

WP6 participant observation Codebook

January 2007

1. Session Report Data

The session report consists of two parts. The first collects data referring to the session's framework and its course (participants, timetable, and agenda). The second part leaves room to note significant differences of the session when compared to previous meetings of the group (e.g. deviating routines, new members, changing roles, etc.). This part is covered in the string variable SPARTIC¹ (Note: as a variable that refers to the session as a whole, SPARTIC precedes the variables for the agenda items).

Up to now, it is open to what extend the data collected in the session report will be used for a systematic contextualisation of the discourse protocols in the sense of proper statistical variables. At least basic session data will be attached to discourse-related data. However, the categories will help to keep a systematic and comparable documentation of the group's sessions. Furthermore, the information you insert into the session protocol is valuable for the description of the evolution and structure of controversies at a later stage of the analysis. You can use them in order to describe the context and peculiarities of controversies. Therefore, note all information you may want to include in your final analysis of controversies.

1.1 General Data

SID Session ID

Four-digit code:

12 Serial number of the observed group assigned by the national team (cf. list for SGROUP)

---- 34 Serial session number for the observed meeting

SCOUNTRY Country code (to be used for SID)

- 1 *Italy*
- 2 *UK*
- 3 *Germany*
- 4 *France*
- 5 *Spain*
- 6 *Switzerland*
- 7 *Transnational*

SGROUP Group

- 11 *National Campaign on Water*
- 12 *Rome Social Forum*
- 13 *Attac Florence*
- 21 *ai Faversham*
- 22 *World Development Movement*
- 23 *London Social Forum*
- 31 *Attac Berlin Financial Markets Group*
- 32 *Berlin Social Forum*
- 41 *No-Vox Network*
- 42 *Solidaires*
- 51 *Córdoba Solidaria*
- 52 *Ecologistas en Acción Córdoba*

¹ Note: The logic of variable names is as follows: the first letter indicates the level of analysis (**S**ession, **A**genda **I**tem, **C**ontroversy followed by an abbreviation of the variable name (e.g. PARTIC for particularities)

- 61 *Attac Geneva*
- 62 *Forum Social Lemanique*
- 71 *Reclaim our UN Campaign*

This list is based on the information from our meeting in Berlin in December 2006. If something has changed, please provide the full name of the observed group as the label of the respective value.

SDATE Date

dd.mm.yyyy *Observation date*

SOBSERV Observer

-- *Observer's name. Please generate a two-digit code for additional observers and provide his/her name in the label.*
1 country code
2 serial number for the observer

SDURA Duration

(min) *Duration of the whole session.*

The duration of the session is easy to register if there is a moderator/chair who opens and ends the session "officially". If this is not the case, try to identify start and end through the setting and content of discourse (i.e. private issues changing for group or general political issues, speakers address the assembly as a whole, not one or two participants only).

Time Measurement

In general, we found it useful in our observations to note the time exactly. However, a watch is a must have for the participant observation. We write down the time at least for each agenda item. Additionally, we take the time for every speech act in case of conflict. This is not obligatory but it proved to be helpful to reconstruct the session and assess the participation of single participants. For the purpose of the Session report it will suffice to estimate the duration of agenda items and breaks.

SBREAK Breaks

(min) *Total duration of breaks in minutes.*

Breaks are those interruptions of the session that are agreed upon by the assembly or suggested by the moderator/chair.

SFLUCT Has there been significant fluctuation in the number of attendants?

String *Records major fluctuation during the session.*

Has there been significant fluctuation in the number of attendants? At the beginning/the end? Related to which issue? **Note only if fluctuation exceeds 20 percent.**

Major fluctuation can be a sign of "voting with the feet": participants may show their dislike of an issue/discussion by choosing the exit option.

SATTTOT Number of attendants

N *Total number of attendants.*

As it is likely that the number will fluctuate, please provide the **maximum number**.

