

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 2 (Content coding of claim-making)**
WP Coordinator: Ruud Koopmans
Deliverable number: **D 2.3**

Report **Final case report of political claims analysis**

Case report **Spain**

Author: Juan Díez Medrano, Jillian Reynolds

Date: 19 March 2004

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Part I: Analytical Summary | 5 |
| Political Communication in the Spanish Public Sphere | 5 |
| A Europeanization of Political Communication in the Spanish Public Sphere? | 8 |
| Part II: Commented Tables | 12 |
| 1. General Information on the Articles Sample | 12 |
| Table 1.1 Number of articles coded per year: total, full sample, European sample (cross table AYEAR by SAMPLE) | 12 |
| Table 1.2 Articles by paper (frequencies PAPER) | 13 |
| Table 1.3 Section from which articles were coded by paper (cross table ASECTION by PAPER) | 13 |
| Table 1.4a Source of article by paper (cross table ASOURCE by PAPER) | 14 |
| Table 1.4b Source of article by year (Cross table ASOURCE by YEAR) | 15 |
| Table 1.5 Articles with and without claims (Frequencies ACLAIM) | 16 |
| 2. Claims Analysis | 17 |
| General Information on Claims | 17 |
| Table 2.1 Number of claims coded per year: total, full sample, European sample (Cross table CYEAR by SAMPLE) | 17 |
| Table 2.2a Country where claim was made by year (Cross table COUNTRY by CYEAR) | 18 |
| Table 2.2b Country where claim was made by issue field (Cross table COUNTRY by ISFIELDS) | 19 |
| Geographical Location of Claims in Spain | 20 |
| Table 3.1 Region in own country where claim was made by isfield1 | 20 |
| Claimants | 20 |
| Table 4.1 Actors of claims by issue field (ACTIS and ACT1SS by ISFIELD1) | 21 |
| Table 4.2 Actor type by issue field (ACTTYP1 by ISFIELD1) | 23 |
| Table 4.3 Twenty-five most often mentioned spokespersons | 24 |
| Table 4.4a Recoded actor scope by broad actor categories | 26 |
| Tables 4.4b Actor scope by issue field | 28 |
| Table 4.4c All claims by year | 30 |
| Table 4.5a Monetary Politics | 31 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 4.5b Agriculture | 31 |
| Table 4.5c Immigration | 32 |
| Table 4.5d Troops deployment | 33 |
| Table 4.5e Retirement and pension schemes | 34 |
| Table 4.5f Education | 35 |
| Table 4.5g European integration | 36 |
| Action Forms | 36 |
| Table 5.1 a Forms of action by issue field | 37 |
| Table 5.1b Forms of action by broad actor categories | 38 |
| Table 5.1c Forms of action by actor scope | 39 |
| Indirect Object Actors | 39 |
| Table 6.1 Presence of addressee by issue field | 40 |
| Table 6.2a Addressees by issue field | 40 |
| Table 6.2b Addressees by year | 42 |
| Table 6.3a Mean evaluation by category of addressees | 43 |
| Table 6.3b Mean evaluation by broad addressee scope | 45 |
| Table 6.4a Addressee scope by issue field | 45 |
| Table 6.4b Addressee scope by year | 47 |
| Table 6.4c Addressee scope by broad addressee category | 48 |
| Issues | 48 |
| Table 7.1 Policy field by year | 49 |
| Table 7.2a Monetary Politics | 50 |
| Table 7.2b Agriculture | 51 |
| Table 7.2c Immigration | 51 |
| Table 7.2d Troops deployment | 52 |
| Table 7.2e Retirement and pension schemes | 53 |
| Table 7.2f Education | 54 |
| Table 7.2g European Integration | 55 |
| Table 7.3a Issue scope by policy field | 57 |
| Table 7.3b Issue scope by year | 58 |
| Table 7.4 a Monetary Politics | 59 |
| Table 7.4b Agriculture | 59 |
| Table 7.4c Immigration | 60 |
| Table 7.4d Troops deployment | 61 |
| Table 7.4e Retirement and Pension schemes | 61 |
| Table 7.4f Education | 62 |
| Table 7.4g European Integration | 63 |
| Positions towards European Integration | 63 |
| Table 8.1 Position regarding European integration by policy field and year | 63 |
| Table 8.2 Position regarding European Integration by actor type | 65 |
| Table 8.3 Position regarding European Integration by actor scope | 66 |
| Table 8.4 Position regarding European Integration by party affiliation and by year | 67 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Object Actors | 68 |
| Table 9.1 Presence of object actor by policy field | 69 |
| Table 9.2 a Object actor type by policy field | 69 |
| Table 9.2b Object actor type by year | 71 |
| Table 9.3a Evaluation by object actor type | 73 |
| Table 9.3b Evaluation by object actor scope | 75 |
| Table 9.4 a Object actor scope by policy field | 76 |
| Table 9.4b Object actor scope by year | 77 |
| Frames | 77 |
| Table 10.1a Presence of frame by policy field | 78 |
| Table 10.1b Presence of frame by broad actor scope | 78 |
| Table 10.2 a Frame type by policy field | 79 |
| Table 10.2b Frame type by year | 79 |
| Table 10.2c Frame type by broad actor type | 80 |
| Table 10.3 Twenty-five most often mentioned frames | 81 |
| Table 10.4a What the EU should not be/lead to | 82 |
| Table 10.4b What the EU is not/does not lead to | 82 |
| Table 10.4c What the EU is/leads to | 83 |
| Table 10.4d What the EU should be/should lead to | 84 |

Part I: Analytical Summary

The following summary report distinguishes between the general characteristics of political communication in the Spanish public sphere and the level and characteristics of Europeanization of this Spanish public sphere.

Political Communication in the Spanish Public Sphere

This analysis focuses on a broad spectrum of policy areas and on several years between 1990 and 2002. It also examines three national newspapers (El País, ABC, and El Mundo) and one regional newspaper (La Vanguardia). Despite the fact that the selection of articles and claims results from a systematic sample of dates in 1990, 1995, 2000, 2001, and 2002, there are differences in the level of representation of policy areas, of years, and newspapers in the number of articles and claims analyzed. While this is interesting per se, it must be kept in mind when interpreting overall characteristics of the style and content of political communication in the Spanish public sphere and making comparisons with other countries.

The main compositional characteristics of the sampled articles and claims are 1) the greater number of articles and claims published in the centre-left newspaper El País, compared to other newspapers (Table 1.2), 2) the gradual increase in the number of articles and claims between 1990 and 2002 (Table 1.1 and Table 2.1), which can be mainly accounted by a sharp increase in the number of articles and claims on immigration and, to a smaller extent, by the small increase in the number of claims per article, and 3) the disproportionate number of claims in the policy areas of Monetary Politics, Immigration, and European Integration when compared to the areas of Agriculture, Education, Pensions, and Troops Deployment (Table 7.1). This finding reflects in part the higher frequency and sustained character of major policy decisions and/or events during the 1990s in the former areas. In the area of monetary politics, for instance, there were major decisions or events during the 1990s, such as qualification of Spain for entry in the EMU and the adoption of the Euro; in the area of immigration, it was the massive and continuous influx of legal and illegal immigrants, especially steep since 1999, which led to daily reports of expulsions/deportations of immigrants and to public debate about legislative reform in this domain; finally, in the area of European integration, it was the European Union's debate and political developments surrounding the Treaties of Maastricht and the Treaty of Nice, the EU enlargement process, and the Convention for the drafting of an EU Constitution. These debates led to a general preoccupation with the balance of power within the EU and with relations between the various governance levels in the EU and the various EU institutions. Events in the other policy areas analyzed in this project have been less frequent and more concentrated in time:

Troops deployment was an issue but mainly in 1990 because of the first Gulf War; education has been an issue but mainly in recent years, because of the reforms of higher and secondary education undertaken by the Conservative government; pension policy has been practically off the political agenda since 1995, when political parties and interest groups reached the agreement known as the Pacto de Toledo; finally, there has not been sustained reform or mobilization around agricultural policy during the decade. BSE led to intense debate and political measures but only between 1996 and 1998, which are not part of the sample of years we analyze in this project (see Tables 7.2a-7.2f).

With this preliminary background about the characteristics of the Spanish sample in mind, one can move to the analysis of the main features of political communication in the Spanish public sphere that emerge from the statistical analysis. One general feature is that news directly collected or coming from press agencies is generally processed and filtered by the newspapers' journalists or correspondents, who generally are the authors of these published articles (Tables 1.4a-1.4b). These journalists thus play an important role in shaping what kind of information the population receives. The favoured style by these journalists is one that focuses only on one main claim formulated in the public sphere (The number of claims by article is 1.1). Furthermore, the reporting of claims by political actors rarely refers to actors that may be affected by the claim (object actors) (Table 9.1), and even more rarely to indirect object actors, such as addressees, opponents, or supporters (Table 6.1). Whether the low presence of object actors (in about half of the claims only) and indirect object actors (in about a third of the claims only) results from the journalists' conscious decisions or from the type of claim that they report is difficult to determine. Finally, the claims reported by newspaper journalists rarely include frames that may shape people's political views and attitudes in the long run. We have ascertained this through detailed examination of claims referring to European integration. This examination shows that claims reported in newspapers rarely include statements concerning the European Union's identity, values, and norms, its aims, its historical foundation, or the relation between different aspects of European integration (Table 10.1a). Commentary/opinion articles by newspaper journalists and by representatives of civil society are almost the ones that, perhaps because of their greater length, include such frames (Table 10.1b). Thus, nine and 5 respectively of the 16 claims by other civil society actors containing a frame appear in signed commentary articles or in interviews. Examples of these contributors or interviewees are Spanish sociologists (e.g. Lamo de Espinosa), jurists (e.g. Herrero de Miñón, Rubio Llorente), writers (e.g. Gala, Semprún), and foreign scholars (e.g. David Held).

Spanish newspapers give utmost priority to claims made by state and political party representatives over claims made by other types of actors (Tables 4.1 and 4.2). The focus on state and political party institutions is what one would expect based on this research project's focus on policy areas; the greater salience of individual state and political party individuals relative to institutions or organizations, on the other hand, may be a reflection of the personalization of politics and journalistic reporting. In fact, the more powerful these political actors are, the more frequently newspapers report what they have to say or do. A listing of claim-makers, ranked by the number of claims reported in Spanish newspapers, reveals that those at the top are indeed prime ministers, heads of state, or key members of state and supranational institutions (Table 4.3). This focus on what state and political party representatives have to say and on what other actors have to say to or about state and political party representatives explains why the vast majority of reported claims concern political and executive actions and statements rather than other forms of claim-making, such as meetings or protest behaviour. In the case of Spain, it also explains why most of the claims are made in Madrid, the state's capital, and in the largest cities, where the leaders of the main peripheral nationalist parties reside (Table 3.1).

Within the parameters outlined in the previous paragraph, the type of actors and forms of claim-making featured in Spanish newspapers vary across policy fields. Policy fields with participation by and/or implications for specific constituencies rather than for the population as a whole and ridden with conflict tend to feature a greater diversity of actors and forms of claim-making (Table 4.1 and Table 5.1a). It is also in these policy areas where claims refer more often to object and indirect object actors (Tables 6.1 and 9.1). Education, pension, agricultural, and immigration policy are policy areas that impact on specific and generally organized constituencies. It is therefore not entirely surprising to find out that claim-making in these areas reveals a slightly more significant presence of civil society actors and a greater frequency of non-institutional claims-making (e.g. meetings, protest) (Table 5.1a). Meanwhile, policy areas such as troops deployment, monetary politics, and European integration have diffuse effects on all sectors of the population and have thus been generally debated by political or state organizations. The only exception to this is monetary politics, which has triggered claims addressed to or on behalf of central banks (Table 6.2.a). Because of this, claims-making in these three policy areas involves non-state, non-political party actors less often than in the remaining four areas. In the areas of education, pensions, agriculture, and immigration parent, student, and teacher organizations (i.e. education), the unions and employers (i.e. pensions), and farming and immigrant organizations (i.e. agriculture and immigration respectively) have often been the

source or target of claims (Tables 4.1 and 6.2a). Some of these non-state actors, such as the military, and employers are portrayed in relatively more negative terms than other actors when they appear as indirect object actors (Table 6.3a); others, such as immigrant organizations are portrayed in relatively more negative terms than other actors but only when they appear as object actors (Table 9.3a); finally, other civil society organizations, however, such as organizations and groups of the elderly are better evaluated on the average than the remaining groups or organizations.

As expected, Spanish journalists tend to attach priority to national news and actors than to foreign ones. Also expected, but still significant, is the finding that Spanish newspapers privilege news and claims referring to actors and issues with a European, non-Spanish scope, over non European ones (Tables 4.4 and 7.3a). This pattern has become clearer within the time frame considered here, mainly because of the increase in the proportion of claims with a Spanish scope in the field of immigration (Table 7.4c). The palette of actors and action forms reported in newspapers also varies across geographical areas. Reporting on non-European actors refers relatively to civil society actors and to protest behaviour less often than does reporting on Spanish and other European actors (Tables 4. 4 and 5.1c). Instead, the focus is on the state, political parties, and foremost of all, these countries' political representatives. This brief description of the geographical scope of claims, claim-makers, and direct and indirect object actors can serve as a transition to the analysis of the process of Europeanization of political communication in the Spanish public sphere.

A Europeanization of Political Communication in the Spanish Public Sphere?

The geographical location of reported claims and the geographical scopes of their various actors and issues depend both on the frequency, timing, and duration of events that are deemed interesting (period effects) and on the journalists' biases toward reporting on particular locations, topics, and actors (structural effects). This distinction is analogous to the distinction between absolute and relative social mobility and presents similar methodological problems. Nonetheless, the analysis of claim-making in various policy areas over the last decade, combined with background knowledge on Spanish and European politics, allows for some tentative conclusions.

Within the range of policies considered here, which is quite representative of the range of themes that organize the Spanish political agenda, one cannot say that the European Union is invisible in the public sphere: Monetary politics, education, pensions, agriculture, education, and immigration would be major topics of political discussion in national public spheres with or without European integration. The statistical examination of claims made between 1990 and 2002 is certainly biased in favour of Europeanization because of the inclusion of the European

integration policy field. The fact that the number of claims in the policy area of European integration is higher than in any of the other policy areas is revealing, however, of the relatively high salience of the European Union in the Spanish public sphere and of the sampling scheme used for 2001, in which only articles with a European scope and/or about the topic of European integration were selected. The same can be said of the fact that, after Spain, the European Union seats are the second most frequent location of claims in our sample (Table 2.2a) and that twenty percent of all claims are made by European Union actors (Table 4.4). A ranking of claim makers by the number of claims that have been reported in the years considered in this investigation finds the key EU representatives at the top of the list. The number of reported claims by Prodi and Duisenberg, for instance, is only barely lower than the one for Aznar (Table 4.3). Moreover, if one leaves the European integration policy field aside, this statistical examination reveals a great deal of Europeanization in fields such as monetary politics and agriculture. In the field of monetary policy fifty percent of all claims in the year 2002 were made by actors with an EU scope (Table 4.4); in agriculture, the corresponding percentage was about thirty percent (Table 4.4). In sum, whether we consider the geographical location of claims, the issues discussed, or the actors involved, the EU is already an established feature of the Spanish public debate.

The statistical examination of the data collected for this study leaves no doubt about the role of EU institutionalization and policymaking and executive powers in determining the emergence and relevance of a European Union sphere of political communication. Whether one analyzes the geographical location of claims reported by newspapers or the actor's and issues' geographical scopes the outcome is always the same: Monetary and agriculture policy (and, of course, European integration policy) are the policy fields in which the European Union geographic scope is most frequent. Furthermore, one sees that over time, the policy field that has experienced a greater degree of "Europeanization" is monetary policy, precisely the policy field in which the shift of responsibility from national governments to EU institutions has been the greatest. Events certainly help increase or maintain the presence of the European Union in the Spanish public sphere, as demonstrated by the high percentage of claims in the monetary policy and European integration fields, two fields that have been especially "eventful" during the 1990s. The field of farm policy, where little has happened during the 1990s, demonstrates, however, that net of major and durable events a high level of institutionalization of a policy field at the European Union level ensures a significant level of Europeanization of the political debate (Tables 7.3a and 7.4a-7.4g).

The data collected for this study also demonstrate that the Spanish sphere of political communication is becoming more Europeanized. Some of the information examined here would

seem to contradict this assertion. There is indeed a great deal of stability during the 1990s in the percentage of claims made in European Union seats (Table 2.2a), as well as in the percentage of claims made by actors representing the European Union (Table 4.4), in the percentage of claims whose issue has a European Union geographic scope (Table 7.3b), and in the percentage of claims whose object actor has a European Union geographic scope (Table 9.4b). Part of the explanation for this stability is the increase in the percentage of claims that can be described as Spanish, and which relate to the topic of immigration. When one focuses on the geographic scope of the place where reported claims were made, for instance, one detects that increases in the percentage of claims about monetary policy made in EU seats are balanced by similar increases in the percentages of claims on immigration and, to a lesser extent, agricultural policy, that are made in Spain. Seen from this perspective, one could even say that the Spanish sphere of political communication has become more national in the 1990s. When one focuses on indirect object actors, however, one detects a significant increase during the 1990s in the percentage of claims whose indirect object actors were EU representatives (Table 6.4b). This trend is particularly steep in the monetary and European integration policy areas, further demonstrating the role of EU institutionalization in the Europeanization of the Spanish public sphere. This is an extremely important finding, because it reveals that Europeanization is taking place in a bottom-up manner, as Spanish political and non-political actors increasingly address or refer to the European Union when making claims in the policy areas examined in the study.

The data collected on claims-making in the Spanish public sphere offers the opportunity to move beyond the analysis of the degree of Europeanization of the sphere of political communication into an examination of how the European Union and its main representatives are portrayed. Statistical analysis of the evaluation of direct and indirect object actors by claim-makers reveals that the European Union and its representatives are positively evaluated, both in absolute and relative terms (Tables 6.3b and 9.3b). This contrasts, for instance, with the negative evaluations generally received by actors from the UK. Claims referring to the issue of European integration tend also to have a positive character, especially, as one would expect, if they are made by EU actors (Table 8.3). The most negative evaluations of European integration are made by British actors, whereas French actors tend to evaluate issues related to European integration in positive terms. Reports on how different political parties across the European Union evaluate issues related to European integration are consistent with the national contrasts. Indeed, on the average most evaluations are positive except when expressed by representatives of the British Conservative Party. It appears too that left-oriented political parties evaluate issues about European integration more favourably than do right-oriented ones (Table 8.4).

