

**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: D3.3

Report **Final case reports on analysis of newspaper editorials**

Case report **Italy**

---

Author: Manuela Caiani and Donatella della Porta

Date: April 2004

# Part I: Analytic Summary

EUROPUB.COM

## WP3: Country report

### The Italian Case

Manuela Caiani and Donatella della Porta

This report addresses the issue of the degree and forms of participation of printed media to a Europeanisation of the public sphere—that is, to take part, as “opinion leaders” and “agenda setters”, in the debate referring to European issues, targets and actors.

Our empirical basis is an analysis of the political claims made (through editorials and commentaries) by some Italian newspapers on European related issues over a period of three single years (2000, 2001, 2002), which allows us to investigate the role of the Italian press in the construction of opinion and discourses on Europe in the national public debate.

In what follows, we shall address our research question by focusing on set of variables referring to the “news style” and content (substantive issue) of editorials (part 1), their addressee (part 2), position (on) and evaluation of Europe (part 3), and the justification of the claim (part 4).

For each part, we shall develop a cross-issue, cross-time, and a cross-“newspaper” analysis. As for the latter, the aim is to investigate the variations in viewpoints on Europe carried out by different types of newspaper.

## 1. The salience of European topics in opinion leading articles

The data collected within the WPIII package indicate that Italian newspapers are not behind other countries as far as the debate on our seven issues is concerned. In Italy, for a period of three single years (2000, 2001 and 2002), a total number of 694 commentaries were coded. Further, the debate on our seven topics of interests has clearly increased over the years, as shown by the total number of editorials (almost double) found in the more recent year (2002) as compared to 2000. Surprisingly, there are not systematic differences regarding the *number of commentaries* made by the two broadsheet newspapers and by the regional ones. This means evidently that the political issues under study are considered as equally important by the four newspapers, even if they are positioned in different sectors of the market (Table 1.1).

About half of all commentaries concerning our seven topics were the “*main*” *editorial of the day*, namely editorials that catch the reader’s eye due to their length or special layout (Table 1.3). In other words, our seven issue fields under study did make it nearly often into the main commentary of the day. The quality newspapers, however, do not cover our selected political issues more than the two regional papers.

Another evidence of the important status assigned to our selected issues by newspapers is the

significant presence of *newspapers' own campaigning* in commentaries: about one fourth of all editorials found (23%) could be located in a newspaper campaign. The two regional newspapers use slightly more often commentaries for own campaigning than the two “quality” newspapers (25-29% of all commentaries for the former versus 16-22% for the latter) (Table 1.4).

Important findings emerge, however, when looking at the type of *the initiating political or communication act* which stimulates the writing of editorials. Overall, the largest part of commentaries is stimulated by political events (political decisions represent 18% of all commentaries, executive actions 10% and meetings 13%). The rest of the database is constituted mainly by commentaries stimulated by objective extra-discursive events (above all external political crises represent 11% of all editorials, and economic developments 7%). Finally, communication events trigger the writing of editorials in 15% of cases. Within political events, the paucity of direct democratic actions and protests (1-3%) that stimulate commenting signals the propensity of Italian newspapers toward an “institutional idea of politics”. In general, there are not relevant differences between the four newspapers in the type of initiating event (Table 2.1a).

Measuring the *scope of the event that stimulate the writing of editorials* can be a useful indicator of the “salience” of the European issues and actors in the debate carried on in the printed media (Table 2.2a). On this point, it is remarkable that half of the editorials of our database are stimulated by initiating events that have a European scope, while one fifth is represented by events that remain inside the Italian boundaries. Once again we do not find much difference between quality and regional newspapers. *Repubblica* is the newspaper more characterized by editorials stimulated by European-scope events (59% of all editorials in the newspaper), while *Nazione* shows the largest share of commentaries stimulated by national (Italian) -scope events (32%). Interestingly enough, *Corriere della Sera*, is much more similar to the regional paper, than to *Repubblica*. This confirms the more pro-European stance of *Repubblica*, that emerged also from the interviews with journalist (see Delphi report; della Porta 2004).

But what about the *issue agendas* of our four newspapers? Overall, the most common issue field commented on by newspapers is EU integration (around one third of the commentaries) (Table 7.1). Other equally frequent issues commented in editorials are monetary politics, matters of troops deployment, and education (19% of all editorials each). The less mentioned issues are immigration (7%), agriculture (3%) and pension (4%). There are however differences across newspapers. The two quality newspapers comment more frequently than the regional papers on the topic of European integration (about 30% of all editorials the former against about 20% the latter), while surprisingly monetary issues are equally well covered by all four newspapers with about 20% of all editorials, (in case the only exception is represented by *Corriere della Sera*, with a share of 16%).

However, our data suggest that the degree of Europeanisation of the public discourse of newspapers, is subject to contingent shifts related with *issue cycles*. In a cross time perspective (Table 8.1), it is worth noticing that in the period under study, “monetary politics” decreases its presence as topic in commentaries (from 25% in 2000 to 18%), while attention to the topic of European integration remains nearly constant (about 30%). The trend of monetary issue can be explained by the focus on the start of the Euro in the year 2000. The peak of the issue of “troops deployment” in 2001 and in 2002 corresponds to the terrorist attack on the USA in 2001 (“September 11<sup>th</sup>”), followed by war (preparations) against Afghanistan and Iraq. Education seems having lost importance in the agenda of media

between 2000 (27%) and 2002 (12%). The peak of agricultural issues in 2001 is evidently related to the emergencies of BSE and the foot and mouth disease (Table 8.2b).

With regard to the research question of Europeanisation, it is particularly important to analyze also the *issue scopes* of the commentaries, which refers to the geographical scope of the substantive content of the claim<sup>1</sup>(Table 7.3). Here, we have to stress that the issue scope in commentaries of the four Italian newspapers is primarily European (more than half of all commentaries) and national (Italian, 26%). The quality paper *Repubblica* put a stronger emphasis on European issues than the other papers (63%), but also the commentators of the regional newspaper the *Mattino* “frames” very often their comments with a European dimension (57%). The *Nazione* and the *Corriere* more often than the other newspapers refer to national Italian issue scope.

## 2. The addressees of editorials

Another indicator of “Europeanisation” of the debate, although of a different type, can be considered the choice of *European institutions and actors as target of claims*<sup>2</sup>. As we can observe in Table 4.3a, in general, even if national actors are still the main target of call or appeal made by journalists, and are generally held responsible for implementing the claims (53%), nevertheless the role of European actors and institutions is also relevant 28%. There are some notable differences in the scope of actors addressed by each newspaper. The most striking variation is in the larger proportion of claims addressed at European level actors by the center-left paper *Repubblica* (36%) in comparison with the other national broadsheet, and the regional newspapers (about 25%). On the contrary the *Corriere della Sera* is the most characterize by journalists’ claims directed towards national actors (57%), but also, at some extent, to supranational institutions (4%). Surprisingly the two regional newspapers target slightly more actors from countries elsewhere in the world than the two “quality” papers (about 15% against 7-10%).

However, in terms of newspapers being carriers of viewpoints on Europeanisation, we found *stress strong variations according the issues fields of the debate*. Our data suggest us that only the field of European integration itself, or at least the already more Europeanized fields, from an institutional point of view, could be said to be Europeanized in the Italian press (Table 4.3b). There is in fact a strong presence of actors with a European scope as addressees of the journalists’ claims on topics concerning the European integration (54% of all editorials) and monetary policy (45%), but only to a lesser extent, in agriculture (28%). Reflecting the EU’s pillar structure claims with European level actors as addressees are present at a middle level in immigration (13%) and troop deployment (10%) debates, and at a very low level in the policy domains that remain the preserve of nation-states, namely education and pension (1-4%).

---

<sup>1</sup> Issue-scope is in principle independent from the scope of the subject actor, target, and/or object actor. E.g., if Amnesty International appeals to the European Court of Justice in protest against the Berlin police’s treatment of immigrant suspects, the actor is supranational, the addressee European, but the scope of the issue (‘The Berlin police’s treatment of immigrant suspects’) remains local. However, if a local Berlin committee for asylum seekers criticizes the Berlin Senate for its treatment of refugee children on the grounds that it constitutes a breach of the Un Children’s Convention, then the issue scope is supranational, in spite of the local scope of the actor and addressee.

<sup>2</sup> The target of the claim is the actor who is held responsible for implementing the claim or at whom the claim is directly addressed in the form of a call or appeal to do or leave something. Addressees are defined by their *discursive* relation to the claimant: they are the objects of demands, criticism or support, or, in other words, they are the actors to whom the claimant relates in the public discourse.

But *to whom political claims are addressed* in newspapers? The analysis of *the types of actors* that newspapers consider as being important in the debate concerning our selected issues, confirms an “institutional idea” of politics of the Italian printed media. State actors are clearly the most important actors whom newspapers feel should be called on to take action or who papers wish to support or criticize on the range of issues fields under our study. The vast majority (over 90%) of claims made in editorials are addressed at state actors (the most part to the government, more than 70% of editorials). Interestingly enough party actors are never mentioned as addressees by journalists. Civil society actors are very rarely the target of newspapers’ demands. Among them, economic interest groups and media and journalists are addressed in 1% of editorials, while the other actors of civil society like social movements organizations, voluntary associations and NGOs are addressed in 5% of cases. Although minimal, there are some interesting differences in the types of actors addressed by each newspaper. *Repubblica* and *Mattino* address slightly more civil society actors (7-8%) than the other two newspapers (4%). Further, *Mattino*, as regional newspaper, appears to be particularly interested in education, as is reflected in the slightly above average number of claims it addresses at educational professionals (4%). The *Nazione* addresses a bit more than the other ones the media and journalists (2%).

In a cross issue perspective (Table 4.2b), it is worth noticing that the preference of journalists to state actors as target of their claims is particularly evident in immigration and pension (100% of editorials) as well as on the topic of European integration (96%). More articulated is the range of addressed actors in agriculture, and education. In fact, together with institutional actors, still predominant, in agriculture economic interest groups play an important role (especially farmers organization, 11%) as well as civil society actors (in particular consumers organizations, 11%). In education, organizations from civil society (16%) are very present. In a cross time perspective, we can notice also that all organizations from civil society start to be considered as addressees only in the recent years, after 2000 (6-7% in 2001 and 2002 against 3% in 2000).

After looking at the *addressees*, it is interesting to see *how the journalists evaluate them*. Indeed, calls and appeals toward specific targets inside the public sphere may be made in a neutral sense, when the journalists refer to targets without a precise evaluation. Vice versa, claims can be made or be combined with expressions of criticism or support for the actors they target. Interestingly, overall, the type of actors that Italian newspapers tend to support or address in a positive sense are equally spread between EU level actors and domestic actors (each 40%, Table 5.2a). This is more true for *Corriere* (46% vs. 32%) and *Mattino* (44% vs. 38%), while *Repubblica* is more likely to evaluate in a positive way European actors (64%) than national actors (26%), and *Nazione* follows an opposite pattern (25% EU level actors against 46% Italian actors). The majority of negatively addressed actors are located in the Italian national sphere (58%). Looking specifically at EU level actors, we can see that they are twice as likely to be addressed positively (40%, see Table 5.2a) than to be criticized (24%, Table 6.2a) by Italian newspapers.

However, this is especially true for *Repubblica* and *Mattino*, where the EU level actors are three times as likely to be addressed positively than negatively (64% vs. 24% for the former, and 38% vs. 14% for the latter). National actors from other EU member states are not a strong focus for criticism for the IT press.

Still about the actors, the distribution of the *positively and negatively addressed actors operating at different levels in each issue field* (Tables 5.2b and 6.2b), demonstrates that European actors receive more support than national actors in the fields of monetary politics, and EU integration. On the contrary, in immigration and pension, EU level actors are not

addressed positively: all positive assessments of political actors in these policy fields are addressed to national actors.

### 3. The evaluation of European integration and European institutions

Another relevant is the *degree of support or criticism toward Europe* in the debate and discourses carried out by newspapers. Which are the positions and attitudes taken by our newspapers on European integration? Are they against a deepening of the integration process, or are in favor of an extension of the rights and positions of European institutions and regulations? Valence positions scores on Europe/European integration range from -1 to +1. Two variables were analyzed to measure the specific positions and overall attitudes taken by newspapers' in their evaluations of the integration process: position and subjective attitude.

The overall position of the media about Europe (Table 3.4a) appears characterized by a neutral, or perhaps only slightly positive attitude toward "further" Europeanisation (0.07). Nevertheless, the positions vary between newspapers. The newspaper with more positive attitudes towards European integration is the *Corriere della Sera* (0.22), even if its support for Europe is sharply decreasing after 2001 (from 0.54 in 2000 to 0.42 in 2001, to -0.09 in 2002). The other quality newspaper, *Repubblica* is slightly more critical one of a further European integration process (-0.04), with a change from a neutral to a negative position after 2001. The two regional newspapers are in general very careful in their approval of Europe (the *Mattino* 0 and the *Nazione* 0.05). Nevertheless in a cross time perspective it is worth noticing that they were followed a very different trend, the first sharply decreasing its strong support after 2001 (from 0.20 in 2001 to -0.16 in 2002), the second increasing its support across the years (from -0.29 in 200 to 0.25 in 2001 and 0.15 in 2002).

However, looking in details and focusing on subjective attitude of newspapers toward the process of EU integration "in general" (Table 3.5a), we found that, overall, the European integration process is evaluated as strongly positive by the Italian newspaper journalists (0.83). The newspaper most in favor to the process of European integration "per se" is *Repubblica* (0.96), while the regional paper the *Nazione*, is the least enthusiastic about "Europe" (0.73). In other words: *Repubblica* appears as the most critical one for what concerns substantial issues and problems relating to the process of European integration (confirming in that the pessimism for the actual moment of stalemate in the process of European integration that emerged also from the interviews with journalists, see Delphi report; della Porta 2004), but in general, it is the most supportive newspaper, for what concerns the European project "per se".

Moreover, in a cross time perspective, it's important to stress that even if Italian newspapers seem to decrease their support for the European integration process across the years (Table 3.4a), a more in-depth look (Table 3.5a) indicate that criticism is actually targeting especially substantial problems and issues than the "idea" of a further European integration.

### 4. Framing Europe

Looking at the way in which Europe is "framed" means to analyze the motivations used by the actors to support their claim-making related to the European integration. This set of variables indicates therefore not only the degree of consensus/dissent vis-à-vis Europe, but also the dominant image of Europe: as an intergovernmental or supranational institution (see country report WP11, della Porta and Caiati 2004). The arguments used to frame Europe can be of four types: identity frame (that refer to the question, what is the EU and what does it stand for?), instrumental frames (that answer the question: what is the EU good or bad for?),

historical frames (that are about positive--e.g. to Enlightenment or classical antiquity--or negative--e.g. to past national isolation or to the Cold War--linkages of the EU to historical periods or experiences), and frames internal to the European integration process (that are frames about causal linkages between one aspect of European integration and another, e.g. between enlargement and institutional reforms).

In about one third of all claims referring to European issues, frames related to European integration are present (Table 11.1a). The newspapers differ in the extent to which they use frames in order to express their concerns about the European integration in the public sphere. “Framing” is used more often by the two quality broadsheet (in 37% of cases *Repubblica* and 43% *Corriere della Sera*) than by the two regional newspapers (16% *Mattino* and 28% *Nazione*).

The *type of frame* used about European integration varies according to the newspaper, but once again there are no significant differences between the two quality newspapers and the regional ones. Overall, the 122 frames found in Italy for the reference period under study are mainly distributed over two types of claims (Table 11.2a): about one third each on identity, normative and value frames (30%), and constitutional and governance frames (28%). The remaining part is mainly constituted by instrumental frames (other than economic, 16%) and frames internal to the integration process (14%). We find some similarities between the *Repubblica* and the *Mattino*, that mainly emphasize in their framing the immaterial aspects of the process of European integration related to identity frames, either general identity frames and constitutional/institutional/governance (the first paper accounts for a share of 60% of such type of frames and the second for a share of 72%). In both cases, proximity to center-left typical approach to Europe as identity driven can explain these similarities. Vice versa, *Corriere della Sera* and *Nazione* refer mainly to the instrumental side of European integration in their editorials, underlining in particular the socio economic dimensions of the process (they account for a share of 31-39% of such type of frames).

The only significant difference between quality and regional newspapers is that the former seem to be able to use a more articulated strategy of framing than the latter are: a strategy that includes the largest range of frames from the identity frames to instrumental arguments, to the historical ones.