SATTFEM Number of female attendants

n ♀ *Maximum number of female attendants.*

SPARTIC Session Particularities

string *Actions, group behaviour and constellations in the observed session that deviate from group routines as they are specified in the group report.*

Please note all particularities regarding: preparation of the session, place of meeting, type of invitation, availability of information, seating order, composition (roles: facilitator, note-taker, guests, newbies; gender; age; minorities), agenda-setting, hidden agenda, rules of discussion/decision-making, participation, atmosphere, respect, conflict-cooperation, power, time-constraints, taboos

1.2. Agenda item Data

A session is divided sequentially into agenda items understood as separate segments within the session as structured by the participants. An agenda item typically comprises a discussion or a cluster of contributions related to a specific topic. Excurses or subordinated discussions are considered part of the related agenda item. Of course, moderation and/or an agenda distributed in advance are helpful to identify separate agenda items. Aberrations and blending with other issues, however, are likely to appear in reality and make the distinction of agenda items difficult. Changes in the type of communication and/or transitional phrases (“so much for this issue”, “any further questions?”) will help to identify a new agenda item. To identify an agenda item one could imagine what somebody would report as the main points of the meeting to somebody who missed it.

Note: single items originally scheduled on the agenda might vanish because of the intense discussion of another issue (record in variable for session particularities SPARTIC). Similarly, ad hoc items may emerge.

For the second and following agenda items copy the values of the session variables into a new row and proceed with ITEM (see example in the matrix). Provided that you did not observe more than one controversy related to the issue, this makes one row for each agenda item. (For more than one controversy per ITEM you will copy session AND item data into a new row [see part two of the codebook]).

ITEM **Agenda item**

1 – n *Serial number of agenda item under discussion.*

ITDUR **Duration of agenda item**

Duration (min) *Estimated duration of discussion related to the agenda item in question.*

ITDES **Description of agenda item**

string *Description of the main issue under discussion and the most relevant related information.*

Guiding questions to be considered are the following: What is at stake? How does the discussion proceed? Is the agenda item related to an issue internal or external to the group? Is there a proposal discussed? Is there a hidden conflict? Who are the main actors/factions? Is this an ad hoc agenda item (not on the agenda initially agreed upon)? Is the agenda item a continuation of an earlier discussion?

ITCOM1 **Type of communication 1**

ITCOM2 **Type of communication 2**

Chronologically first/second dominant mode of interaction observed with regard to the agenda item.

A brainstorming regarding the text for a banner is followed by a discussion.
ITCOM1=[4], ITCOM2=[3]

1 *Input or Proposal*

The agenda item consists of an input or a proposal presented to the assembly. An input informs others on a specific issue, a proposal provides a concrete plan how to proceed with regard to a certain issue, e.g. which measures to take.

Input: An invited guest holds a speech about changes in the Bolkestein directive to inform the assembly about gains and losses in the struggle against it.

Proposal: A sub-group needs money for an action and suggests taking it from group funds.

2 *Separate contributions*

Several speakers address the assembly in unrelated contributions.

Solidarity round: a dozen speakers tell the assembly about upcoming events.

3 *Discussion*

Participants debate a specific issue (or several issues at the same time).

4 *Brainstorming*

Participants exchange ideas regarding a specific issue without discussing them.

Brainstorming can be observed particularly when the group deals with an issue in an early stage.

The group thinks of possible ways to express their protest against the visit of Vladimir Putin. Everybody who has an idea, shares it with the others.

5 *Go-Round*

Every participant gives his opinion on a specific issue. In contrast to [4 Brainstorming] a go round aims at assessing different opinions, not vague ideas, in a late stage of discussion. Mostly, a go round is a means deliberately chosen by the moderator to integrate all participants and obtain an impression of their opinions.

6 *Output production*

Participants exchange about the production of a tangible output, i.e. the text of a flyer. This situation is more likely to be observed in small groups.

9 *Other form of communication*

ITCOMOT1 Specification of ITCOM “other”

ITCOMOT2

string *Specify form of communication. Try to be precise enough to allow recoding into new value for ITCOM1 and ITCOM2.*

ITPART Participation related to the agenda item

1 – n *Participation during the course of the agenda item.*

Please provide the number of active participants for the agenda item as a whole. Active participation means to make at least one statement that aims at receiving the attention of the whole group.

If only one person is talking (e.g. an input not followed by questions), the code for participation would be “1”.

ITDEC1 Mode of Decision

ITDEC2

ITDEC3

Indicates if and according to which criteria a decision was taken on a procedural or substantive issue.

