

Codebook: Credibility in Political Social Media Influencers' Content

Variables, Definitions, and Boundary Conditions

Contents

1	General Coding Instructions	2
2	Political Content	2
2.1	Variable: Political [1, 0]	2
2.2	Variable: Formal Politics [1, 0]	3
3	Partisanship	3
3.1	Variable: Pro-Trump / Republicans [1, 0]	3
3.2	Variable: Pro-Harris / Democrats [1, 0]	4
3.3	Variable: Anti-Trump / Republicans [1, 0]	4
3.4	Variable: Anti-Harris / Democrats [1, 0]	5
4	Topic	5
4.1	Variable: Topic [multi-label, up to 2]	5
5	Credibility Signaling	6
5.1	Variable: Expertise [1, 0]	7
5.2	Variable: Benevolence [1, 0]	8
5.3	Variable: Consistency [1, 0]	10
5.4	Variable: Ordinarity [1, 0]	12
5.5	Variable: Immediacy [1, 0]	13
	References	15

1 General Coding Instructions

This codebook defines the variables and decision rules used to classify political social media posts collected from X (formerly Twitter), Instagram, and TikTok during the U.S. 2024 presidential election period. Each post receives a value on every variable defined here. Coders should read the post text and view the post media (where available) before assigning codes, and apply the variables in the order they appear: political screening first, then partisanship, then topic, then the five credibility signals.

Three principles apply across all variables:

- **Code from the post itself, not from background knowledge about the account.** A coder may know that a particular account holder has a partisan affiliation, but the codes record only what the specific post conveys. If a post by a known Republican commentator contains no pro-Republican or anti-Democrat content, none of the partisanship codes apply.
- **The credibility signal must target the influencer.** For the five credibility variables, the signal must portray the influencer themselves as the credible party. A post that describes someone else as expert, benevolent, consistent, ordinary, or unfiltered does not earn a credibility code for the influencer. A retweet or quoted post counts only when the influencer's own added framing makes the signal apply to themselves.
- **The influencer is not always the speaker.** In reaction videos, embedded interviews, or live streams featuring guests, the transcript may belong to a different person. Ask whether the variable's requirement (e.g., *the influencer expressing care*, *the influencer staying consistent under pressure*) is fulfilled by the influencer's own actions or framing, not by what a guest says.

2 Political Content

2.1 Variable: Political [1, 0]

Question. Is this post political or not political?

Definition. Political content includes both *formal politics* – discussion of political institutions, actors, parties, elections, candidates, policies, and governmental processes (Graham et al.) – and *lifestyle-based politics*: lifestyle values presented as matters of collective/societal concern (social justice, health, equality, culture, ethics) to which individuals connect through personal experience and narrative (Bennett; Suuronen et al.).

Coding rule. Code 1 if the post engages with formal politics *or* with lifestyle-based politics. Code 0 otherwise.

Code 1 (Yes)	Code 0 (No)
Discusses an election, candidate, party, legislation, political institution, or governmental process.	Purely entertainment, lifestyle promotion, product marketing, or interpersonal content with no public-issue framing.
Advances a value-laden position on a collective concern (racial equality, immigration, public health, religious freedom) framed as a public issue, not a personal preference.	

2.2 Variable: Formal Politics [1, 0]

Question. Among posts coded `political = 1`, does the post discuss formal politics? **Formal politics** encompasses discussion of political institutions, actors, parties, elections, candidates, policies, or governmental processes (Graham et al.). Code 1 if any of these elements is present. **Lifestyle politics** is the residual: political content addressing values, social justice, environmentalism, health, equality, cultural issues, or ethics through personal experience or societal impact, with no mention of formal political elements (Bennett; Suuronen et al.). Code 0 if the post is political but contains none of the formal elements above.

Coding rule. Applies only when `political = 1`. Code 1 if the post mentions any formal political element (institution, actor, party, election, candidate, policy, or governmental process). Code 0 (lifestyle) if political but none of these are present. If `political = 0`, code 0.

Code 1 (Yes)	Code 0 (No)
Discusses any specific candidate, politician, party, election, vote, government agency, court ruling, or piece of legislation.	Addresses a value-laden public concern (gender, race, environment, faith, health, ethics) without naming any formal political element – code as lifestyle politics (0).

