Coding Scheme Proposal for the Davenport and Moore G8/NATO Protest and Policing Project

Patrick Scott

For Dr. Will Moore
Florida State University
Friday, May 3, 2013

Introduction

The following is a coding scheme proposal for the Davenport and Moore G8/NATO Protest and Policing Project. In the initial stage of this project, researchers participated in the protest that occurred in Chicago, IL, in 2012 for the G8 and NATO summits that occurred there. The researchers, spread throughout the protest, recorded 17 different panoramas every fifteen minutes for three hours.   This coding scheme represents a method by which we can take this quasi-sequential data and code into a format that can be used to answer various research questions. When completed, this data will be of great use for researchers in understanding the micro-relationships in protest-police interactions and media interpretations of violent clashes.

This scheme will proceed as follows. The first part will briefly present the research questions that I aim to code the data for. Whenever a coding scheme is made, understanding the questions that we are trying to answer is critical to make sure that the method we employ will allow us the best leverage on our questions. In the second part of this scheme, I will look at what behaviors and interactions in particular we want to capture from these videos. After that, in the third section, I provide a set of instructions for prospective coders, followed by criteria that a coder may use to discern what information to document and the best way to do so. I will then conclude with a few remarks regarding the importance and application of this data.

Objectives

There are two main objectives for this project. The first is gather data to model and deepen our understanding of the relationship and interaction between protesters and police forces that are tasked to manage them. The second objective is to investigate the factors that determine which events, in protests with protest-police clashes, are reported in news media and the impact that media has in framing perceptions of protests.

The interactions between protester and police are not fully understood. Protesters and police forces both have incentives to provoke the other to take aggressive action against them first, because the use of violence by the other side robs them of their legitimacy and credibility. Violent repression on nonviolent movements can increase the legitimacy of the movements, and signal the resolve of the movement (Chenoweth and Stephan 2011). In order to appropriately understand this interaction, how police might goad protesters into attacking them, and vice versa, requires detailed event data that can shed light on the steps that both sides take to get themselves close to a conflict with being the one to initiate it. The difficulty in obtaining this data, however, is that researchers who seek to study a protest's interactions are part of a protest that could become violent and dangerous. The first step in this project, obtaining this dangerously acquired data, has been accomplished.

The second objective of this project is to understand the determinants of variations between actual events in a protest and the reported events. A protest's efficacy as a tool of social change can be heavily influenced by the type of media coverage it gets (McLeod and Detenber 1999), but the factors that affect what is reported versus what happens in protests is less certain. Moreover, the recent ubiquity of social media means that information about the goings on in protests could become less exclusive to those in attendance; footage from the protests in Chicago revealed a large number of participants recording photos and video of the events. The opportunity provided by this protest allows a comparison

between actual events, recorded by on-the-scene researchers, social media records of events, and news media reports. Understanding the evolving link between protest events and, eventually, public perceptions shaped through new or social media reports, could change the way we view the efficacy of protests as a medium of social awareness and change.

What Do We Want to Capture?

The videos taken at the Chicago protests provide a valuable source of information, but the manner in which they are coded can profoundly affect the usefulness of end-product dataset. The data must be coded in such a way as to provide us the maximum leverage possible over the research questions we have presented. Toward this end, I outline three primary criteria that should be coded in this scheme: tracking the movements and behaviors of protesters groups over time and locations, the behavior of police both inside and without the protest, and the presence of media personnel and social media reporting by protestors themselves.

The first criterion is coding the data in such a way as to capture the protest events both temporally and spatially. This means having systematic way of recording behaviors over time as the protest moved along its route from the northern start point to its end in (***) park. Toward this end, the coding scheme requires input that allows the observations to be geocoded. The coder will be instructed to use Google Maps Street View to locate approximately where along the protest route the video capture took place, allowing the coder to document side of street, and the nearest intersection. From this information, these observations can be geotagged, and can allow researchers to control and track

events along the routes (e.g. control for a particularly rowdy group of protesters as they move along the route).

I use Schweingruber and McPhail (1999) as a template for coding the protest behaviors, because this coding scheme will allow us to document a broad range of salient actions that will help us understand what events took place and how. This data can be used in conjunction with the information collected from social media accounts to gauge how quickly knowledge of the events that occurred in the protest spread, and then compared with what news media reported, so we can understand the discrepancies. Although the observations occur in fifteen minute increments, and a true sequential dataset is beyond our grasp, (Bakeman and Gottman 1996, 51), we can still use this behaviors template for tracking how disruptive or energetic sections of the protest impacted other section's behavior (action diffusion), and see how various behaviors such as mass video recording impacted peoples' willingness to act more or less violent.