Note the difference between everybody agreeing [5] and nobody contradicting [3].

10 *Not applicable*

Coded if no decision was taken

11 *Straw poll, no decision taken*

Is coded when a straw poll as an informal type of voting was made. No decision was taken in the formal sense but the distribution of opinions on a potential decision became visible to everyone.

12 *Veto, no decision taken*

No decision could be taken, because one or more actor(s) made use of his/her/their right to veto.

- 21 *Nodding, tacit agreement*
Is coded when a proposal was made and nobody objected so that it was clear to everyone that this is the decision of the group.
- 22 *Majority vote*
Coded if there was an explicit majority vote (by raising hands, casting ballots etc.)
- 23 *Unanimity*
Is coded when there was explicit consent by everyone or unconvinced dissenters did no longer object. Unanimity is reached either by a vote which was intended to be a majority vote but turned out to be unanimous or by everybody agreeing explicitly.
- 9 *other*

ITDECOT1 Specification of ITDEC “other”

ITDECOT2

ITDECOT3

string *Specify mode of decision. Try to be precise enough to allow recoding into new value for ITDEC1-3.*

ITOUT1 Decision taken

ITOUT2

ITOUT3

string *Outcome of a decision*

Results of a discussion without tangible consequences should be written down in the description of the agenda item ITEM.

The group decided that Maria writes a press release in the group’s name.

The group refused the proposed text for a flyer. Three quarters voted against the text that was proposed by one faction.

2. Controversy Data

A discourse protocol is coded for every controversy that may emerge. A controversy is an explicit and extended verbal disagreement in the group. It starts as soon as a dissenting voice is followed by a reaction (e.g. a justification) of at least three speech acts or of a reaction that lasts more than three minutes. If two or more controversies can be connected to one and the same issue, they are considered as a single controversy.

Note that coding does not refer to single speech acts but to prevailing tendencies of the controversy as a whole.

In the matrix, each controversy is coded in a separate case.

For the second and following controversies addressing the same issue, copy the values for the respective session [S-] and agenda variables [IT-] into a new row.

CID Controversy-ID

1 – n *Serial number of the observed controversy.*

CSUBJ Subject of controversy

string *Description of the subject of this controversy.*

Describe the main question which the debate was focused on. In case of two or more independent controversies taking place at the same time, relate to one of them only. If there are sub-questions, list the relevant ones.

Should the group participate in a forthcoming demonstration organized by the trade unions against cuts of welfare subsidies? Subordinated question: does it make sense to mobilise on the date foreseen by the unions?

CREF1 Main reference point of controversy (numeric)

CREF2 Second important reference point of controversy (only coded if necessary)

Classification of the subject of this controversy

Reference point for the analysed controversy. Relevant for the coding is the perspective from which the group debates the main question as stated in CSUBJ. CREF2 is coded only if the controversy has an ambiguous reference point.

The group discusses whether and how to participate in a demonstration organized by the trade unions. If the group discusses whether a collective participation serves the political aims of the group, code [4]. If the controversy turns out to focus on whether participation would imply accepting the moderate stance of the trade unions, code [7].

1 *Internal organisation*

Questions which mainly regard the rather practical management of the group itself or the coordination of the meeting. Questions of rather short term relevance. Does not comprise questions which are meant to have a long term effect on the groups structure (see code [2])

Should the press release written by Elena checked by another member of the group?

2 *Internal structure*

Questions which mainly regard the group itself but not just technical matters but more fundamental issues of the long term structure of the group

Should we, the network against the privatisation of the municipal water company, have a formal speaker?

3 *External delegation*

Questions about the delegation of group members for a meeting of another group (or subgroup).

Should we send anyone to the meeting of the Euromayday preparatory group?

Note: If the main question is however, whether the group should participate in the Euromayday at all, then [4] is coded, even though this discussion might also comprise the question of delegation.

4 *External group action (organisation/tactics)*

This includes debates about all actions that present the group to a larger public, be it within the movement or in the public space, media or vis-à-vis representatives of the political system.

Should the group write a press release to publish their opinion about a policy proposal that is discussed publicly?