3 Partisanship

The four partisanship variables capture whether the post promotes or criticises each of the two major parties or their 2024 presidential candidates. They are *not* mutually exclusive: a post can be coded 1 on more than one variable simultaneously (e.g., a post that praises Harris while attacking Trump is coded 1 on both `pro_harris_democrats` and `anti_trump_republicans`).

3.1 Variable: Pro-Trump / Republicans [1, 0]

Question. Does the post promote or compliment the policies, character, or platform of Donald Trump or the Republican Party?
Coding rule. Code 1 if the post’s intent is to promote, endorse, or compliment Trump or the Republican Party. Code 0 otherwise.

Code 1 (Yes)	Code 0 (No)
Endorses Trump or a Republican candidate; explicitly calls on audience to vote for them.	Neutral mention of Trump or Republicans without praise.
Praises Republican policy positions, character, or accomplishments.	Shares a Trump clip without commentary signaling approval.
Shares pro-Trump content with added approval (e.g., “He’s right about this.”).	

3.2 Variable: Pro-Harris / Democrats [1, 0]

Question. Does the post promote or compliment the policies, character, or platform of Kamala Harris or the Democratic Party?

Coding rule. Code 1 if the post’s intent is to promote, endorse, or compliment Harris or the Democratic Party. Code 0 otherwise.

Code 1 (Yes)	Code 0 (No)
Endorses Harris or a Democratic candidate; calls on audience to vote for them.	Neutral mention of Harris or Democrats without praise.
Praises Democratic policy positions, character, or accomplishments.	Shares a Harris clip without commentary signaling approval.
Shares pro-Harris content with added approval.	

3.3 Variable: Anti-Trump / Republicans [1, 0]

Question. Does the post detract from or criticize the policies, character, or platform of Donald Trump or the Republican Party?

Coding rule. Code 1 if the post’s intent is to criticize, attack, or detract from Trump or the Republican Party. Code 0 otherwise.

Code 1 (Yes)	Code 0 (No)
Calls Trump or Republicans dishonest, dangerous, incompetent, or unfit; mocks their statements; criticizes their policies.	Neutral reporting of a Trump or Republican statement without critique.
Shares anti-Trump content with added agreement or amplification.	Mentions a policy disagreement without directing it at Trump or the Republican Party.

3.4 Variable: Anti-Harris / Democrats [1, 0]

Question. Does the post detract from or criticize the policies, character, or platform of Kamala Harris or the Democratic Party?

Coding rule. Code 1 if the post’s intent is to criticize, attack, or detract from Harris or the Democratic Party. Code 0 otherwise.

Code 1 (Yes)

Code 0 (No)

Calls Harris or Democrats dishonest, dangerous, incompetent, or unfit; mocks their statements; criticizes their policies.

Neutral reporting of a Harris or Democratic statement without critique.

Shares anti-Harris content with added agreement or amplification.

Mentions a policy disagreement without directing it at Harris or the Democratic Party.

4 Topic

4.1 Variable: Topic [multi-label, up to 2]

Question. What is the main topic (or two main topics) of the post?

Coding rule. Select up to two topic labels from the list below. Choose the topic(s) the post is *primarily* about, not topics that appear incidentally. If no label applies, leave the field empty.

israel – Israel/Palestine

Posts mainly discussing the Israel/Palestine conflict, including the war, the humanitarian crisis, related protests, or the geopolitical implications.

russia – Russia/Ukraine

Posts mainly discussing the Russia/Ukraine conflict, including the war, sanctions, NATO involvement, or the geopolitical implications.

intl – Other International

Posts discussing other international affairs, conflicts, or geopolitics not covered by Israel/Palestine or Russia/Ukraine.

envir – Environmental

Posts mainly focusing on environmental problems, including natural disasters and humanitarian crises caused by environmental issues.

gender – Gender / Women’s Rights

Posts mainly focusing on women’s rights or LGBTIQ+ rights. Includes abortion when discussed as a rights issue, but not when discussed primarily as healthcare (use **health**).

