

Zobel, Malisa; Lehmann, Pola

Article — Accepted Manuscript (Postprint)

Positions and saliency of immigration in party manifestos: A novel dataset using crowd coding

European Journal of Political Research

Provided in Cooperation with:
WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Suggested Citation: Zobel, Malisa; Lehmann, Pola (2018) : Positions and saliency of immigration in party manifestos: A novel dataset using crowd coding, European Journal of Political Research, ISSN 1475-6765, Wiley, Oxford, Vol. 57, Iss. 4, pp. 1056-1083, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12266>

This Version is available at:
<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/247344>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Online Appendix to Positions and Saliency of Immigration in Party Manifestos

Pola Lehmann and Malisa Zobel

Appendix A: Parties Covered and their Positions and Saliency Scores

Country	Election	Party	Overall	Immigration		Integration	
			Saliency	Saliency	Position	Saliency	Position
Sweden	2006	Green Ecology Party	5.56	2.53	0.80	3.03	1.00
		Left Party	4.63	1.80	0.43	2.83	0.91
		Social Democratic Labour Party	4.07	1.02	0.75	3.05	0.67
		Liberal People's Party	10.58	1.65	-0.40	8.93	0.46
		Christian Democrats	5.65	0.81	1.00	4.84	1.00
		Moderate Coalition Party	5.24	0.93	0.63	4.31	0.65
		Centre Party	4.78	1.27	0.75	3.50	0.64
	2010	Green Ecology Party	5.34	1.53	0.75	3.82	0.90
		Left Party	2.76	0.79	1.00	1.97	0.60
		Social Democratic Labour Party	1.77	0.00	.	1.77	0.80
		Liberal People's Party	8.19	2.40	0.64	5.79	0.53
		Christian Democrats	7.10	1.04	0.80	6.05	0.69
		Moderate Coalition Party	2.90	0.47	0.44	2.43	0.76
		Sweden Democrats	11.27	3.92	-0.50	7.35	-0.40
		Centre Party	1.32	0.40	1.00	0.92	0.86
		Norway	2005	Socialist Left Party	4.47	1.09	0.50
Norwegian Labour Party	4.09			1.56	0.31	2.53	0.79
Liberal Party	4.20			1.59	0.75	2.61	0.83
Christian People's Party	5.23			2.04	0.47	3.19	0.83
Conservative Party	2.16			0.56	0.78	1.60	0.96
Centre Party	2.28			0.88	0.18	1.41	0.77
Progress Party	4.59			2.08	-0.80	2.50	0.00
2009	Socialist Left Party		5.03	1.73	0.63	3.29	0.97
	Norwegian Labour Party		5.33	2.11	0.25	3.22	0.87
	Liberal Party		3.89	1.99	0.38	1.90	0.98
	Christian People's Party		3.98	0.92	0.68	3.06	0.86
	Conservative Party		4.68	1.97	-0.03	2.72	0.48
	Centre Party		2.55	0.73	0.37	1.82	0.70
	Progress Party		4.92	2.54	-0.51	2.39	0.17
Denmark	1998	Red-Green Unity List	12.07	6.03	0.00	6.03	0.71
		Socialist People's Party	0.34	0.00	.	0.34	1.00
		Social Democratic Party	9.40	6.27	-0.42	3.13	-0.08
		Centre Democrats	7.48	4.21	-0.22	3.27	0.57
		Danish People's Party	13.41	6.71	0.55	6.71	0.91
		Liberals	20.00	15.71	-0.36	4.29	-1.00
		Christian People's Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Conservative People's Party	7.63	4.66	-0.73	2.97	-0.29
		Danish People's Party	12.86	10.00	-0.86	2.86	-1.00
		Progress Party	10.00	4.00	-1.00	6.00	-1.00