5 *Strategic decision*

Questions of collective strategy of the group, i.e. decisions which are not primarily directed at a concrete collective activity but which have a long term perspective regarding the group's strategic orientation.

Does it generally make sense to address our target group in press releases or should we try to concentrate on influencing people directly?

6 *Metadiscourse*

A discourse about the discussion itself and its conditions: style of speech, personal conflicts impeding a factual discussion, but also discussions about what the result of preceding discussions is supposed to be.

Does Muriel take advantage of her role as a moderator to support her faction of the group?

7 *Core values*

Questions of principle addressing fundamental norms and values of the group. This type of controversy might evolve from another controversy. Of course, it is also possible that a principal debate about values is foreseen on the agenda.

Is violence never acceptable?

9 *Other*

CREFOT1 Specification of CREF “other”**CREFOT2**

string *Specify type of controversy. Try to be precise enough to allow recoding into new value for CREF1 and CREF2.*

CORIGIN Origin of conflict

Describes the previous history of the conflict

Note: Point of reference is the actual controversy, not the subject in a broad sense.

Note that “pre-structuration” [2] includes “preset on agenda” [3]

1 *Continuation of an earlier conflict*

2 *Pre-structuration*

The subject of the conflict has been dealt with at a preparatory stage and is part of the agenda (i.e. it includes code [3]).

A proposal was prepared by a working group in order to discuss it in this meeting

3 *Linked to agenda*

The debated question is linked to a pre-existing agenda item but has not been dealt with in a preparatory stage. Either it is announced explicitly as an agenda item or there was an agenda item of which it was obvious that this specific debate (or a very similar one) would evolve

4 *Gradually evolving*

The question discussed evolved from a discussion about a different issue or a primarily very unfocused/general debate which eventually centred on this question.

Note: for a conflict to be coded as “gradually evolving” it does not suffice to have a presentation about the subject or a general exchange of information about the subject. There has to be some other controversial discussion prior to this controversy. Otherwise [5] is coded.

5 *Unexpected*

The conflict did not evolve and was not foreseen but was addressed by one or more speakers, e.g. when after the break a group of three people said they wanted to talk about the macholike behaviour of some men in the group.

One person complains about a speech held in Turkish during the demonstration which she could not understand and was therefore unsure if she agreed with the speaker. Other speakers react and say that Turkish was a legitimate language in an immigrant neighbourhood.

CDURA Duration of controversy

Duration of this controversy in minutes

A controversy starts, when the first person contradicts another person and ends when nobody addresses the controversial issue any longer. If no detailed record of the controversy is available, the duration has to be estimated (see TIME MEASUREMENT, SDURA).

1 – n *Value in minutes*

CATTOT Number of attendants

1 – n *Number of people present during this controversy*

CPART Number of participants

Number of people who actively participated in this controversy

Active participation means to make at least one statement that aims at receiving full attention of the whole group.

1 – n *Number of active participants*

CFPART Number of female participants

Number of women who actively participated in this controversy

Active participation means to make at least one statement that aims at receiving full

attention of the whole group.

1 .. n *Number of active female participants*

As a general rule to differentiate the code for CRECI, CSYMM, CPOWER, CCOOP, consider not only the mere number of statements showing a certain tendency but also their importance for the course of the controversy..

CRECI Reciprocity

Degree to which other positions are referred to during the controversy.

Indicates whether most speakers referred to others' positions during the discussion implicitly or explicitly or whether they made statements regardless of what other speakers said before.

In contrast to CSYMM, CRECI measures response, not equal treatment.

Note: see also CFOCUS

- 1 *Low*
Most or all speakers did not refer to other speakers' positions
- 2 *Medium*
There was a significant number of speakers who did not refer to others' positions
- 3 *High*
Most speakers referred to other speakers' positions

CSYMM Symmetry

Symmetry of relations between speakers

Indicates to what degree speakers treated each other as equal discussants. This variable does not refer to the quantitative distribution of speech-acts but to the way the speakers relate to each other (not necessarily relating to statements) during the controversy. In an asymmetric constellation one side is considered/treated as inferior to or less important than the other side.

In contrast to CRECI, CSYMM measures equal treatment, not response.

