

Project: **The Transformation of Political Mobilisation and Communication in European Public Spheres**

Project acronym: Europub.com
Project website: <http://europub.wz-berlin.de>

Funded by: 5th Framework Programme of the European Commission
Contract No. HPSE-CT2000-00046
Work package: **WP 3 (Analysis of newspaper editorials)**
WP Coordinator: Barbara Pfetsch
Deliverable number: **D 3.3**

Report **Final case report on the analysis of editorials**

Case report **France**

Author: Virginie Guiraudon

Date: 27 April 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
PART I: ANALYTIC SUMMARY	3
PART II: COMMENTED TABLES	5
1. ARTICLE-LEVEL: GENERAL OVERVIEW	5
2. ARTICLE-LEVEL: INITIATING EVENTS	7
3. CLAIM-LEVEL: COMMENTATORS.....	12
<i>POSITIONS AND SUBJECTIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS EU INTEGRATION.....</i>	<i>17</i>
4. ADDRESSEES, SUPPORTERS AND OPPONENTS.....	22
5. POSITIVELY EVALUATED ADDRESSEES AND SUPPORTERS	30
6. NEGATIVELY EVALUATED ADDRESSEES AND SUPPORTERS	33
7. ISSUES AND AIMS PER PAPER	36
8. ISSUES AND AIMS PER YEAR.....	42
9. MAIN ASPECT COMMENTED UPON	45
10. OBJECT ACTORS	46
<i>POSITIVELY EVALUATED OBJECT ACTORS</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>NEGATIVELY EVALUATED OBJECT ACTORS.....</i>	<i>50</i>
11. FRAMES.....	52

PART I:

Analytic Summary

This report focuses on the printed press' explicit own voice in public debates in the form of newspaper editorials in France based on a sample of four dailies (*Le Monde*, *Le Figaro*, *Ouest France* and *L'Humanité*). We examine their particular rather detailed argumentative structure, and the interpretive frames that are behind policy evaluations, proposals and demands.

The French coders read every issue of the years 2000, 2001, 2002 to find editorials on our seven issue fields in four French dailies. Commentaries are opinion articles written by a journalist or editor of the analysed newspaper and recognizably representing the newspaper's point of view. Editorials therefore do not include guest commentaries, reprints of editorials from other newspapers, contributions by regular columnists or 'analysis' type articles.

We have selected four diverse newspapers:

- *Le Monde* is a center-Left quality broadsheet with a paying readership of about 450000 in 2002, which prides itself in its coverage of international news.
- *Le Figaro* is a Right-leaning quality broadsheet with a paying readership of 345000 in 2002, with a very important business/economy section.
- *Ouest France* is a regional paper with headquarters in Brittany, a western region with as strong (Celtic) identity and an important farm and fishing industry. It has the first French newspaper as far as readership is concerned with 850 000 paying readers.
- *L'Humanité* is a daily that used to be the official newspaper of the Communist party. It is still run by Communists but open to a wider range of Left-wing opinions. It is not read by "the masses" but seeks to defend the interest of the working class and the "excluded." It has a small readership (46000). It is the only national daily (outside of the regional papers and sports dailies) that has a "popular" touch.

When French editorials are compared to those from newspapers of other countries, common features of French editorial writing will no doubt stand out. What is most striking at this point when studying the editorials from our four French newspapers is how each has a clear identity and editorial line that is reflected in the editorials. When focusing on editorials on European integration, or with a EU dimension, each paper has its own way of approaching the European project:

Ouest France is the most "europhile" in terms of the objective and subjective attitudes towards European integration. It has a historical commitment in the "Europe of the founding fathers" and a "Christian social" identity that is still reflected in the current editorial line and the resort to historical and normative frames on European integration. Out of the four newspapers, it writes the largest number of editorials about the EU, addresses EU actors most. The articles are concerned with the future of the EU, the process itself and enlargement. There is a very consistent and stable pattern over time, across issues and regardless of the actual writer of the editorial.

Le Monde is the second most europhile newspaper and there is a wider range of opinions expressed in the daily on Europe. Mostly *Le Monde* is this area as in others is trying to be

bland rather than polemical. Their focus is also on the future of Europe and relies on instrumental and economic frames.

Le Figaro while overall expressing slightly positive views of the EU still lets conservative and Gaullist voices present a cautious view of the integration process. They favor a “Europe of nations” that would be good for the national interest and the role of Europe in the world. Europe is a means to an end and if they like it is because the current neo-liberal character of the project. There is a sense that there is a “multiple personality” of the newspaper in the editorial pages, reflected perhaps in the standard deviations of the opinion averages that we observed. The liberal economists are more europhile than the conservative old guard that still writes polemical articles in *Le Figaro*.

L’Humanité is the most distinct voice of the four. The editorials criticize the EU more than any other yet this is not an *a priori* against European integration. *A contrario*. They want “another Europe.” A social Europe, a Europe that would share their values. They are the only ones that really give a voice to social movements. The Europe they want resemble a permanent “European Social Forum.” Still, because of their euroskepticism (and also their lack of resources, the fact that they do not have a correspondent, etc.). They write less editorials on European integration. Moreover, they address national actors more. This is perhaps do not find EU actors legitimate. There is another explanation: they are interested in issue areas such as pensions and the protests that surround reforms of the welfare state. These remain national policy domains and thus it is not surprising that their addressees are mainly national. There is no rigid line and many opinions are expressed, including by the same writer.

- PART
Commented Tables

II:

1. Article-level: General overview

Table 1.1: Number of commentaries coded per year and per paper

Year	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L`Humanité	in %	(N)
2000	33,1	26,9	35,5	21,6	27,9	189
2001	29,3	32,6	32,2	36,8	33,3	226
2002	37,6	40,4	32,2	41,6	38,8	263
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	133	193	121	231		678

The French coders examined every day of the years 2000, 2001, 2002 to find editorials on our seven issue fields in four French dailies. Our analysis is based on 678 commentaries. Commentaries are opinion articles written by a journalist or editor of the analysed newspaper and recognizably representing the newspaper's point of view. Editorials therefore do not include guest commentaries, reprints of editorials from other newspapers, contributions by regular columnists or 'analysis' type articles.

There is an increase over time in the number of editorials coded. This is in part due, as we discuss below, to the increase of editorials on troops deployment, one of our issue areas.

The number of editorials differs according to the newspaper. There are fewer in *Ouest France* because there is not even one editorial a day. At least every other day, the front page features instead a commentary by an outsider. *L`Humanité*, the Communist daily, not only has an editorial line, it has more editorials period. The differences between the number of editorials coded could also be attributed to differences in coding techniques as one coder coded many more than the other.

Table 1.2: Number of commentaries coded per section and paper

Section	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L`Humanité	in %	(N)
Mixed international/national news section	0,8	.	100,0	100,0	52,1	353
Commentary pages	97,7	99,5	.	.	47,5	322
Business/Economy section	1,5	.	.	.	0,3	2
International news section	.	0,5	.	.	0,1	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	133	193	121	231		678

Le Monde and *Le Figaro*, which have more news pages, have a commentary page where they also include their editorial whereas the other two papers do not. Their editorial is situated elsewhere.

Table 1.3: Number of main commentaries coded per paper

A mained	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
no
yes	100	100	100	100	100	678
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	133	193	121	231		678

678 editorials were coded for the French case. 231 for the Communist daily, 193 for the right-leaning quality paper, 133 for the left-leaning quality paper and 121 for the regional daily.

Table 1.4: Number of newspapers' own campaigning in commentaries per paper

Campaign	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	in %	(N)
No	99,2	97,9	95,9	92,6	96,0	651
Yes	0,8	2,1	4,1	7,4	4,0	27
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	133	193	121	231		678

“Campaigning,” a British notion, does not travel well across the Channel. French newspapers only very rarely present their own “campaign.” It is exceptional in the French dailies except in the case of *L'Humanité*. This daily founded a century ago by Socialist essayists and leaders became the official Communist daily and now still has a Communist editorial line. It is in part tradition and its links to political parties that may account for its modest resort to “campaigning” (7,4%). When the editorial mentioned a poll or a study contained in the paper, coders considered that it was a newspaper « campaign ». There are few instances (4% of all articles).

Table 1.5: Number of commentaries with and without claims

A claim	Commentaries coded	
	(N)	%
No	76	11,2
Yes	602	88,8
Total	678	100

76 articles, more than one in ten, did not include any claim. Most of the discussion below thus relies on the description of the 602 claims.

2. Article-level: Initiating events

Table 2.1a: types of initiating events per paper

Initiating event	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Political decision	27,8	9,6	15,1	5,0	13,2	80
Executive action	4,5	3,8	4,2	14,0	7,4	45
Judicial action	0,8	1,3	0,8	0,5	0,8	5
Non-specified statement	12,8	13,5	0,8	9,0	9,4	57
Meeting	16,5	20,5	23,5	17,5	19,2	117
Direct-democratic action	0,8	.	0,8	1,0	0,7	4
Protest action	1,5	7,1	2,5	12,0	6,6	40
Com. events partly directed to the media	9,0	5,1	8,4	6,0	6,9	42
Com. events directed only to the media	3,8	0,6	1,7	9,5	4,4	27
Com. events initiated by the media	0,8	0,6	1,7	1,5	1,2	7
External political crisis	5,3	7,1	5,9	11,5	7,9	48
Natural crisis	1,5	4,5	5,0	2,5	3,3	20
Economic developments	6,0	6,4	9,2	2,0	5,4	33
Societal developments	.	.	0,8	.	0,2	1
Biographical political events	.	0,6	2,5	0,5	0,8	5
Elections	6,8	6,4	9,2	3,5	6,1	37
Other objective extra-discursive events	2,3	12,8	7,6	4,0	6,6	40
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	133	156	119	200		608

In this section we are interested in the events that stimulate the writing of an editorial. There are 70 editorials without initiating event. One type of event seems to generate an important number of editorials in all newspapers: meetings (19%). These type of events have their own agenda yet can be construed as public events also designed to be relayed in the press. Political decisions also trigger editorial writing yet there is a lot of variation across the dailies in their willingness to comment on such events. While over a quarter of *le Monde* editorials build on political decisions in its editorials, this is only the case of one in ten in *Le Figaro* and one in twenty in *L'Humanité*.

In fact, the political agenda that editorials react to and comment upon varies greatly. If one compares the center-Left *Le Monde* and the Left-leaning *L'Humanité*, this is striking. The former follows the official political agenda: political decisions, executive actions and elections trigger 39,5% of all editorials coded. The latter follows non-institutional events: social movements and external political crises (23,5%).

Communicative events by the media or for the media trigger a little over 10% of all editorials. Journalists do not seem to be powerless awaiting the communication activities of the political elite. They depend instead on the political process as commentaries normally comment upon it. They do have different priorities as to what events require that they position themselves.

Table 2.1b: types of initiating events per issue fields

Initiating event	Per issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	in %	(N)
Political decision	22	13,5	25	7,4	12,5	20	10,2	13,2	80
Executive action	.	1,9	11,1	22,7	.	4,0	0,6	7,4	45
Judicial action	.	3,8	.	0,6	.	.	1,1	0,8	5
Non-specified statement	9,8	5,8	5,6	11,7	18,8	14,0	5,1	9,4	57
Meeting	6,1	21,2	16,7	15,3	16,7	4,0	34,1	19,3	117
Direct-democratic action	2,4	1,1	0,7	4
Protest action	2,4	.	11,1	2,5	18,8	24,0	5,1	6,6	40
Com. events partly directed to the media	7,3	11,5	5,6	3,1	6,3	6,0	9,1	6,8	41
Com. events directed only to the media	3,7	3,8	.	3,1	8,3	14,0	3,4	4,4	27
Com. events initiated by the media	.	3,8	.	.	2,1	6,0	0,6	1,2	7
External political crisis	2,4	.	.	27,0	.	2,0	0,6	7,9	48
Natural crisis	3,7	26,9	5,6	0,6	.	.	.	3,3	20
Economic developments	32,9	.	5,6	.	2,1	.	1,7	5,4	33
Societal developments	.	1,9	0,2	1
Biographical political events	.	.	.	0,6	2,1	.	1,7	0,8	5
Elections	6,1	.	2,8	1,2	6,3	.	14,8	6,1	37
Other objective extra-discursive events	1,2	5,8	11,1	4,3	6,3	6,0	10,8	6,6	40
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	82	52	36	163	48	50	176		607

The type of initiating events that trigger editorials greatly depends on the policy issues that is commented upon. Editorials on troops deployment refer to external political crises (27% of editorials in this issue field). Editorials on monetary politics refer to economic developments (32,9% of all editorials in this field). Protest actions trigger commentary in the field of education (18,8%) and pensions (24%).

