

# Codebook for the Media Content Analysis on Trust Contestations in the Public Sphere

## Deliverable 4.1

**EnTrust: Enlightened Trust: An Examination of Trust and Distrust in Governance – Conditions, Effects and Remedies**

WP4: The role of the media in trust/distrust building: Information or polarisation?

Work package leader: UCPH, with the assistance of the project coordinator USIEGEN

Due date: 30 June 2022

Submission date: 27 June 2022

---

### Project Information

Project Type: Collaborative Project  
Call: H2020 SC6 GOVERNANCE-01-2019: Trust in Governance  
Start date: February 2020  
Duration: 48 months  
Coordinator: Prof. Dr. Christian Lahusen, University of Siegen  
Grant Agreement No: 870572  
EU-funded Project Budget: € 2,978,151.25



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 870572. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union.

[www.entrust-project.eu](http://www.entrust-project.eu)

---

# Discursive Trust Contestation Analysis: Codebook

Hans-Jörg Trezn (UCPH and Scuola Normale Superiore), Ulrike Zschache (University of Siegen)

## 1. Concept of Discursive Trust Contestation

Discursive Trust Contestation Analysis (DTCA) comprises several approaches of content analysis in the area of contentious politics: actor claims-making analysis (Cinalli et al. 2021; Koopmans and Statham 2010; Statham and Trezn 2012) and discursive actor attribution analysis (Gerhards, Roose, and Offerhaus 2011). Similar to a claim, a discursive trust contestation is perceived as a speech act that establishes a social relationship between a trust giver and a trust receiver. The speaker in a trust contestation can be identical with the trust giver (“I trust the government”) or it can be an attributor of a trust relationship (“the people do no longer trust government”). Unlike a claim, a discursive trust contestation does however not necessarily point into the direction of ‘what is to be done’ or ‘what should be done’. A discursive trust contestation rather qualifies the social relationship from the perspective of the speaker (either the trust attributor or the trust giver): another person is claimed to be or not to be worth of being trusted. Similar to discursive actor attribution analysis, DTCA sees trust attribution as a contingent social process that highlights specific elements of that relationships and gives reasons/sets the conditions for being trusted/non trusted. Like attributing responsibility in the sense of moral duty, accountability, blame or shame, attributing trust relies on the assessment of other actors’ performance and its consequences.

The approach of DTCA aims at a standardised content analysis focusing on public interpretation processes in which actors assess the importance/role of trust in social relationships and/or other actors’ trustworthiness. The unit of analysis in this approach is the trust contestation. The trust contestation is the reconstructed answer to the question: “Who expresses to trust/mistrust another actor/system for doing/not doing what and based on what criteria of trustworthiness.” The element of trust contestation consists in the confirmation/support (trust) or in the violation/brokenness (mistrust) of a criteria of (un)trustworthiness, which is attributed to an addressee (the trustee, trusted). The trust contestation is in this sense a unilateral relationship between a trust giver and a trust receiver. It is not relevant whether the trust receiver (the person/institution trusted/mistrusted) responds or actually receives the message. The criteria of (un)trustworthiness evoked by the sender of the message as a basis of his/her judgement are not necessarily shared by the receiver nor do they necessarily bind trust giver and receiver together in a social relationship. The criteria of (un)trustworthiness that forms the basis of the judgement are only attributed to or hold valid from the perspective of the sender (or the attributor of a trust relationship, e.g. journalist). The question whether receiver or any other actor shares or contests them is out of focus in DTCA.

A trust contestation is the assessment of the quality of a relationship between two actors/institutions in their role as trust giver and trust receiver. This assessment can be done either by the trust giver herself ('I trust') or by a third person in its role as a trust attributor. A trust contestation can thus take the form of an individual statement (I trust/do not trust), an appeal (we trust/can trust/should trust, cannot trust....) or an ascription (I observe how others do trust/do not trust, e.g. 'a politician states that people have lost trust in government').

The trust contestation can continue over one or several sentences, sometimes also spread over the entire text. Later statements by the same trust attributor/giver belong to the same trust contestation as long as the trust receiver is also the same. This implies also to later statements that do not contain explicit references to trust, but can specify the issue or the principle of trustworthiness.

