

UPDATED FINAL CODEBOOK
THE OUTRAGE INDUSTRY: MAPPING OUTRAGE CONTENT ANALYSIS

March 12, 2009*
Prepared by Sarah Sobieraj

*Updated January 15, 2013, raising the cap on incidents per variable per case from “6 or more” to “20 or more.” For comparisons with wave I data, transform variable to a 6 or more cap.

SECTION A: CLASSIFICATION VARIABLES

Variable Name: Case Number

Variable Label: CASE

Cases should be assigned a 6 digit number, as follows:

TV: first 4 digits are the program number, assigned chronologically beginning w/ 1000. The last 2 digits are for the week number, assigned chronologically beginning with 01. The first week's episode of the first television program in the sample will therefore be: **100001**. The case number for the second week of that program will be **100002**.

RADIO: first 4 digits are the show number, assigned chronologically beginning w/ 2000. The last 2 digits are for the week number, assigned chronologically beginning with 01. The first week's episode of the first radio program in the sample will therefore be: **200001**. The case number for the second week of that program will be **200002**.

BLOGS: first 4 digits are the blog number, assigned chronologically beginning w/ 3000. The last 2 digits are for the post's week number, assigned chronologically beginning with 01. Posts are defined discrete blog entries with unique timestamps. The first post from the first blog in the sample will therefore be: **300001**. The second post from that blog will be **300002**.

COLUMNISTS/OPEDS: first 4 digits are the author number, assigned chronologically beginning w/ 4000. The last 2 digits are for the week number, assigned chronologically beginning with 01. The first week's column by the first author in the sample will therefore be: **400001**. The case number for the second week of that column will be **400002**.

Instructions to coders:

Coders must assign columnists, and blogs a 4 digit number in keeping with the above system and keep these numbers logged in a shared spreadsheet, as they will be used multiple times (For example, posts from the blog Little Green Footballs might all hypothetically begin with 3012). Television and radio programs should be sorted by program and numbered consecutively, such that the resulting case numbers will communicate that the case is week 3 of program 10.

Variable Name: Date of Original Airing/Publication/Distribution

Variable Label: DATE

Dates should be assigned in a 6 digit number format: MMDDYY

Where date information is unavailable (e.g. webmaterial w/o date stamp) use 999999

Example:

- January 5, 2009 = 010509
- December 13, 2008 = 121308

Variable Name: Type of Content

Variable Label: TYPE

- 01 TV news commentary
- 02 TV News and commentary*
- 03 Interview Television
- 04 Talk Radio
- 05 Blog Post
- 06 Newspaper Column
- 97 OTHER

*News commentary = O'Reilly, Countdown, Maddow, etc.

News AND commentary (where analysis and info are separate) = Situation Room

Interview Television = Meet The Press

Variable Name: Political Orientation

Variable Label: POLIT

Is the program/blog/columnist/organization generally considered to be left of center, right of center, or politically neutral?

- 00 Neutral
- 01 Left of Center
- 02 Right of Center
- 97 OTHER (jot down in notes)
- 99 UNKNOWN or MISSING DATA

Variable Name: Length of Episode (measured in half hour units)

Variable Label: LENGTHV

This is intended to provide a rough estimate, not to measure the time on air in a precise stopwatch fashion. As a result, do not deduct time for commercials.

How many minutes of this show/episode were coded?

- 01 roughly 30 minutes
- 02 roughly 60 minutes
- 98 NOT APPLICABLE (e.g., written document)

Variable Name: Length of Text (measured in 250 word increments)

Variable Label: LENGHTH

What is the total length of the text?

