CODING PROTOCOL

Training set 1 and 2
Senate Speeches: 500 speeches 2005-2008
http://people.fas.harvard.edu/~jgrimmer/Speeches.html

House Speeches: 1000 speeches 2005-2008
http://people.fas.harvard.edu/~jgrimmer/HouseSpeech.html

Training set 3:
Senate Speeches: 500 speeches 2005-2008
http://people.fas.harvard.edu/~jgrimmer/Speeches2.html

Training set 4:
The 111th House. The files are available here:
http://www.stanford.edu/~jgrimmer/Website/OldSpeeches/

Training set 5:
the speeches from 110th Congress (a sample of size 1000) posted here:
http://stanford.edu/~jgrimmer/Website/Sample110/

Training set 6:
many different sources: in the google folder “coding phase/trainingset6”

EXTERNAL information/research COLUMN
In this category you are going to put a 1 every time to code the speech you need to rely on external research or on information that are not in the speech, for example if you cannot infer the party ID of a candidate from the speech. (Please also see the section of category 6 under “common mistakes”)

CATEGORIES:
1) Opposite party taunting: partisan taunting of opposite party’s member, administration, President and/or bill/policy.
DESCRIPTION: Partisan taunts are explicit, public, and negative statements about members of the Congress, the administration, the President, or piece of legislation belonging to or sponsored by the opposite party. Ex. “You lie!!”, “You always get it wrong”, “a dumb position”, “The Republican party is always wrong about...”, “Democrats always failed in...”, “crazy policy proposals”, “they are acting in bad faith..”, etc...Ex. on the final day of the health care debate, House Republicans declared “Freedom dies a little today”, Grayson's charge that Republican's health plan is “hurry up and die”.

5
IMPORTANT NOTE: Pay attention to the nature of the speech: whether a speech has at least one sentence strongly attacking/offending directly or indirectly the opposite party, a member of the opposite party, the administration led by the opposite party, the President from the opposite party or a bill/policy sponsored by the opposite party. This might require external research (Wikipedia might be faster than the personal page of the politician since in the latter is not always so clear the party id Wikipedia is right in the box on the right). For instance, anytime there is a strong/over-the-top attack toward a member of the Congress, researching the party identification of the politician is a key element to distinguish between category 1 and category 2 (within party taunting).

To identify the sponsor of a bill, a good source is the library of the congress website: http://thomas.loc.gov/home/LegislativeData.php?n=BSS or also http://www.govtrack.us/ For example see the House’s speech 104 (Democratic), a critique of the National Food Uniformity Act which, after some research in the library of Congress, turns out to be a Republican-sponsored bill.

Moreover, in this category, as in all of those falling in the “partisan” group it’s important to distinguish between a simple “criticism” and “taunting”. Simple critique, with no “over the top” comments, attacks or offenses should fall in category 6 (general policy). In fact, they should simply be considered as a description or presentation of the politician’s opinion about a group or policy. Recognizing mistakes and disagreement is not necessarily “Taunting”.

Ex. TAUNTING=1: speech 17-Senate:“One of the greatest mistakes of this administration - not counting the great mistakes made before 9/11—was withdrawing our special forces and not providing the support needed[...]. How many costly mistakes are the American people going to be asked to bear?” Attacking the skills of the other party.

Ex: CRITIQUE=6: speech 13-Senate: “A mistake was made— not made by a Republican President; it was made during the Presidency of our last Democratic President.”

Ex TAUNTING=1: speech 104-House “I am deeply disturbed by this proposal that would strip away states’ ability to protect their citizens’ food supply[...] This bill would nullify approximately 200 state laws aimed at reducing the incidence of these food-borne illnesses. It’s shameful that this bill does not create any uniform safety standards, but simply strips away states’ rights to protect their residents.” strong attack

Ex CRITIQUE=6 Speech 125-Senate:“We cannot expect it to grow and constrict it to the borders of this country. That is what we are doing, in the tax policy that we have heard from the other side of the aisle. The question always comes back to all the spending that we have in this bill, some $146 billion above the $50 billion increase that the President already put in place. Where are we going to get the money to do that? [...] They talk about closing the tax gap. We had testimony in committee, and they thought that the reasonable amount was $35 billion in collections as a reasonable expectation over 5 years. Yet on the other side, they insist it is going to be much more, regardless of what the IRS--the ones who would
know--said in our Budget Committee hearings.” *underline the incorrect statement of the other side but without any judgment about their moral standing, political skills or personal attitude.*

2) Within party taunting.
**DESCRIPTION:** Explicit, public, and negative attacks on a member of his/her own party, piece of legislation/policy sponsored by his/her own party and/or the President from his/her own party.
**IMPORTANT NOTE:** This category requires external research, of the same kind done for category 1. Moreover, pay particular attention to attacks to the administration and the President behind which this category might lay. *To distinguish between disagreement and taunting please refer to the criteria presented in category 1.*

3) Other taunting
**DESCRIPTION:** explicit, public, and negative attacks on other actors: bureaucrats, foreign countries, or media personalities, but also bipartisan committees and similar.
**IMPORTANT NOTE:** *To distinguish between disagreement and taunting please refer to the criteria presented in category 1.*

