Protocol for trophy hunting article inclusion and coding

Coders independently determined the overall ‘sentiment’ of an article, which is their judgement of how an article conveys the acceptability of trophy hunting (TH) to readers.

Step 1: Include or exclude

Coders read the entire article and assess whether it contains sufficient material specifically relating to trophy hunting (TH) to make a judgement about the article’s sentiment regarding TH.

Criteria for inclusion:

* The article contains sufficient content to make a judgement on its overall sentiment regarding TH.

Criteria for exclusion:

* The article is not about TH (e.g. articles about sports teams “hunting for trophies”)
* The article is about TH but contains insufficient content to make a judgement on its overall position (e.g. an article that mentions TH only in passing).

Step 2: for included articles only

Coders assign the article to one of four categories based on their judgement of the article’s sentiment regarding trophy hunting: pro/anti/it’s complicated/neutral.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pro** | **Anti** | **It’s complicated** | **Neutral** |
| Article contains arguments that are mostly or exclusively in favour of TH.  Example from *The Guardian*:  THE ETHICS OF TROPHY HUNTING - COULD SHOOTING LIONS ACTUALLY SAVE THEM FROM EXTINCTION? | Article contains arguments that are mostly or exclusively against TH.  Example from *The Daily Mail*:  HUNTER PAYS £36K TO KILL CECIL THE LION WITH A BOW AND ARROW | Article contains a proportionate amount of both for an against arguments for TH.  Example from *The Daily Mail*:  BLOODLUST ON THE BEAR HUNT | Article does not contain for or against arguments, only descriptive information regarding TH without employing sensational language.  Example from *The Daily Mail*:  HOWLS AS A MIGHTY BEAST MOURNS HIS FRIEND |

**Notes:**

1. Coders should begin reading each article assuming it has a neutral sentiment.
2. Coders should use a conservative approach, not allowing their judgement to be swayed by a relatively small proportion of an article containing elements of an argument that contrasts with the rest of the article. For instance, an article containing primarily anti-TH statements and one pro-TH statement should be coded as anti, not neutral or it’s complicated. Coders are making judgements about the overall ‘feel’ of an article in terms of its presentation of TH.
3. Legality should not be considered as an argument for or against TH unless the material on legality has normative or moral connotations. For instance, material simply describing complicated regulations around trophy hunting using neutral language does not count as pro-TH. However, material defending a hunt by arguing that it was legal (stating or implying that it is therefore not unethical), does count as pro-TH.
4. The language used in a TH article can be used to aid the readers’ overall judgement. For instance: Anti language – “*Gruesome* photographs show Alex Goss posing beside the bodies of two lions after they were *slaughtered* during hunts in South Africa.” Neutral language – “Photographs of Alex Goss alongside the bodies of two deceased lions after the hunt in South Africa.”
5. If an article advocates for banning trophy hunting imports, thus indirectly prohibiting the activity of TH, this counts as anti TH.

**Duplicate articles**

1. Duplicates within same publication (i.e. different versions of same article): include most recent version in analysis
2. Duplicates in regional editions of the same publication (e.g. The Sun and The Scottish Sun): include article with higher word count.