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Introduction

On the day after Christmas, 2004, the world witnessed a disaster in the Indian Ocean. An earthquake in the Bay of Bengal triggered tsunamis that flooded the coasts of India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand and killed hundreds of thousands and left millions homeless and destitute. The scale of these events in terms of casualties and damage is not unique: in the same area, the Bangladesh storm surge of 1970 killed more than 300,000 people. From a European viewpoint, what made the disaster so extraordinary this time was the number of European citizens that went missing in the affected areas.

Most European governments were slow to realize that this catastrophe far from home required a response other than just expressing sympathy, collecting money and sending relief. Their citizens were at the scene of the disaster, and both the European victims in Asia and their relatives at home expected their own governments to come to the rescue.

Thailand has for a long time been a popular tourist resort for Scandinavians, especially during Christmas. Approximately 30,000 Swedes and thousands of Norwegians and Finns were on holiday in the Phuket area in the last weeks of December. Soon after the waves had hit the beaches it became clear that a large number of Scandinavians on holiday in Thailand were believed to be missing. The Tsunami crisis was depicted as the worst peacetime disaster ever in all three countries. Apart from the stress this sheer number of missing persons caused in the Nordic countries, criticism rose about the slow and indecisive reaction of the Scandinavian governments. It took the three governments more than 24 hours to react to the crisis and several days to initiate any rescue attempts.

The three Scandinavian countries, Finland, Norway and Sweden are perceived of as close and similar societies, both to their citizens and to the world outside. Similar government structures and comparable political party systems shape political life and limit the direct political control over agencies that are relatively independent. The formal role of media, experts and political opposition as criticasters is modest but perceived of as free from political constraints. Yet, in spite of near-identical problems, constraints and reactions of those governments, only in Sweden did the role of the government become a drama in itself. Why is it that after crises some political leaders find themselves ensnared in a blame game at the highest political levels and on the front pages of all daily newspapers, whereas similar political behaviour in neighbouring countries is not seen as blameworthy or compromising at all?

Seemingly similar incidents in similar settings can trigger surprisingly different processes of politicization. Some are treated quasi-fatalistically as 'normal incidents' that are bound to occur in the public sphere, others spark a blaze of media attention and political upheaval.
This article presents a model of the selective politicization of policy failures and applies it to the political process during the Tsunami crisis in the Scandinavian countries. The following section outlines three core dimensions of crisis induced blame games. It also explains how we seek to analyse blame avoidance and blame management in the three Scandinavian countries. After analysing the patterns of blame games in each case, we will elaborate our model by distinguishing specific institutional and individual factors that may help to explain why the politicization processes took different turns in the cases. The paper thereby concludes with the formulation of hypotheses that specify the conditions under which a blame game can be shaped.

**The selective politicization of policy failures**

When things go wrong, policymakers attempt to use framing strategies to (re-)allocate blame. Three such strategies emerge from the literature on framing and accountability as particularly important: 1) depicting events as violations of core public values; 2) depicting events as operational incidents or as symptoms of endemic problems; 3) depicting the events as caused by a single actor or by 'many hands'. A conceptual framework outlines the different outcomes of political blaming by political elites when certain framing strategies are adopted (Brändström and Kuipers, 2003).

*Violation of crucial values*

Invoking values is the point of departure of the politicization process. The degree to which a series of events is framed as a violation of core public values determines to which extent these events become a matter of political and societal debate. After the occurrence of a failure, debates will focus on blameworthiness. Different interpretations, by different actors, of the incident will struggle for domination. Personal, political and organizational gains and losses are at stake in this process (Boin et al., 2004; Anheier, 1999; Kingdon, 1995: 90-109; ’t Hart, 1993; Edelman, 1964; 1977; 1988; 1995). The negativity bias in electoral behaviour instructs politicians to duck accountability whenever possible. In addition, politicized failures are a powerful weapon in the hands of political opponents, a situation which most political actors wish to avoid at all times as well (Brändström and Kuipers, 2003).

In this phase of politicization, political actors whose institutional position leads them to fear the blame-game primarily try to stay out of it. This may not apply to oppositional MP:s. Following McGraw (1991) we wish to distinguish between blame avoidance and blame management. Blame avoidance means that actors wish to frame incidents as either not blameworthy or not political. Participation in the framing process and the political debate will increase if issues can be linked to substantive values that touch on sweeping social and political themes such as justice, democracy, liberty (Nelkin, 1975) or national security...
(Edelman, 1977; Bostdorff, 1994; Buzan et al., 1998). ‘Issue salience’ is the key to capturing political and public attention (Rochefort and Cobb, 1994). Timing and substance are also important reasons why attention focuses on certain issues. As Kingdon noted, momentum is essential: when an issue fails to catch on, ‘participants quickly cease to invest in it’ (1995:104). When an issue does catch on and it becomes politicized, the blame game starts and actors engage in blame management rather than avoidance. McGraw (1991) pointed out that it is not always possible to avoid a blame generating situation and that actors turn to ‘after the fact damage control strategies’ (1991: 1135). Instead of framing the situation as not blameworthy, actors start to invest in framing themselves as not to blame for it.

Constructing Agency: Extending and up-scaling

Once a crisis has been discovered politically, questions about responsibility and blame are put squarely on the table. Actors can depict the crisis as a stand-alone, ad hoc disturbance in an otherwise well-functioning system, or as an embedded incident, epitomizing a much larger systemic failure. The dominant diagnosis of events depends very much on the temporal perspective adopted by participants framing the anatomy of the crisis. If the immediate causes of a crisis – such as ‘ignoring orders’ to explain a plane crash – are emphasized, responsibility is likely to be found at the technical, operational, subordinate level. If, on the contrary, the incident is placed in a broader time perspective, actors are more likely to focus on powerful underlying causes – such as routines, cultures and ethics policies of the organization at hand.