Regarding monetary policy, about half of the commentaries react to economic developments and political decisions.

Regarding agricultural policy, « natural crisis » such as the break out of an epidemic (mad cow, foot-and-mouth disease) lead to the writing of over a quarter of the editorials. Yet, journalists position themselves in the subsequent management of the crisis : the political decisions (13,5%), declarations to the media (15,3%) and meetings that follow (21,2%). Over half of the commentaries are triggered by political statements. It should be noted that no article comments on farmers' protests. Are they so ordinary that they are no longer newsworthy?

Regarding immigration policy, it is noteworthy that judicial actions (court rulings) that are important in this policy field do not trigger commentaries. It is unclear whether this stems from a lack of coverage of these events or the lack of expertise as to their importance (i. e. recognizing a path-breaking judicial decision). In the immigration policy field, a variety of initiating events lead to editorial writing : political decision (26,5), executive actions, meetings, protest actions and extra-discursive events make up about 70% of all editorials. This is the most heterogeneous issue field in this respect. Objective extra-discursive events

(11,1% of editorials in the immigration issue field) include the deaths of migrants. There were many deaths of persons trying to go from France to the UK and other events such as the deaths of Chinese migrants in Dover or on the Mediterranean sea have been covered in French newspapers.

Regarding troops deployment, there are no surprises. Three types of events dominate: meetings (such as UN Security Council meetings or NATO meetings), executive decisions (e. g. decisions to send troops) and external political crises make up over two thirds of all events triggering editorials.

Regarding pensions, editorials comment upon meetings, declarations and political decisions. Yet, protests are an important category of initiating events in this field.¹ This is especially the case because the Communist daily *L'Humanité* as we noted previously refers to protests a lot in its editorials and is also the newspaper with the greatest number of editorials coded.

In the field of education, protests also trigger editorials (again the presence of *L'Humanité* in our sample partly explains this characteristic of editorial writing). Political decisions and media-directed events constitute events that initiate editorial writing.

Finally, when commenting on European integration, journalists pick up on the institutional agenda. Meetings such as European Council summits and Council of ministers and elections feature prominently as initiating events. In our interviews with journalists and editors from the four newspapers that we coded, this came out clearly: although journalists complain that the EU is not a “sexy” topic and that coverage is “institutional,” they wait for events on the EU calendar to write editorials and feel that their readers somehow expect them to comment on summits, elections, etc. In a sense, the regular events that impose a steady rhythm to the life of EU institutions such as the summits at the end of each presidency allow journalists to plan an editorial that uses such events as an occasion to position themselves on European integration.

Table 2.2a: scopes of initiating events per paper

Issue scope	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	7,5	3,9	2,6	2,5	4,0	24
Other supranational	3,0	0,6	0,9	1,5	1,5	9
EU	40,6	27,9	51,3	13,5	30,5	184
Other European supranational	.	.	.	2,5	0,8	5
Multilateral	6,0	1,3	10,3	9,0	6,6	40
Bilateral	6,8	13,0	5,1	7,0	8,1	49
Germany	1,5	3,2	3,4	1,0	2,2	13
France	23,3	33,1	24,8	39,0	31,3	189
UK	1,5	3,2	0,9	3,5	2,5	15
Italy	.	1,3	.	1,0	0,7	4
Spain	.	0,6	.	0,5	0,3	2
Netherlands	.	0,6	.	0,5	0,3	2
Other EU-members	1,5	1,3	.	2,0	1,3	8
Turkey	1,5	.	.	.	0,3	2
USA	5,3	8,4	.	6,5	5,5	33
Middle East	0,8	1,3	0,9	9,0	3,6	22
Rest of the world	0,8	.	.	1,0	0,5	3
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	133	154	117	200		604

¹ There were many demonstrations against pension reform, which was enacted in the spring of 2003.

There are only two types of events that trigger the writing of commentaries: French and EU events. The presence of EU events as initiating events stem from the fact that we code editorials on European integration and some issue fields where competence has been shifted to the EC or EU (monetary and agricultural policies).

Regarding differences between newspapers, the importance of EU events in triggering editorials seems to follow the newspaper editorial line towards European integration: *Ouest France* has traditionally been a Euro-enthusiast Christian-democratic paper, *Le Monde* historically has a social-democratic pro-integration line whereas the right-leaning *Figaro* and Left daily *L'Humanité* have either lukewarm or Euro-skeptic.

L'Humanité clearly pays less attention to EU events. Two hypotheses could be explored. 1) *L'Humanité* has no EU correspondent and 2) *L'Humanité* refers to protests a lot as initiating events to write editorials and there are few EU-wide protests except for events such as the European Social Forum that they cover a lot yet only happened once during our coding period. The most probable hypothesis is that if a newspaper covers protests in the area of education and pensions (see above and also table 2.2b), these events tend to have a French-only scope whereas if a newspaper pays attention to monetary politics, Eu or Us scopes in initiating events are more likely.

Additionally, there seems to be a stronger focus of the right-leaning *Le Figaro* on US events (8.4%), whereas the Communist daily superbly ignores the US but refers to events in the Middle East more than other newspapers (9% of their editorials) and the political crises there.

Table 2.2b: scopes of initiating events per issue fields

Issue scope	Per issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	.	.	.	14,2	2,1	.	.	4,0	24
Other supranational	1,3	.	.	2,5	.	.	2,3	1,5	9
EU	49,4	44,2	16,7	3,1	6,3	.	61,4	30,5	184
Other European supranational	.	.	.	2,5	.	.	0,6	0,8	5
Multilateral	7,6	1,9	.	16,7	2,1	2,0	2,3	6,6	40
Bilateral	.	1,9	13,9	20,4	.	.	5,7	8,1	49
Germany	1,3	1,9	2,8	0,6	.	.	5,1	2,2	13
France	24,1	38,5	55,9	9,9	89,6	98,0	11,9	31,2	188
UK	5,1	11,5	5,6	0,6	.	.	1,1	2,5	15
Italy	2,3	0,7	4
Spain	.	.	2,8	.	.	.	0,6	0,3	2
Netherlands	1,3	0,6	0,3	2
Other EU-members	1,3	4,0	1,3	8
Turkey	1,1	0,3	2
USA	8,9	.	.	15,4	.	.	0,6	5,5	33
Middle East	.	.	2,8	13,0	.	.	.	3,6	22
Rest of the world	.	.	.	1,2	.	.	0,6	0,5	3
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	79	52	36	162	48	50	176		603

The commentaries analysed strongly reflect the pillar structure of the European Union. European events trigger editorials in strongly Europeanised issue fields, like monetary politics and agriculture (and of course European integration).

Commentaries on troops deployment pick upon bilateral, multilateral and UN events.

Pensions and education are commented upon mainly after developments in France. Still, one needs to remember that even if the event that initiates the editorial took place in France, the commentator limits itself to discuss the French aspects of an issue. For example, the closing of a factory in Lille, France may be the occasion to go on to reflect on the nefarious consequences of the Stability pact or ECB policy on growth and employment. The initiating event is only the pretext to do what is called “broder” (weaving in other ideas).

3. Claim-level: Commentators

Table 3.1a: names of commentators per paper

Name of the ten most important commentators		Per paper (in %)				Total	
		Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
No Name		99,2	.	.	0,5	21,6	130
Le Monde	Colombani, Jean-Marie	0,8	.	.	.	0,2	1
Le Figaro	Belot, Jean de	.	16,6	.	.	4,3	26
	Rousselin, Pierre	.	14,0	.	.	3,7	22
	Mariano, Antoine-Pierre	.	9,6	.	.	2,5	15
	Schiffrès, Michel	.	8,3	.	.	2,2	13
	Reclus, Philippe	.	7,6	.	.	2,0	12
	Rioufol, Ivan	.	7,0	.	.	1,8	11
	Bollaert, Baudoin	.	5,1	.	.	1,3	8
	Thréard, Yves	.	5,1	.	.	1,3	8
	Brézet, Alexis	.	5,1	.	.	1,3	8
	Girard, Renaud	.	4,5	.	.	1,2	7
Ouest-France	Hutin, François-Régis	.	.	31,0	.	6,0	36
	Limagne, Joseph	.	.	28,4	.	5,5	33
	Burel, Paul	.	.	12,1	.	2,3	14
	Boissonat, Jean	.	.	8,6	.	1,7	10
	Boulic, Jean-Yves	.	.	4,3	.	0,8	5
	Le Solleu, Bernard	.	.	4,3	.	0,8	5
	Redon, Julien	.	.	3,4	.	0,7	4
	Hutin, Jeanne-Emmanuelle	.	.	2,6	.	0,5	3
	Plagnol, Hervé	.	.	1,7	.	0,3	2
	Urvoy, Michel	.	.	1,7	.	0,3	2
L'Humanité	Laurent, Pierre	.	.	.	23,6	7,8	47
	Piérot, Jean-Paul	.	.	.	14,6	4,8	29
	Apel-Muller, Patrick	.	.	.	12,6	4,2	25
	Cabanes, Claude	.	.	.	10,1	3,3	20
	Odent, Bruno	.	.	.	8,0	2,7	16
	Le Hyaric, Patrick	.	.	.	7,0	2,3	14
	Ducoin, Jean-Emmanuel	.	.	.	7,0	2,3	14
	Sylvestre, Charles	.	.	.	5,0	1,7	10
	Guillou, Lin	.	.	.	4,5	1,5	9
	Le Puill, Gérard	.	.	.	1,5	0,5	3
Total (%)		100	82,8	98,3	94	93,4	
(N)		130	130	114	187		562
Total of all editorials		130	157	116	199		602

Editorials in *Le Monde* are not signed. *Le Figaro* has the largest number of editorial writers. At the regional paper *Ouest France*, well over half of the editorials are written by the editor-in-chief and the head of the editorial page (Hutin and Limagne).

Table 3.1b: names of commentators per issue field

Name of the ten most important commentators	Per issue field (in %)						
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI
No name	29,3	22,8	29,7	17,8	7,0	14,3	25,4
Apel-Muller, Patrick	.	.	2,7	8,2	10,5	8,2	.
Belot, Jean de	8,5	.	5,4	.	.	.	7,5
Boissonat, Jean	7,3	.	5,4	.	.	.	1,2
Bollaert, Baudoin	2,4	.	2,7	.	.	.	2,3
Boulic, Jean-Yves	.	.	5,4	.	.	2,0	.
Brun, Caroline	2,0	.
Brézet, Alexis	7,0	2,0	.
Burel, Paul	6,1	10,5	.	.	5,3	.	.
Cabanes, Claude	.	3,5	.	6,2	3,5	.	3,5
Ducoin, Jean-Emmanuel	2,4	4,1	2,9
Frat, Muriel	4,1	.
Girard, Renaud	.	.	.	3,4	.	.	.
Guillou, Lin	.	3,5	.	.	7,0	6,1	.
Hutin, François-Régis	.	3,5	5,4	.	.	.	16,2
Lambroschini, Charles	.	.	.	2,7	.	.	.
Laurent, Pierre	7,3	.	5,4	15,8	14,0	4,1	2,9
Le Hyaric, Patrick	3,7	.	.	.	14,0	.	.
Le Puill, Gérard	.	5,3
Le Solleu, Bernard	8,2	.
Limagne, Joseph	.	.	.	5,5	.	.	12,7
Mariano, Antoine-Pierre	7,3	.	.	.	8,8	.	.
Odent, Bruno	.	.	.	8,2	.	.	.
Piérot, Jean-Paul	2,4	.	10,8	11,6	.	.	2,9
Plagnol, Hervé	.	3,5
Reclus, Philippe	9,8	.	.	.	3,5	.	.
Rioufol, Ivan	.	3,5	5,4	.	.	14,3	.
Rousselin, Pierre	.	3,5	5,4	5,5	.	.	4,0
Schifrès, Michel	.	.	.	2,7	.	.	2,9
Sylvestre, Charles	.	5,3	.	.	3,5	.	1,7
Thréard, Yves	.	7,0
Total (%)	86,6	71,9	83,8	87,7	84,2	69,4	86,1

The above table lists the top ten editorial writers for all newspapers except *Le Monde* (no signature). Most write on all issues, although some journalists that also write editorials (Le Puill, the agriculture expert at *l'Humanité*). It is difficult to state that one person dominates a domain. Regarding European integration, there is a strong presence of the *Ouest France* director and chief editor (Hutin) and one of the editors in chief who is also the head of the EU desk (Limagne). Both are proud to be pro-European. Limagne, whom we interviewed (see WP6 French report), thinks that the media have a role to play in raising awareness about the EU. He is also proud that his region, Brittany, “saved” the yes to Maastricht in the 1993 referendum and that the newspaper stance may have had something to do with it. In brief, the two chief editorial writers of *Ouest France* are committed to the EU and to their role as opinion leaders in the field of European integration. Both of them have written almost 30% of the editorials that were coded on that issue area.