ident – Identity Issues

Posts mainly focusing on identity, including ethnicity, race, or cultural identity.

relig – Religion

Posts mainly discussing religious topics, beliefs, or practices.

health – Public Health

Posts mainly focusing on the state of the healthcare system, including staff shortages, deaths or complications due to abortion restrictions (medical framing), COVID-19, or healthcare access.

legis – Legislation

Posts mainly discussing a specific piece of legislation and expressing support or opposition as the primary topic.

rally – Rally / Political Event

Posts mainly discussing or taking place at a political rally or event for any candidate.

secur – Security

Posts mainly discussing security or security issues. Security can be linked to crime or immigration, but security must be the foregrounded topic.

immig – Immigration

Posts mainly discussing immigration, such as refugee flows, illegal immigration, or resource pressures from population change. If crime is the dominant frame, use **secur**.

media – Media Bias

Posts mainly discussing perceived media bias in any direction, mainstream or alternative.

pres – Presidential Candidate

Posts about the fitness, selection, competency, history, or character of a presidential candidate.

cand – Other Candidate

Posts about the fitness, selection, competency, or history of a down-ballot or state-specific candidate.

educ – Education

Posts about the education system, academia, schooling, or education of American youth.

vote – Voting Mobilization

Posts discussing voter engagement, voter registration, or get-out-the-vote programs.

econ – Economic

Posts mainly discussing the job market, employment, salaries, inflation, or other economic topics.

5 Credibility Signaling

The five credibility variables capture distinct dimensions of how political influencers establish themselves as credible sources. The first three draw on Source Credibility Theory: *expertise* (Hovland and Weiss), *benevolence* (Teven and McCroskey), and *consistency* (which extends the classical trustworthiness construct with the principled-persistence component of Perceived Political Authenticity (Luebke and Engelmann)). The remaining two – *ordinariness* and *immediacy* – come from the Perceived Political Authenticity framework (Luebke and Engelmann).

All five variables are binary and coded independently: a single post can earn one, several, or no credibility codes. Each variable is divided into **subdimensions**. Code the main variable 1 if *any* subdimension applies, and record which subdimension(s) triggered the code.

The three cross-cutting general coding instructions apply throughout: the signal must target the influencer, retweets count only when the influencer adds personal framing, and live or guest content is judged on the influencer’s own actions or appearance.

5.1 Variable: Expertise [1, 0]

Question. Would a viewer come away thinking that this account provides expert knowledge on the topic?

Definition. The influencer signals expertise through one or more of three mechanisms: claiming their own credentials, engaging an expert source directly, or citing named external evidence.

E1. Own credentials. The influencer claims their own degree, professional background, or relevant experience (e.g., academic position, professional licensure, documented field experience).

E2. Expert guest or primary source. The influencer has talked to, or is talking to, a named domain expert or primary source (scientist, academic, military official, specialist practitioner, journalist with documented beat), and deploys that person as a knowledge resource for the audience.

E3. Named external evidence. The influencer cites a specific named study, report, statistic, or expert not directly spoken to (e.g., “According to the WHO report from 2023...”, “A study by Smith et al. found...”). Generic attributions without a name do not qualify (e.g., “research shows...”, “studies suggest...”).

Code 1 (Yes)

[E1] Claims own degree, credential, or professional background.

[E2] Interviews or has spoken with a named domain expert or primary source, deployed as a knowledge resource. Even without explicit endorsement of their claims.

[E3] Names a specific study, report, or source as evidence (“Study X found...”, “According to the CDC...”).

Code 0 (No)

Pundit, partisan commentator, or politician giving a political opinion – not domain expertise.

Mentions or criticizes a credentialed person without deploying them as a knowledge source – expert appears as a news subject, not an information provider.

Expert appears in retweeted or quoted content without the influencer framing them as a source.

Generic phrases without attribution: “research shows”, “studies suggest”, “experts say”.

Examples.

Coded YES (1) – E1 – self-credential applied to analysis

Caption: “A lot of misinformation going around on the immigration numbers this week. Let me walk through what the research actually shows.”