People's attitudes toward European integration are decisively shaped by how they conceive of the European Union and the European integration process itself. These conceptions are both created and reflected by the media, which thus contribute to reproduce them. The information collected for this project reveals, however, that claims with a European scope and/or about European integration policy rarely include frames, commentary articles excepted. With this in mind, the statistical analysis of the 228 frames that have been coded reveals that these frames overwhelmingly concern identity/normative/value and constitutional/governance issues (Table 10.2a). Among the positively valued frames one can list democracy (the European Union is and leads toward democracy), a community of values (the European Union is based on a community of values) and equality among countries/regions (the European Union should lead towards equality between countries/regions). Among the negatively valued frames one can list sovereignty (the European Union erodes national sovereignty), transparency (the European Union is not a transparent set of institutions), racism/xenophobia and fascism/nazism (the European Union should not lead to and, in fact, overcomes racism/xenophobia and fascism/nazism) (Table 10.4a-10.4d). A differentiation between Spanish and non-Spanish actors reveals that the former use the equality frame more often than do the latter. Furthermore, qualitative analysis of the claims that contain frames shows that Spanish actors do not frame European integration as threatening national identity or express concern about a loss of sovereignty.

Part II: Commented Tables

General Information on the Articles Sample

This report examines the characteristics of the articles and claims sampled for this study.

Table 1.1 reports the number of articles that were coded (1943). Nine hundred ninety-five correspond to the full sample, while 948 correspond to the sample that includes articles with a European scope only. The sample for the year 2001 includes this type of articles only, which explains why the sample size is smaller. The years 2000, 2001, and 2002 comprise about 80% of the articles, whereas 1990 and 1995 represent 9.6% and 11.8% respectively. For both samples we observe increasing numbers of articles up to 2002, even after exclusion of the year 2000 in which a larger number of newspapers were analyzed.

Table 1.1 Number of articles coded per year: total, full sample, European sample (cross table AYEAR by SAMPLE)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| AYEAR * SAM | 1943 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1943 | 100,0% |

AYEAR * SAMPLE Crosstabulation

| | | SAMPLE | | Total | |
|-------|------|--------------------------------------|--|--------|--------|
| | | article coded from full sample issue | article coded from reduced European sample issue | | |
| AYEAR | 1990 | Count | 118 | 69 | 187 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 11,9% | 7,3% | 9,6% |
| | 1995 | Count | 148 | 82 | 230 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 14,9% | 8,6% | 11,8% |
| | 2000 | Count | 418 | 257 | 675 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 42,0% | 27,1% | 34,7% |
| | 2001 | Count | | 315 | 315 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | | 33,2% | 16,2% |
| | 2002 | Count | 311 | 225 | 536 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 31,3% | 23,7% | 27,6% |
| Total | | Count | 995 | 948 | 1943 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 1.2 shows the distribution of articles by paper. If we compare El País with ABC, which we sampled in all years, we see that the number of articles from the former is about 18% higher than that from the latter. We coded the Catalan newspaper, La Vanguardia and the national newspaper El Mundo only in 2000. The comparison between the two reveals that we coded a slightly higher number of articles from the latter.

Table 1.2 Articles by paper (frequencies PAPER)

Statistics

PAPER

| | | |
|---|---------|------|
| N | Valid | 1943 |
| | Missing | 0 |

PAPER

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid El Pais | 1038 | 53,4 | 53,4 | 53,4 |
| Abc | 724 | 37,3 | 37,3 | 90,7 |
| La Vanguardia | 101 | 5,2 | 5,2 | 95,9 |
| El Mundo | 80 | 4,1 | 4,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 1943 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 1.3 shows the section of the newspaper in which the article was included for each of the different papers. There is a high concentration in three key categories: the international news section, the business/economy section, and the national news section, comprising nearly 90% of all articles. If we consider that the mixed international/national news section is similar to the first and third category, the only other category with a significant amount of articles (6.5%) is the commentary pages. The results are similar for El País and ABC, although ABC doubles the number of articles in commentary pages in El País. La Vanguardia and El Mundo have an even higher proportion of commentary articles and lower proportions of articles in the national news section (e.g. 7.5% of the El Mundo articles). El Mundo also has, by far, the highest proportion of articles in the international section and in the economy section. Finally, La Vanguardia is the newspaper with the most balanced distribution of articles across sections.

Table 1.3 Section from which articles were coded by paper (cross table ASECTION by PAPER)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ASECTION * PAPER | 1943 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1943 | 100,0% |

ASECTION * PAPER Crosstabulation

| | | | PAPER | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------|---------|--------|---------------|----------|-------|
| | | | El Pais | Abc | La Vanguardia | El Mundo | |
| ASECTION | Mixed international/national news section | Count | 55 | 18 | 12 | | 85 |
| | | % within PAPER | 5,3% | 2,5% | 11,9% | | 4,4% |
| | Regional/local news section | Count | 3 | | 4 | | 7 |
| | | % within PAPER | ,3% | | 4,0% | | ,4% |
| | Commentary pages | Count | 44 | 62 | 13 | 8 | 127 |
| | | % within PAPER | 4,2% | 8,6% | 12,9% | 10,0% | 6,5% |
| | Business/Economy section | Count | 330 | 208 | 29 | 32 | 599 |
| | | % within PAPER | 31,8% | 28,7% | 28,7% | 40,0% | 30,8% |
| | International news section | Count | 356 | 255 | 28 | 34 | 673 |
| | | % within PAPER | 34,3% | 35,2% | 27,7% | 42,5% | 34,6% |
| | National news section | Count | 245 | 177 | 15 | 6 | 443 |
| | | % within PAPER | 23,6% | 24,4% | 14,9% | 7,5% | 22,8% |
| No differentiation between sections | Count | 2 | | | | 2 | |
| | % within PAPER | ,2% | | | | ,1% | |
| Section unknown | Count | 3 | 4 | | | 7 | |
| | % within PAPER | ,3% | ,6% | | | ,4% | |
| Total | Count | 1038 | 724 | 101 | 80 | 1943 | |
| | % within PAPER | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 1.4a shows that newspapers do not differ with respect to who authors the articles. National office editors or journalists wrote about 56% of these articles and foreign correspondents wrote about 33.0%. Therefore, almost 90% of the articles are the papers' own coverage, which reveals a great deal of autonomy. The third source of articles on our topics is national press agencies., The category "other EU press agency" only represents 3.0% of the total articles, and media sources from the rest of the world are practically insignificant.

Table 1.4a Source of article by paper (cross table ASOURCE by PAPER)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ASOURCE * PAPER | 1943 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1943 | 100,0% |

ASOURCE * PAPER Crosstabulation

| | | | PAPER | | | | Total |
|--------------|---|----------------|---------|--------|---------------|----------|-------|
| | | | El Pais | Abc | La Vanguardia | El Mundo | |
| ASOURCE | Own coverage: foreign correspondent's report | Count | 355 | 220 | 31 | 35 | 641 |
| | | % within PAPER | 34,2% | 30,4% | 30,7% | 43,8% | 33,0% |
| | Own coverage: article by nat. office editor or journalist | Count | 550 | 446 | 49 | 41 | 1086 |
| | | % within PAPER | 53,0% | 61,6% | 48,5% | 51,3% | 55,9% |
| | National press agency | Count | 51 | 23 | 6 | | 80 |
| | | % within PAPER | 4,9% | 3,2% | 5,9% | | 4,1% |
| | Other EU press agency | Count | 32 | 22 | 4 | | 58 |
| | | % within PAPER | 3,1% | 3,0% | 4,0% | | 3,0% |
| | Non-EU press agency | Count | 2 | | 1 | | 3 |
| | | % within PAPER | ,2% | | 1,0% | | ,2% |
| | Other EU media source | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within PAPER | ,1% | | | | ,1% |
| | Non-EU media source | Count | 2 | | | | 2 |
| | | % within PAPER | ,2% | | | | ,1% |
| Other source | Count | 45 | 13 | 10 | 4 | 72 | |
| | % within PAPER | 4,3% | 1,8% | 9,9% | 5,0% | 3,7% | |
| Total | Count | 1038 | 724 | 101 | 80 | 1943 | |
| | % within PAPER | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 1.4b displays trends in the main sources used for writing the articles included in our sample. Most remarkable is the decline in the percentage of articles falling in the category “Other EU press agencies”, which changes from 9.1% in 1990 to only 1.3% in 2002. A possible explanation for this finding is that progress in the European integration process has moved the Spanish papers towards appointing permanent correspondents in other member countries and thus becoming more autonomous from external sources. Indeed, the number of articles written by correspondents rises five percentage points. This change has run parallel to a substantial increase in the percentage of articles provided by national offices, from 50% in 1990 to about 60% in 2002.

Table 1.4b Source of article by year (Cross table ASOURCE by YEAR)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ASOURCE * AYEAR | 1943 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1943 | 100,0% |

ASOURCE * AYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | AYEAR | | | | | Total |
|---------|---|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | |
| ASOURCE | Own coverage: foreign correspondent's report | Count | 52 | 68 | 239 | 101 | 181 | 641 |
| | | % within AYEAR | 27,8% | 29,6% | 35,4% | 32,1% | 33,8% | 33,0% |
| | Own coverage: article by nat. office editor or journalist | Count | 99 | 128 | 338 | 198 | 323 | 1086 |
| | | % within AYEAR | 52,9% | 55,7% | 50,1% | 62,9% | 60,3% | 55,9% |
| | National press agency | Count | 7 | 6 | 32 | 11 | 24 | 80 |
| | | % within AYEAR | 3,7% | 2,6% | 4,7% | 3,5% | 4,5% | 4,1% |
| | Other EU press agency | Count | 17 | 20 | 11 | 3 | 7 | 58 |
| | | % within AYEAR | 9,1% | 8,7% | 1,6% | 1,0% | 1,3% | 3,0% |
| | Non-EU press agency | Count | | | 3 | | | 3 |
| | | % within AYEAR | | | ,4% | | | ,2% |
| | Other EU media source | Count | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | % within AYEAR | | | ,1% | | | ,1% |
| | Non-EU media source | Count | | 1 | | | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within AYEAR | | ,4% | | | ,2% | ,1% |
| | Other source | Count | 12 | 7 | 51 | 2 | | 72 |
| | | % within AYEAR | 6,4% | 3,0% | 7,6% | ,6% | | 3,7% |
| Total | Count | 187 | 230 | 675 | 315 | 536 | 1943 | |
| | % within AYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Our main goal in this module is to examine claims formulated by political actors, as reflected in the information provided by newspapers. In this respect, it is important to determine how often articles include claims. **Table 1.5** shows that 25.2% of the articles lack any claim at all, and 1.9% repeat claims already reported in previous articles. Almost three-fourths of the articles contain new claims or both new and repeated claims. We now move to the analysis of claims, the central aspect of our analysis.

Table 1.5 Articles with and without claims (Frequencies ACLAIM)**Statistics**

ACLAIM

| | | |
|---|---------|------|
| N | Valid | 1943 |
| | Missing | 0 |

ACLAIM

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | no | 490 | 25,2 | 25,2 | 25,2 |
| | yes, but only already coded ones | 37 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 27,1 |
| | yes, includes new claims | 1416 | 72,9 | 72,9 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 1943 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Claim analysis

► General information on claims

Table 2.1 shows that in total the Spanish data include 2180 claims, 1134 belonging to the full sample, and 1046 to the European sample. Therefore, there are 1.12 claims per article on average. Just as one observes for the number of articles, the number of claims increases over time. If one focuses on the full sample, one sees that the number of claims increased from 116 in 1990 to 362 in 2002. If one focuses on the reduced sample, the number increased from 61 in 1990 to 262 in 2002.

Table 2.1 Number of claims coded per year: total, full sample, European sample (Cross table CYEAR by SAMPLE)

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | | Cases | | | | | |
| | | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| CYEAR * SAMPLE | | 2180 | 80,5% | 527 | 19,5% | 2707 | 100,0% |

| CYEAR * SAMPLE Crosstabulation | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|--|--------|--------|
| | | SAMPLE | | Total | |
| | | article coded from full sample issue | article coded from reduced European sample issue | | |
| CYEAR | 1990 | Count | 116 | 61 | 177 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 10,2% | 5,8% | 8,1% |
| | 1995 | Count | 138 | 87 | 225 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 12,2% | 8,3% | 10,3% |
| | 2000 | Count | 518 | 276 | 794 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 45,7% | 26,4% | 36,4% |
| | 2001 | Count | | 360 | 360 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | | 34,4% | 16,5% |
| | 2002 | Count | 362 | 262 | 624 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 31,9% | 25,0% | 28,6% |
| Total | | Count | 1134 | 1046 | 2180 |
| | | % within SAMPLE | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 2.2a shows trends from 1990 to 2002 in the countries where claims originated. As one would expect, the greatest percentage of claims were made in Spain (47.7%). The category “Spain” is followed by the categories “EU seats” (16.8%), “the rest of the world” (6.8%), “re-unified Germany” (5.4%), and “France” (5.0%). There are no discernable changes over time, except perhaps an increase between 1990 and 1995, followed by stability at this higher level, in the claims made in Spain. There is also a substantial decline in the percentage of claims made in non-European locations (Russia, USA, Japan, Middle East, UN seats, NATO seats, Rest of World), from 24.2% of all claims in 1990 to only 13% in 2002. Thus, one can conclude that claims on the policy topics examined here have become more European over time and within Europe, somewhat more national.

Table 2.2a Country where claim was made by year (Cross table COUNTRY by CYEAR)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| COUNTRYS * CYEAR | 1134 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1134 | 100,0% |

COUNTRYS * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| COUNTRYS | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|--|----------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| Germany (incl. GDR) | Count | | 3 | 12 | 37 | 9 | 61 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 2,6% | 8,7% | 7,1% | 2,5% | 5,4% |
| France | Count | | 10 | 7 | 27 | 13 | 57 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 8,6% | 5,1% | 5,2% | 3,6% | 5,0% |
| UK | Count | | 4 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 30 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 3,4% | 2,2% | 2,7% | 2,5% | 2,6% |
| Italy | Count | | | | 4 | 9 | 13 |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | ,8% | 2,5% | 1,1% |
| Spain | Count | | 39 | 75 | 214 | 179 | 507 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 33,6% | 54,3% | 41,3% | 49,4% | 44,7% |
| Netherlands | Count | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| | % within CYEAR | | ,9% | | ,4% | ,3% | ,4% |
| Other pre-1995 EU members | Count | | 4 | 7 | 28 | 11 | 50 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 3,4% | 5,1% | 5,4% | 3,0% | 4,4% |
| Austria, Finland, Sweden | Count | | 3 | 1 | 21 | 10 | 35 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 2,6% | ,7% | 4,1% | 2,8% | 3,1% |
| EU seats | Count | | 18 | 8 | 96 | 69 | 191 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 15,5% | 5,8% | 18,5% | 19,1% | 16,8% |
| Switzerland | Count | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 |
| | % within CYEAR | | ,9% | | ,4% | | ,3% |
| upcoming enlargement countries | Count | | 2 | | | 4 | 6 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 1,7% | | | 1,1% | ,5% |
| Other European countries (excl. CIS countries) | Count | | 2 | 5 | 4 | | 11 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 1,7% | 3,6% | ,8% | | 1,0% |
| Turkey | Count | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 |
| | % within CYEAR | | ,9% | ,7% | | ,3% | ,3% |
| Russia (incl. USSR) | Count | | 3 | | 7 | | 10 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 2,6% | | 1,4% | | ,9% |
| USA | Count | | 6 | 6 | 14 | 12 | 38 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 5,2% | 4,3% | 2,7% | 3,3% | 3,4% |
| Japan | Count | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| | % within CYEAR | | ,9% | | ,4% | ,3% | ,4% |
| Middle East | Count | | 8 | 2 | 15 | 3 | 28 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 6,9% | 1,4% | 2,9% | ,8% | 2,5% |
| UN seats | Count | | | | 4 | | 4 |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | ,8% | | ,4% |
| NATO seats | Count | | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | ,4% | | ,2% |
| Rest of the world | Count | | 10 | 11 | 25 | 31 | 77 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 8,6% | 8,0% | 4,8% | 8,6% | 6,8% |
| Total | Count | | 116 | 138 | 518 | 362 | 1134 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 2.2b relates issue fields to the various geographical locations where the claims were made. One of the main hypotheses in this project is that the degree of vertical Europeanization of a policy area depends on how institutionalized this policy area is at the European Union level. Thus, one should see more vertical Europeanization in European Union integration, monetary and agricultural policies than in other areas. The statistical results for Spain largely confirm these expectations with respect to the vertical Europeanization of European Union integration, monetary, and agricultural policies. The percentages of claims made in cities corresponding to

European Union seats are 25%, 26%, and 34% respectively. Spain, however, is still the origin of the largest percentages of claims in all areas, except for troops deployment, where the primacy corresponds to the Middle East.