Table 3.2a: calls for change per paper

Call for change by journalist	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
No call for change/not to change	50,4	29,9	44,0	37,1	39,4	236
Call for change	46,5	62,4	55,2	58,9	56,4	338
Neutral/ambiv. attitude as to whether change is needed	1,6	4,5	.	1,5	2,0	12
Call for the situation to remain as it is	1,6	3,2	0,9	2,5	2,2	13
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	129	157	116	197		599

Commentators in three of our four newspapers use their commenting to call for a change in politics. 56,4% of all editorials call for change. In the *Figaro*, this attitude is especially strong: here 62,4% call for change whereas the attitude in *Le Monde* is more ambivalent (46,5%). This variable is subjective. Therefore there may be differences between coders of different newspapers. This could explain the lower percentage of calls for change in *Le Monde*. Still, *Le Monde* can be “wishy-washy” and consensual even in its editorials.

Table 3.2b: calls for change per issue field

Call for change by journalist	Per issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
No call for change/not to change	39,0	19,3	18,9	50,3	42,1	28,6	43,6	39,4	236
Call for change	54,9	71,9	78,4	46,9	50,9	69,4	53,5	56,4	338
Neutral/ambiv. attitude as to whether change is needed	3,7	3,5	.	0,7	1,8	2,0	2,3	2,0	12
Call for the situation to remain as it is	2,4	5,3	2,7	2,1	5,3	.	0,6	2,2	13
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	82	57	37	145	57	49	172		599

There are some policy fields where the call for change is weaker: troops deployment, pensions, European integration and monetary policies. The strongest call for change is made in the field of immigration followed by education and agriculture. Agricultural policy is noteworthy since France has traditionally defended the Common Agricultural Policy in spite of a decline of the sector in terms of employment. Only the regional daily *Ouest France* has many readers from the farming industry. This may explain why there is no defence of the status quo in the “Parisian” papers.

Table 3.3a: conflict lines of commentator per paper

Conflict lines	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Leadership in Europe	2,2	23,8	1,7	5,4	7,6	14
Involvement in the European Project	6,7	16,7	1,7	5,4	7,1	13
Future of Europe	22,2	4,8	18,3	.	12,5	23
Political levels	4,4	9,5	11,7	.	7,1	13
Decision making within EU	4,4	2,4	1,7	.	2,2	4
EU reform	13,3	2,4	11,7	.	7,6	14
Values	8,9	.	3,3	5,4	4,3	8
Citizenship	2,2	7,1	3,3	29,7	9,2	17
Political information	.	.	.	2,7	0,5	1
Deepening	6,7	9,5	18,3	.	9,8	18
Widening	8,9	.	15,0	.	7,1	13
Relations between EU MS	8,9	.	6,7	10,8	6,5	12
Type of entity	4,4	11,9	5,0	37,8	13,0	24
EU influence in the world	4,4	4,8	.	.	2,2	4
Europe and the USA	2,2	7,1	.	.	2,2	4
Level of problem solving	.	.	2,6	2,7	1,4	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	45	42	60	37		184

The commentators refer to the primary conflict lines in the discussion regarding European integration (other conflict lines were coded according to certain priority coding rules yet they are not featured in the table). Coder subjectivity may be a factor as well. In brief, interpretation requires caution.

Overall, few conflict lines dominate yet each newspaper seems to focus on one or two, reflecting a different attitude towards the European project.

The two dailies that traditionally have supported European integration discuss the “future of Europe.” In that sense they adhere to the idea that Europe is a process. In French, we speak of “la construction européenne” suggesting a never ending building process.

Le Figaro, that still hosts some Gaullist tendencies is more worried about French “leadership in Europe,” a relevant question if one believes in a “Europe of nations” and considers the EU as a vector for French *grandeur*.

The Communist daily that wishes to defend the interests of the working classes and to echo social movements is more interested in defining what type of Europe is needed. The want of course a social Europe (“l’Europe sociale”). They also have a commitment to citizenship issues. European citizenship is also about social rights.

Only *Ouest France* seems to reflect on the issue of widening. This came out in interviews as well. As their journalist and editorial writer Limagne pointed out, “Europe is changing. Our newspaper is attached to the Europe of the founding fathers. Yet now we have a Europe of 25. This modifies our vision of Europe even if we are still attached to the values of the founding fathers, in particular the principle of solidarity” (see WP6 French report). Other newspapers avoid this conflict line. It must be said that France is not on the geographical front line of enlargement yet is concerned by the effect of enlargement on redistributive policies (CAP and

structural funds).² Journalists of the regional paper are aware of these developments since Brittany is a rural region that also has received structural funds. Yet, as table 3.3b below shows, editorials where the “widening” conflict line appears do not concern agriculture.

Table 3.3 b: conflict lines of commentator per issue field

Conflict line	Per issue field (in %)					Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	EUI	%	(N)
Leadership in Europe	6,9	20,0	.	25,0	6,4	7,6	14
Involvement in the European Project	13,8	.	.	.	6,4	7,1	13
Future of Europe	3,4	.	.	.	15,7	12,5	23
Political levels	3,4	20,0	.	.	7,1	7,1	13
Decision making within EU	2,9	2,2	4
EU reform	3,4	10,0	.	.	8,6	7,6	14
Values	5,7	4,3	8
Citizenship	6,9	.	.	.	10,7	9,2	17
Political information	.	10,0	.	.	.	0,5	1
Deepening	17,2,0	10,0.	100	.	7,9	9,8	18
Widening	9,3	7,1	13
Relations between EU MS	10,3	.	.	25,0	5,7	6,5	12
Type of entity	31,0	20,0	.	25,0	8,6	13,0	24
EU influence in the world	3,4	.	.	25,0	1,4	2,2	4
Europe and the USA	2,9	2,2	4
Level of problem solving	.	10,0	.	.	0,7	1,1	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	29	10	1	4	140		184

The number of conflict lines coded is 184. For 2001 and 2002, they were only coded when there was a European scope to the issue debated. The conflict lines are about the EU. Therefore they do not readily apply to certain policy domains (troops deployment, immigration, pensions and education).

This being said, it is prudent to say that regarding the most relevant field, European integration, the type of conflict lines that were identified are almost all featured in editorials except for the most outward looking ones (Europe and the USA, Europe influence in the world) and the most “technical” (i. e. tedious) one: EU decision-making.

² French publics, according to the Eurobarometer surveys, are not enthusiastic about enlargement.

Positions and subjective attitudes towards EU Integration

Note: the following tables only for those cases with a European issue scope.

Table 3.4a: Position regarding European integration by paper and year

Paper	Year	Moyenne	N	Ecart-type
Le Monde	2000	0,5	29	0,7
	2001	0,1	21	0,8
	2002	0,3	34	0,9
	Total	0,3	84	0,8
Le Figaro	2000	0,8	25	0,5
	2001	0,3	24	0,8
	2002	0,2	34	0,9
	Total	0,4	83	0,8
Ouest France	2000	0,5	31	0,8
	2001	0,6	25	0,7
	2002	0,7	26	0,7
	Total	0,6	82	0,7
L'Humanité	2000	-0,5	28	0,8
	2001	-0,4	9	0,9
	2002	-0,6	14	0,6
	Total	-0,5	51	0,8
Total	2000	0,3	113	0,9
	2001	0,3	79	0,8
	2002	0,2	108	0,9
	Total	0,3	300	0,9

Here the commentators' position towards European integration is analysed. Table 3.4a indicates the average position of a newspaper regarding its stance on the question whether integration should be deepened and rights of the EU extended. Position scores were coded and computed in such a way that a score of $-1,00$ indicates that the newspaper always took a negative position regarding the rights and competences of the EU, while a score of $1,00$ indicates that a positive stance towards more rights and competences is expressed.

Overall, the commentators in the four newspapers mildly support further integration and more rights for the EU (average is $0,3$; standard deviation $0,9$). *L'Humanité* in fact has a consistently negative stance over time. A neo-liberal Europe of bankers and “patrons” as they see does not warrant their support. *Le Figaro* and *Le Monde* have strong positive stances in 2000 (year of the French Presidency and the Nice treaty) and then display only mild assent. *Ouest France*, as expected, has a consistent positive stance (averaging $0,6$)

Table 3.4b: Position regarding European integration by policy field and year

Issue Field	Year	Moyenne	N	Ecart-type
Monetary politics	2000	0,1	21	0,9
	2001	0,2	25	0,8
	2002	-0,2	25	0,9
	Total	0,0	71	0,9
Agriculture	2000	0,1	9	0,9
	2001	0,1	14	0,9
	2002	0,1	9	0,9
	Total	0,1	32	0,9
Immigration	2000	0,7	6	0,5
	2001	0,2	5	0,4
	2002	0,8	8	0,7
	Total	0,6	19	0,6
Troops deployment	2000	1,0	1	.
	2002	0,0	3	1,0
	Total	0,3	4	1,0
Retirement and pension schemes	2002	-1,0	2	0,0
	Total	-1,0	2	0,0
European Integration	2000	0,4	76	0,9
	2001	0,4	35	0,9
	2002	0,4	61	0,8
	Total	0,4	172	0,8
Total	2000	0,3	113	0,9
	2001	0,3	79	0,8
	2002	0,2	108	0,9
	Total	0,3	300	0,9

Attitudes towards European integration are remarkably stable : No change over time with an average of 0,4 (maximum possible score = 1). There is a serious decline in positive attitudes in the field of monetary policy. This did not come out clearly from table 3.B about the call for change in this issue field (over half of the editorials yet not as much as in other policy areas). After the “honeymoon” of the launch of the euro, as growth dropped, deficits grew and the ECB kept ignoring political calls for a less rigorist anti-inflationary policy, this is not surprising. Regarding the immigration policy field, attitudes vary. It should be noted that this policy area is in part within the EC legal framework since 1999, although decision-making remains largely intergovernmental. Opinions seem unstable as to whether EC competence in this area should be further accrued.

Table 3.5a: Subjective attitude regarding European integration by paper and year

Paper	Year	Moyenne	N	Ecart-type
Le Monde	2000	0,9	29	0,4
	2001	0,4	21	0,7
	2002	0,9	34	0,4
	Total	0,8	84	0,5
Le Figaro	2000	0,8	25	0,4
	2001	0,8	24	0,4
	2002	0,8	34	0,4
	Total	0,8	83	0,4
Ouest France	2000	1,0	31	0,0
	2001	1,0	25	0,2
	2002	1,0	26	0,2
	Total	1,0	82	0,2
L'Humanité	2000	0,3	28	0,8
	2001	0,4	9	0,5
	2002	0,5	14	0,5
	Total	0,4	51	0,7
Total	2000	0,7	113	0,6
	2001	0,7	79	0,5
	2002	0,8	108	0,4
	Total	0,8	300	0,5

All newspapers strongly support the integration process. The difference in scores does give us their official stance or “ligne éditoriale” on the EU. Starting with the most europhile: 1) *Ouest France*, 2) *Le Monde*, 3) *Le Figaro*, 4) *L'Humanité*. *Ouest France* has the highest score possible and the standard deviation is very small suggesting consistency in opinions. *L'Humanité* is the less europhile yet the standard deviation is higher suggesting a balancing act between the EU they dream of and the EU that they see as deviating from that dream. It also means that contrary to what is often thought, the daily is open to diverse opinions.

Table 3.5b: Subjective attitude regarding European integration by policy field and year

Issue Field	Year	Moyenne	N	Ecart-type
Monetary politics	2000	0,8	21	0,5
	2001	0,7	25	0,5
	2002	0,8	25	0,4
	Total	0,7	71	0,5
Agriculture	2000	0,6	9	0,7
	2001	0,6	14	0,5
	2002	0,6	9	0,5
	Total	0,6	32	0,6
Immigration	2000	1,0	6	0,0
	2001	0,6	5	0,5
	2002	0,9	8	0,4
	Total	0,8	19	0,4
Troops deployment	2000	1,0	1	.
	2002	0,7	3	0,6
	Total	0,8	4	0,5
Retirement and pension schemes	2002	0,0	2	0,0
	Total	0,0	2	0,0
European Integration	2000	0,7	76	0,6
	2001	0,7	35	0,6
	2002	0,9	61	0,3
	Total	0,8	172	0,5
Total	2000	0,7	113	0,6
	2001	0,7	79	0,5
	2002	0,8	108	0,4
	Total	0,8	300	0,5

Editorials show strong support for the European integration across policy fields and over time.