Transcript: “I’ve been studying immigration policy at the University of Wisconsin for 17 years. The statistics circulating on social media strip away all context. When you look at longitudinal data – which my research team has tracked since 2006 – you get a much more nuanced picture than either side presents. Here’s what the peer-reviewed evidence actually says.”

Why YES (E1). The influencer claims their own credentials (17 years at a named institution; own research team) and applies them to analyse the topic.

Coded YES (1) – E2 – named expert deployed as knowledge resource

Caption: “I sat down with Dr. James Okafor – 12 years as an ER physician in Chicago. What he told me stayed with me all week.”

Transcript: “Dr. Okafor has seen firsthand what happens to gunshot victims when the ER is overwhelmed. He walked me through actual patient patterns – not statistics, but real cases.”

Why YES (E2). A named, credentialed practitioner is brought onto the influencer’s platform as a knowledge resource. The expert informs the audience; he is not discussed as a news subject.

Coded NO (0) – Pundit and politician are not domain experts

Caption: “Tucker Carlson is 100% right about this.”

Transcript: “Tucker laid it out perfectly... Rep. Jordan was also on saying the same thing. Sharing this clip because the press won’t cover it.”

Why NO. A partisan commentator and a politician are invoked. Neither is a domain expert. No E1, E2, or E3 signal is present.

Coded NO (0) – Generic attribution is not E3

Caption: “Studies show most Americans agree.”

Transcript: “Studies show over 60% of Americans share these values... ”

Why NO (not E3). No named study, report, or source is cited. “Studies show” is a generic phrase that does not identify any specific evidence.

5.2 Variable: Benevolence [1, 0]

Question. Does the post portray the influencer as someone who cares about the wellbeing of others?

Definition. The post signals that the influencer cares about others’ wellbeing. The bar is expressed concern or benevolent action, not proven outcome – sincerely signalling care is enough (Teven and McCroskey). The signal must reflect the influencer’s own benevolence, not someone else’s.

- B1. Care for a named group.** Expresses personal care for a specific, identifiable minority or demographic group (e.g., “I care deeply about LGBTQ youth”, “Undocumented families deserve better”).
- B2. Care for the audience.** Expresses personal care directed at the influencer’s own followers or community (e.g., “I’m doing this for you”, “I want the best for my community”).
- B3. Care for society at large.** Expresses personal care for a diffuse collective – the country, future generations, “everyone”, society broadly (e.g., “This is bad for all of us”, “I care about what happens to America”).
- B4. Own charitable act.** Reports a concrete personal act of care already performed or ongoing (donating, volunteering, fundraising, providing direct assistance).
- B5. Call for charity.** Calls on the audience to support a humanitarian cause, donate, or volunteer.

Code 1 (Yes)

Code 0 (No)

[B1] Expresses personal care for a named, identifiable group or demographic.

Retweet or share of someone else’s concern with no added personal expression from the influencer.

[B2] Expresses personal care for the influencer’s own audience or community.

Political advocacy or electoral support – supporting a candidate, calling to vote, or promoting party policies. Voter mobilization is not benevolence.

[B3] Expresses personal care for a diffuse collective (the country, future generations, society broadly).

Purely factual reporting of a tragedy without personal emotional investment.

[B4] Reports a concrete personal act of care (donating, volunteering, fundraising).

Criticizing someone else’s failure to help – the benevolence must be the influencer’s own.

[B5] Calls on audience to donate, volunteer, or support a humanitarian cause, framed through own concern.

Examples.

Coded YES (1) – B4 – own charitable act

Caption: “I donated to the relief fund. Link in bio.”

Transcript: “I know a lot of you are asking what you can do. I just made a donation to the Texas flood relief fund – it’s not much but it’s something. These families need help now.”

Why YES (B4). The influencer reports a concrete personal act of care (donating) and frames it through genuine concern for those affected.

Coded YES (1) – B1 – care for a named group

Transcript: “I saw someone share a story about a family losing their Medicaid coverage and I just had to say something. This is heartbreaking and I genuinely care about what happens to these families.”

Why YES (B1). The influencer expresses personal care for an identifiable group (families losing healthcare coverage). The concern is the influencer’s own, not simply a repost of someone else’s.