Extending the scope and time frame of the crisis is not without consequences for the accountability of actors involved. As Bovens and ‘t Hart (1996) concluded in their study on evaluation politics: going back in time often means going up the hierarchy, from street-level implementing actors to top-level strategic policy makers and senior analysts. Top-level policymakers facing a crisis are therefore keen to narrowly define the scope of investigation and debate to the incident, while their critics will want to broaden the time horizon and deepen the scope of any post-mortems. The latter will receive support from operators and middle managers when the grassroots feel that their superiors are trying to frame them as scapegoats by deliberately restricting the investigation (Brändström and Kuipers, 2003).

Constructing responsibility: Blame dispersion or concentration?

Even if it is agreed that the unwanted events were not just operational incidents, but shaped by earlier decisions of top-level officials or symptomatic of the organizational culture, the question still remains who precisely should be punished. Defenders are inclined to argue that the incident is the result of a network failure. Their explanation of events invokes complex causal chains involving the interplay of actors, decisions and structures. Responsibility for
failure is attributed to the proverbial ‘many hands’: blame dispersed means sanctions avoided (Thompson, 1980). The network argument will come natural when the scope of failure is already extended beyond the operational level. If the origins of the problem are seen as complex, the concentration of blame - by firing a minister or agency head - loses some of its intuitive appeal. By contrast, a narrow definition of the incidents will facilitate scapegoat solutions (Ellis, 1994; Jones, 2000). When politicians succeed in limiting the definition of a critical event in terms of only a limited number of causal factors, they signal that they are ready to take steps, to act and implement measures to deal with the problem (Rochefort and Cobb, 1994). Having a scapegoat at hand can be so convenient that it can become an important consideration in the design of entire governance institutions (Hood, 2002).

The Crisis Politicisation Tree

The three dimensions discussed above are related to one another as sequences in a politicization process. The figure below depicts them as a decision tree, presenting for each dimension two alternative options that influence the final outcome of the blaming process. When the problem occurs, the severity of the incident needs to be assessed first: if it is not perceived as a violation of crucial values by a critical number of stakeholders, the politicization process ends there. If crucial values are at stake, the two other dimensions come into play. The event can be framed as either isolated or structural, depending on the space of time that becomes the dominant reference frame in the debates. Subsequently, both stand alone incidents and systemic failures can be attributed to either complex networks or single actors. The locus of blame of these alternate strategies is A) the scapegoat, an isolated single actor failure; B) the organizational or operational mishap, an incident produced by ‘many hands’; C) the policy maker(s), responsible for shaping flawed policies and/or tolerating deficient implementation strategies and organizational malpractices; and D) the endemic system failure, a structural problem indicating many actors.

Figure 1. Constructing blame by framing political crises
From: Brändström and Kuipers, 2003: 302
As the problem occurs political actors may succeed to frame incidents as non-political, or not blameworthy and blame is avoided. If they do not succeed, and crucial values are invoked that are framed as violated by responsible actors, the politicization process begins. Now political actors concentrate on blame management strategies. They can do so by constantly shifting the blame from the political level (high in the hierarchy) to the operational level (low in the hierarchy). Also they can stretch the scope of issue framing horizontally, from concentrated blame to dispersion over many hands. Their political opponents will tend to do the opposite. Actors at the operational level who find themselves scapegoated by skillful blame managers will feed the opponents with the necessary evidence to shift the frames from the low level and dispersion to high concentration of blame at the top level. News media play an important role in the blame game, in offering a public stage for framing tactics and by reporting and commenting on the events and actions.

**An Asian Disaster Making Waves in Scandinavia**

This study aims not only to see whether the model above can be employed to probe into the politicization of government failure in the Scandinavian cases, it also compares those cases to explore which factors influenced the different outcomes of the blaming process. We attempt to find out whether the framing strategies of blame avoidance and blame management described in the previous section occur similarly in similar cases. What factors—individual, institutional, cultural, situational—may help explain why certain patterns of blame avoidance/management occurred in one case and not in the other, given the similarities of the incidents and of the political systems in which these incidents occurred? For example, the institutional advantages some actors enjoy when it comes to dispersing and withholding information are likely to affect the course and outcome of blame games: access to mass media,
institutional legitimacy, personal attributes, etc. Comparative research will reveal under which conditions certain framing strategies are likely to occur and can help to explain outcomes of political blaming in relation to the political-institutional setting in which it takes place.

[in addition, a content analysis on national newspaper articles will be conducted to reveal if and at what points in time the daily newspapers started to judge negatively on government behaviour; to reallocate responsibility; to attribute blame to specific actors; and to publish on blaming strategies by those actors. This analysis includes a survey of articles that were published on the Tsunami disaster in two daily newspapers for each case in the first month following the event. The survey employs a codebook to score each article. The code book and codebook instructions can be found in the appendix to this paper. The content analysis is yet not completed and results are therefore not included in this version of the article.]