Actors in a trust relationship can be individual, collective or a system. The receiving actor/collective/system is the passive part, the attributor/giver are the active part: A targets B as being/not being trustworthy. Or A sustains that B does/does not find C trustworthy. Assessing the trustworthiness of the other actor means underlying some criteria of worth, which are claimed as being valid or applying to a particular actor, but which again can be contested by others. What is contested is not the criteria of worth but the way it applies to other actors. The attribution of trust might be related to having been successful in doing something for the profit of all, having been successful to avoid failure or harm or being seen as competent for doing something. It might relate to what the actor did already (diagnostic) or to what the actor is expected to do in the future (prognostic). The actor is found to be trustworthy based on the assessment of his/her/its previous performance (a diagnosis what the actors was doing) or based on the prediction of his/her/its likely behavior in the future (a prognosis of how the actor will perform). A trust contestation can further be individual (I do not trust) or collective (we do not trust/shall not trust).

## 2. Sampling

We use newspaper archives that allows us to select content from printed and/or online news sites through search words. We only focus on news provided by professional journalism. For each country we compile a list with the 10 most popular news sites. From this list 3 professional journalism news sites will be collected. The final choice of news sites for each country will be taken by accounting for diversity of opinion (pro-governmental and oppositional news sites) according to the country ranking.

As the most comprehensive search word, we propose 'Covid' or 'Corona' or 'pandemic' and 'trust'. Make sure that you search for trust in your language in its various semantic varieties (e.g. including 'distrust', 'mistrust', 'trustful', 'trustworthy', etc.).

Sampling should encompass the entire period from 1/3/2020-30/6/2021. Please sample each month separately and document total number of articles per month and newspaper. This will allow us to identify issue cycles based on the frequency of articles per

month. Save either entire output in the form of news articles in PDF or text format or search lists with hyperlinks (depending on the functionality of the archive you use)!

For the analysis we will select four periods: March-April 2020, September-October 2020, December-January 2020/21, March-April 2021. We would expect governments, and the appropriateness of their lockdown measures to be salient in the first period anti-lockdown protests in the second period, anti-vaccine protests in the third and anti-Pharma protests in the fourth. We aim to code 800 units of trust contestation (200 for each period). Random selection procedures will be agreed with each team based on the sampling results.

At the last stage, we will collect user comments, which requires manual sampling from Facebook. We will select Facebook posts from our sampled newspapers that display highest degrees of trust contestations. For finding such articles, we recommend to use Crowdtangle and perform searches with reference to 'trust\*' (with all combinations) for given time periods (March 2020-July 2021). The output of this search should be ranked in terms of overperformed articles. You then need to scroll down this list manually and search for Covid related articles. Among those, you should identify those with a substantial number (25plus) of trust contestations in user comments. For accessing user comments, coders will need to open the original Facebook post of the news article, in which trust contestations appear. On Facebook, the first 50 comments will appear automatically, even though longer comments will be abbreviated and replies to comments hidden. By clicking on 'View more comments', this list can be expanded. Try to open a substantial number of 200plus comments (if available) before you perform a search for 'trust\*' (use abbreviations, e.g. fid, trust, Vertrau, etc.) Browser search functions should be used (ctrl-f) to show relevant entries in the commenting section. If more than 25 comments including a trust-related search word appear, we will code the first 25 trust related comments for each post in their order of appearance. In total, each team should code a minimum of 250 comments, i.e., at least 10 posts with intensive trust contestation need to be identified. Depending on the difficulties of national teams to find and access relevant news articles on Facebook, individual solutions can be agreed in line with the main purpose of the study (e.g., by expanding the time frame). We only code main comments and not reply to comments.

### 3. Coding rules

A coding unit encompasses a discursive trust contestation. It can be identified through the presence of a trust attributor or trust giver in text. In a simplified way: someone in the news article talks about trust (or distrust). This is typically done in the form of a statement: a trust attributor or trust giver is either directly or indirectly quoted by the journalist or the journalist herself is contesting trust (e.g. in an opinion article).

One article can contain several coding units. A new coding unit in the same article is identified by a change of the trust giver-receiver relationship, either by a change of the actor relationship or a change of the level or direction of trust/mistrust. e.g.: I trust the government, but not the opposition = two coding units; 'x mistrusts the government and y does also mistrust the government = two coding units; 'I do not trust and people should

also not trust = two coding units; 'I trust the government on vaccines but not for its lockdown measures= two coding units), e.g. 'Understandably, Americans are more trusting of public health officials and institutions, but even then, recent accusations of government interference in data and reporting may have hit levels of confidence.'=two coding units

A new coding unit is also defined by a change of the trust attributor. E.g. a journalist writes "How I see it, large parts of society have lost trust in the current government policies. However, latest opinion polls from the ABC institute suggest that the majority of our society is still trusting the current government policies." – two different trust attributors = two coding units).