Table 2.2b Country where claim was made by issue field (Cross table COUNTRY by ISFIELDS)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| COUNTRYS * ISFIELD1 | 1134 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1134 | 100,0% |

COUNTRYS * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | |
| COUNTRYS Germany (incl. GDR) | Count | 21 | | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 61 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 8,9% | | 3,3% | 1,0% | 1,3% | 1,4% | 8,4% | 5,4% |
| France | Count | 8 | | 7 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 34 | 57 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 3,4% | | 3,3% | 5,1% | 2,6% | 1,4% | 9,5% | 5,0% |
| UK | Count | 10 | 2 | 4 | 4 | | 4 | 6 | 30 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 4,3% | 2,5% | 1,9% | 4,0% | | 5,4% | 1,7% | 2,6% |
| Italy | Count | 2 | | 5 | 1 | | | 5 | 13 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | ,9% | | 2,4% | 1,0% | | | 1,4% | 1,1% |
| Spain | Count | 82 | 44 | 129 | 18 | 65 | 59 | 110 | 507 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 34,9% | 55,0% | 61,1% | 18,2% | 84,4% | 79,7% | 30,7% | 44,7% |
| Netherlands | Count | 2 | 2 | | | | | | 4 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | ,9% | 2,5% | | | | | | ,4% |
| Other pre-1995 EU members | Count | 8 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | | 32 | 50 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 3,4% | 2,5% | 2,8% | 1,0% | 1,3% | | 8,9% | 4,4% |
| Austria, Finland, Sweden | Count | 6 | | 2 | | | | 27 | 35 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 2,6% | | ,9% | | | | 7,5% | 3,1% |
| EU seats | Count | 62 | 27 | 8 | 3 | 3 | | 88 | 191 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 26,4% | 33,8% | 3,8% | 3,0% | 3,9% | | 24,6% | 16,8% |
| Switzerland | Count | 1 | | 2 | | | | | 3 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | ,4% | | ,9% | | | | | ,3% |
| upcoming enlargement countries | Count | | | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 6 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | ,5% | 2,0% | | | ,8% | ,5% |
| Other European countries (excl. CIS countries) | Count | | | 3 | 4 | | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 1,4% | 4,0% | | 1,4% | ,8% | 1,0% |
| Turkey | Count | | | | 2 | | | 1 | 3 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 2,0% | | | ,3% | ,3% |
| Russia (incl. USSR) | Count | | | | 1 | 1 | | 8 | 10 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 1,0% | 1,3% | | 2,2% | ,9% |
| USA | Count | 10 | | 9 | 11 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 38 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 4,3% | | 4,3% | 11,1% | 1,3% | 8,1% | ,3% | 3,4% |
| Japan | Count | 3 | | | 1 | | | | 4 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,3% | | | 1,0% | | | | ,4% |
| Middle East | Count | | | 5 | 23 | | | | 28 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 2,4% | 23,2% | | | | 2,5% |
| UN seats | Count | | | | 4 | | | | 4 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 4,0% | | | | ,4% |
| NATO seats | Count | | | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 2,0% | | | | ,2% |
| Rest of the world | Count | 20 | 3 | 23 | 16 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 77 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 8,5% | 3,8% | 10,9% | 16,2% | 3,9% | 2,7% | 2,8% | 6,8% |
| Total | Count | 235 | 80 | 211 | 99 | 77 | 74 | 358 | 1134 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

► Geographical location of claims in Spain

The examination of where claims were made gives light on what kind of action and debate goes on around our seven fields. **Table 3.1** shows that 69.4% of all claims made in Spain (507) happened in Madrid and that 11.8% of all claims happened in the other four largest cities: Barcelona, Valencia, Sevilla and Zaragoza. Nineteen percent of all claims were made in 15 other locations. Despite Spain's quasi-federal territorial organization, claims and actions reported on are still highly centralized in the capital. Centralization is evident in all fields except in Immigration (51.2%) and European integration (65.5%). Monetary Politics and Retirement and Pension schemes display the greatest concentration in Madrid (84.1% and 81.5% respectively). A factor that could explain the concentration in the capital and the main peripheral cities is the media's prioritization of claims made by political and state actors.

Table 3.1 shows that the greatest number of reported claims made in Spain are in the areas of Immigration (129), European Integration (110), and Monetary Politics (82). These results differ from those for the whole selection of claims.

Table 3.1 Region in own country where claim was made by isfield1

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| summary region in own country * ISFIELD1 | 507 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 507 | 100,0% |

summary region in own country * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: subs., livestock, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops and deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European integration | |
| summary reg capital city in own country | Count | 69 | 35 | 66 | 14 | 53 | 43 | 72 | 352 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 84,1% | 79,5% | 51,2% | 77,8% | 81,5% | 72,9% | 65,5% | 69,4% |
| other four largest cities | Count | 5 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 25 | 60 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 6,1% | 4,5% | 11,6% | 5,6% | 3,1% | 16,9% | 22,7% | 11,8% |
| other locations | Count | 8 | 7 | 48 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 13 | 95 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 9,8% | 15,9% | 37,2% | 16,7% | 15,4% | 10,2% | 11,8% | 18,7% |
| Total | Count | 82 | 44 | 129 | 18 | 65 | 59 | 110 | 507 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

► Claimants

This section focuses on the actor variables. It examines who the claimants are, what kinds of actor dominate each issue, and what are these actors' scopes. **Table 4.1** examines all the different categories of actors by issue field. The main actor by far is the government/executive (46.1%).

Further, if one sums together all state and party actors, they represent three of every four claims reported in Spanish papers. Other civil society actors (excluding media and economic interest groups) only represent 4.8% of the claims, which may reflect either low public participation of Spanish society or the media's trend to preferably report on the authorities positions, or both. European integration is the issue most dominated by state and party actors while Education and Agriculture, in this order, are the issues in which the citizenry appears more active, represented by the economic interest groups. Retirement and pension schemes and monetary politics are other policy fields in which non-state/party actors, representing groups affected by these policies, play a significant role as claimants. The fact remains, however, that the government is the main actor in all fields except monetary politics, which is dominated by claimants representing central banks (33.2% of the claims, against 28.9% made by governments). Meanwhile, political parties from the opposition play a small role as claimants.

Table 4.1 Actors of claims by issue field (ACTIS and ACT1SS by ISFIELD1)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ACT1S * ISFIELD1 | 1134 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1134 | 100,0% |
| summary of act1s * ISFIELD1 | 1134 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1134 | 100,0% |

ACT1S * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | Total | |
|-------|---|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--------|----------------------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | | European Integration |
| ACT1S | whole polities | Count | 2 | 5 | 10 | 7 | | 1 | 17 | 42 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | ,9% | 6,3% | 4,7% | 7,1% | | 1,4% | 4,7% | 3,7% |
| | politicians | Count | 6 | 5 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 25 | 67 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 2,6% | 6,3% | 5,7% | 6,1% | 6,5% | 10,8% | 7,0% | 5,9% |
| | former states(wo)men | Count | 2 | | | 1 | | | 3 | 6 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | ,9% | | | 1,0% | | | ,8% | ,5% |
| | government/executive | Count | 68 | 45 | 90 | 53 | 32 | 21 | 214 | 523 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 28,9% | 56,3% | 42,7% | 53,5% | 41,6% | 28,4% | 59,8% | 46,1% |
| | legislative | Count | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 30 | 48 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,7% | 1,3% | 1,9% | 2,0% | 7,8% | 1,4% | 8,4% | 4,2% |
| | judiciary | Count | | | 5 | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 2,4% | | 3,9% | 2,7% | ,6% | 1,1% |
| | police and internal security agencies | Count | | | 25 | | | | 1 | 26 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 11,8% | | | | ,3% | 2,3% |
| | military | Count | 1 | | 3 | 13 | | | 2 | 19 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | ,4% | | 1,4% | 13,1% | | | ,6% | 1,7% |
| | central banks | Count | 78 | | | | 3 | | | 81 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 33,2% | | | | 3,9% | | | 7,1% |
| | social security executive organisations | Count | | | | | 2 | | | 2 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | | 2,6% | | | ,2% |
| | other state executive agencies | Count | 4 | | 5 | | 1 | | 1 | 11 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,7% | | 2,4% | | 1,3% | | ,3% | 1,0% |
| | political parties | Count | 9 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 17 | 55 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 3,8% | 1,3% | 6,6% | 3,0% | 7,8% | 6,8% | 4,7% | 4,9% |
| | unions and employees | Count | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 8 | 5 | 1 | 21 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | ,4% | 2,5% | 1,9% | | 10,4% | 6,8% | ,3% | 1,9% |
| | employers organisations and firms | Count | 7 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | 13 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 3,0% | 1,3% | ,9% | | 2,6% | 1,4% | | 1,1% |
| | churches and religious organisations and groups | Count | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 3 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | 1,3% | ,5% | | | 1,4% | | ,3% |
| | media and journalists | Count | 15 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 12 | 38 | 93 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 6,4% | 2,5% | 5,2% | 10,1% | 6,5% | 16,2% | 10,6% | 8,2% |
| | farmers and agricultural organisations | Count | | 15 | 1 | | | 1 | | 17 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | 18,8% | ,5% | | | 1,4% | | 1,5% |
| | educational professionals and organisations | Count | 1 | | 2 | | | 10 | 1 | 14 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | ,4% | | ,9% | | | 13,5% | ,3% | 1,2% |
| | economists and financial experts | Count | 33 | | | | 3 | | 1 | 37 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 14,0% | | | | 3,9% | | ,3% | 3,3% |
| | other scientific and research professionals | Count | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | 1,3% | | | | | ,3% | ,2% |
| | students, pupils, and their parents | Count | | | | | | 5 | | 5 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | | | 6,8% | | ,4% |
| | other professional organisations and groups | Count | | | 3 | | 1 | | 2 | 6 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 1,4% | | 1,3% | | ,6% | ,5% |
| | consumer organisations and groups | Count | 3 | 1 | | | | | | 4 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,3% | 1,3% | | | | | | ,4% |
| | migrant organisations and groups | Count | | | 8 | | | | | 8 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 3,8% | | | | | ,7% |
| | solidarity and human rights organisations | Count | 1 | | 7 | | | | | 8 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | ,4% | | 3,3% | | | | | ,7% |
| | peace movement organisations and groups | Count | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 1,0% | | | | ,1% |
| | terrorist groups | Count | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 1,0% | | | | ,1% |
| | other civil society organisations and groups | Count | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | | | 1,4% | ,3% | ,2% |
| | the general public | Count | | | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | ,9% | 2,0% | | | ,3% | ,4% |
| | unknown/unspecified actors | Count | | | 2 | | | | | 2 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | ,9% | | | | | ,2% |
| Total | | Count | 235 | 80 | 211 | 99 | 77 | 74 | 358 | 1134 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

summary of act1s * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | |
| summary of act1s | state and party actors | Count | 172 | 52 | 158 | 78 | 58 | 37 | 295 | 850 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 73,2% | 65,0% | 74,9% | 78,8% | 75,3% | 50,0% | 82,4% | 75,0% |
| | economic interest groups | Count | 41 | 18 | 7 | | 13 | 7 | 2 | 88 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 17,4% | 22,5% | 3,3% | | 16,9% | 9,5% | ,6% | 7,8% |
| | media and journalists | Count | 15 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 12 | 38 | 93 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 6,4% | 2,5% | 5,2% | 10,1% | 6,5% | 16,2% | 10,6% | 8,2% |
| | other civil society actors | Count | 5 | 3 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 5 | 54 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 2,1% | 3,8% | 10,0% | 2,0% | 1,3% | 23,0% | 1,4% | 4,8% |
| | general/unknown/unspecified | Count | 2 | 5 | 14 | 9 | | 1 | 18 | 49 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | ,9% | 6,3% | 6,6% | 9,1% | | 1,4% | 5,0% | 4,3% |
| Total | | Count | 235 | 80 | 211 | 99 | 77 | 74 | 358 | 1134 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 4.2 also reflects the structure of mobilization and organization of Spanish civil society across the different issue fields. Fifty-seven percent of claims were made by named spokespersons of an organization, 28.7% by an organization or institution itself, and 4.8% by anonymous spokespersons. Only 2.6% and 7.1% of claims, respectively, were made by unorganised anonymous persons and individuals and by named representatives of unorganized collectives. These results indicate that reported claims generally refer to institutions.

Table 4.2 Actor type by issue field (ACTTYP1 by ISFIELD1)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ACTTYP1 * ISFIELD1 | 1134 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1134 | 100,0% |

ACTTYP1 * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---|--|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|
| | | Monetary politics: currency an interest rate | Agriculture: subs., livest quotas, disease control | Immigration entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education integration | | European |
| ACTTYI unorganised collec | Count | 8 | 3 | 10 | 4 | | 2 | 2 | 29 |
| | % within ISFI | 3,4% | 3,8% | 4,7% | 4,0% | | 2,7% | ,6% | 2,6% |
| named representa | Count | 15 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 36 | 80 |
| of an unorganized | % within ISFI | 6,4% | 2,5% | 3,8% | 6,1% | 3,9% | 13,5% | 10,1% | 7,1% |
| collective | Count | 73 | 32 | 82 | 30 | 28 | 14 | 67 | 326 |
| organisation or ins | % within ISFI | 31,1% | 40,0% | 38,9% | 30,3% | 36,4% | 18,9% | 18,7% | 28,7% |
| anonymous | Count | 9 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 50 |
| spokesperson(s) | % within ISFI | 3,8% | 3,8% | 5,2% | 6,1% | 3,9% | 4,1% | 4,2% | 4,4% |
| named spokesper: | Count | 130 | 40 | 100 | 53 | 43 | 45 | 238 | 649 |
| | % within ISFI | 55,3% | 50,0% | 47,4% | 53,5% | 55,8% | 60,8% | 66,5% | 57,2% |
| Total | Count | 235 | 80 | 211 | 99 | 77 | 74 | 358 | 1134 |
| | % within ISFI | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

The results of **Table 4.3** are consistent with the findings above. Aside from 400 claims made by anonymous persons, the first ten most frequent named actors are all authorities—e.g. Aznar, the Spanish Prime Minister (1.6% of claims), Prodi (1.5%), Duisenberg, the former President of the ECB (1.4%), etc. In position 11 one finds the first non-authority actor, Andrés Ortega, journalist from El País, and in position 21 the first non-European actor, Bill Clinton. Most named claimants are European and represent institutions. Significantly, only 12 out of the 25 most frequently quoted actors are Spanish. (11 with a Spanish scope, as Pedro Solbes is a Commissioner).

Table 4.3 Twenty-five most often mentioned spokespersons**Statistics**

ACTNAME1

| | | |
|---|---------|------|
| N | Valid | 1134 |
| | Missing | 0 |

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| | 400 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 35.3 |
| Aznar, Jose Maria | 18 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 36.9 |
| Prodi, Romano | 17 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 38.4 |
| Duisenberg, Wim | 16 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 39.8 |
| Schroeder, Gerhard | 15 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 41.1 |
| Solbes, Pedro | 14 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 42.3 |
| Arias Cañete, Miguel | 12 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 43.4 |
| Schussel, Wolfgang | 12 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 44.4 |
| Chirac, Jacques | 11 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 45.4 |
| Pique, Josep | 10 | .9 | .9 | 46.3 |
| Rato, Rodrigo | 8 | .7 | .7 | 47.0 |
| Ortega, Andres | 7 | .6 | .6 | 47.6 |
| Kohl, Helmut | 7 | .6 | .6 | 48.2 |
| Rojo, Luis Angel | 7 | .6 | .6 | 48.9 |
| Gonzalez, Felipe | 7 | .6 | .6 | 49.5 |
| Fischler, Franz | 7 | .6 | .6 | 50.1 |
| Montoro, Cristobal | 6 | .5 | .5 | 50.6 |
| Rumi, Consuelo | 6 | .5 | .5 | 51.1 |
| Moscovici, Pierre | 6 | .5 | .5 | 51.7 |
| Chaves, Manuel | 6 | .5 | .5 | 52.2 |
| Clinton, Bill | 5 | .4 | .4 | 52.6 |
| Pujol, Jordi | 5 | .4 | .4 | 53.1 |
| Chevenement, Jean-Pierre | 4 | .4 | .4 | 53.4 |
| Trillo, Federico | 4 | .4 | .4 | 53.8 |
| Barak, Ehud | 4 | .4 | .4 | 54.1 |
| Haider, Jorg | 4 | .4 | .4 | 54.5 |
| Giscard d'Estaing, Valery | 4 | .4 | .4 | 54.9 |
| Baron, Enrique | 4 | .4 | .4 | 55.2 |
| Ovidio | 4 | .4 | .4 | 55.6 |
| Blair, Tony | 4 | .4 | .4 | 55.9 |
| Delors, Jacques | 4 | .4 | .4 | 56.3 |

Table 4.4(a) shows that in 509 of the 1130 coded claims, or 45%, the scope was national. The second most important scope is the EU (225), followed by Germany, the Rest of the world, France and USA (64, 53, 53 and 44 actors each). Most of the 225 EU scope actors were political institutions, which reflects the low level of reporting on what happens in the rest of EU civil society but also the latter's lesser involvement in the public sphere. Spain shows fewer state and party actors than show all claims taken together (75.2%), as well as more actors belonging to the other categories. It is difficult to draw firm conclusions from these findings, however, since the press possibly biases reporting on foreign actors toward state and party actors.

Table 4.4a Recoded actor scope by broad actor categories

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * summary of act1s | 1130 | 99,6% | 4 | ,4% | 1134 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * summary of act1s Crosstabulation

| | | | summary of act1s | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| | | | state and party actors | economic interest groups | media and journalists | other civil society actors | general/un known/uns pecified | |
| recoded first actor scope | supranational: UN | Count | 6 | | | | | 6 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 100,0% | | | | | 100,0% |
| | other supranational | Count | 9 | | | 3 | | 12 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 75,0% | | | 25,0% | | 100,0% |
| | EU | Count | 213 | | | 1 | 11 | 225 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 94,7% | | | ,4% | 4,9% | 100,0% |
| | other European supranational | Count | 2 | | | | | 2 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 100,0% | | | | | 100,0% |
| | multilateral | Count | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | 5 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 20,0% | 40,0% | | | 40,0% | 100,0% |
| | bilateral | Count | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 100,0% | | | | | 100,0% |
| | germany | Count | 54 | 5 | 2 | | 3 | 64 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 84,4% | 7,8% | 3,1% | | 4,7% | 100,0% |
| | france | Count | 42 | 3 | | 1 | 7 | 53 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 79,2% | 5,7% | | 1,9% | 13,2% | 100,0% |
| | uk | Count | 23 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 31 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 74,2% | 3,2% | 12,9% | 6,5% | 3,2% | 100,0% |
| | italy | Count | 7 | | | 1 | | 8 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 87,5% | | | 12,5% | | 100,0% |
| | spain | Count | 327 | 68 | 76 | 30 | 8 | 509 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 64,2% | 13,4% | 14,9% | 5,9% | 1,6% | 100,0% |
| | netherlands | Count | 4 | | | | 2 | 6 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 66,7% | | | | 33,3% | 100,0% |
| | other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | 9 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 64,3% | | 14,3% | 14,3% | 7,1% | 100,0% |
| | austria, finland, sweden | Count | 34 | | | 1 | | 35 |
| | | % within recoded first actor scope | 97,1% | | | 2,9% | | 100,0% |
| Switzerland | Count | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 100,0% | | | | | 100,0% | |
| upcoming enlargement countries | Count | 7 | | | | 1 | 8 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 87,5% | | | | 12,5% | 100,0% | |
| other european countries ex CIS | Count | 6 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 9 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 66,7% | 11,1% | 11,1% | | 11,1% | 100,0% | |
| turkey | Count | 3 | | | | | 3 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 100,0% | | | | | 100,0% | |
| russia | Count | 12 | | | | | 12 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 100,0% | | | | | 100,0% | |
| USA | Count | 37 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 44 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 84,1% | 2,3% | 4,5% | 6,8% | 2,3% | 100,0% | |
| Japan | Count | 2 | 1 | | | | 3 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 66,7% | 33,3% | | | | 100,0% | |
| Middle East | Count | 21 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 26 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 80,8% | | 7,7% | 3,8% | 7,7% | 100,0% | |
| Rest of the world | Count | 29 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 53 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 54,7% | 7,5% | 7,5% | 13,2% | 17,0% | 100,0% | |
| Total | Count | 850 | 86 | 93 | 52 | 49 | 1130 | |
| | % within recoded first actor scope | 75,2% | 7,6% | 8,2% | 4,6% | 4,3% | 100,0% | |

Table 4.4(b) displays the scope of actors for each issue field. Compared to the EU actor scope's total (19.9%), actors with this scope are more prominent in monetary politics, agriculture and European integration, while they barely appear in the other fields. Sixty percent of claims made on immigration were by actors with a Spanish scope, as were an outstanding 85.7% and 79.5% in Retirement and pension schemes and Education respectively. Therefore, the level of institutionalization of the EU in a field seems indeed to enhance the visibility of European level actors.