**Context**

At 01.58 am on Sunday, December 26th an earthquake that measured 9.0 at the Richter scale caused two Tsunami waves. Between 03.00 and 04.00 the waves ravaged the sunny tourist resorts of Southeast Asia. In the table below the key features of the cases are presented. (FM= Foreign Ministry, MFA = Minister of Foreign Affairs, PM= Prime Minister)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities and differences in response</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N people potentially affected</td>
<td>2 500 in southern Thailand</td>
<td>3 000 in Thailand or other parts of Asia</td>
<td>10 000 - 15 000 in Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N people initially missing</td>
<td>200-300</td>
<td>700-800</td>
<td>More than 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First government reaction</td>
<td>The President was critiqued for not expressing condolences until days after the disaster. A press conference was held the 27th. The PM held his first press conference on the 28th.</td>
<td>PM arrived in Oslo after two days. PM and MFA had no contact until Monday. First press release from the MFA on the 26th. First press conference by the MFA the 27th. First press conference by the PM on the 30th.</td>
<td>PM arrived in Stockholm next day. MFA arrived at the office 31.5 hrs after the floods. She went to a theatre Sunday night 26th. First press conference with PM and MFA on Monday, 27th.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Operation of information channels        | The hotline established at the FM after 9/11 jammed quickly on Sunday 26. Less than 10% of | Emergency team established at MFA operating 6 different telephone numbers on Sunday. | FM encouraged relatives to call switchboard at the FM which jammed immediately. On January 10,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible actors</td>
<td>An ad hoc emergency team was created, MFA became responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency telephone number</td>
<td>Emergency telephone number was activated 2 days later. No one knew how to operate it. Only 50% of the incoming phone calls were answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PM appointed a new committee</td>
<td>The PM appointed a new committee to be the contact point for victims and relatives. A call center was engaged to take all phone calls from victims and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling the lists of missing persons</td>
<td>Decision by the FM not to publish the list. National Criminal Police took over, lists were published and the number of missing reduced.Officials spoke of 250 Finns missing, the police updated the list to 260 missing. On January 1 the list dropped to 193.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA led the operative crisis management</td>
<td>At the MFA a crisis staff was established the 26th to get an overview of the catastrophe. MFA led the operative crisis management. PM led the press conferences. A coordination group was established in the Cabinet office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis management preparedness and training</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior had an operational and prepared crisis management response system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The govt. cancelled regular crisis management exercises</td>
<td>A two year old crisis management coordination plan had still not been implemented. It was perceived as slow, bureaucratic and rigid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization of evacuation and assistance</td>
<td>The first airplane that arrived in Phuket carried insurance staff, which was criticized. Finnair was sent to Thailand to evacuate Finns on Monday 27th. On January 2nd, last Finns were evacuated. The Finnish Rescue Team was not authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by rescue services</td>
<td>On the 29th Scandinavian airlines planes were made ready to repatriate Scandinavians. A team of seven rescue workers went to Aceh province on new years eve under UN flag. A military planes with doctors and nurses took</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Red Cross representatives argued their aid was sufficient[^26].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits to affected area</th>
<th>On January 16, the PM’s of the Scandinavian countries visited Thailand together to express their sympathy.</th>
<th>The health directorate sent doctors and teams of psychologists.</th>
<th>week and criticized for arriving too late. Identification teams were sent with cooling equipment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Inquiries and commissions | High profile commission assigned by the govt. of ex-top politicians installed on Jan. 13 to investigate govt. response, date of conclusion not decided[^31]. Also, an internal investigation started Jan. 10 within FM, which was presented Jan. 27[^32]. | Parliament and government agreed Jan. 13th on an investigation committee to evaluate responsible agencies[^33]. Commission members were experts from public and private sector. Report due by April 20[^34]. An internal investigation of the MFA was also initiated. | On January 13 a commission was assigned by the PM after parliamentary approval to investigate the govt. response. The Commission members were mainly high level experts. Their report is due December 2005. |

The cases introduced in the table above will now be compared with respect to the different blame games that evolved in the weeks following the disaster. We use the dimensions of ‘the politicization tree’ to analyze how the politicization processes ensued, and which blame avoidance and blame management strategies were used by the actors involved.

**1) Violating core values: blameworthy or not?**

“Norway is the best country to live in. But not the best country to belong to when a disaster hits you on vacation.” Thus wrote a journalist on the Norwegian government’s reaction to the Tsunami disaster[^35]. Norway’s neighbours thought likewise of their own country in the weeks after Christmas 2004. The Swedish King concluded in an unprecedented and constitutionally controversial interview when asked if the government had done its job: ‘I have a feeling that we have been very busy, but at the same time it is hard to see that we have done anything’[^36]. The important question here is whether these government responses were considered blameworthy or not, had core values been violated? Initially both Sweden and Norway framed the Tsunami disaster as a total surprise, and as ‘too big to handle’. Their ministers of Foreign Affairs asserted that they were ‘simply unprepared with the scope of the dis-
However, decisive action by other European countries soon rendered these arguments unacceptable at press conferences. For instance, Italy had confiscated all Italian flights bound for Thailand the first day after the disaster to fly down and bring Italians home, and Finland had quickly sent national airline Finnair to evacuate Finns out of Phuket. However, the Finnish politicians, on their part, were like the Norwegian and Swedish governments blamed for their slow and inadequate handling of information and indecisive government reaction. Finnish parliamentary investigators soon ascribed the evacuation by Finnair to decisions by travel insurance companies rather than to government heroism. Many believed the national rescue teams of each of the three countries could have been sent to the affected areas much quicker and by not doing so they failed a core task to protect their citizens.

Clearly, all three Nordic governments initially did not consider themselves the sole or even the central actor responsible for their citizens abroad in case of such a disaster overseas. The Cabinet offices and the Ministries of Foreign Affairs in each case claimed to have been taken by surprise by the magnitude of the catastrophe and the effect it had on their own population so far from the disaster scene. The political leaders initially considered the tsunami a freak event that could not be foreseen. The first response was to plan for humanitarian aid. Meanwhile, citizens from Finland, Norway and Sweden witnessed gradually more alarming media reports on television of the devastating situation in the coastal areas. Thailand had since long been popular among Scandinavian citizens on holiday and critics argued that the governments should have been aware of this. In a speech the Swedish Minister of Foreign Affairs admitted the government should be able to protect its citizens abroad. In all three countries, the Prime Ministers assigned the responsibility for coping with the crisis to the Foreign Ministries. Even though the disaster was no one’s fault, the perceived slow response by officials in the three countries was seen as blameworthy. Compared to other countries like Germany and Italy it was increasingly seen as a failure and a violation of a core value: the responsibility of the state to keep its citizens safe.