Omitted from my coding scheme that appears in the S and M (1999) framework are numerous distinctions between behaviors that we are uninterested in recording. For example, handing out leaflets is irrelevant to our coding scheme because it does contribute to the study of our research questions. Also, onlookers, passersby and "others" are omitted due to their lack of relevance. However, our research questions necessitate generating new categories that will be more salient and allow us to measure the interactions we seek.

Specifically, what we hope to expand our understanding on is the second criterion, the behavior of the police and their role in the development of the protest. The S and M (1999) framework considers all law enforcement personnel the same, whereas I create a meaningful distinction between law enforcement

beyond the boundaries of the acceptable protest lines, and those who are inside the protest itself, monitoring activities and providing eyes and information to the police command center. Police within the crowd could have different effects of the likelihood of violent agitation, as opposed to those outside of the protest, looking in. Conversely, these law enforcement agents could also be acting as agent provocateurs, stirring up trouble to provide the police the excuse they need to end the protest as defenders of the city's law and order. I therefore hope to capture these effects to promote the study of the role of law enforcement in large protests, and the interaction between the protesters and police inside and without the crowd.

The presence of media personnel and the use and ubiquity of video recordings are the third criteria captured in this coding scheme, providing us with the data needed to look at the effect of media presence on behaviors as opposed to social media pressures. Is law enforcement less likely to use violence if there are 30 cell phone cameras recording his behavior, as opposed to a traditional news crew? Will protesters consider the same pressure in the same way? Also, the presence of traditional news media crews might impacts the news that makes its way into reports that air, but it is often difficult to know that for sure. This coding scheme allows us to get at both of those questions, opening up the potential for studying and understanding the effects of new and social media on social movements' perceptions and effectiveness.

Instructions for Coding

4 observations per hour * 17 observers = 68 total observations per hour * 3 hours = 204 observations

The following are coding instructions for using the coding sheet. These instructions should allow any prospective coder the process for coding the videos collected.

Step one

Record the time of the video (to the nearest 15 min interval), and the number and position of the observer. Row=(1-8, or R for the roving team). These fields are found at the top of the coder sheet.

Step Two

Watch the video, and focus on the location. Use Google Street View of the route to determine the location of the footage. At the top of the coder sheet, report the street the video is taken on, and the N, S, E, or W side of the street. Also record the nearest intersecting cross street. This will be used to geocode the location.

Step Three

Watch the video, and this time, focus on the crowd. You will need to document the behavior of the people that you see. There are four types of people we are interested in observing: the protesters, the in-crowd police, the barricaded police (positioned behind barriers or maintaining a barricade line of some sort), and media personnel. We will ask you to note the behavior of each group, one at a time. In this step, we focus on the protesters.

1. Record your estimate of how many you can see in each video clip. While you do not need to count every person, try to be as precise as you can. Then record this number by writing the corresponding number (1-8) in the proper column at the bottom of the sheet. For example, if you can only see 100 people, you would mark the number 4 in the bottom, in the row marked "Total actors" and the column marked "Protest"

2. Answer the density question by considering how difficult it looks to travel through the crowd. Circle the closest response from the options provided.

3. Now go through the list on the left. There are 60 possible behaviors that we are interested in. Your task is to go through each behavior, and determine the percentage of actors that are participating in that activity. Once you determine the percentage of actors participating in a behavior, mark the appropriate number (e.g. 2 for between 10 and 20 percent) in the column that labeled "Protest."

4. **If any activity of a violent nature** (anything beyond vocal) occurs, mark at the bottom of the sheet who the targets of the violence were (e.g. if the protesters throw rocks at the police, you would record the percent of visible participants un the "Melee Weapon - Throwing" category, and then at the bottom, under targets in the "protest" column, write in 'police.').

Step Four

Record the behaviors from the police.

1. Re-watch the video and count how many police are in the crowd, and, separately, how many are outside the protest behind the barricades or other barriers. Record this number, like done with the protest crowd, at the bottom in the appropriate column.