Tables 4.4b Actor scope by issue field

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * ISFIELD1 | 1130 | 99,6% | 4 | ,4% | 1134 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | |
| recoded first actor scope | supranational: UN | Count | | | | 6 | | | 6 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | | 6,1% | | | ,5% |
| | other supranational | Count | 2 | | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 12 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | ,9% | | 1,0% | 5,1% | 1,3% | ,6% | 1,1% |
| EU | Count | 74 | 23 | 4 | 6 | 2 | | 116 | 225 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 31,8% | 28,8% | 1,9% | 6,1% | 2,6% | 32,4% | 19,9% |
| other European supranational | Count | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | ,5% | | | ,3% | ,2% |
| multilateral | Count | 2 | | | 1 | | | 2 | 5 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | ,9% | | | 1,0% | | ,6% | ,4% |
| bilateral | Count | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | ,5% | | | | ,1% |
| germany | Count | 19 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 31 | 64 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 8,2% | 3,8% | 3,8% | 1,0% | 1,3% | 1,4% | 8,7% |
| france | Count | 10 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 28 | 53 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 4,3% | 3,8% | 3,3% | 3,0% | 1,3% | 1,4% | 7,8% |
| uk | Count | 11 | 2 | 4 | 5 | | | 4 | 31 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 4,7% | 2,5% | 1,9% | 5,1% | | 5,5% | 1,4% |
| italy | Count | | | 4 | 1 | | | 3 | 8 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | 1,9% | 1,0% | | ,8% | ,7% |
| spain | Count | 84 | 45 | 126 | 18 | 66 | 58 | 112 | 509 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 36,1% | 56,3% | 60,0% | 18,2% | 85,7% | 79,5% | 31,3% |
| netherlands | Count | 2 | 3 | | | | | 1 | 6 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | ,9% | 3,8% | | | | | ,3% |
| other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | 4 | | 3 | | | | 7 | 14 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 1,7% | | 1,4% | | | 2,0% | 1,2% |
| austria, finland, sweden | Count | 4 | 1 | 4 | | | | 26 | 35 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 1,7% | 1,3% | 1,9% | | | 7,3% | 3,1% |
| Switzerland | Count | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | ,5% | | | | ,1% |
| upcoming enlargement countries | Count | | | 2 | 3 | | | 3 | 8 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | 1,0% | 3,0% | | ,8% | ,7% |
| other european countries ex CIS | Count | | | 3 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | 1,4% | 3,0% | 1,4% | ,6% | ,8% |
| turkey | Count | | | | 2 | | | 1 | 3 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | | 2,0% | | ,3% | ,3% |
| russia | Count | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 8 | 12 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | ,5% | 2,0% | 1,3% | 2,2% | 1,1% |
| USA | Count | 10 | | 9 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 44 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 4,3% | | 4,3% | 12,1% | 1,3% | 8,2% | 1,7% |
| Japan | Count | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 3 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | ,9% | | | 1,0% | | | ,3% |
| Middle East | Count | | | 5 | 21 | | | | 26 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | 2,4% | 21,2% | | | 2,3% |
| Rest of the world | Count | 9 | | 25 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 53 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 3,9% | | 11,9% | 9,1% | 5,2% | 2,7% | 1,1% |
| Total | Count | 233 | 80 | 210 | 99 | 77 | 73 | 358 | 1130 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 4.4(c) shows that between 1990 and 2002 the EU and Spain are the only two scopes in which one observes an increase in the percentage of reported claims. These trends contrast to those relative to claims with the scopes “other supranational”, “Germany”, “other European countries”, “upcoming enlargement countries”, “Russia”, “USA” and “Middle East”, whose percentages gradually decrease.

Table 4.4c All claims by year

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * CYEAR | 1130 | 99,6% | 4 | ,4% | 1134 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first actor scope | supranational: UN | Count | | 1 | 5 | | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | ,7% | 1,0% | | ,5% |
| other supranational | Count | | 3 | 6 | 3 | 12 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | 2,2% | 1,2% | ,8% | 1,1% | |
| EU | Count | 21 | 13 | 108 | 83 | 225 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 18,1% | 9,4% | 21,0% | 22,9% | 19,9% | |
| other European supranational | Count | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,4% | | ,2% | |
| multilateral | Count | 1 | | 4 | | 5 | |
| | % within CYEAR | ,9% | | ,8% | | ,4% | |
| bilateral | Count | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | ,3% | ,1% | |
| germany | Count | 7 | 7 | 33 | 17 | 64 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 6,0% | 5,1% | 6,4% | 4,7% | 5,7% | |
| france | Count | 5 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 53 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 4,3% | 5,8% | 4,7% | 4,4% | 4,7% | |
| uk | Count | 4 | 3 | 14 | 10 | 31 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,4% | 2,2% | 2,7% | 2,8% | 2,7% | |
| italy | Count | | | 3 | 5 | 8 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,6% | 1,4% | ,7% | |
| spain | Count | 43 | 74 | 224 | 168 | 509 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 37,1% | 53,6% | 43,6% | 46,4% | 45,0% | |
| netherlands | Count | 1 | | 1 | 4 | 6 | |
| | % within CYEAR | ,9% | | ,2% | 1,1% | ,5% | |
| other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 14 | |
| | % within CYEAR | ,9% | 1,4% | 1,4% | 1,1% | 1,2% | |
| austria, finland, sweden | Count | 1 | | 27 | 7 | 35 | |
| | % within CYEAR | ,9% | | 5,3% | 1,9% | 3,1% | |
| Switzerland | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,2% | | ,1% | |
| upcoming enlargement countries | Count | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 2,6% | ,7% | ,4% | ,6% | ,7% | |
| other european countries ex CIS | Count | 2 | 4 | 3 | | 9 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 1,7% | 2,9% | ,6% | | ,8% | |
| turkey | Count | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 | |
| | % within CYEAR | ,9% | ,7% | | ,3% | ,3% | |
| russia | Count | 5 | | 7 | | 12 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 4,3% | | 1,4% | | 1,1% | |
| USA | Count | 7 | 8 | 16 | 13 | 44 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 6,0% | 5,8% | 3,1% | 3,6% | 3,9% | |
| Japan | Count | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | |
| | % within CYEAR | ,9% | | ,2% | ,3% | ,3% | |
| Middle East | Count | 7 | 2 | 14 | 3 | 26 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 6,0% | 1,4% | 2,7% | ,8% | 2,3% | |
| Rest of the world | Count | 6 | 11 | 12 | 24 | 53 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 5,2% | 8,0% | 2,3% | 6,6% | 4,7% | |
| Total | Count | 116 | 138 | 514 | 362 | 1130 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

The examination of the evolution of actor scopes field by field, reveals that in monetary politics (**Table 4.5a**) the reported claims with EU scope double between 1990 and 2002 (25% to 50.8%), while those with Spanish scope become almost six times less frequent (62.5% to 11.1%). In fact, the percentages of reported claims with European country scopes decrease throughout the period, as do those with USA, Japan and Rest of the world scopes.

Table 4.5a Monetary Politics

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * CYEAR | 233 | 99,1% | 2 | ,9% | 235 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first actor scope | other supranational | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,0% | | ,9% |
| | EU | Count | 4 | 2 | 36 | 32 | 74 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 25,0% | 3,8% | 35,6% | 50,8% | 31,8% |
| | multilateral | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,0% | | ,9% |
| | germany | Count | | 5 | 10 | 4 | 19 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 9,4% | 9,9% | 6,3% | 8,2% |
| | france | Count | | 6 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 11,3% | 2,0% | 3,2% | 4,3% |
| | uk | Count | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 11 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 5,7% | 5,9% | 1,6% | 4,7% |
| | spain | Count | 10 | 33 | 34 | 7 | 84 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 62,5% | 62,3% | 33,7% | 11,1% | 36,1% |
| | netherlands | Count | 1 | | | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | | 1,6% | ,9% |
| | other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | | 2 | 2 | | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,8% | 2,0% | | 1,7% |
| | austria, finland, sweden | Count | | | | 4 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 6,3% | 1,7% |
| | USA | Count | | 1 | 5 | 4 | 10 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 1,9% | 5,0% | 6,3% | 4,3% |
| | Japan | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | 1,6% | ,9% |
| | Rest of the world | Count | | 1 | 1 | 7 | 9 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 1,9% | 1,0% | 11,1% | 3,9% |
| Total | | Count | 16 | 53 | 101 | 63 | 233 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Agriculture policy (**Table 4.5b**) shows two dominant scopes throughout the examined period: Spain and EU. While the EU's share remains more or less constant around 30%, Spain's drops from 66.7% to 40%. This is compensated by the increasing importance of reported claims from other EU member countries, which may reflect the on-going debate on the CAP reform. The absence of claims with non-European (countries and EU) scopes reveals that coverage about this field focuses on what happens within Europe and neglects events happening in the rest of the world.

Table 4.5b Agriculture

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * CYEAR | 80 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 80 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first actor scope | EU | Count | 1 | 1 | 10 | 11 | 23 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 33,3% | 33,3% | 25,6% | 31,4% | 28,8% |
| | germany | Count | | | | 3 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 8,6% | 3,8% |
| | france | Count | | | | 3 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 8,6% | 3,8% |
| | uk | Count | | | | 2 | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 5,7% | 2,5% |
| | spain | Count | 2 | 2 | 27 | 14 | 45 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 66,7% | 66,7% | 69,2% | 40,0% | 56,3% |
| | netherlands | Count | | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,6% | 5,7% | 3,8% |
| | austria, finland, sweden | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,6% | | 1,3% |
| Total | Count | 3 | 3 | 39 | 35 | 80 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

The field of immigration shows a greater variety of actor scopes (**Table 4.5c**), although Spain is clearly the dominant one, and increasingly so (50%, 60.2% and 68.9% of all reported claims). This is probably due to growing immigration and the ensuing political debate. The increase in the percentages of Spanish claims in this policy area have run parallel with a decrease in the percentages of reported claims with non-European actor scopes.

Table 4.5c Immigration

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * CYEAR | 210 | 99,5% | 1 | ,5% | 211 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first actor scope | other supranational | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,1% | 1,1% | 1,0% |
| | EU | Count | 2 | | 2 | | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 12,5% | | 2,3% | | 1,9% |
| | other European supranational | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,1% | | ,5% |
| | bilateral | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 1,1% | ,5% |
| | germany | Count | 1 | | 4 | 3 | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | 4,5% | 3,3% | 3,8% |
| | france | Count | | | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,4% | 4,4% | 3,3% |
| | uk | Count | 1 | | | 3 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | | 3,3% | 1,9% |
| | italy | Count | | | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,4% | 1,1% | 1,9% |
| | spain | Count | 3 | 8 | 53 | 62 | 126 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 18,8% | 50,0% | 60,2% | 68,9% | 60,0% |
| | other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | | | 3 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,4% | | 1,4% |
| | austria, finland, sweden | Count | | | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,4% | 1,1% | 1,9% |
| | Switzerland | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,1% | | ,5% |
| | upcoming enlargement countries | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,3% | | 1,0% |
| | other european countries ex CIS | Count | 2 | 1 | | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 12,5% | 6,3% | | | 1,4% |
| | russia | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | | | ,5% |
| | USA | Count | | 1 | 4 | 4 | 9 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 6,3% | 4,5% | 4,4% | 4,3% |
| | Middle East | Count | 1 | 1 | | 3 | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 6,3% | | 3,3% | 2,4% |
| | Rest of the world | Count | 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 25 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 31,3% | 31,3% | 9,1% | 7,8% | 11,9% |
| Total | | Count | 16 | 16 | 88 | 90 | 210 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

In the field of Troops deployment (**Table 4.5d**) there is a greater variety of scopes. The Middle East is the leading scope (21.2%) followed by Spain (18.2%).

Table 4.5d Troops deployment

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * CYEAR | 99 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 99 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first actor scope | supranational: UN | Count | | 1 | 5 | | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 6,7% | 15,6% | | 6,1% |
| | other supranational | Count | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 6,7% | 9,4% | 5,0% | 5,1% |
| EU | Count | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 6 |
| | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | 6,3% | 10,0% | | 6,1% |
| multilateral | Count | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 3,1% | | | 1,0% |
| germany | Count | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | | | | | 1,0% |
| france | Count | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | | 3,1% | 5,0% | | 3,0% |
| uk | Count | 1 | | 1 | 3 | | 5 |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | | 3,1% | 15,0% | | 5,1% |
| italy | Count | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | 5,0% | | 1,0% |
| spain | Count | 9 | 2 | 1 | 6 | | 18 |
| | % within CYEAR | 28,1% | 13,3% | 3,1% | 30,0% | | 18,2% |
| upcoming enlargement countries | Count | 3 | | | | | 3 |
| | % within CYEAR | 9,4% | | | | | 3,0% |
| other european countries ex CIS | Count | | 3 | | | | 3 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 20,0% | | | | 3,0% |
| turkey | Count | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 6,7% | | 5,0% | | 2,0% |
| russia | Count | 2 | | | | | 2 |
| | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | | | | 2,0% |
| USA | Count | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | 12 |
| | % within CYEAR | 15,6% | 26,7% | 6,3% | 5,0% | | 12,1% |
| Japan | Count | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | | | | | 1,0% |
| Middle East | Count | 6 | 1 | 14 | | | 21 |
| | % within CYEAR | 18,8% | 6,7% | 43,8% | | | 21,2% |
| Rest of the world | Count | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 9 |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | 13,3% | 6,3% | 20,0% | | 9,1% |
| Total | Count | 32 | 15 | 32 | 20 | | 99 |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | | 100,0% |

In contrast to the field of Troops deployment, the fields of Retirement and pension schemes and education show little variety of actor scopes. (Tables 4.5e and 4.5f). Spain is the dominant scope in both fields throughout the period.

Table 4.5e Retirement and pension schemes

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * CYEAR | 77 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 77 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first actor scope | other supranational | Count | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 5,3% | | | 1,3% |
| | EU | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 5,4% | | 2,6% |
| | germany | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,7% | | 1,3% |
| | france | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,7% | | 1,3% |
| | spain | Count | 2 | 16 | 31 | 17 | 66 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 84,2% | 83,8% | 89,5% | 85,7% |
| | russia | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,7% | | 1,3% |
| | USA | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,7% | | 1,3% |
| | Rest of the world | Count | | 2 | | 2 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 10,5% | | 10,5% | 5,2% |
| Total | Count | 2 | 19 | 37 | 19 | 77 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 4.5f Education

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * CYEAR | 73 | 98,6% | 1 | 1,4% | 74 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first actor scope | germany | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 2,7% | 1,4% |
| | france | Count | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 25,0% | | | 1,4% |
| | uk | Count | | | 4 | | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 15,4% | | 5,5% |
| | spain | Count | 6 | 2 | 19 | 31 | 58 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 50,0% | 73,1% | 83,8% | 79,5% |
| | other european countries ex CIS | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,8% | | 1,4% |
| | USA | Count | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 25,0% | 3,8% | 10,8% | 8,2% |
| | Rest of the world | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,8% | 2,7% | 2,7% |
| | Total | Count | 6 | 4 | 26 | 37 | 73 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 4.5g displays the distribution of reported claims by actor scope in the field of European Integration. This field shows no dominant actor scope: While 32.4% of the reported claims have EU scope actors and 31.3% have Spanish actors, the remaining claims are distributed among a long list of actor scopes, such as Germany, France, Austria, Finland, Sweden, and upcoming enlargement countries. Claims with non-European scopes (supranational, Russia, USA, Rest of the world) only represent 5.6% of all claims on this issue. While from 1990 to 2002 reported

claims made by Spain scope actors and EU scope actors raise, those by German, French, and UK scope actors decrease.