- 01 less than 250 words
- 02 250 – 499 words
- 03 500 – 749 words
- 04 750 – 999 words
- 05 1000 -1249 words
- 06 1250-1499 words
- 07 more than 1500 words
- 98 NOT APPLICABLE (e.g., case is NOT a written document)

SECTION B: CONTENT VARIABLES

Instructions to coders:

The definitions and examples on the pages that follow are intended to provide guidance during the coding process, to transform a largely subjective process of interpretation into more concrete and reliable measures. The instructions and examples for each variable are the first information upon which you should base your decisions, **but for cases that seem more difficult to judge, use Appendix A: Outrage versus Conventional Argumentation as a source of additional guidance.**

Variable Label: Insulting Language

Variable Name: LANG

This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker uses insulting words in reference to a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party, or other organization or their behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views. **This variable should specifically capture insulting words (stupid, pompous, idiot), not all insults more generally speaking.** For example, describing someone as “a child” is insulting, but does not use insulting words so should not be counted as insulting language (it would however, be captured under BELITT).

IMPORTANT: If insulting language is used concretely to name call, code only under NAMECL. For example, “asinine” in reference to a person or group’s behavior is “insulting language,” but if the person or group is called “asinine,” reserve this for the “name calling” variable.

Examples:

- He needs to shut up
- The whole idea was asinine
- The policy was stupid, plain and simple

Use of insulting language:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Name Calling

Variable Name: NAMECL

This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker engages in name calling in reference to a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization. Affectionate, light-hearted teasing should be weeded out. Instead, look for name-calling that is used to make the subject look foolish/inept, hypocritical, deceitful, or dangerous.

Examples:

- He's asinine
- You are a lunatic

Instances of name calling:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Emotional Display

Variable Name: EMOTD

This variable is intended to capture audio and/or visual emotional displays in reference to a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization (or their behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views). In printed text (e.g., blog posts, webpages) it is unlikely to appear often, but would most likely be communicated through “shouting” via the deliberate use of all caps, multiple exclamation points, enlarged text, etc. EMOTD is about the FORM of expression, see EMOTL for emotional content, although the two will often present concurrently and each should be noted.

Examples:

- Yelling/Raising Voice
- Banging hands on table
- Crying
- Hanging up the phone in anger
- Spitting
- Use of all capital letters in a written document (for dramatic emphasis)

Number of “turns” or “chunks” in which there is an emotional display:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Emotional Language

Variable Name: EMOTL

This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker engages in verbal or written expressions of emotion in reference to a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization. Emotion words related to anger, fear, and sadness are the key indicators. EMOTL is about the literal content of what is said/written, rather than how it is communicated. EMOTD, on the other hand, is about the way something is said/written of expression.

Examples:

- “I’m **furious**”
- “I’m **infuriated!**”
- “This is an **outrage!**”
- “This makes me **sick**”

Number of “turns” or “chunks” in which there is emotional language:

00	none	08	eight	16	sixteen
01	one	09	nine	17	seventeen
02	two	10	ten	18	eighteen
03	three	11	eleven	19	nineteen
04	four	12	twelve	20	twenty or more
05	five	13	thirteen		
06	six	14	fourteen		
07	seven	15	fifteen		

Variable Label: Verbal Fighting/Sparring
Variable Name: SPAR

This variable is intended to capture aggressive jousting between speakers. In radio and television it may take the form of dismissive interruptions or rude exchanges between guests/callers or between hosts and guests/callers characterized by a lack of civility.

Examples:

- Dismissive interruptions
- Talking over someone in an aggressive manner
- Saying things like “give me a break” or “come on” while someone else is speaking

Number of overt verbal conflicts:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Character Assassination

Variable Name: ASSNTN

These are ad hominem attacks. This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker attempts to damage the reputation of a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party, or other organization by attacking their character. In politics, questioning the veracity of a statement is common, and should not be confused with character assassination, which is more extreme. Saying someone was not honest in a reply to a journalist is not character assassination, but saying that someone is a liar who cannot be trusted is character assassination.

Examples:

- “He is corrupt.”
- “McCain is a pure lying bastard! If he had a red tie on, he'd look you straight in the eye and insist it was blue.”