Table 3.5c: Subjective attitude regarding European integration by paper and commentator

	Name	Moyenne	N	Ecart-type
Le Monde		0,8	84	0,5
	Total	0,8	84	0,5
Le Figaro	Baudis, Dominique	1,0	1	.
	Belot, Jean de	0,9	21	0,4
	Bollaert, Baudoin	0,9	8	0,4
	Brézet, Alexis	1,0	2	0,0
	Girard, Renaud	1,0	2	0,0
	Mariano, Antoine-Pierre	0,9	7	0,4
	Reclus, Philippe	0,9	7	0,4
	Rioufol, Ivan	0,7	3	0,6
	Rousselin, Pierre	0,9	12	0,3
	Schiffrès, Michel	0,4	7	0,5
	Thréard, Yves	0,3	4	0,5
Total	0,8	83	0,4	
Ouest France	Boissonat, Jean	0,9	8	0,4
	Boulic, Jean-Yves	1,0	3	0,0
	Burel, Paul	1,0	8	0,0
	Hutin, François-Régis	1,0	31	0,0
	Hutin, Jeanne-Emmanuelle	1,0	2	0,0
	Limagne, Joseph	1,0	25	0,0
	Pillet, Didier	1,0	1	.
	Plagnol, Hervé	0,0	1	.
	Redon, Julien	1,0	2	0,0
	Urvoy, Michel	1,0	1	.
	Total	1,0	82	0,2
L'Humanité	Apel-Muller, Patrick	0,5	2	0,7
	Cabanes, Claude	0,6	7	0,8
	Ducoin, Jean-Emmanuel	0,4	7	0,8
	Guillou, Lin	0,0	1	.
	Laurent, Pierre	0,5	10	0,5
	Le Hyaric, Patrick	0,7	3	0,6
	Le Puill, Gérard	-0,3	3	0,6
	Odent, Bruno	0,5	4	0,6
	Piérot, Jean-Paul	0,4	9	0,5
	Sylvestre, Charles	-0,4	5	0,5
	Total	0,4	51	0,7
Total		0,8	84	0,5

When examining the individual attitude of editorial writers, the overall impression per newspaper is confirmed. In *Ouest France*, there is no dissenting voice: every one shows strong support for the integration process. At *Le Figaro* the director or editor-in-chief Jean de Belot is strongly pro-EU, yet less enthusiastic voices can be heard (Shiffrès and Thréard) For *l'Humanité*, there is a wide range of opinions between writers and between editorials written by the same person. Only one writer is negative (but we have only 3 editorials to base our comments) : the agriculture correspondent Gérard Le Puill. Yet this is consistent with the answers that he gave us in the interview we did with him (WP6).

4. Addressees, Supporters and Opponents

Table 4.1a: presence of addressee by paper

Presence of Addressee	By paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
No indirect object	1,5	1,3	0,9	0,5	1,0	6
Addressee	97,7	93,0	96,6	89,9	93,7	564
Supported actor	0,8	5,1	2,6	6,0	4,0	24
Opponent	.	0,6	.	3,5	1,3	8
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	130	157	116	199		602

Within each commentary we coded – if possible – an addressee in the strict sense, whom the journalist calls upon, a supporter and an opponent of the journalists' view. As in the following we are only analysing one addressee actor in total per editorial, we have created a new variable 'addressee analysed' that decides which actor is chosen for the analysis. If no addressee was coded, we checked for the supporter and then for the opponent. This is also reflected in table 4.1a: nearly 98% of the actors analysed in this section have been coded as addressees in the strict sense.

Table 4.1b: presence of addressee by issue field

Presence of addressee	By Issue Field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
No indirect object	1,2	.	.	0,7	.	2,0	1,2	0,8	5
Addressee	96,3	94,7	97,3	88,4	94,7	95,9	95,4	93,8	564
Supported actor	1,2	3,5	2,7	10,3	.	2,0	2,3	4,0	24
Opponent	1,2	1,8	.	0,7	5,3	.	1,2	1,3	8
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	82	57	37	146	57	49	173		601

11% of all commentaries in troops deployment do not have an addressee.

Table 4.2a: addressees by paper

Addressee	By paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Whole polities	.	9,7	.	8,1	5,2	31
Politicians	4,7	2,6	3,5	2,0	3,0	18
Former states(wo)men	.	0,6	1,7	.	0,5	3
Government/executive	78,9	69,0	78,3	70,7	73,5	438
Legislative	5,5	3,2	5,2	0,5	3,2	19
Judiciary	.	1,3	.	.	0,3	2
Military	1,6	.	2,6	0,5	1,0	6
Central banks	5,5	3,9	1,7	1,0	2,9	17
Social security executive org.	.	0,6	.	.	0,2	1
Political parties	0,8	.	0,9	4,0	1,7	10
Unions and employees	0,8	1,3	0,9	3,5	1,8	11
Employers org. and firms	.	0,6	0,9	3,0	1,3	8
Churches and religious org. and groups	0,8	0,6	.	.	0,3	2
Media and journalists	.	0,6	.	.	0,2	1
Farmers and agricultural org.	.	.	1,7	.	0,3	2
Educational professionals and org.	.	3,2	1,7	.	1,2	7
Economist and financial experts	0,8	.	.	.	0,2	1
Students, pupils, and their parents	.	1,3	.	.	0,3	2
Pro- and anti-EU camp. org. and groups	.	0,6	.	0,5	0,3	2
Peace movement org. and groups	.	.	.	5,1	1,7	10
Other civil society org. and groups	0,8	0,6	0,9	1,0	0,8	5
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	85	155	72	198		596

Summary addressee	By paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
state and party actors	96,9	81,3	93,9	78,8	86,2	514
economic interest groups	1,6	1,9	3,5	6,6	3,7	11
media and journalists	.	0,6	.	.	0,2	1
other civil society actors	1,6	6,5	2,6	6,6	4,7	28
general/unknown/unspecified	.	9,7	.	8,1	5,2	31
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	128	155	115	198		596

State and party actors clearly dominate as addressees of the editorials. Two thirds of the addressees are governments. This is the case across newspapers. Only the Left newspaper also addresses economic interest groups and civil society actors. Yet overall writers invoke the “powers-that-be,” the executives, in standard editorial writing.

Table 4.2b: addressees by issue field

Addressee	By Issue Field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
Whole polities	8,6	5,3	.	9,7	.	.	4,1	5,2	31
Politicians	4,9	3,5	.	1,4	1,8	.	5,3	3,0	18
Former states(wo)men	1,2	.	.	.	1,8	.	0,6	0,5	3
Government/executive	59,3	82,5	100	75,2	68,4	77,1	70,8	73,5	438
Legislative	1,2	.	.	0,7	.	2,1	9,4	3,2	19
Judiciary	.	1,8	0,6	0,3	2
Military	.	.	.	4,1	.	.	.	1,0	6
Central banks	21,0	2,9	17
Social security executive org.	1,8	.	.	0,2	1
Political parties	1,2	.	.	1,4	7,0	.	1,8	1,7	10
Unions and employees	10,5	.	2,9	1,8	11
Employers org. and firms	1,2	3,5	.	.	8,8	.	.	1,3	8
Churches and religious org. and groups	1,2	0,3	2
Media and journalists	0,6	0,2	1
Farmers and agricultural org.	.	3,5	0,3	2
Educational professionals and org.	14,6	.	1,2	7
Economist and financial experts	1,2	0,2	1
Students, pupils, and their parents	4,2	.	0,3	2
Pro- and anti-EU campaign org. and groups	1,2	0,3	2
Peace movement org. and groups	.	.	.	6,9	.	.	.	1,7	10
Other civil society org. and groups	.	.	.	0,7	.	2,1	1,8	0,8	5
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	81	57	37	145	57	48	171		596

Summary addressee	By issue Field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
state and party actors	88,9	87,7	100,0	82,8	80,7	79,2	88,3	86,2	514
economic interest groups	2,5	7,0	.	.	19,3	.	2,9	3,7	1
media and journalists	0,6	0,2	1
other civil society actors	.	.	.	7,6	.	20,8	4,1	4,7	28
general/unknown/unspecified	8,6	5,3	.	9,7	.	.	4,1	5,2	31
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	81	57	37	145	57	48	171		596

Again addressees are mainly governments and executives across policy fields (100% of addressees in the immigration field are governments based on 37 editorials). In the field of monetary policy, central banks of course are also addressed (21% of editorials in this field).

Table 4.2c: addressees by year

Addressee	By year			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Whole polities	.	10,3	5,2	5,2	31
Politicians	0,5	4,3	3,9	3,0	18
Former states(wo)men	.	.	1,3	0,5	3
Government/executive	84,1	65,8	71,3	73,5	438
Legislative	.	2,2	6,5	3,2	19
Judiciary	0,5	.	0,4	0,3	2
Military	.	2,2	0,9	1,0	6
Central banks	2,2	7,1	.	2,9	17
Social security executive org.	0,5	.	.	0,2	1
Political parties	1,1	1,1	2,6	1,7	10
Unions and employees	3,8	1,6	0,4	1,8	11
Employers organizations and firms	.	2,7	1,3	1,3	8
Churches and religious org. and groups	.	.	0,9	0,3	2
Media and journalists	.	0,5	.	0,2	1
Farmers and agricultural org.	1,1	.	.	0,3	2
Educational professionals and org.	2,2	0,5	0,9	1,2	7
Economist and financial experts	0,5	.	.	0,2	1
Students, pupils, and their parents	1,1	.	.	0,3	2
Pro- and anti-EU campaign org. and groups	0,5	.	0,4	0,3	2
Peace movement org. and groups	.	1,1	3,5	1,7	10
Other civil society org. and groups	1,6	0,5	0,4	0,8	5
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	182	184	230	510	596

There is no clear evolution over time in the type of addressees in editorials. The ECB is featured as an addressee more in 2001 than in 2000 yet in 2002 no editorials address the ECB.

Summary addressee	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
state and party actors	89,0	82,6	87,0	86,2	514
economic interest groups	5,5	4,3	1,7	3,7	22
media and journalists	.	0,5	.	0,2	1
other civil society actors	5,5	2,2	6,1	4,7	28
general/unknown/unspecified	.	10,3	5,2	5,2	31
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	182	184	230		596

There is no clear trend here either. There is a stability in the dominance of state and party actors as addressees. There is however no change in editorial writing that suggests that there should be a change between 2000 and 2002.

Table 4.3a: addressee scope by paper

Addressee scope	By paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	5,5	0,6	3,5	4,5	3,5	21
Other supranational	2,3	.	0,9	.	0,7	4
EU	40,6	37,0	45,2	21,2	34,1	203
Other European supranational	.	.	.	2,0	0,7	4
Multilateral	3,1	.	.	1,5	1,2	7
Bilateral	0,8	.	.	.	0,2	1
Germany	2,3	1,9	5,2	0,5	2,2	13
France	32,0	44,8	39,1	47,0	41,7	248
UK	0,8	1,9	1,7	1,0	1,3	8
Italy	1,6	0,6	.	.	0,5	3
Spain	.	.	.	0,5	0,2	1
Other EU-members	1,6	.	.	2,5	1,2	7
Turkey	0,8	0,6	.	.	0,3	2
USA	7,8	11,0	3,5	16,2	10,6	63
Middle East	0,8	0,6	0,9	2,5	1,3	8
Rest of the world	.	0,6	.	0,5	0,3	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	128	154	115	198		595

34,1% of all editorials address EU actors (see table 4.3b for policy fields concerned). The more editorials have a positive attitude towards the EU and the European integration process, the more they address the EU, suggesting that they deem it is a legitimate entity. So *Ouest France* addresses the EU more than *le Monde* (45,2% vs. 40,6%) that in turn addresses the EU more than *le Figaro* (37%). *L'Humanité* is much less likely to address the EU (21%) and the most eurosceptic.

