Appendix

This appendix provides the interested reader with additional information about the coding instructions and intercoder reliability of the content analysis data used in this analysis.

Types of Casualties

Reference to Killed in Action (KIA), Wounded in Action (WIA), and Prisoners of War (POW) were considered throughout the entire article's text. In each instance, coding decisions followed the same process. First, coders determined the subject of reference for every news story. This is, coders determined whether the reference was made regarding to KIA, WIA or POW. Any given story could have made reference to only one of those categories or to the three of them. Second, how should the reference be classified? Both casualties and prisoners could be coded as American or Allied forces, Enemy forces, Civilians, or indeterminate. Third, what is the nature of the reference? Does it make a vague reference to casualties or prisoners (e.g. "the forces took prisoners" or "the battle resulted in many American deaths), does it make a numerical reference ("374 enemy soldiers were wounded in the attack"), does it refer to a group ("the 2nd division took heavy losses"), or does it refer to an individual ("the soldier was captured as he fled enemy forces")? In sum, there were four categories possible: vague, numerical, group or individual. Any given story could have contained information regarding several of these categories, thus they are not mutually exclusive. Finally, once the nature of the reference was coded, one final decision was made. Were the casualties anonymous or identifiable? In other words, could a reader of the article determine the name or identity of the prisoners or casualties in question? Because of the way textual coverage works, identifiable references were almost

always references to individuals. Below, there are four examples that should help the reader clarify the sort of stories we used for our analysis and the way coders classified the information provided by the stories.

> **POW/American or Allied Forces/Numerical/Anonymous** (2/13/1915) – "[…] the German official communication intimates that the appearance in this district of a strong German force was a surprise to the Russians and that the Germans captured 26,000 prisoners." This note helps illustrate the four steps taken to determine the coding of the casualties. For instance, this news story makes reference to prisoners of war (POW) not to either killed or wounded in action (KIA and WIA, respectively). Then, these prisoners were classified under the category "American or Allied Forces" given that the soldiers captured, according to the information provided, were Russians and this is a story from World War I. The reference made about these soldiers is "Numerical": twenty-six thousand combatants were captured. Finally, there was no information provided regarding the identity of these soldiers. Therefore, these POW were coded as "anonymous."

> **KIA and WIA/Enemy/Numerical/Anonymous** (9/21/1940) – "Six hundred Germans have been killed and 1,400 wounded by British aerial bombardments since the start of the war […]" This illustration offers insight to a coding case in which both KIA and WIA were reported, both of which were classified under the category "Enemy" given the reference to the Germans and the fact that this story comes from World War II. This story also has a precise numerical count of both

KIA and WIA, and thus was classified accordingly. Finally there was not enough information to determine the identity of the KIA or the WIA, leaving the coders in need to classify this as “Anonymous”.

KIA/Enemy/Individual/Anonymous (5/13/1952) – “North Korean Lieut. Gen. Nam II, head of the communist delegation, said Allied planes strafed a marked convoy at 11:30 A.M. yesterday north of Hangsu and *shot dead one working personnel of our delegation*.” In this other example from the Korean War, the term “communist” was used to determine that the KIA should be placed under the “Enemy” category. With regard to the decision to code this story as “individual” as opposed to “numerical” (after all one is a number), the rationale is straightforward. The coders had more information about that “one” person beyond the numerical component of the said information. Coders were able to know that the “individual” worked for the communist delegation under the supervision of Lieut. Gen. Nam II although her identity remained “anonymous”.

KIA/American or Allied Forces/Individual/Identifiable (10/4/1968) – “The Defense Department today listed the names of the following servicemen from the New York area as having been killed in Vietnam: Army. Alicea, Robert, Pfc, Brooklyn […]” Most of the stories where KIAs were identifiable were of this sort, namely lists of soldiers who were reported dead during the war.