Table 4.5g European integration

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first actor scope * CYEAR | 358 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 358 | 100,0% |

recoded first actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first actor scope | other supranational | Count | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,6% | | 1,0% | ,6% |
| | EU | Count | 12 | 10 | 56 | 38 | 116 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 29,3% | 35,7% | 29,3% | 38,8% | 32,4% |
| | other European supranational | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | | ,3% |
| | multilateral | Count | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 2,4% | | ,5% | | ,6% |
| | germany | Count | 5 | 2 | 18 | 6 | 31 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 12,2% | 7,1% | 9,4% | 6,1% | 8,7% |
| | france | Count | 4 | 1 | 17 | 6 | 28 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 9,8% | 3,6% | 8,9% | 6,1% | 7,8% |
| | uk | Count | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 2,4% | | 1,6% | 1,0% | 1,4% |
| | italy | Count | | | | 3 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 3,1% | ,8% |
| | spain | Count | 11 | 11 | 59 | 31 | 112 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 26,8% | 39,3% | 30,9% | 31,6% | 31,3% |
| | netherlands | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 1,0% | ,3% |
| | other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | 1 | | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 2,4% | | 1,0% | 4,1% | 2,0% |
| | austria, finland, sweden | Count | 1 | | 23 | 2 | 26 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 2,4% | | 12,0% | 2,0% | 7,3% |
| | upcoming enlargement countries | Count | | 1 | | 2 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,6% | | 2,0% | ,8% |
| | other european countries ex CIS | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | | ,6% |
| | turkey | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 2,4% | | | | ,3% |
| | russia | Count | 2 | | 6 | | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 4,9% | | 3,1% | | 2,2% |
| | USA | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 4,9% | 3,6% | 1,6% | | 1,7% |
| | Rest of the world | Count | | 1 | | 3 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,6% | | 3,1% | 1,1% |
| Total | | Count | 41 | 28 | 191 | 98 | 358 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

► **Action Forms**

This section examines the reported action forms for the sample of claims. **Table 5.1a** includes different action categories in the seven issue fields. The predominant form is “non-specified statements”. The second most frequent category is “other verbal statements” (14.6% of total claims), followed by “meetings” (12.2%), “political decisions” (9.9%), “executive actions” (5.9%), “protest actions” (1.9%), and, finally, judicial actions (0.8%). Political decisions are more frequent in monetary politics and retirement and pension schemes than in the entire range

of policies taken as a whole (13.2% and 22.2%, respectively, versus 9.9%). Reported claims in monetary politics, agriculture and immigration, especially, are more often in the form of “executive actions” than are those in the full range of policies (6.4%, 6.4%, and 13.5% respectively versus 5.9%). “Judicial actions” are concentrated in education, immigration and retirement and pension schemes (3.2%, 1.5%, 1.4% respectively). “Non-specified statements” are most frequent in reported claims about Troops deployment (61.8%), followed closely by education (61.3%). “Meetings” are a significant form of action for claims on European integration, agriculture and retirement and pension schemes (17.8%, 15.4%, 15.3%), which may reflect the role of negotiation between various actors in these. Finally, “protest actions” are found most often in the fields of agriculture (5.1% of actions), immigration and troops deployment (4.5% in both).

Table 5.1 a Forms of action by issue field

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| summary of form1 * ISFIELD1 | 1041 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1041 | 100,0% |

summary of form1 * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | |
| summary of form1 | political decision | Count | 29 | 5 | 14 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 30 | 103 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 13,2% | 6,4% | 7,0% | 6,7% | 22,2% | 4,8% | 9,4% | 9,9% |
| | executive action | Count | 14 | 5 | 27 | 5 | 2 | | 8 | 61 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 6,4% | 6,4% | 13,5% | 5,6% | 2,8% | | 2,5% | 5,9% |
| | judicial action | Count | | | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 1,5% | | 1,4% | 3,2% | ,6% | ,8% |
| | non-specified statement | Count | 123 | 45 | 116 | 55 | 30 | 38 | 163 | 570 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 55,9% | 57,7% | 58,0% | 61,8% | 41,7% | 61,3% | 50,9% | 54,8% |
| | other verbal statement | Count | 34 | 7 | 14 | 16 | 12 | 10 | 59 | 152 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 15,5% | 9,0% | 7,0% | 18,0% | 16,7% | 16,1% | 18,4% | 14,6% |
| | meeting | Count | 20 | 12 | 17 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 57 | 127 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 9,1% | 15,4% | 8,5% | 3,4% | 15,3% | 11,3% | 17,8% | 12,2% |
| | protest action | Count | | 4 | 9 | 4 | | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | 5,1% | 4,5% | 4,5% | | 3,2% | ,3% | 1,9% |
| Total | | Count | 220 | 78 | 200 | 89 | 72 | 62 | 320 | 1041 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 5.1b provides information on the strategies used by different types of actors. As one would expect, political, executive, and judicial actions are most frequent among state and party actors. Non-specified statements are most frequent amongst economic interest groups (70.5%, compared to 54.8% in all fields taken together), and other verbal statements amongst other civil society actors (25.9%, compared to 14.6% in all fields taken together). Meetings are most frequent in reported claims by state and party actors, while protest actions are most frequent in

reported claims by other civil society actors (16.7%), and general/unknown/ unspecified actors (10.2%).

Table 5.1b Forms of action by broad actor categories

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| summary of form1 * summary of act1s | 1041 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1041 | 100,0% |

summary of form1 * summary of act1s Crosstabulation

| | | | summary of act1s | | | | Total |
|------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| | | | state and party actors | economic interest groups | other civil society actors | general/unknown/unspecified | |
| summary of form1 | political decision | Count | 96 | 1 | | 6 | 103 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 11,3% | 1,1% | | 12,2% | 9,9% |
| | executive action | Count | 55 | | | 6 | 61 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 6,5% | | | 12,2% | 5,9% |
| | judicial action | Count | 8 | | | | 8 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | ,9% | | | | ,8% |
| | non-specified statement | Count | 451 | 62 | 30 | 27 | 570 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 53,1% | 70,5% | 55,6% | 55,1% | 54,8% |
| | other verbal statement | Count | 119 | 16 | 14 | 3 | 152 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 14,0% | 18,2% | 25,9% | 6,1% | 14,6% |
| | meeting | Count | 119 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 127 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 14,0% | 5,7% | 1,9% | 4,1% | 12,2% |
| | protest action | Count | 2 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 20 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | ,2% | 4,5% | 16,7% | 10,2% | 1,9% |
| Total | | Count | 850 | 88 | 54 | 49 | 1041 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 5.1c displays the relation between forms of action and actor scopes. Except in the case of actors with other European supranational scope, the most frequent form of action is non-specified statements. Claims by EU scope actors tend to take the form of non-specified statements (44%), followed by “other verbal statements” (19.1%), “political decisions” (16.4%), and “meetings” (14.2%). Local actors are the ones about which a higher percentage of claims in the form of protest are reported (12.5%).

Table 5.1c Forms of action by actor scope**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ACTSCOP1 * summary of form1 | 1041 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1041 | 100,0% |

ACTSCOP1 * summary of form1 Crosstabulation

| | | summary of form1 | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------|----------------|-------|--------|
| | | political decision | executive action | judicial action | non-specified statement | other verbal statement | meeting | protest action | | |
| ACTSCOP | supranational: | Count | | 1 | | 3 | 2 | | | 6 |
| | United Nations | % within ACTSCO | | 16,7% | | 50,0% | 33,3% | | | 100,0% |
| | other supranation | Count | 2 | | | 7 | 2 | 1 | | 12 |
| | | % within ACTSCO | 16,7% | | | 58,3% | 16,7% | 8,3% | | 100,0% |
| | European Union | Count | 37 | 14 | | 99 | 43 | 32 | | 225 |
| | | % within ACTSCO | 16,4% | 6,2% | | 44,0% | 19,1% | 14,2% | | 100,0% |
| | other European supranational | Count | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| | | % within ACTSCO | 50,0% | | 50,0% | | | | | 100,0% |
| | multilateral | Count | | | | 3 | 2 | | | 5 |
| | | % within ACTSCO | | | | 60,0% | 40,0% | | | 100,0% |
| | bilateral | Count | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within ACTSCO | | | | 100,0% | | | | 100,0% |
| | national | Count | 57 | 44 | 5 | 404 | 90 | 85 | 18 | 703 |
| | | % within ACTSCO | 8,1% | 6,3% | ,7% | 57,5% | 12,8% | 12,1% | 2,6% | 100,0% |
| | regional | Count | 5 | 1 | 1 | 45 | 13 | 9 | 1 | 75 |
| | | % within ACTSCO | 6,7% | 1,3% | 1,3% | 60,0% | 17,3% | 12,0% | 1,3% | 100,0% |
| | local | Count | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | | | 1 | 8 |
| | | % within ACTSCO | 12,5% | 12,5% | 12,5% | 50,0% | | | 12,5% | 100,0% |
| | unclassifiable | Count | | | | 4 | | | | 4 |
| | | % within ACTSCO | | | | 100,0% | | | | 100,0% |
| Total | Count | | 103 | 61 | 8 | 570 | 152 | 127 | 20 | 1041 |
| | % within ACTSCO | | 9,9% | 5,9% | ,8% | 54,8% | 14,6% | 12,2% | 1,9% | 100,0% |

► Indirect object actors

Just as important as the content of a claim itself are the actors that are addressed by the claimants. **Table 6.1** displays the types of indirect object actors (addressees, supported actors and opponent actors), and the number of claims with no indirect object actors: 68% of the full sample's claims. Education is the issue field where indirect object actors appear most often (51.4% of its claims) followed by Agriculture (43.7%). The field whose claims include the lowest percentage of claims is Troops deployment (27.7%), followed by European Integration (28.2%), and Monetary politics (28.5%). Opponents are most frequent in the fields of Education, Immigration, and Agriculture, which tells about the high level of conflict in these policy areas. Agriculture and Education are the issue fields whose claims include the highest percent of supported actors, and also of calls for actors to take actions (the strict category "addressee").

Table 6.1 Presence of addressee by issue field

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| IOPRES * ISFIE | 1134 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1134 | 100,0% |

IOPRES * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | |
| IOPRES no indirect object | Count | | 168 | 45 | 144 | 72 | 49 | 36 | 257 | 771 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | 71,5% | 56,3% | 68,2% | 72,7% | 63,6% | 48,6% | 71,8% | 68,0% |
| addressee | Count | | 22 | 11 | 21 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 29 | 108 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | 9,4% | 13,8% | 10,0% | 6,1% | 11,7% | 13,5% | 8,1% | 9,5% |
| supported actor | Count | | 23 | 12 | 12 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 33 | 105 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | 9,8% | 15,0% | 5,7% | 7,1% | 11,7% | 12,2% | 9,2% | 9,3% |
| opponent | Count | | 22 | 12 | 34 | 14 | 10 | 19 | 39 | 150 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | 9,4% | 15,0% | 16,1% | 14,1% | 13,0% | 25,7% | 10,9% | 13,2% |
| Total | Count | | 235 | 80 | 211 | 99 | 77 | 74 | 358 | 1134 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 6.2a reports about indirect object actors in each of the seven issue fields. Ninety-one percent of addressees are state and party actors; this share is even higher in the case of European Integration (97.0%). In Troops deployment, monetary politics and immigration the addressees are also state and party actors in more than 90% of the cases. The policy fields in which reported claims include more indirect object actors representing civil society are education, followed by retirement and pension schemes, precisely those fields that are most “national” in terms of actors and issues. Also, education, immigration and European Integration are the fields in which claims include political parties most often as indirect object actors.

Table 6.2a Addressees by issue field

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| main indirect object actor: addressee>supported>opponent * ISFIELD1 | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |
| summary of ios * ISFIELD1 | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |

main indirect object actor: addressee>supported>opponent * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | |
| main indirect object addressee>supported>opponent | politicians | Count | | 1 | | | 2 | | 6 | 9 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | 2,9% | | | 7,1% | | 5,9% | 2,5% |
| former states(wo)member states | Count | | | | | | | | 2 | 2 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | | 2,0% | ,6% |
| government/executive organizations | Count | 26 | 29 | 48 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 67 | 224 | 224 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 38,8% | 82,9% | 71,6% | 74,1% | 57,1% | 47,4% | 66,3% | 61,7% | 61,7% |
| legislative | Count | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,5% | | 1,5% | | 3,6% | 5,3% | 5,0% | 2,8% | 2,8% |
| judiciary | Count | | | 1 | | | | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 1,5% | | | | 2,0% | ,8% | ,8% |
| police and internal security agencies | Count | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 1,5% | | | | | | ,3% |
| military | Count | | | | 5 | | | | | 5 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 18,5% | | | | | 1,4% |
| central banks | Count | 33 | | | | 1 | | | 34 | 34 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 49,3% | | | | 3,6% | | | 9,4% | 9,4% |
| social security executive organizations | Count | | | | | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | | 7,1% | | 1,0% | ,8% | ,8% |
| political parties | Count | 2 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 38 | 38 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 3,0% | 2,9% | 14,9% | 3,7% | 3,6% | 21,1% | 14,9% | 10,5% | 10,5% |
| unions and employee organizations | Count | | | | | 5 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 10 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | | 17,9% | 5,3% | 3,0% | 2,8% | 2,8% |
| employers organizations and firms | Count | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | 6 | 6 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 3,0% | 2,9% | 1,5% | | | 5,3% | | 1,7% | 1,7% |
| churches and religious organizations and groups | Count | | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | | 5 | 5 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | 2,9% | 1,5% | | | 7,9% | | 1,4% | 1,4% |
| media and journalists | Count | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,5% | | | | | | | ,3% | ,3% |
| farmers and agricultural organizations | Count | | 2 | | | | | | 2 | 2 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | 5,7% | | | | | | ,6% | ,6% |
| educational professionals and organizations' | Count | | | | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | | | 5,3% | | ,6% | ,6% |
| economists and financial experts | Count | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,5% | | | | | | | ,3% | ,3% |
| migrant organizations and groups | Count | | | 3 | | | 1 | | 4 | 4 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 4,5% | | | 2,6% | | 1,1% | 1,1% |
| pro- and anti-European campaign organizations | Count | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,5% | | | | | | | ,3% | ,3% |
| solidarity and human rights organizations | Count | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 1,5% | | | | | ,3% | ,3% |
| terrorist groups | Count | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 3,7% | | | | ,3% | ,3% |
| Total | Count | 67 | 35 | 67 | 27 | 28 | 38 | 101 | 363 | 363 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

summary of ios * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | |
| summary of ios | state and party actors | Count | 62 | 31 | 61 | 26 | 23 | 28 | 98 | 329 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 92,5% | 88,6% | 91,0% | 96,3% | 82,1% | 73,7% | 97,0% | 90,6% |
| economic interest groups | Count | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 19 | 19 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 4,5% | 8,6% | 1,5% | | 17,9% | 10,5% | 3,0% | 5,2% | 5,2% |
| media and journalists | Count | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,5% | | | | | | | ,3% | ,3% |
| other civil society actors | Count | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | | 6 | | 14 | 14 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 1,5% | 2,9% | 7,5% | 3,7% | | 15,8% | | 3,9% | 3,9% |
| Total | Count | 67 | 35 | 67 | 27 | 28 | 38 | 101 | 363 | 363 |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 6.2b reports changes between 1990 and 2002 in the distribution of claims by indirect object actors. The weight of state and party actors rises to 93.6% of addressees, while that for the other main three categories declines.

Table 6.2b Addressees by year

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| main indirect object actor: addressee>supported>opponent * CYEAR | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |
| summary of ios * CYEAR | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |

main indirect object actor: addressee>supported>opponent * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---|---|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| main indirect object actor: addressee>supported>opponent | politicians | Count | 1 | | 7 | 1 | 9 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | | 3,4% | 1,1% | 2,5% |
| | former states(wo)men | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | | ,6% |
| | government/executive | Count | 22 | 18 | 121 | 63 | 224 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 68,8% | 58,1% | 58,7% | 67,0% | 61,7% |
| | legislative | Count | | 1 | 5 | 4 | 10 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,2% | 2,4% | 4,3% | 2,8% |
| | judiciary | Count | | | 3 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,5% | | ,8% |
| | police and internal security agencies | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | | ,3% |
| | military | Count | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | 3,2% | 1,5% | | 1,4% |
| | central banks | Count | 1 | 4 | 26 | 3 | 34 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | 12,9% | 12,6% | 3,2% | 9,4% |
| | social security executive organizations | Count | | | 3 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,5% | | ,8% |
| | political parties | Count | 2 | 5 | 14 | 17 | 38 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 16,1% | 6,8% | 18,1% | 10,5% |
| | unions and employees | Count | 1 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 10 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | 6,5% | 2,9% | 1,1% | 2,8% |
| | employers organizations and firms | Count | 1 | | 5 | | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | | 2,4% | | 1,7% |
| | churches and religious organizations and groups | Count | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | 1,0% | 1,1% | 1,4% |
| | media and journalists | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 1,1% | ,3% |
| | farmers and agricultural organizations | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | | ,6% |
| educational professionals and organizations' | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | 1,1% | ,6% | |
| economists and financial experts | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | | ,3% | |
| migrant organizations and groups | Count | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 4 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | | 1,0% | 1,1% | 1,1% | |
| pro- and anti-European campaign organizations | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | | ,3% | |
| solidarity and human rights organizations | Count | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | 1,1% | ,3% | |
| terrorist groups | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | | ,3% | |
| Total | Count | 32 | 31 | 206 | 94 | 363 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

summary of ios * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| summary of ios | state and party actors | Count | 27 | 29 | 185 | 88 | 329 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 84,4% | 93,5% | 89,8% | 93,6% | 90,6% |
| | economic interest groups | Count | 2 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 19 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 6,5% | 6,8% | 1,1% | 5,2% |
| | media and journalists | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 1,1% | ,3% |
| | other civil society actors | Count | 3 | | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 9,4% | | 3,4% | 4,3% | 3,9% |
| Total | Count | 32 | 31 | 206 | 94 | 363 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 6.3a reports on how indirect object actors are evaluated. The average evaluation of the government, addressed in 224 cases, is negative (-0.2634), better, however, than those of the military, and churches and religious groups (-0.6 each), and employers organizations and firms (-0.66). By way of contrast, politicians receive relatively positive evaluations (0.44). On the whole, the evaluation of addressees is negative (-0.19). The largest standard deviation of evaluations corresponds to economic interest groups (0.946), while the smallest corresponds to executive actors (0.8819).