Note: Asymmetry should not be confused with "incivility" (CUNCIV), e.g. old friends, who respect each other as equals might in a heated discussion call the other an idiot. In this case, this speech-act is not an expression of asymmetry but of incivility. However, in other situations, attacking someone personally might very well be an expression of asymmetry.

- 1 *Very asymmetric*
With few exceptional speech acts the speakers did not treat each other as equals.
- 2 *Asymmetric*
In most speech acts others were not treated as equals, however a considerable minority of speech acts did treat the others as equals
- 3 *Symmetric*
In most speech acts others were treated as equals, but a considerable minority did not
- 4 *Very Symmetric*
With one or two exceptional speech acts the speakers treated each other as equals

CPOWER Type of power

Type of power relevant in this controversy

This is to grasp the dimension of soft-power (SP) versus hard-power (HP).

SP is communicative power based on words and symbols, values and beliefs. SP aims at changing peoples' minds.

HP is power ultimately based on material, physical or other kinds of sanctions, e.g. expressing a veto, threat of exit, rule of majority. HP is non-communicative; it is not dependent on changing peoples' minds as it actualises mutual or one-sided dependencies. However, to be coded as HP, a speaker has to use his resources/position strategically to influence the controversy. Demands based on procedural rules, for instance, is a form of HP. However, when people argue for a position in congruence with or just mentioning rules, this is SF.

SP and HP are not to be mixed up with “good” and “bad” (or legitimate and illegitimate) forms of influencing a controversy.

The scale measures the degree to which HP and SP were present in the controversy. A high degree of hard power is present when either many speakers rely on some kind of hard power or when one or a few speakers use hard power to such a degree, that the whole discussion is dominated by this. Typical speech acts addressing hard power are offers as well as demands.

One way to assess the importance of hard power is a thought experiment: Whenever it makes an important difference *who* or how many put forward a position, there is hard power (except person-related soft power, see Variable CSPSRC, Code 2). There can be various reasons why a specific speakers arguments count more which will be coded in CHPSRC and CSPSCR.

Note that hard power can be used in a symmetric as well as an asymmetric manner, so asymmetry should not be confused with power.

The group is divided into two factions regarding the question of whether or not the group should support the demonstration of the unions. Since the group has a long tradition of internal conflicts, they know that even though the two positions are very distinct (one side is absolutely in favour, the other absolutely against), this issue is not going to split the group. But they have to find an agreement of what to do. Since the pro-faction is the majority, they discuss about a demo-appeal which is to be published beforehand and which shall include some criticism directed against the unions. The discussion about this appeal is quite controversial but all diverging opinions are respected. Since both sides know each others positions already very well, there are not a lot of arguments exchanged but mainly different demands and offers are made and either rejected or accepted until the leaflet is finished. This is an example for code [4] (very hard power) because the discussion was primarily based on the veto position of the minority and the ability of the majority to mobilize for the demonstration. (Note: CSYMM would be coded [4])

An example for asymmetric soft power:

In a group, there is a value conflict about whether to cooperate with unions and NGOs.. It is obvious that neither side accepts the opponents' position. Nevertheless, both factions try to convince those who did not yet take sides, putting forward the various arguments each side holds. Since in this debate it is not relevant who presents which arguments, but rather whether arguments are acceptable, code communicative power (Code [4]). Due to the asymmetric behaviour, CSYMM would be coded [1]).

- 1 *Hard power clearly prevailing → code CHPSRC*
- 2 *Rather hard power → code CHPSRC and CSPSRC*
- 3 *Rather soft power → code CHPSRC and CSPSRC*
- 4 *Soft power clearly prevailing → code CSPSRC*

CHPSRC1 Main source of hard power

CHPSRC2 Second important source of hard power

Specifies the source of hard power relevant in this controversy.

To be coded if CPOWER is not [4]. This applies also vice versa: If a source of hard power is coded here, then CPOWER has to be [1], [2], or [3].

Specifies what sources of hard power speakers could rely on. If different speakers had different sources of hard power, then the most important source is coded. The most important source is that source which made the biggest difference during the course of the controversy.