L'Humanité and *Le Figaro* conversely address French actors more than *Ouest France* and *Le Monde*. In *Le Figaro* and *L'Humanité*, editorial writers address the US more. As we will see below, editorials addressing the USA regard troop deployment (Afghanistan, Iraq, ...) and monetary policy (the federal reserve bank)

Table 4.3b: addressee scope by issue field

Addressee scope	By issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	.	.	.	13,8	1,8	.	.	3,5	21
Other supranational	.	.	.	2,8	.	.	.	0,7	4
EU	60,5	38,6	48,6	6,2	3,5	.	60,6	34,1	203
Other European supranational	.	.	.	2,1	.	.	0,6	0,7	4
Multilateral	2,5	3,5	.	0,7	.	2,1	0,6	1,2	7
Bilateral	0,6	0,2	1
Germany	2,5	.	2,7	0,7	.	.	5,3	2,2	13
France	24,7	54,4	45,9	25,5	94,7	97,9	24,7	41,7	248
UK	4,9	3,5	.	1,4	.	.	.	1,3	8
Italy	1,8	0,5	3
Spain	0,6	0,2	1
Other EU-members	1,2	3,5	1,2	7
Turkey	1,2	0,3	2
USA	3,7	.	.	4,7	.	.	0,6	10,6	63
Middle East	.	.	.	5,5	.	.	.	1,3	8
Rest of the world	.	.	2,7	0,7	.	.	.	0,3	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100,0	100,0	100	100	100	
(N)	81	57	37	145	57	48	170		595

The fields where EU actors are a majority of addressees are monetary policy and European integration. In both cases, about 60% of addressees are EU actors and 25% are French actors. This is expected given that they are relevant actors in the decision-making structures. One perhaps would have expected less national addressees in monetary policy. National-level actors are still relevant regarding European integration since they decide on key orientations, treaty changes, etc.

Agriculture is a common European policy. Yet it is implemented at the national level and national executives weigh in the decision-making process (via the SCA, the special Committee on Agriculture, and various Council committees. Thus it makes sense to address national-level actors in this field (54,4%).

UK actors are addressed in the field of monetary policy since the British pound has not joined the eurozone and in the field of agriculture because of its involvement in several animal disease outbreaks. The USA is addressed in both monetary affairs and troops deployment; One interesting finding regards the fact that EU actors are solicited in the field of immigration. The problems at the EU external border of Calais (separating France from “opt-out” UK) may explain this propensity to call upon EU actors to solve the situation.

As expected given EU competence, European-level actors are irrelevant and thus ignored in the field of pensions and (primary and secondary) education. One oddity that needs to be checked is the UN scope for editorials on pensions.

Table 4.3c: addressee scope by year

Addressee scope	By Year			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	2,7	3,3	4,4	3,5	21
Other supranational	0,5	1,6	.	0,7	4
EU	45,1	30,4	28,4	34,1	203
Other European supranational	.	.	1,7	0,7	4
Multilateral	1,6	1,1	0,9	1,2	7
Bilateral	0,5			0,2	1
Germany	2,7	0,5	3,1	2,2	13
France	39,6	40,2	44,5	41,7	248
UK	0,5	3,3	0,4	1,3	8
Italy	.	1,1	0,4	0,5	3
Spain	.	.	0,4	0,2	1
Other EU-members	3,8	.	.	1,2	7
Turkey	.	.	0,9	0,3	2
USA	1,1	17,4	12,7	10,6	63
Middle East	1,6	1,1	1,3	1,3	8
Rest of the world	.	.	0,9	0,3	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	182	184	229		595

There seems to be a 9/11 factor as the Un and the US are addressed more in 2001 and 2002 compared to 2000. There is a decline over time of EU addressees. This may mean that 2000 was an eventful year in the area of European integration (with the French presidency and Nice treaty). Monetary policy is important in 2001 so this should not lead to a decline in EU addressees. There is a slight increase of national addressees over time. Germany is not present consistently over time (with a drop in 2001° although one could surmise that the French partner in the EU should be regularly addressed.

Table 4.3d: addressee scope by broad addressee category

Addressee scope	By broad addressee					Total	
	State and party actors	Economic interest groups	Media and journalists	Other civil society actors	General/ unknown/ unspecified	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	2,9	.	.	.	19,4	3,5	21
Other supranational	0,8	0,7	4
EU	34,8	22,7	100	14,8	45,2	34,1	203
Other European supranational	.	.	.	14,8	.	0,7	4
Multilateral	0,2	13,6	.	11,1	.	1,2	7
Bilateral	0,2	0,2	1
Germany	2,5	2,2	13
France	42,0	59,1	.	51,9	16,1	41,7	248
UK	1,6	1,3	8
Italy	0,6	0,5	3
Spain	.	4,5	.	.	.	0,2	1
Other EU-members	1,4	1,2	7
Turkey	0,2	.	.	3,7	.	0,3	2
USA	10,9	.	.	3,7	19,4	10,6	63
Middle East	1,6	1,3	8
Rest of the world	0,4	0,3	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	514	22	1	27	31		595

Almost half of the EU addresses are unspecified, general or unknown. As General de Gaulle said once in an interview: “L’Europe, l’Europe.” It is invoked in vague terms (as savior or demon).

5. Positively evaluated Addressees and Supporters

Table 5.1a: Positively evaluated Addressees per paper

Positively evaluated addressee	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L`Humanité	%	(N)
Whole polities	.	4,9	.	10,3	4,8	12
Politicians	2,5	1,2	.	3,8	2,0	5
Former states(wo)men	.	.	2,0	.	0,4	1
Government/executive	77,5	70,4	70,6	51,3	65,6	164
Legislative	15,0	6,2	11,8	1,3	7,2	18
Military	.	.	3,9	1,3	1,2	3
Central banks	.	4,9	2,0	.	2,0	5
Political parties	.	.	.	6,4	2,0	5
Unions and employees	.	1,2	2,0	9,0	4,0	10
Employers organizations and firms	.	1,2	2,0	.	0,8	2
Churches and religious org. and groups	.	1,2	.	.	0,4	1
Farmers and agricultural org.	.	.	3,9	.	0,8	2
Educational professionals and org.¹	.	3,7	.	.	1,2	3
Students, pupils, and their parents	.	2,5	.	.	0,8	2
Pro- and anti-EU campaign org. and groups	.	1,2	.	1,3	0,8	2
Peace movement org. and groups	.	.	.	12,8	4,0	10
Other civil society org. and groups	.	1,2	.	2,6	2,0	5
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	40	81	51	78		250

Summary of positive evaluated addressee	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L`Humanité	%	(N)
State and party actors	95,0	82,7	90,2	64,1	80,4	201
Economic interest groups	2,5	2,5	7,8	9,0	5,6	14
Other civil society actors	2,5	9,9	2,0	16,7	9,2	23
General/unknown/unspecified	.	4,9	.	10,3	4,8	12
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	40	81	51	78		250

Table 5.1b: Positively evaluated Addressees per issue field

Positively evaluated addressee	Per issue Field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	N
Whole polities	5,7	.	.	10,8	.	.	3,7	4,8	12
Politicians	5,7	.	.	3,1	.	.	1,2	2,0	5
Former states(wo)men	2,9	0,4	1
Government/executive	65,7	88,2	100	60,0	60,0	58,8	62,2	65,6	164
Legislative	2,9	.	.	1,5	.	5,9	18,3	7,2	18
Military	.	.	.	4,6	.	.	.	1,2	3
Central banks	14,3	2,0	5

Political parties	.	.	.	3,1	10,0	.	1,2	2,0	5
Unions and employees	25,0	.	6,1	4,0	10
Employers organizations and firms	2,9	.	.	.	5,0	.	.	0,8	2
Churches and religious org. and groups	1,2	0,4	1
Farmers and agricultural org.	.	11,8	0,8	2
Educational professionals and org.¹	17,6	.	1,2	3
Students, pupils, and their parents	11,8	.	0,8	2
Pro- and anti-EU campaign org. and groups	2,4	0,8	2
Peace movement org. and groups	.	.	.	15,4	.	.	.	4,0	10
Other civil society org. and groups	.	.	.	1,5	.	5,9	3,7	2,0	5
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	35	17	14	65	20	17	82		250

Summary of positively eval. addressee	Per issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
State and party actors	91,4	88,2	100	72,3	70,0	64,7	82,9	80,4	201
Economic interest groups	2,9	11,8	.	.	30,0	.	6,1	5,6	14
Other civil society actors	.	.	.	16,9	.	35,3	7,3	9,2	23
General/unknown/unspecified	5,7	.	.	10,8	.	.	3,7	4,8	12
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	35	17	14	65	20	17	82		250

Table 5.2a: Scope of positively evaluated Addressees per paper

Scope of positively ev. addressee	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	10,0	.	3,9	10,3	5,6	14
EU	47,5	35,0	62,7	23,1	39,0	97
Other European supranational	.	.	.	5,1	1,6	4
Multilateral	2,5	.	.	1,3	0,8	2
Bilateral	2,5	.	.	.	0,4	1
Germany	2,5	2,5	5,9	1,3	2,8	7
France	30,0	42,5	25,5	51,3	39,8	99
UK	2,5	3,8	2,0	.	2,0	5
Italy	.	1,3	.	.	0,4	1
Spain	.	.	.	1,3	0,4	1
Turkey	2,5	1,3	.	.	0,8	2
USA	.	12,5	.	2,6	4,8	12
Middle East	.	.	.	3,8	1,2	3
Rest of the world	.	1,3	.	.	0,4	1

Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	40	80	51	78		249

Table 5.2b: Scope of positively evaluated Addressees per issue field

Scope of positively ev. addressee	Per issue Field							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	.	.	.	21,5	.	.	.	5,6	14
EU	62,9	35,3	50,0	10,8	.	.	67,9	39,0	97
Other European supranational	.	.	.	4,6	.	.	1,2	1,6	4
Multilateral	.	.	.	1,5	.	5,9	.	0,8	2
Bilateral	1,2	0,4	1
Germany	.	.	.	1,5	.	.	7,4	2,8	7
France	17,1	64,7	42,9	40,0	100	94,1	17,3	39,8	99
UK	11,4	.	.	1,5	.	.	.	2,0	5
Italy	1,2	0,4	1
Spain	1,2	0,4	1
Turkey	2,5	0,8	2
USA	8,6	.	.	13,8	.	.	.	4,8	12
Middle East	.	.	.	4,6	.	.	.	1,2	3
Rest of the world	.	.	7,1	0,4	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	35	17	14	65	20	17	81		249

6. Negatively evaluated Addressees and Supporters

Table 6.1a: Negatively evaluated Addressees per paper

Negatively ev. addressee	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Whole polities	.	10,2	.	6,4	4,6	11
Politicians	8,1	4,1	12,5	1,1	5,1	12
Former states(wo)men	.	2,0	.	.	0,4	1
Government/executive	82,3	69,4	87,5	80,9	79,7	189
Judiciary	.	2,0	.	.	0,4	1
Central banks	6,5	4,1	.	2,1	3,4	8
Political parties	.	.	.	3,2	1,3	3
Unions and employees	.	2,0	.	.	0,4	1
Employers org. and firms	.	.	.	6,4	2,5	6
Churches and religious org. and groups	1,6	.	.	.	0,4	1
Media and journalists	.	2,0	.	.	0,4	1
Educational professionals and org.¹	.	4,1	.	.	0,8	2
Economists and financial experts	1,6	.	.	.	0,4	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	62	49	32	94		237

Summary of negatively ev. Addressee	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
State and party actors	96,8	81,6	100,0	87,2	90,3	214
Economic interest groups	1,6	2,0	.	6,4	3,4	8
Media and journalists	.	2,0	.	.	0,4	1
Other civil society actors	1,6	4,1	.	.	1,3	3
General/unknown/unspecified	.	10,2	.	6,4	4,6	11
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	62	49	32	94		237

Table 6.1b: Negatively evaluated Addressees per issue field

Negatively ev. Addressee	Per issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
Whole polities	11,8	3,7	.	9,6	.	.	1,7	4,6	11
Politicians	5,9	3,7	.	.	2,9	.	13,3	5,1	12
Former states(wo)men	2,9	.	.	0,4	1
Government/executive	52,9	81,5	100,0	90,4	73,5	89,5	81,7	79,7	189
Judiciary	.	3,7	0,4	1
Central banks	23,5	3,4	8
Political parties	2,9	.	.	.	5,9	.	.	1,3	3

Unions and employees	2,9	.	.	0,4	1
Employers organizations and firms	.	7,4	.	.	11,8	.	.	2,5	6
Churches and religious org. and groups	1,7	0,4	1
Media and journalists	1,7	0,4	1
Educational professionals and org.¹	10,5	.	0,8	2
Economists and financial experts	2,9	0,4	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	34	27	11	52	34	19	60		237

	Per issue field (in %)							Total	
Summary of negatively ev. addressee	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	%	(N)
State and party actors	85,3	88,9	100	90,4	85,3	89,5	95,0	90,3	214
Economic interest groups	2,9	7,4	.	.	14,7	.	.	3,4	8
Media and journalists	1,7	0,4	1
Other civil society actors	10,5	1,7	1,3	3
General/unknown/unspecified	11,8	3,7	.	9,6	.	.	1,7	4,6	11
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	34	27	11	52	34	19	60		237