2) Constructing agency: operational or political actors?
In all three cases everyone’s eyes were fixed at the operational level at first instance, and they were intended to be. The Swedish PM argued that his own actions had been delayed due to a lack of information, incoming fax messages had not been sent up the hierarchy: [...] ‘I think all people understand that the Minister of Foreign Affairs can not be expected to be standing by the fax machine to monitor incoming fax messages’. This and other stray information presumably kept the Swedish government from taking action until 36 hours into the crisis. The other two Nordic governments had also failed to react during the first day, and they too
attributed the cause of the delay to similar technical problems. In addition, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs shifted blame to the travel agencies by stating that they had said they would manage to evacuate the guests themselves and did not need government aid41.

The core assertion of this dimension is that framing a failure in narrow technical/operational terms decreases the likelihood of further politicization because solutions are easy to find. If the problem becomes perceived in wider systemic terms, blame games are more likely to escalate as solutions become harder to agree upon. In the three Scandinavian countries the initial criticism by media, public and experts focused on the technical problems with the overloaded telephone lines at the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, and on the slow dissemination of information to and within the Cabinets. In Sweden and Finland especially, the ad hoc emergency phone lines had jammed within hours and only a few percent of the callers got through. The prepared ‘crisis hot lines’ in both Finland and Norway proved dysfunctional and improvisation took hours.

This was not the only operational failure at hand. The lists of victims became a tense symbolical issue in all three countries. The value of potentially minimizing the number of missing by publishing their names was sacrificed to protect the privacy and integrity of the victims and their families. When, at one point, the three governments chose different approaches to this dilemma, their actions were compared, which triggered further scrutiny by media. The Swedish and Norwegian police blamed their Foreign Ministries for their inability to handle the lists of missing and the delay to release the names, as done in other countries, was called a failure42. The Rescue Services in all three countries raised similar critique on the slow organization of evacuation flights and on the governments’ failure to timely respond to offers of assistance presented by government agencies43.

In each case, the Foreign Minister defended the organizational shortcomings but admitted that their response had been too slow. Internal investigations were promised, to evaluate their Ministries’ crisis management capacities44. Framing the problem as mainly a lack of resources allowed for the politicians to assume responsibility and offer solutions to the problem, in the form of organizational improvements. In Finland and Norway, this strategy helped to center most public discussions around issues such as the lack of information, technical malfunctions, and slow reactions by civil servants and agencies.

In Sweden the blame game escalated in media and in press conferences as the top political leadership could not reject the criticism. Prime Minister Persson in a number of press conferences unsuccessfully continued to focus on lower level activities arguing that he had trusted the ministry to do their job: “I contacted my state secretary, and asked him to inform me about the situation. He contacted the Foreign Ministry, which replied that the situation was being monitored and was under control”45. Persson’s attempt to blame individuals at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for failing to do their job backfired and left him
open to even more intense scrutiny of his and his governments actions dating back a long time before the tsunami. In response to Persson's accusations, the civil service had started leaking compromising information pointing at a more structural undervaluation of crisis management preparedness and systemic neglect of evaluations of earlier crises. The new information fuelled the Swedish debate and this event became symptomatic of an endemic vulnerability: institutional unpreparedness and organizational incapacity to handle crises. The outcome falls in line with the predicted blaming behavior presented earlier: the operational level may not always appreciate to receive the blame and thus react by broadening the time frame to include the responsibility of their superiors. By contrast, Norwegian political actors had not denied their part in the slow reactions, but shared it with the lower levels in the government hierarchy. Although it became clear that the Norwegian government had failed to implement a two year old plan to enhance crisis management capacity, this did not fuel their blame game. The political leaders in Norway managed to focus on the incident.

In framing agency all three cases revealed an attempt by the political leadership to focus opponents, media and public attention on technical, situational malfunctions and problematic organizations. The top political leadership managed to disperse/shift blame to a varying degree, with the least successful result in Sweden.

3) Constructing responsibility: Actor or network?

'Under conditions such as these, government action alone is never enough' Finnish Prime Minister Matti Vanhanen stated in his New Year message47. Political leaders of all three Scandinavian countries sent the same message to public and media: this was not just our responsibility. On the third dimension of the crisis politicisation tree, blame is either assigned to one specific actor, or dispersed across a complex network of actors. In case of the first framing strategy, we are more likely to see individuals and/or organizations being sacrificed as 'scapegoats', whereas in the second case consequences implicate a larger system.

The criticism of the governments for the perceived slow response was handled differently in the three cases. In Finland the government was quick to admit their shortcomings and accept responsibility for what had gone wrong on the operational level, once the initial blame management strategy (deny blameworthiness of government actions) had failed. Vanhanen signaled the importance of this by assigning a high level investigation committee. The attempts to hold him or the Minister of Foreign Affairs accountable did not have much effect as the dominant perception of events soon included the many hands in the government that had taken part in rescue operations and information processing. Swedish media commented that the Finnish Prime Minister did not act as a symbolic leader to 'comfort' the population, in the same way as the Swedish Prime Minister and this was according to journalists not expected by the Finnish public. By publishing all information available (i.e. the
lists) the need for symbolic leadership was less. The political opposition did not, as opposed to Swedish counterparts, criticize the government, for which the Prime Minister expressed his gratitude in a hearing on February 2nd. His predecessor, Ahtisaari, the chair of the Finnish Investigation Committee, stated in a press conference on January 11 that it was not their aim to assign blame. Instead, the committee's job was to analyze the events in order to improve future operations. In a parliamentary hearing the Prime Minister admitted information had been slow because many were away on holiday but that the organization at large had functioned. As a consequence, no specific actor could be blamed. In addition to blaming many hands ha also shifted blame by attributing responsibility to various government agencies for lack of information, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for insufficient emergency hotlines and staff capacity, the EU for lack of cooperation between EU-countries, and media for not correctly reporting about the crisis.

