That means that we allow for interpretation on the part of coders. You will be interpreting claims within electoral announcements and party programs, based on your understanding of the document and the other documents we gave you as background information.

As detailed below, you will be identifying six different kinds of sentences within party documents:

1. Sentences that make a specific issue claim, but do not relate that claim to an identity group. (One issue code, "No group" code)
2. Sentences that make a specific issue claim, and which relate that claim to one or more identity groups. (One issue code, one or more specific group codes)
3. Sentences that make an "other" issue claim, but do not relate that claim to an identity group. ("Other issue" code, "No group" code)
4. Sentences that make an "other" issue claim, and which relate that claim to one or more identity groups. ("Other issue" code, one or more specific group codes)
5. Sentences that are "junk", and do not relate to an identity group. ("Junk (no issue)" code, "No group" code)
6. Sentences that are "junk", but which relate to one or more identity groups. ("Junk (no issue)" code, one or more specific group codes)

An example of "1" would be "We need to establish public pensions." This would be coded as "Social security - pos" and "No group."

An example of "2" would be "We need to establish public pensions for the elderly." This would be coded as "Social security - pos" and "Old - pos."

An example of "3" would be "We need to promote economic prosperity." This would be coded as "Other issue" (because the issue claim being made does not clearly fit into one of the established issue categories in the coding scheme) and "No group."

An example of "4" would be "We need to promote the economic interests of the middle class." This would be coded as "Other issue" and "Middle class - pos"

An example of "5" would be "This year's party conference was a hoot!" This would be coded "Junk (no issue)" and "No group."

An example of "6" would be "Germans are awesome." This would be coded "Junk (no issue)" and "Germans - pos."

Types of Categories

The categories that you apply to each sentence come in pairs of positive and negative valence. We include **70 issue categories** (e.g. "nationalism - pos," "nationalism - neg", "electoral inclusion - pos", "electoral inclusion - neg") and **114 group categories** (e.g. "Germans - positive", "Germans - negative", "workers – pos", workers - neg").

Even though each issue and group therefore appears twice, this is still a fairly complex coding scheme. That means that you first have to familiarize yourself well with the entire scheme, since reliable coding requires you to keep all available categories in mind at all times. At the coding workshop, we will do some exercises in order to familiarize you with the coding scheme.

Each sentence can be coded under one and only one issue category (see above). However, each sentence can be coded using *multiple* group categories.

Example:

> "Die Nachtarbeit für Frauen und jugendliche Arbeiter ist jedoch ausnahmslos zu verbieten." ["Night work for women and young workers, however, should be forbidden without exception."]
>
> → One issue claim linked to two groups. The issue claim is "social security - pos", linked to the group claims "women – pos," and "young – pos."

How to identify group claims

Group claims occur when a party links a claim to a specific social group, or makes a statement in favor of or against that social group. Social groups can be mentioned in the form of a *noun* (e.g. "Germans") or an *attribute* of a noun (e.g. "the German people," "Italian culture," "our people."

Some guidelines for determining whether the mention of a group counts as a group claim:

- Sentences that do not refer to any group, or that mention a group in a way that is neither negative nor positive, are coded as "No group."

- Where a party simply mentions a noun or an adjective referring to a group identity, but does not actually say anything about that group, do not code this as a group claim. In particular, references to groups in party names are not to be counted as group claims. For example, a sentence that refers to the "deutschfortschrittliche Parteirichtung" ["German Progressive party line"] should be coded as "No group."

- Statements that describe a group positively or negatively should be coded as positive or negative respectively. For example, the sentence "Jews are a problem" should be coded "Jews - neg."

- If a group is linked to a policy that is intended to favor that group, it is counted as a positive group claim. However, if there are several issues claims in one segment, groups can only be linked to the first issue claim. For example, the sentence "We need to introduce a free Sunday so that workers can be with their families." should be coded "Workers – positive," since the policy is intended to do something *for* workers.

- If a sentence consists of several segments to be coded individually, e.g. a numbered list of issue claims or of several issue claims separated by semi-colons (see above), then you need to mark the group claim in each of these segments. For example: "We need to do the following things for the workers of the monarchy: give them better pay; provide them with health insurance; and ensure safer working conditions." Here you should code "workers – pos" three times, because all three things count as individual segments and all are done for the workers.

- Statements about harming or taking something away from a group should be coded as negative. For example, the sentence "Aristocrats lands should be seized and divided among the poor." should be coded as both "Aristocrats - neg" and "Lower class - pos."