Note: Trust attributor and trust giver cannot be identical within one coding unit. It is however possible that a trust giver changes role and also attribute trust=two coding units.

Note: each coding unit must have an explicit (dis)trust mentioning. This also applies to all cases of changing trust giver-receiver relationships. Example: 'I would not trust Trump. I would also not trust Biden'= two units of analysis. I would not trust Trump, but I believe that Biden is a good candidate' = only the Trump related statement is coded as a unit of analysis, the Biden related statement is disregarded.

A coding unit does often but not necessarily relate to one sentence or paragraph in the news text. It can however also spread over the article whenever the same trust sender/attributor is quoted again. If the same trust relationship is confirmed/mentioned later in the article it will be treated as the same coding unit. If additional information is made available (e.g. on principles of trustworthiness) these should be included in the coding of that unit. (Thus, the entire article should be read before coding starts.)

Only main news text is coded, article headlines and sub-headings are disregarded. embedded content (Twitter, Instagram posts) is also not coded.

## 4. Variables

### Variables for the Media content analysis

The elements of a trust contestation take the following form:

"Who [trust giver] finds whom [trust receiver] trustworthy how (form) based on what principles/reasoning and for doing what [issue].

Or

"Who [trust giver] is said to find whom [trust receiver] trustworthy how (form) based on what principles/reasoning and for doing what [issue] by which attributor/observer?"

Note that not all trust contestations will contain reference to principles of trustworthiness and/or issue. The minimum form of a trust contestation is attributor/giver – receiver – form. This means that you simply do not code a variable if it is not addressed in the text (leaving the coding field empty).

## Variables

1) Coder	(combination of country code and coder's name)
2) Newspaper	
101	Politiken
102	Jyllands Posten
103	BT
201	SZ
202	FAZ
203	Bild
301	La Repubblica
302	Corriere della Sera
303	Il Fatto Quotidiano
401	Mladá Fronta Dnes (printed)
402	iDnes.cz (online)
403	Blesk (printed)
404	Blesk.cz (online)
405	Právo (printed)
406	Novinky.cz (online)
501	Wyborcza
502	Niezależna
503	Fakt
504	Rzeczpospolita
601	Kathimerini
602	EfSyn - Efimerida Syntakton
603	Proto Thema

701	Blic
702	Danas
703	Kurir

- 3) Title of article in original language (copy/paste)' String variable
- 4) Identification number of article (4 digit code, starting with 1 for DK, 2 for D, 3 for I, 4 for CZ, 5 for PL and 6 for EL, the first Danish coded article will thus be 1001)
- 5) Identification number of trust contestation, 4-digit code starting with 0001
- 6) Date of the article
- 7) Type of article
  1. news article
  2. opinion/commentary
  3. other
- 8) Form of trust relationship
  1. individual judgement (I trust/do not trust..., e.g.: 'Given the high level of corruption in this country, I can no longer trust our politicians'<sup>1</sup>)
  2. appeal (we can/cannot/should(should not trust..., e.g..' we should make even more efforts to trust each other during the pandemic', 'after this series of corruption, we can no longer trust this government. Note that appeals can be direct (by the sender) or indirect (by the attributor, e.g. x said that after this series of scandals people should no longer trust government))
  3. ascription, observation and/or explanation of trust relationships of others, e.g. in the form of a diagnosis/statement of facts: 'our society has become more trustful during the pandemic' or in the form of a prognosis: 'the financial aids will keep up good faith of the people and make people trust in government', or 'the government needs to fight corruption to restore trust among the voters', or 'the unequal distribution of negative consequences during the pandemic will erode trust in society')
  4. no trust relationship, yet factual, normative or causal statement about trust (If form d is coded, then "trust" will most probably be coded as an issue, see below issue variable)

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that "individual judgement" may be also understood as "direct judgement". If a groups of people (e.g. 3 experts authoring an article) expresses a direct judgement about trust ("We do not trust the president"), then this should also be coded as the first form.