4) Bipartisan support for an individual, group or piece of legislation.
**DESCRIPTION:** this is meant as the opposite of partisan taunting (1 and 2). Members of Congress sometimes express support or compliment the work of the opposition. A speech is going to be classified as 4, the speaker needs to thank, praise, openly support the work of an exponent of the opposite party. Therefore, a simple mention of a co-sponsorship of a bill is not enough (the speech would still be a 6).
**IMPORTANT NOTE:** Please pay attention to the nature of the speech more than the content. In other words, if a speech has at least one sentence, one reference to the bipartisan nature/ tone of the speech, it should fall in category 4. For instance, the speech 105 from the Senate, Ted Kennedy at the beginning defines the bipartisan nature of the speech in two ways:
   a. “This bipartisan proposal...” that is declaring openly the bipartisan nature of the speech
   b. The sentence “It is a privilege to join Senator Hatch, Senator Feinstein, Senator Specter and Senator Harkin in sponsoring...” openly support and praise other Senators from the opposite party. This last case requires a research of the party identification of the Senators mentioned.

5) Honorary statements
**DESCRIPTION:** this category captures important types of statements that are not partisan taunting. Honorary statements are statements meant to commemorate a national holiday, historical recurrence, nationally/internationally relevant event (i.e. Super bowl, World Cup), recognize a prominent individual, or some other group.
6) Policy statements without taunting and/or with credit claiming

DESCRIPTION: A discussion of a policy, including the praising of some kind of achievement for its own party, a simple critique of policy positions of the other party (when not taunting) etc...
This category includes:
   a. Statements where politicians describe policies without explicitly attacking or praising any legislation or any sponsor.
   b. Those speeches that openly support a piece of legislation, sponsored by their own party (otherwise 5).
   c. Those speeches that praised or claim credits for one’s party (often similar to point b)
   d. Those speeches that disagree or criticize policies or political positions without taunting. (otherwise 1)
   e. Those speeches describing political situations, political forecasting etc...

IMPORTANT NOTE: Please pay attention: This category has an important meaning itself and should not be used as a default category for any doubtful coding decision. For this case the decision making tree may be very helpful.

COMMON MISTAKES:
Following are some examples of mistakes done in past coding, in the use of this category:
EXAMPLES from training set 3
In all these cases below some of you made two mistakes:
1) They did not put the necessary 1 in the column of the external research
2) They categorize as 6 instead of 4
Please, pay attention to these examples and double check if you made the mistake and use these as a reference if you have doubts in the next training set.

Speech 3 = category 4
“Now, I am also pleased that Senators Dole, Graham, Kennedy, Chambliss, Reed, Mikulski, Murray, Salazar, Lieberman, Menendez, Brown, Nelson of Nebraska, and Cardin are cosponsoring this new legislation today. Senator Bob Dole and former Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala have been instrumental in this effort as well, through their thoughtfulness and work on the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors. It is unsurprising that the commission found that family members play a critical role in the recovery of our wounded service members.”

Speech 34= category 4
“I wish to join with Senator Specter in opposing the DeMint amendment [...] I support the Senator from Pennsylvania.”
Speech 250 = category 4
“I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY, Senator BAUCUS and Senator LOTT for their hard work and leadership to get immediate assistance to the hurricane victims. All of America is pulling together to support the people of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. Since Hurricane Katrina devastated the Gulf Coast, Americans from all walks of life, from all across the country, have poured out their hearts to help.”

Speech 349 = category 4
“I am very pleased to have the distinguished chairman of the Senate Governmental Affairs and Homeland Security Committee, Senator Lieberman, as a cosponsor, Senator Carper, who was the author of the postal reform bill with me in the last Congress, Senator Coleman, and Senator Akaka, all of whom have been very active on postal issues.”

7) Procedural statements: motions, etc.
DESCRIPTION: The House and Senate floor operates under formal rules of order. This requires some speeches that are only procedural. Those speeches belong here.
IMPORTANT NOTE: Please note that this is a purely procedural category. Do not let the length of the speeches trick you, and please read them anyway. In many cases short speeches might actually have some partisan taunting value (1, 2, or 3) or have absolutely no content and fall in category 8.

8) No content at all or not discernible content:
DESCRIPTION: This category is for those speeches that consist of sentences with no clear content, not referring to any sort of procedure, and/or whose content cannot be infer from the context. Examples: “So this is a private sort of agreement between the two of you?” speech 28 of the House The speech consists only of this sentence. It is hard to identify any content.

Suggested decision making tree:
The tree below simply aims to suggest the way that the categories should be thought. Following there is an example of how to use it.
EXAMPLE of how to use the TREE:

Or in the speech 20: “it gives me absolute pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Wilson), my friend and neighbor, who lives right up the road from me in Columbia.” Speaker is REPUBLICAN.

1. **NATURE**: since it is a positive speech, with a positive tone toward Mr. Wilson, we start from the partisan/bipartisan branch. To exclude or not the 4, let’s research who is Mr. Wilson.
2. Mr. Wilson belongs to the **SAME PARTY** as the speaker. Is it claiming some credit or praising him for something? No, so not a 6 (credit claiming). It is not honorary speech about Mr. Wilson (he didn’t die or anything like that) so it cannot be a 5. Let’s move to the neutral branch of the tree.
3. **NEUTRAL → CONTENT**: it does not describe any policy or law so it’s not a 6 (general policy description). It is not a procedural speech either, not an 7. It definitely has a content that can be neglected, personal and not politically significant:
4. it’s a 8