Number of “turns” or “chunks” in which character assassination occurs:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Misrepresentative Exaggeration
Variable Name: EXAG

This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker engages in very dramatic negative exaggeration in reference to the behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views of a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party, or other organization, such that it significantly misrepresents or obscures the truth. What we have defined as “conventional political speech” should not be counted, see definition of conventional speech for clarification.

Examples:

- Obama is “Left of Lenin”
- Democrats have designs on planting the seeds of socialism in the US
- Obama backs a freedom of choice act to abolish every restriction on abortion in every state

Number of “turns” or “chunks” in which misrepresentative exaggeration occurs:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Mockery/Sarcasm

Variable Name: MOCK

This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker makes fun of the behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views of a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization to make the subject look bad or to rally others in criticism of the subject. Affectionate, light-hearted teasing should be weeded out. Instead, **look for humor that is used to make the subject look foolish/inept, hypocritical, deceitful, or dangerous.** It might also come in the form of a physical impersonation intended to make others laugh at the expense of the subject (think Tina Fey).

Examples:

- “When Charlie Gibson asked about her foreign policy credentials, Sarah Palin said--with a straight face--she lives near Russia. Yesterday, the McCain campaign said--with a straight face--that by sitting next to foreigners for a few minutes while paparazzi took pictures, Palin was "boosting her foreign policy credentials" and giving herself "experience with foreign leaders...I think this new proximity approach to building a resume is brilliant! We should all do it; it saves so much time and effort. Why go to school and struggle with learning stuff and then have to spend years working your way up a career when you can simply plop yourself down next to something and get the same results? I could become a pediatric surgeon by having a latte in the Childrens Hospital coffee shop. I could watch the Space Shuttle take off from that viewing spot across the water and become an astronaut.” (ridiculous/inept person)
- “If the subject matter weren't so serious and dire, this would be a comedy. This is a bunch of Senator Blowhards and Foghorns all giving their opening statements. We're looking at a Bunch of Colonel Sanders telling the chickens that they shouldn't have come into the coop. I mean these are the guys that screwed this up in many cases.” (ridiculous/hypocritical group)
- “Our illustrious leader reads from his teleprompter to tell us how our economy reached this point. It has nothing to do with policy over the last 7 years. It is because of "investors from abroad." He's so sweet. Just read or listen and make your own assumptions about these "justifications." Isn't our leader so sweet? I just want to pinch him on the cheeks and ask, "you do have Scotch nearby?" (note: also *belittling*)

Number of “turns” or “chunks” in which mockery occurs:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Conflagration

Variable Name: CONFLG

This variable is intended to capture attempts made to escalate non-scandals into scandals. In this variable, record speech that overstates or dramatizes the importance or implications of minor gaffes, oversights, or improprieties. By non-scandal we refer to an episode, event, or trend that a learned, dispassionate observer would not consider significant or scandalous.

Examples:

- The relationship between Ayers and Obama
- Jeremy Wright
- McCain’s “fundamentals of the economy” (actual quote was double-speak, but not “completely out of touch” as the L has beaten into the ground. The quote was: "You know there's been tremendous turmoil in our financial markets and Wall Street. And it is, people are frightened by these events. Our economy, I think, still, the fundamentals of our economy are strong, but these are very, very difficult times.")

Number of “turns” or “chunks” in which conflagration occurs:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Ideologically Extremizing Language
Variable Name: IDEXTRM

This variable is intended to capture extremist language used to critically describe a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization or their behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views. Usually the descriptive language will be used as an implicit slur rather than as simple description.

Examples:

- Left-wing
- Right-wing
- Far right
- Far left
- Radical
- Extreme
- Reactionary

Instances of extremizing language:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Slippery Slope
Variable Name: SLOPE

This variable is intended to capture fatalistic arguments, which suggest that some behavior, policy, or decision is a small step that will inevitably pave the way for much more extreme behaviors, policies, or decisions. Slippery slope arguments make dire forecasts about the future. When in doubt, do not use this code. True slippery slope arguments should be easy to identify.