Table 6.2a: Scope of negatively evaluated Addressees per paper

	Per paper (in %)				Total	
Scope of negatively ev. addressee	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	3,2	.	3,1	.	1,3	3
Other Supranational	1,6	.	.	.	0,4	1
EU	30,6	38,8	21,9	22,3	27,8	66
Multilateral	4,8	.	.	2,1	2,1	5
Germany	.	2,0	6,3	.	1,3	3
France	41,9	53,1	53,1	37,2	43,9	104
UK	.	.	3,1	2,1	1,3	3
Italy	3,2	.	.	.	0,8	2
Other EU-members	3,2	.	.	5,3	3,0	7
USA	9,7	6,1	9,4	30,9	17,3	41
Middle East	1,6	.	3,1	.	0,8	2
Total (%)°	100	100	100	100	100	

(N)	62	49	32	94	237
-----	----	----	----	----	-----

Table 6.2b: Scope of negatively evaluated Addressees per issue field

Scope of negatively ev. Addressee	Per issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	.	.	.	5,8	.	.	.	1,3	3
Other supranational	.	.	.	1,9	.	.	.	0,4	1
EU	58,8	33,3	36,4	3,8	5,9	.	48,3	27,8	66
Multilateral	5,9	7,4	1,7	2,1	5
Germany	5,9	1,7	1,3	3
France	26,5	51,9	63,6	5,8	94,1	100	33,3	43,9	104
UK	.	7,4	.	1,9	.	.	.	1,3	3
Italy	3,3	0,8	2
Other EU-members	2,9	10,0	3,0	7
USA	.	.	.	76,9	.	.	1,7	17,3	41
Middle East	.	.	.	3,8	.	.	.	0,8	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	34	27	11	52	34	19	60		237

7. Issues and aims per paper

Table 7.1: policy field per paper

Issue Field	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Monetary politics	18,6	19,1	10,3	8,0	13,6	82
Agriculture	10,1	10,2	12,9	6,5	9,5	57
Immigration	8,5	5,1	6,9	5,0	6,2	37
Troops deployment	20,9	15,9	12,1	40,2	24,3	146
Retirement and pension schemes	3,1	8,9	2,6	18,1	9,5	57
Education	5,4	12,1	6,0	8,0	8,2	49
European Integration	33,3	28,7	49,1	14,1	28,8	173
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	129	157	116	199		601

The analysis includes all commentaries that had a reference to one of the seven policy fields under study: Monetary politics, agricultural politics, immigration politics, matters of troops deployment, retirement politics, educational politics or politics of European Integration. Table 7.1 reflects the distribution of the commentaries across those issues. 28,8 % of the commentaries in all four newspapers made matters of European Integration a subject of discussion. Other frequently commented issues were matters of troops deployment (24,3%), monetary politics (13,6%) . The least important issue in this row was immigration (6,2%).

The distribution across newspapers however, reveals different priorities. The so-called quality newspapers show roughly comparable issue agendas, with the only difference, that *Le Figaro* has a pet peeve: education policy. Both comment a lot on monetary policy. Both these newspapers target readers that should be interested in these issues (“*les décideurs*”) and ambition to resemble the *Financial Times*. *L'Humanité* commented twice as often on the topic of troops deployment, than *Le Monde* and 40% of the editorials are on their topic. In comparison, the regional newspaper pays more attention to the issues of agricultural politics, which makes sense since they are located in a farm region (Brittany). The most europhile newspaper is also the paper that writes more editorials on European integration (*Ouest France*), the least europhile writes the fewest (*l'Humanité*).

Tables 7.2a – 7.2g: Subissues within policy fields per paper, separate for each policy field

Issue Field : MON	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Monetary Politics General	.	3,3	.	.	1,2	1
Interest Rate Adjustments	29,2	23,3	33,3	.	22,0	18
EMU Convergence crit. and stab. pact	16,7	33,3	16,7	93,8	37,8	31
Exchange rate intervention	.	3,3	.	.	1,2	1
Independence Central Banks	4,2	.	8,3	.	2,4	2

Common currency	45,8	20,0	41,7	6,3	28,0	23
Dynamics of euro campaign	4,2	.	.	.	1,2	1
Other Specific	.	16,7	.	.	6,1	5
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	24	30	12	16		82

Issue Field : AGRI	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Reform of the system of subsidies	23,1	25,0	46,7,0	15,4	28,1	16
Subsidies and enlargement of the EU	.	.	.	7,7	1,8	1
BSE	76,9	75,0	40,0.	69,2	64,9	37
Foot and Mouth Disease	.	.	13,3	.	3,5	2
Other Specific	.	.	.	7,7	1,8	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	13	16	15	13		57

Issue field: IMM	Per paper (in%)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
General Immigration politics	27,3	75,0	25,0	20,0	35,1	13
Institutional framework	9,1	.	.	.	2,7	1
Entry and border controls	.	12,5	25,0	10,0	10,8	4
Expulsions	.	12,5	.	50,0	16,2	6
Migration programs and quotas	27,3	.	25,0	.	13,5	5
Visa and consular policy	36,4	.	12,5	.	13,5	5
Actions relating to smuggling	.	.	.	20,0	5,4	2
Non valid	.	.	12,5	.	2,7	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	11	8	8	10		37

Issue field:TRP	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
General reference to deploy. of troops	7,4	.	7,1	1,3	2,7	4
Deployment for military aggression	7,4	72,0	.	61,3	47,3	69
Deploy. for invas. of foreign sov. Terr.	55,6	12,0	57,1	3,8	19,9	29
Deploy. in covert aggressive operations	.	.	14,3	.	1,4	2
Deployment for peace keeping	11,1	12,0	7,1	33,8	23,3	34
Deployment to rescue civilians	3,7	4,0	14,3	.	2,7	4
Deployment in times of crisis	7,4	.	.	.	1,4	2
Other specific ref. to deploy. of troops	7,4	.	.	.	1,4	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	27	25	14	80		146

	Per paper (in %)				Total	
--	------------------	--	--	--	-------	--

Issue field: PEN	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
General reference to pension schemes	50,0	42,9	33,3	13,9	24,6	14
Demographic changes	.	21,4	33,3	5,6	10,5	6
Retirement ages	25,0	21,4	33,3	41,7	35,1	20
Income levels in retirement	.	.	.	2,8	1,8	1
State versus private pension schemes	25,0	7,1	.	25,0	19,3	11
State pension scheme	.	.	.	5,6	3,5	2
Private pension scheme	.	.	.	5,6	3,5	2
Other specific	.	7,1	.	.	1,8	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	4	14	3	36		57

	Per paper (in %)				Total	
Issue field: EDU	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
General education politics	.	36,8	28,6	18,8	24,5	12
Structural issues	14,3	15,8	14,3	.	10,2	4
Resource allocation and salaries	.	15,8	14,3	68,8	30,6	15
Private education	28,6	.	.	.	4,1	2
Curriculum	.	5,3	28,6	6,3	10,2	5
Scholarships and fees	14,3	5,3	.	.	2,0	1
Problems at school	42,9	21,1	14,3	6,3	18,4	9
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	7	19	7	16		49

	Per paper (in %)				Total	
Issue Field : EUI	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
General European integration	4,7	13,3	1,8	10,7	6,9	12
Shared values and Identity	.	.	7,0	3,6	2,9	5
Role of a specific country in the EU	32,6	26,7	24,6	32,1	28,3	49
Relations. betw. EU and nat. levels	25,6	35,6	29,8	3,6	26,0	45
Institutional structure	11,6	.	12,3	.	6,9	12
Defining the EUs core tasks	.	6,7	.	28,6	6,4	11
Relations. betw. EU instit. and pub.	2,3	2,2	3,5	17,9	5,2	9
Enlargement	20,9	13,3	21,1	3,6	16,2	28
Budget	2,3	.	.	.	0,6	1
Non valid	.	2,2	.	.	0,6	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	43	45	57	28		173

Table 7.3: issue scope by paper

	By paper (in %)				Total	
Issue scope	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	5,4	1,9	5,2	12,3	6,7	40
Other supranational	3,1	.	.	.	0,7	4
EU	64,3	52,2	73,9	27,2	50,8	203
Multilateral	3,1	1,3	5,2	7,7	4,5	27

Bilateral	4,7	12,7	1,7	20,5	11,4	68
Germany	.	0,6	0,9	.	0,3	2
France	16,3	28,0	13,0	30,3	23,3	139
UK	.	.	.	1,0	0,3	2
Other EU-members	.	.	.	1,0	0,3	2
USA	3,1	3,2	.	.	1,5	9
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	129	157	115	195		596

Table 7.4: issue scope per policy field

Issue scope	Per issue field							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	.	.	.	28,0	.	.	.	6,7	40
Other supranational	.	.	.	2,8	.	.	.	0,7	4
EU	91,5	60,7	51,4	2,8	5,3	.	97,7	50,8	303
Multilateral	1,2	5,4	.	14,7	1,8	2,0	.	4,5	27
Bilateral	.	.	2,7	46,2	.	.	0,6	11,4	68
Germany	.	.	2,7	.	.	.	0,6	0,3	2
France	2,4	32,1	43,21	2,1	91,2	98,0	.	23,3	139
UK	.	1,8	.	.	1,8	.	.	0,3	2
Other EU-members	1,2	0,3	2
USA	4,9	.	.	3,5	.	.	.	1,5	9
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	82	56	37	143	57	49	172		596

Table 7.5a – 7.5g : issue scope per paper, separate for each policy field

Issue scope: MON	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
EU	95,8	80,0	100	100	91,5	75
Multilateral	4,2				1,2	1
France	.	6,7	.	.	2,4	2
USA	.	13,3	.	.	4,9	4
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	24	30	12	16		82

Issue scope: AGRI	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
EU	53,8	56,3	78,6	53,8	60,7	34
Multilateral	.	.	7,1	15,4	5,4	3
France	46,2	43,8	14,3	23,1	32,1	18
UK	.	.	.	7,7	1,8	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	13	16	14	13		56

	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L`Humanité	%	(N)
Issue scope: IMM						
EU	63,6	62,5	62,5	20,0	51,4	19
Bilateral	9,1	.	.	.	2,7	1
Germany	.	.	12,5	.	2,7	1
France	27,3	37,5	25,0	80,0	43,2	16
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	11	8	6	10		37

	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L`Humanité	%	(N)
Issue scope: TRP						
Supranational: UN	25,9	12,0	42,9,5	31,2	28,0	40
Other supranational	14,8	.	.	.	2,8	4
EU	14,8	.	.	.	2,8	4
Multilateral	7,4	4,0	35,7	16,9	14,7	21
Bilateral	14,8	80,0	14,3	51,9	46,2	66
France	7,4	.	7,1	.	2,1	3
USA	14,8	4,0	.	.	3,5	5
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	27	25	14	77		143

	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L`Humanité	%	(N)
Issue scope: PEN						
EU	.	.	.	8,3	5,3	3
Multilateral	.	7,1	.	.	1,8	1
France	100	92,9	100	88,9	91,2	52
UK	.	.	.	2,8	1,8	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	4	14	3	36		57

	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L`Humanité	%	(N)
Issue scope: EDU						
Multilateral	14,3	.	.	.	2,0	1
France	85,7	100	100	100	98,0	48
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	7	19	7	16		49

	Per paper (in %)				Total	
--	------------------	--	--	--	-------	--

Issue scope: EUI	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
EU	97,7	97,8	100	92,6	97,7	168
Bilateral	2,3				0,6	1
Germany	.	2,2	.	.	0,6	1
Other EU-members	.	.	.	7,4	1,2	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	.
(N)	43	45	57	27		172

8. Issues and aims per year

Table 8.1: policy field by year

issue field	Per year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Monetary politics	12,6	16,7	12,1	13,6	82
Agriculture	14,2	11,3	4,3	9,5	57
Immigration	3,8	6,5	7,8	6,2	37
Troops deployment	6,6	33,3	31,0	24,3	146
Retirement and pension schemes	6,6	9,7	11,6	9,5	57
Education	14,8	3,2	6,9	8,2	49
European Integration	41,5	19,4	26,3	28,8	173
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	183	186	232		601

Journalistic products, including commentaries, reflect distinct issue cycles over time that depend on the actual political developments. To analyse these movements the presence of issues will be analysed across the years 2000, 2001 and 2002 (Table 8.1). In this period “Monetary politics” has gained importance. This peak might have been caused by the introduction of the Euro in cash that has caught the attention of readers and of commentators. “Agricultural politics” stimulated more commentaries in 2000 than in later years. The peak of the issue of “troops deployment” in 2001 and in 2002 corresponds to the terrorist attack on the USA in 2001 (“September 11th”), followed by war (preparations) against Afghanistan and Iraq. The issue of “retirement and pension schemes” fades in and out of the public debate; so does education. The peak of matters of “European Integration” in 2000 might be due to the sanctions that the Eu-14 have imposed on Austria in spring 2000 and the French Presidency and Nice debate in the fall. Issues of Immigration gain more attention, mainly as the Sangatte camp (where migrants on their way to the UK are housed) attracts a lot of media attention.