The Norwegian government also chose to accepted blame when initial attempts to avoid it had failed. The Minister of Foreign Affairs at first defended his ministry declaring, “everything worked automatically”. Top civil servants at the Foreign Ministry attempted to shift responsibility to the travel agencies for misjudging their own capacity to evacuate victims during the first week. The director of the travel industry admitted in an interview that it had taken too long to establish communication with authorities and that “our emergency plan failed”. During a web chat with the public on January 3, the Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs commented on his ministry’s belated response, “The responsibility is mine”. Likewise the Norwegian Prime Minister admitted in an interview that the government reaction was too slow and that more people should have been sent to the disaster area initially. He added “We need a more modern Ministry of Foreign Affairs for sure, but I don’t want to talk more about this since I don’t want to interfere in the Minister of Foreign Affairs area”. The opposition welcomed the government’s acknowledgements of their role in the failure and as in Finland the debate ended there.

If the blame games in Finland and Norway developed similarly, especially with regards to the role of the opposition as de-politicizing the events, the scenario was different in Sweden. Initially the government denied that it had reacted too slowly. When it finally admitted so after the first week, both Prime Minister Persson and Foreign Minister, Laila Freivalds, emphasized that the slow response was not due to blameworthy actions by anyone. Meanwhile they pointed at mistakes made by lower level civil servants to process the incoming information. The dispute did not end here, as in Finland and Norway but instead the blame game intensified. “I think it’s a sign of weak leadership if political leaders don’t take responsibility in this situation,” the Centre Party leader said, deriding the Prime Minister’s attempts to scapegoat civil servants. In a joint article in a daily newspaper, the Swedish opposition parties blamed Prime Minister Persson for being both weak and power blinded.
A Norwegian opposition party leader criticized the Swedish move as ‘party politics’ and as political abuse of a tragedy\textsuperscript{62}. The Prime Minister did not comment.

Moreover, stories about the Prime Minister’s lack of concern for government crisis management capacities started to leak out of the Ministries. Besides enlarging the scope and time frame of failure, this information even more shifted attention away from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to the Prime Minister. Political opponents joined in the accusations of cancelled crisis management exercises for the civil service under the incumbent Prime Minister. He was held personally accountable that recommendations of previous investigations and evaluations had not been implemented\textsuperscript{63}.

In response to the opposition’s critique, the Social Democratic party secretary charged the Swedish King of violating his constitutional rights when he went on air passing judgment on the government\textsuperscript{64}. Journalists critically assessed that the Prime Minister had sent forth the party secretary as a “kamikaze pilot” to attack the King\textsuperscript{65}. The King was widely appreciated for his touching speech during a memorial ceremony\textsuperscript{66}. Following this manoeuvre the Prime Minister criticized the Thai government for failing to issue a warning they received two hours before the Tsunami. The opposition called it yet another badly chosen attempt to pass the buck, ‘[…] Göran Persson seems to be very eager to disperse blame and avoid responsibility’ an opposition leader said in an interview\textsuperscript{67}. The more the Prime Minister defended and explained the late response by pointing at others, the more his opponents and media focused on his personal actions when the Tsunami hit.

**Conclusions:**

In all three cases, core values clearly were at stake and defined as such by media, public and experts. The first attempts by government officials to avoid being blamed by framing the flood disaster as an ‘act of god’ failed and it was the slow response by the governments that became the source of criticism. Media, public and experts focused on the accountability of political elites for the delayed actions. By framing operational civil servants at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as responsible, the Prime Minister’s offices along with other ministries, in all three countries, depicted themselves as victims of lacking information and problematic technology, implying that their behaviour was indeed unfortunate but not blameworthy.

These framing attempts, had they been successful, would have placed blame on a lower level actor within the government, acting under unexpected and overwhelming circumstances and would likely have depoliticised the crisis. Such an actor could be scapegoated or several people could be blamed for an organizational mishap, according to the outcomes presented in the model. Initially this seemed to be the dominant frame, there were few statements that framed the problem differently in any of the three cases. However, in
Sweden, as the first weeks passed, reports in media, statements by the political opposition and experts increasingly politicised the events, defining the slow response as a strategic political failure produced by the attitude of its political leadership, rather than as the blunder of any civil servant.

The political opposition in Sweden maintained that the failure of the Swedish Government was due to a long-standing neglect of crisis management capacity on the top national level. Despite, or maybe because of the fact that the Swedish Prime Minister in the past four years had taken a more direct, informal symbolic role in crises as the ‘father of the nation’, the Tsunami response became high politics. The problems related to government preparedness received particular attention by media and political opposition in Sweden, and less so in the other two cases (although the media mentioned it). Along the dimensions of the model the blame shifted to actors at a higher level and concentrated on a personal failure in accord with outcome C, failing policymakers. The Swedish Prime Minister, who was very active in communicating during the crisis, became the personification of failure, but with systemic implications.

Another pattern could be seen in Finland and Norway, where shortcomings at the operational, lower levels remained the main cause of the slow government reaction. The Prime Ministers in both Finland and Norway early on delegated more responsibility to their agencies than did their Swedish colleagues. Many hands were implicated in both Finland and Norway and responsibility was shared between many actors, mainly the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and government agencies. According to the model the cause of the slow response is in line with outcome B of the model and can be attributed to an organizational mishap. However, in Norway not only the public authorities had to assume responsibility, the travel industry was indicated as well. They publicly accepted their role in the delayed reactions, as opposed to the travel industry in both Finland and Sweden, who rather played a crucial role in pushing for government actions.

