



trans4DEMO

Contentious Politics and Democratic Renewal
in Sustainability Transitions

Deliverable 3.1:

Procedure and Codebook: Political claims analysis mapping mobilization on sustainability transitions in Denmark, Poland and Italy



Funded by
the European Union

This project has received funding from the European Union's HE research and innovation programme under the grant agreement No. 101178267

Project acronym:	Trans4demo
Project full title:	Contentious Politics and Democratic Renewal in Sustainability Transitions
Call identifier:	HORIZON-CL2-2024-DEMOCRACY-01
Type of action:	HORIZON-RIA
Start date:	January 2025
End date:	December 2027
Grant agreement no:	101093003

D3.1 Procedure and Codebook on Typology			
Executive Summary:	This document presents a codebook and procedures for a Political Claims Analysis mapping the contestation of sustainability transitions in Poland, Italy and Denmark. The pilot studies examine three questions: 1). What types of action repertoires do political actors mobilizing on themes of sustainability transitions use to promote their political projects; 2). How do political actors frame ‘urgency’ and ‘crisis’ during that mobilization, and 3). How are claims and repertoires of action legitimized and de-legitimized. The first part of the document outlines the nature of Political Claims Analysis, its utility in mapping patterns of mobilization and claim-making about sustainability transitions, and methodological challenges. It then discusses sampling strategies and coding procedures. In the second part coding variables for the Political Claims Analysis are operationalized. More specifically it spells out how coders will record a) locality in time and space of mobilization, b) information about the claimant, c) information about forms of the claim, d) information about the addressee of claims, e) the issue focus of claims, f) the group for whom the claims purport to represent, and g) justification of the claim.		
WP:	3		
Author(s):	Angela Bourne (RUC) Francesco Campo (RUC) Przemysław Pluciński (AMU) Marta Kosińska (AMU) Artur Lipiński (AMU) Dominika Zajączkowska (AMU) Filippo Menga (LC) Gian Marco Moise (LC)		
Editor:	Angela Bourne (RUC)		

Leading Partner:	Roskilde University		
Participating Partners:	Adam Mickiewicz University Lisbon Council		
Version:	0.1	Status:	
Deliverable Type:		Dissemination Level: PU	PU
Official Submission Date:		Actual Submission Date:	04.02.2026

Disclaimer

This document contains material, which is the copyright of certain TRANS4DEMO contractors, and may not be reproduced or copied without permission. All TRANS4DEMO consortium partners have agreed to the full publication of this document if not declared "Confidential". The commercial use of any information contained in this document may require a license from the proprietor of that information. The reproduction of this document or of parts of it requires an agreement with the proprietor of that information.

The TRANS4DEMO consortium consists of the following partners:

No.	Partner Organisation Name	Partner Organisation Short Name	Country
1	Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań	AMU	PL
2	Nordisk Institutt for Studier av Innovasjon, Forskning og Utdanning	NIFU	NO
3	Linköpings Universitet	LiU	SE
4	Institut für ökologische Wirtschaftsforschung	IÖW	DE
5	Scuola Normale Superiore	SNS	IT
6	Rijksuniversiteit Groningen	RUG	NL
7	Roskilde Universitet	RUC	DK
8	The Hebrew University of Jerusalem	HUJI	IL
9	The Lisbon Council for Economic Competitiveness	LC	BE
10	Eco-Agents (Miljøagentene)	E-A	NO
11	Green Transition Denmark (Rådet for Grøn Omstilling)	GTD	DK
12	New Community Foundation (Fundacja Nowej Wspólnoty)	FNW	PL
13	Israeli Energy Forum	IEF	IL

Document Revision History

Version	Description	Contributions
0.1		

Authors

Author	Partner
Angela Bourne,	RUC
Francesco Campo	RUC
Przemysław Pluciński	AMU
Marta Kosińska	AMU
Artur Lipiński	AMU
Dominika Zajączkowska	AMU
Filippo Menga	LC
Gian Marco Moise	LC

Reviewers

Name	Organisation
Przemysław Plucinski	AMU

Table of Contents

Disclaimer.....	4
The TRANS4DEMO consortium consists of the following partners:	4
Document Revision History.....	5
Authors.....	5
Reviewers.....	5
Table of Contents	6
List of Tables.....	8
PART 1: Research questions and methods	9
2. Research Questions.....	9
3. Political Claims Analysis	9
4. Case selection.....	11
4.1 Pilot studies.....	11
4.2 Contentious episodes.....	11
4.3 Time periods.....	12
5. Data and Sampling	12
5.1 Data source	12
5.2 Two phase sampling strategy: National and local newspapers.....	12
5.3 Keywords.....	12
5.4 Identifying texts for analysis	12
5.5 Snowballing	12
6. Dataset	13
6.1 Entry of data onto datasheet	13
7. Training and consistency checks	13
7.1 Training in method and coding categories	13
7.2 Dealing with hard to classify cases	13
7.3 Intercoder reliability	13
PART 2: Codebook and Procedures for Mapping Contentious Politics of Sustainability Transitions	14
1. General guidelines	14
1.1 Delimitation rules.....	14
1.2 Exclusion rules.....	14
1.3 Connected events	14
2. Metadata.....	15
2.1 Claim ID	15

2.2 Short claim summary	15
2.3 Episode heading	15
2.4 Coder	15
2.5 Search keywords (national).....	15
2.6 Search keywords (local)	15
2.7 Source.....	15
2.8 Source html	16
2.9 Snowballing source	16
2.10 Snowballing html.....	16
3. Locality	16
3.1 Country.....	16
3.2 Locality of claim	16
3.3 Date of the claim.....	16
3.4 Weekday of the claim	16
4. Claimant	16
4.1 Claimant categories.....	16
4.2 Scope of claimant.....	18
4.3 Claimant(s) name	19
5. Form of the Claim.....	19
5.1 Action form (broad)	19
5.2 Action form (subcategory)	19
6. Addressee.....	21
6.1 Addressee categories.....	21
6.2 Scope of addressee	23
6.3 Addressee(s) name.....	24
7. Aims.....	24
7.1 Ambition.....	24
7.2 Sustainability transition sectors.....	24
7.3 List of demands	25
7.5 Summary of demands	27
8. Object actor.....	27
8.1 List of representative claims	27
8.3 Summary of representative claims	28
9. Justification of the claim	29

9.1 Urgency-crisis claim	29
9.3 Summary of urgency-crisis claims.....	30
10. (De)legitimizing claims	30
10. 1. Legitimizing/delegitimizing claims	30
10. 2 Summary of legitimizing-delegitimizing claims.....	32
11. Summary of entry	32
12. Additional notes	32
13. References for Part 1 and 2	32

List of Tables

Part 1

4.1 Contentious episodes studied per country case study

Part 2

5.2.1 Action forms broad and narrow

7.3.1: Demands related to sustainability transitions

9.1.1: Urgency-crisis claims

10.1.1 Legitimizing and delegitimizing claims

PART 1: Research questions and methods

1.1 Introduction

Trans4demo seeks to understand the dual challenge of populism and climate change and their impact on liberal democratic values and just transition in Europe. To this end, WP3 addresses two research questions: 1). What types of action repertoires do political actors mobilizing on themes of sustainability transitions use to promote their political projects; and 2). How do political actors frame 'urgency' and 'crisis' during that mobilization. To better understand how contestation of sustainability transitions relates to liberal democratic values, we ask an additional question: 3). How are claims and repertoires of action legitimized and de-legitimized.