Tables 8.2a – 8.2g: Subissues within policy fields by year, separate for each policy field

Issue field: MON	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Monetary Politics General	.	3,2	.	1,2	1
Interest Rate Adjustments	13,0.	45,2	3,6	22,0	18
EMU Converg. crit. and stab. pact	17,4	19,4	75,0	37,8	31
Exchange rate intervention	4,3	.	.	1,2	1
Independence Central Banks	.	3,2	3,6	2,4	2
Common currency	43,5,0	25,8	17,9	28,0	23
Dynamics of euro campaign	4,3	.	.	1,2	1
Other Specific	17,4	3,2	.	6,1	5
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	23	31	28		82

	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Issue Field: AGRI					
Reform of the system of subsidies	3,8	38,1	70,0	28,1	16
Subsidies and enlarg. of the EU	.	.	10,0	1,8	1
BSE	92,3	52,4	20,0	64,9	37
Foot and Mouth Disease	.	9,5	.	3,5	2
Other Specific	3,8	.	.	1,8	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	26	21	10		57

	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Issue field: IMM					
General Immigration politics	28,6	8,3	55,6	35,1	13
Institutional framework	.	8,3	.	2,7	1
Entry and border controls	14,3	8,3	11,1	10,8	4
Expulsions	14,3	16,7	16,7	16,2	6
Migration programs and quotas	28,6	16,7	5,6	13,5	5
Visa and consular policy	.	33,3	5,6	13,5	5
Actions relating to smuggling	14,3	.	5,6	5,4	2
Non valid	.	8,3	.	2,7	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	7	12	18		37

	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Issue field: TRP					
General ref. to deploy. of troops	8,3	3,2	1,4	2,7	4
Deployment for military aggression	.	58,1	45,8	47,3	69
Deploy. for invasion of foreign sov. territory	25,0	9,7	27,8	19,9	29
Deploy.in covert aggressive operations	.	3,2	.	1,4	2
Deployment for peace keeping	50,0	22,6	19,4	23,3	34
Deployment to rescue civilians	8,3	.	4,2	2,7	4
Deployment in times of crisis	.	3,2	.	1,4	2
Other specific ref. to deploy. of troops	8,3	.	1,4	1,4	2
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	12	62	72		146

	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Issue field: PEN					
General reference to pension schemes	33,3	11,1	29,6	24,6	14
Demographic changes	16,7	22,2	.	10,5	6
Retirement ages	8,3	44,4	40,7	35,1	20
Income levels in retirement	.	.	3,7	1,8	1
State versus private pension schemes	33,3	11,1	18,5	19,3	11
State pension scheme	.	5,6	3,7	3,5	2
Private pension scheme	.	5,6	3,7	3,5	2
Other specific	8,3	.	.	1,8	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	12	18	27		57

Issue field: EDU	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
General education politics	25,9	33,3	18,8	24,5	12
Structural issues	7,4	33,3	6,3	10,2	5
Resource allocation and salaries	29,6	.	43,8	30,6	15
Private education	7,4	.	.	4,1	2
Curriculum	11,1	33,3	.	10,2	5
Scholarships and fees	3,7	.	.	2,0	1
Problems at school	14,8	.	31,3	18,4	9
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	27	6	16		49

Issue field: EUI	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
General European integration	9,2	11,1	1,6	6,9	12
Shared values and Identity	3,9	2,8	1,6	2,9	5
Role of a specific country in the EU	31,6	30,6	23,0	28,3	49
Relationship between EU and national levels	21,1	33,3	27,9	26,0	45
Institutional structure	13,2	2,8	1,6	6,9	12
Defining the EUs core tasks	7,9	2,8	6,6	6,4	11
Relationship between EU institutions and public	6,6	5,6	3,3	5,2	9
Enlargement	6,6	11,1	31,1	16,2	28
Budget	.	.	1,6	0,6	1
Non valid	.	.	1,6	0,6	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	76	36	61		173

9. Main aspect commented upon

Table 9.1: Aspect commented upon per paper

Aspect	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
No (substantial issue is commented upon)	73,8	53,9	62,6	55,8	60,5	358
Yes (political dispute is commented upon)	26,2	46,1	37,4	44,2	39,5	234
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	126	154	115	197		592

For each commentary it was coded whether the journalist mainly commented upon a substantial subject of an issue (e.g. the pros and cons of deployment of troops) or upon the political process and dispute around that issue (e.g. the commenting upon the parliamentary decision on deploying troops). The goal was to find out whether a journalist focused on one of the seven policy topics under study or whether he presented the policy topic as a political dispute. Table 9.1 shows that *Le Monde* is the least likely to focus on the political dispute, followed by *Ouest France* and *Le Figaro*. *L'Humanité* 55,8% of all editorials only focus on the substantial issue. The coder who read *Le Monde* and *Ouest France* seems to have identified more articles that focus on the “substantial issue” rather than the coder responsible for the other two papers. Still, it is not counterintuitive, as *Le Monde* and *Ouest France* are less “polemical” than the editorials in *le Figaro* and *l'Humanité*.

Table 9.2: Aspect commented upon per issue field

Aspect	Per Issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
No (substantial issue is commented upon)	65,8	53,6	77,8	64,4	45,6	57,9	59,1	60,5	358
Yes (political dispute is commented upon)	34,2	46,4	22,2	35,6	54,4	42,1	40,9	39,5	234
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	79	56	36	146	57	47	171		592

Editorials on European integration resemble the average pattern: about 60% focus on the substantial issue and 40% on the political dispute. The fact that editorials on pensions focus on the dispute rather than policy substance should not be surprising: there is a consensus that there is a need for pension reform (*inter alia* for demographic reasons) but the debate has focused on resistance to change and on the political costs of such reforms.

10. Object actors

Table 10.1a: Presence of object actor per paper

Presence of object actor	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
No	0,8	1,3	0,9	2,0	1,3	8
Yes	99,2	98,7	99,1	98,0	98,7	594
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	130	157	116	199		602

The object actors of commentaries are all actors whose interests are, or would be affected positively or negatively by the journalist's claim.³ This category allows to understand whether the journalists and if who they speak on behalf of or react against.

A commentary does not necessarily contain an object actor. Table 10.1a shows that in almost all editorials object actors were present.

Table 10.1b: Presence of object actor per policy field

Presence of object actor	Per issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
No	.	3,5	.	.	7,0	.	1,2	1,3	8
Yes	100	96,5	100	100	93,0	100	98,8	98,7	593
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	82	57	37	146	57	49	173		601

There are only 8 editorials where the object actor cannot be identified (in agriculture and pensions).

³ The object actor may be identical with the addressee, e.g., when a journalist calls on the President of the European Central Bank to resign. Here, the President of the ECB is both addressee and object.

Table 10.2a: Object actor type per paper

Object actor	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Whole polities	23,3	50,3	18,3	28,7	31,1	185
Politicians	0,8	0,6	.	1,0	0,7	4
Government/executive	27,1	4,5	40,0	4,6	16,3	97
Legislative	1,6	.	.	.	0,2	2
Military	1,6	4,5	1,7	0,5	2,0	12
Central banks	0,8	0,6	.	0,5	0,5	3
Social security executive org.	.	.	.	0,5	0,2	1
Other state executive agencies	.	1,3	.	1,0	0,7	4
Political parties	.	.	.	0,5	0,2	1
Unions and employees	1,6	1,9	0,9	8,7	3,9	23
Employers organisations and firms	.	1,9	.	.	0,5	3
Churches and religious org. and groups	0,8	.	.	.	0,2	1
Farmers and agricultural org.	3,1	3,2	7,0	2,1	3,5	21
Educational professionals and org.	3,1	5,2	2,6	4,1	3,9	23
Students, pupils, and their parents	2,3	6,5	3,5	2,6	3,7	22
Consumer organizations and groups	1,6	2,6	5,2	3,1	3,0	18
Migrant organisations and groups	7,8	5,2	6,1	5,1	5,9	35
Peace movement org. and groups	.	.	.	1,0	0,3	2
Org. and groups of the elderly	1,6	1,3	3,5	.	1,3	8
Terrorist groups	.	0,6	.	1,5	0,7	4
Other civil society org. and groups	0,8	.	.	.	0,2	1
Whole economies	10,1	4,5	8,7	2,6	5,9	35
The general public	12,4	5,2	2,6	31,8	15,0	89
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	129	155	115	195		594

Summary object actor	Per paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
State and party actors	31,8	11,6	41,7	8,7	20,9	124
Economic interest groups	4,7	7,1	7,8	10,8	7,9	47
Other civil society actors	17,8	21,3	20,9	17,4	19,2	114
General/unknown/unspecified	45,7	60,0	29,6	63,1	52,0	309
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	129	155	115	195		594

Table 10.2b: Object actor type by policy field

Object actor	By issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
Whole polities	32,9	9,1	2,7	45,2	9,4	4,1	46,2	31,2	185
Politicians	2,3	0,7	4
Government/executive	12,2	1,8	2,7	11,0	.	.	39,8	16,2	96
Legislative	.	.	.	0,7	.	.	0,6	0,3	2
Military	.	.	.	8,2	.	.	.	2,0	12
Central banks	3,7	0,5	3
Social security executive org.	0,6	0,2	1
Other state executive agencies	1,2	.	.	.	3,8	2,0	.	0,7	4
Political parties	0,6	0,2	1
Unions and employees	3,7	.	.	.	34,0	.	1,2	3,9	23
Employers organisations and firms	.	1,8	1,2	0,5	3
Churches and religious org. and groups	0,6	0,2	1
Farmers and agricultural org.	.	38,2	3,5	21
Educational professionals and org.	46,9	.	3,9	23
Students, pupils, and their parents	44,9	.	3,7	22
Consumer organizations and groups	.	32,7	3,0	18
Migrant organisations and groups	.	.	91,9	.	1,9	.	.	5,9	35
Peace movement org. and groups	.	.	.	1,4	.	.	.	0,3	2
Org. and groups of the elderly	.	.	2,7	.	13,1	.	.	1,3	8
Terrorist groups	.	.	.	2,7	.	.	.	0,7	4
Other civil society org. and groups	.	1,8	0,2	1
Whole economies	40,2	.	.	.	1,9	.	0,6	5,9	35
The general public	6,1	14,5	.	30,8	35,8	2,0	6,4	15,0	89
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	82	55	37	146	53	49	171		593

Summary object actor	By issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
state and party actors	17,1	1,8	2,7	19,9	3,8	2,0	43,9	20,7	123
economic interest groups	3,7	40,0	.	.	34,0	.	2,3	7,9	47
other civil society actors	.	34,5	94,6	4,1	15,1	91,8	0,6	19,2	114
general/unknown/unspecified	79,3	23,6	2,7	76,0	47,2	6,1	53,2	52,1	309
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	82	55	37	146	53	49	171		593

Table 10.2c: Object actor type by year

Object actor	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Whole polities	22,5	21,9	45,4	31,1	185
Politicians	0,5	1,6	.	0,7	4
Government/executive	22,0	12,6	14,8	16,3	97
Legislative	.	0,5	0,4	0,2	2
Military	2,2	3,3	0,9	2,0	12

Central banks	1,1	0,5	.	0,5	3
Social security executive org.	0,5	.	.	0,2	1
Other state executive agencies	.	0,5	1,3	0,7	4
Political parties	0,5	.	.	0,2	1
Unions and employees	4,9	2,7	3,9	3,9	23
Employers organisations and firms	1,1	.	0,4	0,5	3
Churches and religious org. and groups	.	.	0,4	0,2	1
Farmers and agricultural org.	1,6	6,6	2,6	3,5	21
Educational professionals and org.	8,8	.	3,1	3,9	23
Students, pupils, and their parents	6,0	2,7	2,6	3,7	22
Consumer organizations and groups	6,6	3,3	.	3,0	18
Migrant organisations and groups	4,4	6,0	7,0	5,9	35
Peace movement org. and groups	.	0,5	0,4	0,3	2
Org. and groups of the elderly	1,1	2,7	0,4	1,3	8
Terrorist groups	.	2,2	.	0,7	4
Other civil society org. and groups	0,5	.	.	0,2	1
Whole economies	4,9	10,4	3,1	5,9	35
The general public	10,4	21,9	13,1	15,0	89
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	182	183	229		594