9) Trust attributor/observer of trust relations: Actor type<sup>2</sup>

-99	Not applicable/unspecified
101	IND - Journalist/author of article
102	IND - Head of state/government
103	IND - Politician belonging to government
104	IND - Politician belonging to opposition
105	IND - Citizen
106	IND - Protester
107	IND - Scientist/ doctor/ expert/governmental expert or adviser
108	IND - Trade union representative
109	IND - Spokesperson of an NGO/social movement
110	IND - Judge/lawyer
111	IND - Business person
112	IND - Church representative
113	IND - Celebrity
114	IND - Representative of IGO (e.g. UN)
115	IND - writer
116	IND - head/representative of educational institution, library, museum
117	IND - representative of police/ army / security authorities
118	IND - sports person
119	IND - medical staff (nurse, medics, therapist)
120	IND - artist, representative of cultural organisation/institution
121	IND - diplomat or other state representative
122	IND - civil society activist, volunteer
123	IND - fire fighter
124	IND - pupil, student
125	IND - head/representative of public administration
199	IND - Other
201	COL - Newspaper/media organisation
202	COL - The government
203	COL - Subgovernment
204	COL - Political party in government
205	COL - Political party in opposition
206	COL - Group of citizens, communities, neighborhood, etc.
207	COL - Anti-vaccination groups
208	COL - The people (as a whole)
209	COL - The majority of the people (only if explicitly mentioned as such)
210	COL - The minority of the people (only if explicitly mentioned as such)

---

<sup>2</sup> To decide whether an individual actor-politician belongs to the government or the opposition, please take into account the level of policymaking addressed in the coding unit/text. E.g. a politician from party A is part of the local government and the text speaks about local policy issues., then code “belonging to government”, even if party A belongs to the opposition at national level. To decide between collective and system actors, do as follows: If the addressed trust receiver is first the government/an institution, and afterwards a representative is mentioned with his/her name, then only the institution is coded as trust receiver. First mentioning is relevant for coding actor either at the individual or collective level.



211	COL - Voters or a group of voters
212	COL - Group of protesters
213	COL - Doctors/medical associations
214	COL - Group of scientists/experts/governmental experts
215	COL - Trade union
216	COL - Social movement/NGO
217	COL - Court
218	COL - Business/private enterprise
219	COL - Church organization
220	COL - Public administration
221	COL - Consumers, customers, clients
222	COL - Employer
223	COL - Employees
224	COL - (politicians in) parliament or second chamber
225	COL - family (members)
226	COL - fire fighters
227	COL - police, army, security authorities
228	COL - athletes, sportsmen, soccer players
229	COL - pupils, students, young people
230	COL - patients
231	COL - teachers, educational institutions (preschools, schools, universities)
232	COL - parents
233	COL - artists, representatives of cultural organisations/institutions
234	COL - medical and care staff (nurses, para/medics, care workers)
235	COL - IGO (e.g. UN)
299	COL - Other
301	SYS - Democracy
302	SYS - The media
303	SYS - A country
304	SYS - The state
305	SYS - Politics (in general)
306	SYS - Science (& technology) (in general)
307	SYS - The judiciary/the law
308	SYS - The market/ the economy
309	SYS - education (system)
399	SYS - Other

10) Trust attributor/observer of trust relations: Actor origin

99. Unspecified/Not applicable (e.g. trust in science)
  1. domestic
  2. national (EU)
  3. national (other European)
  4. US
  5. national (outside Europe)
  6. transnational/international/global (e.g. UN, WHO, humanity)
  7. EU (e.g. Commission president, MEP)

11) Trust attributor/observer of trust relations: Actor origin (only if mentioned in text, e.g. CDU member xxx states that...')

-99	Not applicable/unspecified
101	DK - Social Democratic Party
102	DK - The Socialist People's Party
103	DK - The Red-Green Alliance
104	DK - The Danish Social-Liberal Party
105	DK - The Liberal Party
106	DK - Liberal Alliance
107	DK - Danish People's Party
108	DK - The Conservative People's Party
109	DK - New Right
199	DK - Other
201	DE - SPD
202	DE - CDU/CSU
203	DE - Gruene
204	DE - FDP
205	DE - AfD
206	DE - Linke
299	DE - Other
301	IT - Partito Democratico (PD)
302	IT - Lega
303	IT - Fratelli D'Italia (Fdi)
304	IT - Movimento 5 Stelle (M5S)
305	IT - Forza Italia (FI)
306	IT - Azione
307	IT - Sinistra Italiana (SI)
308	IT - Movimento Democratico Progressista - Articolo 1 (MdP)
309	IT - Più Europa (+EU)