WP3 addresses these questions empirically-using Political Claims Analysis in pilot studies of mobilization around sustainability transitions in Poland, Italy and Denmark. The research draws on a conceptual framework on repertoires of action and competing conceptions of crisis and urgency developed in WP2 (D2.1, Working Paper: Urgency, Crisis and Repertoires of Action, 30.4.25).

This document presents the codebook which researchers at Roskilde University (RUC), Adam Mickiewicz University (AMU), and The Lisbon Council (LC) will use to conduct the Political Claims Analysis. The first part states the research question and outlines the nature of Political Claims Analysis, its utility in mapping patterns of mobilization and claim-making on climate change policy, and methodological challenges. It then discusses sampling strategies and coding procedures. In the second part we specify variables used for Political Claims Analysis in the pilot studies, specifically how we code a) locality in time and space of mobilization, b) information about the claimant, c) forms of the claim, d) the addressee of claims, e) issue focus, f) the group for whom the claims purport to represent, and g) justification of the claim.

2. Research Questions

As stated above, we address three research questions:

1. What repertoires of action do people mobilizing in the public sphere deploy in contestation of sustainability transitions in the three cases?
2. How and when are frames of 'urgency' and 'crisis' used in claim making?
3. How are claims and repertoires of action legitimized and de-legitimized?

3. Political Claims Analysis

Political Claims Analysis is a form of qualitative content analysis used to map the contours of contentious politics, principally using data sampled from newspaper, newswires, or social media sources (Hutter, 2014; Carvalho, 2024). Political Claims Analysis is part of a family of approaches often, but not exclusively used in

research on social movements, using similar methods and sources, but focusing on different units of analysis or protest variables (see, for example, Koopmans and Rucht 2002 on Protest Event Analysis and Kriesi et al, 2021 for Contentious Episodes Analysis). Political Claims Analysis charts the features of mobilization by a wide range of institutional and civil society actors, rather than just protest events (Koopmans and Statham, 1999, 6). Political claims are broadly conceived as ‘the strategic demands made by collective actors within a specific contested issue field’ and include all forms of claim-making, whether ‘routine’, or ‘non-routine’, ‘conventional’ or ‘unconventional’ (ibid). In practice, this ranges from the expression of political opinions, party-political policy positions, government decisions, court rulings, mass protest and political violence.

There are several advantages to using Political Claims Analysis. Like other similar approaches mentioned above, it is well suited to gathering data on characteristics of protest and political claims-making across country contexts and over time (Earl et al 2004; Hutter 2014, Koopmans and Statham 2010, 54). The advantages of Political Claims Analysis more generally is that it ‘shifts the focus of inquiry towards processes of interaction between actors, and the coalitions, alliances and networks, and the conflict lines, that connect and relate different types of collective actors in a ‘multi organizational field’ (Koopmans and Statham, 1999, 6). These qualities make the approach appropriate for the purpose of WP3 of Trans4demo, which aims to map the contours of contestation on sustainability transitions in Denmark, Poland and Italy.

There are, however, several methodological shortcomings. Reliance on newspaper or other publicly available information on news and political communication confronts several types of selection bias (Earl et al, 2004; Hutter, 2014). The most important is the selective nature of journalistic reporting. Newspapers and wire services provide only a partial historical record, which reflect commercial imperatives and journalistic norms of newsworthiness. Existing studies, for instance, show that political claim making is more likely to be reported if it takes place in proximity to the outlets reporting them, they are sizable, use violence or novel action forms, are sponsored by known organizations, the police are involved or counterdemonstrations took place (Earl et al, 2004, 69; Koopmans and Rucht 2002, 247). Reporting also follows variable cycles of media interest, which is likely to affect the frequency of reports on a particular issue.

Due to the lack of a better alternative, we argue that the use of newspaper sources is the best source of comparable data on contentious politics of sustainability transitions. We also limit our analytical claims to contentious politics in the **public sphere**. As Koopmans and Rucht put it, newspaper data mirrors not ‘reality per se’, but a construction of reality (2002, 252). This image of reality filtered by newspapers is what many political elites and mass public rely on to understand the world, such that ‘protests and other events that remain unreported are simply ‘non-existent’ (ibid, see also Kriesi et al 2012, 47, 58; Earl 2004, 76).

Political Claims Analysis directs attention to seven dimensions of contentious politics, each of which are specified in more detail in Part II, Codebook and Procedures for Mapping Contentious Politics of Sustainability Transitions. These seven dimensions are:

1. Location of the claim in time and space (WHEN and WHERE is the claim made?)
2. Claimant: the actor making the claim (WHO makes the claim?)
3. Form of the claim (HOW is the claim inserted in the public sphere?)

4. The addressee of the claim (AT WHOM is the claim directed?)
5. The substantive issue of the claim (WHAT is the claim about?)
6. Object actor: on whose behalf is the claim made (FOR WHOM?)
7. The justification for the claim (WHY should this action be undertaken?)

4. Case selection

4.1 Pilot studies

Denmark, Poland, and Italy were selected to ensure meaningful variation across Trans4Demo as a whole. Together, they represent different democratic traditions and contemporary democratic conditions, ranging from established liberal democracy to more contested democratic trajectories. The countries also differ in their histories and repertoires of protest movements, allowing for comparative analysis of civic mobilization across contexts. Finally, their geographical dispersion strengthens the consortium by covering Northern, Central-Eastern, and Southern Europe, enhancing the project's comparative and transnational scope.

4.2 Contentious episodes

Our analysis focuses on three contentious episode per country case study. We define episodes in one of two ways, depending on the case. According to Kriesi et al. 2021's methodology, a contentious episode involves interactions between governments and challengers initiated by a policy proposal by a local or national government or the European Union and the point in time when challenges to that policy initiative taper out (2021, 13). Unlike Kriesi et al's approach, however, we focus on challengers to government policy rather than the interaction of the two and the role of third actors, which better matches our research question. A second type of contentious episode we examine corresponds to Tarrow's (1993) idea of protest cycle. A protest cycle involves 'an increasing and then decreasing wave of interrelated collective actions and reactions to them whose aggregate frequency, intensity, and forms increase and then decline in rough chronological proximity' (1993, 286-7).

