

**Documentation of text corpus creation, coding and quantitative content analysis for
“The framing of IMF, World Bank, WHO and ILO in political reform debates in Russia and
Ukraine”¹**

(as of 22 December 2019)

Heiko Pleines, pleines@uni-bremen.de

Creation of the text corpus

The text corpus comprises all references to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, World Health Organisation (WHO) and International Labour Organisation (ILO) in parliamentary debates in the lower house of the Russian parliament (“Duma”) from 1998 to 2008 and in the Ukrainian parliament (“Verkhovna Rada”) from 2010 to 2019. The rationale for the case selection is outlined in the academic presentation of the result.

In order to create the text corpus full transcripts of all relevant parliamentary sessions were searched using the online database available at the official websites of the respective parliaments: <http://transcript.duma.gov.ru/> and <https://portal.rada.gov.ua/meeting/stenogr>

As search term the names of the respective institutions were used (including different versions of the name² in all grammatical cases as well as abbreviations).

The final text corpus comprises the transcripts of 216 debates (sittings) in the lower house of the Russian parliament (“Duma”) and 550 debates (sittings) in the Ukrainian parliament (“Verkhovna Rada”).

Coding

The full transcripts of all relevant parliamentary debates have been imported into MAXQDA for coding. The references to IMF, World Bank, WHO and ILO were coded automatically using the respective function offered by MAXQDA.³

References to IMF, World Bank, WHO or ILO, which are not related to the national context, i.e. which refer to other countries without implying a direct comparison (as e.g. in debates about development aid), have not been included in the analysis. Technical announcements by the head of parliament (like “We will now vote on the ratification of the WHO convention”) have been excluded from the analysis. Also not included in the analyses are passages where a relevant international organisation is mentioned without any further elaboration (e.g. when discussing an unrelated issue the amount of funding is put into context with the explanation that “it is equal to all IMF funding we have received so far” or when a minister is excused for not attending a parliamentary sitting because he is “attending a meeting with the IMF”).

Everything else was coded manually. All references to IMF, World Bank, WHO and ILO (as coded automatically) were checked for the assignment of codes from three groups of codes: speaker, policy field and image of international organisation. Units of analysis are full speech segments, usually a full

¹ The full research work has been conducted within subproject B06 “External reform models and internal debates on the new conceptualization of social policy in the post-Soviet region” of the Collaborative Research Centre 1342 “Global Dynamics of Social Policy” (project no. 374666841), which is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation)

² This concerns the World Bank where the search terms were Mirovoi Bank, Vsemirny Bank and Mezhdunarodny Bank Rekonstruktsii i Razvitiya. It also concerns the International Labour Organisation with International Labour Conference and International Labour Office as additional search terms.

³ Work started with MAXQDA 2018 and then been moved to MAXQDA 2020. As a result, the original version of the final text corpus is available as MAXQDA 2020 file (.mx20). The file can be opened with a reader which is available online free of charge (<https://www.maxqda.com/products/maxqda-reader>). Moreover, the file has additionally been saved in a convertible format (.qdpX)

passage of a speech in parliament or all related answers of one person in a questions & answers session. As a result each code is only counted once for a full segment. In each speech segment the relevant codes were assigned to just one mentioning of each international organisation. If the organisation was mentioned again in the same segment, codes were only assigned if they were new, i.e. they had not been assigned to previous parts of the same segment. As a result the unit of analysis is not the name of the international organisations, but a full speech segment related to an international organisation.

Speaker

Speaker means the person in parliament making the statement which includes the coded reference to one of the four international organisations. Each speaker was coded based on membership of a parliamentary faction at the time of the respective statement. If membership was not indicated in the transcript, it was taken from the list of deputies of the respective parliamentary session. Factions of political parties with close links were covered by the same code.