Denmark	2005	Red-Green Unity List	2.45	1.47	-0.33	0.98	1.00
		Socialist People's Party	4.59	0.96	0.60	3.63	0.89
		Social Democratic Party	10.03	0.69	-0.50	9.34	0.63
		Centre Democrats	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Danish Social-Liberal Party	6.82	1.14	-1.00	5.68	0.40
		Liberals	10.28	4.35	-0.82	5.93	0.13
		Christian People's Party	20.00	5.85	0.25	14.15	0.79
	2007	Conservative People's Party	3.43	2.86	-0.40	0.57	1.00
		Danish People's Party	14.00	12.00	-0.67	2.00	-1.00
		New Alliance	33.33	16.67	0.25	16.67	0.63
		Red-Green Unity List	7.26	2.31	-0.57	4.95	0.07
		Socialist People's Party	4.29	2.86	-1.00	1.43	1.00
		Social Democratic Party	10.26	5.13	-0.17	5.13	1.00
		Danish Social-Liberal Party	19.23	13.46	0.71	5.77	0.67
	2011	Liberals	27.13	8.53	0.36	18.60	0.63
		Conservative People's Party	4.96	2.48	0.33	2.48	0.00
		Danish People's Party	29.79	19.15	0.11	10.64	-0.80
		Liberal Alliance	1.15	0.00	.	1.15	1.00
		Red-Green Unity List	11.56	8.44	0.13	3.11	0.64
		Socialist People's Party	1.83	0.41	0.50	1.43	0.57
Social Democratic Party		1.78	0.59	-1.00	1.18	1.00	
Finland	2007	Danish Social-Liberal Party	29.92	18.90	0.54	11.02	0.71
		Liberals	15.49	6.19	0.57	9.29	0.57
		Conservative People's Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Danish People's Party	19.65	14.45	-0.56	5.20	-0.89
		Green Union	3.82	1.76	0.83	2.06	1.00
		Left Wing Alliance	5.13	1.03	0.00	4.10	0.94
		Finnish Social Democrats	1.76	0.00	.	1.76	1.00
	2011	Christian Democrats in Finland	2.52	0.36	1.00	2.16	1.00
		National Coalition	3.76	0.23	-1.00	3.52	0.87
		Finnish Centre	0.64	0.26	1.00	0.38	1.00
True Finns		6.35	3.77	-0.95	2.57	-0.60	
Swedish People's Party		5.66	1.89	1.00	3.77	1.00	
Green Union		3.73	1.30	0.50	2.43	1.00	
Left Wing Alliance		1.16	0.00	.	1.16	1.00	
2011	Finnish Social Democrats	0.18	0.00	.	0.18	1.00	
	Christian Democrats in Finland	6.43	2.51	0.69	3.92	0.92	
	National Coalition	1.25	0.50	1.00	0.75	1.00	
	Finnish Centre	1.04	0.00	.	1.04	1.00	
	True Finns	6.14	2.83	-0.74	3.30	0.18	
	Swedish People's Party	1.17	0.58	1.00	0.58	1.00	

Netherlands	2006	Green Left	7.79	2.80	0.47	4.99	0.35
		Socialist Party	5.64	2.22	0.15	3.42	0.33
		Labour Party	4.54	1.59	-0.03	2.95	0.25
		Democrats' 66	3.32	0.93	0.43	2.39	0.36
		People's Party for Freedom and Democracy	4.24	2.03	0.09	2.21	0.67
		Christian Democratic Appeal	3.51	1.71	0.13	1.80	0.75
		Christian Union	5.26	2.28	0.22	2.97	0.25
		Party of Freedom	13.87	5.84	-1.00	8.03	-0.82
		Party for the Animals	2.42	1.50	0.00	0.92	0.63
		Reformed Political Party	4.58	1.83	-0.30	2.75	-0.30
	2010	Green Left	5.78	1.99	0.26	3.79	0.44
		Socialist Party	3.40	1.03	0.20	2.37	0.52
		Labour Party	3.39	1.13	0.11	2.26	0.26
		Democrats' 66	2.62	1.07	-0.06	1.55	0.31
		People's Party for Freedom and Democracy	7.29	4.07	-0.63	3.22	-0.14
		Christian Democratic Appeal	3.37	1.55	-0.27	1.81	0.06
		Christian Union	5.39	1.58	0.12	3.81	0.28
		Party of Freedom	11.65	5.01	-0.97	6.64	-0.84
		Party for the Animals	1.18	0.74	0.20	0.44	0.00
		Reformed Political Party	3.45	1.22	-0.16	2.24	-0.15
Spain	2000	United Left	1.42	0.58	0.35	0.84	0.77
		Spanish Socialist Workers' Party	2.53	1.26	0.50	1.26	0.94
		Popular Party	1.66	1.04	0.47	0.62	1.00
		Convergence and Union	1.67	0.80	0.43	0.87	0.87
		Basque Nationalist Party	0.77	0.19	0.50	0.58	0.92
	2008	United Left	2.76	1.21	0.36	1.55	0.91
		Spanish Socialist Workers' Party	3.89	2.15	0.08	1.74	0.87
		Popular Party	4.28	2.25	-0.11	2.03	0.72
		Basque Nationalist Party	0.22	0.11	1.00	0.11	.
		Basque Solidarity	1.71	1.09	0.57	0.62	0.75
		Canarian Coalition	5.38	4.37	-0.15	1.01	0.50
		Aragonist Council	2.05	0.34	1.00	1.71	0.87
	2011	Future Yes	2.24	0.89	0.83	1.34	0.89
		Amaiur	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Commitment-Q	3.30	1.52	0.41	1.78	1.00
		United Left	3.44	1.66	0.15	1.78	0.86
		Spanish Socialist Workers' Party	2.07	0.92	0.53	1.16	0.92
		Union, Progress and Democracy	2.06	1.11	0.43	0.95	1.00
		Popular Party	2.30	1.36	0.27	0.94	0.89
		Forum Asturias	0.67	0.22	0.00	0.44	0.83
Basque Nationalist Party	0.78	0.52	0.50	0.26	1.00		
Canarian Coalition	1.69	1.17	0.22	0.52	1.00		