310	IT - Italia Viva (IV)
399	IT - Other
401	CZ - ODS (Civic Democratic Party)
402	CZ - Piráti (Czech Pirate Party)
403	CZ - SPD (Freedom and Direct Democracy)
404	CZ - STAN (Mayors and Independents)
405	CZ - ČSSD (Mayors and Independents)
406	CZ - KSČM (Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia)
407	CZ - TOP 09
408	CZ - ANO 2011
499	CZ - Other
500	PL - United Right (governing coalition, conservative right)
501	PL - Prawo I Sprawiedliwość (Law and Justice)
502	PL - Solidarna Polska (United Poland)
503	PL - Partia Republikańska (Republican Party)
510	PL - Civic Coalition (liberal opposition)
511	PL - Platforma Obywatelska (Civic Platform)
512	PL - Nowoczesna (Modern Party)
513	PL - Inicjatywa Polska (Polish Initiative)
514	PL - Zieloni (The Green Party)
520	PL - The Left
521	PL - Nowa Lewica (New Left)
522	PL - Lewica Razem (Left Together)
531	PL - Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe (Polish People's Party)
532	PL - Konfederacja (Confederation, far-right)
533	PL - Kukiz'15
534	PL - Polska 2050
535	PL - Porozumienie Jarosława Gowina

599	PL - Other
601	GR - New Democracy/Νέα Δημοκρατία (ND)
602	GR - SYRIZA/ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
603	GR - KINAL/KINAA
604	GR - Communist Party of Greece (ΚΚΕ)
605	GR - Greek Solution/Ελληνική Λύση (EL)
606	GR - MeRA25 - European Realistic Disobedience Front
607	GR - Golden Dawn/Χρυσή Αυγή (GD)
608	GR - Course of Freedom/Πλεύση Ελευθερίας (PE)
609	GR - Union of Centrists/Ένωση Κεντρώων (EK)
610	GR - ANTARSYA/ΑΝΤΑΡΣΥΑ
699	GR - Other
701	SRB - Srpska napredna stranka (Serbian Progressive Party)
702	SRB - Socijalistička partija Srbije (Socialist Party of Serbia)
703	SRB - Srpska radikalna stranka (Serbian Radical Party)
704	SRB - Srpski pokret Dveri (Serbian Movement “Dveri”)
705	SRB - Stranka slobode i pravde (Freedom and Justice Party)
706	SRB - Narodna stranka (People’s Party)
707	SRB - Demokratska stranka (Democratic Party)
708	SRB - Ne davimo Beograd (Don’t drown Belgrade)
709	SRB - Pokret slobodnih građana (Movement of Free Citizens)
710	SRB - Demokratska stranka Srbije (Democratic Party of Serbia)
711	SRB - Pokret obnove Kraljevine Srbije (Movement for the Restoration of KoS)
712	SRB - Srpska stranka Zavetnici (Serbian Party Oath-keepers)
713	SRB - Zajedno za Srbiju (Together for Serbia)

714	SRB - Srpski patriotski savez (Serbian Patriotic Alliance)
715	SRB - Dosta je bila
799	SRB - Other
801	other countries extreme right
802	other countries moderate right
803	other countries moderate left
804	other countries extreme left

12) Trust giver (same actor categories like above)

13) Trust receiver (same actor categories like above)

14) Degree of (dis)trust

101	DESCRIPTIVE: Are trusting <sup>3</sup>
102	DESCRIPTIVE: Are increasingly trusting
103	DESCRIPTIVE: Are decreasingly trusting
104	DESCRIPTIVE: Are mistrusting
201	NORMATIVE: Should be trusting <sup>4</sup>
202	NORMATIVE: Should not trust
301	CONDITIONAL/PROGNOSTIC: Increasing trust <sup>5</sup>
302	CONDITIONAL/PROGNOSTIC: Decreasing trust
303	CONDITIONAL/PROGNOSTIC: Stabilizing/balancing/calming/securing trust
400	Degree of trust unspecified or open <sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Descriptive (e.g., polls show that the majority trust the government', 'polls show that levels of trust are rising. If in one unit of analysis information is provided about both degree (are (dis)trusting) and trend (are increasingly/decreasingly trusting), coders should give priority to degree.