A more in-depth look at the *specific frames* mostly used in editorials on the topic of European integration shows that the idea of Europe as a “community of values” is the most prominent frame used (7% of all frames, Table 11.3). The next prominent one is represented by considerations related to aspects internal to the European integration process (here the most frequent emphasized causal linkage by journalists is that between enlargement and institutional reforms, 6% of all cases). These frames, often used in editorials, are followed by normative and constitutional frames inside the category of identity frames--such as “federalism” (5%), “democracy” (4%), and “sovereignty” (4%)—and by instrumental frames such as “relation with USA” (5%) and “strength in global competition” (5%). When considering frames that express “what the EU should not be” (Table 11.4a), once again we find at the top of the rank identity frames (related here to institutional/constitutional/governance worries): the European integration process should not be “(national) sovereignty”, the EU integration should not led to “over regulation”. Even the most frequent frames used in the Italian public sphere to express “what the EU is”, refers to identity (Table 11.4c). Indeed, European integration is perceived as a community of values (19% of such claims)—values linked in constitutional-institutional frames such as democracy (10%) and pluralism (10%), but also to an instrumental frame such as the acceptance of the EU by citizens (10%). Nevertheless, the identity frames related to the immaterial aspect of the

process remain those most often used by journalists in order to explain what the EU is: cosmopolitanism, globalization, freedom, responsibility, peace.

Finally, another way to investigate the way in which Italian newspapers communicate their opinion on European integration is the analysis to *specific conflict lines* in the discussion regarding the future of Europe in opinion leading articles. In fact, the conflict line variable allow us to analyze whether newspapers take a position on a side or another of a set of political cleavages common to the debate about Europeanisation. These positions can be considered as “representative” of the traditional right/conservative and left/liberal/progressive cleavages common to national politics.

Overall, four broad conflict lines are predominantly discussed in the Italian debate: the relation between the “insiders” and “outsiders” within the debate on enlargement, the relation between the EU and the national level, the relation to the US and the relation between the member states. Confirming the fears that emerged also in our interviews (see Delphi report, della Porta 2004), all four newspapers strongly focus on the question of the enlargement (16%), debating if membership should be limited, with other states staying outside the EU structure, or if an enlarged EU is beneficial (“widening”). Among them the regional *Nazione* is the most interested one in the topic (22%). Among the several categories that refer to the second “big” question, the most often used is that of “future of Europe” (14%), followed by conflict lines such as “political level” (6%), “EU reform” (4%) and “decision making” (1%). When comparing the quality newspapers it is worth noticing that *Repubblica* is more concentrated on the “identity” side of the problem concerning the “future of Europe” (20%), whether it should be a federation or a Europe of the nations; the *Corriere* is equally interested both in “identity” and “pragmatic” aspects of the question: More integration is needed for optimal political/economic results or less integration (“deepening the EU”, 12%)? Should the Council or the Commission gain more rights (“EU reforms”, 5%)? Should politics and policymaking be carried out at nation-state level or shifting competences to the supranational level is necessary for EU politics to function effectively (“political levels”, 8%)? Also the two questions of the relation between the EU and the US and the relation between the member states are significantly present in Italian editorials (the first one, is more frequently discussed in the *Mattino*). The question of how the relations between the member states should look like is discussed more in terms of the legitimate degree of “defense of national interests” (whether they come first or should be sacrificed where necessary for the common good, 12%), than in terms of “leadership in Europe” (that is, whether there should be an equal say between the member states, 7%). The *Corriere* is particularly interested in the former aspect (21%), while the *Mattino* is much more present than the four other papers on the latter (18%).

## 5. (Some) conclusions

The analysis of the editorials on our seven issues indicates some general tendencies in the Italian printed media.

First of all, there are very few systematic differences related with the type of newspapers (quality versus regional), both in terms of the news-styles and in terms of content. As for the latter, more significant is instead the alignment of center-left newspapers (*Repubblica*, and in a less homogeneous way, *Il Mattino*) with the more “identity” oriented pro-European instances of the Italian moderate Left (see Delphi report, della Porta 2004) and instead a more

tame Europeanism (and more of the “pragmatic type) by the center-right newspapers (*Corriere della Sera* and *La Nazione*).

In terms of support for European integration, the analysis of the editorials also confirm a general degree of internalization of “Europe as a good thing”, but at the same time strong concerns about the danger of too quick or too radical turning points in the integration process. Moreover, even within our short range of time, critical stances appear as increasing. As observed in other parts of our research (della Porta and Caiani 2004; della Porta 2004), it is especially on issues related with the social dimension of citizenship (such as retirement and pension schemes and, under other respects, migration) that comments addressing the EU are more critical.

All in all, although the editorials rarely appear as part of a media-driven campaign (more often instead taking position in campaigns initiated by other actors), they tend to cover some of the main issues that emerge in the discourse event analysis. On European integration, the enlargement and monetary issue play a most relevant role.

The analysis of the editorials also confirms the presence of relevant differences between issues fields, with a public sphere composed of various, and varied, fragments. Also, while some areas (including European integration) are regularly covered, others (such as agriculture and troops deployment) have a more contingent pattern of relevance.

In defining the issue scope, the journalists recognize a multilevel governance, but with relevant differences in the attribution of competences in the various fields. In fact, Europe is referred to very often in monetary policies, often in agriculture, less so in migration and troop deployment, very rarely in education and pension schemes. Significantly, the increasing reference to the EU is combined with a reduced attention to individual European actors, and instead a significant attention to the USA, as world super-power.

Also confirming an institutional idea of politics, editorials mainly address governmental actors—and more so in the most Europeanized areas.

# Part II: Commented Tables<sup>3</sup>

EUROPUB.COM

**WP3: Country report**

**The Italian Case**

Manuela Caiani and Donatella della Porta

## 1. Article level: general overview

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

Year	By paper <sup>4</sup> , in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
2000	20	25	29	34	27	184
2001	35	35	35	22	33	226
2002	46	40	35	44	41	284
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	156	246	161	131		694

In Italy, for a period of three single years (2000, 2001 and 2002), a total number of 694 commentaries were coded (Table 1.1). For the selection, editorials were defined in the strict sense of opinion articles written by a journalist or editor of the coded newspaper and recognizably representing the newspaper's point of view. Editorials therefore did not include guest commentaries, reprints of editorials from other newspapers, or contributions by regular columnists. Also excluded were 'analysis' type articles, even if they were on a page or in a section labeled 'opinion' or 'comments'. Thus, the publication of an editorial was considered as the strategic unit of action in the public sphere constituting an instance of claims-making, where a political opinion was expressed. By definition every commentary/ editorial contained one claim of the journalist. If we consider that the editorials were selected according

---

<sup>3</sup> For the presentation of the data in the tables we mainly used rounded figures (i.e. with no decimals), the "0" only where figures are greater than zero and lower than 0.5, while when cells are really zero, we put "." in the cell.

<sup>4</sup> Abbreviations for newspapers: REP (Repubblica), COR (Corriere della Sera), MATT (Mattino), NAZ (Nazione).

to the same sample for every year, it is worth noticing that in the more recent year (2002), the total number of them almost doubled if compared to 2000.

To ensure the compatibility of this work package with data collected in other work-packages (WP2 and WP6), and to allow for cross national comparison, we measured the editorial agenda communicated in the same four newspapers as have been analyzed in other parts of the Europub project: *Repubblica*, *Corriere della Sera*, *Mattino* and *Nazione*<sup>5</sup>. Surprisingly, there are not systematic differences regarding the number of commentaries made by the two broadsheet newspapers and by the regional ones. This means evidently that the political issues under study are considered as equally important by the four newspapers, even if they are positioned in different sectors of the market.

Commentaries concerning our seven topics were found mainly in the center-right oriented quality newspaper with nation-wide distribution, *Corriere della Sera*, that accounts for almost twice as much commentaries as each of the other newspaper (246 commentaries). For what concerns the rest of the database, almost the same number of editorials was found in the two selected regional newspapers, the *Mattino* (161) and the *Nazione* (131), and in the center-left oriented quality newspaper *Repubblica* (156).

**Table 1.2: Section from which commentaries were coded by paper**

Section	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
Mixed internat. /national news section	62	92	93	37	75	521
Regional/local news section	.	.	.	4	1	5
Commentary pages	32	6	2	59	21	145
Business / economy section	.	.	1	.	0	1
International news section	5	2	4	.	2	17
National news section	1	.	1	1	1	5
Total (N)	100	100	100	100	100	694

All editorials in the home news section and also in the economic and business section of the newspapers were checked for relevant acts. Culture and sports sections, letters to the editor, as well as supplements were excluded from the coding; editorials in the regional and local sections (if present at all) were only included if a reference to them was made in the international/national news section of the paper<sup>6</sup>.

More than two thirds of the total commentaries of the database are from mixed international and national news sections (75%), while the remaining part come mainly from commentary pages (21%) (Table 1.2). Few editorials are from international, national and regional/local news sections. The distribution of commentaries in the sections is different among the four newspapers, even for newspapers belonging to the same “type” (quality vs. regional newspapers). Indeed, in the *Corriere della Sera* and the *Mattino* almost all editorials are concentrated in mixed international and national news (90%), while in *Repubblica* and

<sup>5</sup> For each Europub national team the composition of the sample of the newspapers had to be: two “quality” newspapers with national diffusion, one regional newspaper and one tabloid. For the Italian case two regional newspapers were chosen, because there wasn’t in Italy any broadsheet that could really be considered as “tabloid”. Thus, the composition of the sample was: *La Repubblica* (center –left oriented) and *Il Corriere della Sera* (center-right oriented) for the “quality” newspapers, *Il Mattino* and *La Nazione*, for the regional ones.

<sup>6</sup> This rule applied to all newspapers except the regional newspaper, for which regional and local sections were fully included.

*Nazione* it is more spread (above all between mixed international and national news section and commentary pages).

**Table 1.3: Number of main commentaries coded by paper**

Main commentary	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
No	65	55	54	26	52	358
Yes	34	45	40	44	41	286
Not identifiable/ Not applicable	1	.	6	30	7	50
Total (N)	100 156	100 246	100 161	100 131	100	694

About half of all commentaries concerning our seven topics were the “main” editorial of the day, namely editorials that catch the reader’s eye due to their length or special layout (Table 1.3).

In conclusion, our seven issue fields under study did make it nearly often into the main commentary of the day. The quality newspapers, however, do not cover our selected political issues more than the two regional papers.

**Table 1.4: Presence of newspapers’ own campaigning in commentaries by paper**

newspapers’ own campaigning	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
No	84	78	71	75	77	536
Yes	16	22	29	25	23	158
Total (N)	100 156	100 246	100 161	100 131	100	694

For each commentary we tried to understand if the motivation for the editorial was a newspaper’s own campaign (Table 1.4). In order to identify when the newspaper was actively setting its own agenda, we coded when the editorials had been written in response to/or to accompany another article/interview published by the paper (not necessarily in the same edition). For instance: if a newspaper obtain an exclusive interview with Romano Prodi in the main section of the newspaper about the stability pact, and the newspaper also issues an editorial commenting on the contents of that interview, this represented for us a campaign by the newspaper. Running a campaign can be considered as the evidence of the important status assigned to an issue by a newspaper. About one fourth of all editorials found (23%) could be located in a newspaper campaign. The two regional newspapers use slightly more often commentaries for own campaigning than the two “quality” newspapers (25-29% of all commentaries for the former versus 16-22% for the latter).

**Table 1.5: Commentaries with and without claims**

Commentaries	Number of commentaries (N)	In % of database
Without claims	21	3
With claims	673	97
Total	694	100

The publication of an editorial is regarded as a strategic action in the printed public sphere constituting an instance of claims-making, where a political opinion is expressed. The

journalist is the one who is making a claim (claimant) in a specific issue field, calling upon an actor (addressee) and speaking for or against somebody (object actor). By definition every commentary contains at maximum one claim of the journalist referring to our issue fields. If there are several claims of the journalist in the commentary, the main claim was coded. Almost all the commentaries we selected contains claims (97%) (Table 1.5). This makes clear that newspapers use their editorial columns to voice their opinion and make their political claims publics.

## 2. Article-level: Initiating events

**Table 2.1a: Types of initiating events by paper**

Initiating event	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
political decision	19	21	14	16	18	125
executive action	8	9	11	12	10	69
judicial action	1	0	3	.	1	6
non-specified statement	9	8	9	6	8	57
meeting	12	18	11	9	13	90
direct-democratic action	1	0	1	2	1	6
protest action	3	2	2	4	3	18
com. events partly directed to the media	6	5	10	8	7	49
com. events directed only to the media	1	2	1	2	1	10
com. events initiated by the media	6	5	4	2	4	30
external political crisis	12	11	13	8	11	77
internal political crisis	1	0	.	2	1	4
natural crisis	4	3	2	8	4	27
economic developments	9	4	9	8	7	47
societal developments	.	2	1	1	1	6
biographical political events	.	0	1	1	0	3
elections	2	5	4	6	4	29
other objective extra-discursive events	6	5	6	8	6	41
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	156	246	161	131		694

Editorials are used by newspapers to voice their opinion or stance on an issue rather than as a means of reporting the issue as a news item. In fact, we notice that usually, within the press around the world, news reporting and commentating are kept separate from one another. Firstly, news reports and comment/analysis/editorial articles are placed in different sections of the newspaper; secondly, in the majority of cases, from a professional point of view, journalistic function of reporting and commentating are clearly demarcated. Moreover, the decision to publish an editorial can be based on different criteria (setting the journal own “agenda”) than those that influence daily news reporting (ordinary coverage of political or factual events that happen).

Thus, a main question becomes: which is the initiating political or communication act which stimulates the writing of the editorial? (Table 2.1a). According our coding it was possible to identify both an initiating political event and an initiating communication event. The first type of events includes from “political decisions” to acts of “policy implementation”, “meetings” (i.e., conferences, congresses etc. that take place indoor, e.g. state-political meeting, party

convention/congress, parliamentary session/debate, election campaign meeting), “direct democratic action” (e.g. launching a referendum, collecting signatures for a referendum, vote on a referendum), as well as “protest” events such as petitioning (signature collection, letter campaign), demonstrative protests (public assembly, legal and non-violent march/demonstration, vigil), confrontational protests (illegal and non-violent demonstration, boycott, strike, self-mutilation-hunger strike, protest-suicide, blockade, occupation, disturbance of meetings, symbolic confrontation) and violent protests (threats, symbolic violence, limited destruction of property, sabotage, violent demonstrations, arson or bomb attacks and severe destruction of property, arson or bomb attacks against people, physical violence against people).

The communications acts are divided in: a) acts partly directed to the media such as public speeches, public letters, other publications (book, research report, leaflet, etc.), presentation of survey/poll results, publicity campaigns (incl. advertising), Internet launch of website or publication on the web site (e.g. anti euro campaign); b) event directed only to the media, like press conference/release, interview, PR stunts; and c) events initiated by the media like for instance newspaper article, or broadcast transmission of specific programme made by the media such as a political documentary (TV programme, film, radio). Finally ‘objective extra-discursive and other political events’ are coded as potential initiating events of the editorials; they included: wars, terrorism, natural catastrophes, epidemic crisis, accident, economic developments, cultural and sport events (e.g. exhibition), corruption and fraud, biographical events of politicians (death, jubilee, retirement, election results).

In general, there are not relevant differences between the four newspapers in the type of initiating event that stimulate the editorials. Overall, the largest part of commentaries is stimulated by political events (political decisions represent 18% of all commentaries, executive actions 10% and meetings 13%). Within political events, the paucity of direct democratic actions and protests (1-3%) that stimulate commenting signals the propensity of Italian newspapers toward an “institutional idea of politics”.

The rest of the database is constituted mainly by commentaries stimulated by objective extra-discursive events (above all external political crises represent 11% of all editorials, and economic developments 7%). Finally, communication events trigger the writing of editorials in 15% of cases. Among these events relating to the media, the most frequent initiating events for editorials of our papers are those partly directed to the media (7%).