Table 6.3a Mean evaluation by category of addressees

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Included | | Excluded | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| evaluation of main indirect object actor * main indirect object actor: addressee>supported>opponent | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |
| evaluation of main indirect object actor * summary of ios | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |

evaluation of main indirect object actor * main indirect object actor: addressee>supported>opponent

evaluation of main indirect object actor

| main indirect object actor: | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|--|---------|-----|----------------|
| politicians | ,4444 | 9 | ,88192 |
| former states(wo)men | ,0000 | 2 | 1,41421 |
| government/executive | -,2634 | 224 | ,88196 |
| legislative | ,1000 | 10 | ,87560 |
| judiciary | -,3333 | 3 | ,57735 |
| police and internal security agencies | ,0000 | 1 | , |
| military | -,6000 | 5 | ,54772 |
| central banks | ,0000 | 34 | ,95346 |
| social security executive organizations | ,3333 | 3 | 1,15470 |
| political parties | -,0526 | 38 | ,98495 |
| unions and employees | ,0000 | 10 | 1,05409 |
| employers organizations and firms | -,6667 | 6 | ,81650 |
| churches and religious organizations and groups | -,6000 | 5 | ,89443 |
| media and journalists | 1,0000 | 1 | , |
| farmers and agricultural organizations | -1,0000 | 2 | ,00000 |
| educational professionals and organizations' | ,5000 | 2 | ,70711 |
| economists and financial experts | ,0000 | 1 | , |
| migrant organizations and groups | ,0000 | 4 | 1,15470 |
| pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups | -1,0000 | 1 | , |
| solidarity and human rights organizations | -1,0000 | 1 | , |
| terrorist groups | -1,0000 | 1 | , |
| Total | -,1901 | 363 | ,90713 |

evaluation of main indirect object actor * summary of ios

evaluation of main indirect object actor

| summary of ios | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|----------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| state and party actors | -,1793 | 329 | ,90463 |
| economic interest groups | -,3158 | 19 | ,94591 |
| media and journalists | 1,0000 | 1 | , |
| other civil society actors | -,3571 | 14 | ,92878 |
| Total | -,1901 | 363 | ,90713 |

The examination of addressees by geographical scope (**Table 6.3b**) reveals that UK indirect object actors receive on the average negative evaluations (-0.555). Other indirect object actors that also receive negative evaluations are those from Spain (-0.316), the Middle East, Russia, and Germany. In contrast, US, French, Austrian, Finnish, and Swedish indirect object actors receive positive evaluations. The average evaluation for EU indirect object actors is positive (0.0460) although there is significant variation across claims (SD=0.901).

Table 6.3b Mean evaluation by broad addressee scope

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|--|----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Included | | Excluded | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| evaluation of main indirect object actor * recoded main indirect object actor scope | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |

Report

evaluation of main indirect object actor

| recoded main indirect | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|---------------------------------|---------|-----|----------------|
| supranational: UN | -1,0000 | 3 | ,00000 |
| other supranational | -,4000 | 5 | ,89443 |
| EU | ,0460 | 87 | ,90101 |
| other European supranational | -1,0000 | 1 | , |
| multilateral | -,6000 | 5 | ,89443 |
| germany | -,1250 | 24 | ,99181 |
| france | ,3750 | 16 | ,88506 |
| uk | -,5556 | 18 | ,78382 |
| italy | -1,0000 | 2 | ,00000 |
| spain | -,3165 | 158 | ,87491 |
| netherlands | 1,0000 | 1 | , |
| other pre-1995 EU-members | 1,0000 | 1 | , |
| austria, finland, sweden | ,1667 | 6 | ,98319 |
| other european countries ex CIS | -1,0000 | 6 | ,00000 |
| turkey | ,0000 | 1 | , |
| russia | -,2000 | 5 | 1,09545 |
| USA | ,6000 | 5 | ,89443 |
| Middle East | -,2857 | 7 | ,95119 |
| Rest of the world | -,1667 | 12 | ,83485 |
| Total | -,1901 | 363 | ,90713 |

Table 6.4a relates addressees to issue fields. Forty-four percent of the claims with at least an addressee had a Spanish scope. By issue field, the highest percentages of claims whose addressee had a Spanish scope correspond to the areas of Education (82%), Retirement and pension schemes (75%), Immigration (62%) and Agriculture (51%). In monetary politics the addressee's main scopes are the EU (51%). In European Integration the EU is also the dominant scope (35.6%) and Spain the second (28%). In the field of Troops deployment one finds a greater diversity of addressees by geographical scope. In particular, 26% are from the Middle East.

Table 6.4a Addressee scope by issue field

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded main indirect object actor scope * ISFIELD1 | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |

recoded main indirect object actor scope * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------------|------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | |
| recoded main indirect object actor scope | supranational: UN | Count | | | | 3 | | | 3 |
| | | % within ISFIELD | | | | 11,1% | | | ,8% |
| other supranational | Count | | | 1 | 3 | 1 | | | 5 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | 1,5% | 11,1% | 3,6% | | | 1,4% |
| EU | Count | 34 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 36 | 87 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 50,7% | 34,3% | 1,5% | 7,4% | 7,1% | | 35,6% | 24,0% |
| other European supranational | Count | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | | | 1,0% | ,3% |
| multilateral | Count | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | | | 5 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 1,5% | | 3,0% | 7,4% | | | | 1,4% |
| germany | Count | 6 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 13 | 24 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 9,0% | 2,9% | 3,0% | | 3,6% | 2,6% | 12,9% | 6,6% |
| france | Count | | | 5 | 1 | 1 | | 9 | 16 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | 7,5% | 3,7% | 3,6% | | 8,9% | 4,4% |
| uk | Count | 7 | 2 | | 1 | | 3 | 5 | 18 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 10,4% | 5,7% | | 3,7% | | 7,9% | 5,0% | 5,0% |
| italy | Count | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 1,5% | | 1,5% | | | | | ,6% |
| spain | Count | 15 | 18 | 43 | 2 | 21 | 31 | 28 | 158 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 22,4% | 51,4% | 64,2% | 7,4% | 75,0% | 81,6% | 27,7% | 43,5% |
| netherlands | Count | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | 2,9% | | | | | | ,3% |
| other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 1,5% | | | | | | | ,3% |
| austria, finland, swe | Count | 1 | | 1 | | | | 4 | 6 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 1,5% | | 1,5% | | | | 4,0% | 1,7% |
| other european countries ex CIS | Count | | | 3 | 2 | | 1 | | 6 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | 4,5% | 7,4% | | 2,6% | | 1,7% |
| turkey | Count | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | | | 1,0% | ,3% |
| russia | Count | | | | 1 | | | 4 | 5 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | 3,7% | | | 4,0% | 1,4% |
| USA | Count | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 5 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | 1,5% | 7,4% | 3,6% | 2,6% | | 1,4% |
| Middle East | Count | | | | 7 | | | | 7 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | 25,9% | | | | 1,9% |
| Rest of the world | Count | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 12 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 1,5% | 2,9% | 10,4% | 3,7% | 3,6% | 2,6% | | 3,3% |
| Total | Count | 67 | 35 | 67 | 27 | 28 | 38 | 101 | 363 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Trends in the addressees' scopes are reported in **Table 6.4b**. The percentage of claims containing at least an addressee whose first addressee has an EU scope increases during the period, moving from 9% in 1990 to 27% in 2002. There is thus a process of bottom-up Europeanization of the Spanish public sphere. The percentages of claims with a Spanish addressee also increase, but not as spectacularly as do those for claims with an EU addressee (they move from 47% of all claims with at least one addressee in 1990 to 51% in 2002). Meanwhile, the percentages of claims whose addressees are supranational, EU member countries' (except Italy), "other European countries", or Russian actors decline throughout the period considered here.

Table 6.4b Addressee scope by year

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded main indirect object actor scope * CYEAR | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |

recoded main indirect object actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded main indirect object actor scope | supranational: UN | Count | | 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,2% | 1,0% | | ,8% |
| | other supranational | Count | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | 6,5% | ,5% | 1,1% | 1,4% |
| | EU | Count | 3 | 2 | 57 | 25 | 87 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 9,4% | 6,5% | 27,7% | 26,6% | 24,0% |
| | other European supranational | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | | ,3% |
| | multilateral | Count | | 1 | 4 | | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,2% | 1,9% | | 1,4% |
| | germany | Count | 5 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 24 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 15,6% | 6,5% | 5,8% | 5,3% | 6,6% |
| | france | Count | | 3 | 12 | 1 | 16 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 9,7% | 5,8% | 1,1% | 4,4% |
| | uk | Count | | 2 | 11 | 5 | 18 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 6,5% | 5,3% | 5,3% | 5,0% |
| | italy | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | 1,1% | ,6% |
| | spain | Count | 15 | 14 | 81 | 48 | 158 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 46,9% | 45,2% | 39,3% | 51,1% | 43,5% |
| | netherlands | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | | ,3% |
| | other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | | ,3% |
| | austria, finland, sweden | Count | | | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,4% | 1,1% | 1,7% |
| | other european countries ex CIS | Count | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 9,4% | 6,5% | ,5% | | 1,7% |
| | turkey | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,5% | | ,3% |
| russia | Count | 2 | | 3 | | 5 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | 1,5% | | 1,4% | |
| USA | Count | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | 3,2% | ,5% | 2,1% | 1,4% | |
| Middle East | Count | | | 7 | | 7 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 3,4% | | 1,9% | |
| Rest of the world | Count | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 12 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 3,2% | 1,9% | 5,3% | 3,3% | |
| Total | Count | 32 | 31 | 206 | 94 | 363 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 6.4c displays the addressees' scopes for each kind of addressee. Regardless of the type of addressee, claims generally refer to addressees with a Spanish scope. The most frequent kind of addressee are state and party actors. Addressees of this type tend to be either Spanish or from other EU member states (26%). The same applies to claims whose addressee is an economic interest group (16%). Meanwhile, when addressees are members of civil society they are British more often than when they belong to other type of social group.

Table 6.4c Addressee scope by broad addressee category

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded main indirect object actor scope * summary of ios | 363 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 363 | 100,0% |

recoded main indirect object actor scope * summary of ios Crosstabulation

| | | | summary of ios | | | | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|
| | | | state and party actors | economic interest groups | media and journalists | other civil society actors | |
| recoded main indirect object actor scope | supranational: UN | Count | 3 | | | | 3 |
| | | % within summary of ios | ,9% | | | | ,8% |
| | other supranational | Count | 4 | | | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within summary of ios | 1,2% | | | 7,1% | 1,4% |
| | EU | Count | 84 | 3 | | | 87 |
| | | % within summary of ios | 25,5% | 15,8% | | | 24,0% |
| | other European supranational | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within summary of ios | ,3% | | | | ,3% |
| | multilateral | Count | 4 | | | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within summary of ios | 1,2% | | | 7,1% | 1,4% |
| | germany | Count | 23 | 1 | | | 24 |
| | | % within summary of ios | 7,0% | 5,3% | | | 6,6% |
| | france | Count | 15 | 1 | | | 16 |
| | | % within summary of ios | 4,6% | 5,3% | | | 4,4% |
| | uk | Count | 16 | | | 2 | 18 |
| | | % within summary of ios | 4,9% | | | 14,3% | 5,0% |
| | italy | Count | 2 | | | | 2 |
| | | % within summary of ios | ,6% | | | | ,6% |
| | spain | Count | 138 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 158 |
| | | % within summary of ios | 41,9% | 68,4% | 100,0% | 42,9% | 43,5% |
| | netherlands | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within summary of ios | ,3% | | | | ,3% |
| | other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within summary of ios | ,3% | | | | ,3% |
| | austria, finland, sweden | Count | 6 | | | | 6 |
| | | % within summary of ios | 1,8% | | | | 1,7% |
| | other european countries ex CIS | Count | 4 | 1 | | 1 | 6 |
| | | % within summary of ios | 1,2% | 5,3% | | 7,1% | 1,7% |
| | turkey | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within summary of ios | ,3% | | | | ,3% |
| russia | Count | 5 | | | | 5 | |
| | % within summary of ios | 1,5% | | | | 1,4% | |
| USA | Count | 4 | | | 1 | 5 | |
| | % within summary of ios | 1,2% | | | 7,1% | 1,4% | |
| Middle East | Count | 6 | | | 1 | 7 | |
| | % within summary of ios | 1,8% | | | 7,1% | 1,9% | |
| Rest of the world | Count | 11 | | | 1 | 12 | |
| | % within summary of ios | 3,3% | | | 7,1% | 3,3% | |
| Total | Count | 329 | 19 | 1 | 14 | 363 | |
| | % within summary of ios | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

► Issues

This section reports on the features of each issue field. **Table 7.1** provides information about the distribution of claims by issue field and about their evolution. The leading issue field is European Integration (32%), followed by Monetary Politics (21%), Immigration (19%), Troops

deployment (9%), Agriculture (7%), Retirement and pension schemes (7%), and finally Education (6%). In 1990 the field with the most claims was Troops deployment because of the impact of the First Persian Gulf war. This field's share of claims, however, decreases throughout the entire period. Meanwhile, claims in the field of agriculture rise from only 3% of the 1990 claims to 10% of the 2002 claims. Claims about Monetary politics reach a peak in 1995 (38% of this year's claims), but then decline to 17% in 2002. The share of claims falling under Immigration issues rise continuously from 1995 to 2002, when this field ranks two among all fields in terms of the percentage of claims. The percentage of Retirement and pension scheme claims peaks in 1995, which coincides with the signing of an agreement on pensions by the main Spanish political actors (the pact will be called Pacto de Toledo). The number of claims in the field of Education fluctuate more than in other fields, peaking in 2002, during the parliamentary debates on education reform. Finally, the percentages of claims about the European integration process tend to become smaller between 1990 and 2002 (from 35% in 1990 to 27% in 2002), just as the percentages of claims about immigration increase.

Table 7.1 Policy field by year

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISFIELD1 * CYEAR | 1134 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1134 | 100,0% |

| ISFIELD1 * CYEAR Crosstabulation | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| ISFIELD1 | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Count | 16 | 53 | 103 | 63 | 235 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 13,8% | 38,4% | 19,9% | 17,4% | 20,7% |
| | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Count | 3 | 3 | 39 | 35 | 80 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 2,6% | 2,2% | 7,5% | 9,7% | 7,1% |
| | Immigration: entry and exit | Count | 16 | 16 | 89 | 90 | 211 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 13,8% | 11,6% | 17,2% | 24,9% | 18,6% |
| | Troops deployment | Count | 32 | 15 | 32 | 20 | 99 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 27,6% | 10,9% | 6,2% | 5,5% | 8,7% |
| | Retirement and pension schemes | Count | 2 | 19 | 37 | 19 | 77 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 1,7% | 13,8% | 7,1% | 5,2% | 6,8% |
| | Education | Count | 6 | 4 | 27 | 37 | 74 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 5,2% | 2,9% | 5,2% | 10,2% | 6,5% |
| | European Integration | Count | 41 | 28 | 191 | 98 | 358 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 35,3% | 20,3% | 36,9% | 27,1% | 31,6% |
| Total | | Count | 116 | 138 | 518 | 362 | 1134 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 7.2a focuses on Monetary Politics. Four issues appear regularly in the coded claims: interest rate adjustments (36% of the total claims in the field of monetary politics), common currency (19%), exchange rate interventions (15%) and EMU convergence criteria and stability pact (14%). While the most important issue in 1990 was the common currency (37.5%),

followed by interest rates, the most important issues in 1995 were interest rates (45.3%), and claims about the EMU criteria (28.3%). In 2000 attention stills focuses on interest adjustments (42.7%), but also on exchange rate interventions (20.4%). The debate seems to diversify in 2002, with common currency as the most discussed issue (30.2%) but also with significant percentages of claims about EMU criteria (25.4%), interest rates (20.6%) and exchange rate interventions (15.9%).

Table 7.2a Monetary Politics

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISSUE1S * CYEAR | 235 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 235 | 100,0% |

ISSUE1S * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------|---|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| ISSUE1S | General Unspecific | Count | 1 | 1 | 17 | 3 | 22 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 1,9% | 16,5% | 4,8% | 9,4% |
| | Interest Rate Adjustments | Count | 4 | 24 | 44 | 13 | 85 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 25,0% | 45,3% | 42,7% | 20,6% | 36,2% |
| | EMU Convergence criteria and stability pact | Count | 1 | 15 | | 16 | 32 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 28,3% | | 25,4% | 13,6% |
| | EMS/ERM | Count | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 1,9% | | | ,4% |
| | Exchange rate intervention | Count | | 4 | 21 | 10 | 35 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 7,5% | 20,4% | 15,9% | 14,9% |
| | Independence Central Banks | Count | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 1,9% | 1,0% | | 1,3% |
| | Eurozone-outsiders: rel. with pre-ins (ERM2) & CC | Count | | | 5 | | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 4,9% | | 2,1% |
| | Common currency (ECU, EURO) | Count | 6 | 5 | 14 | 19 | 44 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 37,5% | 9,4% | 13,6% | 30,2% | 18,7% |
| | Other Specific | Count | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 18,8% | 3,8% | 1,0% | 1,6% | 3,0% |
| | General evaluation or policy direction | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 1,6% | ,4% |
| Total | | Count | 16 | 53 | 103 | 63 | 235 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 7.2b focuses on Agriculture. In both 1990 and 1995 there were only three claims, all on the system of subsidies, while in 2000 and 2002 there were 39 and 35. As mentioned earlier, this field still remains one with the least claims. In 2000 BSE is the most important issue (53.8% of all claims on the topic of Agriculture), followed by the reform of the system of subsidies (23.1%), and other diseases (17.9%).

Table 7.2b Agriculture

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISSUE1S * CYEAR | 80 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 80 | 100,0% |

ISSUE1S * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------|---|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| ISSUE1S | Reform of the system of subsidies | Count | 3 | | 9 | 23 | 35 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | | 23,1% | 65,7% | 43,8% |
| | subsidies and enlargement of the European Union | Count | | 2 | | 5 | 7 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 66,7% | | 14,3% | 8,8% |
| | subsidies and international trade | Count | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 33,3% | | | 1,3% |
| | BSE | Count | | | 21 | | 21 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 53,8% | | 26,3% |
| | other diseases | Count | | | 7 | | 7 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 17,9% | | 8,8% |
| | quotas for livestock and dairy production | Count | | | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 5,1% | 2,9% | 3,8% |
| | Other Specific | Count | | | | 6 | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 17,1% | 7,5% |
| Total | | Count | 3 | 3 | 39 | 35 | 80 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Claims on Immigration claims are among the most frequent ones (**Table 7.2c**). Claims in this field are spread out across various issues, but in general the most important one is expulsions/deportations (27%), followed by entry and border controls (16.6%), general evaluations or policy direction (14.7%), actions related to smuggling and illegal entries (12.3%), which appear only in 2000 and 2002, and migration quotas and programs (10.4%). Issues such as the institutional framework, visa and consular policy, specific issues, and the role of third parties in preventing migration represent less than 10% of the claims on Immigration. In sum, claims on immigration in Spanish newspapers focus more on events than on policy debates. Nevertheless, claims evaluating the direction of policy triple their weight between 1990 and 2002.