Table 4.1 Contentious episodes studied per country case study

Country	Contentious Episodes
Denmark	Land use reform (Green Three-Part) Contestation over solar parks Rewilding
Italy	Anti-renewables contestation in Sardinia Farmers' protests against European Green Deal Ilva steel factor mobilization
Poland	Contestation over solar parks and wind turbines Farmers' protests against European Green Deal Protests and mobilisations against decarbonisation

4.3 Time periods

We select episodes based on existing country knowledge that fall within the period 2019 to present, roughly corresponding to the launch of the European Green Deal, under Ursula von der Leyen's first Commission presidency. Episodes begin, depending on the case, when a disputed governmental climate change initiative emerges on the public agenda, and ends when issue stops being visible in public debates. Where an episode is not tied to a specific government initiative, analysis begins when a protest cycle is initiated and ends when it declines.

5. Data and Sampling

5.1 Data source

We collect data from one national newspaper for each country study, and local newspapers. In the Polish case we collected data from national and local editions of *Gazeta Wyborcza*. In the Italian case, we collect data from national and local editions of *Corriere della Sera*. Due to differences in structure of the media system in Denmark, we collect data from the national newspaper *Politiken*, and used Infomedia, a Danish news aggregator, to source various local newspapers.

5.2 Two phase sampling strategy: National and local newspapers

Sampling of newspaper articles takes place in two phases. In the first phase, coders sample articles from national newspapers, using one or a small number of keywords to identify each of the core episodes. In the second phase, coders sample articles using local newspapers in a region identified as a significant arena of contentious politics in the first national phase. A more detailed list of keywords, developed inductively from case knowledge in the first phase, is used to sample articles from local newspapers.

5.3 Keywords

Due to differences in the set up of search interfaces for the different newspapers, variation in the number of keywords selected at different phases is expected. There will also be some variation in sampling strategies due to the nature of contentious episodes examined, their national salience or longevity, or extent of news coverage. For example, where coverage is extensive, coders can find strategies to delimit the number of articles examined by focusing on contentious politics on a single weekday of the week. Alternatively, where coverage is more limited, coders can increase the number of keywords, to extend the sample. The principle governing the use of either of these strategies is theoretical saturation, the point at which continuing to code additional data no longer produces new themes, categories, or insights that meaningfully contribute to your theoretical understanding of the phenomenon.

5.4 Identifying texts for analysis

To identify texts for analysis, coders read the heading and first paragraph of articles identified by relevant keywords. If this content indicates the article is not relevant, the coder turns to the next article.

5.5 Snowballing

While newspaper articles in the selected newspapers are the primary source of information for claims making, if there is missing data which limits the ability of the coder to find enough information to fill

relevant cells in the coding sheet, snowballing techniques are used. Snowballing is a sampling strategy in which new information is discovered by following leads from existing sources.

Newspaper articles from the same newspaper used for the study, or other well-known national or local newspapers should be the first source of additional information. However, coders can make use of other data sources, including websites, official documents or other credible sources.

6. Dataset

6.1 Entry of data onto datasheet

Once the coder identifies claims related to contestation of sustainability transitions, they enter information onto a prepared excel sheet. Coding categories are spelt out at length in Part II of this codebook.

7. Training and consistency checks

7.1 Training in method and coding categories

All coders have participated in training for Political Claims Analysis, based on joint study of the literature on protest event analysis and its variants. Familiarity with coding categories is ensured through joint elaboration and revision of this codebook.

7.2 Dealing with hard to classify cases

All those involved in coding met at regular intervals during the coding process to discuss difficult cases and resolve unanticipated coding issues.

7.3 Intercode reliability

Intercode reliability tests will take place in two phases. Halfway through the coding, pairs of coders from each country case study will pair up and code a sample of selected articles. Reliability scores will be calculated using Cohen's kappa, which is often used to measure intercode reliability in Political Claims Analysis. If major discrepancies among country coders are discovered, partial recoding may be necessary. A second reliability check will take place after data is collected, using the same procedure.

To check reliability across country cases, all coders will independently code a sample of English language articles, both mid-way and after completion of coding to check that coding categories are interpreted consistently.

PART 2: Codebook and Procedures for Mapping Contentious Politics of Sustainability Transitions

As stated above, we collect data on the seven elements of Political Claims Analysis outlined above. To identify coding categories for several of these dimensions we draw on categories developed for Koopmans and Statham's EUROPUB project (Koopmans 2002). This allows us to draw on categories tried and tested in major international research projects and facilitate comparison across datasets. Others have been developed specifically for Trans4demo.

1. General guidelines

1.1 Delimitation rules

We delimit one claim from another with reference to the **claimant** (see section 4, part II) and the **action form** (see section 5, part II). For example, where a protest involving opposition parties, environmental groups and church organizations take place outside a parliament where a parliamentary vote is taking place, we will code three claimants for the **demonstrative protests** (ie. **political parties**, **environmental groups** and **church organizations**) and one claimant for the **parliamentary votes** (i.e **political parties**). This will be recorded as four claims.

The time period for a claim reflects continuity over time. For example, a protest that lasted several days is coded as a claim if the same actors were involved, even if it took place in different cities. If the same group organized a protest after an interruption of days, weeks, or months, it was coded as another event. A court case or investigation involving several stages and various courts were coded as a single event, even if it lasted several years.

1.2 Exclusion rules

We only code claims addressing one of the three contentious episodes per country study listed in Table 4.1 above (see section 4.2, Part II). Opinion pieces by individual journalists or commentators and press reports about commentary from foreign newspapers are not included. However, editorials specifically addressing sustainability transitions are included. We also include comments by public intellectuals, well-known academics and celebrities.

1.3 Connected events

In order to record which actors were involved in the same events - regardless of their claims - we use the same code claim stem plus a letter. Thus, all claims associated with a particular event will have same claim code stem (eg PO001), despite the number claimants and action forms (eg. PO001a, PO001b, PO001c). (See section 2.1, part II on claim ID for more details).

2. Metadata

This is data collected to help the coding and analysis process.

2.1 Claim ID

Each claim is given a separate code. It includes two letters to indicate country: PO for Poland, IT for Italy and DK for Denmark, plus an item number beginning with 001. Thus the first claim will be PO001 for Poland, IT001 for Italy and DK001 for Denmark.

As described in Delimitation and Exclusion Rules (section 1, Part II) we separate claims by claimant (see section 4, part II), and action form (see section 5, part II). Where various claimants and action forms are found in a single event, we record connections between claims by adding a letter for each connected claim to the claim ID.

For example, where a protest involving opposition parties, environmental groups and church organizations take place outside a parliament where a parliamentary vote on new legislation is taking place, we will code three claimants for the **demonstrative protests** (ie. **political parties, environmental groups and church organizations**) and one claimant for the **parliamentary votes** (i.e **political parties**). This will be recorded in four lines labeled with country code plus letter. That is PO001a demonstrative protests + political parties; PO001b demonstrative protests + environmental group, PO001c demonstrative protests + church organizations, PO001d parliamentary votes + political parties.