In the quality newspaper *Corriere della Sera* commentaries are a bit more often stimulated by political events than in the other papers (50% of all editorials in the former, against a range of 42-44% of such editorials in *Repubblica*, *Nazione* and *Mattino*). In the *Mattino* and *Nazione* there are more commentaries related to objective extra-discursive initiating events (a range of 36-42% of all editorials against a range of 30-34% in the two quality newspapers). A signal of the different “power” as actors in the public sphere of the two types of newspapers (quality vs. regional ones), can be seen in the different presence of the editorials initiated by “event” created by the media themselves (5-6% against 2-4%), as well as commentaries initiated by events partly directed to the media, toward which the attention of the two regional newspaper is a bit bigger (8-10% of all editorials against 5-6%).

**Table 2.1b: Types of initiating events by issue field**

Initiating event	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
political decision	9	.	27	6	43	32	19	18	125
executive action	23	.	2	15	3	7	4	10	69
judicial action	.	.	.	.	7	1	2	1	6
non-specified statement	9	5	12	9	3	4	11	8	57
meeting	2	5	6	11	10	6	29	13	90
direct-democratic action	.	.	.	.	3	.	3	1	6
protest action	1	.	4	1	.	9	1	3	18
com. events partly directed to the media	10	5	4	4	10	8	7	7	49
com. events directed only to the media	3	.	.	.	3	1	2	1	10
com. events initiated by the media	2	.	2	5	7	6	6	4	30
external political crisis	2	.	6	48	.	2	4	11	77
internal political crisis	.	.	.	.	.	3	.	1	4
natural crisis	.	81	12	1	.	2	.	4	27
economic developments	33	.	.	.	3	.	1	7	47
societal developments	.	.	4	.	.	3	.	1	6
biographical political events	1	.	.	1	.	1	.	0	3
elections	2	.	12	1	3	2	8	4	29
other objective extra-discursive events	5	5	8	1	3	14	5	6	41
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	133	21	49	130	30	133	198		694

*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

The types of initiating events that prompt a newspaper to give its opinion on an issue vary substantially between issue fields (Table 2.1b). Executive and political decisions are initiating events mainly for commentaries in pension (66% of all editorials in the field), education (55%) and EU integration (58%). But, actually, while in the first two policy fields more present are strictly “political decisions” (43% in pension and 32% in education), on the topic of European integration editorials are stimulated mainly by meetings (29%). This reflects the increase in attention paid to European integration by the media during EU summits and other meetings organized by European Union institutions, as well as the reduced legislative competences at the EU level. Objective extra-discursive events stimulate the writing of commentaries above all in the debates concerning agriculture (86% of editorials in this field), and partly troop deployment (52%). Commentaries stimulated by events created directly by the media are more often present in pension, education and European integration (6-7% of the editorials in these fields) than in the other policy fields. In conclusion, the debate on the two less Europeanized policy field (pension and education) appear more often “framed” in political terms than what happens in the most Europeanized policy fields, like for instance agriculture, but also on the less-Europeanized but much “supra-national” field of troop

deployment) where the attention of the media is mainly attracted by the “emergency” of ‘objective extra-discursive events (for similar findings see work package 2 of the Europub project). It is also the case for the depoliticized area of monetary politics, where most commentaries are started by executive decisions. Nevertheless, this is true only partially on European integration topic. Here editorials are stimulated with a quite similar frequency by the “occasions” of meetings (29%) as well as by political, executive and judicial decisions (25%).

**Table 2.2a: Scope of initiating event by paper**

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	6	4	4	8	5	36
other supranational	3	2	5	2	3	22
<b>EU</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>343</b>
multilateral	10	13	16	9	12	85
bilateral	4	3	1	4	3	20
germany	1	.	.	.	0	1
france	.	0	.	.	0	1
Uk	1	0	.	1	0	3
Italy	<b>16</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>175</b>
netherlands	.	.	.	1	0	1
other EU-members	.	1	.	.	0	2
USA	1	.	.	.	0	1
Rest of the world	.	.	1	.	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	155	246	159	131		691

Measuring the scope of the event that stimulate the writing of editorials can be a useful indicator of the “salience” of the European issues and actors in the debate carried on in the printed media (Table 2.2a). The scope of the initiating event is not defined by one actor, nor by the locality where the event happens to take place, but by the ensemble of actors involved. e.g. a speech of Silvio Berlusconi at a EU summit has an ‘EU’ scope, not because of Berlusconi or what he says but because this is a meeting of European actors. The scope of a speech by Tony Blair about the Euro is also defined by the audience he addresses. If it is the German Bundestag, the scope is ‘bilateral’ (UK and Germany), if it is the European Council, it is ‘EU’, if it is a meeting of the Labour Party, it is ‘national’ (UK). It is remarkable that half of the editorials of our database are stimulated by initiating events that have a European scope, while one fifth is represented by events that remain inside the Italian boundaries. The remaining part of commentaries is initiated by references to events that have a bilateral or multilateral scope (15%), and supranational scope (8%).

However, newspapers differ in terms of the scope of events that initiate the commentary. Once again we do not find much difference between quality and regional newspapers. *Repubblica* is the newspaper more characterized by editorials stimulated by European-scope events (59% of all editorials in the newspaper), while *Nazione* shows the largest share of commentaries stimulated by national (Italian) -scope events (32%). Interestingly enough, for what concerns the number of editorials initiating by European events, the other quality newspaper, *Corriere della Sera*, is much more similar to the regional paper, than to *Repubblica*. This confirms the more pro-European stance of *Repubblica*, that emerged also from the interviews with journalist (see Delphi report; della Porta 2004).

**Table 2.2b: Scope of initiating event by issue field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	.	.	2	26	.	.	1	5	36
other supranational	5	.	.	9	7	.	1	3	22
<b>EU</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>343</b>
multilateral	5	20	43	40	3	1	1	12	85
bilateral	.	.	10	5	7	5	1	3	20
germany	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	1
france	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	0	1
uk	.	5	2	.	.	1	.	0	3
italy	<b>7</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>175</b>
netherlands	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	1
other EU-members	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	2
USA	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	0	1
Rest of the world	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	133	20	49	129	30	132	198		691

*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

There are however significant differences between the issue fields in the scope of the event that trigger editorials (Table 2.2b). While commentaries on monetary policy and the topic of European integration, are very often stimulated by events with a specific reference to Europe (84% of editorials with an European event scope for the former, and 90% for the latter), in the other policy fields under study, immigration, troop deployment, pension and education, events referring to European Union stimulate commenting at a very lower degree (a range of 2%-6%). This confirms the picture of large difference in the formats of debates on different issues that emerged the data collected on the discursive event analysis (country report WP11, della Porta and Caiani 2004).

### 3. Claim-level: Commentators

**Table 3.2a: Call for change by paper**

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
no call for change/not to change expressed by journalist	9	17	5	20	13	88
call for change	73	71	78	66	72	486
neutral/ambivalent attitude as to whether change is needed	17	10	16	13	14	91
call for the situation to remain as it is	1	1	1	1	1	8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	153	238	153	129		673

Commentators can use their commenting to call for a change in politics, or they can display a neutral/ambivalent attitude as to whether change is needed, or call for the situation to remain as it is (Table 3.2a). Commentators in all four newspapers very often use their editorials to call for a change in politics (a range of 66%-78%). No significant differences emerge between papers, although the *Mattino* emerges as slightly more assertive in demands for changes (78%) than the other regional newspaper, *Nazione* (66%). The two quality newspapers remain in-between

**Table 3.2b: Call for change by issue field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
no call for change/not to change expressed by journalist	16	11	17	10	11	8	16	13	88
call for change	72	84	77	69	71	83	66	72	486
neutral/ambivalent attitude as to whether change is needed	11	5	6	21	18	8	16	14	91
call for the situation to remain as it is	2	.	.	1	.	2	2	1	8
Total (N)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	673

*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

The proportion of editorials in which papers make these calls differs across issue fields (Table 3.2b). The papers are most likely to make calls for change in the fields of agriculture (84%) and education (83%). Within European integration there are fewer calls for change (66%). The newspapers use their editorial voice to call for the situation to change in relation to European integration less often than in other policy areas, confirming a quite supportive climate for Europeanisation.

**Table 3.3a: Position of commentator on conflict lines by paper**

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
Leadership in Europe	3	6	18	4	7	10
Involvement in the European Project	6	2	5	.	3	4
Future of Europe	20	8	18	17	14	20
Political levels	.	8	.	13	6	8
Decision making within EU	.	3	.	.	1	2
EU reform	3	5	9	.	4	6
Values	3	.	5	4	2	3
Political information	3	.	.	.	1	1
Deepening	.	12	.	4	6	9
Widening	14	15	14	22	16	23
Identity	.	8	.	4	4	6
Relations between EU MS	9	21	.	4	12	18
Type of entity	17	.	9	4	6	9
EU influence in the world	9	2	.	.	3	4
Europe and the USA	14	12	23	13	14	21
Reforms and enlargement	.	.	.	9	1	2
Total (N)	100	100	100	100	100	146

Conflict lines are only coded for claims that have a European scope.

Table 3.3a shows the references of the commentator to specific conflict lines in the discussion regarding the future of Europe. In fact, the conflict line variable allows us to analyze whether newspapers take a position on a side or another of a set of political cleavages common to the debate about Europeanisation. These positions can be considered as “representative” of the traditional right/conservative and left/liberal/progressive cleavages common to national politics. More than twenty conflict lines were specifically developed to evaluate the position of newspapers on political cleavages related to the issues over which the European Union and the European integration process is contested. For example: if a commentator is explaining his vision of a fully functioning EU (conflict line that we indicated with the label “future of Europe”), the scope is the vision of fully functioning EU in future. On this point the commentator can stress the argument that an intergovernmental organization should predominate, as a ‘Europe of the nations’, or, on the contrary, he can prefer a supranational organization as a ‘Federal Europe’. Overall, four broad conflict lines are predominantly discussed in the Italian debate: the relation between the “insiders” and “outsiders” within the debate on enlargement, the relation between the EU and the national level, the relation to the US and the relation between the member states.

Confirming the fears that emerged also in our interviews (see Delphi report, della Porta 2004), all four newspapers strongly focus on the question of the enlargement (16%), debating if membership should be limited, with other states staying outside the EU structure, or if an enlarged EU is beneficial (“widening”). Among them the regional *Nazione* is the most interested one in the topic (22%).

Among the several categories that refer to the second “big” question, the most often used is that of “future of Europe” (14%), followed by conflict lines such as “political level” (6%), “EU reform” (4%) and “decision making” (1%). When comparing the quality newspapers it is worth noticing that *Repubblica* is more concentrated on the “identity” side of the problem concerning the “future of Europe” (20%), whether it should be a federation or a Europe of the nations; the *Corriere* is equally interested both in “identity” and “pragmatic” aspects of the question: More integration is needed for optimal political/economic results or less integration (“deepening the EU”, 12%)? Should the Council or the Commission gain more rights (“EU reforms”, 5%)? Should politics and policymaking be carried out at nation-state level or shifting competences to the supranational level is necessary for EU politics to function effectively (“political levels”, 8%)?

Also the two questions of the relation between the EU and the US and the relation between the member states are significantly present in Italian editorials (the first one, is more frequently discussed in the *Mattino*).

The question of how the relations between the member states should look like is discussed more in terms of the legitimate degree of “defense of national interests” (whether they come first or should be sacrificed where necessary for the common good, 12%), than in terms of “leadership in Europe” (that is, whether there should be an equal say between the member states, 7%). The *Corriere* is particularly interested in the former aspect (21%), while the *Mattino* is much more present than the four other papers on the latter (18%).

**Table 3.3b: Position of commentator on conflict lines by issue field**

	In % within issue field					Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	EU I	In %	(N)
Leadership in Europe	.	.	.	.	8	7	10
Involvement in the European Project	.	.	.	.	3	3	4
Future of Europe	.	.	.	.	16	14	20
Political levels	11	.	.	.	5	6	8
Decision making within EU	6	.	.	.	1	1	2
EU reform	.	.	.	.	5	4	6
Values	.	.	.	25	2	2	3
Political information	.	.	.	25	.	1	1
Deepening	.	.	.	.	7	6	9
Widening	6	100	.	.	17	16	23
Identity	.	.	100	.	4	4	6
Relations between EU MS	6	.	.	.	14	12	18
Type of entity	28	.	.	.	3	6	9
EU influence in the world	.	.	.	50	2	3	4
Europe and the USA	44	.	.	.	11	14	21
Reforms and enlargement	.	.	.	.	2	1	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	18	1	1	4	122		146

*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

Because of the low case numbers, the conflict lines can only be fruitfully analyzed within the issue field of European integration (Table 3.3b). Nevertheless, looking at the (few) editorials on the topic of monetary politics that refer to conflict lines about “Europe”, it is worth noticing that the most discussed problem is the one concerning “Europe and the USA”, 44%.

### Positions and subjective attitudes towards EU Integration

Which are the positions and attitudes taken by our newspapers on European integration? Are they against a deepening of the integration process, or are in favor of an extension of the rights and positions of European institutions and regulations?

Valence positions scores on Europe/European integration range from -1 to +1. The positions and attitudes of the media towards the European integration were measured looking at two different aspects. The first one was the 'Relation of issue position (aim of the editorial) towards European integration' (Table 3.4a-3.4b) – a variable that seeks to capture the objective effects of a commentator's claim on rights, resources, competencies of European institutions. It is independent of the kind of Europe envisaged by the actor, just measures if the editorial asks for more or less competences, rights, and resources for Europe, in general or in a specific policy domain. In other words, this variable does not measure an actor's overall stance with regard to European integration but this specific position on a particular aspect of the integration process. The second aspect was 'subjective attitude towards EU/integration process of

commentator' (Table 3.5a-3.5c). This variable, combined with the previous one, allows to code more subtle arguments that are used to justify the previous statements: for instance, if the commentator says that the integration process can only be salvaged by giving back some competencies to the national level, or by shifting power from the commission to the council of ministers. In both cases this implies objectively a reduction in the competencies etc. of the EU, and therefore the variable ("relation of issue position towards EU integration") would be -1. However, at the same time the claim refers positively to the integration process, i.e. it is not hostile to the integration process as such (in this case the variable "subjective attitude towards EU" would be +1).

These two variables were coded only for issues in the field of European integration, or for claims in the six substantive fields which have a European issue scope. In this way, we are able to analyze what happens when media are talking about "Europe", either in the six specific policy fields and when they refer to general aspects of the process of European integration its-self.

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

Paper	Year	Mean	N	Std. Dev.
La Repubblica	2000	0.08	24	0.8
	2001	0.00	31	1.0
	2002	-0.15	40	0.9
	Total	<b>-0.04</b>	95	0.9
IL Corriere della Sera	2000	0.54	28	0.5
	2001	0.42	43	0.9
	2002	-0.09	54	1.0
	Total	<b>0.22</b>	125	0.9
Il Mattino	2000	0.00	30	1.0
	2001	0.20	25	0.8
	2002	-0.16	31	0.7
	Total	<b>0.00</b>	86	0.8
La Nazione	2000	-0.29	17	0.9
	2001	0.25	12	1.0
	2002	0.15	33	0.9
	Total	<b>0.05</b>	62	0.9
Total	2000	0.12	99	0.8
	2001	0.23	111	0.9
	2002	-0.07	158	0.9
	Total	<b>0.07</b>	368	0.9

The overall position of the media about Europe (Table 3.4a) appears characterized by a neutral, or perhaps only slightly positive attitude toward "further" Europeanisation (0.07). Nevertheless, the positions vary between newspapers. The newspaper with more positive attitudes towards European integration is the *Corriere della Sera* (0.22), even if its support for Europe is sharply decreasing after 2001 (from 0.54 in 2000 to 0.42 in 2001, to -0.09 in 2002). The other quality newspaper, *Repubblica* is slightly more critical one of a further European integration process (-0.04), with a change from a neutral to a negative position after 2001. The two regional newspapers are in general very careful in their approval of Europe (the *Mattino* 0 and the *Nazione* 0.05). Nevertheless in a cross time perspective it is worth noticing that they were followed a very different trend, the first sharply decreasing its strong support after 2001

(from 0.20 in 2001 to -0.16 in 2002), the second increasing its support across the years (from -0.29 in 2000 to 0.25 in 2001 and 0.15 in 2002).

In order to appreciate these findings, it is necessary to compare table 3.4a and table 3.5a. In table 3.5a we can see that, overall, the European integration process is evaluated as strongly positive by the Italian newspaper journalists (0.83, Table 3.5a). The newspaper most in favor to the process of European integration “per se” is *Repubblica* (0.96), while the regional paper the *Nazione*, is the least enthusiastic about “Europe” (0.73). In other words: *Repubblica* appears as the most critical one for what concerns substantial issues and problems relating to the process of European integration (confirming in that the pessimism for the actual moment of stalemate in the process of European integration that emerged also from the interviews with journalists, see Delphi report; della Porta 2004), but in general, it is the most supportive newspaper, for what concerns the European project “per se” .