- 0 *Not applicable*
Coded if there is no relevant hard power
In the second example given above in CPOWER the code would be [0] because there is no hard power involved.
- 1 *Resources*
Speakers promote their view by announcing to mobilise or withhold resources that are at their disposal but are not personal characteristics [2].
A group member working in the student-run self administration indicates that he would not use the students' copy machines to xerox a leaflet of the group in which

critique is directed to George W. Bush instead of the capitalist system as a whole.

2 *Personal characteristics*

Speakers use authority instead of soft power, e.g. because they emphasise their status as experts, their merits or their experience. By using their personal characteristics as sources of hard power they try to threaten others.

A group member impedes a discussion about the structure of a congress only by referring to his experiences with previous events but without presenting arguments against concerns that have been brought up.

A speaker reacts to objections against a text he has written only by referring to his status as an experienced researcher.

3 *Representation of others*

In their contributions, speakers refer to others they represent instead of using soft power. The 'others' may be present or absent in the meeting.

In the meeting of an anti-G8-campaign a church official indicates that his organisation would not support a counter-summit if it includes a communist party.

4 *Authority of rules*

Speakers resort to rules valid in the group to influence the course of the meeting.

The facilitator interrupts a side controversy with reference to his role.

9 *Other*

CHPSCROT1 Specification of CHPSRC "other"

CHPSRCOT2

string *Specify other source of hard power. Try to be precise and detailed enough to allow recoding into new value of CHPSRC.*

CSPSRC1 Main source of soft power

CSPSRC2 Second important source of soft power

Specifies the source of soft power relevant in this controversy.

To be coded if CPOWER is not [1]. This applies also vice versa: If a source of hard power is coded here, then CPOWER has to be [2], [3], or [4].

Specifies what sources of soft power speakers could rely on. If different speakers had different sources of soft power, then the most important source is coded. The most important source is that source which made the biggest difference during the course of the controversy.

0 *Not applicable*

Coded if there is no relevant soft power

1 *Arguments*

Speakers try to convince the others solely through presenting the better arguments.

2 *Agitation/Empathy*

Speakers try to convince others by their performance, their appeal to emotions or their authentic experience rather than by the use of arguments.

9 *Other*

CSPSCROT1 Specification of CSPSCR "other"

CSPSRCOT2

string *Specify other source of soft power. Try to be precise and detailed enough to allow recoding into new value of CSPSCR.*

CCOOP Competitiveness

Degree of competitiveness between speakers

Indicates to what degree the discussion was a competition between the various positions of the speakers. The dimension ranges from competitive relations to cooperative speech acts.

Indicators for high competitiveness are speech acts, in which speakers give no indication that they are ready to change their position, e.g. when they seem quite convinced that

there is no form of power (neither hard nor soft) to make them change their mind. This might be indicated by an assertive speech style as well as through continuous repetition of the same position.

Indicators of low competitiveness (high degree of cooperation) are such speech acts where speakers signify that they are prepared to change their position, e.g. when they seem unsure of whether their opinion is right or even when they are convinced about their position but are willing to compromise with the others. This might be explicitly indicated by speakers ("This is just a spontaneous thought but I think...", "How about if we...", "If you are ready to delete this sentence, I will be fine with the press release" etc.) or signified by tone of voice, thinking pauses etc.

Note: This variable relates to the attitude/behaviour of speakers, not to the envisaged outcome of the debate, i.e. if speakers argue in favour of a compromise, this does not necessarily mean, that they are cooperative. For example, if they continuously uphold a specific compromise, arguing that this is the best compromise and everybody should agree, then this is a competitive behaviour.

- 1 *Cooperative*
Most or all speakers showed a cooperative attitude
- 2 *Rather cooperative*
A cooperative attitude was prevalent but a considerable minority acted in a competitive way
- 3 *Rather competitive*
A competitive attitude was prevalent but a considerable minority acted in a cooperative way
- 4 *Competitive*
Most or all speakers showed a competitive attitude

CCONFL Conflict situation

Type of conflict situation

Describes the type of conflict situation during the controversy regarding identifiable 'camps' or factions amongst the discussants.