2.2 Short claim summary

At most a one sentence summary of the case that serves as an aid memoire. For example, it could include something like. ‘Vulkangruppe, sabotage, electricity cuts in Berlin’.

2.3 Episode heading

Each of the three episodes for each pilot studies is given an individual name (see Table 4.1, Part I). Select the episode heading from the dropdown menu to indicate which episode the claim relates to.

2.4 Coder

Initial of coder entering data on the spreadsheet. For example, Michael Samuelson’s entries would be recorded as MS.

2.5 Search keywords (national)

A record of the specific keywords used in searches locating the national newspaper article in which the claim is recorded. (See section 5.2, Part I for details).

2.6 Search keywords (local)

A record of the specific keywords used in searches locating the local newspaper article in which the claim is recorded. (See section 5.2, Part I for details).

2.7 Source

Provide a record of the newspaper article where information was found to record the claim. Use the following format: article author, article title, newspaper title, newspaper date (day, month, year). For

example, Mallory Moench, 'Activist group says it was behind Berlin fire that cut power to thousands', 4 January 2026. Include several articles if necessary.

2.8 Source html

Provide an internet link for sources relevant to the claim.

2.9 Snowballing source

As spelt out in Snowballing (section 5.5, Part I), newspaper articles in the selected newspapers are the primary source of information for claims-making. However, if there is missing data which limits the ability of the coder to find enough information to fill relevant cells in the coding sheet, snowballing techniques are used.

Where snowballing is used, coders should record the new source of information for which data was found, using the same format for recording newspaper articles in Section 2.7, part II above. If other sources of information are used, these should be recorded in a similar format.

2.10 Snowballing html

Provide an internet link for source relevant to the claim

3. Locality

These variables record location of the claim in time and space, that is where and when the claim was made.

3.1 Country

Select country from dropdown menu: Denmark, Italy or Poland

3.2 Locality of claim

Write down location where claim was made, with as much precision as possible. That is, if city is known, record this, if region is known, record this.

3.3 Date of the claim

Record year, month and day (if known) in which the claim was made. If not clear, record the same year, month and day as publication of the newspaper article it was first mentioned.

3.4 Weekday of the claim

Record weekday on which the claim was made. That is, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday etc.

4. Claimant

These variables record information about the claimant or actor who makes a claim about sustainability transitions in the public sphere.

4.1 Claimant categories

We use most coding category ACT1S from the EUROPUB dataset (Koopmans, 2002), with a few additions better capturing contestation of sustainability transitions.

1. Whole polities

Whole countries/polities: e.g., 'the EU', 'Britain', if used not to refer to the government or any other specific institution, but to the polity as a whole; note that 'the Europeans', 'the British', etc. are coded in 'general public'.

2. The general public (e.g., 'citizens', 'the citizenry', 'die Öffentlichkeit', 'the electorate', 'the Germans', 'the population', 'taxpayers'; only if explicitly mentioned!)

3. Politicians (if unspecified and unclear whether referring to government, parliament or parties)

4. Former states(wo)men

5. Government/executive

Governments and government representatives (spokespersons, ministers, royalty etc.) irrespective of territorial scope. The EU-Commission and Council of Ministers, the UN General Secretary and Security Council are coded as governments. Other examples: mayor, Landesregierung, ministry of education

6. Legislative

Legislatives and parliaments (all chambers), including individual members thereof, including parliamentary fractions of political parties. Examples: Bundestag, House of Lords, local councils, parliamentary fraction of the SPD, Labor MPs. Intergovernmental organizations which draw up international treaties on the basis of unanimous consent of the signatories are coded among executive/government. The European Parliament and the General Assembly of the UN are, however, coded as legislatures, because they have (limited, but still) the power to make binding decisions on the basis of majority decisions.

7. Judiciary

E.g., European Court of Justice, openbaar ministerie (public prosecutor), individual judges, juries.

8. Police and internal security agencies

E.g., police, Bundesgrenzschutz, secret service, Verfassungsschutz, Europol. Note: the Police Union is coded as a union.

9. Military

E.g., Bundeswehr, NATO

10. Central banks

11. Executive agencies

Includes executive agencies at local, regional, state and supranational and international levels.

12. Political parties

This category should be used only for parties as parties, e.g., party chairman, party congress, "die SPD", "a Labor party spokesman", as well as for sub-organizations of parties (e.g., Junge Sozialisten). Note that the same person may be coded differently according to the way in which her or his position is described: e.g., Bundeskanzler Schröder is coded as government, Mitglied des Bundestages Schröder is coded as legislative, SPD Parteivorsitzender Schröder is coded as political party.

13. Unions and employees

Includes the general categories 'workers' and 'employees'

14. Employers organizations and firms

15. Churches and religious organizations and groups

16. Media and journalists

17. Environmental organizations and groups

18. Farmers and agricultural organizations

19. Educational professionals and organizations

Including schools, universities in their educational capacity.

20. Experts

Includes scientific and research professionals and institutions' (e.g., experts, research institutes, universities in their research capacity).

21. Students, pupils, and their parents

22. Other professional organizations and groups

E.g., Deutscher Ärztekammer, Berufsverband Deutscher Psychologen, Deutscher Sportbund, doctors, football players, writers, solicitors, musicians. Note: unions are always coded as unions, non-union organizations of police and judges are coded under their respective institution. Includes independent climate councils, such as Klimarådet in Denmark.

23. Consumer organizations and groups

24. Pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups

25. Solidarity and human rights organizations

This includes only private organizations such as Pro Asyl, Anti-Racist Alliance, Arbeiterwohlfahrt, Amnesty International, Terre des Hommes, medecins sans frontières etc

26. Welfare organizations

E.g., Red Cross, Arbeiterwohlfahrt, not state welfare agencies (these are coded as state executive agencies).

27. Racist and extreme right organizations and groups

Includes vague descriptions such as "skinheads" or "right-wing extremists". Radical right parties should be coded as political party, unless the party label is merely window dressing and does not indicate significant involvement in the electoral process (e.g. the Freiheitliche Arbeiterpartei in Germany).

28. Organizations and groups of the elderly

29. Women's organizations and groups

30. Neighbourhood groups

E.g., informal groups set up to protest a specific sustainable transition installation such as solar parks.

31. Terrorist groups

32. Other civil society organizations and groups

Including not already mentioned social categories such as 'youth', 'the unemployed', 'children', etc.

33. Other

4.2 Scope of claimant

This is an amended version of EUROPUB variable ACTSCOP1. The category transnational was added. Select relevant code from dropdown menu.

1. Supranational: United Nations

2. Other supranational

3. European Union

4. Other European supranational

5. Multilateral,

State actors cooperating with several other state actors.

6. Bilateral

State actors cooperating bilaterally.

7. Transnational

Non-state organizational actors who co-operate across state borders.