Germany	1998	Alliance 1990/Greens	6.25	2.91	0.74	3.34	0.87
		Party of Democratic Socialism	6.78	2.51	0.83	4.26	0.87
		Social Democratic Party of Germany	1.53	0.51	0.80	1.02	0.70
		Free Democratic Party	3.11	1.90	0.07	1.21	0.74
		Christian Democratic/Christian Social Union	10.51	7.79	-0.35	2.72	0.40
	2002	Alliance 1990/Greens	5.24	1.75	0.86	3.49	0.88
		Party of Democratic Socialism	4.74	2.13	1.00	2.61	0.95
		Social Democratic Party of Germany	3.17	1.12	0.11	2.05	0.88
		Free Democratic Party	3.73	1.46	0.52	2.27	0.87
		Christian Democratic/Christian Social Union	6.16	3.04	-0.48	3.12	0.34
	2009	Alliance 1990/Greens	5.14	1.62	0.78	3.52	0.85
		The Left	5.96	2.23	0.95	3.73	0.95
		Social Democratic Party of Germany	3.47	0.96	1.00	2.51	0.96
		Free Democratic Party	1.70	0.58	0.77	1.12	0.72
		Christian Democratic/Christian Social Union	6.08	1.01	0.20	5.06	0.72
	2013	Alliance 1990/Greens	5.30	2.19	0.94	3.11	0.95
		The Left	4.33	1.42	0.74	2.91	0.93
		Social Democratic Party of Germany	4.52	0.97	0.79	3.55	0.96
		Free Democratic Party	5.04	1.94	0.92	3.10	0.94
		Christian Democratic/Christian Social Union	4.97	1.55	0.45	3.42	0.72
	Austria	1999	The Greens	5.51	2.55	0.52	2.96
Austrian Social Democratic Party			0.89	0.89	0.25	0.00	.
Austrian Freedom Party			4.81	2.16	-0.39	2.64	0.41
Austrian People's Party			2.48	1.86	-0.57	0.62	0.00
2002		The Greens	3.65	0.15	-1.00	3.50	0.79
		Austrian Social Democratic Party	4.26	1.22	0.79	3.04	0.86
		Austrian Freedom Party	4.65	3.26	-0.64	1.39	0.41
		Austrian People's Party	5.13	3.00	-0.17	2.12	0.83
2006		The Greens	5.05	3.03	0.86	2.02	1.00
		Austrian Social Democratic Party	4.72	1.53	0.64	3.19	0.57
		Austrian Freedom Party	20.92	10.77	-0.91	10.15	-0.85
		Austrian People's Party	4.37	1.94	-0.10	2.43	0.50
		Alliance for the Future of Austria	12.01	7.17	-0.65	4.84	0.07
2008		The Greens	6.03	3.73	0.31	2.30	0.69
		Austrian Communist Party	3.48	0.00	.	3.48	0.00
		Austrian Social Democratic Party	4.16	1.08	0.62	3.08	0.73
	Austrian Freedom Party	10.82	5.19	-0.67	5.63	-0.27	
	Austrian People's Party	8.20	4.59	-0.64	3.61	-0.50	
	Alliance for the Future of Austria	8.43	4.65	-0.88	3.78	-0.92	