For Russia the code “speaker” includes:

- Representative of state executive (member of the government, the presidential administration and state organs including the Central Bank)
- Party of Power (i.e. the party close to the President, for the time under study: Our House – Russia, Unity, People’s Deputy, Regions of Russia and United Russia respectively)
- Fatherland – All Russia (joined United Russia in 2002)
- Liberal parties (represented in parliament were Yabloko and the Union of Right Forces)
- Left-wing (Communist Party, other left-wing parties of the 1990s (People’s Power, Agricultural Party), (other) left-wing parties of the 2000s (Rodina, Just Russia))
- Right-wing (LDPR, other right-wing parties (only one speech))
- independent deputies (not belonging to any faction)
- Other (mainly representatives of regional parliaments and foreign states)

For Ukraine the code “speaker” includes:

- Representative of state executive (member of the government, the presidential administration and state organs including the Central Bank)
- Orange Camp (UDAR/Bloc Poroshenko/Narodny Front (i.e. the members of the government coalition under President Poroshenko), Batkivshchyna (Fatherland, the party of Yulia Tymoshenko), Nasha Ukraine (dissolved in 2012), Samopomich, People’s Will, Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (party of Serhii Kaplin), People’s Movement of Ukraine (Rukh), Civil Position (Party of Anatoliy Hrytsenko), Democratic Alliance)
- Right-wing (Svoboda / Radical Party (as right-wing populist parties)
- extreme right (UKROP)
- Blue Camp (Party of Regions / Opposition Bloc, Revival Party (joint list with Opposition Bloc in 2019 elections), Ukraine – Forward (joint list with Opposition Bloc in 2014 elections))
- Left-wing (Communist Party)
- Independent deputies
- Other (Lytyvyn Bloc (dissolved in 2012)

Exactly one code “speaker” is assigned to every coded reference to IMF, World Bank, WHO or ILO. If none of the distinctive codes fits, “other” is selected as code. If the number of codes for “other” exceeded 10, they are checked to decide whether a new code should be established.

Policy field

All policy fields which are mentioned in a direct connection to IMF, World Bank, WHO or ILO are coded. As a result for one individual reference to IMF, World Bank, WHO or ILO several policy fields can be coded (e.g. the statement: “IMF demands related to taxation and inflation will lead to high unemployment and poverty, making a meaningful social policy impossible” refers to five policy fields: tax policy+state budget, monetary policy, (un)employment/labour policy, poverty, social policy). At the same time, no policy field is coded if none is explicitly mentioned (as e.g. in the statement: The aim of the IMF is to promote neo-liberal policies globally without any concern for local problems.)

Coding started with a list of policy fields expected to be relevant and a comprehensive list of social policy fields, as they are of primary interest for the analysis. The list of policy fields was extended inductively during the coding process.

The full list includes 14 codes for policy field (including the code for “other”):

- Poverty
- health policy
- tobacco/alcohol/narcotics
- pensions
- (un)employment/labour policy
- Demography (and family/youth)
- education policy
- social policy (in general)
- tax policy+state budget (includes monetary policy)
- industrial policy/subsidies
- energy policy
- agricultural policy
- trade policy
- other

Image of international organisation

Here image refers to the framing approach, in the sense that the code “image” refers to the “frame” used in relation to the international organisation. Following Entman (1993, 52) “to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described. Typically frames diagnose, evaluate, and prescribe”.⁴

References to the role of the four international organisations in national politics, which are at the core of the analysis, have been grouped into three general frames deductively. Important elements of these frames relate to intentions of the international organisations and to the content of their advice (i.e. the design and potential impact of specific policy measures). An overview of core elements of the respective frames is given in table 1.

The standard positive frame is the one produced by the international organisations themselves, which sees them as offering sound advice promoting “best practices” and “good governance”. This credits

⁴ Robert M. Entman: Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm, Journal of Communication, Volume 43, Issue 4, December 1993, Pages 51–58, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>.

them with the potential to help countries back on a track of sustainable development. The international organisations get active when countries are in need of support, so that they assume the role of a “rescuer”. Respective codes are: “supporter/helper”, “source of good advice”

A common negative frame sees their policy advice as based on a wrong ideology or lack of country-specific knowledge, which often leads to counterproductive results and which is forced upon countries. This can be presented as global hegemony of neo-liberal ideas or as a form of “neo-colonialism”, as the leadership of those international organisations is dominated by “Western” countries. Respective codes are: “capitalist dominance”, “Western dominance”, “source of bad advice”

Assigning less power to international organisations, the pragmatic frame would argue that their financial support as well as policy advice might be helpful, but that, in the end, it is down to individual countries to make their choice. The frame could thus be termed “informed consent”. Respective codes are: “one advice among many” and for IMF and World Bank also “source of financial support”. These two sub-codes have been kept separately in the analysis, as they often refer to separate assessments.