- Statements about the victimization of a particular group should be coded as positive. For example, "Die Deutschen haben so sehr unter diesem Parlament gelitten." („The Germans have suffered so greatly under this parliament.") should be coded as "Germans - pos."

References to group identities can take a variety of forms (nouns and modifiers) besides the proper name of the group in question (e.g. "Germans"), occasionally calling for a judgement call on the part of coders. Here are several examples:

> „der Schutz des Deutschtums in Österreich durch Gesetzgebung und Verwaltung..." (DVP 1896) [„the protecting of Germanness in Austria through legislation and administration..."]
>
> „Da die Deutsche Volkspartei alle Kreise unseres Volkes umfassen soll..." (DVP 1896) ["That the German Peoples Party should encompass all sections of our people..."] (**Note:** "German" in "German Peoples Party" does *not* count because it is part of a party name. However, it is clear from context that "our people" means "we Germans".)
>
> „...daß der deutsche Besitzstand unversehrt erhalten..." (DFP 1897) [„...that German vested rights remain intact…"]
>
> „Wir fordern, daß nicht weiterhin durch Maßnahmen der Verwaltung das deutsche Element zurückgedrängt und geschädigt werde." (DFP 1897) ["We demand that the German element not be further pushed back and harmed by administrative means."]

If a group is mentioned in a preceding sentence, and there is a clear demonstrative pronoun (e.g. in German: dieser, diese, dieses) referring directly back to the group, it should be coded as a group claim. For example, if one sentence states "…die Mittelstände" ("the middle classes") and the next sentence states "Für diese zu sorgen durch eine…" ("To care for these [the middle classes] through a…"), the second sentence should be coded as "Middle class – positive."

Occasionally, single words and phrases can include multiple group claims. For example, the following reference to a "Judeo-Magyar minority" should be counted as one claim about Jews (Jews, negative) and another about Hungarians (Hungarians, negative):

> „...gelenkt von den fast durchwegs korrupten Parteien der judäomagyarischen Minderheit..." (CSRP 1907) [„...guided by the almost invariably corrupt parties of the Judeo-Magyar minority…"]

Some additional clarifying comments:

- For the purposes of this project, and in conformity with the Imperial Austrian census, **Jews** are counted as a nationality rather than as a religious group (see coding scheme).
- **Territorial identity** claims should refer to the *people* of a province, region, city, or local community, not to the place itself. "The Viennese are corrupt" counts as a group claim; "Vienna is wonderful" does not.
    - Because it was also one of Imperial Austria's seventeen provinces, references to the people of the city of **Trieste** should be coded as "people of a province" rather than "people of a city." Similarly, the twin cities of **Gorizia and Gradisca** formed a single province – references to the peoples of those cities therefore should also be coded as "people of a province."
- **Political parties** do not have their own identity categories. How a party (or group of parties) is to be coded therefore depends on how it is described in the relevant text. Most of the time, references to parties will be coded based on ideological group identities. For example, positive references to "socialists," "socialist parties," or "the Social Democratic Party" would all be coded as "Socialists - pos." In some cases, however, parties are identified with other kinds of groups, such as class. For example, a sentence that disparages "*bürgerliche* parties" should be coded as "Middle class - neg."
    - Parties' references to themselves are to be ignored. For example, if the Christian Socials write "The Christian Social party is amazing!" this sentence should be coded as "Junk (no issue)" and "No group."
- A simple greeting to **voters** often appears in the heading of an electoral announcement (e.g. "*Wähler!*") These should be coded as "No group," not as civic identity.

What to do when no category fits a claim

You will likely come across something in a text which you can clearly identify as a substantive claim about an *issue*, but which does not fit under any of our pre-defined categories. In this case, code the claim under the category "Other issue." Similarly, if you come across a *group* claim where you cannot find the corresponding group in our listing, please use the "Other group" category.

1. Code as "Other issue"

The generic "other issue" category is a residual category which is to be applied only to claims that really do not fit under any of the specific issue areas provided. These should be relatively rare.

2. Code as "Other group":

If you think you found an appeal to a social identity group that fits all the criteria (linked to a claim and comes in the form of a noun or and attribute to a noun), but you cannot find a corresponding group category in our list, you should ask yourself whether people were likely to identify with that category. For example, if a claim is made about "Interessen weiter Bevölkerungsschichten schützen" ["protecting the interests of the broader population"], do you think that people will identify as members of "weiter Bevölkerungssschichten" ["the broader population"] and perceive commonalities in their interests? If yes, please use the "other group category."