Switzerland	2007	Green Party of Switzerland	5.65	2.70	0.73	2.95	0.63
		Green Liberal Party	6.80	3.88	1.00	2.91	1.00
		Swiss Labour Party	1.83	0.00	.	1.83	.
		Social Democratic Party of Switzerland	8.66	3.24	0.41	5.42	0.71
		Radical Democratic Party	3.94	2.36	-0.33	1.57	1.00
		Christian Democratic People's Party of Switzerland	8.80	0.80	1.00	8.00	0.70
		Protestant People's Party of Switzerland	1.12	0.00	.	1.12	1.00
		Christian Social Party	9.71	5.14	0.33	4.57	0.25
		Federal Democratic Union	2.50	0.00	.	2.50	1.00
	Swiss People's Party	8.96	5.38	-0.89	3.58	-0.74	
	2011	Green Party of Switzerland	5.77	2.16	1.00	3.61	0.87
		Green Liberal Party	8.45	7.04	1.00	1.41	1.00
		Social Democratic Party of Switzerland	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Radical Democratic Party	3.37	2.88	0.50	0.48	1.00
		Christian Democratic People's Party of Switzerland	5.41	2.70	0.25	2.70	0.25
		Protestant People's Party of Switzerland	4.00	0.00	.	4.00	1.00
		Christian Social Party	6.14	0.72	1.00	5.42	0.87
		Swiss People's Party	29.17	27.50	-0.73	1.67	-1.00
Conservative Democratic Party of Switzerland		6.49	5.19	0.00	1.30	-1.00	
Ireland	2007	Green Party	1.48	1.02	0.73	0.46	1.00
		Labour Party	1.25	0.72	0.25	0.54	0.67
		Progressive Democrats	2.74	1.73	-0.17	1.01	0.76
		Family of the Irish	1.48	0.95	-0.05	0.52	0.82
		Soldiers of Destiny	1.68	0.86	0.32	0.82	1.00
		We Ourselves	1.02	0.30	-0.20	0.72	0.75
	2011	United Left Alliance	2.06	1.03	1.00	1.03	1.00
		Green Party	1.09	0.73	0.50	0.36	0.50
		Socialist Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Labour Party	1.18	0.56	0.50	0.63	0.78
		Family of the Irish	0.60	0.47	0.43	0.13	1.00
		Soldiers of Destiny	0.31	0.31	1.00	0.00	.
We Ourselves	0.98	0.33	0.50	0.66	0.75		
United States	2004	Democratic Party	1.10	0.44	0.25	0.66	1.00
		Republican Party	1.39	0.89	-0.13	0.50	0.78
	2008	Democratic Party	2.75	1.74	0.21	1.01	1.00
		Republican Party	2.23	1.04	-0.29	1.19	0.54
	2012	Democratic Party	1.61	1.02	0.57	0.59	1.00
		Republican Party	1.79	0.90	-0.60	0.90	0.60
Canada	2011	Green Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		New Democratic Party	1.56	1.56	0.50	0.00	.
		Liberal Party of Canada	0.97	0.49	1.00	0.49	0.00
		Conservative Party of Canada	2.91	1.83	0.00	1.08	1.00
		Quebec Bloc	2.99	2.16	0.32	0.83	0.41

