

GDADS2 Variables

Descriptions, Intercoder Agreement Ratings, and Notes on the Global Digital Activism Data Set, version 2.0

Mary Joyce (Dec. 2013)

Download the data set and codebook at <http://digital-activism.org/projects/gdads/>

	Variable Name	Variable Description	Krippendorff's α	Notes
1	CASEID	Case number	NA	Textual variable, agreement not calculated.
2	TITLE	Title of campaign described in case	NA	Textual variable, agreement not calculated.
3	GOALDESC	Textual description of campaign goal(s)	NA	Textual variable, agreement not calculated.
4	GOALTYPE	Categorical goal typology	0.58	A variety of goal categorization schemes were attempted, but regardless of the number or specificity of categories, the problem of overlap was persistent. We invite other researchers to create an improved categorization scheme for this variable.
4	VIOL	Dummy variable on presence of physical violence in campaign (1=yes)	0	Physical violence initiators by participants was so rare (present in 1% of campaigns) that there was no agreement as to when violence <i>did</i> occur, the reason for the very low α . Average pairwise agreement for this variable is 96%
5	INITDESC	Textual description	NA	This is a textual variable, and agreement was not calculated.
6	FRML	Dummy variable on whether or not a formal organization (org title + physical address) initiated the campaign	0.54	Despite multiple attempts, we were unable to create a reliable categorical variable for initiator. This was due to the lack of specificity of the source material and of the phenomenon itself: It is often unclear who initiated a digital activism campaign because initiators may choose to intentionally obscure their identities and may not be affiliated with named organizations. An earlier variable INITTYPE, had an even lower agreement rate.
7	INITCOUN	Country in which campaign initiator(s)	.785	The lack of specificity of the initiator also made the country in which the initiator was based harder to identify.

		were/was based		
8	INITREG	Region of initiator	NA	Agreement not calculated because not generated by coders, derivative variable of INITCOUN.
9	INITSUBREG	Subregion of initiator	NA	Agreement not calculated because not generated by coders, derivative variable of INITCOUN.
10	TARGDESC	Description of campaign target	NA	Textual variable, agreement not calculated.
11	TARGETYPE	Categorical target typology	.806	(No notes.)
12	TARGCOUN	Country in which campaign targets(s) were/was based	.886	Targets, mostly governments, were easier to identify due to their formal organizational identity and clear geographic affiliation.
13	BYEAR	Year the campaign began	.781	The starting year of the campaign was often not explicitly stated and needed to be inferred by coders based on available evidence. We were not able to reach acceptable agreement of EYEAR because most sources were written in the middle of the campaign and ending year information was missing or ambiguous.
14	SITE	URLs of website used by campaign	.502	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of website use in the campaign is 1 and the absence of website use in the campaign is 0. This variable does not meet the threshold for agreement and should not be considered reliable. We are including it because in 8.5% of cases a blog or a website were the only applications used, so we have added their corresponding variables, SITE and BLOG, back into the data set.
15	FORUM	URLs of forums used by campaign	.823	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of forum use in the campaign is 1 and the absence of forum use in the campaign is 0.
16	EPET	URLs of e-petitions used by campaign	.847	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of e-petition use in the campaign is 1 and the absence of e-petition use in the campaign is 0.

17	EPETNUM	Number of signatures on most popular e-petition, where one was use	-	The agreement rate is missing, should be similar to the social network and microblog counts.
18	SOCNET	URLs of social network groups used by campaign	.703	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of social network use in the campaign is 1 and the absence of social network use in the campaign is 0. Use of social networks (most often Facebook) were often not mentioned explicitly, but were only revealed through the hyperlinks in the text. Some coders may have missed these links.
19	SOCNETNUM	Number of members or likes in most popular group use by campaign	0.54	Unlike in a normal content analysis, the text was not static, making the generation of agreement between coders difficult. The number of members are likes was likely to change between codings.
20	MICBLOG	URLs of microblogs used by campaign	.867	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of microblog use in the campaign is 1 and the absence of microblog use in the campaign is 0.
21	MICBLOGNUM	Number of tweets on most popular campaign hashtag, where one existed.	0.54	The problem here was likely due to the software we used, TweetMeme (no longer in operation), which seemed to be an unreliable calculator of number of tweets.
22	BLOG	URLs of blogs used by campaign	.502	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of blog use in the campaign is 1 and the absence of blog use in the campaign is 0. This variable does not meet the threshold for agreement and should not be considered reliable. We are including it because in 8.5% of cases a blog or a website were the only applications used, so we have added their corresponding variables, SITE and BLOG, back into the data set.
23	VIDEO	URLs of digital videos used by campaign	.756	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of digital video use in the campaign is 1 and the absence of digital video use in the

				campaign is 0.
24	MAP	URLs of digital maps used by campaign	.741	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of digital map use in the campaign is 1 and the absence of digital map use in the campaign is 0.
25	SMS	Dummy variable on whether the campaign was reported to have used SMS	0	SMS was so rare (present in 2% of campaigns) that there was no agreement as to when SMS was used, the reason for the very low α .
26	HACK	Textual variable describing whether hacking was part of the campaign	1.0	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of offline tactics in the campaign is 1 and the absence of offline tactics in the campaign is 0.
27	PARTOFF	Textual variable describing whether offline mobilization part of the campaign	.750	This is a textual variable. Agreement is calculated by converting it into a dummy where the presence of offline tactics in the campaign is 1 and the absence of offline tactics in the campaign is 0.
28	OUTDESC	Textual variable describing of the campaign outcome (focus on goal achievement)	NA	Textual variable, agreement not calculated.
29	OUTTYPE1	Categorical variable on goal achievement.	.606	The outcome was often not mentioned in the principle source (Source1) and the broad range of outcomes made categorization difficult. This is the original coding structure of the variable.
30	OUTTYPE2	Collapsed version of OUTTYPE1	.691	Because of the low agreement on the original categorization scheme, the second version of the variable is also provided. In this version the values 1 (total success) and 2 (partial success) are merged, resulting in greater confidence, but with lower precision as to the type of success.
31	NARR	Paragraph-length textual description of the campaign.	NA	Textual variable, agreement not calculated.