Table 7.2c Immigration

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISSUE1S * CYEAR | 211 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 211 | 100,0% |

ISSUE1S * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------|--|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| ISSUE1S | General evaluation or policy direction | Count | 1 | 2 | 11 | 17 | 31 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 12,5% | 12,4% | 18,9% | 14,7% |
| | institutional framework, responsibilities, procedures, costs | Count | | | 6 | 10 | 16 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 6,7% | 11,1% | 7,6% |
| | entry and border controls | Count | 4 | 3 | 12 | 16 | 35 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 25,0% | 18,8% | 13,5% | 17,8% | 16,6% |
| | expulsions/deportations | Count | 5 | 2 | 23 | 27 | 57 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 31,3% | 12,5% | 25,8% | 30,0% | 27,0% |
| | migration programs and quotas | Count | | | 16 | 6 | 22 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 18,0% | 6,7% | 10,4% |
| | role of third parties in preventing migration | Count | | | 4 | | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 4,5% | | 1,9% |
| | visa and consular policy | Count | 2 | 6 | | 4 | 12 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 12,5% | 37,5% | | 4,4% | 5,7% |
| | actions relating to smuggling and illegal | Count | | | 17 | 9 | 26 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 19,1% | 10,0% | 12,3% |
| | other specific issues | Count | 4 | 3 | | 1 | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 25,0% | 18,8% | | 1,1% | 3,8% |
| Total | Count | 16 | 16 | 89 | 90 | 211 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 7.2d displays the distribution of claims in the field of Troops deployment. This field weighs heavily in the total number of coded claims for 1990, with 32 claims, but then loses considerably in importance. Sixty-six percent of claims on Troops deployment in 1990 referred to the deployment of troops in covert aggressive operations against a hostile regime, in most cases that of Saddam Hussein. In year 2000 “peace-keeping operations” was the most frequent claim in this field (43.8%), followed by claims on operations for military invasions of foreign sovereign territory (40.6%). The latter is the most frequent issue in 2002 (45%), partly due to the Spanish-Morocco diplomatic and military incident regarding the Perejil Island, followed by operations for military aggression on foreign sovereign territory (20%).

Table 7.2d Troops deployment

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISSUE1S * CYEAR | 99 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 99 | 100,0% |

ISSUE1S * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|--|--|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| ISSUE1S | General unspecific reference to deployment of troops | Count | | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 6,7% | 3,1% | | 2,0% |
| | d.o.t for mil. aggression on foreign sovereign territory | Count | | 3 | | 4 | 7 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 20,0% | | 20,0% | 7,1% |
| | d.o.t for mil. invasion of foreign sovereign territory | Count | 4 | 1 | 13 | 9 | 27 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 12,5% | 6,7% | 40,6% | 45,0% | 27,3% |
| | d.o.t in covert aggr. operations vs hostile | Count | 21 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 31 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 65,6% | 33,3% | 6,3% | 15,0% | 31,3% |
| | d.o.t for peace-keeping | Count | | 2 | 14 | 2 | 18 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 13,3% | 43,8% | 10,0% | 18,2% |
| | d.o.t to rescue/protect civilians facing | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | 5,0% | 1,0% | |
| d.o.t in crisis, civil emergency, catastrophic | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 3,1% | | 1,0% | |
| d.o.t for non-military humanitarian purposes | Count | | 2 | 1 | | 3 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | 13,3% | 3,1% | | 3,0% | |
| d.o.t in the context of military alliances | Count | 6 | | | | 6 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 18,8% | | | | 6,1% | |
| other specific reference to deployment of troops | Count | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | 6,7% | | 5,0% | 3,0% | |
| Total | Count | 32 | 15 | 32 | 20 | 99 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 7.2e shows the distribution of claims in the field of Retirement and pension schemes. The most frequently mentioned subfield is the state pension scheme (35.1%), followed by private pension schemes (15.6%), and income levels in retirement (13%). The field of Retirement and pension schemes is the one with the least claims (77), and a considerable number of them correspond to 1995 (19), when important negotiations on the Spanish state pension scheme were undertaken. This is indeed the most frequent subfield in that year (42.1%), and also in 2002 (52.6%). Debate on income levels in retirement became an important sub-issue in 2000 and 2002 (21.6% and 10.5% respectively).

Table 7.2e Retirement and pension schemes

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISSUE1S * CYEAR | 77 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 77 | 100,0% |

ISSUE1S * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------|---|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| ISSUE1S | General | Count | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 15,8% | 5,4% | 5,3% | 7,8% |
| | Demographic changes: ageing population | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 5,4% | | 2,6% |
| | Retirement ages | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 50,0% | 5,3% | 5,4% | 5,3% | 6,5% |
| | Income levels in retirement, Poverty in | Count | | | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 21,6% | 10,5% | 13,0% |
| | State versus private pension schemes | Count | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 50,0% | 10,5% | 10,8% | 5,3% | 10,4% |
| | State pension scheme | Count | | 8 | 9 | 10 | 27 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 42,1% | 24,3% | 52,6% | 35,1% |
| | Private pension scheme | Count | | 4 | 7 | 1 | 12 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 21,1% | 18,9% | 5,3% | 15,6% |
| | Other / Specific | Count | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 5,3% | 8,1% | 15,8% | 9,1% |
| Total | Count | | 2 | 19 | 37 | 19 | 77 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 7.2f provides information on the distribution of claims across different topics in the field of education. Structural issues are the dominant topic (33.8%), followed by general unspecific references (13.5%), resource allocation and salaries (12.2%), other specific issues (12.2%) and curriculum (10.8%). Private education only appears as a source of claims in 2002. It represents, however, 10.8% of that year's total number of claims on education. Claims on problems at school are rather residual, as are those on scholarships and fees (2.7% each of total claims).

Table 7.2f Education

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISSUE1S * CYEAR | 74 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 74 | 100,0% |

ISSUE1S * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------|----------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| ISSUE1S | General unspecific | Count | 3 | | 5 | 2 | 10 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 50,0% | | 18,5% | 5,4% | 13,5% |
| | Structural issues | Count | | 2 | | 23 | 25 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 50,0% | | 62,2% | 33,8% |
| | Resource allocation and salaries | Count | 2 | | 4 | 3 | 9 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 33,3% | | 14,8% | 8,1% | 12,2% |
| | Private education | Count | | | | 4 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 10,8% | 5,4% |
| | Administrative power allocation | Count | | | 5 | | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 18,5% | | 6,8% |
| | Curriculum | Count | | | 8 | | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 29,6% | | 10,8% |
| | Scholarships and fees | Count | | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 25,0% | 3,7% | | 2,7% |
| | Problems at school | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,7% | 2,7% | 2,7% |
| | other specific issues | Count | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 16,7% | 25,0% | 11,1% | 10,8% | 12,2% |
| Total | Count | | 6 | 4 | 27 | 37 | 74 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

European Integration is the field that gathers the largest number of reported and coded claims (31.6%). **Table 7.2g** shows that there is no dominant sub-issue in this field, as the focus of debate changes from year to year. The topic for which one finds the greater percentage of claims is the one referring to the role of a specific country and the balance of power (19.3% of all claims in the field of European integration), followed closely by Enlargement (15.1%), institutional structure (13.4%) and the relationship between EU, national and regional levels (12.3%). The salience of the first topic above increases considerably from 1990 to 2000 (9.8% to 28.8% of each years' claims), only to become less relevant in 2002 (4.1%). Other issues that lose weight are the EU's associational agreements or treaties (4.9% in 1990; 2.0% in 2002), and Non-EU forms of European integration (19.5% in 1990, no claims in 2002). On the other hand, in the subfields "Enlargement" and "the relationship between the different levels and the future" one observes a significant increase in the number of claims over the years (from 2.4% in 1990 to 27.6% of 2002's in the former and from 4.9% in 1990 to 22.4% in 2002 in the latter). The only two other issues with more than 10% of claims on European integration in 2002 are "other specific EU integration issues" (12.2%), and "the institutional structure" (11.2%).

Table 7.2g European Integration

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISSUE1S * CYEAR | 358 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 358 | 100,0% |

ISSUE1S * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| ISSUE1S | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|--|----------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| General European integration, not specific | Count | | 7 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 24 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 17,1% | 14,3% | 3,1% | 7,1% | 6,7% |
| National vs. European Identity, shared values | Count | | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 5 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 2,4% | 3,6% | 1,6% | | 1,4% |
| Role of a specific country and balance of power in | Count | | 4 | 6 | 55 | 4 | 69 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 9,8% | 21,4% | 28,8% | 4,1% | 19,3% |
| Relationship EU - nat.®. levels / future | Count | | 2 | 1 | 19 | 22 | 44 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 4,9% | 3,6% | 9,9% | 22,4% | 12,3% |
| Institutional structure &relationship between EU | Count | | 5 | 7 | 25 | 11 | 48 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 12,2% | 25,0% | 13,1% | 11,2% | 13,4% |
| Defining EU's core tasks/balance of different | Count | | 3 | | 6 | 4 | 13 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 7,3% | | 3,1% | 4,1% | 3,6% |
| Relationship between EU institutions and public | Count | | | | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | 2,1% | 3,1% | 2,0% |
| Enlargement | Count | | 1 | 4 | 22 | 27 | 54 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 2,4% | 14,3% | 11,5% | 27,6% | 15,1% |
| Budget: Financing the EU and spending EU funds | Count | | 1 | | 30 | 1 | 32 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 2,4% | | 15,7% | 1,0% | 8,9% |
| other specific EU integration | Count | | 7 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 25 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 17,1% | 10,7% | 1,6% | 12,2% | 7,0% |
| Associational agreements/ treaties EU - | Count | | 2 | | 7 | 2 | 11 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 4,9% | | 3,7% | 2,0% | 3,1% |
| Personnel issues within EU/discussions about | Count | | | | | 5 | 5 |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | | 5,1% | 1,4% |
| Non-EU forms of European integration | Count | | 8 | 2 | 11 | | 21 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 19,5% | 7,1% | 5,8% | | 5,9% |
| Total | Count | | 41 | 28 | 191 | 98 | 358 |
| | % within CYEAR | | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 7.3a displays the distribution of the reported claims' issue scopes by policy fields. Logically, claims in the field of European Integration issues have an overwhelming EU scope (93.3%), or else supranational, other European supranational, and multilateral or bilateral. The second field where the EU scope is dominant among claims is Monetary politics (72.8%). The third field is Agriculture (66.3%). These results reflect the effect of institutionalization in the degree of Europeanization of national public spheres. Meanwhile, in less institutionalized fields such as Immigration and Troops deployment, the percentages of claims with a EU scope are moderate but smaller (10% and 8.1% each). In the fields of Retirement and pension schemes and Education claims have a predominant Spanish scope (79.2% and 78.4% of all their claims). Taken as a whole, 23.1% of the claims have an exclusively Spanish scope; this result can be compared with those for other countries to determine if the focus on Spanish issues is relatively high or low. After EU and Spanish scopes, the overall rank-order of scopes goes as follows: 1) "bilateral" (7.9%), 2) "multilateral" (5.6%), 3) USA (1.7%), 4) Rest of the World (a remarkably low 1.6%), 5) United Nations (1.5%), 6) other European supranational (1.4%), 7) other supranational (1.1%) and 8) Germany (1.1%). In 2002, claims with some kind of national scope represent 28,9% of the claims, which if one considers EU members only declines to 26.7%. If one excludes Spain, only 3.6% of the claims have a EU national scope..

Table 7.3a Issue scope by policy field

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first issue scope * ISFIELD1 | 1133 | 99,9% | 1 | ,1% | 1134 | 100,0% |

recoded first issue scope * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: subs., livest quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops and deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European integration | | |
| recoded first issue scope | supranational: UN | Count | | | | 17 | | | | 17 |
| | % within ISFIE | | | | | 17,2% | | | | 1,5% |
| other supranational | Count | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 4 | | 12 |
| | % within ISFIE | 1,3% | | ,5% | 3,0% | 1,3% | | 1,1% | | 1,1% |
| EU | Count | 171 | 53 | 21 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 334 | | 593 |
| | % within ISFIE | 72,8% | 66,3% | 10,0% | 8,1% | 6,5% | 1,4% | 93,3% | | 52,3% |
| other European supranational | Count | | | 1 | | | | 15 | | 16 |
| | % within ISFIE | | | ,5% | | | | 4,2% | | 1,4% |
| multilateral | Count | 6 | 3 | 14 | 37 | | | 3 | | 63 |
| | % within ISFIE | 2,6% | 3,8% | 6,7% | 37,4% | | | ,8% | | 5,6% |
| bilateral | Count | 1 | | 51 | 34 | 1 | | 2 | | 89 |
| | % within ISFIE | ,4% | | 24,3% | 34,3% | 1,3% | | ,6% | | 7,9% |
| germany | Count | 4 | | 6 | | 1 | 1 | | | 12 |
| | % within ISFIE | 1,7% | | 2,9% | | 1,3% | 1,4% | | | 1,1% |
| france | Count | 5 | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | | 10 |
| | % within ISFIE | 2,1% | | 1,4% | | 1,3% | 1,4% | | | ,9% |
| uk | Count | 4 | | 1 | | | 4 | | | 9 |
| | % within ISFIE | 1,7% | | ,5% | | | 5,4% | | | ,8% |
| italy | Count | | | 2 | | | | | | 2 |
| | % within ISFIE | | | 1,0% | | | | | | ,2% |
| spain | Count | 21 | 24 | 98 | | 61 | 58 | | | 262 |
| | % within ISFIE | 8,9% | 30,0% | 46,7% | | 79,2% | 78,4% | | | 23,1% |
| other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | 3 | | | | | | | | 3 |
| | % within ISFIE | 1,3% | | | | | | | | ,3% |
| austria, finland, switzerland | Count | | | 3 | | | | | | 3 |
| | % within ISFIE | | | 1,4% | | | | | | ,3% |
| other european countries ex CIS | Count | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIE | | | ,5% | | | | 1,4% | | ,1% |
| russia | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 2 |
| | % within ISFIE | | | ,5% | | 1,3% | | | | ,2% |
| USA | Count | 8 | | 3 | | 2 | 6 | | | 19 |
| | % within ISFIE | 3,4% | | 1,4% | | 2,6% | 8,1% | | | 1,7% |
| Japan | Count | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIE | ,4% | | | | | | | | ,1% |
| Rest of the world | Count | 8 | | 4 | | 4 | 2 | | | 18 |
| | % within ISFIE | 3,4% | | 1,9% | | 5,2% | 2,7% | | | 1,6% |
| Total | Count | 235 | 80 | 210 | 99 | 77 | 74 | 358 | | 1133 |
| | % within ISFIE | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 7.3b displays trends in the scopes of the most important issue of each claim. The percentage of claims with an EU first issue scope increases from 44.8% in 1990 to 57.8% in

2000, and then drops to 52.2% in 2002. The percentage of claims with a Spanish first issue scope increases continuously from 11.2% in 1990 to 27.6% in 2002. This trend results mainly from increases in the percentage of claims made about Immigration made in Spain.

Table 7.3b Issue scope by year

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recorded first issue scope * CYEAR | 1133 | 99,9% | 1 | ,1% | 1134 | 100,0% |

recorded first issue scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recorded first issue scope | supranational: UN | Count | | 5 | 11 | 1 | 17 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,6% | 2,1% | ,3% | 1,5% |
| | other supranational | Count | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 1,7% | 2,2% | 1,0% | ,6% | 1,1% |
| EU | Count | 52 | 53 | 299 | 189 | 593 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 44,8% | 38,4% | 57,8% | 52,2% | 52,3% | |
| other European supranational | Count | 3 | | 13 | | 16 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 2,6% | | 2,5% | | 1,4% | |
| multilateral | Count | 29 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 63 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 25,0% | 7,2% | 2,5% | 3,0% | 5,6% | |
| bilateral | Count | 14 | 16 | 31 | 28 | 89 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 12,1% | 11,6% | 6,0% | 7,7% | 7,9% | |
| germany | Count | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 12 | |
| | % within CYEAR | ,9% | 2,2% | ,8% | 1,1% | 1,1% | |
| france | Count | | 7 | 1 | 2 | 10 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | 5,1% | ,2% | ,6% | ,9% | |
| uk | Count | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 9 | |
| | % within CYEAR | ,9% | 1,4% | 1,0% | ,3% | ,8% | |
| italy | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,2% | ,3% | ,2% | |
| spain | Count | 13 | 31 | 118 | 100 | 262 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 11,2% | 22,5% | 22,8% | 27,6% | 23,1% | |
| other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | | 2 | 1 | | 3 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | 1,4% | ,2% | | ,3% | |
| austria, finland, sweden | Count | | | 2 | 1 | 3 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,4% | ,3% | ,3% | |
| Switzerland | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,2% | | ,1% | |
| other european countries ex CIS | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,2% | | ,1% | |
| russia | Count | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | % within CYEAR | ,9% | | ,2% | | ,2% | |
| USA | Count | | 2 | 7 | 10 | 19 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | 1,4% | 1,4% | 2,8% | 1,7% | |
| Japan | Count | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | | ,3% | ,1% | |
| Rest of the world | Count | | 4 | 3 | 11 | 18 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | 2,9% | ,6% | 3,0% | 1,6% | |
| Total | Count | 116 | 138 | 517 | 362 | 1133 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Tables 7.4a to 7.4g report on trends in each policy field. In the field of Monetary politics no clear trend in terms of issue scope during the period being considered here. In 1995 only 24.5% of the claims in this field had a Spanish scope while 22.7% of the claims referred to other EU countries. In 2000, the percentage of EU country issue scopes decreases to 7.8% and in 2002

only 1.6% had an EU country scope. The percentage of claims with an USA issue scope increases during the entire period, from 0 in 1990 to 6.3%.