<sup>4</sup> Normative (e.g. 'after this serious of corruption, people should no longer trust the government')

<sup>5</sup> Conditional/prognostic/ (e.g. I expect that the trust in government will be increasing until the elections' or 'if the government continues to be corrupt, trust will decrease'). Please keep in mind that this category only applies if dis/trust is the dependent variable (e.g. which factors/conditions may lead to more or less dis/trust?). Do NOT use this code if dis/trust as independent variable has an impact on something else (e.g. affects the likelihood that people will get vaccinated)

<sup>6</sup> Degree of trust unspecified or open (e.g. 'levels of trust will go up and down quickly during the next 5 months election campaigns' 'Trust depends on transparency')

15) Principles of un/trustworthiness 1 (applies to trust giver-receiver relationships: what makes the trust receiver trustworthy from the perspective of trust giver? Leave this field empty if no principle of un/trustworthiness is specified!)<sup>7</sup>

-99	Not applicable/unspecified
101	DIAGN - Success of past performance <sup>8</sup>
102	DIAGN - Failure of past performance
103	DIAGN - Ambivalent
201	PROG - Success of expected performance
202	PROG - Failure of expected performance
203	PROG - Ambivalent
301	TRAIT - Competence, expertise/incompetence, lack of expertise <sup>9</sup>
302	TRAIT - Power & influence
303	TRAIT - Powerlessness, non-influential
304	TRAIT - Responsibility/irresponsibility
305	TRAIT - Honesty/dishonesty
306	TRAIT - Altruistic, care, support, common good
307	TRAIT - Selfish, egoistic, private interests
308	TRAIT - Stability/instability
309	TRAIT - Independence/dependence, impartiality/partiality
310	TRAIT - Transparency/intransparency
311	TRAIT - Reliability/unreliability
312	TRAIT - Rationality/irrationality
313	TRAIT - Safety/unsafety
315	TRAIT - Proximity, approachability, familiarity/remoteness, anonymity
316	TRAIT - Justice, fairness, equality /injustice, unfairness, discrimination, inequality, lack of representation
317	TRAIT - Discipline

---

<sup>7</sup> Max. 2 principles can be coded - in case of doubt if one or the other criterion applies, code both

<sup>8</sup> Performance can apply to individual, collective and system trust receivers, judgement based on past or expected output/results, e.g.' We cannot trust Boris Johnson based on his handling of the crisis'.

<sup>9</sup> Individual, collective traits/character Will typically apply to individual and collective trust receivers.

318	TRAIT - xenophobia
319	TRAIT - diligence
320	TRAIT - Courage, decisiveness/lack of courage, hesistancy, indecisiveness
321	TRAIT - largeness
322	TRAIT - politeness, respectfulness/ impoliteness, being rude, lack of respect
323	TRAIT - old age
324	TRAIT - obedience
325	TRAIT - Persuasive power
326	TRAIT - sensationalism
327	TRAIT - radicalism
399	TRAIT - Other
401	SYS - Honesty/dishonesty <sup>10</sup>
402	SYS - Transparency/intransparency
403	SYS - Rationality/irrationality
404	SYS - Stability/instability
405	SYS - Safety/unsafety
406	SYS - Centrality
407	SYS - Decentrality
408	SYS - Openness
409	SYS - Closeness
410	SYS - Independence/dependence, impartiality/partiality
411	SYS - Reliability/unreliability
415	SYS - Liberalism, freedom
416	SYS - Justice, fairness, equality /injustice, unfairness, discrimination, inequality, lack of representation
417	SYS - flexibility, openness to innovation, adjustment, progress/lack of innovation, modernisation backlog
418	SYS - Unnaturalness, against divine will

419	SYS - Power & influence
420	SYS - Checks & balances
421	SYS - politeness, respectfulness/ impoliteness, being rude, lack of respect
422	SYS - Proximity, approachability, familiarity/remoteness, anonymity
499	SYS - Other

16) Principles of un/trustworthiness 2

17) Issue 1 (what is at stake? What is the decision area?) Leave this field empty if no issue is specified!

