

# Exzerpieren und Literature Review

---

Franz Eder

Institut für Politikwissenschaft | Universität Innsbruck

# Lernziele für diese Einheit

## Lernziele

- Markieren und Notieren
- creative (dis)agreement
- Exzerpt
- literature review
- Forschungslücke
- Forschungsstränge

# Notizen und Hervorhebungen

- Texte zu lesen heißt, sie zu “erarbeiten”
- Ziel: zentrale Inhalte und Erkenntnisse beschreiben und zusammenfassen zu können (Punch 2014, p. 96)
- Zwei-Farben-System:
  - Farbe 1: für zentrale Begriffe, Strukturelemente oder Kernaussagen
  - Farbe 2: Erläuterungen zu diesen Begriffen und Elementen
  - Notizen am Rand: zusätzliche Informationen zur besseren Strukturierung des Textes und/oder um eigene Gedanken festzuhalten
- Achtung:
  - sparsamer Umgang mit Hervorhebungen
  - Hervorhebungen hängen von Erkenntnisinteresse ab
- creative agreement bzw. disagreement (Turabian 2007, pp. 37-39; Booth, Colomb, und Williams 2008, pp. 88-91)
- permanente Aktualisierung des Storyboards

# Beispiel eines Exzperpts



## Contesting counter-terrorism: discourse networks and the politicisation of counter-terrorism in Austria

Franz Eder<sup>1</sup> · Chiara Libiseller<sup>2</sup> · Bernhard Schneider<sup>1</sup>

Published online: 19 February 2020  
© Springer Nature Limited 2020

### Abstract

Why do political actors prefer one counter-terrorism policy over another? We apply discourse network analysis and the advocacy coalition framework to the recent debate on counter-terrorism measures in Austria and argue that actors' positions are based not so much on objective security factors and international or structural causes but on domestic politics and three interdependent variables. Political actors choose specific counter-terrorism policies because of: (1) a sense of ownership; (2) ideology; and (3) anticipated political gains. We show how different actors in Austria exploit the counter-terrorism debate to shield themselves from being blamed for being passive, to promote their ideological views, and/or to gain politically.

**Keywords** Austria · Counter-terrorism · Data retention · Political networks · Politicisation · Security policy

### Introduction

Why do political actors choose certain counter-terrorism policies over others? Or, to put it in more specific terms, why do certain political actors endorse the curtailment of liberties of their fellow citizens in the fight against transnational terrorism whereas others oppose such policies? Research on these questions and the causes of counter-terrorism legislation can be divided into three schools. Realists regard these policies as either the result of external pressure on states by major powers or international organisations (Gregory 2005; Whitaker 2007), or as the consequence of sheer material facts. States face a certain level of threat and experience a number of terrorist attacks; at the same time, they have command over or seek to acquire certain capabilities to tackle these threats. Consequently, counter-terrorism policies are the

✉ Franz Eder  
franz.eder@uibk.ac.at

<sup>1</sup> Department of Political Science, University of Innsbruck, Universitätsstraße 15, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria

<sup>2</sup> Department of War Studies, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK

logical result of weighing externally induced risks against capabilities (Blomberg et al. 2011; Jost 2017).

A second school focuses on the rationality of decision-makers and the political consequences of implementing policies in the fight against transnational terrorism. Following this line of reasoning, representatives of the executive branch of government balance the political costs of certain policies before deciding which instrument to promote. In general, however, they profit from the expansion of executive powers and hence have an incentive to promote them (Owens and Pelizzo 2010).

A third and final school of thought argues that ideas, perceptions and narratives explain counter-terrorism policies. Such policies are either the result of the political left-right-positioning of their proponents (Rykkja et al. 2011) or the outcome of a discursive process (Jackson 2007b; Spencer 2012).