Coded NO (0) – Pure partisan attack without personal care

Caption: “Democrats are destroying this country. Period.”

Transcript: “Look at the policies they’ve pushed – open borders, skyrocketing inflation, attacks on our values. They don’t care about you or your family. Vote them out. Share this with everyone you know.”

Why NO. The post is partisan attack and electoral mobilization. “They don’t care about you” criticizes another party’s failure to help – the benevolence boundary rules require the signal to belong to the influencer, not be attributed by contrast to an opponent. The influencer expresses no personal concern for anyone’s wellbeing. None of B1–B5 is triggered.

Coded NO (0) – Sharing a clip without personal expression of care

Caption: “Tucker Carlson is 100% right about this.”

Transcript: “Sharing this clip because the press won’t cover it.”

Why NO. Instrumental amplification with no personal expression of concern for the wellbeing of others. No subdimension is triggered.

5.3 Variable: Consistency [1, 0]

Question. Does the post signal that the influencer demonstrates personal persistence against real opposition or cost?

Definition. The post signals that the influencer maintains their position despite facing or risking something. The signal can be prospective (acknowledging a risk they are currently taking), longitudinal (claiming long-standing stability), or retrospective (reporting costs already paid). Any one of these is sufficient.

C1. Prospective cost. States the current opinion while acknowledging future costs or risks of doing so – including explicit costs (“I know this will cost me sponsors”) and implied risk (“I’m not scared of saying the truth”, “I don’t care what happens to me for saying this”).

C2. Longitudinal stability. States that the opinion has been held consistently over time, especially before it was popular or safe (“I’ve been saying this since 2021”, “I said this before it was popular”).

C3. Retrospective cost. States that past costs or consequences have already been incurred for holding or sharing the opinion (“I’ve lost sponsors over this”, “I’ve been banned for saying this”, “This has cost me professionally”).

Code 1 (Yes)	Code 0 (No)
[C1] Acknowledges future costs or risks of the current statement – explicit (“this will cost me. . .”) or implied (“I’m not scared of saying the truth”).	Free-speech advocacy as a general political value, without foregrounding the influencer’s own personal persistence.
[C2] Claims the opinion has been held consistently over time, especially before it was popular or safe.	Religious or partisan loyalty (“I follow God’s principles”, “I always vote Republican”). Standing by an identity is not standing by a position under cost.
[C3] Reports that past costs or consequences have already been incurred for holding or sharing the opinion.	General strong opinions or anti-establishment sentiment without a personal persistence signal.

Examples.

Coded YES (1) – C1 – implied prospective cost

Caption: “I will always defend the right to speak freely, no matter what.”

Transcript: “Big Tech and the establishment want to silence voices they disagree with. I don’t care what it costs me – I’m not stopping.”

Why YES (C1). “No matter what” and “I don’t care what it costs me” signal readiness to pay a personal price. An explicit cost need not be named; implied prospective risk is sufficient for C1.

Coded YES (1) – C2 – longitudinal stability

Caption: “People are only talking about this now. I’ve been saying it for years.”

Transcript: “I said this in 2020, I said it in 2022, nobody wanted to hear it.”

Why YES (C2). The influencer explicitly claims the opinion predates its current acceptance. Holding a position consistently over time before it was popular is the core C2 signal.

Coded YES (1) – C3 – retrospective cost

Caption: “Lost many brand deals this month. Not changing what I say.”

Transcript: “Two platforms banned me this week because I refused to stop talking about this. That’s fine. I knew what I was getting into.”

Why YES (C3). Concrete past consequences are named (lost sponsorships). The influencer reports having already paid a professional cost for holding the position.

Coded NO (0) – Free speech as abstract value – no personal persistence

Caption: “Free speech is a constitutional right. Period.”

Transcript: “Everyone deserves to say what they think without being silenced. It’s what this country stands for. I believe in that completely.”

Why NO. Free speech is invoked as a general principle, not as something the influencer is personally defending at personal cost or against specific opposition directed at them. No prospective risk, longitudinal claim, or past cost is present. None of C1, C2, or C3 is triggered.

Coded NO (0) – Anti-establishment framing without personal stake

Caption: “The mainstream press buries this story.”