-99	Not applicable/Unspecified
100	ECONOMY GENERAL
101	ECON - Employment
102	ECON - Financial aids
103	ECON - Growth
104	ECON - Supply
105	ECON - Taxes or social contributions payments
200	HEALTH ISSUES AND HEALTH POLICIES GENERAL
201	HEALTH - Vaccine
202	HEALTH - Hospitals
203	HEALTH - Quarantine
204	HEALTH - Corona emergency measures
205	HEALTH - Tracing apps
300	DEMOCRATIC POLITICS GENERAL
301	DEM - Elections
302	DEM - Consultations/participation
303	DEM - Citizenship/rights
304	DEM - Control of government
305	DEM - Law/legal process
306	DEM - Corruption



310	DEM - International relations
311	DEM - administration, bureaucracy
400	VALUES IDENTITIES GENERAL
401	VAL&ID - The role of trust <sup>11</sup>
500	SCIENCE, KNOWLEDGE & EXPERTISE general
600	MEDIA & COMMUNICATION
601	MED - Mass media
602	MED - fake news, alternative media, conspiracy
700	LEISURE SECTOR, free time activities
701	LEI - sports
702	LEI - culture, leisure, arts
703	LEI - travelling, tourism
800	EDUCATION
801	EDU - schools
802	EDU - universities
803	EDU - child care, kindergarten
999	Other

18) Issue 2 (what is at stake? What is the decision area?) Leave this field empty if no issue is specified!

19) Understandings of (Dis)trust (What does Trust/Mistrust mean to the actors? What is its role? Why is it important? What does it involve for them? What emotions does it trigger? (string variable: copy in any statement)

---

<sup>11</sup> If trust is raised as an independent issue, i.e. if not the trustworthiness of a trust receiver is debated but the role/importance of trust itself is thematised, e.g. ‚In Corona times, trust has become even more important‘.)

## Variables for user commenting analysis

### Unit of analysis: a trust contestation in the form of a user comment on Facebook

1. Coder
2. Newspaper (as above)
3. Country (as above)
4. Total number of comments
5. Form<sup>12</sup>
  - 1 contestation of (dis)trust attributor/giver statement in main news article (direct or indirect response) supportive
  - 2 contestation of (dis)trust attributor/giver statement in main news article (direct or indirect response) opposing
  - 3 contestation of (dis)trust attributor/giver statement in main news article (direct or indirect response) neutral/unclear
  - 4 contestation of other actors' statement in main news article (direct or indirect response) supportive
  - 5 contestation of other actors' statement in main news article (direct or indirect response) opposing
  - 6 contestation of other actors' statement in main news article (direct or indirect response) neutral/unclear
  - 7 independent trust contestation
  - 8 other
6. Target (whose statement is contested) (only in the case of form 1, 2 and 3) (actor list as above)
7. Target origin (as above)
8. Trust receiver (who is trusted/mistrusted) (if trust receiver is same as target, it should be coded here again) (actor list as above)
9. Trust receiver origin (as above)

---

<sup>12</sup> The form variable is hierarchical. Should a trust contestation in a user comment contain two or even all three forms, always chose the one in the higher order.

10. Degree of (dis)trust (as above)
11. Principles trustworthiness article (see above)
12. Principles trustworthiness comment (see above)
13. Second Principle of trustworthiness article (see above)
14. Second Principle of trustworthiness comment (see above)
15. Issue 1 same as in main article (see above)
16. Issue 1 different as in main article (see above)
17. Issue 2 same as in main article (see above)
18. Issue 2 different as in main article (see above)
19. style/language
  1. Factual/Informative (e.g. bringing in new data, referring to historical facts, evidence)
  2. opinioned (expressing personal opinion, referring to beliefs, values, preferences, normative or aesthetic judgements)
  3. hate speech (racist, inflammatory, insulting) (not harsh critique)
  4. Parody/Sarcasm
  5. Other or unclear/ambivalent

## References

- Cinalli, M., H. J. Trenz, V. K. Brändle, O. Eisele, and C. Lahusen. 2021. *Solidarity in the Media and Public Contention over Refugees in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Gerhards, Jürgen, Jochen Roose, and Anke Offerhaus. 2011. 'Rekonfiguration von Politischer Verantwortungszuschreibung Im Rahmen Staatlichen Wandels'. in *Gesellschaftliche Politisierung und Internationale Institutionen*, edited by M. Zürn and M. Ecker-Ehrhardt. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Koopmans, Ruud, and Paul Statham, eds. 2010. *The Making of a European Public Sphere. Media Discourse and Political Contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Statham, Paul, and Hans-Jörg Trenz. 2012. *The Politicisation of Europe. Contesting the Constitution in the Mass Media*. London: Routledge.