While all of these approaches have taught us much about the origins and evolution of counter-terrorism policies, only a few studies have explored the role of domestic politics in the construction of (counter)terrorism and the politicisation of this policy field (Tsoukala 2006; Huysmans and Buonfino 2008; Neal 2012). That is all the more surprising against the backdrop of the 'domestic turn' (Gourevitch 2002; Kaarbo 2015; Krebs 2018) in the overall International Relations (IR) literature and the research on the domestic-political explanation of foreign and security policy (Fearon 1998). In a first step, to fill this gap, we bring together the second and the third school and argue that counter-terrorism policies are the outcome of a discursive battle between various domestic political actors. Hence, counter-terrorism as a policy field is highly politicised and contested, and resembles any other 'normal' policy field in democratic societies.

For this exploratory study, we use the case of the Austrian debate on the implementation of several surveillance and other counter-terrorism measures as a vehicle to demonstrate that these policies are not so much induced by an 'objective' discussion over the usefulness and the need for these instruments, but more by ideological and political considerations. Following Sabatier's (1988) Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), and applying Leifeld's (2013) Discourse Network Analysis (DNA) approach, we argue that the discursive battle lines in this political game are drawn along the lines of government versus the opposition, the executive branch versus the legislative branch, the judiciary and civil society; and GAL (green/alternative/libertarian) versus TAN (traditional/authoritarian/nationalist) parties. Counter-terrorism legislation is not the outcome of a sober, objective analysis of externally induced threats and responses to them, but the product of three interdependent variables: (1) a sense of ownership by those officially responsible for fighting terrorism; (2) a GAL vs. TAN orientation; and (3) the anticipated political gains by party leaders of supporting or opposing certain legislation.

Overall, this article makes three contributions. First, it broadens the literature on the domestic causes of foreign and security policies with a case study on counter-terrorism. Second, it introduces novel insights into the construction and politicisation of counter-terrorism in democracies. And finally, it adds Austria as a yet unexplored case to the well-researched cases of other European countries to the overall counter-terrorism literature.

GAP  
POLITICISATION  
THESE  
CASE  
RESEARCH DESIGN  
RESULT  
CONTRIBUTIONS

RQ  
3 FORSCHUNGS-STRÜCKE

# Exzerpte

## ! Definition

Zusammenfassung eines Textes sowie die wörtliche Wiedergabe von Textstellen aus einem Werk ([Theisen 2005](#), p. 121).

## Vorteil von Exzerpten

- längerfristige Nutzbarkeit von Texten
- besseres Textverständnis ([Theisen 2005](#), p. 121; [Turabian 2007](#), pp. 37 & 43)

## Achtung!!!

- Exzerpte müssen so sauber wie möglich ausgearbeitet werden um:
  1. den maximalen Nutzen daraus für das spätere Weiterarbeiten zu generieren
  2. um zu verhindern, dass Plagiate daraus entstehen

# Struktur von Exzerpten

nach Turabian (2007, p. 40)

## Kopf

- bibliographische Angaben zur Weiterverwendung des exzerpierten Textes
- Aufnahme in Literaturdatenbank

## Zusammenfassung

- Problemstellung, Erkenntnisinteresse, These
- Forschungsdesign und Ergebnisse
- dient der besseren Vergleichbarkeit von Texten

## detaillierte Argumentation

- Argumentationsschritte
- Paraphrasen
- direkte Zitate (“strikingly original” (Booth, Colomb, und Williams 2008, p. 97))
- eigene Gedanken (farblich) abheben und damit kenntlich machen

# Beispiel eines Exzerpts

Eder, Franz, Chiara Libiseller, and Bernhard Schneider. 2021. "Contesting Counter-Terrorism: Discourse Networks and the Politicisation of Counter-Terrorism in Austria." *Journal of International Relations and Development* 24 (1, DOI [10.1057/s41268-020-00187-8](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-020-00187-8)): 171-95.