Australia	2004	Australian Greens	2.83	2.47	0.71	0.35	1.00
		Australian Labor Party	0.27	0.00	.	0.27	1.00
		Liberal Party of Australia	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		National Party of Australia	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
	2007	Australian Greens	1.46	0.36	1.00	1.09	1.00
		Australian Labor Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Liberal Party of Australia	1.18	1.18	-1.00	0.00	.
		National Party of Australia	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
	2010	Australian Greens	3.41	1.71	0.88	1.71	1.00
		Australian Labor Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Liberal Party of Australia	2.99	2.99	-1.00	0.00	.
		National Party of Australia	0.28	0.28	.	0.00	.
	2013	Australian Greens	2.12	1.54	0.75	0.58	1.00
		Australian Labor Party	0.41	0.20	.	0.20	1.00
		Palmer United Party	5.80	3.57	0.25	2.23	1.00
		Liberal Party of Australia	2.81	2.64	-0.38	0.17	1.00
Katter's Australian Party		10.88	8.84	-0.58	2.04	0.33	
National Party of Australia		1.02	0.68	-0.30	0.34	0.20	
New Zealand	2005	Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		New Zealand Labour Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		ACT New Zealand	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Jim Anderton's Progressive	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		New Zealand National Party	3.89	3.33	0.00	0.56	-1.00
	2008	Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		New Zealand Labour Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		ACT New Zealand	0.93	0.93	1.00	0.00	.
		United Future New Zealand	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Progressive Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		New Zealand National Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
	2011	Maori Party	1.31	0.26	1.00	1.05	0.00
		Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		New Zealand Labour Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		ACT New Zealand	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		United Future New Zealand	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		New Zealand National Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		New Zealand First Party	0.00	0.00	.	0.00	.
		Maori Party	0.25	0.00	.	0.25	.
		Mana Party	0.43	0.00	.	0.43	1.00

Appendix B: Calculation of Saliency and Positions

The saliency variables reflect the saliency of both the overarching immigration issue and the individual saliency of the two topics within this issue, immigration and integration.

$$saliency = \frac{\sum_{p,i} QS_{immi} + \sum_{p,i} QS_{inti}}{\sum_{p,i} QS_{immi} + \sum_{p,i} QS_{inti} + \sum_{p,i} QS_{non-immi}}$$

$$saliency_{immi} = \frac{\sum_{p,i} QS_{immi}}{\sum_{p,i} QS_{immi} + \sum_{p,i} QS_{inti} + \sum_{p,i} QS_{non-immi}}$$

The position variables give information about the share of supportive, sceptical or neutral statements with the range of all immigration or integration related quasi-sentences. They are calculated by subtracting the share of sceptical quasi-sentences from the share of supportive quasi-sentences and dividing this by the share of these two plus the share of the neutral quasi-sentences:

$$immi_pos = \frac{\sum_{p,i} QS_{immi+} - \sum_{p,i} QS_{immi-}}{\sum_{p,i} QS_{immi+} + \sum_{p,i} QS_{immi-} + \sum_{p,i} QS_{immi_neu}}$$

p = party, i = election, immi = all immigration related quasi-sentences, inti = all integration related quasi-sentences, non-immi = all non immigration or integration related quasi-sentences, immi+ = all positive immigration related quasi-sentences, immi- = all negative immigration related quasi-sentences, immi_neu = all neutral/status quo immigration related quasi-sentences

The two additional variables *saliency_inti* and *inti_pos* are calculated in the same way as the immigration saliency and position variable.

Appendix C: Coding Instructions First Round

Coding Instructions

Task

Evaluate whether the given statements address the issues of immigration and immigrant integration by labelling each sentence as “yes, addresses these issues”, “no, does not address these issues”, or “possibly addresses these issues”. These statements originate from political texts.

For this task, you will receive

- a sentence or part of a sentence (e.g. a subordinate clause without a main clause).
 - The sentences originate from English language texts produced by different political parties (e.g. election manifestos, speeches etc.).
 - You will also receive the original surrounding sentences as contextual information. This additional information should not be labelled and is only provided to help you better understand and contextualize the sentence/part of a sentence.
- a question with three different answer possibilities.
- an explanation of the different possible answers.
- example sentences to explain the possible answers.

Process

First, carefully read the sentence provided. Then, on the basis of this sentence alone, try to answer the question by matching the sentence with one of the three answers provided. If you find that it is not possible to label the sentence given only the provided sentence, in a next step consult the surrounding sentences for contextual understanding. Finally, match the provided sentence with the answer that best describes it.

Question: Is the sentence (or partial sentence) provided concerned with the issue of immigration and/or immigrant integration?