Transcript: “Meanwhile the mainstream media keeps burying the story. Sharing this clip because the press won’t cover it.”

Why NO. The post criticizes a media institution but signals no personal cost and no position held over time against opposition. None of C1, C2, or C3 is triggered.

5.4 Variable: Ordinariness [1, 0]

Question. Does the influencer come across as someone from ordinary life, not from an elite or professional class?

Definition. The influencer presents themselves as a regular, non-elite person – down-to-earth, relatable, like someone you would meet on the street (Luebke and Engelmann). The signal can be explicit (stating ordinary identity) or implicit (performing ordinary life through actions, tasks, or family and social context).

O1. Explicit identity claim. Explicitly states own ordinariness, working-class background, past struggles, poverty, or relatability (e.g., “I’m not a policy expert”, “I grew up poor”, “I’m just like you”, “I’m a regular person”). Includes naming a non-elite community as one’s own.

O2. Performance of everyday life. Mentions or visually shows relatable everyday tasks, routines, hobbies, or social context (e.g., picking kids up from school, cooking, sports, commuting, referencing friends or family in a domestic or peer-group context).

Code 1 (Yes)

[O1] Explicitly states own ordinariness, working-class background, past struggles, or membership in a non-elite community.

[O2] Mentions or shows relatable everyday tasks, routines, or social context (family, friends, domestic setting, hobbies, responsibilities).

[O2] Visual cues: filming in kitchen, living room, or car; casual clothing; domestic setting. Code 1 even if text alone does not signal it. *Note: visual signals are not available in text.*

Code 0 (No)

Criticizing elites or the establishment without positioning the influencer themselves as ordinary. Anti-elitism does not equal self-as-ordinary.

Informal language or slang alone (“lol”, “omg”) with no everyday-identity or everyday-life signal.

Describing another person – a politician or public figure – as ordinary or relatable. The signal must belong to the influencer.

Examples.

Coded YES (1) – O1 + O2 – explicit identity claim and morning routine

Caption: “Just got my kids off to school, sat down with my coffee, and read about these Medicaid cuts.”

Transcript: “I’m not a policy expert. I grew up in a family that relied on Medicaid and food assistance – I know exactly what cuts like this mean in real life, not in budget terms.”

Why YES (O1 + O2). A morning routine (school drop-off, coffee) triggers O2. An explicit non-expert disclaimer and working-class biography trigger O1. Both subdimensions are active.

Coded YES (1) – O2 – family context during everyday activity

Caption: “Making dinner with my mom and she asks me what I think about the new healthcare bill. . .”

Transcript: “We’re cooking and she tells me she’s been stressed about her prescription costs for months. I don’t have all the policy answers but this is exactly why these decisions matter – it hits families like ours directly.”

Why YES (O2). The influencer is placed in a domestic family setting (cooking dinner, a parent’s everyday worry) and speaks from that personal context. The reference to a family member’s concrete concern anchors the post in ordinary life rather than a professional or public role.

Coded NO (0) – Anti-elite rhetoric about others is not self-as-ordinary

Caption: “These DC elites have no idea what regular Americans deal with.”

Transcript: “Tucker laid it out perfectly – the political class is completely disconnected from working people. He’s a real guy who actually gets it.”

Why NO. Criticizes elites and praises another person’s ordinariness, but does not position the influencer themselves as a regular person. Neither O1 nor O2 is triggered.

Coded NO (0) – Casual tone alone is not ordinariness

Caption: “lol this is wild.”

Transcript: “. . . I stand on my faith and biblical principles. . . God bless.”

Why NO. Informal register is present but no everyday task, working-class identity, or social context is referenced. Slang alone does not trigger O1 or O2.

5.5 Variable: Immediacy [1, 0]

Question. Would a professional communications team have let this content through as-is? If no, code 1.

Definition. The post conveys unfiltered, direct access to the influencer’s own communication (Luebke and Engelmann) through visible emotional rawness or format rawness. Immediacy is about *how* the influencer communicates, not about *what* they communicate. Code 1 if any subdimension applies.