8. National

9. Regional

- 10. Local
- 11. Unclassifiable

4.3 Claimant(s) name

Record the names of all claimants. Use English translation of the name first, followed by the name in native language. For example Liberals (*Venstre*) for the political party.

5. Form of the Claim

This set of variables records repertoires of action, or how the claim is inserted into the public sphere. This variable draws on the EUROPUB variable FORM. Each main category has several subcategories

5.1 Action form (broad)

Select from the following list. For more detailed description see table in section 5.2 part II.

1. Political decisions
2. Executive action
3. Judicial action
4. Verbal statements
5. Meetings
6. Direct-democratic actions
7. Petitioning
8. Demonstrative protests
9. Confrontational protests
10. Violent protests

5.2 Action form (subcategory)

There are subcategories for each of the Action Form (broad) categories listed in 5.2 above. Record Action Form (subcategory) for each of the matching broader categories.

Table 5.2.1 Action forms broad and narrow

Action Form (Broad) CODING CATEGORY	Action Form (Subcategories) CODING CATEGORY
Political decisions	legislation (proposal), parliamentary vote, parliamentary motion (non-legislative), administrative decree/decision (e.g., decision to deport asylum seekers, to lower interest rates), resolution (political parties), ruling (courts), binding agreement (among several parties), personnel decisions (resignation/dismissal from/appointment to office, other.

Executive action	financial and other material support; deportation/expulsion; arrests/detention; other repression (e.g., bans, police raids, criminal investigations); (preparation of) troops deployment/withdrawal (the actual action, not the decision to) other
Judicial action	criminal lawsuit; civil lawsuit; administrative lawsuit; constitutional lawsuit
Verbal statements	non-specified statement, press conference/release, interview, public speech, (public) letter, newspaper article, op-eds, other publication (book, research report, leaflet, etc.), graffiti, presentation of survey/poll result, publicity campaign (incl. advertizing), other
Meetings	state-political meeting (e.g., summits, state visits); party convention/congress; parliamentary session/debate; election campaign meeting; other conferences/meetings/assemblies
Direct-democratic action	launching of referendum, collecting signatures for referendum, presentation of signatures for referendum; vote on referendum, other
Petitioning	petition/signature collection; letter campaign; other
Demonstrative protests	public assembly, march, demonstration (legal and non-violent); vigil/picket; other
Confrontational Protests	confrontational protests', illegal demonstration (if non-violent); boycott; strike; self-mutilation (e.g., hunger strike, suicide); blockade; occupation; disturbance of meetings; symbolic confrontation (e.g., farmers dumping animal dung in front of a government building), other
Violent Protests	threats (e.g., bomb threat); symbolic violence (e.g., burning puppets or flags, throwing eggs or paint); limited destruction of property (e.g., breaking

	windows); sabotage; violent demonstration (violence initiated by protestors); arson and bomb attacks, and other severe destruction of property; arson and bomb attacks against people (incl. inhabited buildings); physical violence against people (fights, brawls, etc.) other.
--	---

6. Addressee

This category records the addressee of the claim, or to whom the claim is directed. Following the guidelines in the EUROPUB project, we define addressee using the following formulation:

“-the addressee of the claim in the narrow sense of the word, referring to the actor who is held responsible for implementing the claim or at whom the claim is directly addressed in the form of a call or appeal to do or leave something;

- the opponent/criticized actor identified in the claim, referring to the actor who is seen as standing in the way of the claim's realization or advocating a position contrary to that of the claimant;

- the supported actor, referring to the actor who is seen as contributing to the claim's realization or advocating a position congruent with that of the claimant.” (Koopmans, 2002, p. 42)

We use the same variables as for claimants (see section 4, Part II)

6.1 Addressee categories

Select up to three of the addressee categories listed below. If there are more than three addressees for a claim, record it in the additional notes column (section 12, Part II) .

We use most coding category ACT1S from the EUROPUB dataset, with a few additions better capturing contestation of sustainability transitions.

1. Whole polities

Whole countries/polities: e.g., ‘the EU’, ‘Britain’, if used not to refer to the government or any other specific institution, but to the polity as a whole; note that ‘the Europeans’, ‘the British’, etc. are coded in ‘general public’.

2. The general public

(e.g., 'citizens', 'the citizenry', 'die Öffentlichkeit', 'the electorate', 'the Germans', 'the population', 'taxpayers'; only if explicitly mentioned!)

3. Ideological/symbolic groups

actors invoked symbolically, often in frames of blame, injustice or power. (eg. urban elites/metropolitan decision-makers, the green lobby/environmental NGOs, foreign investors/external developers, experts detached from reality)

4. Politicians

(if unspecified and unclear whether referring to government, parliament or parties)

5. Former states(wo)men

6. Government/executive

Governments and government representatives (spokespersons, ministers, royalty etc.) irrespective of territorial scope. The EU-Commission and **Council** of Ministers, the UN General Secretary and Security Council are coded as governments. Other examples: mayor, Landesregierung, ministry of education

7. Legislative

Legislatures and parliaments (all chambers), including individual members thereof, including parliamentary fractions of political parties. Examples: Bundestag, House of Lords, local councils, parliamentary fraction of the SPD, Labor MPs. Intergovernmental organizations which draw up international treaties on the basis of unanimous consent of the signatories are coded among executive/government. The European Parliament and the General Assembly of the UN are, however, coded as legislatures, because they have (limited, but still) the power to make binding decisions on the basis of majority decisions.

8. Judiciary

E.g., European Court of Justice, openbaar ministerie (public prosecutor), individual judges, juries.

9. Police and internal security agencies

E.g., police, Bundesgrenzschutz, secret service, Verfassungsschutz, Europol. Note: the Police Union is coded as a union.

10. Military

Bundeswehr, NATO

11. Central banks

12. Executive agencies

Includes executive agencies at local, regional, state and supranational and international levels.

13. Political parties

This category should be used only for parties as parties, e.g., party chairman, party congress, "die SPD", "a Labor party spokesman", as well as for sub-organizations of parties (e.g., Junge Sozialisten). Note that the same person may be coded differently according to the way in which her or his position is described: e.g., Bundeskanzler Schröder is coded as government, Mitglied des Bundestages Schröder is coded as legislative, SPD Parteivorsitzender Schröder is coded as political party.

14. Unions and employees

Includes the general categories 'workers' and 'employees'

15. Employers organizations and firms

16. Churches and religious organizations and groups

17. Media and journalists

18. Environmental organizations and groups

19. Farmers and agricultural organizations

20. Educational professionals and organizations

Including schools, universities in their educational capacity.

21. Experts

Includes scientific and research professionals and institutions' (e.g., experts, research institutes, universities in their research capacity).

22. Students, pupils, and their parents

23. Other professional organizations and groups

E.g., Deutscher Ärztekammer, Berufsverband Deutscher Psychologen, Deutscher Sportbund, doctors, football players, writers, solicitors, musicians. Note: unions are always coded as unions, non-union organizations of police and judges are coded under their

respective institution. Includes independent climate councils, such as Klimarådet in Denmark.