Examples:

- "...the far Left couldn't care less about gay "marriage." They want to see the abolition of marriage as an institution and radical social change to redefine the human experience itself. This is precisely what we see in Scandinavian countries where this nonsense has played out to its logical extension: The rates of cohabitation are skyrocketing, and the institution of marriage is rapidly dying off. Girls and boys grow up in a culture and see no picture of marriage to emulate or aspire to. There is really no end to the aberrant forms of human sexuality that will come to the courthouse also demanding "marriage." And when marriage can mean anything, marriage means nothing."

Number of "turns" or "chunks" in which slippery slope arguments occur:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Belittling

Variable Name: BELITT

This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker demeans a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization (or their behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views). Belittling generally attempts to deflate or undercut a person's status. For example, the speaker/author may suggest that an adult is childlike/immature, suggest someone fairly accomplished is of low class status, or imply that a man is in some way feminine. This may be done in the context of mockery or exaggeration.

Examples:

- Dave Letterman's joke, "So John McCain calls up and says I'm not going to be there kids, because everything is going to hell, but the funny thing is that no one told his vice presidential candidate, Sarah Palin, and honest to God, right now she's still circling the theater in a white minivan. She's gonna pick him up later..."

Number of "turns" or "chunks" in which belittling occurs:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

Variable Label: Use of Obscene Language

Variable Name: OBSCENE

This variable is intended to measure whether the author or speaker uses obscene language in reference to a person, group of people (e.g., immigrants, journalists, Democrats), branch of the government, political party or other organization (or their behaviors, planned behaviors, policies, or views). For the purposes of this study, obscenities include:

F-word derivatives: Words based on, or incorporating, the F-word. Examples include fucker and motherfucker.

Scatological terms: Words that have to do with feces, urine and defecation. Examples include "shit," "bullshit," "shithead," and piss.

Anatomical terms: Words referring to parts of the human anatomy, mostly the private parts, and are considered crude. Examples include "ass," "asshole," "dick," "dickhead," and "tits."

Mild obscenities: Words used in everyday language, but that may be offensive to some. Examples include "damn," "hell," as well as milder forms of anatomical terms like "boobs."

Derogatory terms: Words or expressions that are used to denigrate and insult one's racial or ethnic background, gender or sexual orientation: Examples include the N-word, whore/ho/slut, various anti-Semitic terms, and anti-homosexual terms like faggot.

Adapted from

<http://www.kids-in-mind.com/help/glossary.htm>

IMPORTANT: If the obscene language is used concretely to name call (e.g., calling someone a “bitch” or an “asshole,” code under both NAMECL and OBSCENE).

Instances in which obscene language is used:

00	none	07	seven	14	fourteen
01	one	08	eight	15	fifteen
02	two	09	nine	16	sixteen
03	three	10	ten	17	seventeen
04	four	11	eleven	18	eighteen
05	five	12	twelve	19	nineteen
06	six	13	thirteen	20	twenty or more

SECTION C: SUMMARY VARIABLES

Variable Label: Overall Tone

Variable Name: OTONE

How venomous is this? This variable asks your assessment of the overall tone of the program, column, blog, etc. This particular variable is about the intensity of the outrage. The variable OAMOUNT should be used to assess the amount of outrage.

Taken as a whole, describe the case you have just analyzed:

- 00 Overall tone is more aptly described as conventional political speech
(Content and form OVERALL are more aptly described as “conventional” political speech, even if there are moments that technically count as outrage.)
- 01 Light intensity outrage
(Close to the border of “conventional” political speech)
- 02 Moderate intensity outrage
(Outrage is present, but not overly emotional in form and/or content)
- 03 Intense outrage.
(There are windows of reason, but the content and/or form is generally quite emotional)
- 04 Very intense outrage.
(Content and/or form may match, but infrequently exceeds this level of emotionality)

Variable Label: Overall Amount

Variable Name: OAMOUNT

This variable asks your assessment of the overall tone of the program, column, blog, etc. This particular variable is about the amount of the outrage. The variable OTONE should be used to assess the intensity of outrage. This is a volume or quantity-based estimation.