- I1. Emotional rawness.** The influencer is visibly or expressly emotional in a way a PR team would not have approved: crying, visibly upset, losing composure, voice breaking, screaming, or explicitly admitting to their own emotional state (“sorry, I didn’t mean to get emotional”, “I can’t hold it together right now”).
- I2. Explicit format rawness.** The influencer explicitly signals that the content is unfiltered or unmediated: broadcasting live, stating it is unscripted, or framing the post as something shared before editorial approval (“no script”, “my honest reaction”, “posting this before my team can stop me”).
- I3. Implicit format rawness.** The content carries technical or stylistic markers of unmediated, personal communication: shaky camera, background noise, typos, erratic punctuation, non-standard grammar, or rant-style stream-of-consciousness delivery without evident planning or polish.

Code 1 (Yes)

Code 0 (No)

[I1] Visibly or expressly emotional: crying, losing composure, voice breaking, screaming, apologizing for emotional state.

Topic is urgent, breaking, or emotional – topic alone is not immediacy.

[I2] Explicitly signals unfiltered content: live broadcast, stated unscripted, explicitly sharing before team sees it.

Performed or polished emotion – carefully worded emotional statement, scripted tearful appeal. If PR could approve it, code 0.

[I3] Implicit rawness: shaky camera, background noise, typos, erratic punctuation, rant-style delivery.

Post reports that someone else is going live or is upset. Signal must belong to the influencer.

Professional TV or studio interview, even on an emotional topic. Production context implies mediation.

Emotional or urgent language alone (“OMG you won’t believe this!”) without rawness in delivery or format.

Examples.

Coded YES (1) – I2 + I3 – explicit and implicit format rawness

Caption: “Literally in the parking lot right now. My manager told me not to post this. I don’t care.”

Transcript: “[background noise, shaky camera] I just saw what came out and I – I can’t not say something. . . [voice unsteady] This matters more than my brand deals.”

Why YES (I2 + I3). Explicit frame of posting against management’s instruction triggers I2. Background noise and shaky camera trigger I3. The unsteady voice is also consistent with I1, though the emotional exposure here is secondary to the format signals.

Coded YES (1) – I1 – emotional rawness

Caption: “I’m sorry, I keep getting emotional.”

Transcript: “[visibly crying, pauses] Sorry – I didn’t mean to – [wipes eyes]. . . [unscripted, loses composure mid-video]”

Why YES (I1). Crying, explicit apology for emotional state, and continued recording while losing composure – all markers of unfiltered emotional rawness.

Coded NO (0) – Urgent language on a polished clip

Caption: “BREAKING – you need to see this.”

Transcript: “Tucker laid it out perfectly... BREAKING: Senate advancing the bill.”

Why NO. Urgent language layered onto a polished TV clip. No I1, I2, or I3 signal is present: the delivery is mediated, the emotion is rhetorical, and the format is professional.

Coded NO (0) – Scripted appeal with casual interjection

Caption: “My values don’t change with the political winds... lol this is really getting wild.”

Transcript: “I stand on my faith and biblical principles... I want every single one of you to go vote Tuesday...”

Why NO. Composed and political throughout. The casual “lol” is insufficient for I3 – it is informal tone, not a marker of unmediated communication. No I1 or I2 signal is present.

References

- [Bennett] Bennett, W. L. The personalization of politics: Political identity, social media, and changing patterns of participation. 644(1):20–39.
- [Graham et al.] Graham, T., Jackson, D., and Wright, S. From everyday conversation to political action: Talking austerity in online “third spaces”. 30(6):648–665.
- [Hovland and Weiss] Hovland, C. I. and Weiss, W. The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. 15(4):635–650.
- [Luebke and Engelmann] Luebke, S. M. and Engelmann, I. Perceiving politicians as true to themselves: Development and validation of the perceived political authenticity scale. 18(5):e0285344. Publisher: Public Library of Science.
- [Suuronen et al.] Suuronen, A., Reinikainen, H., Borchers, N. S., and Strandberg, K. When social media influencers go political: An exploratory analysis on the emergence of political topics among finnish influencers. 29(3):301–317.
- [Teven and McCroskey] Teven, J. J. and McCroskey, J. C. The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. 46(1):1–9. Publisher: Routledge _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529709379069>.