Answer 1: Yes, it addresses the issue of immigration and/or immigrant integration

Answer 2: No, it does not address the issue of immigration and/or immigrant integration

Answer 3: It might possibly address the issue of immigration and/or immigrant integration

Important explanations

This research project is focused on the issue of ‘immigration and/or immigrant integration’. A sentence may or may not address this issue. If you are unsure whether a sentence addresses this issue you may select the third answer “possibly” as the best answer. But, please use this answer with extreme caution and only choose this option if the sentence is exceptionally difficult to label. For example, if you are undecided whether to label a sentence according to the first or second answer,

but are leaning toward the first, it is better to label the sentence with the “yes” option than the third “might possibly address” option.

Immigration and immigrant integration

Sentences that address this issue deal with (legal or unauthorized) entry into a country, as well as the permanent residency of people who are not yet citizens of the respective country (foreigners). They also relate to the issue of migrants who already live in a country (this may also include second-generation immigrants). Regardless of whether a sentence addresses such issues from a favourable, negative, liberal, restrictive or fact-based (describing the status-quo) perspective, it should be categorised as answer option 1 (‘yes, it addresses the issue’). Sometimes sentences can express a very general approval or disapproval of immigration and multicultural society, while at other times they can discuss highly specific legal conditions of immigration and immigrant integration. Sentences that link societal problems back to immigration issues and formulate certain expectations of migrants also belong to this category. This includes sentences that demand increased rights for, better societal inclusion of, and increased support for migrants. Issues of cultural and religious rights of migrants, as well as questions of representation and visibility of immigrant minorities in public and economic life belong to this category too. This also applies to issues regarding privileged access immigration (e.g. co-ethnics, commonwealth migrants or highly qualified individuals and investors). Moreover, sentences addressing the causes of migration and people fleeing their home countries or demanding stricter border controls and visa regulations equally belong to the “yes, addresses the issue” category. Sentences that link immigration and immigrant integration with the European Union, such as freedom of movement within the EU and border control agencies like Frontex, are equally relevant.

In sum, all sentences belong to the “yes, addresses the issue” answer if they in any way address matters of immigration (including asylum-seekers and refugees) and/or issues of integration of immigrants and their descendants.

The following issues are therefore excluded: Emigration (own country citizens moving abroad).

Examples

- “Abolish mandatory and indefinite detention of asylum seekers.”
- “We stand for securing borders and sending illegal immigrants back.”
- “Multiculturalism has enriched our country.”
- “These temporary visas would also provide conditions in relation to settlement and assimilation into our community.”
- “Our immigration programme will focus on skilled migrants targeting skills shortages.”
- “Newcomers should be required to accept our culture and values.”

Thank you!

--

Please read the sentence below and code the sentence (or partial sentence) marked in blue:

Appendix D: Coding Instructions Second Round

Coding instructions

Task

Evaluate whether the given statements address issues of immigration OR issues of immigrant integration (as defined below). In a second step evaluate whether statements are supportive and favourable OR sceptical and disapproving OR neutral of the issues addressed. These statements originate from political texts.

For this task, you will receive

- a target sentence or part of a sentence (e.g. a subordinate clause without a main clause)
 - The sentences originate from English language text produced by different political parties (e.g. election manifestos, speeches etc.)
 - You will also receive the surrounding sentences as context information. This additional information should not be labelled and is only provided to help you better understand and contextualize the sentence/part of a sentence.
- two questions

Process

First, carefully read the sentence. Then, on the basis of this sentence alone, try to answer the questions. If you find that it is not possible to answer the question using only the provided sentence, in a next step consult the surrounding sentences for contextual understanding. Please keep in mind to take the meaning of the sentence as the basis for your coding and not sole keywords.

You will always receive the same two questions:

First Question: Does the sentence provided address issues of immigration OR immigrant integration?

Answer 1: It addresses issues of immigration

Answer 2: It addresses issues of immigrant integration

Second Question: Is the sentence supportive and favourable OR sceptical and disapproving of the issue OR neutral and describing the status quo?