24. Consumer organizations and groups

25. Pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups

26. Solidarity and human rights organizations

This includes only private organizations such as Pro Asyl, Anti-Racist Alliance, Arbeiterwohlfahrt, Amnesty International, Terre des Hommes, medecins sans frontières etc

27. Welfare organizations

E.g., Red Cross, Arbeiterwohlfahrt, not state welfare agencies (these are coded as state executive agencies).

28. Racist and extreme right organizations and groups

Includes vague descriptions such as “skinheads” or “right-wing extremists”. Radical right parties should be coded as political party, unless the party label is merely window dressing and does not indicate significant involvement in the electoral process (e.g. the Freiheitliche Arbeiterpartei in Germany).

29. Organizations and groups of the elderly

30. Women's organizations and groups

31. Neighbourhood groups

E.g., informal groups set up to protest a specific sustainable transition installation such as solar parks.

32. Terrorist groups

33. Other civil society organizations and groups

Including not already mentioned social categories such as 'youth', 'the unemployed', 'children', etc.

34. Other

6.2 Scope of addressee

List scope of address for each of the three addressees listed for 6.1

This is an amended version of EUROPUB variable ACTSCOP1. The category transnational was added. Select relevant code from dropdown menu.

1. supranational: United Nations

2. other supranational

3. European Union

4 other European supranational

5. Multilateral

State actors cooperating with several other state actors.

6. Bilateral

State actors cooperating bilaterally.

7. Transnational

Non-state organizational actors who co-operate across state borders.

8. national

9. regional

10. local

11. unclassifiable

6.3 Addressee(s) name

Record the name of each of the addressees identified in 6.1. Use the English translation of the name first, followed by the name in native language. For example Liberals (*Venstre*) for the political party. If there are more than three addressees, these should be listed in the additional notes category (section 12, Part II).

7. Aims

This category addresses the substantive issue of the claim related to sustainability transitions. It helps clarify what the claim is about.

Coders should list up to three ambitions to the claim. If there are more than three aims, these should be listed in the additional notes category (section 12, Part II).

7.1 Ambition

1. Not ambitious enough

Includes claims that define green transition policies as insufficient to address current climate-related needs. Such policies are portrayed as too late, outdated, inadequate, or ineffective in the short and/or long term. These claims argue that existing measures fail to match the scale or urgency of the climate crisis and may include accusations that policies prioritize economic or industrial interests over environmental and climate imperatives.

2. Too ambitious

Includes claims that define green transition policies as problematic because they are perceived to impose excessive or unjustified burdens on other sectors of society. Such claims portray policies as overly demanding, disruptive, or as generating crises outside the domain of climate governance. Affected sectors typically include the labor market, agriculture, tourism, and living conditions. They emphasize the negative spillover effects of green transition policies on non-climate domains, which may be framed in economic terms (e.g. loss of wages, employment, or property value), distributive or fairness terms (e.g. disproportionate impacts on specific communities or social groups), or governance-related terms (e.g. lack of democratic consultation, insufficient stakeholder involvement, or top-down policy imposition). Another common claim includes damages to the environment in favor of climate. While the broader category of such claims includes explicitly ideological opposition to the green transition as a whole (ideological overreach), claims do not necessarily reject the transition in principle. More commonly, they contest specific policy designs, timelines, or modes of implementation (instrumental or situational overreach).

7.2 Sustainability transition sectors

Coders can list up to three sustainability transition sectors the claim relates to. If there are more than three sectors, these should be listed in the additional notes category

1. Biodiversity and Ecosystems

Key Issues include deforestation, land use change, wetland or peatbogs degradation, biodiversity loss / species extinction (e.g. wolves, birds). It typically involves contestation over land use and rights (e.g., indigenous or local resistance to conservation or extraction projects); forestry (e.g. Białowieża primeval forest deforestation); Infrastructure (dams, roads) vs ecosystems; windpower vs birds/bats collisions, habitat disturbances, onshore and offshore

2. Resource Extraction and Use

Key Issues include coal, oil and gas maintenance and/or expansion vs phase-outs, mining for transition metals and other critical resources for 'green tech', plastic regulation. It typically involves contestation over resistance to coal mine closures or oil/gas phase-outs (e.g., Poland, Germany); extractive conflicts tied to lithium, cobalt, copper and other critical minerals (deep-sea mining, indigenous land)

3. Labor and Industrial Relations

Key Issues include job losses in fossil sectors, labor market frictions, re-skilling and up-skilling challenges, automation. It typically involves contestation over unions protecting jobs in fossil or heavy industries, tensions between "green unions" and old divisions ("yellow" and "red unions"), potentially as status quo defenders, concerns over precarization in new green jobs (e.g., solar installation, recycling)

4. Pollution Control (Air, Water, Light, Soil)

Key issues include industrial runoff, plastics, light pollution. It typically includes agricultural runoff regulations (e.g., nitrogen laws) often opposed by farmers, and water access disputes.

5. Agriculture and Food Systems

Key Issues include nitrogen regulation, pesticide bans, meat production / cultivated meat concerns, CAP (*Common Agricultural Policy*), farming subsidies, EU-Mercosur deals, food waste and food waste prevention. It typically includes contestation by farmers resisting EU green regulations as threats to income and 'traditional' farming; opposition to trade deals (e.g., Mercosur) seen as unfair for EU farmers; and conflicts between agri-business and smallholder/organic farmers

6. Renewable Energy Transitions

Key Issues include wind turbine siting, solar land use, critical minerals demand and use. It typically includes contestation such as local initiatives, often NIMBY, resistance to wind and solar farms; indigenous and rural opposition to land-intensive energy projects; disputes over centralized vs decentralized (community-based) energy (more policy- and decision-makers level than local resistance)

7. Mobility and Transport

Key Issues include Low-emission zones (LEZs), electric vehicle mandates, modal shift policies, urban parking policies, airport and air travelling expansion. It typically includes contestation between urban drivers and delivery services opposing car bans or LEZs; Resistance to public transport investment (as deferrable to private car transport); conflict over airport growth vs climate goals

8. Tourism & Leisure

Key Issues include mass-/over-tourism, housing crisis, carbon footprint of travel. It typically includes contestation such as resistance from local populations to touristification, aviation-related emissions and degrowth tourism debates, and tourism-driven gentrification and local housing crises

9. Knowledge, Science, Education

Key Issues include climate education, curriculum reform, green skill pipelines, disinformation and misinformation. It typically includes contestation such as attacks on climate science by fossil lobbies or populist movements; political polarization over "green elites" and "technocracy"; and resistance to climate education mandates in conservative regions.

7.3 List of demands

Coders should list mention of up to three of the broad demand claim categories from the first column below. If there are more than three demands, these should be listed in the additional notes category.