Taken as a whole, what portion of the chunks/turns would you estimate contained outrage:

- 00 None
- 01 Up to 1/3 of the content could be classified as outrage
- 02 Between 1/3 and 2/3 of the content could be classified as outrage
- 03 More than 2/3 of the content could be classified as outrage

Variable Label: Number of Discrete “Speakers”
Variable Name: SPKRS

How many participants were involved in a speaking or writing role?

- 01 one
- 02 two
- 03 three
- 04 four
- 05 five
- 06 6 or more

Variable Label: Outrage Users

Variable Name: USERS

Taking this case as a whole, outrage was employed by:

- 01 Host(s)/Author/Blogger
- 02 Guests/Experts
- 03 Audience Members/Callers
- 04 Combination of the Above
- 97 OTHER (only one speaker, variable does not apply)
- 98 NOT APPLICABLE (use if no outrage)
- 99 UNKNOWN or MISSING DATA

TOPICS: (created 4 variables TOPIC1 – TOPIC\$)

Please the four topics that received the most attention.

Please jot down a verbatim example of outrage from the case. This need not be illustrative of the program as a whole; Feel free to choose the most egregious, clever, or memorable example.

EXCERPT: (created 2 variables EXCERP1 AND EXCERP2)

SAID/WRITTEN BY: (variables = 1SAIDBY and 2SAIDBY)

SAID/WRITTEN TO: (variables = 1SAIDTO and 2SAIDTO)

IN REFERENCE TO/CONTEXT: (variables = 1IN REF and 2INREF)

APPENDIX A: OUTRAGE VERSUS CONVENTIONAL ARGUMENTATION

Section I: Outrage

Outrage: The term *outrage* refers to a particular form of political discourse involving the mindful attempt¹ to provoke an emotional response from the audience, usually in the form of anger, fear, or moral righteousness. Outrage is often, but not always, accomplished through the use of categorical statements, exaggerations, and partial truths about opponents which may take the form of individuals, organizations, or entire communities of interest (e.g., progressives or conservatives) or circumstance (e.g., immigrants). Outrage sidesteps the messy nuances of complex political issues in favor of ad hominem attacks, overgeneralizations, mockery, and dire forecasts of impending doom. Outrage is not so much a discussion as it is verbal competition, political conversation with a scorecard.

Spirited, animated, even argumentative talk about politics does not necessarily qualify as outrage. We term the other side of the line “conventional argumentation.”

Section II: Conventional Political Argumentation that is NOT Outrage

Conventional argument, where disagreements are sharp and feelings are strong, is not outrage when discussion remains within the bounds of civility. In civil discussion, those on the other side are still regarded as worthy opponents whose ideas are legitimate and must be engaged. Humor is light-hearted and not aimed at diminishing the subject. Argument is aimed at convincing others based on the intellectual qualities of one’s position, and not on the personal, deficient qualities of those espousing a contrary view.

Section III: Illustrations of Conventional Political Argumentation

1. Discussion remains within the bounds of civility.

Politics is about disagreement and disagreement, even passionate disagreement, is not by definition uncivil. Civility is characterized by speakers who present themselves as reasonable, calm, and courteous. Brooks and Geer (2007) seem to have it right: “we operationalize incivility as claims that are inflammatory and superfluous...Incivility requires going an extra step; that is, adding inflammatory comments that add little in the way of substance to a discussion” (5). Uncivil argument is likely to be characterized by ad hominem arguments or personal invective.