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

	Year	Mean	N	Std. Dev.
Monetary politics	2000	-0.21	38	0.8
	2001	0.19	32	0.9
	2002	0.07	46	0.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.01</b>	116	0.8
Agriculture	2000	-0.50	2	0.7
	2001	-1.00	4	0.0
	2002	1.00	1	.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>-0.57</b>	7	0.8
Immigration	2000	1.00	1	.
	2001	1.00	1	.
	2002	-0.29	7	0.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	9	0.9
Troops deployment	2000	0.00	2	1.4
	2001	0.44	9	0.9
	2002	-0.37	19	0.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>-0.10</b>	30	0.9
Retirement and pension schemes	2000	1.00	2	0.0
	2001	0.00	3	1.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.40</b>	5	0.9
Education	2000	-1.00	1	.
	2001	-1.00	1	.
	2002	0.00	4	1.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>-0.33</b>	6	1.0
European Integration	2000	0.36	53	0.8
	2001	0.33	61	0.9
	2002	-0.07	81	0.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.17</b>	195	0.9
Total	2000	0.12	99	0.8
	2001	0.23	111	0.9
	2002	-0.07	158	0.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.07</b>	368	0.9

In a cross issue perspective (table 3.4b), when talking about European issues, editorials explicitly expressing a positive attitude toward increased Europeanisation are at a high level on European integration (0.17), while on monetary politics newspapers are more careful in their approval of Europe (0.01). Nevertheless, in both the topics, we can notice a decrease of support for the European integration from 2000 to 2002.

Unfortunately, the calculations of the mean evaluations in the other policy fields are based on an extremely low number of editorials, and this makes reliable assessments of newspapers' positions on specific policy fields other than European integration and monetary politics impossible. It seems, however, that Italian newspapers construct their opinion on specific issues with a European scope in the fields of pension (0.40) in a more positive way than for issues specifically related to agriculture (-0.57), education (-0.33) and troop deployment (-0.10).

**Table 3.5a Subjective attitude of commentator regarding European integration by paper and year**

Paper	Year	Mean	N	Std. Dev.
La Repubblica	2000	0.87	24	0.3
	2001	0.97	31	0.2
	2002	1.00	40	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.96</b>	95	0.2
IL Corriere della Sera	2000	0.39	28	0.5
	2001	0.91	43	0.3
	2002	0.96	54	0.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.82</b>	125	0.4
Il Mattino	2000	1.00	30	0.0
	2001	0.96	25	0.2
	2002	0.48	31	0.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.80</b>	86	0.4
La Nazione	2000	0.29	17	0.9
	2001	0.58	12	0.5
	2002	1.00	33	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.73</b>	62	0.6
Total	2000	0.68	99	0.6
	2001	0.90	111	0.3
	2002	0.89	158	0.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.83</b>	368	0.4

In a cross time perspective (Table 3.5a), the EU-supporting attitude of Italian newspapers increases from 2000 to 2001 and 2002. An exception is the *Mattino* that linearly decreases its approval for the process of EU integration from 2000 (1) to 2002 (0.48). The two quality newspapers differ regarding their support for the integration project, with the center-right oriented *Corriere della Sera* more careful toward “Europe” (0.82).

A comparison between Table 3.4a and 3.5a shows interesting findings. Even if Italian newspapers seem to decrease their support for the European integration process across the years (Table 3.4a), a more in-depth look (Table 3.5a) indicate that criticism is actually targeting especially substantial problems and issues than the “idea” of a further European integration.

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

	Year	Mean	N	Std. Dev.
Monetary politics	2000	0.71	38	0.5
	2001	0.87	32	0.3
	2002	0.83	46	0.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>116</b>	0.4
Agriculture	2000	0.50	2	0.7
	2001	0.50	4	0.6
	2002	1.00	1	.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>7</b>	0.5
Immigration	2000	0.00	1	.
	2001	1.00	1	.
	2002	0.86	7	0.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>9</b>	0.4
Troops deployment	2000	1.00	2	0.0
	2001	0.89	9	0.3
	2002	0.68	19	0.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>30</b>	0.4
Retirement and pension schemes	2000	1.00	2	0.0
	2001	0.67	3	0.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>5</b>	0.5
Education	2000	1.00	1	.
	2001	1.00	1	.
	2002	0.50	4	0.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>6</b>	0.5
European Integration	2000	0.64	53	0.6
	2001	0.95	61	0.2
	2002	0.99	81	0.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>195</b>	0.4
Total	2000	0.68	99	0.6
	2001	0.90	111	0.3
	2002	0.89	158	0.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>368</b>	0.4

For the said problem of the low number of cases (as discussed with regard to Table 3.4b), it is not possible to make reliable assessments of newspaper's subjective attitudes on specific policy fields other than European integration and monetary politics (Table 3.5b). However, looking at the editorials in which newspapers take a European scope on issues within the other fields, it is worth noticing that, once again, as we saw in the previous table, the highest level of support can be found in the field European integration itself (0.88). Moreover, this support appears increasing in time. Further, even in the field of monetary politics, where support for further competences and rights of the EU had been rather low, journalists support the integration project as a whole (0.80), and with a slightly increasing approval (from 0.71 in 2000 to 0.87 in 2001, to 0.83 in 2002). For what concerns the other issues fields, where the number of editorials taking position on Europe is low, it is worth noticing that, journalists commenting about agricultural affairs, appears as the least supportive of the project of EU as a whole (0.57), even if in absolute terms the approval of Europe per se is much higher than support for specific issues related to the process in this policy domain.

Looking at the mean of support for European integration of the individual commentators, we notice a high degree of homogeneity within the single newspapers, with however, once again, a more univocal supportive stance by *Repubblica* and *Mattino*, and instead a wider range of position in *Corriere della Sera* and *Nazione*.

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

PAPER	SNAME	Mean	N	Std. Dev.
La Repubblica	Bonanni, Andrea	1.00	4	0.0
	Caracciolo, Lucio	1.00	5	0.0
	De Cecco, Marcello	0.88	8	0.4
	Giannini, Massimo	1.00	4	0.0
	Manzella, Andrea	1.00	6	0.0
	Pirani, Mario	1.00	4	0.0
	Polito, Antonio	1.00	16	0.0
	Rampini, Federico	1.00	8	0.0
	Rodotà, Stefano	1.00	5	0.0
	Valli, Bernardo	0.80	5	0.5
	Total	0.96	95	0.2
IL Corriere della Sera	Bonanni, Andrea	0.64	14	0.5
	Caretto, Ennio	1.00	3	0.0
	Folli, Stefano	0.89	9	0.3
	Giavazzi, Francesco	0.92	13	0.3
	Onida, Fabrizio	1.00	3	0.0
	Ostellino, Piero	0.67	3	0.6
	Panebianco, Angelo	1.00	4	0.0
	Romano, Sergio	1.00	9	0.0
	Ronchey, Alberto	0.75	4	0.5
	Savona, Paolo	0.50	4	0.6
	Talamona, Mario	0.33	3	0.6
	Venturini, Franco	0.95	20	0.2
	Total	0.82	125	0.4
Il Mattino	Bolaffi, Angelo	0.89	9	0.3
	Cardini, Franco	0.75	4	0.5
	Casavola, Francesco Paolo	0.67	3	0.6

	D'Antonio, Mariano	0.60	5	0.6
	Esposito, Marco	1.00	4	0.0
	Manfellotto, Bruno	0.80	5	0.5
	Paquarelli, Gianni	0.20	5	0.5
	Pasquarelli, Gianni	1.00	7	0.0
	Tito, Michele	0.67	6	0.5
	Total	0.80	86	0.4
La Nazione	Cangini, Franco	1.00	3	0.0
	Canè, Gabriele	1.00	2	0.0
	De Carlo, Cesare	0.88	8	0.4
	Fini, Massimo	1.00	3	0.0
	Giardina, Roberto	1.00	5	0.0
	Martino, Antonio	0.83	6	0.4
	Mazzuca, Giancarlo	0.79	14	0.4
	Preti, Luigi	0.00	2	1.4
	Total	0.73	62	0.6

The table lists about the first ten most often mentioned journalists for each newspapers.

#### 4. Addressees, Supporters, Opponents

**Table 4.1a: Presence of addressee by paper**

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
no indirect object addressee	0	4	2	2	0	10
supported actor	91	94	91	92	91	619
opponent	5	2	5	4	5	29
Total (N)	100	100	100	100	100	673

Within each editorials we coded, when possible, an addressee in the strict sense, to whom the journalist directs the call, a supporter and an opponent of the journalists' view (Table 4.1a). Overall, almost all editorials (90%), shows an actor that are held responsible by the journalist for implementing his demands or at whom the comment is directly addressed in the form of a call or appeal to do or leave something. A much smaller portion of editorials (4-5%) is directed to actors that we can more correctly define as "opponents/criticized", namely actors who are not directly held responsible for implementing the claim, but who are seen as advocating a position contrary to that of the journalist, or "support actors", whom are seen as contributing to the claim's realization or advocating a position congruent with that of the journalist. There are no significant differences among newspapers.

**Table 4.1b: Presence of addressee by issue field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
no indirect object addressee	5	4	.	.	2	.	2	5	10
supported actor	90	92	95	100	96	93	92	90	619

supported actor	.	2	3	.	1	4	4	.	29
opponent	5	2	2	.	2	3	2	5	15
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	127	19	48	127	28	129	195		673

*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

Table 4.1b shows that there are only small differences between the issue fields in terms of newspapers' claims being targeted at specific actors who are expected to act/are held responsible. Looking specifically at European integration, we can see that newspapers are just as likely to make claims directed at an addressee about integration as they are about the other issue fields.

**Table 4.2a: Addressees by paper**

	By paper, in %				In %	Total (N)
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ		
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>607</b>
Politicians	2	5	.	4	3	20
Former states (wo) men	.	.	1	.	0	1
Government/executive	74	72	73	76	74	487
Legislative	8	11	11	8	10	64
Judiciary	1	0	.	1	1	3
Military	1	.	1	.	1	3
Central banks	6	3	2	2	4	23
Social security executive organizations	.	.	1	.	0	1
Other state executive agencies	.	1	2	.	1	5
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
Farmers and agricultural org.s	.	0	1	.	0	2
Economists and financial experts	1	0	1	2	1	5
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>
Churches & religious org.s/groups	1	0	.	1	1	3
Educational professionals / org.s	2	1	4	2	2	14
Other scientific/ research inst.	1	.	.	1	1	3
Students, pupils, parents	.	0	1	.	0	2
Other professional org.s /groups	.	.	1	.	0	1
Consumer organizations /groups	1	0	1	.	1	3
Peace movement organizations and groups	2	1	.	.	1	5
Terrorist groups	.	.	1	.	0	1
Other civil society org.s/groups	.	0	1	1	1	3
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	153	237	147	126		663

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]

To whom political claims are addressed in different newspapers? The overall picture for all four papers (Table 4.2a), shows that the vast majority, over 90%, of claims made in editorials are addressed at state actors (the most part to the government, more than 70% of editorials). Interestingly enough party actors are never mentioned as addressees by journalists. Civil

society actors are very rarely the target of newspapers' demands. Among them, economic interest groups and media and journalists are addressed in 1% of editorials, while the other actors of civil society like social movements organizations, voluntary associations and NGOs are addressed in 5% of cases. State actors are clearly the most important actors whom newspapers feel should be called on to take action or who papers wish to support or criticize on the range of issues fields under our study.

Although minimal, there are some interesting differences in the types of actors addressed by each newspaper. *Repubblica* and *Mattino* address slightly more civil society actors (7-8%) than the other two newspapers (4%). Further, *Mattino*, as regional newspaper, appears to be particularly interested in education, as is reflected in the slightly above average number of claims it addresses at educational professionals (4%). The *Nazione* addresses a bit more than the other ones the media and journalists (2%).

**Table 4.2b: Addressees by issue field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>607</b>
Politicians	.	17	7	2	4	5	2	3	20
Former states (wo) men	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	1
Government/executive	73	56	63	83	79	61	80	74	487
Legislative	.	.	26	4	7	15	13	10	64
Judiciary	.	.	2	.	4	.	1	1	3
Military	.	.	.	2	.	.	.	1	3
Central banks	19	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	23
Social security executive organizations	.	.	.	.	4	.	.	0	1
Other state executive agencies	.	.	2	.	4	2	.	1	5
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	.	.	.	.	.	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
Farmers and agricultural org.s	.	11	.	.	.	.	.	0	2
Economists and financial experts	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	5
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	.	<b>3</b>	.	<b>2</b>	.	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	.	<b>5</b>	.	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>
Churches & religious org.s/groups	.	.	.	1	.	1	1	1	3
Educational professionals / org.s	.	.	.	.	.	11	.	2	14
Other scientific/ research inst.	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	1	3
Students, pupils, parents	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	0	2
Other professional org.s /groups	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	1
Consumer organizations /groups	1	11	.	.	.	.	.	1	3
Peace movement organizations and groups	.	.	.	3	.	.	1	1	5
Terrorist groups	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	0	1
Other civil society org.s/groups	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	3
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	<b>1</b>	.	.	<b>1</b>	.	.	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
(N)	122	18	46	127	28	127	195		663

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

In a cross issue perspective (Table 4.2b), it is worth noticing that the preference of journalists to state actors as target of their claims is particularly evident in immigration and pension (100% of editorials) as well as on the topic of European integration (96%). Looking at the

subcategories of institutional actors addressed by claim-making, interestingly, immigration is the policy field where the legislative is most often targeted by journalists (26%). Not surprisingly in monetary policy we found a significant role of central banks (19% of claims). More articulated is the range of addressed actors in agriculture, and education. In fact, together with institutional actors, still predominant, in agriculture economic interest groups play an important role (especially farmers organization, 11%) as well as civil society actors (in particular consumers organizations, 11%). In education, organizations from civil society (16%) are very present. It is worth noticing that, even if within the field of European integration almost all claims made by newspapers on the topic are addressed to state actors, the only other type of actors addressed are civil society actors, both as organizations (2%) and as general unorganized public (2%). Interestingly, in the topic of European integration, within civil society the organizations addressed as target by journalists' claims are churches and religious groups, the peace movements, and "other civil society organizations", that from a more detailed look inside the data have emerged to be identifiable with "new-global movement organizations". Thus, on issues inherent to the process of European integration, interest groups and media themselves are not seen as important actors to be addressed, supported or criticized by the press.

**Table 4.2c: Addressees by year**

	In % within year			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>607</b>
Politicians	5	2	3	3	20
Former states (wo) men	.	1	.	0	1
Government/executive	73	71	76	74	487
Legislative	6	12	10	10	64
Judiciary	2	.	.	1	3
Military	1	1	0	1	3
<b>CENTRAL BANKS</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>23</b>
Social security executive organizations	.	1	.	0	1
Other state executive agencies	.	2	.	1	5
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
Farmers and agricultural org.s	.	1	0	0	2
Economists and financial experts	2	.	1	1	5
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>
Churches & religious org.s/groups	.	.	1	1	3
Educational professionals / org.s	3	3	1	2	14
Other scientific/ research inst.	.	1	1	1	3
Students, pupils, parents	.	1	.	0	2
Other professional org.s /groups	.	.	0	0	1
Consumer organizations /groups	.	1	.	1	3
Peace movement organizations and groups	.	1	2	1	5
Terrorist groups	.	.	0	0	1
Other civil society org.s/groups	.	.1	1	1	3
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)	173	217	273		663

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]

In a cross time perspective (Table 4.2c), executive actors are constantly addressed as targets of journalists' claims. The legislative appears to increase (even if very slightly) its importance as addressee of demands from 2000 (6%) to 2001 (12%) and 2002 (10%). The central banks are targeted above all in 2000 (7%). Interestingly, among economic interest groups, unions and employees are never targeted by journalists, while economists and financial experts appear as the actors more referred to (even if not homogeneously across the years). Interestingly, all organizations from civil society start to be considered as addressees in the recent years, after 2000 (6-7% in 2001 and 2002 against 3% in 2000). An exception are the most traditional organizations related to educational issues (educational professional and organizations), that are the only ones targeted by journalists' claims in the 2000 (3%).