Table 7.3.1: Demands related to sustainability transitions

Broad Demand Category (USED FOR CODING)	Includes:
Abolitory Demands (Stop / Withdraw / Ban) <i>Demands aimed at stopping, reversing or canceling climate-related policies, projects, infrastructures.</i>	Cancel climate regulations (withdraw EU climate targets; repeal carbon taxes; repeal CAP conditionalities)
	Stop specific green infrastructure (halt wind farms, solar parks, power lines, rewilding zones)
	Moratorium / suspension of climate policies (pause new installations, freeze implementation of Fit for 55, delay policy deadlines)
	Ban specific technologies or practices (e.g., lab-grown meat, pesticides substitutes, new livestock restrictions)
	Other
Progressive Demands (Introduce / Accelerate / Strengthen) <i>Demands oriented toward introducing, accelerating or strengthening climate action and green transition</i>	Accelerate climate mitigation (faster decarbonization, quicker coal phase-out)
	Introduce stricter environmental protections (protect ecosystems, safeguard biodiversity, stop deforestation)
	Strengthen climate governance and monitoring (better enforcement, science-based targets)
	Expand support schemes for sustainable practices (subsidies for organic farming, green transport, energy efficiency)
	Other
Protective Demands (Protect / Safeguard / Exempt) <i>Demands for shielding specific groups, territories, or livelihoods from the costs of the green transition.</i>	Protect vulnerable groups/sectors (farmers, miners, fishers, low-income households)
	Exempt specific regions or occupations (mountain communities, islands, rural areas)
	Safeguard local autonomy over land and resources (local veto over energy installations)
	Protect cultural landscapes and ways of life (preserve grazing lands, prevent rewilding)
	Other
Material Demands (Compensate / Pay / Provide) <i>Demands for tangible economic resources or redistribution.</i>	Financial compensation (losses from energy infrastructure, climate policies, CAP reforms)
	Subsidies and support funds (for farms, transport sectors, energy-poor households)
	Fair pricing or market protections (price floors, anti-import shields, protection from volatility)

Symbolic Demands (Acknowledge / Apologize / Recognize) <i>Demands oriented toward recognition, dignity, and moral legitimacy.</i>	Investment demands (investment into local green jobs, infrastructure, adaptation)
	Other
	Recognition of identity and way of life (acknowledge rural or pastoral identities threatened by climate policies)
	Public acknowledgment of past harms (recognition of previous injustices in energy/land reforms)
	Symbolic protection of landscapes ("recognize our landscape as cultural heritage")
	Apologies or political responsibility claims (government or EU institutions should acknowledge wrongdoing or mismanagement)
	Other

7.5 Summary of demands

Reproduce text of newspaper article describing the demand in a) original language and b) English translation.

8. Object actor

This variable identifies those on whose behalf a claim is made, when it is not the same as the claimant. It is a form of representative claims analysis, and as such is a narrower version of the object actor than that used in the EUROPUB dataset.

8.1 List of representative claims

Coders should list up to three representative claims. If there are more than three, this should be recorded in the additional notes column.

1. Polity

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of political systems at local, regional, state and international jurisdictions, such as state or regional governance structures like the European Union, NAFTA, or the Union of South American Nations.

2. Citizens/the people

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of citizens in general or people of a country, a region, or the world in general.

3. The environment

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of nature, including the planet, specific environments, animals and other living systems.

4. Industry or professions

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of economic sectors or professions, such as the fishing industry, automobile production, or other professional groups. This includes examples like the steel lobby or firefighters—any group defined primarily by occupation.

5. Organization / Institution

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of specific named organizations or institutions, such as companies or formal political bodies like parliaments or the European Commission.

6. Ethnic Minority

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to represent the interests of a specific ethnic or religious minority group within Europe or within a particular country, such as Muslims or the Roma.

7. Ethnic Majority

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to represent the interests of the ethnic or religious majority of a country or region, such as White Europeans, White Germans, or Christian Europe.

8. Property owners

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the rights of property owners, including not only property owners in a strict sense but also the wealthy, bankers, CEOs, and capitalists.

9. Workers

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of the working class, lower socio-economic groups, and the poor.

10. Farmers / Agricultural Organizations

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing individuals or groups engaged in agricultural production, including farmers, agricultural producers, and farming communities, as well as organizations representing agricultural interests such as farmers' unions, cooperatives, or agricultural associations. This category is used when claims concern agriculture, farming livelihoods, or agricultural policy and are articulated by or on behalf of actors connected to the agricultural sector.

11. Elites

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of individuals with political or cultural power, such as politicians, highly educated people, or civil servants. Those with primarily economic power are classified under owners.

12. Individuals

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of one or more specific named individuals. References to generalized figures such as "the average person" or "the man on the street" are coded as citizens instead.

13. Gender

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of any group defined by gender, gender identity, or sexual orientation.

14. Generational

Claims that refer implicitly or explicitly to representing the interests of a group of people defined by age or generational divisions, such as children, pensioners, or youth.

15. No Object

Claims that do not refer to representing any identifiable object.

16. Other object

8.3 Summary of representative claims

Reproduce text of newspaper article describing the representative claims in a) original language and b) English translation.

9. Justification of the claim

These variables address claims about why action is necessary.

9.1 Urgency-crisis claim

Urgency-crisis claims draw on discourses of urgency and crisis spelt out in Trans4demo Deliverable 2.1 Working Paper: Urgency, Crisis and Repertoires of Action. Coders are asked to list up to three crisis-urgency claims, using categories listed in the **second column** of the table below. If there are more than three claims, these should be recorded in the additional notes column.

Table 9.1.1: Urgency-crisis claims

ORIENTATIVE CATEGORIES (do not use for coding)	CODING CATEGORIES
Low urgency positions. <i>Prioritize other policy domains (such as labor, economic growth, or national sovereignty) or different scales of governance (for example, national over transnational) over climate action.</i>	Denialism claims that climate change is not a crisis.
	Green nationalist discourses reject climate governance when it is framed as a threat to national sovereignty or economic autonomy, while simultaneously promoting the protection of national landscapes or biodiversity. This pattern has been observed among several populist right-wing parties, including Alternative für Deutschland, Law and Justice, and Fidesz.
	Yes-but environmentalist discourses support limited forms of climate governance while prioritizing national economic interests. The literature identifies “yes-but” environmentalism as a strategy adopted by political actors undergoing a “green turn,” whereby commitment to climate action is conditional upon its compatibility with economic growth and domestic political stability.
Intermediate positions	Competing urgency discourses accept climate change as a crisis and do not contest climate governance per se, but emphasize the need to balance climate policies with their perceived impacts on other sectors of society. Rather than rejecting climate action in principle, they contest specific policy designs, timelines, or modes of implementation. Local or conditional urgency discourses highlight the negative spillover effects of green transition policies on non-climate domains. These effects are framed in economic terms (e.g. loss of wages, employment, or property values), distributive or fairness terms (e.g. disproportionate impacts on specific communities or social groups), or governance-related terms (e.g. lack of democratic consultation, insufficient stakeholder involvement, or top-down policy imposition). Such discourses are most commonly articulated by local communities and farmers directly affected by green transition policies.
High urgency positions.	Politicized high-urgency discourses emphasize the systemic political and economic roots of the climate crisis, often linking it to broader socio-economic or cultural crises. These perspectives demand structural change and political accountability and may call for climate policies that explicitly