Important elements of these frames relate to intentions of the international organisations and to the content of their advice (i.e. the design and potential impact of specific policy measures). An overview of core elements of the respective frames is given in table 1.

Table 1: Overview of elements related to “image” codes

	positive frame (“rescuer”)	pragmatic frame (“informed consent”)	negative frame (“neo-liberal global dominance” / “neo- colonialism”)
Moral evaluation	positive	neutral (pragmatic)	negative
problem	Financial and economic crisis	Financial and economic crisis	Financial and economic crisis
Cause	Inefficient policies	Sub-optimal policies or “bad luck”	unfair global economic order
Intention of international organisation	helper / promoter of “good governance”	no specific agenda / “who cares?”	domination
Content of advice	proven recipe	worth considering	wrong ideology
recommendation	to be accepted	to be considered	to be avoided
<i>Related codes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “supporter/helper” • “source of good advice” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “patronizer” • “source of financial support” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “capitalist dominance” • “neo-colonial dominance” • “source of bad advice”

Source: compiled by the author as part of the codebook creation

A minimalist approach to frames was used in the content analysis, which requires only a clear identification of a distinctive element in order to assign a frame, but not necessarily a broader description of different elements of that frame. It is then part of the analysis to examine how coherent and complete the presentation of the respective frames are in the actual political debates.

All references coded for speaker have also been coded for image of international organisation. If none of the distinctive codes fit, “other” was selected as code. If the number of codes for “other” exceeded ten, they were checked to decide whether a new code should be established.

A substantial number of references to the IMF, World Bank, WHO and ILO did not relate to the three deductive frames presented above. Based on the actual text corpora an inductive list of further codes was compiled. They can be ordered into three groups: (1) international organisations as source of information/standards, (2) administrative issues related to the international organisations, (3) demanding information in order to hold to account the international organisation or the national government for its relations with the international organisations.

(1) international organisations as source of information/standards

“source of data/forecast”

Most obviously, the four international organisations can be quoted as source of statistical data and forecasts. In this case the speaker does not assign agency to the international organisation. It is seen as a neutral and presumably competent source of information, like e.g. a national statistical office.

“source of knowledge”

In a few cases a similar approach has been used to knowledge (in the form of causal claims) established by the international organisations (e.g. a WHO study on the consequences of tobacco consumption or research by the World Bank about the impact of state subsidies on private investment). The code has been assigned when a speaker makes a respective reference, independently of external judgement about the validity of the respective claim or the correctness of its reproduction.

“source of standards/rules”

In a rather similar vein the international organisations can be seen as sources of standards and rules. A very prominent example for this is the WHO Convention on Tobacco Control. More specific rules including in bilateral agreements between the international organisation and the country under study (i.e. Russia or Ukraine) have also been included here. This code is compatible with all three of the above mentioned frames, but in the text corpora studied here it is often used without any specific framing attached or with the implicit frame of “established standards which should be followed”.

(2) administrative issues related to the international organisations

“role as member state”

One organisational aspect is the role of the country under study (i.e. Russia or Ukraine) as member state of the international organisation. This code does not refer to agreements with the international organisation or adherence to its standards and rules. This code focuses exclusively on administrative issues within the international organisation, like voting rights or membership dues and privileges.

“event organiser or participant”

This code is assigned if the international organisation is mentioned as organiser or participant in an open, i.e. public event. This code does not refer to consultations/meetings with national politicians.

As intercoder-reliability was very low for this group of codes has been excluded from the analysis. It had been coded 43 times.