## Erkenntnisinteresse

"Why do political actors choose certain counter-terrorism policies over others? Or, to put it in more specific terms, why do certain political actors endorse the curtailing of liberties of their fellow citizens in the fight against transnational terrorism whereas others oppose such policies?" (171)

## Forschungslücke

3 Forschungsstränge:

- Realistische Schule: CT-Politik als das Ergebnis der Abwägung von Risiken und Fähigkeiten (171-172)
- Rational decision-makers: CT-Politik als das Ergebnis der Abwägung von politischen Kosten und Nutzen von Entscheidungsträgern (172)
- Ideen und Wahrnehmungen: CT-Politik als das Ergebnis von ideologischer links-rechts Positionierung und/oder diskursiven Prozessen (172)

Lücke: CT-Politik als Ergebnis innenpolitischer Dynamiken bzw. von Politisierungsprozessen noch kaum erforscht

## These

"counter-terrorism as a policy field is highly politicised and contested, and resembles any other 'normal' policy field in democratic societies." (172)

## Forschungsdesign und Case Study

Kombination von „Advocacy Coalition Framework“ nach Sabatier und „Discourse Network Analysis“ nach Leifeld am Beispiel der Überwachung in Österreich

## Ergebnisse

"Counter-terrorism legislation is not the outcome of a sober, objective analysis of externally induced threats and responses to them, but the product of three interdependent variables: (1) a sense of ownership by those officially responsible for fighting terrorism; (2) a GAL vs. TAN orientation; and (3) the anticipated political gains by party leaders of supporting or opposing certain legislation." (172)

## Einschränkungen

Auf Grundlage dieses Einzelfalls kann nicht generalisiert werden (173)

Hier könnte man ansetzen und eine vergleichende Studie mit einem ähnlichen Forschungsdesign machen → diese Forschungslücke wird auch in de Conclusio angesprochen (siehe S. 189).

Abbildung 2: Beispiel eines Exzerpts des Textes von Eder, Libiseller, und Schneider (2021)



# Literature Review

## ! Definition

“[A] literature review is a very specific piece of argumentative writing, based largely on critical review of relevant journal articles, that acts to create a ‘space’ for your research.” (O’Leary 2014, p. 98)

## Zweck nach O’Leary (2014, p. 99)

- Information für Leser:innen über Stand der Forschung
- Glaubwürdigkeit der Autor:innen etablieren
- Argument für Forschungslücke

## Was ein Literature Review NICHT ist! (Powner 2015, p. 99)

- Zusammenfassung jedes einzelnen Textes
- kein historischer Hintergrund
- nicht alles was man zum Thema gelesen hat

# Aufbau eines Literature Reviews

- Klassifizierung/Strukturierung der Forschungslandschaft
- Herausstreichen von “Forschungssträngen” und Entwicklungen
- zusammenfassen – organisieren – analysieren – zusammenführen (Punch 2014, p. 102)
- Baum vs. Wald
- empirische vs. theoretische/methodische Neuerungen
- Einbettung der eigenen Arbeit in die Forschungslandschaft

# Beispiel eines Literature Review

Eder (2023, pp. 517-519)

DNA originated in the late 2000s with the works of Schneider, Janning, Leifeld, and Malang, who investigated the role of political networks in public policy (Janning et al. 2009). The overall goal of this research programme was to evaluate the benefits of social network analysis for the study of political processes, especially in the realm of public policy, and to determine its applicability to this policy field. Philip Leifeld then advanced and formalized the approach in his PhD thesis on German pension politics (Leifeld 2016, 2013), laying the foundations for DNA's development into a promising tool for grasping the content and dynamics of policy debates.

Ever since, scholars have applied DNA in a variety of cases and have thereby contributed to a vivid research community and the emergence of four interdependent streams of research. Studies in the *first stream* apply DNA to cases from the field of public policy, and they further develop and refine the approach. The DNA provides the framework for analysing public policies in different geographical regions and diverse political systems, such as energy policies (Rinscheid 2015), software patents, and property rights in Europe (Leifeld and Haunss 2012), agricultural policies in Brazil (Ghinoi, Wesz Junior, and Piras 2018), or health policies in the UK (Buckton et al. 2019; Hilton et al. 2020). All these studies underline the usefulness of the approach for both displaying the content of a policy debate and visualizing the attempt of policy actors to influence the policy process in their favour by building coalitions of like-minded.

In contrast to these contributions, studies in the *second stream* seek to methodologically advance DNA. On the one hand, they move forward from sole description to inference (Leifeld 2018). The goal of these contributions is to identify “the generative mechanisms behind policy debates” (Leifeld 2020, 181), and to uncover the structural causes of continuity and change in such debates (see also van Meegdenburg in this volume). On the other hand, these studies move beyond the qualitative analysis of political claims and apply natural language processing, such as machine learning, for a supervised classification of statements (Haunss et al. 2020; Lapesa et al. 2020).