<i>These focus on promoting the establishment and strengthening of climate policies, albeit with divergent approaches.</i>	incorporate concerns related to distributive justice, the economy, and the labor market. Such discourses are frequently associated with green parties and left-wing populist actors.
	Depoliticized high-urgency discourses , by contrast, prioritize technocratic solutions to climate governance. They rely on scientific expertise, neutral language, and managerial approaches, and are commonly adopted by actors engaged in international governance who seek to mobilize policymakers across the political spectrum, such as those involved in United Nations conferences or multilateral climate summits.
	Fatalistic discourses argue that climate change is an unavoidable tragedy.
Unclassifiable	

9.3 Summary of urgency-crisis claims

Reproduce text of newspaper article describing the urgency-crisis claim in a) original language and b) English translation.

10. (De)legitimizing claims

This variable addresses legitimizing and delegitimizing discourses used by claimants regarding a) the claims they make and/or b) action repertoires used.

10.1 Legitimizing/delegitimizing claims

Coders should record up to three legitimizing or delegitimizing claims. If there are more than three these should be listed in the additional notes column.

Table 10.1.1 Legitimizing and delegitimizing claims

Legitimizing-delegitimizing claims CODING CATEGORY	Description of subcategories (do not code)
Liberal Democratic Claims <i>Justifications related to how decisions are made and whose voice is included in democratic procedures; representation, participation, and quality of decision-making.</i>	Procedural justice ("We were excluded from the decision-making process")
	Representation claim ("We had no representation in the decision")
	Participation claim ("We should be consulted before energy installations are built")

	Transparency claim (“The decision-making process was opaque / hidden”)
	Majoritarian claim (“Most residents oppose this project”)
	Technocratic vs. anti-technocratic framing (used to contrast democratic voice with rule by experts)
	Other
Distributive & Socioeconomic Justice Claims <i>Justifications regarding who bears the costs and who benefits; sectoral and interest-based grievances.</i>	Distributive justice (“The costs fall on us — farmers, drivers, working people”)
	Rights claim (property, livelihood, work) (“Our property rights / right to work / right to a livelihood are being violated”)
	Environmental damage from green infrastructure (economic framing) (e.g., economic losses due to wind turbines, solar parks, rewilding)
	Reference to past injustice (“In previous reforms, we also bore the burden”)
	Reference to long-standing mismanagement (“Energy/infrastructure projects were mismanaged for decades, and now we pay the price”)
	Sectoral livelihood claims (work, income, production as the basis of grievance)
	Other
Recognition and Identity Claims <i>Justifications related to social recognition, dignity, symbolic inclusion, and the preservation of ways of life.</i>	Recognition justice (“They ignore/destroy our way of life, our rural identity”)
	Professional identity (farmers, shepherds, miners, taxi drivers as identity-based actors)
	Cultural identity (food traditions, cultural landscapes — e.g., Sardinia)
	Territorial identity (cultural framing) (islanders, mountain communities, culturally distinct regions)
	Environmental damage from green infrastructure (cultural framing) (“Wind turbines destroy our landscape” as a symbolic, not economic, claim)
	Alternative ecological priorities (“Grazing protects biodiversity”; “rewilding harms local species”; defense of place-based ecological knowledge)

	Other
Epistemic claim <i>Justifications related to whose knowledge counts in governing transitions; legitimacy of expertise.</i>	Anti-scientific claim (rejecting scientific knowledge as irrelevant or misleading)
	Pro-science claim ("Transition is too slow; science says we must act faster")
	Challenges to expert authority (questioning institutions, scientific bodies, state experts)
	Counter-expertise claims (local knowledge, practical/experiential evidence, alternative scientific interpretations)
	Other

10.2 Summary of legitimizing-delegitimizing claims

Reproduce text of newspaper article describing the urgency-crisis claim in a) original language and b) English translation.

11. Summary of entry

Coder provides a short two-three sentence summary of the main features of the claim.

12. Additional notes

This column is used to record information that the coder finds relevant. It could include ideas for future research, methodological issues, or additional information.

13. References for Part 1 and 2

Bourne, Angela, Aleksandra Moroska-Bonkiewicz, Bénédicte Laumond, Francesco Campo, Franciszek Tyszka, Katarzyna Domagała, and Mathias Holst Nicolaisen "Initiatives Opposing Populist Parties (IoPP) in Europe Dataset", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/V4TEB2>, Harvard dataverse, deposit 26 July 2024

Carvalho, T (2024) Analysing protest events: a quantitative and systematic approach, in Cox, L., Szolucha, A., Arribas Lozano, A., Zambrano, M., and Chattopadhyay, S. (eds) *Handbook of Research methods and Applications for Social movements*, (Cheltenham, UK, Edward Elgar publishing)

Earl, J., Martin, A., McCarthy, J. D., Soule, S., (2004) The Use of Newspaper Data in the Study of Collective Action, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, p. 65-80.

Hutter, S. (2014) Protest event analysis and its offspring, in della Porta, D (ed) *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Koopmans, R. (2002). Codebook for the analysis of political mobilisation and communication in European public spheres. *Europub.com Project*, Work Package 2 (Content Coding of ClaimMaking), ("Ultimate version," 15 April 2002).

Koopmans, R. and Rucht, D. (2002) Protest Event Analysis, in Klandermans, B and Staggenborg, S (eds) *Methods of Social Movement Research*, University of Minnesota Press, p. 231-259.

Koopmans, R., & Statham, P. (1999). Political claims analysis: Integrating protest event and political discourse approaches. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, 4(2), 203–221.

Koopmans, R and Statham, P (2010) Theoretical Framework, Research Design, and Methods, in Koopmans, R and Statham, P (eds) *The Making of a European Public Sphere: Media Discourse and Political Contention. Communication, Society and Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp. 34-60.

Kriesi, H., Hutter, S., Bojar, A., Altiparmakis, A., Gessler, T. Hunger, S. Pilati, K., and Schulte-Cloose, J (2021) A New Approach for Studying Political Contention- Contentious Episode Analysis, in Bojar, A; Gessler, T., Hutter, S., and Kriesi, H., (eds) *Contentious Episodes in the Age of Austerity: Studying the Dynamics of Government-Challenger Interactions*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 3-23.

Kriesi, H, Koopmans, R, Duyvendak, J and Giugni, M. G., (1992) New social movements and political opportunities in Western Europe, *European Journal of Political Research*, 22: 219-244.