2. Now go through the list on the left. There are ## possible behaviors that we are interested in. Your task is to go through each behavior, and determine the percentage of police that are participating in that activity. Once you determine the percentage of police participating in a behavior, mark the appropriate number (e.g. 2 for between 10 and 20 percent) in the column that labeled "Police (Crowd)." Repeat this step for "Police (Bar.)" [Barricaded Police]. Re-watch as many times as needed to get your counts as accurate as possible.

Step Five

Re-watch video once again, but this time focus on the behavior of the media people – journalists, writers, and social scientists. Record he number of media personnel visible at the bottom of the "Media" column. Then go through each behavior, and determine the percentage of media personnel that are participating in that activity. Once you determine the percentage of people participating in a behavior, mark the appropriate number (e.g. 2 for between 10 and 20 percent) in the column that labeled "Media." Re-watch as many times as needed to get your counts as accurate as possible.

Step Six

Once you are done coding the behavior as you saw them, go to the section on the bottom right of the coding sheet. This is where you mark your overall confidence in the outcomes you are reporting on the sheet. This section should be used to validate or express concern with the quality of the video in allowing you to document the behaviors sought in this design.

Note: We have provided these instructions in the 'watch-code, watch-code' format intentionally. This is done to avoid your reliance on your memory for the information you are coding. We want to explicitly discourage you from trying to remember how many people you saw doing one thing or another, and encourage you to draw all of your coding from the videos as they are seen.

How to Code the Behaviors (What We Are Looking For)

There are five main categories of behaviors: vocal, movement, actions, emotional, and media. I will outline each one, and set forth how they are to be ideally interpreted. These explanations are guidelines

to follow, and a certain amount of discretion will need to be used. However, using these categories, the videos should afford you the opportunity to document the behaviors in the protest as faithfully as possible.

Vocal

The first behavior category is the vocal. We include three sub categories, and eleven vocal behaviors. The three sub-categories, **speech**, **non-speech** and **silence**, are relatively straightforward. People speaking recognizable words to each other, on the phone, to police, or to any others are **talking**. **Singing** is defined as a single or collective melodic production. **Chanting** is considered a common chorus spoken by more than 5 people simultaneously. **Taunting** is broken down into **general**, which means as a derisive or angry speech directed at no one entity, and "at opp", meaning **at opposition**, means that the taunting is directed at a party in particular whom the taunt-or is engaged. This can mean protesters taunting cops or vice versa. **Shouting** is speech with elevated volume.

The non-speech elements are sounds that do not involve word formation. **Cheers**, **boos**, and **oohs and ahhs** all fit into their own categories. The quiet elements are included to capture both **attentive** protestors to speeches around them (recorded as few participants shouting or talking, and many participants listening), and law enforcements who are **paying attention** to the commotion around them. Of course, actors may be quiet because they are simply not paying attention to anything, which, if apparent, is considered **uninvolved**.

Movement

The movement categories involve the level of movement by the actors. Actors can be **stationary** and **standing**, **sitting**, which in a march is unlikely, or **walking** or **running**. **Running** is considered movement

with the feet where only one foot is in contact with the ground at a time. Law enforcement has additional means by which they may be mobile, including **horseback** and **vehicles**. The scale of movement is unnecessary with mounted police (they are unlikely to be galloping through the crowd), but the direction of their movements is what interests use here. Cops on horseback may **move with the crowd** or **against i**t, but vehicles, not likely to be inside the crowd, will **move toward the crow**d outside the barriers or **away from them**. The behavior of the vehicle or mounted police should be so coded.

Actions

Actions refer to behaviors involving the use of hands. In this coding scheme, there are several behaviors with hands, and then with objects which can occupy those hands. I will start with empty-hand behaviors. Hands can be **doing nothing** in general, **fidgeting**, or making **gestures**. Gestures have explicit meaning, whereas waving and restlessness or fidgeting convoy a different state from the actors. **Restlessness or fidgeting** includes empty moving hands and arms, but for no purpose, and as a result of a general state of agitation of the actor. **Holding hands** involves hold other human's hands, **holding another human** includes grasping at some other part of another's body besides their hands, to stay together, or to prevent harm or a strike. The context should be evident. Lastly, hands can **strike**, **push** or **pull**. These are considered violent actions. **Targets** of any violent behavior (striking, throwing, discharging, pushing, or pulling) should be included at the bottom of the list; these should be considered by the coder as primary targets, and as protesters, police inside the crowd, police outside the crowd, or possibly media. If there are more than one target, it should be noted on the back of the coding sheet.