**Table 4.3a Addressee scope by paper**

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	1	3	.	2	2	10
other supranational	1	1	1	.	1	5
<b>EU</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>186</b>
multilateral	1	1	2	1	1	9
germany	1	1	1	2	1	8
france	1	1	1	.	1	5
uk	2	0	.	1	1	5
<b>Italy</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>348</b>
other EU-members	.	0	1	2	1	4
other european countries ex						
CIS	.	0	.	.	0	1
turkey	.	0	.	.	0	1
russia	2	.	1	.	1	5
USA	10	7	12	11	10	64
Middle East	.	.	3	3	1	9
Rest of the world	.	.	.	1	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	152	237	147	125		661

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]

As we can observe in Table 4.3a, in general, even if national actors are still the main target of call or appeal made by journalists, and are generally held responsible for implementing the claims (53%), nevertheless the role of European actors and institutions is also relevant 28%. It is worth noticing that this distribution of claims between national and European targets made by journalists in editorials is quite similar to the findings emerged in work-package 2 of Europub project, where we found that a share of 20% of claims made by civil society and state actors was directed to European institutions and a 58% to national the level (della Porta and Caiani 2004). Interestingly, if actors from EU institutions are more likely to be addressed by Italian newspapers than national actors from other European Union member states (4%), at the same time, these latter are less likely to be targeted by journalists than national actors from countries elsewhere in the world (especially from USA, 10%).

There are some notable differences in the scope of actors addressed by each newspaper. The most striking variation is in the larger proportion of claims addressed at European level actors by the center-left paper *Repubblica* (36%) in comparison with the other national broadsheet, and the regional newspapers (about 25%). On the contrary the *Corriere della Sera* is the most

characterize by journalists' claims directed towards national actors (57%), but also, at some extent, to supranational institutions (4%). Surprisingly the two regional newspapers target slightly more actors from countries elsewhere in the world than the two "quality" papers (about 15% against 7-10%).

**Table 4.3b Addressee scope by issue field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	.	.	.	8	.	.	.	2	10
other supranational	1	.	.	2	.	1	.	1	5
<b>EU</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>186</b>
multilateral	1	6	2	4	.	.	1	1	9
germany	2	6	.	.	.	.	3	1	8
france	.	.	.	1	.	.	2	1	5
uk	.	11	.	1	4	1	.	1	5
<b>Italy</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>348</b>
other EU-members	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	4
other european countries ex									
CIS	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	1
turkey	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	1
russia	.	.	.	4	.	.	.	1	5
USA	11	.	.	36	.	.	3	10	64
Middle East	.	.	.	7	.	.	.	1	9
Rest of the world	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	1
Total	10	100	100	100	100	10	100		
(N)	122	18	46	126	28	126	195		661

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

Here, a cross policy comparison points at relevant differences (Table 4.3b), with a strong presence of actors with a European scope as addressees of the journalists' claims on topics concerning the European integration (54% of all editorials) and monetary policy (45%), but only to a lesser extent, in agriculture (28%). Reflecting the EU' s pillar structure, claims with European level actors as addressees are present at a middle level in immigration (13%) and troop deployment (10%) debates, and at a very low level in the policy domains that remain the preserve of nation-states, namely education and pension (1-4%). However, in term of Europeanisation, we can notice that on topics concerning agriculture, national actors from other EU countries play a certain role as target of journalists' claims (17%) in comparison to actors from Non-EU members. from EU countries (a range of 7-9%).

Therefore, in terms of newspapers being carriers of viewpoints on Europeanisation only the field of European integration itself, or at least the already more Europeanized fields, from an institutional point of view, could be said to be Europeanized in the Italian press.

**Table 4.3c: Addressee scope by year**

	In % within year			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
supranational: UN	1	1	3	2	10
other supranational	1	1	1	1	5
<b>EU</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>186</b>
multilateral	1	1	2	1	9
germany	2	1	2	1	8
france	2	.	0	1	5
uk	1	1	.	1	5
<b>Italy</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>348</b>
other EU-members	1	1	0	1	4
other european countries ex CIS	.	.	0	0	1
turkey	.	.	0	0	1
russia	.	1	1	1	5
USA	1	11	15	10	64
Middle East	.	1	3	1	9
Rest of the world	1	.	.	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)	172	217	272		661

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]

In a cross time perspective (Table 4.3c), the number of journalists' editorials with a European target is decreasing over the three-year period from 37% in 2000 to 21% in 2001 to 28% in 2002. Even the numbers of editorials directed to national Italian addressees decreases across the years (10% point less). Given the fact that the share of editorials directed to other EU members (both national and bi-multilateral) and to supranational level remains pretty constant across the years, what accounts for the change seems to be the increased attention from 2000 to 2002 towards USA actors, that even more are targeted as direct addressees by Italian journalists. The war in Afghanistan and 'war on terror' seems to have monopolize journalists' attention in the last two years, even if the process of European integration in this period has moved important steps ahead. Moreover, the introduction of the Euro in the year 2000 could explain that peak in that year.

**Table 4.3d: Addressee scope by broad addressee category**

	In % within recoded first actor scope					Total	
	State and party actors	Economic interest groups	Media and journalists	Other civil society actors	General/ unknown/ unspecified	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	2	.	.	.	.	2	10
other supranational	1	.	.	6	.	1	5
<b>EU</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>14</b>	.	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>186</b>
multilateral	1	14	13	9	.	1	9
germany	1	.	.	.	.	1	8
france	1	.	.	.	.	1	5
uk	1	.	.	.	.	1	5
<b>Italy</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>80</b>	.	<b>53</b>	<b>348</b>
other EU-members	1	.	.	.	.	1	4
other european countries ex CIS	.	.	.	3	.	0	1
turkey	0	.	.	.	.	0	1
russia	1	.	.	.	.	1	5
USA	10	14	13	.	.	10	64
Middle East	2	.	.	.	.	1	9
Rest of the world	.	14	.	.	.	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	605	7	8	35	6		661

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]

Table 4.3d shows that most of claims targeted at EU actors by newspapers are directed at state actors (29%), but that also European economic interest groups play a significant role in the views of journalists (14%). Italian newspapers address very few commentaries at civil society organizations operating at the EU level (3%). Interestingly enough, multilateral (9%) and supranational (6%) civil society actors- organizations or simply networks – are more likely to be addressed by journalist’ claims than European ones.

## 5. / 6. Positively and negatively evaluated Addressees, Supporters and Opponents

After looking at the addressees, it is interesting to see how the journalists evaluate them. Indeed, calls and appeals toward specific targets inside the public sphere may be made in a neutral sense, when the journalists refer to targets without a precise evaluation. Vice versa, claims can be made or be combined with expressions of criticism or support for the actors

they target. In our measurement, these evaluations of the addressees range from –1 for negative judgments, to +1 for positive judgments, and are calculated as an average for an aggregated addressed actor that include also opponents and supported actors.

Because the number of cases is relatively small, these results have to be treated with caution. The distribution of positive evaluations strongly depends on the attention the different actors get. If EU actors for example do not appear at all in retirement politics, they of course are not supported in this field either. Therefore the following results need to be valued taking into consideration the share of attention of the specific actors.

To simplify the analysis and presentation, information from positively-evaluated addressees and supported actors is combined. The same has been done for what concerns negatively addressed addressees and opposed actors.

**Table 5.1a Positively evaluated Addressees per paper**

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>150</b>
Politicians	.	.	.	4	1	1
Government/executive	62	84	79	82	77	122
Legislative	13	2	10	7	8	13
Judiciary	3	2	.	.	1	2
Military	.	.	2	.	1	1
Central banks	13	7	4	4	7	11
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>
Churches & religious org.s/groups	3	2	.	4	2	3
Educational professionals / org.s	5	2	.	.	2	3
Consumer organizations /groups	3	.	2	.	1	2
Other civil society org.s/groups	.	.	2	.	1	1
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)						159

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]

Not only did the journalists call most often on state actors as addressees actors (Table 4.2a), but they also support them most often (94%, Table 5.1a). Within state actors the most positively evaluated actors by our newspapers, are the governments (in 84% of cases for *Corriere della Sera*, 79% for *Mattino*, 82% for the *Nazione*). However, the *Repubblica* is the newspaper that is less likely to evaluate state actors positively.

If we compare table 5.1a with table 6.1a, it is worth noticing that, overall, the share of state actors negatively evaluated by journalists is lower (89%), but once again with the exception of *Repubblica*, where state, and among them governmental actors are more likely to be negatively evaluated.

If we compare table 4.2a (that refers to the “attention” that editorials give to different categories of actors as targets of their comments) and table 5.1a (that refers to their “evaluation”), we have interesting findings. Civil society actors for example get a significant share of the attention in the *Repubblica* and in the *Mattino* (7-8%), but while in the former the attention is followed by positive evaluation (10%), this is less true in the latter (4%).

The *Nazione*, that addresses a bit more than the other papers media and journalists (attention, 2%), actually do not support them (evaluation).

**Table 5.1b Positively evaluated Addressees per issue field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>150</b>
Politicians	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	1
Government/executive	66	67	80	94	83	60	76	77	122
Legislative	.	.	20	.	.	.	19	8	13
Judiciary	.	.	.	.	17	.	2	1	2
Military	.	.	.	3	.	.	.	1	1
Central banks	29	.	.	.	.	.	.	7	11
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>33</b>	.	<b>3</b>	.	<b>40</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>
Churches & religious org.s/groups	.	.	.	3	.	10	2	2	3
Educational professionals / org.s	.	.	.	.	.	30	.	2	3
Consumer organizations /groups	3	33	.	.	.	.	.	1	2
Other civil society org.s/groups	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(N)	38	3	5	35	6	10	62		159

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

**Table 6.1b Negatively evaluated Addressees per issue field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>295</b>
POLITICIANS	.	15	11	2	.	7	1	4	13
Government/executive	67	54	59	73	79	57	83	69	228
Legislative	.	.	26	7	7	19	10	11	36
Judiciary	.	.	4	.	.	.	.	0	1
Military	.	.	.	4	.	.	.	1	2
Central banks	19	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	10
Social security executive organizations	.	.	.	.	7	.	.	0	1
Other state executive agencies	.	.	.	.	7	4	.	1	4
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	.	.	.	.	.	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>
Farmers and agricultural org.s	.	15	.	.	.	.	.	1	2
Economists and financial experts	9	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	5
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	.	<b>6</b>	.	<b>1</b>	.	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	.	<b>9</b>	.	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>
Educational professionals / org.s	.	.	.	.	.	7	.	2	6
Other scientific/ research inst.	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	1	2

Students, pupils, parents	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	1	2
Other professional org.s /groups	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	1
Consumer organizations /groups	.	8	.	.	.	.	.	0	1
Peace movement organizations and groups	.	.	.	7	.	.	1	2	5
Terrorist groups	.	.	.	2	.	.	.	0	1
Other civil society org.s/groups	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	2
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	<b>2</b>	.	.	.	.	.	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	54	13	27	55	14	84	84		331
[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]									
Issue fields are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.									

Table 5.1b shows that state actors are the most likely actors to be positively addressed in all issue fields. Nevertheless, by comparing tables 5.1b and 6.1b<sup>7</sup>, we can see that, in general, in some issues fields, actors, are more likely to be addressed negatively than positively. This is true especially in education (negatively addressed = 84; positively addressed = 10), pension (14 against 6), immigration (27 against 5) and agriculture (13 against 3). This shows that the overall balance of opinions given by newspapers about actors operating in these fields is a negative one. On the contrary in the topic of EU integration and monetary politics, the amount, in absolute terms, of negatively and positively addressed actors is more equally shared. Almost all political actors evaluated positively by newspapers in relation to European integration and monetary politics are state actors (95-98%), divided mainly in government executive actors (66%) and central banks (29%) in monetary politics and government (76%) and legislative (19%) in EU integration. While the majority of actors addressed negatively by the press are also state actors, the newspapers' negative evaluations appear as slightly more widespread across a wider range of state actors.

**Table 5.2a Scope of positively evaluated Addressees per paper**

	By paper, in %				Total In %	Total (N)
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ		
supranational: UN	.	2	.	.	1	1
other supranational	3	2	2	.	2	3
<b>EU</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>
multilateral	.	.	.	4	1	1
germany	.	2	.	.	1	1
france	.	2	2	.	1	2
<b>italy</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>
other EU-members	.	.	.	4	1	1
turkey	.	2	.	.	1	1
USA	8	11	13	21	13	20
Middle East	.	.	2	.	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	39	44	48	28		159
[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]						

<sup>7</sup> It is interesting to notice that when passing from positively evaluated addressees actors to the negatively ones, some categories of actors, like for instance churches, disappear.

Interestingly, overall, the type of actors that Italian newspapers tend to support or address in a positive sense are equally spread between EU level actors and domestic actors (each 40%), Table 5.2a. This is more true for *Corriere* (46% vs. 32%) and *Mattino* (44% vs.38%), while *Repubblica* is more likely to evaluate in a positive way European actors (64%) than national actors (26%), and *Nazione* follows an opposite pattern (25% EU level actors against 46% Italian actors). Outside of the national and EU domains, only actors in the USA are quite often supported or addressed positively (especially in editorials of the *Nazione*, 21%).

**Table 6.2a Scope of negatively evaluated Addressees per paper**

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	1	3	.	2	2	6
other supranational	1	1	.	.	1	2
<b>EU</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>78</b>
multilateral	3	2	2	.	2	5
germany	1	2	.	3	2	5
france	1	1	.	.	1	2
Uk	3	1	.	.	1	3
<b>Italy</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>191</b>
other EU-members	.	1	2	2	1	3
other european countries ex						
CIS	.	1	.	.	0	1
Russia	3	.	2	.	1	3
USA	7	6	12	5	7	24
Middle East	.	.	4	6	2	6
Rest of the world	.	.	.	2	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	81	125	57	67		330

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]

Table 6.2a offers us a different picture of criticized actors. The majority of negatively addressed actors are located in the Italian national sphere (58%). Again, the only types of actors negatively addressed in proportions deserving comments are those operating at the EU level (24%) or national actors from the USA (7%). Looking specifically at EU level actors, we can see that they are twice as likely to be addressed positively (40%, see Table 5.2a) than to be criticized (24%) by Italian newspapers.

Interesting differences in the way in which individual newspapers present their opinion on actors operating at different levels emerge if comparing the data for positively addressed actors in Table 5.2a with data for criticized actors in Table 6.2a. Each of the papers vary in the extent to which they have expressed support for EU actors. This is especially true for *Repubblica* and *Mattino*, where the EU level actors are three times as likely to be addressed positively than negatively (64% vs. 24% for the former, and 38% vs. 14% for the latter). National actors from other EU member states are not a strong focus for criticism for the IT press. Other than EU actors, actors at the trans-national and supranational level are rarely addressed negatively. USA are more likely be addressed positively (13%) than negatively (7%) (See Table 5.2a).

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

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	.	.	.	3	.	.	.	1	1
other supranational	.	.	.	6	.	10	.	2	3
<b>EU</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>33</b>	.	<b>14</b>	.	<b>10</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>
Multilateral	.	.	.	3	.	.	.	1	1
Germany	.	33	.	.	.	.	.	1	1
France	.	.	.	3	.	.	2	1	2
<b>Italy</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>
other EU-members	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	1
Turkey	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	1
USA	18	.	.	37	.	.	.	13	20
Middle East	.	.	.	3	.	.	.	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
(N)	38	3	5	35	6	10	62		159

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

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

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	.	.	.	11	.	.	.	2	6
other supranational	2	.	.	2	.	.	.	1	2
<b>EU</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	.	<b>50</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>78</b>
multilateral	2	8	4	2	.	.	1	2	5
germany	4	.	.	.	.	.	4	2	5
France	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	2
Uk	.	15	.	.	7	.	.	1	3
<b>Italy</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>191</b>
other EU-members	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	1	3
other european countries ex									
CIS	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	1
Russia	.	.	.	6	.	.	.	1	3
USA	6	.	.	33	.	.	4	7	24
Middle East	.	.	.	11	.	.	.	2	6
Rest of the world	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	54	13	27	54	14	84	84		330

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

Tables 5.2b and 6.2b illustrate the distribution of the positively and negatively addressed claims of the newspapers between actors operating at different levels in each issue field.

European actors receive more support than national actors in the fields of monetary politics, and EU integration (Table 5.2b): the same issue fields where they receive more attention by journalists (Table 4.3b). In troops deployment European actors get most support than real attention. The US is strongly supported in this field: 37% of all supported actors are from the US.

Secondly, in immigration and pension, EU level actors are not addressed positively: all positive assessments of political actors in these policy fields are addressed to national actors. In immigration, when (rarely) EU level actors are addressed, they are criticize (11%). The same is true, at least potentially, also for pension (7% of editorials, where they are targeted negatively against 0% positively). While, surprisingly, in education, when EU actors are addressed, they are referred to in positive terms. Anyway in these last two policy fields, the numbers of cases is too small to do reliable conclusions.

On the contrary, in the topic of EU integration, we can see that EU level actors are positively evaluated (65%), more often than they are negatively evaluated (50%).

**Table 6.1a Negatively evaluated Addressees per paper**

	By paper, in %				Total In %	Total (N)
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ		
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>295</b>
Politicians	2	7	.	3	4	13
Government/executive	79	63	61	73	69	228
Legislative	5	14	16	9	11	36
Judiciary	.	.	.	2	0	1
Military	2	.	.	.	1	2
Central banks	4	4	.	3	3	10
Social security executive organizations	.	.	2	.	0	1
Other state executive agencies	.	1	5	.	1	4
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>
Farmers and agricultural org.s	.	1	2	.	1	2
Economists and financial experts	1	1	2	3	2	5
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	<b>.</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>
Educational professionals / org.s	1	2	5	.	2	6
Other scientific/ research inst.	1	.	.	2	1	2
Students, pupils, parents	.	1	2	.	1	2
Other professional org.s /groups	.	.	2	.	0	1
Consumer organizations /groups	.	1	.	.	0	1
Peace movement organizations and groups	4	2	.	.	2	5
Terrorist groups	.	.	2	.	0	1
Other civil society org.s/groups	.	1	.	2	1	2
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	<b>.</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>.</b>	<b>.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	82	125	57	67		331

[Information from addressees, opponents and supported actors is combined; only claims with an addressee.]

Most criticism is directed towards state actors (Table 6.1a). The criticism towards these actors is anyway lower than their share of attention (Table 4.2a).

## 7. Issues and aims per newspaper

The following section reports on several main features of the way in which different policy fields are commented upon by Italian newspapers in editorial articles.

**Table 7.1 policy field per paper**

	In % within paper				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
Monetary politics: currency and interest rate	20	16	20	22	19	127
Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control	3	3	3	4	3	19
Immigration: entry and exit	5	10	6	6	7	48
Troops deployment	19	14	25	21	19	127
Retirement and pension schemes	5	4	5	4	4	28
Education	15	20	18	23	19	129
European Integration	33	35	24	20	29	195
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	153	238	153	129		673

Table 7.1 analyses the proportion of claims made by newspaper and policy field.

Around one third (29 %) of the commentaries we selected in each of the four newspapers are about European Integration. Other equally frequent issues commented in editorials are monetary politics, matters of troops deployment, and education (19% of all editorials each). The less mentioned issues are immigration (7%), agriculture (3%) and pension (4%). There are however differences across newspapers. The two quality newspapers comment more frequently than the regional papers on the topic of European integration (about 30% of all editorials the former against about 20% the latter), while surprisingly monetary issues are equally well covered by all four newspapers with about 20% of all editorials, (in case the only exception is represented by *Corriere della Sera*, with a share of 16%). In comparison, the regional newspapers pay more attention to the issues of troops deployment (21-25% the regional ones against 14-19% the quality ones). *Corriere della Sera* appears particularly interested in immigration (10% of all editorials of the paper), *Nazione* in education (23%).

**Tables 7.2a – 7.2g Sub issues within policy fields per paper, separate for each policy field**

a	Monetary politics				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
General Unspecific	10	5	10	14	9	12
Interest Rate Adjustments	19	16	19	14	17	22
EMU Convergence criteria and stability pact	13	32	26	7	21	26
Exchange rate intervention	29	11	26	18	21	26
Independence Central Banks	10	14	.	7	8	10
Common currency (ECU, EURO)	10	14	10	25	14	18
Dynamics of Euro campaigns	3	.	.	4	2	2
Other Specific	7	8	10	11	9	11
Total	100	100	100	100	100	

(N)	31	37	31	28	127
-----	----	----	----	----	-----

Tables 7.2a-7.2g shows the distribution of claims made by each newspaper in relation to the specific sub issue areas in these two policy fields.

As far as monetary policy is concerned (Table 7.2a), most present in commentaries are issues around the EMU convergence criteria (including the stability pact, 21%) and exchange rate intervention (21%), followed by interest rate adjustments (17%) and (less than expected) the common currency Euro (14%). An exception is the *Nazione*, with a share of 25% of all its editorial on this field about the Euro. The *Corriere della Sera* provides a high proportion of editorial content on convergence criteria (32%).

B	Agriculture				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
Subsidies and enlargement of the European Union	.	17	.	.	5	1
BSE	25	33	75	100	58	11
Foot and Mouth Disease	.	50	25	.	21	4
Other diseases	75	.	.	.	16	3
Total (N)	100 4	100 6	100 4	100 5	100	19

Although agriculture (Table 7.2b), also belong to policy fields in which the European political institutions have growing competences, and where consequently changes have occurred in term of policy governance in the recent years, this topic is strongly and constantly underrepresented in media comments, comparing to the other issues, with no differences among the four newspapers in this respect. Further, the (few) editorials are mainly concentrated on the topic of BSE (11 commentaries on 19 in the field) or “other diseases”. This give the impression that the debate on some important elements of the policy governance (and above all the European dimension of that), like for instance the discussion on quotas for life stock, is strongly underrepresented in the Italian public sphere created by the voice of journalists, while the attention is attracted only by the “emergency” of the animal diseases. This lack of consistent attention to agriculture reflects the very structure of news reporting of the Italian newspapers, where no specialized attention is devoted to the field, which is considered as of minor and declining importance for the national economy.

c	Immigration				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
General evaluation or policy direction	25	9	33	13	17	8
Instit. framework, responsibilities, proced., costs	13	13	11	13	13	6
Entry and border controls	13	39	.	25	25	12
Expulsions/deportations	25	4	.	.	6	3
Migration programs and quotas	13	22	33	13	21	10
Actions relating to smuggling and illegal entries	.	9	.	38	10	5
Other specific issues	13	4	22	.	8	4
Total (N)	100 8	100 23	100 9	100 8	100	48

Commentaries on immigration policy (Table 7.2c) focus very much on questions of entry and border controls, 25% (especially the editorials in *Corriere della Sera*, with 39% of all editorials in this policy field) and migration programs and quotas, 21% (especially the *Mattino* with a share of 33% of cases).

d	Troops deployment				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
General unspecific reference to deployment of troops	3	9	11	7	8	10
d.o.t for mil. aggression on foreign sovereign territory	69	76	37	63	60	76
d.o.t in covert aggr. operations Vs hostile regimes/groups	.	.	3	.	1	1
d.o.t for peace-keeping	21	15	42	11	24	30
d.o.t in times of crisis	.	.	.	4	1	1
other specific reference to deployment of troops	7	.	8	15	7	9
<b>Total (N)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>127</b>
	29	33	38	27		

As for troop deployment (Table 7.2d), troop deployment for military aggression on foreign sovereign territory is the main sub-issue in all four papers (60%), followed by military actions relating to peace keeping (24%). Here as well, coverage is determined by emergency, in particular the war in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

e	Pensions				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
General	14	40	.	80	31	9
Demographic changes: ageing population	14	10	29	.	14	4
Retirement ages	29	10	43	.	21	6
State pension scheme	43	40	14	20	31	9
Other / Specific	.	.	14	.	3	1
<b>Total (N)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>
	7	10	7	5		

Minor attention among journalists appear to attract the issues we selected concerning retirement and pension (Table 7.2e), within which the main sub-issue under discussion in the various papers are general matters about the topic and state-pension scheme (9 commentaries each sub-issue).

f	Education				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
General unspecific	.	4	4	3	3	4
Structural issues	30	34	29	20	29	37
Resource allocation and salaries	35	17	18	17	20	26
Private education	17	4	.	13	8	10
Administrative power allocation	.	4	4	7	4	5
Curriculum	.	6	7	10	6	8

Information and communication technologies	.	6	11	10	7	9
Scholarships and fees	.	.	.	3	1	1
Problems at school	9	6	25	7	11	14
Other specific issues	9	17	4	10	11	14
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	23	47	28	30		128

As for as the sub-issues in education (Table 7.2f), Italian journalists discussed mainly structural issues and topics referring resource allocation and salaries by (20-29%). While the first sub-issue is almost equally covered in all newspapers, with the exception of the *Nazione* (with the lowest share of editorials on the topic, 20%), the second is discussed in particular by the quality newspaper *la Repubblica* (35% against a share of 17-18% of the other papers).

g	European integration				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
General European integration, not specific	.	5	.	.	2	4
National vs. European Identity, shared values	4	11	6	15	9	17
Role of a specific country and balance of power in the EU	<b>39</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>42</b>	81
Relationship EU - nat.&reg. levels / future constitution	<b>26</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>17</b>	34
Institutional structure & relationship between EU instit.	2	2	3	4	3	5
Relationship between EU institutions and public	2	2	3	.	2	4
Enlargement	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>13</b>	26
Other specific EU integration	4	5	3	.	4	7
Associational agreements/ treaties EU - non-EU countries	2	.	.	.	1	1
Personnel issues within EU/discussions about candidacies	.	2	.	.	1	2
Non-EU forms of European integration	6	7	11	4	7	14
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	51	82	36	26		195

Table 7.2g shows that comments by the Italian press equally cover three of sub issues within the field of European integration: the most important issue covered is the role of a specific country in the EU (42%), then, the relationship between the EU and national levels (17%), and the enlargement (13%). Minor attention is paid in general to European institutions and their functioning. No clear distinctions can be made between the two quality newspapers and the regional ones. The role of a specific country in the EU, for instance, equally high up on the agenda of the *Mattino* (56%) and the *Corriere della Sera* (43%). The regional *Nazione* published articles on the relationship between the EU and national levels as much as the national broadsheets *Repubblica* (26-27%), and at the same time was more likely to comment on enlargement (27%) than the other three papers.

**Table 7.3 issue scope by paper**

	By paper, in %				In %	Total (N)
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ		
supranational: UN	5	4	3	7	5	31
other supranational	2	2	1	2	2	13
<b>EU</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>363</b>
other European supranational	.	1	.	.	0	2
multilateral	9	13	14	4	11	72
bilateral	1	2	1	4	2	13
Uk	1	.	.	1	0	2
<b>Italy</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>173</b>
Russia	1	.	.	.	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	152	238	151	129		670

Table 7.3 allows us to examine the overall proportion of comments given by newspapers in relation to issues with different scope. Here we can see how much of each newspapers editorial agenda gives opinion on issues relating to the European Union in comparison to national Italian issues and issues with other scopes.

With regard to the research question of Europeanisation thus, it is particularly important to analyze the issue scopes of the commentaries. The issue scope refers to the geographical and/or political scope of the substantive content of the commentary. It has to be noted that the issue scope is in principle independent from the scope of the cited addressees, and/or the object actors.<sup>8</sup> Overall, it is worth noticing that the issue scope in the commentaries of the four Italian newspapers is primarily European (more than half of all commentaries) and national (Italian, 26%). The quality paper *Repubblica* put a stronger emphasis on European issues than the other papers (63%), but also the commentators of the regional newspaper the *Mattino* “frames” very often their comments with a European dimension (57%). The *Nazione* and the *Corriere* more often than the other newspapers that refer to national Italian issue scope.

<sup>8</sup> E.g., if a journalist appealed to the European Court of Justice in protest against the Berlin police's treatment of immigrant suspects, the addressee is European, but the scope of the issue ('The Berlin police's treatment of immigrant suspects') remains local.

**Table 7.4 issue scope per policy field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	.	.	2	24	.	.	.	5	31
other supranational	1	.	.	7	3	.	1	2	13
<b>EU</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>363</b>
other European supranational	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	2
multilateral	2	6	42	37	3	1	.	11	72
bilateral	.	.	6	6	.	2	.	2	13
Uk	.	6	.	.	.	1	.	0	2
<b>Italy</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>173</b>
russia	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	127	18	48	126	29	127	195		670

*Issue fields are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.*

Table 7.4 shows the proportion of newspapers claims in editorials that refer to European issues. Here we can assess the degree of Europeanisation of Italian newspapers' opinion leading in each field. There are significant differences between the issue fields. As expected, the main policy fields discussed in the context of the EU in the four sampled newspapers are European integration (97%) and monetary politics (91%), but not agriculture, or at least not at the same degree (39%). Concerning the two policies fields still well anchored at national level, namely pension and education, it is worth noticing that while the latter is discussed almost entirely within a "domestic" frame (5%), the former, surprisingly, is debated as frequently as immigration (17-19%) with a European reference

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

a	Monetary politics				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
other supranational	.	3	.	.	1	1
EU	97	87	94	89	91	116
multilateral	3	3	.	.	2	2
Italy	.	8	7	11	6	8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	31	37	31	28		127

A set of tables (7.5a-g) gives information on scope separately for each policy field, allowing to investigate the differences in opinion leading by individual newspapers. The following tables seem to show that the distribution of issue scopes within the different policy fields did not differ very much across newspapers. Table 7.5a indicates, in particular,

that when comments are about monetary politics, regardless of the newspaper, journalists adopt mainly a European scope (87-97%).

b	Agriculture				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
EU	50	50	33	20	39	7
multilateral	.	17	.	.	6	1
Uk	25	.	.	.	6	1
italy	25	33	67	80	50	9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	4	6	3	5		18

Table 7.5b shows that, however, on agricultural issues, there are some differences among papers, with the two quality papers more likely than the regional ones to frame their comments in a European “way”( 50% vs. 20-30%).

c	Immigration				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	13	.	.	.	2	1
EU	25	13	33	13	19	9
multilateral	63	52	33	.	42	20
bilateral	.	9	.	13	6	3
italy	.	26	33	75	31	15
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	8	23	9	8		48

Table 7.5c shows that the *Nazione* frames their comments on immigration mainly (75%) in national terms, while *Repubblica* and *Mattino* are more likely to discuss these issues with a European angle (25% and 33%).

d	Troop Deployment				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	25	27	13	33	24	30
other supranational	11	6	5	7	7	9
EU	25	12	32	26	24	30
multilateral	29	49	47	19	37	47
bilateral	7	6	3	11	6	8
italy	.	.	.	4	1	1
russia	4	.	.	.	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	28	33	38	27		126

The issue scope of commentaries on troops deployment does not vary much between the newspapers under study, with the exception of *Corriere della Sera*, that show a lower share of European issue scopes in comparison to the other papers (12% against 25-32%), and of *Mattino*, for what concerns the supranational level of reference (only 13% of its editorials).

e	Pension				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
other supranational	.	10	.	.	3	1
EU	14	.	57	.	17	5
multilateral	.	10	.	.	3	1
italy	86	80	43	100	76	22
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	7	10	7	5		29

f	Education				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
EU	9	2	4	7	5	6
multilateral	.	2	.	.	1	1
bilateral	.	2	.	3	2	2
uk	.	.	.	3	1	1
italy	91	94	96	87	92	117
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	23	47	27	30		127

Table 7.5e and 7.5f confirm a clear domination of national issues concerning retirement and pension schemes and education in all four newspapers. Surprisingly enough, in pension only the regional newspaper the *Mattino* differs from the other for a larger share of editorials with a European issue scope (57%).

g	European Integration				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
other supranational	.	1	.	4	1	2
EU	100	96	100	92	97	190
other European supranational	.	2	.	.	1	2
italy	.	.	.	4	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	51	82	36	26		195

Table 7.5g reflects the logical result that commentaries on matters of European Integration discussed predominantly European issues.

## 8. Issues and aims per year

Table 8.1 policy field by year

	In % within year			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
Monetary politics	25	16	18	19	127
Agriculture	3	6	1	3	19
Immigration	10	3	9	7	48

Troops deployment	2	20	29	19	127
Retirement and pension schemes	5	6	2	4	29
Education	27	21	12	19	128
European Integration	30	28	30	29	195
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)	179	219	275		673

In a cross time perspective, it is worth noticing that in the period under study, “monetary politics” decreases its presence as topic in commentaries (from 25% in 2000 to 18%), while attention to the topic of European integration remains nearly constant (about 30%). The trend of monetary issue can be explained by the focus on the start of the Euro in the year 2000. The peak of the issue of “troops deployment” in 2001 and in 2002 corresponds to the terrorist attack on the USA in 2001 (“September 11<sup>th</sup>”), followed by war (preparations) against Afghanistan and Iraq. Education seems having lost importance in the agenda of media between 2000 (27%) and 2002 (12%).

The following tables show the changes in specific sub-issues commented upon by the press over the three year sample (8.2a-g).

**Tables 8.2a – 8.2g Sub issues within policy fields by year, separate for each policy field**

<b>a</b>	<b>Monetary politics</b>			<b>Total</b>	
	2000	2001	2002	In %	(N)
General Unspecific	5	11	13	9	12
Interest Rate Adjustments	21	23	10	17	22
EMU Convergence criteria and stability pact	.	17	42	21	26
Exchange rate intervention	30	17	15	21	26
Independence Central Banks	11	14	.	8	10
Common currency (ECU, EURO)	27	11	4	14	18
Dynamics of Euro campaigns	.	.	4	2	2
Other Specific	7	6	13	9	11
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)					127

Table 8.2a shows that, even if the overall levels of attention for the several issues did not change dramatically, newspapers commented on certain issues to a larger extent in some years than others. For instance, the common currency was discussed in a larger number of editorials in 2000 than in other years. The other sub issue with strong variation has been convergence, that strongly increases its presence in editorials discussions in 2001 and 2002.

<b>b</b>	<b>Agriculture</b>			<b>Total</b>	
	2000	2001	2002	In %	(N)
Subsidies and enlargement of the European Union	.	.	50	5	1
BSE	100	50	.	58	11
Foot and Mouth Disease	.	25	50	21	4
Other diseases	.	25	.	16	3
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)	5	12	2		19

Table 8.2b confirms that BSE was a dominant issue in 2000 and in 2001 and the foot and mouth disease in 2001 and 2002. The discussion of subsidies in the course of the process of enlargement gained importance in 2002.

<b>c</b>	<b>Immigration</b>			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
General evaluation or policy direction	.	.	33	17	8
Instit. framework, responsibilities, proced., costs	18	14	8	13	6
Entry and border controls	24	29	25	25	12
Expulsions/deportations		14	8	6	3
Migration programs and quotas	35	14	13	21	10
Actions relating to smuggling and illegal entries	18	29	.	10	5
Other specific issues	6	.	13	8	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	
<b>(N)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>24</b>		<b>48</b>

The two most discussed sub-issues on immigration follow different trends across the years. “migration programs and quotas” strongly decreases its presence in the comments of our four papers from 2000 to 2002, while entry and border control remains nearly constant.

<b>d</b>	<b>Troops deployment</b>			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
General unspecific reference to deployment of troops	.	.	13	8	10
d.o.t for mil. aggression on foreign sovereign territory	33	61	60	60	76
d.o.t in covert aggr. operations Vs hostile regimes/groups		2	.	1	1
d.o.t for peace-keeping	67	32	18	24	30
d.o.t in times of crisis	.	.	1	1	1
other specific reference to deployment of troops	.	5	9	7	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	
<b>(N)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>80</b>		<b>127</b>

Not surprisingly, troop deployment for military aggression on foreign territory increases over the years its presence in the journalistic debate. Troop deployment relating to peace keeping on the contrary loses importance.

<b>e</b>	<b>Pension</b>			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
General	22	43	17	31	9

Demographic changes: ageing population	22	7	17	14	4
Retirement ages	11	21	33	21	6
State pension scheme	44	21	33	31	9
Other / Specific	.	7	.	3	1
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)	9	14	6		29

Table 8.2e shows that in 2000 more commentaries on “retirement and pension schemes” had a rather general reference. Also the issue of state pension scheme has decreased between 2000 and 2002, while the issue of retirement ages increases.

f	Education			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
General unspecific	6	2	.	3	4
Structural issues	17	35	38	29	37
Resource allocation and salaries	21	15	27	20	26
Private education	6	11	6	8	10
Administrative power allocation	4	4	3	4	5
Curriculum	8	2	9	6	8
Information and communication technologies	6	7	9	7	9
Scholarships and fees	2	.	.	1	1
Problems at school	10	17	3	11	14
Other specific issues	19	7	6	11	14
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)	48	46	34		128

Table 8.2f shows that more commentaries dealt with structural issues of education in 2001 and in 2002 than in 2000 when, instead, more commentaries were written on resource allocation and salaries.

g	European Integration			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
General European integration, not specific	.	5	1	2	4
National vs. European Identity, shared values	9	5	11	9	17
Role of a specific country and balance of power in the EU	38	53	36	42	81
Relationship EU - nat.&reg. levels / future constitution	30	8	16	17	34
Institutional structure & relationship between EU instit.	2	.	5	3	5
Relationship between EU institutions and public	.	5	1	2	4
Enlargement	15	7	17	13	26

Other specific EU integration	2	8	1	4	7
Associational agreements/treaties EU - non-EU countries	.	.	1	1	1
Personnel issues within EU/discussions about candidacies	2	.	1	1	2
Non-EU forms of European integration	2	10	9	7	14
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)	53	61	81		195

Table 8.2g reveals a peak of the sub-issue “role of a specific country in the EU” in 2001 (53%) . Another interesting result is the decreases of the issue on the relationship between national and EU level and future constitution. The issue of enlargement remains on the contrary, nearly constant.

## 9. Main aspect commented upon

For each commentary it is coded whether the journalist mainly commented upon a substantial subject of an issue (e.g. the pros and cons of school reform) or the political process and dispute around that issue (e.g. the parliamentary debate on school reform). The goal was to find out whether a journalist focused on the substantial aspects of the issue or whether s/he presented the policy topic as a political dispute.

**Table 9.1 Aspect commented upon per paper**

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
no (substantial issue is commented upon)	95	88	98	92	93	623
yes (political dispute is commented upon)	5	12	2	8	7	49
Total (N)	100	100	100	100	100	672

Table 9.1 shows that almost all editorials (93%) focused on aspects of the substantial policy field itself .

One could have assumed that the regional newspapers would emphasize the entertaining aspects of politics, i.e. the political dispute, but surprisingly almost all their commentaries concentrated on substantial issues. Further analysis is needed about the reasons of this result. Surprisingly, only the *Corriere della Sera* is a bit more likely to focus on political disputes.

**Table 9.2 Aspect commented upon per issue field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
no (substantial issue is commented upon)	96	84	90	91	93	97	90	93	623
yes (political dispute is commented upon)	4	16	10	9	7	3	10	7	49

Total (N)	100 127	100 19	100 48	100 126	100 29	100 128	100 195	100 672
--------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	-----------	------------	------------	------------

*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

For what concerns the policy fields, the (few) commentaries about agriculture focus more than the other editorials on aspects of the political dispute (16%) while commentaries about “education” and about “monetary politics” focus the least on aspects of the political dispute (3-4%) (Table 9.2).

## 10. Object actors

An object actor is an actor whose interests are, or would be, affected by the outcome of a newspaper’s claim. Object actors can be affected in a positive or negative way by a newspaper’s claim. In some cases a newspaper makes statements that would affect an actor in both a positive and a negative way (ambivalent) or it may not be clear in what way the paper’s claim would affect an actor (neutral). For instance, a newspaper editorial might call upon the British Prime Minister not to join the single currency because it would have negative consequences for the national UK economy. Here the object actor, the UK economy, would be negatively impacted upon. The data presented in this section enables us to discuss the types of actors affected by newspapers claims, the differences in the types of actors affected by claims in each policy field, the scopes of actors evaluated positively and negatively by individual newspapers, and the differences in the scopes of object actors evaluated positively and negatively in each policy field.

**Table 10.1a Presence of object actor per paper**

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
no	3	5	1	1	3	19
yes	97	95	99	99	97	654
Total (N)	100 153	100 238	100 153	100 129	100	673

The majority of editorials we found relevant for our analysis contains actors on whose behalf claims are made (97%) (Table 10.1a). This is true for each of the newspapers, although *Corriere della Sera* is slightly less likely than the other newspapers to make a claim in which an actor who will be affected can be identified (95%).

**Table 10.1b Presence of object actor per policy field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
no	1	5	2	6	10	1	2	3	19
yes	99	95	98	94	90	99	98	97	654
Total (N)	100 127	100 19	100 48	100 127	100 29	100 128	100 195	100	673

*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

Table 10.1b shows that there are not significant variations in the presence of object actors between the policy fields. Object actors are slightly less likely to be present in topics concerning pension.

**Table 10.2a Object actor type per paper**

	By paper, in %				Total In %	Total (N)
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ		
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>97</b>
Politicians	.	0	.	1	0	2
Government/executive	12	8	7	15	10	65
Legislative	.	.	1	3	1	6
Judiciary	1	.	1	.	1	3
Military	2	3	2	2	2	15
Central banks	.	2	.	1	1	5
Political parties	1	.	.	.	0	1
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	.	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
Farmers and agricultural org.s	1	.	.	1	1	3
Economists and financial experts	.	0	.	.	0	1
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>219</b>
Churches & religious org.s/groups	.	0	.	.	0	1
Educational professionals / org.s	8	8	14	14	10	68
Other scientific/ research inst.	2	2	.	.	1	7
Students, pupils, parents	5	11	5	10	8	52
Other professional org.s /groups	.	.	.	1	0	1
Consumer organizations /groups	1	1	1	2	1	9
Migrant organizations and groups	6	9	5	5	7	44
Organizations and groups of elderly	3	1	5	4	3	20
Terrorist groups	3	1	2	2	2	14
Rebel forces/guerrilla	1	.	.	.	0	1
Other civil society org.s/groups	.	0	.	1	0	2
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>334</b>
whole polities	30	32	33	18	29	190
whole economies	20	10	19	16	15	101
the general public	5	11	4	4	7	43
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	149	226	151	128		654

[Only claims with an object actor.]

In contrast to the types of actors newspapers address their claims at (see section on addressees), newspapers claims tend to affect the interests of a wide range of actors coming from three main groups: firstly general actors (51%), secondly civil society actors (34%) and finally state and party actors (15%) (Table 9.2a). Interestingly “parties” here appeared as objects of journalist’s editorials, while they were totally absent as addressees. On the other hand, surprisingly, here the category of “media and journalists” is not present at all.

Half of all object actors mentioned are either whole polities (29%), e.g. countries as political entities, or whole economies (15%) or the general public (7%). Within the broad category of civil society actors the biggest shares have “educational professional and organization”

“students, pupils and their parents” and “migrant organizations and groups” (7-10%). Among state and party actors is mainly the government that would be affected by the journalists’ claims, but also (even if a lesser extent) the military.

Differences between newspapers are rather minor. Interestingly, the *Nazione* speaks most often on behalf of state and party actors, and within this category most often on behalf of the governmental actors. At the same time, it speaks much less frequently than the other papers on behalf of general entities (38%).

**Table 10.2b Object actor type by policy field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>5</b>	.	.	<b>38</b>	<b>4</b>	.	<b>24</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>97</b>
Politicians	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	2
Government/executive	1	.	.	26	.	.	17	10	65
Legislative	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	1	6
Judiciary	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	3
Military	.	.	.	12	.	.	1	2	15
Central banks	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	5
Political parties	.	.	.	.	4	.	.	0	1
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	.	.	.	.	.	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
Farmers and agricultural org.s	.	17	.	.	.	.	.	1	3
Economists and financial experts	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	1
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>219</b>
Churches & religious org.s/groups	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	0	1
Educational professionals / org.s	.	.	.	.	.	54	.	10	68
Other scientific/ research inst.	.	6	.	.	.	5	.	1	7
STUDENTS, PUPILS, PARENTS	.	.	.	.	8	39	.	8	52
Other professional org.s /groups	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	1
Consumer organizations /groups	2	28	2	.	.	.	.	1	9
Migrant organizations and groups	.	.	85	.	.	.	2	7	44
Organizations and groups of elderly	1	.	.	.	73	.	.	3	20
Terrorist groups	.	.	.	12	.	.	.	2	14
Rebel forces/guerrilla	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	1
Other civil society org.s/groups	.	.	4	.	.	.	.	0	2
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>334</b>
whole polities	8	11	4	39	8	1	67	29	190
whole economies	77	.	.	1	4	.	1	15	101
the general public	6	39	4	11	4	1	6	7	43
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
(N)	126	18	47	119	26	127	191		654

[Only claims with an object actor.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

In monetary politics (Table 9.2b), the object of commentaries are mainly the general public (91%) and in particular “whole economies” (77%). The majority of claims in agriculture still refer to the general public (50%), while the second largest category mentioned in editorials in

this issue is that of civil society actors (33%), represented mainly by consumers' associations (28%) and research institutions (6%). Economic interest group (mainly farmers) represent a smaller share (17%)<sup>9</sup>. Not surprisingly in immigration actors on whose behalf claims are made are mainly migrants (85%). Troop deployment and the topic of European integration are those where there is the largest share of claims that have as object institutional actors (24-38%), while immigration, pension and education are characterize by the largest share of claims made for benefits or disadvantage of actors from civil society.

**Table 10.2c Object actor type by year**

	In % within year			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
<b>STATE AND PARTY ACTORS</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>97</b>
Politicians	1	.	.	0	2
Government/executive	9	7	13	10	65
Legislative	1	.	2	1	6
Judiciary	1	1	0	1	3
Military	.	4	2	2	15
Central banks	1	1	.	1	5
Political parties	1	.	.	0	1
<b>ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS</b>	.	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
Farmers and agricultural org.s	.	1	.	1	3
Economists and financial experts	.	.	0	0	1
<b>MEDIA AND JOURNALISTS</b>	.	.	.	.	.
<b>OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>219</b>
Churches &religious org.s/groups	1	.	.	0	1
Educational professionals / org.s	15	10	8	10	68
Other scientific/ research inst.	1	1	1	1	7
Students, pupils, parents	11	9	5	8	52
Other professional org.s /groups	1	.	.	0	1
Consumer organizations /groups	1	2	1	1	9
Migrant organizations and groups	7	4	9	7	44
Organizations and groups of elderly	2	6	2	3	20
Terrorist groups	.	3	3	2	14
Rebel forces/guerrilla	.	.	0	0	1
OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ORG.S/GROUPS	1	.	.	0	2
<b>GENERAL/UNKNOWN/UNSPEC.</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>334</b>
whole polities	23	27	35	29	190
whole economies	21	11	15	15	101
the general public	3	12	5	7	43
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)	178	212	264		654

[Only claims with an object actor.]

<sup>9</sup> It is worth noticing that the same categories were those most frequently mentioned also in the claim-making of the general actors (see work-package two of Europub project), but there, the rank of the interests defended runned from economic interest groups to to the more post-materialistic interests of consumers groups or the generic public.

In a cross time perspective (Table 9.2c), “whole polities” as object decrease across the years (from 23% in 2000 to 35% in 2002), while “whole economies” decrease<sup>10</sup>. Among the broad category of “institutional actors”, that remains nearly constant over the years, it is worth noticing that executive actors slightly increase their presence from 9% in 2000 to 13% in 2002. References to migrants as object of claims slightly are increasing.

### Positively evaluated object actors

The following tables focus on the scopes of object actors that are positively or negatively evaluated by newspapers. Object actors who are neither positively Nor negatively evaluated (ambivalent or no evaluation) are not included in these tables. Analyses of Tables 10.3a and 10.4a enable us to see what types of actors benefit from newspapers’ political claims and what types of actors are affected negatively by newspapers’ claims. In order to understand the representation of Europe and the EU by newspapers it is useful to look at the way in which newspapers’ claims affect EU level actors as compared to national Italian actors.

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

	By paper, in %				Total In %	Total (N)
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ		
supranational: UN	.	1	.	.	0	1
other supranational	4	.	2	.	1	4
<b>EU</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>161</b>
other European supranational	.	1	.	.	0	1
multilateral	5	6	7	2	5	16
uk	3	.	.	2	1	3
<b>Italy</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>116</b>
other EU-members	.	.	.	5	1	3
russia	.	.	.	2	0	1
USA	.	2	2	2	1	4
MIDDLE EAST	4	.	6	2	2	7
Rest of the world	1	.	.	.	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	78	121	54	65		318

[Only claims with an object actor.]

Comparing Table 10.3a and 10.3b, we can see that EU level actors are twice as much likely to be positively considered as object of the claim, than national Italian actors (51% vs. 20%). Overall, it is interesting to notice that half of newspaper claims positively affect object actors with a European scope (51%), with the exception of the *Nazione* that is less likely than the other papers to positively evaluating EU level actors (37%). On the contrary, national actors are less likely to be positively affected by the editorial claims of individual newspapers, and this is especially true in the quality newspaper *Repubblica* (with a share of only 24% of editorials with positive evaluation towards national actors). In general, newspapers claims rarely refer to actors operating beyond the nation state, either at supranational UN levels (1%), or multilateral (5%).

<sup>10</sup> In the claim-making of general actors, other than only media and journalists (see WP2), we found exactly opposite trends across the years concerning these two broad categories: whole economies and whole polities.

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

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
supranational: UN	.	.	.	5	.	.	.	0	1
other supranational	.	.	.	5	.	.	2	1	4
<b>EU</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>26</b>	.	.	<b>82</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>161</b>
other European supranational	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	1
multilateral	.	7	78	.	.	.	1	5	16
uk	.	7	.	.	8	1	.	1	3
<b>Italy</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>116</b>
other EU-members	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	3
russia	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0	1
USA	4	.	.	5	.	.	1	1	4
Middle East	.	.	.	21	.	.	2	2	7
Rest of the world	.	.	6	.	.	.	.	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	50	14	18	19	13	70	134		318

[Only claims with an object actor.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

The scopes of positively evaluated object actors varies greatly across issue fields (Table 10.3b). Commentaries on “retirement and pension schemes” or “educational politics” evaluate positively almost exclusively national object actors (92-99%). Commentaries on “troops deployment” have often extra -European object actors as reference: important designations are the Middle East (21%) and the United States (5%). Finally, in the most Europeanized topics, commentaries focus positively on EU actors (about 80%). But this is less true for agriculture (36%), where half of the commentaries focus on Italian actors.

Further, comparing Tab. 10.3b and 10.4b, we can see that, in monetary politics and EU integration, EU level actors are much more likely to be positively evaluated as objects of the editorials than negatively (80% vs. 67% in the former, and 82% vs. 44% in the latter).

### Negatively evaluated object actors

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

	By paper, in %				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
other supranational	.	5	.	4	2	2
<b>EU</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>
multilateral	13	30	9	29	21	18
bilateral	.	.	.	4	1	1
<b>Italy</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>
other EU-members	.	10	14	.	6	5
other european countries ex						
CIS	6	5	.	.	2	2
USA	.	.	5	4	2	2
Middle East	25	.	27	36	23	20
Rest of the world	.	5	.	4	2	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	16	20	22	28		86

[Only claims with an object actor.]

Table 10.4a shows the distribution of negatively evaluated actors per paper. The two quality newspapers are much more likely to evaluate negatively European actors than the two

regional newspapers. However, this line between the two “types” cannot be traced for what concerns the national Italian actors as objects. In fact, the *Repubblica* and *Mattino* that more frequently evaluate negatively these domestic actors.

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

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
other supranational	.	.	.	3	.	.	6	2	2
<b>EU</b>	<b>67</b>	.	.	.	.	.	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>
multilateral	.	100	78	28	.	.	.	21	18
bilateral	.	.	11	.	.	.	.	1	1
<b>Italy</b>	<b>33</b>	.	.	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>
other EU-members	.	.	.	.	.	.	31	6	5
other european countries ex	.	.	11	3	.	.	.	2	2
CIS	.	.	.	.	.	.	13	2	2
USA	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
<b>Middle East</b>	.	.	.	<b>56</b>	.	.	.	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>
Rest of the world	.	.	.	6	.	.	.	2	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	15	1	9	36	2	7	16		86

[Only claims with an object actor.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

Table 10.4b shows similar scope for negatively evaluated object actors across policy fields as those of positively evaluated object actors.

## 11. Frames

Looking at the way in which Europe is “framed” means to analyze the motivations used by the actors to support their claims related to the European integration. The arguments used to frame Europe can be of four types: identity frame (that refer to the question, what is the EU and what does it stand for?), instrumental frames (that answer the question: what is the EU good or bad for?), historical frames (that are about positive--e.g. to Enlightenment or classical antiquity--or negative--e.g. to past national isolation or to the Cold War--linkages of the EU to historical periods or experiences), and frames internal to the European integration process (that are frames about causal linkages between one aspect of European integration and another, e.g. between enlargement and institutional reforms)<sup>11</sup>. For each commentary that referred to the topic of European integration or that had an European issue scope frames were coded. This enables us to analyze the way newspapers give opinions on European integration and the different ways in which they describe the issue.

<sup>11</sup> Within the category of “identity frames” we distinguished among (a) general identity frames (e.g. national identity), (b) frames related to principles, norms and values (e.g. social justice), (c) constitutional, institutional and governance frames (e.g. democracy, human rights).

Within the category of “instrumental frames” we distinguished among (a) general (e.g. opportunity space for citizens), (b) political (e.g. political stability), and (c) economical (e.g. economic growth) instrumental frames.

**Table 11.1a Presence of frame by paper**

	In % within paper				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
No	64	57	84	72	68	255
Yes	37	43	16	28	32	122
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	96	128	89	64		377

[Only cases with a European issue scope (ISSCOP1=3 or 4).]

Out of a total of 673 editorials containing claims, 377 articles provide opinions in the field of European integration or on another issue with European issue scope. Within this sub-set, in about one third of all claims referring to European issues frames related to European integration are present (Table 11.1a).

The newspapers differ in the extent to which they use frames in order to express their concerns about the European integration in the public sphere. As we can see, “framing” is used more often by the two quality broadsheet (in 37% of cases *Repubblica* and 43% *Corriere della Sera*) than by the two regional newspapers (16% *Mattino* and 28% *Nazione*).

**Table 11.1b Presence of frame by issue field**

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
No	78	75	100	90	100	100	55	68	255
Yes	22	25	.	10	.	.	46	32	122
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	121	8	9	30	5	6	198		377

[Only cases with a European issue scope (ISSCOP1=3 or 4). FRAPRES by ISFIELD1.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

Given the fact that only those frames with a reference to European Integration were coded, the distribution of frames across policy fields (Table 11.1b) is not surprising. Editorials on the topic of European integration are characterized by a larger presence of frames when compared to the other policy fields (46% of cases), even to the Europeanized field of monetary politics, where editorials with frames on Europe account for 22%. However, giving the low number of cases in the other policy fields than European integration and monetary politics (and partly troop deployment), no firm statements can be made.

**Table 11.2a Frame type by paper<sup>12</sup>**

	In % within paper				Total	
	REP	COR	MATT	NAZ	In %	(N)
identity, normative and value frames	23	33	36	28	30	36
constitutional and governance frames	37	20	36	28	28	34
economic frames	6	13	.	22	11	13
other instrumental frames	14	18	7	17	16	19
historical frames	3	2	7	.	3	3
frames internal to the integration process	17	15	14	6	14	17
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	35	55	14	18		122

[Only cases with a European issue scope (ISSCOP1=3 or 4), and only cases with a frame.]

Overall, the 122 frames found in Italy for the reference period under study are mainly distributed over two types of claims (Table 11.2a): about one third each on identity, normative and value frames (30%), and constitutional and governance frames (28%). The remaining part is mainly constituted by instrumental frames (other than economic, 16%) and frames internal to the integration process (14%).

When looking at the types of frames mainly used by the newspapers, it is worth noticing that once again there are no significant differences between the two quality newspapers and the regional ones. On the contrary, we find some similarities between the *Repubblica* and the *Mattino*, that mainly emphasize in their framing the immaterial aspects of the process of European integration related to identity frames, either general identity frames and constitutional/institutional/governance (the first paper accounts for a share of 60% of such type of frames and the second for a share of 72%). In both cases, proximity to center-left typical approach to Europe as identity driven can explain these similarities. Vice versa, *Corriere della Sera* and *Nazione* refer mainly to the instrumental side of European integration in their editorials, underlining in particular the socio economic dimensions of the process (they account for a share of 31-39% of such type of frames). The only significant difference between quality and regional newspapers is that the former seem to be able to use a more articulated strategy of framing than the latter are: a strategy that includes the largest range of frames from the identity frames to instrumental arguments, to the historical ones.

<sup>12</sup> The following tables only present data for editorials containing a frame.

**Table 11.2b Frame type by policy field**

	In % within issue field				In %	Total (N)
	MON	AGR	TRP	EU I		
identity, normative and value frames	7	50	.	37	30	36
constitutional and governance frames	7	.	33	34	28	34
economic frames	41	.	.	2	11	13
OTHER INSTRUMENTAL FRAMES	15	50	67	13	16	19
historical frames	.	.	.	3	3	3
frames internal to the integration process	30	.	.	10	14	17
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	27	2	3	90		122

[Only cases with a European issue scope (ISSCOP1=3 or 4), and only cases with a frame.]  
*Issue fields* are: Monetary politics: currency and interest rate; Agriculture: Subs., quotas, disease control; Immigration: entry and exit; Troops deployment; Retirement and pension schemes; Education; European Integration.

The type of frame used about European integration varies a lot according to the subject of the claims, namely the topics about which they are used (Table 11.2b). Due to the low number of cases with frames in troop deployment and agriculture, we will not analyze the distributions of the different frames inside these two fields.

As for as the topics over which the debate is carried on, it is not surprisingly that a bit less than half of all cases in monetary politics are economic frames, 41%. The other two types of frame that often are used by journalists in public debate concerning monetary policy are, firstly, frames internal to integration process (30%) and, secondly, once again instrumental frames referred to the “material” side of the process (15%).

On the topic of European integration, on the contrary, we see a more articulated strategy of framing used by the newspapers. Public positions on the topic of European integration are predominantly framed with identity or normative considerations (58%), both in terms of principles and values (37%) and in terms of constitutional/institutional arguments (28%). Here economic frames play a more reduced role (11%), even if a significant share is constituted by other types of instrumental frames than the economical ones (16%). Among frames internal to the European integration process, which create linkages between one aspect of European integration and another, the most prominent is that between institutional reforms and enlargement.

**Table 11.2c Frame type by year**

	In % within year			In %	Total (N)
	2000	2001	2002		
identity, normative and value frames	21	38	35	30	36
CONSTITUTIONAL AND GOVERNANCE FRAMES	36	16	27	28	34
economic frames	8	22	5	11	13
other instrumental frames	9	19	22	16	19
historical frames	2	.	5	3	3
frames internal to the integration process	25	6	5	14	17
Total	100	100	100	100	
(N)	53	32	37		122

[Only cases with a European issue scope (ISSCOP1=3 or 4), and only cases with a frame.]

The role of different types of frames varies over the years (Table 11.2c). Identity frames about Europe appear increasing across the years under study: they are more relevant in 2001 (38%) and 2002 (35%) than in 2000 (21%). On the contrary, constitutional and governance arguments are slightly decreasing from 2000 (36%) to 2002 (27%). Besides these variations across the years, it is difficult to find clear trends in the use of frames. Nevertheless, economic frames about Europe appear to be particularly relevant in 2001 (22%), while frames internal to integration process are more often used in 2000 (25%).

**Table 11.3 Twenty-five most often mentioned frames**

Frame	Number of claims (N)	In % of all frames
community of values	9	7
institutional reforms before enlargement	7	6
federalism	6	5
Relation with USA	6	5
strength in global competition	6	5
democracy	5	4
sovereignty	5	4
equality among countries	4	3
rule of law	4	3
influence in international relations	4	3
political integration before common currency	4	3
acceptance of the EU	3	3
economic stability	3	3
political integration before economic integration	3	3
national identity	3	3
Americanization	2	2
freedom	2	2
international understanding	2	2
peace	2	2
pluralism	2	2
security	2	2
environmental protection	2	2
economic growth	2	2
national economy	2	2
social integration before economic integration	2	2
<i>28 other mentioned frames</i>	30	25
<b>Total (53 frames)</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>

When looking at the total number of cases in which frames are used (Table 11.3), the idea of Europe as a “community of values” is the most prominent frame used in editorials (7% of all frames). The next prominent one is represented by considerations related to aspects internal to the European integration process (here the most frequent emphasized causal linkage by journalists is that between enlargement and institutional reforms, 6% of all cases). These frames, often used in editorials, are followed by normative and constitutional frames inside the category of identity frames--such as “federalism” (5%), “democracy” (4%), and “sovereignty” (4%)—and by instrumental frames such as “relation with USA” (5%) and “strength in global competition” (5%).

**Table 11.4a: What the EU should not be/lead to: most frequent frames**

Frame	Number of claims (N)	In % of all such frames
sovereignty	2	67
over regulation	1	33
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>

[FRAME1S for FRAPOS1=-2.]

The table lists the 2 most often mentioned frames because they represent the total number of frames of such types we found.

Together with the type of framing strategy used in the public debate, it is also interesting to look at the ways in which frames are linked to the process of European integration. Indeed, frames can be used both negatively and positively referring to Europe and can be referred to the present or to a possible future. In fact, not only the direction of a specific frame has been coded, but also if the frame refers to a description of what is perceived as a present status (“what the EU is /does not lead to?”) or as a wish for the future (“what does Europe should/should not stand for?”).

When considering frames that express what the EU should not be (Table 11.4a), once again we find at the top of the rank identity frames (related here to institutional/constitutional/governance worries): the European integration process should not be “(national) sovereignty”, the EU integration should not led to “over regulation”.

**Table 11.4b: What the EU is not/does not lead to: most frequent frames**

Frame	Number of claims (N)	In % of all such frames
equality among countries	1	17
public sphere	1	17
legitimacy	1	17
strength in global competition	1	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>

[FRAME1S for FRAPOS1=-1.] The table lists the 4 most often mentioned frames because they represent the total number of frames of such types we found.

The most prominent frames used to (critically) underline what the EU actually is not (Table 11.4b), are: “equality among countries”, “public sphere”, “legitimacy”, and “strength in global competition”. The first one refers in particular to institutional aspects related to “Europe”, while the second and the third deal with the crucial question of the so called “democratic deficit” of the EU. Finally, the fourth is about an instrumental economic argument.

**Table 11.4c: What the EU is/leads to: ten most frequent frames**

Frame	Number of claims (N)	In % of all such frames
community of values	4	19
democracy	2	10
pluralism	2	10
acceptance of the EU by citizens	2	10
cosmopolitanism	1	5
globalization	1	5
freedom	1	5
responsibility	1	5
international understanding	1	5
peace	1	5
<i>11 other mentioned frames</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>24</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100</b>

[FRAME1S for FRAPOS1=1]

The most frequent frames used in the Italian public sphere to express what the EU is, refers to identity (Table 11.4c). Indeed, European integration is perceived as a community of values (19% of such claims)—values linked in constitutional-institutional frames such as democracy (10%) and pluralism (10%), but also to an instrumental frame such as the acceptance of the EU by citizens (10%). Nevertheless, the identity frames related to the immaterial aspect of the process remain those most often used by journalists in order to explain what the EU is: cosmopolitanism, globalization, freedom, responsibility, peace.

**Table 11.4d: What the EU should be/should lead to: ten most frequent frames**

Frame	Number of claims (N)	In % of all such frames
community of values	5	7
federalism	5	7
strength in global competition	5	7
rule of law	4	6
Relation with USA	4	6
influence in international relations	4	6
equality among countries	3	4
democracy	3	4
Americanization	2	3
sovereignty	2	3
<i>27other mentioned frames</i>	34	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100.0</b>

[FRAME1S for FRAPOS1=2.]

As far as the future or an ideal state of the EU is concerned, the most common frames are, once again “community of value” (whose presence confirms the importance of “values” in the vision of journalists about Europe), “federalism” and “strength in global competition”. The latter one is obviously more critical than the previous ones.

## Abbreviations and definitions

### *Regions/countries/scopes*

CH	Switzerland
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States (Russia and the former Soviet republics. excluding the three Baltic countries)
DE	Germany
ES	Spain
EU seat	European Union seats (Brussels. Luxembourg. Strasbourg. Frankfurt. Etc.)
FR	France
GDR	German Democratic Republic (East-Germany)
IT	Italy
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America

### *Newspapers*

REP	Repubblica
COR	Corriere della Sera
MATT	Mattino
NAZ	Nazione

*Issue fields*

MON	Monetary politics: currency and interest rate
AGR	Agriculture: Subsidies. livestock quotas. disease control
IMM	Immigration: entry and exit
TRP	Troops deployment
PEN	Retirement and pension schemes
EDU	Education
EUI	European Integration