Examples:

¹ There is always a gap between a concept and its operationalization. Please note that we have retained “mindfulness” as an element of this definition for conceptual clarity, even though we realize that we can not measure, and do not attempt to measure, mindfulness through an examination of content. We do, however, hope to explore intent in other research modules which engage producers directly.

- Conventional: “I don’t think you’re going anywhere with that argument.”
- Outrage: “That’s a dumb argument.”

2. Those on the other side are still regarded as worthy opponents whose ideas are legitimate and must be engaged.

This may be more obvious. Does the speaker dismiss the other side, or engage its arguments? Does he or she ridicule the opposing argument, critique in florid, hyperbolic terms, call its intelligence or the integrity of its proponents into question? Civil argument may offer emphatic opposition but does so by sticking to a rebuttal with fact-based argument. It involves treating others – both those with whom one is speaking and those who are the subject of the speech – with respect. Mutz and Reeves (2005) put it this way: “[uncivil talk includes] gratuitous asides that show a lack of respect and/or frustration with the opposition” (5).

Examples:

- Conventional: “The Republicans’ health plan is fatally flawed, won’t work, can’t work, because their projections assume the uninsured will be able to purchase insurance with a \$5000 tax credit while the average policy costs \$12,000.”
- Outrage: “The Republicans’ health plan is a ruse, put into the platform so the party could say it has a health plan even though they know it will never pass Congress and, to tell the truth, they don’t care if it ever passes Congress.”

3. Humor is light-hearted and not aimed at diminishing the subject.

Conventional humor is gentle and non-belittling, remaining respectful of opponents.

Examples:

Conventional: “How do I know it’s wrong? Because it was in my fortune cookie: ‘Beware of Democrats bearing gifts.’”

Outrage: “I’d call that position dog food except that my dog wouldn’t touch something so vile.”

APPENDIX B: “TURNS” AND “CHUNKS” (AS DEFINED BY THIS RESEARCH)

Turns:

In keeping with Perrin (2005), a “turn” is defined as a contiguous block of speech by a single participant; thus a turn can be as short as a single word or as long as several paragraphs. Turns may overlap, as in the case of interruptions. When turns overlap, it can be difficult to determine how one turn ends and the new (interrupter’s) turn begins, but coders should make every effort to do so. When a speaker or writer is engaged in a prolonged monologue (as in the case with some talk radio hosts, for example), the prolonged monologue should be divided into turns for consistent analysis. These intra-monologue turns can be discerned by listening for pauses, inserted advertisements or station breaks, and clear segues/subject changes.

Chunks:

When the case is composed of written rather than spoken words, we will refer to the units as “chunks.” A chunk will be defined as a contiguous block of text between any two of the following: the beginning or ending of a paragraph or section, in-text advertisement (as seen on some blogs) a line break/space, or a clear segue/subject change.

NEW Additional questions, thinking toward analysis:

1) What do we do to control for the fact that some measures ONLY apply to non-print material (e.g., verbal sparring) – don't want the printed material to look as though it contains less outrage content because of a structural difference between the way the written and non-written material is coded.

- Construct “outrage scores differently for written and verbal”

2) TV or radio may have 100 turns in an episode, allowing them to more easily reach “3, 4, or 5 or more” than columns, blog posts, email alerts, etc. which are likely to have far fewer “turns” or chunks than a 30 minute until of talk. How to standardize?

- Perhaps we'll try to come up with what we think is roughly equivalent content to a 30 minute show (could apply the “word count” tool to a talk radio transcript as a guide). This may be a large # of words, much larger than most of our cases, but we can then calculate with fractions, etc.

Reminder:

For analysis, each case will ultimately be assigned a standardized outrage score, which will be a composite variable that takes into account the standardized² outrage counts as determined by the content variables, the overall tone, and the overall volume.

² Standardization refers here both to accounting for outrage based on a per half hour ratio for verbal content as well as standardization between verbal and written materials such that they are comparable. These details will need to be worked out, but shouldn't be overly arduous.