- 1 *Dissent by one or a few*
One main faction is challenged by just one or a few people
- 2 *Dissent by a considerable minority*
One main faction is challenged by a minority
- 3 *Bipolar*
Two factions of about the same strength are identifiable
- 4 *Multipolar*
Several different factions are identifiable
- 5 *Diffuse*
No clear factions are identifiable

CUNCIV Uncivility

Degree of uncivility amongst the discussants

Describes to what degree speakers addressed others in an uncivil way. Indicators for an uncivil discourse are especially personal attacks (they do not need to be very fierce) but also riotous speech against groups of people who are present.

Note: see also CSYMM.

- 0 *No uncivility*
No personal attack whatsoever.
- 1 *Rare uncivility*
Just one or two uncivil interventions, though they might have been harsh.
- 2 *Some uncivility*
Uncivil behaviour occurred to a considerable extent
- 3 *Frequent uncivility*
Uncivil behaviour dominated the discussion

CFOCUS Focus of controversy

Degree to which the controversy is focused around one question ("focusedness")

This measures the degree to which (temporally) consecutive interventions relate to the same question (as specified in CSUBJ).

The issue at stake is clearly the approval of the budget for the next year but some people talk about activities planned for the next year, others talk about money in general and again others do make proposals on the issue of the budget. This debate is unfocused or maybe semi-focused, depending on whether the three issues addressed take up about the same time (=unfocused) or one of them takes up clearly the biggest part (=semi-focused).

In a situation with a long list of speakers, where it takes quite a while until a speaker who raises his/her hand finally gets to speak, several questions might be discussed at the same time and speakers might clearly address the specific question which they relate to but since other issues have been addressed by most the speakers before and after, this is coded as an unfocused controversy [1].

Note however: Since most speakers did address one specific question (thus implicitly relating to other speakers positions in that debate), the reciprocity of this controversy would be coded CRECI = [2] or even [3].

- 1 *Unfocused*
There is no clear focus on a specific question (various or no clear question is addressed by the speakers)
- 2 *Semi-focused*
There is one question which most speakers address, but a significant proportion of interventions is not about this subject
- 3 *Focused*
There is clearly one question being debated with no or negligible interventions directed at other issues.

CATMO Atmosphere

Degree of negative emotional tension during the controversy.

The coding of this variable largely relies on the observers' impression of what most people in the group feel.

Note that a heated and emotional debate does not necessarily imply a tense atmosphere because this depends on the discussion culture of the group. A battlesome group regularly involved in heated debates will not feel a tense atmosphere during such debates. So generally, the coding should be considered relative to the standard of each group.

Indicators for increased tensivity are: The audience moaning, making shirty comments or of course speakers explicitly addressing the uncomfortable atmosphere.

Whenever a single provocative intervention by one speaker does not lead to people being upset, visibly angry, etc. but on the contrary, the group deals with this provocation in a relaxed way, then this incident is *not* an indicator for a tense atmosphere but in the contrary it underlines how relaxed the atmosphere is. If however, the majority seems quite angry about the provocation but this is not addressed, and speakers *pretend* to be cool about the issue, then this is not a relaxed atmosphere.

- 1 *Relaxed*
- 2 *Mixed*
- 3 *Tense*

CDECORI Decision-orientation

Degree to which the discussion is oriented towards a decision

Relevant is the proportion of speakers who make explicit proposals for a decision in relation to those who merely give their opinion without expecting or hoping for a decision on the matter.

'Decision' refers to this specific controversy. A debate which is expected to finally lead to a

decision (maybe in a couple of weeks) is not considered decision-oriented.

- 0 *No decision-orientation*
The discussion was just an exchange of opinions with no explicit relation to a decision to be taken in this controversy.
- 1 *Some decision-orientation*
Some speakers made a concrete proposal or stated their preferences with regard to other proposals, but it remained unclear if a decision would be taken or at least some speakers did not expect a decision to be taken.
- 2 *Definitely decision-orientation*
Most speakers made a concrete proposal or stated their preferences with regard to another proposals, expecting (or wanting) a decision to be taken on the matter.

CDECOUT Outcome of controversy

Outcome of a controversy when a decision has been made. The variable aims at portraying the result of the controversy with regard to the debated subject (as specified in CSUBJ). CSYMM, CPOWER and CCOOP refer to the process of the controversy. The process may or may not be mirrored in the outcome.