Summary object actor	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
State and party actors	26,9	19,1	17,5	20,9	124
Economic interest groups	7,7	9,3	7,0	7,9	47
Other civil society actors	27,5	17,5	14,0	19,2	114
General/unknown/unspecified	37,9	54,1	61,6	52,0	309
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	182	183	229		594

Positively evaluated object actors

Table 10.3a: Scopes of positively evaluated object actors by paper

Positively ev. obj. act. scope	By paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	2,3	2,8	.	0,7	1,4	6
Other supranational	.	0,9	.	.	0,2	1
EU	50,0	46,3	62,9	22,6	42,4	182
Multilateral	9,3	.	10,1	1,4	4,4	19
Germany	.	.	1,1	.	0,2	1

France	16,3	42,6	15,7	41,8	31,5	135
UK	1,2	1,9	1,1	0,7	1,2	5
Italy	.	1,9	.	.	0,5	2
Other EU-members	1,2	.	.	0,7	0,5	2
Other european countries ex CIS	4,7	.	.	.	0,9	4
Turkey	1,2	.	.	0,7	0,5	2
USA	.	2,8	.	0,7	0,9	4
Middle East	10,5	0,9	6,7	28,8	13,5	58
Rest of the world	3,5	.	2,2	2,1	1,9	8
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	86	108	89	146		429

Table 10.3b: Scopes of positively evaluated object actors by issue fields

Positively ev. obj. act. scope	Issue Field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
Supranational: UN	.	.	.	5,7	.	.	0,8	1,4	6
Other supranational	.	.	.	1,1	.	.	.	0,2	1
EU	73,2	37,0	18,5	5,7	.	.	84,3	42,3	181
Multilateral	2,8	6,5	44,4	1,1	.	2,8	.	4,4	19
Germany	0,8	0,2	1
France	15,5	52,2	25,9	6,8	100	97,2	10,7	31,5	135
UK	5,6	2,2	1,2	5
Italy	1,7	0,5	2
Other EU-members	1,4	0,8	0,5	2
Other european countries ex CIS	.	.	.	4,5	.	.	.	0,9	4
Turkey	.	2,2	0,8	0,5	2
USA	1,4	.	.	3,4	.	.	.	0,9	4
Middle East	.	.	7,4	63,6	.	.	.	13,6	58
Rest of the world	.	.	3,7	8,0	.	.	.	1,9	8
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	71	46	27	88	39	36	121		428

Negatively evaluated object actors

Table 10.4a: Scopes of negatively evaluated object actors by paper

Negatively ev. obj. act. scope	By paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
EU	31,3	5,0	70,0	10,0	26,4	19
Multilateral	6,3	10,0	.	.	5,6	4
France	28,1	40,0	20,0	.	26,4	19
Italy	6,3	.	.	20,0	5,6	4
Other EU-members	12,5	5,0	10,0	40,0	13,9	10
Turkey	3,1	10,0	.	.	4,2	3

USA	.	5,0	.	.	1,4	1
Middle East	9,4	25,0	.	30,0	15,3	11
Rest of the world	3,1	.	.	.	1,4	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	32	20	10	10		72

Table 10.4b: Scopes of negatively evaluated object actors by issue fields

Negatively ev. obj. act. scope	By issue field (in %)							Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	(N)
EU	66,7	50,0	20,0	.	.	.	36,1	26,4	19
Multilateral			20,0	7,7	14,3	.	2,8	5,6	4
France	33,3		60,0	.	85,7	100	13,9	26,4	19
Italy	11,1	5,6	4
Other EU-members	.		.	7,7	.	.	25,0	13,9	10
Turkey	8,3	4,2	3
USA	2,8	1,4	1
Middle East	.		.	84,6	.	.	.	15,3	11
Rest of the world		50,0						1,4	1
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	4	2	5	13	7	3	36		72

11. Frames

Table 11.1a: Presence of frame by paper

Presence of frame	By paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
No	20,0	42,7	18,4	32,3	28,5	95
Yes	80,0	57,3	81,6	67,7	71,5	238
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	85	96	87	65		333

For each commentary that referred to the topic of European integration or that had an European issue scope Frames with a reference to European integration were coded. In 71,5% of these cases, a frame was present. Over 80% of cases in *Ouest France* and *Le Monde* had frames coded. Less frames were identified in the other two papers. This may be due to the fact different coders were responsible for each set of dailies.

Table 11.1b: Presence of frame by issue field

Presence of frame	By issue field (in %)						Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EUI	%	(N)
No	41,2	40,0	52,6	40,0	100,0	16,7	28,5	95
Yes	58,8	60,0	47,4	60,0	.	83,3	71,5	238
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	85	35	19	5	3	186		333

Education is absent since no editorial in this field had a Eu scope, three editorials on pensions (in *L'Humanité*) had a EU scope.

Table 11.2a: Frame type by paper

Summary of frame	By paper (in %)				Total	
	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanité	%	(N)
Identity, normative and value frames	20,6	14,5	26,8	56,8	27,7	66
Constitutional and governance frames	13,2	20,0	4,2	13,6	12,2	29
Economic frames	16,2	12,7	7,0	15,9	12,6	30
Other instrumental frames	20,6	21,8	9,9	9,1	15,5	37
Historical frames	13,2	12,7	16,9	4,5	12,6	30
Frames internal to the integration process	16,2	18,2	35,2	.	19,3	46
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	68	55	71	44		238

These are summary variables of frames. It is difficult to draw conclusions from such aggregates. For the writers of *L'Humanité*, the EU is not a means to an end ! They focus on values (56,8%). The editorials in that paper also consider that the issue is what kind of entity the EU is. For those papers that focus on the process (see tables on conflict lines), they are more likely to frame the issue in instrumental or economic terms or invoke frames linked to

the integration process itself). The Christian-democratic *Ouest France* writers love the founding fathers. In their editorials, 16,9% of the frames they invoke are historical frames.

Table 11.2b: Frame type by policy field

Summary of frame	By issue field (in %)					Total	
	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	EUI	%	(N)
Identity, normative and value frames	24,0	9,5	66,7	.	29,7	27,7	66
Constitutional and governance frames	8,0	.	.	.	16,1	12,2	29
Economic frames	34,0	19,0	33,3	.	3,9	12,6	30
Other instrumental frames	16,0	61,9	.	100	8,4	15,5	37
Historical frames	2,0	4,8	.	.	18,1	12,6	30
Frames internal to the integration process	16,0	4,8	.	.	23,9	19,3	46
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	50	21	9	3	155		238

The frames invoked in opinions about the European integration process are first and foremost normative (29,7%) or linked to the process itself (23,9%). The area where economic and instrumental frames dominate is agriculture. This is less the case for monetary policy: there is a normative dimension (24% of frames in this area). For immigration, two thirds of the frames are normative and one third are economic (we are only dealing with 9 frames).

Table 11.2c: Frame type by year

Summary of frame	By year (in %)			Total	
	2000	2001	2002	%	(N)
Identity, normative and value frames	34,0	10,7	31,6	27,7	66
Constitutional and governance frames	12,6	10,7	12,7	12,2	29
Economic frames	11,7	25,0	5,1	12,6	30
Other instrumental frames	10,7	21,4	17,7	15,5	37
Historical frames	7,8	17,9	15,2	12,6	30
Frames internal to the integration process	23,3	14,3	17,7	19,3	46
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	
(N)	103	56	79		238

2001 is a year where economic and instrumental frames are more important and identity less so. 2000 and 2002 present fairly similar patterns. Given that economic frames are mainly present in monetary and agricultural policies, this may be the case that 2001 was eventful in these fields and led to more editorials than in other years (with foot and mouth and the build up to the launch of the euro) as indicated in Table 8.2a and 8.2b.

Table 11.3: Twenty-five most often mentioned frames

25 most often mentioned frames	(N)	%
Institutional reforms before enlargement	30	12,6
French German cooperation	15	6,3
Community of values	14	5,9
Economic growth	14	5,9
History of the EU	10	4,2
Racism	8	3,4
Social justice	8	3,4
Democracy	8	3,4
Relation with USA	8	3,4
Environmental protection	8	3,4
Acceptance of the EU	7	2,9
Liberalism	6	2,5
Federalism	6	2,5
National interest	6	2,5
Solidarity	5	2,1
Influence in international relations	5	2,1
Economic stability	5	2,1
Peace	4	1,7
Equality among countries	4	1,7
Efficiency	4	1,7
Consumer protection	4	1,7
Communist rule in Eastern Europe	4	1,7
Enlargement before institutional reforms	4	1,7
Fascism	3	1,3
Sovereignty	3	1,3
Total	193	81,1
Total number of frames	238	100,0

While Germany is not prominently featured in editorials (compared to the US or the UK), the Franco-German couple is still in editorials a motor for integration and often invoked. With history of the EU and the reference to a community of values, this makes about a quarter of the frames invoked. These dimensions which take us back to the origins of the European Community after WW2 seem more important than instrumental frames even if economic growth is the fourth most mentioned frame. The main frame however in these years is the perspective of enlargement and the institutional reforms that this should have entailed: the treaty of Nice (2000), the Convention on the future of Europe are all events that keep this issue alive in the news and perhaps in the mind of editorial writers.

Table 11.4a: What the EU should not be/lead to: ten most often mentioned frames

Frames	Total	
	(N)	%
Fascism	3	20,0
Racism	2	13,3
Liberalism	2	13,3
Americanization	1	6,7
Globalization	1	6,7
Equality among countries	1	6,7
Federalism	1	6,7
Relation with USA	1	6,7
National interest	1	6,7
Unemployment	1	6,7
Nazi rule	1	6,7
Total	15	100

Table 11.4b: What the EU is not be/does not lead to: ten most often mentioned frames

Frames	Total	
	(N)	%
Racism	6	23,1
Credibility	3	11,5
Nationalism	2	7,7
Solidarity	2	7,7
Democracy	2	7,7
Acceptance of the EU	2	7,7
National interest	2	7,7
Community of values	1	3,8
Liberalism	1	3,8
Social justice	1	3,8
Equality among countries	1	3,8
Sovereignty	1	3,8
Opportunity space for citizens	1	3,8
Economic growth	1	3,8
Total	26	100

There are only a few frames that can be commented upon. Yet they bring us back to old and current debates: the EU should not be fascist and racist. This was a preoccupation for the founding fathers after the Third Reich but in 2000 with the “Haider debate” and the sanctions against Austria, racism was again in the headlines. This may explain why racism is the most often mentioned frame where the editorial writer states the EU is not and should not lead to.

Table 11.4c: What the EU is/leads to: ten most often mentioned frames

Frames	Total	
	(N)	%
Community of values	13	28,3
Peace	4	8,7
Economic growth	4	8,7
Economic stability	4	8,7
Liberalism	3	6,5
Christian values	2	4,3
Tolerance	2	4,3
Federalism	2	4,3
Competition in Europe	2	4,3
Globalization	1	2,2
Modernization	1	2,2
Responsibility	1	2,2
Free trade	1	2,2
Equality among countries	1	2,2
Democracy	1	2,2
Centralization	1	2,2
Bureaucracy	1	2,2
Influence in international relations	1	2,2
Environmental protection	1	2,2
Total	46	100

Table 11.4d: What the EU should be/should lead to: ten most often mentioned frames

Frames	Total	
	(N)	%
Economic growth	9	12,7
Environmental protection	7	9,9
Social justice	5	7,0
Democracy	5	7,0
Acceptance of the EU	5	7,0
Efficiency	4	5,6
Influence in international relations	4	5,6
History of the EU	4	5,6
Federalism	3	4,2
National interest	3	4,2
Strength in global competition	3	4,2
Consumer protection	3	4,2
French German cooperation	3	4,2
Solidarity	2	2,8
Relation with USA	2	2,8
Cope with transnational social problems	2	2,8
Humanism	1	1,4
Social equality	1	1,4
Human rights	1	1,4
Civil society	1	1,4
Other	1	1,4
Economic stability	1	1,4
Public services	1	1,4
Total	71	100

According to the frames referred to in editorials, the EU is in reality a community of values. Less so a peaceful and prosperous entity (see table 7.c). When contemplating what the EU should be (as opposed to what it is), it should be a motor for economic growth and social justice, it should be democratic and environmentally friendly. Few would disagree with these goals. Issues such as the national interest or the influence of the EU in the world are mentioned yet less so (these are small numbers to conjecture upon in any case).