Intercoder Reliability

A reliability test using 161 stories and conducted prior to the initial data collection effort confirmed that the five coders were applying the protocol with acceptable levels of agreement and chance-corrected intercoder reliability. After the initial data collection process, additional rounds of reliability testing were conducted on additional casualty variables using two coders on all 192 stories that had been coded as making individual or numerical mention of American dead, and on story type for all 608 stories that contained any mention of any casualty (see Table A1 for complete reliability test results for each variable used in the analysis).

For every content variable in the analysis, we calculated either the average and minimum levels of pairwise agreement or the average and minimum pairwise correlations across all combinations of our five coders using PRAM reliability testing software (Neuendorf 2002). For nominal and ordinal variables, the measures of minimum pairwise agreement were used to calculate Brennan and Prediger's kappa (1981), which subtracts a chance agreement term based on the number of coding categories in the content variable being tested. We also calculated Krippendorff's alpha (2004), which corrects for multiple sources of chance agreement within a covariance framework across multiple coders.[1] All content variables used in this analysis achieved acceptable levels of intercoder reliability, achieving at least a .70 level of reliability with either kappa or alpha, as appropriate.

To maximize the validity of the content analysis data, coders were assigned to every fifth story in sequence within each war to ensure that any remaining coding error would distribute randomly across sampled days and that any single day's coding was done by more than one person. As a result, war coverage in 144 of 154 sampled days was analyzed by all five coders (the remaining 10 days had fewer than five war stories to code). Coders were also assigned to

[1] To calculate Krippendorff's alpha, we used the "kalphav2_0.sps" SPSS macro developed by Andrew Hayes at Ohio State University.

begin their analysis in different wars and to proceed in chronological order so that any idiosyncratic errors would distribute evenly across wars. This additional validity check ensures that trends within and across wars are not merely artifacts of the coder assignment process.

Table A1: Intercoder Reliability Statistics for Content Variables Used in the Analysis

	Type (# of Categories)	Average Pairwise Agreement	Minimum Pairwise Agreement	Brennan and Prediger's kappa[a]	Krippen-dorff's alpha[b]
Moral Judgments					
Supports US Moral Stance	Nominal (2)	94.4%	92.5%	.850	.460
Criticizes US Moral Stance	Nominal (2)	91.6%	88.2%	.764	.292
Supports Enemy Moral Stance	Nominal (2)	99.1%	98.1%	.962	.122
Criticizes Enemy Moral Stance	Nominal (2)	90.1%	87.6%	.752	.291
Type of Story					
"Names of the Dead" List	Nominal (2)	92.7%	92.7%	.854	.724
News or Op-ed/Editorial/Letter	Nominal (2)	97.5%	97.5%	.950	.787
Mentions of Casualties					
American Prisoners	Nominal (2)	94.7%	91.8%	.836	.434
Enemy Prisoners	Nominal (2)	96.2%	94.3%	.886	.692
Civilian Refugees	Nominal (2)	99.1%	98.1%	.962	.122
American Wounded	Nominal (2)	93.1%	89.3%	.786	.599
Enemy Wounded	Nominal (2)	96.8%	95.0%	.900	.578
Civilian Wounded	Nominal (2)	96.7%	94.3%	.886	.630
American Dead	Nominal (2)	91.2%	86.8%	.736	.708
Enemy Dead	Nominal (2)	95.8%	93.2%	.864	.493
Civilian Dead	Nominal (2)	95.5%	92.5%	.850	.712
Individually Identifiable Dead					
American Dead	Nominal (2)	94.7%	89.9%	.798	.477
Enemy Dead	Nominal (2)	99.1%	98.8%	.976	.297
Civilian Dead	Nominal (2)	98.4%	96.2%	.924	.271

[a] Intercoder reliability calculated from minimum pairwise agreement

[b] Intercoder reliability measured as chance-corrected covariance

Note: Each cell reports results based on parallel coding of all 161 stories included in the reliability test. Reliability test results for the "Names of the Dead" variable come from a second reliability test between two coders that re-analyzed all 192 stories that had been coded as mentioning individual or numerical representations of American dead, while results for "News or Op-ed/Editorial/Letter" come from a third test between two coders of all 608 stories mentioning casualties of any type.