Hands can grasp a variety of objects; we are interested in signage, melee weapons, ranged weapons, shields. Anything not included there may be included as other. A note on the back of the coding sheet should be made for this situation. Most of these objects can be **held**, **waved**, **thrown** or used for

striking. **Signage** is any sort of carried symbol or materials with characters on them representing an understood message. **Melee weapons** include rocks, sticks, clubs, batons, blackjacks, knives, swords, and any other held item whose primary purpose of possession is to inflict bodily harm, but only within an arm' reach. If a melee weapon is thrown, it should be recorded as such. **Ranged weapons** are weapons that not require a throw to do harm beyond the immediate arm's reach of an actor. These include firearms, grenade launchers or any sort, bows, crossbows, slings, slingshots, and spear throwers. One may strike another with a ranged weapon within arm's reach, or an actor may discharge one. **Shields** are any device used for the purpose of protection from any attack of any nature. Riot shields, planks, trays, and boards can all be included here. These or course can be used offensively, for pushing or striking, and should be recorded as such.

Emotional

The emotional behaviors will naturally be more subjective, the intention is to capture an increased degree of mood or attitudes for explicit behaviors. Whether or not they are actually used in any data analyses or not will be seen later, but the hope and the present reason for their inclusion is to capture general changes in emotional tone of relevant actors in the protest. Since we cannot capture a continuous feed, some behaviors might seem to come from nowhere. If the emotional feelings of the crowd can acts as predictors for future aggression, then emotions will provide us important leverage over the onset and diffusion of feelings and behaviors through the protest.

Facial expressions will follow a template that will be provided at a later time, but are intuitively straightforward. **Pleased** is a content or non-dissatisfied look, sad is indicated by sorrow or lament, and crying is coded with any visible evidence of such. **Aggression** is kept a general category, and any angry or determined face will be considered aggressive. **Indifference** is coded as the absence of any of the other

facial expressions. **Tone** will be the most subjective component of the behaviors; consequently, it is kept as simple as possible, as they will capture the growing or waning level of aggression that is expressed through speech and non-speech communication. **Unapparent** is the baseline category here, and if there is doubt regarding the general tone, then this category should be used. **Pleased** should only be coded when the communication sounds distinctively jovial, fun, or excited. If the communications sound markedly **aggressive**, angry or hateful, they should be thus coded.

Media

The last category is media behaviors, including phone or camera. The **phone** category includes checking, typing and video recording. **Checking** amounts to more than a three second glance, reading should be apparent. **Typing** of any kind should be obvious and included where seen. We will assume that holding the phone in one hand in a motion that aims the built-in camera on their phone as a particular direction indicates that an actor is using their **phone to record video**. We will also assume that legitimate **interviews** will involve more than a camera phone; an actual video recorder will distinguish these. Other video recording using a purpose built camera should be coded as **camera video recording**.

Conclusion

I have outlined about a coding scheme which can be used to take video recordings from an important protest and code them as observations that can be used to expand our understanding of protest behavior. This scheme effectively captures the behaviors to inform both of our research questions, and advance our understanding of social protests. This work is the first step towards building the data needed to testing the relationships and interactions between protesters and law enforcement

personnel. Toward this end, I hope to see the use or small drones by researchers to monitor violent

clashes, which should expand our ability in the future to model protesters and police behavior by

allowing researcher to observe clashes directly, while protecting them from immediate danger. The

biggest area to benefit from this project will be the public perceptions of social movements. As the

availability of social media and its use expands, we could one day hope to gather a data from a thousand

phones documenting events from all angles, helping us understand reporting selection in protests, and

the impacts this has on public perception.

References

Bakeman, Roger, and John M. Gottman. 1997. Observing interaction: An introduction to sequential analysis. Cambridge University Press.

Chenoweth, Erica & Maria J. Stephan. 2011. Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict, New York: Columbia University Press.

McLeod, Douglas M., and Benjamin H. Detenber. 1999. "Framing effects of television news coverage of social protest." Journal of Communication 49, no. 3 (1999): 3-23.

Schweingruber, David, and Clark McPhail. 1999. "A method for systematically observing and recording collective action." Sociological methods & research 27, no. 4 (1999): 451-498.