How then can these outcomes be explained? As the governments were increasingly seen as responsible and the dissatisfaction was growing, its officials had to manage the accusations that were made against them. It seems to have been a successful move by the Finnish and Norwegian governments to publicly apologize and assume full responsibility for having acted too slowly. In Sweden the government chose to continue to focus on the behaviour of other actors. The attempts to widen the frame of responsibility to include, for instance the King and the Thai government, were immediately dismissed by the political opposition. In fact, it reinforced the critique of the government who appeared to try to ‘pass the buck’, stimulating critics to dig deeper into the actions taken by the government. Any possible wrongdoing instantaneously sparked a new debate.
In the Swedish case the politicization process kept reinforcing itself, the more the government denied having acted appropriately, the more it stimulated faultfinding by political opponents and media. In response, the Swedish Prime Minister proposed a number of improvements to crisis management capacities, although none directly including his own cabinet office (Debate in Parliament, 2005-01-19, Rixlex. SvD, 2005-01-20). Had the Swedish Prime Minister focused solutions on lower levels while assuming responsibility on a high level, as in Norway and Finland, critique of the political elite might have been milder.

The aim of this study is not only to see whether the model that was used could be applied to the Scandinavian cases. We are also interested in what factors, beyond the model, influenced the different outcomes of the blaming process. What factors, individual, institutional, cultural, and situational, may help explain why different patterns of blaming emerged in the cases, why the outcome in terms of politicisation also differed, and under what conditions are these different outcomes are likely to emerge?

These case studies offer a rather coarse cut of the blame game and politicisation in the three countries and the empirical findings can only inductively provide indications of what, and how, conditioning factors influence the blame game. Several hypotheses could be formulated with bearing on what contextual and individual factors appear important in shaping blaming patterns.

The first factor that seems to be of importance in determining the intensity of the blame game is the relative impact a crisis has on society in any specific case. The more severe the material and personal damage the more likely that the blame game will escalate. Sweden was hit worse in terms of affected victims than Finland or Norway and the drive to assign responsibility and blame seem to have been stronger in Sweden. Also, the impact of the event is increased by the uncertainty that comes with it: the fact that Sweden did not substantially bring down the number of missing persons in the first month made every political move delicate and fixed the eyes of the entire nation on the way government was handling the crisis. Under such circumstances, many more people are potentially involved as relatives and acquaintances of the potentially missing and the crisis thus has a direct impact on a larger part of the population.

The second conditional factor that seems important given the empirical evidence is the formal or informal concentration of power. The higher the formal and perceived centralization of executive power, the more likely that the blame game will upscale. During his incumbency, Persson had deliberately centralized power within his Cabinet and has been accused of assigning weak ministers under a tight rein. When the crisis hit Sweden, all attention automatically turned to the Prime Minister.
The third possible factor is the timing and form of inquiry. The sooner policymakers announce a full and convincingly independent inquiry the less likely that blaming will escalate. Decisive action on assigning investigations to prominent heavy-weight (but non-incumbent) politicians made escalation of less likely in Finland than in Sweden and Norway.

Future research should further hypothesize and test the relation between political escalation and personal and material damage, because this link may not be as straightforward as it was in this study (for instance Bovens and ‘t Hart, 1996, suggest it is not). The concentration of power in relation to the political/administrative system in which it operates is an important factor to substantiate with further research because it could help us predict politicization processes in future crises originating in different contexts. Timing and form of inquiry as a legitimating and de-escalation tool is highly relevant to both analysts and political practice. Further examination of this condition may be useful for political actors who wish to mitigate the political damage after a crisis and for analysts to further understand when and how they function as formal procedures in crisis aftermaths.
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**Codebook**
(based on Verheuvel, 2002)

1. File number / identification number document

2. Medium:
   1. Dagens Nyheter
   2. Svenska Dagbladet
   3. Norwegian Newspaper A
   4. Norwegian Newspaper B
   5. Finnish Newspaper A
   6. Finnish Newspaper B

3. Date
   1. Day (1-31)
   2. Month (1-12)
   3. Year (2004 or 2005)

4. Period
   1. Week 1 (26/12 – 01/01)
   2. Week 2 (02/01 – 08/01)
   3. Week 3 (09/01 – 15/01)
   4. Week 4 (16/01 – 22/01)
   5. Week 5 (23/01 – 29/01)

5. Which actor does the article cite or paraphrase?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PM Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MFA Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opposition Leader Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PM Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MFA Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opposition Leader Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PM Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MFA Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opposition Leader Finland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Which tactics does the Swedish Prime Minister use? (in the quote or paraphrase)

N  Y 
0  1  denying violation of crucial values
0  1  deny crucial values being involved, frame the event as non-political
0  1  frame the events as incidental, non-recurring
0  1  frame the event as operational, technical
0  1  narrow the time frame to immediate aftermath of event
0  1  disperse responsibility
0  1  scapegoat one individual
0  1  scapegoat one organization

7. Which tactics does the Swedish Minister of Foreign Affairs use? 
(in the quote or paraphrase)

N  Y 
0  1  denying violation of crucial values
0  1  deny crucial values being involved, frame the event as non-political
0  1  frame the events as incidental, non-recurring
0  1  frame the event as operational technical
0  1  narrow the time frame to immediate aftermath of event
0  1  disperse responsibility
0  1  scapegoat one individual
0  1  scapegoat one organization

8. Which tactics does the Swedish Opposition Leader use? (in the quote or paraphrase)

N  Y 
0  1  emphasizing violation of crucial values
0  1  point at crucial values violated
0  1  frame the events as symptomatic, structural
0  1  frame the event as strategic, political
0  1  widen the time frame to include previous events and govt. actions
0  1  concentrate responsibility
0  1  compromise one individual
0  1  compromise one organization