Answer 1.1/2.1: It is supportive/favourable

Answer 1.2/2.2: It is sceptical/disapproving

Answer 1.3/2.3: It is neutral/describes status quo

Important explanations

This research project is focused on the two related but distinct issues of (1) immigration and (2) immigrant integration. Sentences may address these issues in a supportive and favourable way, in a

sceptical and disapproving way or in a neutral way. The 'neutral' option should only be used if the sentence solely describes the status quo and no value judgement can be made.

1. Immigration

Immigration is about who crosses the border and takes up residence, no matter in what capacity they enter, i.e. exchange students, labor migrants, asylum seekers etc. and no matter whether there exists a legal provision of entry and residence. Thus all statements regarding the admission and control of entry of people not (yet) citizens of the respective country should be coded as addressing immigration.

1.1. Supportive of immigration (+)

Statements that are supportive of immigration might e.g.:

- Stress the benefits of immigration.
- State the need for migrant workers.
- Refer to international obligations to take in refugees and asylum seekers.
- Emphasize the protection of refugees and their human rights.
- Stress the right of already residing migrants to be with their families, and therefore the need to ease family reunification migration.
- Make positive references to the freedom of movement within the European Union.

1.2. Sceptical of immigration (-)

Sceptical or disapproving statements about immigration might e.g.:

- Stress the costs of immigration.
- State that there is no need for migrant workers.
- State that foreign labour decreases natives' wages.
- State that there are already enough refugees in the country.
- Refer to 'bogus asylum-seekers', or refugees actually being economic migrants.
- Argue that instead of taking in (more) refugees and asylum seekers the sources of displacement in the countries of origin need to be tackled.
- Call for stricter immigration and border controls.
- Call for exceptions to the freedom of movement within the European Union.
- Demand deportation or return to countries of origin of rejected asylum seekers or persons without valid residence permits (please note the difference to 2.2., which covers demands to deport long term residents based on criminal allegations).

1.3. Neutral/Status quo description of immigration

Neutral statements about immigration:

- Do not imply value judgements.
- Only refer to the description of the status quo.
- Use technocratic language.
- Only state facts.

2. Immigrant integration

Immigrant integration is about people who reside in a county where they or their parents are not (yet) citizens or naturalized citizens. Statements which formulate the conditions for persons to become citizens, participate in the social, economic and political life also belong into this category. Furthermore statements that make references to how immigration has transformed society are similarly included.

2.1. Favourable of immigrant integration (+)

Statements that are supportive of immigrant integration might:

- Make positive references to multiculturalism and diversity.
- Stress cosmopolitan values with regard to immigrants.
- Demand inclusion of immigrants into the political and social community.
- Demand anti-discrimination policies based on ethnicity and national origin (not gender, sexual orientation etc.).
- Demand policies against racism.
- Stress promotion and support over requirements and duties for immigrants.
- Demand more social, political, cultural or religious rights for immigrants.
- Stress civic values instead of ethnic ones for being able to receive citizenship, e.g. after 10 years of residence everyone should have the right to citizenship.

2.2. Sceptical of immigrant integration (-)

Sceptical or disapproving statements about immigrant integration might e.g.:

- Make negative references to multiculturalism and diversity.
- Stress the importance of ethnic homogeneity and national culture.
- Call for immigrants to give up e.g. their culture of origin, their religion, their customs and/or traditions.
- Warn of Islamization due to migrants from Muslim countries.
- Specify duties and requirements in order to stay in the country, for example, sufficient language skills, long years of residency in country, sufficient income etc.
- Demand citizenship and integration tests.
- Associate immigrant communities with problems, for example crime.
- Link immigrant residents to criminal behaviour and demand consequences (e.g. deportation or removal of residence permits or removal of citizenship for naturalized citizens – please note the difference to 1.2., which covers deportation and forced return based on residence status).
- Demand an oath of allegiance (i.e. loyalty to the state) of immigrants or prospective immigrants.
- Stress the deservingness of nationals over immigrants.
- Stress ethnic criteria (e.g. being born by parents from same country) for being able to receive citizenship.

2.3. Neutral/Status quo description of immigrant integration

Neutral statements about immigration:

- Do not imply value judgements.
- Only refer to the description of the status quo.
- Use technocratic language.
- Only state facts.

Thank you!

--

Please read the sentence below and code the bold sentence (or partial sentence) marked in blue: