

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: Work package 6 Interviews with journalists
WP Coordinator: Paul Statham
Deliverable number: D 6.2

Report

Author: Paul Statham

Date: October 2004

Pressing Europe?: Journalists and the ‘Europeanisation’ of the Public Sphere

Analytic summary

In general, we found that newspapers tend to treat Europe as a topic to be reported using exactly the same criteria for news selection and values that are applied to other types of news. There are some special adjustments and difficulties necessary for gathering and reporting news on Europe, but newspaper organisations tend to see these as technical matters which they need to address to keep in step with their job of reporting on politics. Changes are thus seen to have occurred within the nature of politics, through processes of Europeanisation. However, journalists do not see the advent of a more Europeanised politics to in any way change or challenge their existing professional norms and practices. To the extent that reporting has changed at all, this has been a response to perceived changes in politics, and the journalists’ professional aim to continue providing the relevant information to their specific readerships. News coverage of Europe is very much ‘business as usual’ for journalists.

The press appears much more in the ‘passive’ role as a supplier of news about European politics and not to any great extent an active protagonist dedicated to promoting a specific political stance on European affairs. In many cases, newspapers seem to take an agnostic and detached view towards European politics, seeing their role as more of educating and informing the public about the changes which are occurring as a consequence of Europeanisation. Readerships were thought to be less interested in European than national politics and have a poor understanding of its workings. Journalists did see themselves as having a responsibility for addressing the ‘democratic deficit’, but much more by filling the information gaps of the public, than by engaging in political advocacy. We found little evidence for explicitly politicised campaigns on Europe by newspapers (the one newspaper which does this, *The Sun* in Britain, took an institutional decision not to speak to us), nor do journalists appear to make particularly strong efforts to influence elites and parties and shape the political agenda on Europe.

Overall our findings indicate that it is general processes of political change, whereby national politics is becoming more closely related to other European countries, and the increasing role of the EU institutions, which appears to be important in shaping news coverage of Europe. Newspapers have responded to these perceived changes by adapting their organisational and working practices for purposes of professional efficiency, and not because European issues have changed their worldviews or the established editorial lines of their newspapers. Of course, we did find some cross-national and cross-newspaper type differences in the contents and style of reporting on Europe, but these were basically a reflection of the different types of political debates over Europe in those countries (e.g., contentious debates in Britain compared to consensual in Germany), and the overall self-understanding of the newspaper’s political line (e.g., left versus right, professional versus popular general readership). We found very little evidence for newspapers and journalists consciously introducing a Europhile or Eurosceptic bias into their coverage in an attempt to be protagonists on

issues of European integration. Likewise neither source strategies nor readerships' political stances on Europe were found to importantly shape coverage of Europe.

Approach

There has been very little systematic empirical research on this topic in the past, in particular with regard to cross-national comparison. Overall this is a fragmented and underdeveloped field of research. Nonetheless, the stance put forward in the extant literature tends to emphasise characteristics of the media and news reporting that purportedly act as barriers to, or at least slow down, an 'Europeanisation' of the public sphere. Newspapers are often blamed for their poor performance in reporting European affairs, or even seen (especially in Britain) as promoters of Euroscepticism. Among such purported tendencies are: journalists' using their traditional 'national' frameworks of interpretation, thereby missing the purportedly special, new and different qualities of Europeanised politics; the prevalence of national networks and use of national sources among journalists; the poor linkages of the news production process to the EU institutions and Brussels; the poor language skills of journalists; the remoteness of the EU and Brussels from editorial meetings and decisions; the knowledge deficit of journalists and editors with respect to the workings of European politics; the obscurity of European politics, its lack of 'news values', in part due to an absence of central and charismatic public figures representative of the EU; the political agendas of newspapers and their proprietors with leanings toward Euroscepticism (especially in Britain with regard to the Murdoch-owned press). (see Anderson and Weymouth 1999, Baisnee 2002, Eilders 2000, Gavin 2001, Morgan 1995, Tumber 1995).

In this study we attempted to address such questions in an open empirical descriptive way, with the aim of filling some of the many gaps in knowledge on this topic. As a mass medium, the national press has a vitally important role in making European issues visible in the public sphere. Its news coverage determines the extent to which Europe as a political institution is made visible to broader public constituencies, and thereby is made open to public actors and has the potential to impact upon the public perceptions of citizens and policy deliberations. Our aim was to assess the provision of the newspaper media with regard to its democratic function of reporting on European politics, empirically. Previous research has shown relatively little cross-national and empirical insight, but, especially with respect to Britain, a lot of conjecture regarding the purported deficits and biases of the media with regard to Europe.

To investigate our central research question, we started from the idea that the news agenda may be influenced by several factors, which may be more or less important relative to each other in shaping the amount, contents, style and political stance of reporting on European politics.

Initially we assessed the internal infrastructure and scope of the news gathering capacity of the newspapers for reporting on Europe, for example, whether it has a specialised EU correspondent based in Brussels. Then we examined the news production and practices for reporting on European affairs, for example, to see to what factors and new values made Europe newsworthy or not within a particular newspaper's self-understanding. Here an attempt was made to see to what extent reporting on European affairs simply involved using the same routine journalistic practices and norms that are applied to other foreign and national politics, or whether,

there were special considerations when reporting on Europe, and if so, where such considerations arise from.

With regard to explaining the level and type of European coverage in a newspaper, we saw this as a possible outcome of three competing factors, each of which can ‘push’ information onto the news agenda: the source strategies of collective actors; the readership’s demand for news; and the newspaper’s own political agenda. These factors could each account for a newspaper or journalist going beyond their normal practices and norms, and increase the level and shape the contents of reporting on Europe.

First, the communicative actions of collective actors, which are external to news production and practices, may influence and shape the contents of European news, for example, when government officials leak stories to journalists, or campaign and protest groups contact journalists with specialist knowledge or information with regard to a protest event. Secondly, it may be the readership’s thirst for a specific type of news that is a factor which either enhances or reduces the scope and style for reporting on Europe, for example, popular tabloid newspapers may consider their readership has no interest in the EU and European affairs which would significantly reduce the chances of EU stories being reported. Thirdly, the newspaper and journalists may see themselves as a political actor with regard to European integration and seek to put forward and promote their own agendas. This will again determine the level and type of reporting on Europe, for example, when a newspaper decides to run a campaign and promote a specific stance on an issue, such as the benefits or disadvantages of monetary Union. Finally, by evaluating the influence of these three general factors relative to one another, we tried to reach an overall understanding of whether it is the source strategies of external collective actors, readerships’ demands for news, or newspapers’ own political agenda-setting, which are important in determining how Europe is made visible to the public through the news. Of course, negative findings with respect to these factors would lead us to see reporting and commentating on Europe to be journalistic ‘business as usual’ rather than a special case.

Sample

Overall, 110 interviews were conducted with journalists and editors of the newspapers that were also used for the content analyses of work packages 2 and 3. Where possible sixteen journalists were interviewed for each national case, composed as follows: four from each of the four newspapers included in work packages 2 and 3 (a left and a right quality paper, a tabloid, and a regional newspaper), and from each of these newspapers, one General Editor, the (main) European correspondent, as well as the journalists or correspondents specialising in immigration and agriculture issues.

In addition, interviews were conducted with eight representatives of European or transnational media. Here we interviewed the chief leader writer and EU or European Correspondent from the Financial Times (Europe), International Herald Tribune, European Voice, and Wall Street Journal Europe. These were the only newspapers that are transnational and also daily and therefore came closest to comparability in terms of news structure with the national dailies (with the exception of the European Voice which is a weekly newspaper, but worthy of study as a special EU-level supranational newspaper). For the supra/transnational study, we did not conduct interviews with agriculture and immigration correspondents, because our inquiries showed that such positions do not exist within the selected newspapers.

Figure 1: Selection of Interviewees for Each Country

<i>Left Broadsheet</i>		<i>Right Broadsheet</i>	
Editor, political lead writer	European EU correspondent	Editor, political lead writer	European EU correspondent
Home Affairs (immigration) correspondent	Agriculture correspondent	Home Affairs (immigration) correspondent	Agriculture correspondent
<i>Popular Paper</i>		<i>Regional Paper</i>	
Editor, political lead writer	European EU correspondent	Editor, political lead writer	European EU correspondent
Home Affairs (immigration) correspondent	Agriculture correspondent	Home Affairs (immigration) correspondent	Agriculture correspondent

In some countries, and for some newspapers, there were difficulties in gaining access to key individuals. One general problem was gaining access to the Editor of the newspaper, who in most cases did not have time to take part in a semi-structured interview that takes more than an hour to complete. In such cases, we decided to switch our attention to the chief leader writers for those newspapers. This has in fact proved to be fruitful, because the chief leader writers are in a key position to answer our questions about editorial policy, and in addition are more able to talk freely about the more sensitive topics – for example, the relative influence of the proprietor on editorial line – than the Editors themselves. Another example of a difficulty in gaining access is demonstrated by the case of The Sun tabloid newspaper in Britain, where after several attempts to interview the four selected journalists, an institutional decision was taken by the editor of the newspaper not to co-operate with our study. This was because of the sensitive nature of the European issue in Britain during this phase of interviews, and the fact that The Sun has waged an explicit Eurosceptic campaign. Some journalists were dissatisfied with the stance taken by their newspaper and one gave an off-the-record interview. In order to have a tabloid newspaper for the British study, we subsequently interviewed journalists from the Mirror, although this newspaper is not used in the other work packages. The Mirror is The Sun's main tabloid competitor and takes diametrically opposed positions on most issues, including Europe. In other cases, when, for example, the newspaper did not have a European or EU Correspondent, or an Agriculture correspondent, then we attempted in each case to select an interviewee who came closest to our 'ideal type', for example, by taking the political correspondent who writes on the topic of Europe or the journalist who covers agricultural issues.

Overall, in part due to the persistence and efforts of the national teams in addressing these specialist media actors, we have been able to complete more interviews than originally envisaged in the proposal.

Method

The semi-structured interviews took approximately one hour to conduct. Prior to conducting the interviews, the interviewer gathered and compiled a basic information fact-sheet on the journalist (e.g., on the history of the post, career of journalist) so that the information gained could be correctly contextualised. The first interviews were conducted face-to-face, but it was agreed that when interviewers were accustomed to the interviewing task, then interviews could also be conducted by telephone and

recorded (of course, with the permission of the interviewee). This is unproblematic for journalists who are used to spending much of their working lives in exchanging detailed information through telephone conversations. All interviews have been recorded, copied and stored. In addition, a coding schedule was designed for the interview materials. The coding scheme for interview material was transformed into a machine readable Access Database interface, which allowed interview material to be stored and ready for comparative analyses using statistical packages (for numeric variables), across key variables. Coding of interviews took between two and three hours per interview. Thus we were able to store our data in a way that makes it available for comparative analysis using simple descriptive statistical techniques (across countries, newspapers, and type of journalists), and in addition allows us access to the key qualitative statements in a systematic way.

Key Findings

1. Producing the News Agenda: Infrastructure, Newsgathering Scope, and Reporting Practices

i. national and sub-national press

With regard to the capacity for reporting on European affairs an important determining factor was whether the newspaper had specialists posted in Brussels or not. Broadsheet newspapers were much more likely than tabloids, popular and local newspapers to have specialist correspondents in Brussels. Institutional decisions to have an EU correspondent or increase resources in Brussels were usually taken simply in response to the increasing importance of EU politics, and not due to any attempt to by the news organisation to take a political stance on Europe. The networks and relationships of such actors with EU institutions not surprisingly facilitated a greater possibility for EU affairs to reach the news. Among the broadsheets, the relationship between EU correspondents and the specialist political reporters from their own newspaper covering national parliamentary affairs was decisive in determining whether politics was more likely to be reported as 'EU supra-/transnational affairs' or alternatively as an external factor impacting on 'national political affairs.'

Tabloid and local newspapers had by comparison fewer institutional links at the supra- and transnational levels. Journalists on popular and local papers claimed that their styles of news coverage (sensationalist/local interest) were not conducive to reporting EU affairs, because they provided few opportunities to present news in narratives that are designed to grab readership attention or inform about local affairs.

Overall, it seems that people working in newspaper organisations have a clear idea in their own minds of the editorial stance and tradition of their newspaper's line. These self-perceptions of editorial stance and readership requirements were often cited as the most influential factor that determined: a) the place of Europe within news coverage; and b) the communicative style applied by the newspaper to present its message to its perceived readership (populist/serious; political line: left/right; Europhile/neutral/Eurosceptic). When deciding how to cover stories about Europe, journalists applied the same professional norms and practices as for other stories, making decisions based on their 'internalised' perceptions of their newspaper's character and tradition. Covering European stories was therefore considered simply as

‘business as usual’ for most newspapers, and there was relatively little evidence for newspapers making a special institutional effort to cover Europe, or for newspapers changing their usual formats to treat European news stories in a special political way.

Although in general covering European affairs seems to be to a large extent ‘business as usual’ for journalists who apply the same reporting practices and news values as they do for national and other foreign politics, we still sought to investigate whether journalists thought that they faced particular ‘concerns, considerations and difficulties’, when they report on political events with respect to Europe. From a list of possible ‘concerns, considerations and difficulties’, journalists were asked whether such factors were more pressing when reporting on stories about Europe. Our specific question was: News reporting is a pressurised and sometimes difficult task. Please mention whether any of the following are a concern for you when reporting a story relating to Europe.

Table 1: Particular concerns/considerations/difficulties of journalists when reporting on Europe

	Rank	All	UK	F	D¹	CH	ESP²	I	NL³
Availability of news space	1	2.5	2.8	2.3	2.6	1.5	2.8	2.8	2.7
Necessity to capture audience attention	2	2.0	2.8	1.6	2.4	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.9
Access to important public figures	3	1.6	1.8	1.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.7	1.1
Availability of resources for research/investigation	4	1.5	1.4	1.8	2.4	1.8	1.7	0.2	1.0
Lack of expert knowledge on topic	5	1.3	1.2	1.6	0.9	1.5	0.4	1.2	2.3
Pressure of deadlines	6	1.3	1.9	1.4	1.7	0.6	2.0	1.4	0.3
Lack of clear cues and positions from politicians	7	1.2	0.9	1.0	1.4	1.5	1.1	0.2	2.3
Access to official documents	8	1.1	1.6	1.4	1.1	0.9	1.7	0.5	0.8
Own lack of understanding of topic	9	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.4	1.7
Pressure from senior editors/journalists	10	0.7	0.5	0.7	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.7
Pressure from management/organisational pressure	11	0.4	0.0	1.4	0.2	0.0	0.6	0.5	0.0
All		1.3	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.3
N		85	13	13	13	10	15	12	9

Scale: No=0, Yes =3

The second column in Table 1 shows the ranking which journalists gave to the specified ‘concerns, considerations and difficulties’ with 1 the most important and 11 the least important. This ranking was calculated on the basis of 85 responses from across the seven countries, Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Spain and Italy. The figures in the All and country columns give a score between 3 for ‘yes’ it is a ‘concern, consideration and difficulty’ to 0 for ‘no’ it is not a ‘concern, consideration and difficulty’. The figures in each cell give the aggregate score for the journalists who responded, between 0 and 3. The figures for All column are weighted to give each country the same impact, and provide the basis for the ranking.

The limited availability of news space was the primary factor cited as a ‘concern, consideration and difficulty’ by journalists overall, and individually in each of the six EU member countries, but not for Switzerland. The perceived problem with news space for Europe seems to indicate that journalists feel that it is harder to gain sufficient space within the newspaper for reporting on European politics in a way that reflects what journalists perceive as its actual importance. In addition, other prominent problems mentioned were the necessity to capture audience attention, and access to important public figures. This seems to indicate that journalists principally face difficulties in ‘writing’ news stories about Europe. Europe as a topic seems to be difficult to ‘package’ for readerships, due to lack of expert knowledge to give it

¹ Germany: Lower than 1.5 = majority disagrees; higher than 1.5 = majority agrees

² Spain: Scale: 0=None; 1=Some; 2=Moderate; 3=A great deal

³ Netherlands: Not all journalists answered all sub-questions

factual grounding, and the lack of visible public figures to give it charisma and for representing the EU. As a consequence journalists find it harder to compete for space with other types of news stories, where such narrative elements are more readily available. In contrast, it is noteworthy that journalists seem to feel under no management or organisational or editorial pressure when reporting on Europe, with such factors hardly registering at all, and being ranked 10th and 11th.

Overall it appears that the complexity and obscurity of Europe as a topic, and competition for news space with issues that have more obvious and clear-cut news values, and not factors deriving from the stances of the news organisation, appear to be the key problems facing journalists writing on European politics. We also find strong cross-national similarities, indicating that journalists in different countries face the same problems with regard to reporting on Europe.

In order to gain a first impression of the factors which journalists thought shaped the newspaper coverage of Europe, we asked them a further question. Here they were required to respond to whether six specified factors contributed to the extent and way that their own newspaper covers Europe. Our specific question was: In your experience how much do you think that the following factors have contributed to the extent and way that your newspaper comments and reports on European issues?

Table 2: Perceived factors which contribute to extent/way own newspaper covers Europe

	Rank	All	UK	F	D	CH	ESP	I	NL ⁴
National politics becoming more closely related to that of other European countries	1	2.4	2.2	Missing	2.5	2.4	2.4	3.0	1.8
The increasing role of European Union institutions	2	2.2	2.4	Missing	2.0	1.9	2.6	2.3 ⁵	1.8
The level of political conflict over Europe	3	2.2	2.9	Missing	1.7	2.2	2.2	1.9	2.0
Newspapers seeing political events within a European context	4	1.7	1.8	Missing	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.5	1.6
National politicians seeing political events within a European context	5	1.7	2.0	Missing	1.8	1.6	2.1	1.6	0.9
Readerships understanding political events in a European context	6	1.1	1.7	Missing	1.2	1.0	1.4	0.9	0.5
N		62	13	Missing	13	9	Missing	14	13

Scale: not at all = 0, a little = 1, moderately = 2, greatly = 3

Table 2 shows our findings for the factors in rank order, with the most important perceived factor ranked 1 and the least important 6. The findings are based on 62 responses from six countries (the data is not available for France). Once more the data for the All column is based on weighting the countries equally. This time the journalists were allowed four responses, which were scored as follows: 'not at all' 0; 'a little' 1; 'moderately' 2; and 'greatly' 3. The aggregate scores of journalists' responses are presented in the cells of the table, with a range from 0 for the least important to 3 for the most important.

⁴ Netherlands: Not all journalists answered all sub-questions.

⁵ Italy: Calculated on 15 responses.

The interesting finding here, is that journalists rank the three factors which simply describe political changes –national politics becoming more closely related to other European countries; the increasing role of the EU institutions; political; conflict over Europe-- as the most important, while those which attribute changes to the influence of a specific actor, either newspapers, politicians, or readerships, are ranked the least important. Again there were few cross-national differences, though both British and Swiss journalists rated the level of political conflict over Europe to be the highest factor in contrast to the other countries, which is a reflection of the more contentious nature of public debates over Europe in the two countries.

Overall our findings suggest that journalists perceive their news coverage to be more influenced by macro-political changes relating to the transnationalisation and supranationalisation of politics, and national conflicts over Europe, rather than the news agenda being shaped by specific actors with stakes in Europeanisation. In general, it implies that reporting on European politics changes according to what events are perceived by journalists to be occurring in the ‘outside’ political world, and not because their own organisations, or national politicians, or even readerships’ demands, are significant agenda-setters on Europe. We will now investigate this somewhat passive and agnostic image of the function of journalism with regard to Europe further, by looking at evidence by ‘sources’ to shape coverage, readership considerations, and then, the newspaper’s own attempts at political agenda-setting through commentating on events.

ii. transnational press

To the extent that it exists at all, the transnational sector of the press is fragmented and specialised. We included the only four examples we could find: two newspapers with a parent newspaper base in the US, the International Herald Tribune and Wall Street Journal Europe; the Financial Times (Europe); and the European Voice (which is not even daily). This transnational press aims for niche markets consisting of European elites, businessmen, EU politicians, and transnational individuals. Many of their readers have professional stakes and interests in EU politics and the economy, in which the EU is increasingly the important regional actor. Thus reporting targeted the concerns of European elites and businessmen rather than ‘ordinary’ citizens. Journalists on these papers also expressed that they had difficulties bringing EU stories ‘alive’ and making complex EU issues of interest to their readers, although their readerships are specialists and interested in the topic. Overall, we found that for the transnational newspapers, the self-perception of the newspaper’s editorial line and stance on issues was the important factor in influencing the level and style of reportage, just as it was for the national newspapers. Journalists on the transnational newspapers also highlighted ‘availability of news space’ as the most important concern/consideration like their national-level counterparts.

2. *Sources Strategies: an external factor influencing news agenda*

i. national and sub-national press

Another factor to assess with regard to news coverage was the extent to which journalists felt that their reporting was influenced or shaped by the mobilisation activities and communication strategies of collective actors. Here we asked journalists to state from a given list of actors, how frequently they were contacted by specific types of collective actors who were attempting to have an influence on their news reporting, for example, by providing new information or evidence, i.e., 'source strategies'. Our specific question was: Some public actors and organisations take 'active' initiatives to get their message across by supplying news stories, for example, through organising press statements, publicity stunts or other campaign activities. How often do the following types of organisation target you with such publicity activities?

Table 3: Journalists perceptions of the frequency of ‘source strategies’ by collective actors (Means)

	Rank	All	UK ⁶	F	D	CH	ESP	I	NL
National government	1	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.3	1.4	2.1	1.9	1.7
National interest groups (e.g., Trade Unions, employers associations)	2	1.8	1.7	1.7	2.1	1.6	1.6	2.0	2.1
Political parties (national)	3	1.7	1.9	0.9	1.9	1.4	1.8	1.7	2.3
European Union institutions/Commission	4	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	0.9	1.8	0.8	1.4
National campaign and protest groups	5	1.4	1.8	1.3	1.0	0.4	1.6	1.4	1.7
Regional or local interest groups (e.g., Trade Unions, employers associations)	6	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.2	1 ⁷	1.0	1.2	1.9
Regional/local government	7	1.2	1.5	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.3	1.0	1.5
Scientific experts/policy think tanks working in this field	8	1.1	1.5	1.7	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.6	1.1
Supranational or transnational institutions (WTO, World Bank, UNHCR etc.)	9	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.2	0.5	1.5	0.4	0.9
Regional or local campaign and protest groups	10	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.5	0.9	0.5	1.4
European interest groups (e.g., Trade Unions, employers associations)	11	0.8	0.7	0.8	1.1	0.9	1.0	0.4	1.0
International or transnational campaign and protest groups	12	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.5
International or transnational interest groups (e.g., Trade unions, employers associations)	13	0.7	0.8	0.6	1.0	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.8
European campaign and protest groups	14	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.6
All		1.1	1.3	1.0	1.4	0.8	Missing	0.9	1.3
N		62	10	11	11	8	Missing	11	11

Scale: never = 0, from time to time = 1, regularly = 2, always/very often = 3

The second column in Table 3 ranks the list of collective actors that we gave to journalists, with those who made most efforts to mobilise information and influence news coverage by communication strategies at number 1. Journalists were given the option of answering ‘never’, ‘from time to time’, ‘regularly’, and ‘always/very often’ for the frequency with actors contact them with source strategies, which were scored 0, 1, 2, 3, respectively, to give an overall score in each cell ranging from 0 to 3. Again the figures in the ‘All’ column are weighted to give each country the same impact.

Overall, our findings in Table 2 demonstrate that national actors made the most efforts to mobilise information in the attempt to influence journalists’ reporting of stories on Europe. Four out of the five most prominent ‘source strategists’ were actors with a national scope: National governments, interest groups, political parties and campaign/protest groups. This demonstrates the importance of national-level lobbying to set the news agenda, compared to the efforts of regional/local, European, and non-

⁶ UK: Editors/leader writers were not asked this question because they are not contacted directly by sources for news stories.

⁷ Switzerland: N=7

EU international actors. Interestingly the EU's own institutions appeared to be the only actor above the nation-state, which made any significant efforts to contact journalists in the attempt to shape the news on Europe. However, one also needs here to give an idea of how frequent such activities were. Whereas journalists were 'regularly' contacted by national governments, interest groups and political parties, EU institutions and the Commission were in touch with journalists only just more than 'from time to time' for such purposes.

Turning to European interest groups and campaign and protest groups, these like their non-EU transnational counterparts, made least efforts of all to reach and shape the news on Europe. This underlines the 'non-public' invisible nature of EU and international lobbying in general. Such organisations appear to largely ignore the national press as an outlet for their activities. By contrast, national social movements were more frequent source strategists than even regional/local governments and supra/transnational institutions. Given that powerful institutional actors usually find it easier than interest groups and NGOs to reach the news, this emphasises once more that national actors of all types attempt more than any others to shape news. Also it shows that media strategies and public constituency-building activities are more important for national interest groups and NGOs, than for international ones, which most likely pursue insider lobbying strategies away from the public domain.

In general, it should be noted that apart from 'regular' contact from nationally-based government actors, interest groups, and political parties, journalists receive only very limited and intermittent contact from any type of actor. This underlines that source strategies of external collective actors probably have a very limited effect in shaping news coverage. To the extent that they have an effect, it will be to emphasise national concerns rather than international ones. It is also striking that there is little cross-national variation with regard to such findings.

After looking at source strategies in general, we wanted also to provide more detailed information on journalists' assessments of the quality of communication strategies by European institutions compared to national ones. Here we gave the journalists the option of rating seven aspects of the EU's communication strategies compared to those of national actors, and scored -1 for 'worse', 0 for 'no different', and +1 for 'better', to give a range from -1 to +1. Our specific question was: In comparison to the national political actors that you deal with, please rate whether the following aspects of European institutions' communication are better, no different, or worse.

Table 4: Assessment of European institutions' communication strategies with journalists compared to national actors

	Rank	All	UK	F	D	CH	ESP	I	NL
Providing material that is accurate	1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	-0.3	0.8	0.6	0.3
Providing specialist knowledge/expertise	2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
Being open to discussion	3	0.1	0.0	-0.4	-0.3	-0.2	0.7	-0.1	1.0
Overall Professional standards	4	0.0	-0.5	-0.3	0.0	0.6	0.8	0.2	-0.5
Providing material which is usable news copy	5	-0.1	-0.6	-0.1	-0.1	0.4	-0.3	0.3	0.0
Being transparent	6	-0.1	-0.3	0.1	-0.5	-0.2	0.7	-0.1	-0.3
Having a clear political line	7	-0.2	-0.7	-0.2	-0.6	-0.2	0.4	-0.3	N/a
All above		0.0	-0.5	-0.1	-0.2	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.1
N		48.0	9	11	11 ⁸	5	Missing	9 ⁹	3
n of not relevant ¹⁰		19	5	5	3	3	Missing	Missing	3

Scale: better = +1, no different = 0, worse = -1.

Table 4 shows our findings. A first general point to make is that overall the quality of the European Union institutions' communication strategies were rated as being 'no different' than those of national actors. This held particularly with regard to being open to discussion, their overall professional standards, providing material which is usable news copy, and being transparent. This finding goes somewhat against the commonplace argument that the EU does not communicate effectively. Instead we see that the EU is actually rated better than national institutions at providing material that is accurate and providing specialist knowledge/expertise. However, the EU is rated worse than national institutions for having a clear political line. This suggests that overall the EU's communication is no better or worse than that of national actors, but that it is different. It appears to be of a more technocratic factual type, which is appreciated by journalists, but it is less politicised and does not provide the same clear political lines of argument that journalists are used to in their national arenas.

It is also worth noting that there are some national differences in the evaluation of EU communication strategies. At one pole, British journalists think that EU communication strategies are considerably worse than national ones, whereas at the other, Spanish journalists think that they are considerably better, with the journalists from other countries finding the standards broadly similar. Here it appears that the communicative style of the EU fits in less well with the norms of the British

⁸ Germany: Not all questions answered by all respondents. At least 9 respondents have answered

⁹ Italy: Each variable is calculated on a different number of responses. This N gives the average number of responses.

¹⁰ Cases where European institutions never contact journalist (Q14) or where not relevant was given as answer

journalistic style for reporting on political debates where strong political opinions and clear lines are often expressed. In contrast Spanish journalists seem to value this style above that of their national politicians, especially with regard to the overall professional standards of the EU.

ii. transnational press

In general, the transnational newspapers seemed to be targeted to an even lesser extent than the national media by collective actors. It is worth noting, however, that in contrast to the national newspapers, EU actors were more likely to be used as sources of news than national based ones.

3. *Readerships' Demand: an external factor influencing news agenda*

i. national and sub-national press

Here we aimed to see to what extent the readerships' demands for news was a factor in shaping coverage on Europe.

Overall, we found that the journalists' perceived relationship with their readerships was an important consideration in their reporting of news. However, this tended to be in a rather indirect way, with journalists constructing a general image of their readership that fitted in with their self-perceptions of the newspaper's editorial line. Journalists felt an obligation to inform readerships about European politics, because European issues are becoming more important to their lives. However, they did not think that the political stance of their readerships on Europe was a factor that impacted on their coverage to any great extent.

We decided to investigate journalists' perceptions of their readerships interest in politics, compared to their interest in European politics, and then to what extent they thought their readership understood the workings of European politics. Here our specific questions were: How interested do you think your readership is in politics? How interested do you think your readership is in European politics? To what extent do you think your readership understands how European politics works?

Table 5: Assessment of Readership's interest in politics and Europe

	Rank	All	UK	F	D	CH	ESP	I	NL
Own readership's interest in politics	1	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.3	2.5	1.7
Own readership's interest in European politics	2	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.6	2.4	1.6	1.5	1.0
Own readership's understanding of workings of European politics	3	1.1	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.0	1.1	1.5	0.9
N		98	13	16	14 (13)	12	15	13	15

Scale: not at all = 0, a little = 1, moderately = 2, greatly = 3

Table 5 shows the journalists' assessments of their readerships interest in politics and European politics, and understanding of European politics. Here respondents were able to answer 'not at all', 'a little', 'moderately', or 'greatly', which were attributed with the scores respectively of 0, 1, 2, 3, thus giving a range from 0 to 3. Table 5 ranks the three journalists' assessments of their readerships.

Overall we discovered that journalists considered their readerships to have a low interest and understanding of European politics. Journalists considered their readerships to be more than 'moderately' interested in politics, but significantly less interested in European politics, and to have only a little understanding of European politics. Also there was no cross-national variation in this rank ordering, which shows that this perception is widespread.

If journalists see their readerships to have a relative lack of interest in European affairs, as well as an ignorance of them, it is important to know how they address this situation, in order to make a judgement on how this affects their reporting of events. One point seems clear already, the perceived political positions of readerships on Europe (whether Eurosceptic, ambivalent or Europhile) do not seem to be a factor that would influence coverage, because journalists do not see their readership as even interested in European politics, let alone having a clear stance on the topic. However, it is also important to see the role that journalists see for themselves in relation to their readerships with regard to Europe. Here we inquired into the extent to which journalists thought that press coverage had contributed to the public's European frame of reference, and whether the journalists considered that they had an obligation to inform and educate the public with regard to Europe. Our specific questions were: Over the past decade, do you think that people in this country have come to view politics and public affairs within a European frame of reference, to any extent? To what extent has media coverage contributed to this? Much is made of the 'democratic deficit' of the EU, what role do you see the press having in reducing this deficit by informing and educating the public?

Table 6: Assessment of press' contribution to public's view of Europe, and perceived duty to reduce EU's democratic deficit

	All	UK	F	D	CH	ESP	I	NL
Press coverage's contribution to public's European frame of reference*	1.9	1.9	1.6	2.5	1.3	2.6	2.0	1.8
N	68	11	14	10	8	10	11	4
Press' general obligation to inform and educate public by reducing EU's democratic deficit+	2.0	2.5	1.4	2.2	1.7	2.3	2.6	1.4
N	97	13	16	13	12	15	13	15

Scale*: not at all = 0, a little = 1, moderately = 2, greatly = 3

Scale+: no role at all=0, a small role = 1, a moderate role =2, an important role=3.

Table 6 shows our findings. The second row of table 6 gives a score ranging from 0 for 'not at all' to 3 for 'greatly', for the extent to which journalists thought that press coverage had contributed to the public's European frame of reference, in cases where they considered that people had come to view politics and public affairs in relation to Europe to some extent. Overall, journalists see press coverage as having had a 'moderate' contribution to the public's Europeanised perception, though this drops slightly for the non-EU Swiss. So journalists see themselves to have some influence over their readerships with respect to increasing European-wide understandings. In addition, we see on a similar scale, from the fourth row in table 6, that journalists also consider themselves to have a moderately important role in informing and educating the public by reducing the EU's democratic deficit.

Thus it seems overall that it is not the political stances of publics on Europe which have an impact on coverage, but journalists' perceptions of their own role with respect to their readership. Journalists tend to work within the parameters of their newspaper's editorial line –which itself has a construct of a perceived audience- but with regard to Europe they are also prepared to some extent to take on an educative and informative function.

ii. transnational press

By contrast, readers of the transnational press are perceived by their journalists to be more strongly interested in European politics. Such journalists actually considered the role of transnational publications in educating the public to be hindered by national newspapers. They thought that the tendency of national newspapers to report EU politics through a 'national filter' and in simplistic terms was detrimental to public knowledge on the important issues concerning European integration.

4. *Political Journalism: an internal factor influencing news agenda*

i. national and sub-national press

Another important factor that can potentially shape the national press coverage of Europe is the extent to which journalists themselves try to influence public and policy agendas by taking a political stance. Here our aim was to consider to what extent journalists and editors see themselves as political actors. It is a commonly held view

both in the public domain and in academia that the press are Eurosceptic actors, or at least promote national perspectives that are resistant to Europe-wide worldviews and understandings. Sometimes such claims are based on impressionistic accounts or sketchy content analyses that serve simply as a basis for the authors to state their own opinions, or dislike of certain sections of the press. An example of this type of research is Anderson and Weymouth's (1999) pejoratively titled 'Insulting the Public? The British Press and the European Union', which depicts sections of the British press as using xenophobic anti-European sentiments in a strategic attempt to keep Britain out of Europe, which apparently is against their proprietor Rupert Murdoch's interests.

Instead of looking for conspiracies, and prejudging the issue, we thought it better simply to focus on how journalists see themselves as commentators on political events with regard to Europe. Here then we wanted to see how journalists perform when they move beyond the reporting function of news and attempt to advocate opinions that might potentially shape the public and policy agenda. More specifically, we examined the level of autonomy that journalists and editors felt that they had as political commentators, which actors they attempt to influence through their commentaries, and whether they perceived any differences in the role of the newspaper when commenting on European as opposed to national political affairs. Finally, at the newspaper level, we also assessed to what extent and with what motives and objectives, newspapers chose to run political campaigns on Europe.

First we tried to establish what degree of autonomy journalists and editors felt that they had to express their own position when commenting on news events –i.e., actually stating opinions on behalf of the newspaper— within their own issue field. For example, the specific question for the EU correspondents was: What level of freedom are you given to express your own individual position when commenting on European issues such as the Convention on the Future of Europe?

Journalists were able to give the following responses, 'none at all', 'a little', 'a moderate amount' or 'a great amount', which were respectively attributed the scores 0, 1, 2, 3, giving a range from 0 to 3. Table 7 shows our findings by country, and also by newspaper type, and newspaper.

Table 7: Journalist's assessment of level of autonomy to express own position when commentating on own issue field

	UK		F		D		CH		ESP		I		NL		All
Left Broadsheet	The Guardian	2.8	Le Monde	2.7	Süddeutsche Zeitung	3.0	Le Temps	2.5	El País	3.0	Repubblica	2.3	De Volkskrant	2.0	2.6
Right Broadsheet	The Times	1.0	Le Figaro	3.0	Frankfurter Allgemeine	2.8	NZZ	3.0	Abc	3.0	Corriere della Sera	2.5	Algemeen Dagblad	2.3	2.5
Popular Paper	The Mirror	2.0	L'Humanité	3.0	Bild	2.0	Blick	3.0	El Mundo	2.8	Il Mattino	2.3	De Telegraaf	2.5	2.5
Regional Paper	The Scotsman	2.8	Ouest-France	3.0	Leipziger Volkszeitung	3.0	Le Matin	3.0	La Vanguardia	3.0	La Nazione	2.8	Leeuwarder Courant	2.8	2.9
All	Total	2.1	Total	2.9	Total	2.7	Total	2.9	Total	3.0	Total	2.5	Total	2.4	2.6
N	N	13	N	14	N	13	N	11	N	15	N	15	N	14	95

Scale: none at all = 0, a little= 1, a moderate amount = 2, a great degree = 3

Range of scale 0 to +3

Overall, the striking feature here is that journalists from all countries and all types of newspaper consider themselves to have great amount of autonomy concerning what they write when they comment on political events. It is perhaps worth noting that the journalists from the British newspaper, the Times, were exceptional in this respect in that they considered themselves to have only a little autonomy. The Times is a Murdoch newspaper. Journalists at the Times attributed their relatively low level of autonomy for commentating on politics to the tight editorial system of decision-making, where there is an editorial board meeting or 'conference' which decides the line that will be taken in most commentaries. In the words of Tim Hames, Chief Leader writer:

'Leaders are a collective activity which are more or less driven by the editor: in our case more driven than the Guardian, less driven by the Mail. Whoever writes the leading article should reflect the established line of the conference.'

This means that within the organisation of the Times the editor holds a strong defining position for the political stance of the newspaper. However, at the same the Times journalists did not consider the stance of their proprietor to influence how they covered European issues to any great extent. Of course, the proprietor will have a say in the appointment of the editor, but on our findings it seems overly simplistic to claim a direct link between the proprietor and the political stance of the newspaper. For the other newspapers, although the journalists considered that they had a lot of autonomy, it was also clear that autonomy was understood to operate within the overall line of the newspaper, which as we saw earlier was an important factor in shaping journalists' news reporting. In this respect the position of Martin Kettle, Chief Leader writer at the Guardian is typical:

'In writing an editorial I am the custodian of the Guardian's institutional position that has evolved over decades, the Guardian is historically an internationalist paper and pro-European. It is sympathetic to moves which involve Europe. That's where we're

coming from. If I believed, which I don't, that Britain should have nothing to do with Europe, then I couldn't write those leaders.'

Overall, journalists see themselves as autonomous when acting as political commentators, but only to express their opinions within perceived constraints set by their understanding of the newspaper's position. The difference with the Times seems to be that it exercises more direct editorial control.

Earlier we examined how 'external' collective actors tried to shape the contents of news by 'source strategies'. In this part of the study we tried to establish which type of 'external' actor journalists and editors tried to influence when they commented on political events. We gave the respondents a closed list of eighteen categories of collective actors from the four general categories -governments and political parties, interest groups, campaign and protest groups, and publics- and asked them whether they tried to influence each actor when commenting on a political event 'never' (0), 'from time to time' (1), regularly (2), or always/very often (3). In this we constructed a score for the range from 0 to 3, for the frequency of attempts by journalists to influence each type of actor through political commentary. Our specific question was: When you are writing an article that gives you the scope to express an opinion on behalf of the newspaper, and comment on political events, how often do you try to get your message across to the following actors?

Table 8: Actors who journalists try to influence when commentating on political events

	Rank	All	UK	F	D	CH	ESP	I	NL
Governments & political parties	2	1.2							
National government	(1)	1.7	2.8	1.0	1.8	1.5	2.5	0.9	1.8
Political parties (national)	(2)	1.5	2.7 ¹¹	0.5	1.6	1.4	1.8	0.7	2.0
Regional/local government	(3)	1.1	1.7	0.3	1.0	0.8	1.6	0.6	1.6
European Union institutions/Commission	(4)	0.9	1.1	0.4	1.3	0.4	1.6	0.6	0.7
Supranational or transnational institutions (WTO, World Bank, UNHCR etc.)	(5)	0.5	0.7	0.4	1.0	0.5	0.9	0.2	0.1
Interest groups	3=	0.8							
National interest groups (e.g. Trade Unions, employers associations)	(1)	1.3	1.9	0.7	1.4	1.4	1.8	0.5	1.4
Regional or local interest groups (e.g. Trade Unions, employers associations)	(2)	0.8	1.3	0.2	0.7	0.8	1.3	0.4	1.1
European interest groups (e.g. Trade Unions, employers associations)	(3)	0.6	0.9	0.3	0.9	0.4	1.0	0.3	0.4
International and transnational interest groups (e.g. Trade Unions, employers associations)	(4)	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.8	0.3	0.8	0.3	0.3
Campaign and Protest groups	3=	0.8							
National campaign and protest groups	(1)	0.9	1.3	0.7	0.7	0.8	1.1	0.4	1.6
Regional and local campaign and protest groups	(2)	0.7	0.9	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.3	1.4
European campaign and protest groups	(3=)	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.4
International or transnational campaign and protest groups	(3=)	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	1.1	0.3	0.3
Publics	1	1.4							
Your readership	(1)	2.5	3.0	2.7	2.3	2.5	Missing	2.1	2.6
National public opinion	(2)	1.6	2.2	0.9	1.8	1.7	Missing	1.3	1.7
Informed political opinion – ‘the chattering classes’	(3)	1.4	2.1	0.8	1.9	1.2 ¹²	Missing	1.2	1.4
Scientific experts/policy think tanks working in this field	(4)	0.9	1.4	0.5	0.7	0.7	1.2	0.5	1.3
Journalists from other newspapers	(5)	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.6	Missing	0.4	0.1
N		73	10	13	13(12) ¹³	11	Missing	14	12

Scale: never = 0, from time to time = 1, regularly = 2, always/v. often = 3

The second column in Table 8 shows the overall rankings for the frequency which journalists attempted to influence the general categories of collective actors and within these the rankings of the different subcategories of actors. The third column ‘All’ gives the aggregate score for the frequency with which journalists stated that

¹¹ UK: N is 9 for this case.

¹² Switzerland: N is 9 for this case.

¹³ Germany: Not all questions were answered by all respondents, although at least 12 out of 13 respondents answered the question for each case.

they contacted the different actors, with the other columns showing this frequency per country.

A first general point to make is that journalists seem to try and influence actors through the political commentary only to a limited extent. Their own readerships were the only constant target, whom journalists tried to influence with a frequency between 'regularly' and 'always'. Otherwise the only collective actors targeted by journalists more than halfway on the scale from 'never' to 'always', were national governments and national political parties, and national public opinion. From this it seems that journalists perceive their own role as political commentators in a limited way, they appear to see themselves as informers about politics, rather than as agenda-setters. The one exception here, of course, is their relationship to their own newspaper's readerships, which as we have seen is structured very much into their self-image of their professional duties and values.

Looking at this limited agenda-setting role, there are still some points to be made. First it seems that agenda-setting activities are directed both at 'publics' (readerships, national public opinion, 'chattering classes') and powerful national institutional actors (national governments and political parties). Very few efforts are made to shape the opinions of interest groups and campaign and protest groups. It is also striking to note that regardless of actor type, journalists have a clear hierarchy of targets who they attempt to influence running from national, then to regional, then to European, and finally to non-EU supra- and transnational. Such patterns hold across countries. It also shows that national journalists do not see themselves as agenda-setters who address EU actors directly.

Overall, of the different actor types, and across all countries, journalists cited their readerships as the group whom they attempt to influence most through their commentating on political events. Although this seems a rather obvious response, it does underline that political commentating tends to be 'business as usual' for journalists: they simply follow their routine perceptions of their newspaper's line to communicate with their readerships about Europe. It is indicative that newspapers perform a more informative and educative function than an explicitly political one.

Another aspect of journalistic political commentary that we attempted to investigate related to their perceived differences in commentating on European political affairs in their specific field compared to national ones. Thus for European Correspondents our specific question was: When the newspaper comments on political affairs relating to Europe, such as the Convention on the Future of Europe, is the newspaper's role in any way different than when giving an opinion on national affairs, with respect to the following statements? Here respondents were required to answer 'yes', which was scored 3, or alternatively 'no' which was scored 0, for each statement. This gave an overall range from 0 to 3 regarding their perceived differences.

Table 9: Perceived differences in commentating on European political affairs compared to national political affairs

	Rank	All	UK ¹⁴	F	D ¹⁵	CH	ESP ¹⁶	I	NL ¹⁷
Newspaper is more likely to defend what it sees as the national interest	1	1.9	1.3 ¹⁸	Missing	1.5	1.9	2.6	2.2 ¹⁹	1.7
Newspaper has more of a duty to improve public knowledge	2	1.6	1.4	Missing	1.1	1.5	2.0	2.0 ²⁰	1.3
Newspaper is more likely to express its own position, independently from other actors	3	1.4	1.4	Missing	1.2	1.1	2.0	1.3	1.5
Newspaper is more likely to try to influence the positions of political elites	4	1.4	1.4	Missing	0.6	1.9	2.0	1.8	0.7
Newspaper is more likely to follow the perceived position of the proprietor	5	0.5	1.0 ²¹	Missing	0.0	0.8	0.9	0.4	0.0
Newspaper is more likely to follow the line of the political party with which it is most closely associated	6	0.4	0.5	Missing	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.3
Newspaper is more likely to follow the line indicated by national public opinion polls	7	0.4	0.2	Missing	0.2	0.0	0.8	0.7	0.3
All		1.1	1.0	Missing	0.7	1.0	1.7	1.2	0.8
N		72	13	Missing	14 (12)	7	15	13-14	9

Scale: 0 = no; 3=yes

The second and third columns, respectively, show the rankings and aggregated scores for the perceived differences of journalists between commentating on European and national political affairs. First we see that the clearest difference is that newspapers are more likely to defend the national interest, which is perhaps not too surprising, since this is a requirement that almost arises by necessity from the topical contents when journalists commentate on Europe. Another recognised difference was that the ‘newspaper has more of a duty to improve public knowledge’ when commentating on Europe. This points to the educative and informative role of journalists when commentating on European affairs. A third finding from table 9 is that the political stances of the proprietor, the party most closely associated with the paper, and expressed through public opinion polls, do not lead to any significant differences for commentating on Europe in comparison to national affairs.

¹⁴ UK: Based on 13 responses, since one journalist refused to answer this question.

¹⁵ Germany: Lower than 1.5 = majority does not see a difference; higher than 1.5 = majority sees a difference.

¹⁶ Spain: Scale: 0=None; 1=A little; 2=Moderate; 3=Large.

¹⁷ Netherlands: Not all journalists answered all sub-questions.

¹⁸ UK: Calculated on 12 responses, since the response of 1 journalist is missing.

¹⁹ Italy: Calculated on 11 responses.

²⁰ Italy: Calculated on 15 responses.

²¹ UK: Guardian excluded from this question, since it has no proprietor.

So far, we have found very little evidence for journalists using commentaries for partisan purposes with regard to Europe. Instead commentating on Europe and the scope for journalists to express overt political positions seems to operate within the limits set by the perceived editorial line and self-image of the newspaper. One last aspect of newspaper activity that we examined was whether the newspapers ran specific campaigns on Europe, and what were the nature and purpose of such campaigns.

A finding which perhaps underlines the limited political role of newspapers on Europe is that many journalists actually simply repeated factors relating to their newspaper's editorial line on Europe, largely in the absence of any explicit political campaigns. Otherwise the newspaper campaigns on Europe tended to relate to specific issues of European integration, and be different between broadsheets and the popular press. For most broadsheets campaigns simply constituted making their editorial line more explicit, for example, the Repubblica in Italy had strongly promoted the Euro and the benefits of a common foreign policy through its commentaries. For the tabloids, campaigns were designed to specify the perceived benefits and disadvantages of an aspect of European integration to readerships. Thus both the Bild in Germany and Il Mattino in Italy ran critical campaigns about the impact of the Euro on rising national prices. The Bild even made one of its journalists a 'Teuro' commissioner asking readers to write in letters of complaint. Such examples were, however, rare, though it should be pointed out that this style of the Bild is perhaps closest to the Sun in Britain, who refused to be part of our study. A last point to make on campaigns is that in non-EU Switzerland newspapers took up more explicit political positions with regard to debates about joining the EU. Blick, for example, had 'Wachstumskampagne' (growth campaign) comparing Switzerland and EU countries across a series of economic indicators to demonstrate that it would be better to join the EU. A further two of our Swiss papers explicitly endorsed the Yes campaign for joining the EU.

ii. transnational press

Similar to the national newspapers, the transnational press did not tend to take explicitly political stances on European issues in their reporting. However, we did find that the European Voice had run long standing campaign for transparency in Europe, in line with their specialist interests, whereas the Wall Street Journal had run a campaign explicitly against the Common Agricultural Policy – Scrap the CAP – which was interestingly untouched by the nationals.

References

Anderson P.J. and A. Weymouth 1999 *Insulting the Public? The British Press and the European Union*. Harlow: Longman

Baisnee O. 2002 Can political journalism exist at the EU level? in R. Kuhn and E. Neveu eds. *Political journalism: new challenges, new practices* London: Routledge

Eilders C. 2000 Media as Political Actors? Issue Focussing and Selective Emphasis in the German Quality Press. *German Politics* 9(3): 181-206.

Gavin N. 2001 British Journalists in the spotlight. *Europe and Media Research. Journalism* 2(3): 299-314.

Morgan D. 1995 British Media and European Union News: The Brussels beat and its Problems. *European Journal of Communication* 10(3): 321-43.

Tumber H. 1995 Marketing Maastricht: The EU and News Management. *Media Culture and Society* 17(3): 511-19.