9. Which tactics does the Norwegian Prime Minister use? 
(in the quote or paraphrase)

N  Y 
0  1  denying violation of crucial values
0  1  deny crucial values being involved, frame the event as non-political
0  1  frame the events as incidental, non-recurring
0  1  frame the event as operational technical
0  1  narrow the time frame to immediate aftermath of event
10. Which tactics does the Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs use? (in the quote or paraphrase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | 0 | 1 | denying violation of crucial values
|   | 0 | 1 | deny crucial values being involved, frame the event as non-political
|   | 0 | 1 | frame the events as incidental, non-recurring
|   | 0 | 1 | frame the event as operational technical
|   | 0 | 1 | narrow the time frame to immediate aftermath of event
|   | 0 | 1 | disperse responsibility
|   | 0 | 1 | scapegoat one individual
|   | 0 | 1 | scapegoat one organization

11. Which tactics does the Norwegian Opposition Leader use? (in the quote or paraphrase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | 0 | 1 | emphasizing violation of crucial values
|   | 0 | 1 | point at crucial values violated
|   | 0 | 1 | frame the events as symptomatic, structural
|   | 0 | 1 | frame the event as strategic, political
|   | 0 | 1 | widen the time frame to include previous events and govt. actions
|   | 0 | 1 | concentrate responsibility
|   | 0 | 1 | compromise one individual
|   | 0 | 1 | compromise one organization

12. Which tactics does the Finnish Prime Minister use? (in the quote or paraphrase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | 0 | 1 | denying violation of crucial values
|   | 0 | 1 | deny crucial values being involved, frame the event as non-political
|   | 0 | 1 | frame the events as incidental, non-recurring
|   | 0 | 1 | frame the event as operational technical
|   | 0 | 1 | narrow the time frame to immediate aftermath of event
|   | 0 | 1 | disperse responsibility
|   | 0 | 1 | scapegoat one individual
|   | 0 | 1 | scapegoat one organization
13. Which tactics does the Finnish Minister of Foreign Affairs use? 
(in the quote or paraphrase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>denying violation of crucial values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>deny crucial values being involved, frame the event as non-political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>frame the events as incidental, non-recurring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>frame the event as operational technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>narrow the time frame to immediate aftermath of event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>disperse responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>scapegoat one individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>scapegoat one organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Which tactics does the Finnish Opposition Leader use? (in the quote or paraphrase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>emphasizing violation of crucial values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>point at crucial values violated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>frame the events as symptomatic, structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>frame the event as strategic, political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widen the time frame to include previous events and govt. actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>concentrate responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>compromise one individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>compromise one organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Does the article include normative judgments on the response to the Tsunami disaster? 
0 No 
1 Yes

16. Is this judgment mostly positive or negative?
1. Positive
2. Negative
3. Neutral
4. not relevant

17. Is failure explicitly attributed to actors’ behavior? 
0. No 
1. Yes

18. Is the behavior of actors explicitly judged upon, or negatively assessed? 
0. No 
1. Yes
19. If so, which actor is blamed for his/her behavior in response to the disaster?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>The Swedish PM</th>
<th>The Swedish MFA</th>
<th>The Swedish Opposition Leader</th>
<th>The Norwegian PM</th>
<th>The Norwegian MFA</th>
<th>The Norwegian Opposition Leader</th>
<th>The Finnish PM</th>
<th>The Finnish MFA</th>
<th>The Finnish Opposition Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Coder’s Remarks
0. No
1. Yes, namely ...........
Appendix 1

Codebook instructions (based on Verheuvel, 2002)

Question 1   File number
All articles used for this analysis need to be coded separately. Every document gets its own
unique code number (for instance, the first article in DN will be coded DN/041227/01)
which is also written on the code sheet (which gets filled out per article)
Relevance: Documents can be easily identified by their own unique number

Question 2   Medium
The coder fills out which newspaper the article stems that he/she is analyzing.
Relevance: This allows us to see if actors react differently to different news media

Question 3   Date
The coder fills out on which date the analyzed article was published.
Relevance: This allows us to oversee the chronology of events and citations and helps us to
define in which period each article belongs (see Q4)

Question 4   Period
1. Week 1 (26/12 - 01/01): immediate response when the Tsunami hit the affected areas
2. Week 2 (02/01 - 08/01): evacuation of victims, handling the missing
3. Week 3 (09/01 - 15/01): visits to Thailand, initiating investigations
4. Week 4 (16/01 - 22/01): proposals for improvements at the Ministry
5. Week 5 (23/01 - 29/01)?

Question 5   Which actors are cited or paraphrased?
This means that the article includes references to an interview or public statements by an
actor. A citation means that the actor's words are displayed literally and marked by quotation
marks. A paraphrase means that the actor's words are expressed by the authors of the article.
For instance, "the Minister says that..."
Relevance: It is important to know which the actors speak up publicly, and it is particularly
important to reveal who said what in public.

Questions 6-14   Strategies
Strategies are the ways by which actors react to media attention and critical questions, and
how they display the event, their own actions and those of others. These strategies can be
inferred from the actor's citations and paraphrases (see Q5) that reveal their behavior and
responses in public and towards the media.

Denying violation of crucial values (or emphasizing)
In this strategy actors argue that the criticized political action was not blameworthy. Actors
can employ this strategy in the immediate aftermath of the event. When an event causes
public unrest and criticism, politicians can deny the blameworthiness of public actors' behavior
causing the event, and deny the blameworthiness of actions in response to the event. They can use the 'Act of God' argument (see Bovens and 't Hart, 1996) or claim that
the crisis or proper response to it, was not their responsibility, or that a better reaction could
not reasonably have been expected.
By contrast, their opponents such as opposition leaders will try to invoke a picture of violation of crucial values. They will do the exact opposite: stress that the crisis could have been foreseen or prevented and that the failure to do so was blameworthy and that the incumbent is responsible.

Deny crucial values being violated, frame the event as non-political
With this strategy, actors do not deny that things went wrong or that the crisis is the result of human behavior; rather, they stress the fact that the nature of the event is non-political. In order to claim that responsibilities for events or judgments thereof lie beyond politics, they stress that the nature of causes or consequences lies beyond the realm of political affairs, e.g. the private sphere, the free market or technical expertise (Buzan et al, 1998). Opponents will do the opposite: point at the political nature of violated values, preferably at sweeping social and political themes such as liberty, justice, equality, safety etc.