(3) demanding information in order to hold to account

“asking for account”

This code is assigned when information is demanded in order to hold either the international organisation and/or the national government to account for relations with the international organisation. This

typically concerns either negotiations and agreements or financial payments made by the international organisations to the country under study (i.e. Russia or Ukraine).

Intercoder reliability

The intercoder reliability between all three coders in the team (Yana Lysenko, Veronika Lukyanenko and Heiko Pleines) was established on the basis of a randomly selected sample of 5% of all documents in the text corpus. It amounted to 85%, i.e. 15% of the codes were assigned differently by one of the coders. All disagreements between the coders concerned subcodes of “image of international organisation”. Nearly half of the disagreements concerned the subcode “role as member state”. In further cases of disagreements the different subcodes belonged to the same group (source of data/forecasts, knowledge, standard/rules). In reaction to these results the code “role as member state” has been excluded from the analysis. Moreover, the analysis has been restricted to the level of the frames and groups, using subcodes only for illustrative purposes. As a result, for the codes included in the quantitative analysis intercoder reliability stands at 94%.

Analysis

In total 7 922 of codes have been assigned in the text corpus. For an overview see table 2. The table has been generated by assigning all transcripts to their case (i.e. Russia 1998/98, Russia 2000-08, Ukraine 2010-14 and Ukraine 2014-19). Then all documents and all codes have been activated in the coding software MaxQDA and the list of codes has been created with the function “Analysis/Compare Groups/quantitative”. For individual codes the function “Analysis/Code Frequencies” has been used alternatively.

In order to establish how often a specific code is used in relation to one of the four international organisations, the function “Analysis/Complex Coding Query/Near (max. distance 0 paragraphs)” has been used. The respective international organisation was used as Code B and the relevant code(s) to be examined (e.g. all subcodes of “image of international organisation” related to one specific frame) were included as A Codes. The result is a list of all references to the IMF where at least one of the selected subcodes is also mentioned.

For more complex combinations (e.g. references by only one group of speakers to one of the international organisations with a specific frame) the function “Analysis/Code Configurations/Complex Code Configurations (unit: segments, differentiation: none)” has been used.

Table 2: Overview of all codes assigned in the text corpus (grouped by cases)

	RF1998-99	RF2000-08	UA2010-14	UA2014-19	total
	[RF+]	[RF-]	[UA-]	[UA+]	
International Organisation					
IMF	162	97	283	919	1461
WorldBank	44	38	61	180	323
WHO	6	47	6	56	115
ILO	32	125	86	34	277
image of international organisation					
positive frame	10	35	60	208	313
pragmatic frame 1: one advice among many	7	4	28	68	107
pragmatic frame 2: source of financial support	64	59	90	126	339
negative frame	69	37	122	410	638
source of info/standards	33	137	79	320	569
asking for account	60	10	33	54	157
other	10	4	1	33	48

policy field					
poverty	0	1	2	17	20
health policy	4	22	18	64	108
tobacco/alcohol/narcotics	1	29	1	9	40
(un)employment/labour policy	27	70	63	40	200
pensions	5	22	77	40	144
demography	2	4	2	3	11
education policy	0	3	2	3	8
social policy in general	8	9	36	53	106
tax policy+state budget	66	72	179	330	647
industrial policy/subsidies	4	5	6	44	59
energy policy	17	3	29	131	180
agricultural policy	0	0	11	16	27
trade policy	0	0	1	4	5
other	5	17	8	7	37
Speaker-RF					
representative of state executive	47	88	0	0	135
Party of Power	31	84	0	0	115
Fatherland - All Russia	0	8	0	0	8
liberal parties	11	9	0	0	20
left-wing	99	66	0	0	165
right-wing	15	14	0	0	29
independent deputy	15	11	0	0	26
other	5	4	0	0	9
Speaker-UA					
representative of state executive	0	0	72	106	178
OrangeCamp	0	0	146	394	540
right-wing	0	0	5	337	342
extreme right	0	0	0	1	1
BlueCamp	0	0	86	166	252
left-wing	0	0	88	5	93
independent deputy	0	0	3	44	47
other	0	0	9	14	23
total	859	1134	1693	4236	7922
N = Documents	80	136	178	372	766