Note that the word consensus is used in a much broader sense by activists. It very often comprises the categories [5], [6] and [7] below.

- 0 *None*
No decision was taken
- 1 *Postponing*
A decision over the controversy (see CSUBJ) was explicitly postponed to a later point in time
- 2 *Delegation of decision*
A decision over the controversy (see CSUBJ) was delegated to a different group or person
- 3 *Rather decree*
The decision does not reflect the preferences of all participants. It was taken notwithstanding objections against this decision.
- 4 *Rather acclamation*
One proposal received positive reactions (e.g. nodding, applause) and is thus conceived hegemonic. This is not necessarily considered a decision however. Acclamation is the result of unilateral communication. Here a decision is approved after one speaker or a faction of speakers has presented their ideas without referring to other opinions that might play a role within the group. An "allowed consensus" [7] by contrast is the result of a discussion where different opinions have been made clear.
- 5 *Rather compromise*
The conflict parties made concessions but different preferences remained.
- 6 *Allowed Consensus*
The decision is not a consensus in the literal sense because dissent has been made explicit, but all participants agreed to a decision in order to reach a common goal.
- 7 *Rather consensus*
All or most participants are fully convinced by the decision taken.

CDECMOD Mode of Decision

Indicates if and according to which criteria a decision was taken on a procedural or substantive issue.

Note the difference between everybody agreeing [5] and nobody contradicting [3].

- 10 *Not applicable*
Coded if no decision was taken
- 11 *Straw poll, no decision taken*
Is coded when a straw poll as an informal type of voting was made. No decision was taken in the formal sense but the distribution of opinions on a potential decision became visible to everyone.
- 12 *Veto, no decision taken*
No decision could be taken, because one or more actor(s) made use of his/her/their right to veto.

- 21 *Nodding, tacit agreement*
Is coded when a proposal was made and nobody objected so that it was clear to everyone that this is the decision of the group.
- 22 *Majority vote*
Coded if there was an explicit majority vote (by raising hands, casting ballots etc.)
- 23 *Unanimity*
Is coded when there was explicit consent by everyone or unconvinced dissenters did no longer object. Unanimity is reached either by a vote which was intended to be a majority vote but turned out to be unanimous or by everybody agreeing explicitly.
- 9 *Other*

CDECMOOT Specification of CDECMOD “other”

string *Specify mode of decision. Try to be precise enough to allow recoding into new value for CDECMOD.*

CPRESS Time pressure

Time pressure (related or unrelated to decision)

Time pressure can result from external pressure (e.g. a deadline or an event that requires a reaction) or internal necessities (e.g. time running out for the actual session). It is coded to the extent the controversy is affected.

- 1 *None*
Time was not relevant during this controversy.

Note: a group might also perceive time pressure, but deliberately choose to ignore it.
If we can't find a consensus we will have to go on with the debate next week. We will not let this kind of external pressure affect our decision.
- 2 *Somewhat*
Time pressure played a role in the discussion, but it did not affect the controversy significantly. (e.g. Time pressure is mentioned during the discussion or people start to leave, because it is late)
- 3 *High*
Coded if time pressure is high and obviously affects the discussion

CMODERA Role performance of moderator

States whether the moderator is mainly active or passive

Note: An active moderator does not necessarily need to be a partisan moderator, actively taking sides for a specific position. (CMODDIS)

- 1 *Active moderation*
An active moderator actively listens and tries to structure the discussion, makes summaries, presents compromise proposals, gives additional information to clarify misunderstandings etc.
- 2 *Passive moderation*
A passive moderator understands his role limited to a minimum of tasks, such as starting the meeting, calling people to the floor, calling the next item on the agenda or perhaps asking for silence.
- 9 *Not applicable*
Coded if there is no moderation.

CMODDIS Moderator as discussant

States to what degree the moderator implicitly takes sides, acts as a discussant, and or takes partisan decisions.

- 0 *No*
The moderator distinguishes between his role as a moderator and as a discussant e.g. by leaving the chair
- 1 *Rarely*
- 2 *Often*
- 9 *Not applicable*
Coded if there is no moderation.