Frame the events as incidental, non-recurring
Actors employ this strategy to depict the event as a stand-alone disturbance in an otherwise well functioning system. Blame avoidance is no longer an option, since the event has already been assessed as a blameworthy failure, and blame has been handed to government. All actors can do is ‘manage the blame’: mitigate the political damage for themselves and for the institutions they stand for. Events are therefore framed as ‘incidents’, which allows responsible actors to limit the discussion to the immediate causes and consequences of failure. They stress the non-recurring, ad hoc nature of failure, using words that focus on the unique character of what happened. By contrast, opponents will point at similar instances of failure to show that the flaws are symptomatic for structural mismanagement of one actor, organization or Cabinet. Opponents will blame responsible actors for their inability to learn from earlier occasions, and they will try to come up with a simplified causal narrative that shows how underlying systemic and political causes produced a disturbing record of failure.

Frame the event as operational, technical
When they try to limit the scope of discussion about who is responsible for an event, actors involved in blame management stress the technicalities of the failures made. They focus on ‘reparation’ and technical improvement of what went wrong on the operational level when they propose and implement any reforms. For instance, a debate about the causes of a plane crash will be narrowed down to an analysis of the pilot’s behavior and personal characteristics. Opponents would in the same example try to include in the debate their criticism of the air traffic system, the company policy that put the wrong man on the wrong place, and the work practices that explain the pilot’s behavior. Opponents will try to shift focus from the operational level to a political strategic level of responsibility, implicating actors on a higher hierarchical level.

Narrow the time frame to immediate aftermath of event
Blame managers will narrow the time frame of the debate to the immediate aftermath of the event by stressing the ‘here and now’: the direct causes and consequences of the failure. Inquiries will be announced/started soon after the event. Inquiry committees get a limited assignment, focused on the time period immediately prior to and after the event.
Opponents will attempt to go back in time (and thereby up in the hierarchy) in attributing responsibility. By pointing at previous experience they emphasize that the responsible actors could have seen this coming, and had a chance to prevent failure. By depicting the event as an indication of a long-term development, they blame the responsible actors for a much more structural failure and frame the event as a warning of potential future flaws.

Disperse responsibility
This strategy means that the actor who is blamed does not (only) defend him/herself by fielding criticism on his or her personal behavior, but points at others as responsible also. They stress the shared responsibility for what happened. The blameworthy event is depicted as the product of many small contributions by several different actors. Opponents are more likely to concentrate the blame since the responsibility of all often means the sanctioning of none. Therefore the opposition will hand the blame to one specific political actor or government organization and focus on its traits and activities that caused the blameworthy event to occur.

Scapegoat one individual
It can also occur that not the opposition concentrates blame, but that concentration of blame is used as a defensive strategy by implicated actors. In such a case one individual is scapegoated by other who attempt to escape the burden of responsibility. When responsible actors name one specific other individual as the main culprit, this is an indication of scapegoating.

Scapegoat one organization
Similarly to the above mentioned strategy of blaming another individual as a strategy of personal blame avoidance, actors can also pass the buck to a specific agency, department or organization.

Question 15 Does the article include normative judgments about the response to the Tsunami disaster?
Normative judgment means that the article pictures the event or government policy in value-loaded terms, positively or negatively. The article could also include the words of others who express their opinion positively or negatively about the disaster response. The judgment that needs to be coded in Q15 does not involve criticism on actors, only on their policies or on government actions. These actions include the following:

- public statements, press conferences by government officials, expressing sympathy, explanations or instructions
- operation of information channels
- evacuation of victims
- send relief agencies, rescue teams of identification squads
- handling of the lists of missing persons
- crisis management preparedness and training
- visits to the affected area.

Relevance: The coder needs to assess whether the media judge the response to the disaster as a negative event, a public failure.
Question 16 Is this judgment mostly positive or negative?
‘Positive’ means that the article contains mostly positive statements and expressions about the disaster response.
‘Negative’ means that the article contains mostly negative statements and expressions about the disaster response, when it emphasizes the failures made and the negative consequences of government actions.
‘Neutral’ means that positive judgments counterbalance negative judgments in the article.
‘Not relevant’ means that the article does not contain any judgment.
Relevance: The coder needs to assess to what extent the disaster response is assessed as a negative event in order to substantiate claims that the event is considered a failure and that values have been violated.

Question 17 Is failure explicitly attributed to actors’ behavior?
This means that the article shows that the failure is a direct consequence of actors’ behavior, which would make them responsible for the negative event. A positive answer to this question does not necessarily mean that the responsible actors are also blamed for the occurrence of failure: it is just an assessment of the articles attribution of responsibility.
Relevance: The coder needs to find out whether failure is attributed to actor’s behavior or to more structural factors (a disaster response could also be hampered by financial constraints, weather conditions, geographical distances, etc. etc.).

Question 18 Is the behavior of one or more actors explicitly judged upon, or negatively assessed?
This means that the article that discusses a case explicitly judges actors’ behavior, emphasizes a causal relation between this behavior and the negative consequences in terms of failure and attributes blame to either of them.
Relevance: In this fashion, the coder can assess whether the article hands the blame to specific responsible actors and holds them accountable for failure.

Question 19 If so, which actor is blamed for his/ her behavior in response to the disaster?
The coder fills out which actors (the responsible prime minister, minister of financial affairs or even government opponents) are held accountable in the article for their contribution to the apparent failure.
Relevance: This allows us to assess which actors are blamed in how many articles by which media.

Question 20 Coder’s Remarks
Here the coder can add interesting findings or remarks or quotes from an article that do not fit any of the codes above but may help analyze the cases more accurately or completely.