A steadily increasing number of studies in the *third stream* apply DNA to policies that are transnational in character. These studies bridge the divide between domestic public policies and the international arena. Most of these studies investigate the dynamics of political debates in the field of climate change and the regulation of carbon dioxide in the United States (Fisher, Leifeld, and Iwaki 2013; Fisher, Waggle, and Leifeld 2013; Kukkonen, Ylä-Anttila, and Broadbent 2017; Fisher and Leifeld 2019) or Italy (Ghinoi and Steiner 2020). Others investigate international financial politics (Haunss 2017) or migration (Wallaschek 2020). The contributions in this stream have demonstrated how to successfully integrate actors from different levels of analysis into a single and coherent framework for analysing political processes. Furthermore, they have underlined that policy debates are increasingly becoming transnational and pluricentric, with a variety of actors seeking to participate.

The *fourth and final stream* is the most recent one and seeks to apply DNA to the realm of foreign and security policy. Eder (2019) refers to DNA for analysing instances of group decision-making in the Bush cabinet in course of the run-up to the Iraq War of 2003. He applies the approach to public speeches and interviews of key decision-makers. Instead of indirectly inferring hasty concurrence-seeking from the presence of antecedent conditions or from final symptoms of groupthink, he is able to visualize non-public decision-making in group settings. Thereby, he unveils concurrence-seeking mechanisms and contributes to the methodological advancement of groupthink (see also Barr and Mintz in this volume). Troy (2019) also refers to DNA, displaying 80 years of papal human rights discourse against the backdrop of global developments. He determines the central figure in this discourse (i.e., Pope John Paul II) and characterizes Pope Francis I as a crucial transformer of the debate. The influence of different feminist perspectives on Canada's foreign policy is in the focus of interest in the study of Morton, Muchiri, and Swiss (2020). They seek to understand how and which feminist perspectives impact Canadian foreign policy and its implementation in various fields.

Finally, Eder, Libiseller, and Schneider (2021) discuss how domestic politics, especially government-opposition dynamics and the perception of political opportunities, determine a country's foreign and security policy in the case of counter-terrorism. Applying DNA, they conclude that this policy field “is highly politicised and contested and resembles any other ‘normal’ policy field in democratic societies” (Eder, Libiseller, and Schneider 2021, 172).

This last and most recent stream of research has demonstrated the potential of applying DNA to the study of foreign and security policy. On the following pages, I will outline the basic foundations of the approach and elaborate why scholars should consider this method more seriously when investigating the foreign policy decision-making of states. As I will demonstrate, DNA allows scholars to investigate the content and the dynamics of a debate, and display the actors and coalitions as the carriers of these political debates that either cause foreign policy to change or to remain in the status quo.



# Literatur

- Booth, C., Wayne, G. Colomb Gregory, und Joseph M. Williams. 2008. *The Craft of Research*. 3. Aufl. Chicago, IL; London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Eder, Franz. 2023. „Discourse Network Analysis“. In *Routledge Handbook of Foreign Policy Analysis Methods*, herausgegeben von Patrick A. Mello und Falk Ostermann, 516–35. London: Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003139850-39>.
- Eder, Franz, Chiara Libiseller, und Bernhard Schneider. 2021. „Contesting counter-terrorism: discourse networks and the politicisation of counter-terrorism in Austria“. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 24 (1, DOI [10.1057/s41268-020-00187-8](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-020-00187-8)): 171–95.
- O’Leary, Zina. 2014. *The Essential Guide to Doing Your Research Project*. 2. Aufl. London, et al.: Sage.
- Powner, Leanne C. 2015. *Empirical Research and Writing: A Political Science Student’s Practical Guide*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Punch, Keith F. 2014. *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Theisen, Manuel René. 2005. *Wissenschaftliches Arbeiten: Technik – Methodik – Form*. München: Franz Vahlen.
- Turabian, Kate L. 2007. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. 7. Aufl. Chicago, IL; London: The University of Chicago Press.