Table 7.4 a Monetary Politics

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first issue scope * CYEAR | 235 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 235 | 100,0% |

recoded first issue scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first issue scope | other supranational | Count | | | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,9% | 1,6% | 1,3% |
| | EU | Count | 11 | 24 | 88 | 48 | 171 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 68,8% | 45,3% | 85,4% | 76,2% | 72,8% |
| | multilateral | Count | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 12,5% | 3,8% | 1,9% | | 2,6% |
| | bilateral | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 1,6% | ,4% |
| | germany | Count | 1 | 3 | | | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | 5,7% | | | 1,7% |
| | france | Count | | 5 | | | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 9,4% | | | 2,1% |
| | uk | Count | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,8% | 1,0% | 1,6% | 1,7% |
| | spain | Count | 2 | 13 | 6 | | 21 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 12,5% | 24,5% | 5,8% | | 8,9% |
| | other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | | 2 | 1 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 3,8% | 1,0% | | 1,3% |
| | USA | Count | | 1 | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 1,9% | 2,9% | 6,3% | 3,4% |
| | Japan | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 1,6% | ,4% |
| | Rest of the world | Count | | 1 | | 7 | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 1,9% | | 11,1% | 3,4% |
| Total | | Count | 16 | 53 | 103 | 63 | 235 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 7.4b reports on trends in the field of Agriculture. Claims fall into only three scopes: EU (66.3% of the total), Multilateral (3.8%), and Spain (30.0%). There are no clear trends.

Table 7.4b Agriculture

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first issue scope * CYEAR | 80 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 80 | 100,0% |

recoded first issue scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first issue scope | EU | Count | 3 | 2 | 19 | 29 | 53 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 66,7% | 48,7% | 82,9% | 66,3% |
| | multilateral | Count | | 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 33,3% | 5,1% | | 3,8% |
| | spain | Count | | | 18 | 6 | 24 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 46,2% | 17,1% | 30,0% |
| Total | Count | 3 | 3 | 39 | 35 | 80 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Trends in the Immigration field (**Table 7.4c**) are more obvious than they are in other fields. In general terms, the most salient scope is the Spanish one (46.7% of the total), followed by bilateral issues (24.3%). Only 1 out of 10 issues had an EU scope, although from 1990 to 2002, its salience nearly doubles (from 6.3% to 11.1%).

Table 7.4c Immigration

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first issue scope * CYEAR | 210 | 99,5% | 1 | ,5% | 211 | 100,0% |

recoded first issue scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first issue scope | other supranational | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,1% | | ,5% |
| | EU | Count | 1 | | 10 | 10 | 21 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | 11,4% | 11,1% | 10,0% |
| | other European supranational | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,1% | | ,5% |
| | multilateral | Count | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 14 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 18,8% | 25,0% | 3,4% | 4,4% | 6,7% |
| | bilateral | Count | 7 | 9 | 15 | 20 | 51 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 43,8% | 56,3% | 17,0% | 22,2% | 24,3% |
| | germany | Count | | | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,4% | 3,3% | 2,9% |
| | france | Count | | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,1% | 2,2% | 1,4% |
| | uk | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | | | ,5% |
| | italy | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,1% | 1,1% | 1,0% |
| | spain | Count | 3 | 2 | 47 | 46 | 98 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 18,8% | 12,5% | 53,4% | 51,1% | 46,7% |
| | austria, finland, sweden | Count | | | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,3% | 1,1% | 1,4% |
| | Switzerland | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,1% | | ,5% |
| | russia | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 6,3% | | | | ,5% |
| | USA | Count | | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,1% | 2,2% | 1,4% |
| | Rest of the world | Count | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 6,3% | 2,3% | 1,1% | 1,9% |
| Total | Count | 16 | 16 | 88 | 90 | 210 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 7.4d reports on trends in the distribution of claims on Troops deployment across issue scopes. There is no predominant scope. Thirty-seven percent of the claims on troops deployment have a multilateral scope. The second most frequent scope category is “bilateral” (34.3%), the third is “UN” (17.2%), and the fourth is “EU” (8.1%). The most significant trend is the increase in claims with EU scope from the year 2000 to the year 2002 (from 9.4% to 25% of the claims on troops deployment).

Table 7.4d Troops deployment

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first issue scope * CYEAR | 99 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 99 | 100,0% |

| recoded first issue scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first issue scope | supranational: UN | Count | | 5 | 11 | 1 | 17 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 33,3% | 34,4% | 5,0% | 17,2% |
| | other supranational | Count | 1 | | 2 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 3,1% | | 6,3% | | 3,0% |
| | EU | Count | | | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 9,4% | 25,0% | 8,1% |
| | multilateral | Count | 24 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 37 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 75,0% | 20,0% | 9,4% | 35,0% | 37,4% |
| | bilateral | Count | 7 | 7 | 13 | 7 | 34 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 21,9% | 46,7% | 40,6% | 35,0% | 34,3% |
| Total | Count | 32 | 15 | 32 | 20 | 99 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 7.4e displays trends in the distribution of claims on Retirement and pension schemes, by issue scope. The most frequent scope for the whole period is “Spain” (79.2% of total claims). The proportion of claims with this scope increases throughout the period. Claims with a EU scope only represent 6.5% of the total.

Table 7.4e Retirement and Pension schemes

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first issue scope * CYEAR | 77 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 77 | 100,0% |

recoded first issue scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first issue scope | other supranational | Count | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 5,3% | | | 1,3% |
| | EU | Count | | 1 | 4 | | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 5,3% | 10,8% | | 6,5% |
| | bilateral | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,7% | | 1,3% |
| | germany | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,7% | | 1,3% |
| | france | Count | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 5,3% | | | 1,3% |
| | spain | Count | 2 | 14 | 28 | 17 | 61 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 73,7% | 75,7% | 89,5% | 79,2% |
| | russia | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,7% | | 1,3% |
| USA | Count | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 5,4% | | 2,6% | |
| Rest of the world | Count | | 2 | | 2 | 4 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | 10,5% | | 10,5% | 5,2% | |
| Total | Count | 2 | 19 | 37 | 19 | 77 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

The distribution of claims on Education across issues scopes is similar to the one for Retirement and Pension schemes (**Table 7.4f**). In particular, only one of the claims in this field in year 2000 has a EU scope. Also, as in the field of Retirement and Pension schemes, the majority of the claims have a Spanish scope (78.4%). Over time, the percentage of claims with this scope tends to increase.

Table 7.4f Education

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first issue scope * CYEAR | 74 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 74 | 100,0% |

recoded first issue scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first issue scope | EU | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,7% | | 1,4% |
| | germany | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 2,7% | 1,4% |
| | france | Count | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 25,0% | | | 1,4% |
| | uk | Count | | | 4 | | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 14,8% | | 5,4% |
| | spain | Count | 6 | 2 | 19 | 31 | 58 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 50,0% | 70,4% | 83,8% | 78,4% |
| | other european countries ex CIS | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 3,7% | | 1,4% |
| | USA | Count | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 25,0% | 3,7% | 10,8% | 8,1% |
| Rest of the world | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 3,7% | 2,7% | 2,7% | |
| Total | Count | 6 | 4 | 27 | 37 | 74 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Table 7.4g reports on the distribution of claims on European integration by geographical scope. As one would expect, the overwhelming majority of claims have a EU scope (93.3%).

Table 7.4g European Integration

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first issue scope * CYEAR | 358 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 358 | 100,0% |

recoded first issue scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first issue scope | other supranational | Count | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 2,4% | 7,1% | | 1,0% | 1,1% |
| | EU | Count | 37 | 26 | 174 | 97 | 334 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 90,2% | 92,9% | 91,1% | 99,0% | 93,3% |
| | other European supranational | Count | 3 | | 12 | | 15 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 7,3% | | 6,3% | | 4,2% |
| | multilateral | Count | | | 3 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,6% | | ,8% |
| | bilateral | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | | ,6% |
| Total | Count | 41 | 28 | 191 | 98 | 358 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

► Positions towards European integration

This section examines whether the claims made in the different fields evaluate European integration in positive or negative terms.

Table 8.1 displays mean evaluation scores for the different fields and for all years. The value “1” means that the issue is seen as contributing positively to European integration. The value “-1” means just the opposite. The average claim tends to be neutral about the effect of the discussed issue on European integration (0.12). The most positive evaluations are found in claims in the fields of troops deployment (0.19), immigration and European integration itself (both 0.14). Notwithstanding these positive overall evaluations, the mean evaluation for claims in the fields of Monetary, Immigration, and European integration politics becomes less positive between 1990 and 2002.

Table 8.1 Position regarding European integration by policy field and year

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Included | | Excluded | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISPOS1 * ISFIELD1 * CYEAR | 1435 | 89,0% | 177 | 11,0% | 1612 | 100,0% |

Report

ISPOS1

| ISFIELD1 | CYEAR | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|---|-------|-------|------|----------------|
| Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | 1990 | ,21 | 24 | ,658 |
| | 1995 | ,07 | 70 | ,461 |
| | 2000 | ,08 | 137 | ,365 |
| | 2001 | ,08 | 13 | ,277 |
| | 2002 | ,11 | 84 | ,440 |
| | Total | ,09 | 328 | ,429 |
| Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | 1990 | ,00 | 6 | ,000 |
| | 1995 | ,00 | 3 | ,000 |
| | 2000 | ,10 | 31 | ,301 |
| | 2001 | ,00 | 4 | ,000 |
| | 2002 | ,02 | 59 | ,227 |
| | Total | ,04 | 103 | ,239 |
| Immigration: entry and exit | 1990 | ,50 | 2 | ,707 |
| | 1995 | ,00 | 1 | , |
| | 2000 | ,00 | 18 | ,000 |
| | 2001 | ,00 | 2 | ,000 |
| | 2002 | ,20 | 41 | ,459 |
| | Total | ,14 | 64 | ,393 |
| Troops deployment | 1995 | ,00 | 2 | ,000 |
| | 2000 | ,75 | 4 | ,500 |
| | 2001 | ,20 | 5 | ,447 |
| | 2002 | ,00 | 10 | ,000 |
| | Total | ,19 | 21 | ,402 |
| Retirement and pension schemes | 1995 | -1,00 | 1 | , |
| | 2000 | ,14 | 7 | ,690 |
| | 2002 | ,00 | 8 | ,000 |
| | Total | ,00 | 16 | ,516 |
| Education | 2000 | ,33 | 3 | ,577 |
| | 2002 | 1,00 | 1 | , |
| | Total | ,50 | 4 | ,577 |
| European Integration | 1990 | ,28 | 78 | ,507 |
| | 1995 | ,11 | 61 | ,451 |
| | 2000 | ,20 | 381 | ,518 |
| | 2001 | ,03 | 144 | ,288 |
| | 2002 | ,06 | 235 | ,322 |
| | Total | ,14 | 899 | ,444 |
| Total | 1990 | ,25 | 110 | ,532 |
| | 1995 | ,08 | 138 | ,453 |
| | 2000 | ,17 | 581 | ,475 |
| | 2001 | ,04 | 168 | ,287 |
| | 2002 | ,07 | 438 | ,350 |
| | Total | ,12 | 1435 | ,428 |

Table 8.2 reports on the evaluation of European integration implicit in claims made by different types of actors. The most critical actors are those falling in the category “other professional organizations and groups” (-0.14). The most favorable actors are internal security agencies (0.33). If one groups the various categories in Table 8.2 into a smaller number, one sees that the actors who make more favorable claims about European integration are state and party actors (0.14).

Table 8.2 Position regarding European Integration by actor type

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Included | | Excluded | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISPOS1 * ACT1S | 1435 | 89,0% | 177 | 11,0% | 1612 | 100,0% |
| ISPOS1 * summary of act1s | 1435 | 89,0% | 177 | 11,0% | 1612 | 100,0% |

ISPOS1 * ACT1S

ISPOS1

| ACT1S | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|--|------|------|----------------|
| whole polities | ,09 | 45 | ,417 |
| politicians | ,09 | 91 | ,412 |
| former states(wo)men | ,12 | 17 | ,485 |
| government/executive | ,17 | 748 | ,448 |
| legislative | ,12 | 95 | ,409 |
| judiciary | ,40 | 10 | ,516 |
| police and internal security agencies | ,33 | 3 | ,577 |
| military | ,14 | 7 | ,378 |
| central banks | ,01 | 91 | ,182 |
| other state executive agencies | ,16 | 19 | ,375 |
| political parties | -,02 | 53 | ,537 |
| unions and employees | ,15 | 13 | ,376 |
| employers organisations and firms | ,00 | 10 | ,471 |
| media and journalists | ,05 | 138 | ,407 |
| farmers and agricultural organisations | ,00 | 18 | ,000 |
| educational professionals and organisations | ,06 | 16 | ,250 |
| economists and financial experts | ,13 | 39 | ,409 |
| other scientific and research professionals and institutions | ,00 | 7 | ,577 |
| other professional organisations and groups | -,14 | 7 | ,378 |
| consumer organisations and groups | ,00 | 1 | , |
| solidarity and human rights organisations | ,00 | 1 | , |
| other civil society organisations and groups | ,00 | 2 | ,000 |
| the general public | ,00 | 3 | 1,000 |
| unknown/unspecified actors | 1,00 | 1 | , |
| Total | ,12 | 1435 | ,428 |

ISPOS1 * summary of act1s

| ISPOS1 | | | |
|-----------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| summary of act1s | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
| state and party actors | ,14 | 1134 | ,434 |
| economic interest groups | ,09 | 80 | ,363 |
| media and journalists | ,05 | 138 | ,407 |
| other civil society actors | ,00 | 34 | ,348 |
| general/unknown/unspecified | ,10 | 49 | ,467 |
| Total | ,12 | 1435 | ,428 |

Table 8.3 examines contrasts in the claimants' evaluation of European integration by issue scope. The most positive claims correspond to actors with European countries' scope (0.29), followed by those with multilateral (0.25), french (0.23), US (0.18), italian (0.17), EU (0.17), and German (0.14) scopes. The average evaluation of European integration in claims with a Spanish issue scope is 0.10. The only issue scopes in which average evaluations of European integration are negative are the "European supranational" (-0,25), "Rest of the World" (-0.7) and "UK" (-0.4) scopes.

Table 8.3 Position regarding European Integration by actor scope

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Included | | Excluded | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISPOS1 * recoded first actor scope | 1433 | 88,9% | 179 | 11,1% | 1612 | 100,0% |

Report

ISPOS1

| recoded first actor scope | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| other supranational | ,00 | 10 | ,471 |
| EU | ,17 | 482 | ,415 |
| other European supranational | -,25 | 4 | ,500 |
| multilateral | ,25 | 4 | ,500 |
| bilateral | ,00 | 3 | ,000 |
| germany | ,14 | 94 | ,499 |
| france | ,23 | 65 | ,523 |
| uk | -,04 | 55 | ,470 |
| italy | ,17 | 6 | ,408 |
| spain | ,10 | 531 | ,397 |
| netherlands | ,10 | 10 | ,316 |
| other pre-1995 EU-members | ,05 | 39 | ,456 |
| austria, finland, sweden | ,06 | 65 | ,496 |
| Switzerland | ,00 | 2 | 1,414 |
| upcoming enlargement countries | ,06 | 16 | ,250 |
| other european countries ex CIS | ,29 | 7 | ,488 |
| turkey | ,00 | 2 | ,000 |
| russia | ,00 | 12 | ,426 |
| USA | ,18 | 11 | ,405 |
| Japan | ,00 | 1 | , |
| Rest of the world | -,07 | 14 | ,267 |
| Total | ,12 | 1433 | ,428 |

Table 8.4 reports average evaluations of European integration by political party. Claimants from both the Spanish Socialist Party, PSOE, and the Spanish Conservative party, PP, express positive evaluations of European integration in their claims. Claimants from the main regionalist parties, the Catalan CiU and the Basque PNV, express positive evaluations but not as positive as those of claimants from the main Spanish political parties.

Table 8.4 Position regarding European Integration by party affiliation and by year

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Included | | Excluded | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| ISPOS1 * ACTPAR1 * CYEAR | 1434 | 89,0% | 178 | 11,0% | 1612 | 100,0% |

| ACTPAR1 CYEAR | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|---|-------|------|-----|----------------|
| Partido Popular (PP) | 1990 | .00 | 1 | . |
| | 1995 | .00 | 10 | .471 |
| | 2000 | .18 | 57 | .539 |
| | 2001 | .00 | 31 | .000 |
| | 2002 | .16 | 68 | .371 |
| | Total | .13 | 115 | .413 |
| Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE-Progr.) | 1990 | .39 | 18 | .502 |
| | 1995 | .12 | 17 | .600 |
| | 2000 | .20 | 25 | .500 |
| | 2001 | .07 | 15 | .258 |
| | 2002 | .10 | 40 | .304 |
| | Total | .17 | 115 | .438 |
| Convergència i Unió (CiU) | 1990 | .00 | 1 | . |
| | 1995 | .33 | 3 | .577 |
| | 2000 | .07 | 14 | .267 |
| | 2001 | .00 | 3 | .000 |
| | 2002 | .00 | 8 | .000 |
| | Total | .07 | 29 | .258 |
| Izquierda Unida (IU) | 1990 | .00 | 1 | . |
| | 1995 | -.33 | 3 | .577 |
| | 2002 | .00 | 1 | . |
| | Total | -.20 | 5 | .447 |
| Partido Nacionalista Vasco (EAJ-PNV) | 1990 | .00 | 1 | . |
| | 2000 | .00 | 2 | .000 |
| | 2001 | .00 | 8 | .000 |
| | 2002 | .00 | 8 | .000 |
| | Total | .00 | 19 | .000 |
| Bloque Nacionalista Galego (BNG) | 2001 | .00 | 1 | . |
| | 2002 | .00 | 1 | . |
| | Total | .00 | 2 | .000 |
| Iniciativa per Catalunya-Els Verds | 2000 | 1.00 | 1 | . |
| | Total | 1.00 | 1 | . |
| Unión de Centro Democrático (UCD) | 1990 | .00 | 1 | . |
| | Total | .00 | 1 | . |
| Euskal Herritarrok/ Herri Batasuna (EH/HB) | 2002 | .00 | 1 | . |
| | Total | .00 | 1 | . |

► Object actors

This section focuses on the presence of object actors in claims reported by newspapers and on the characteristics of these object actors. **Table 9.1** shows that less than half the claims refer to

an object actor (43.4%). While almost all the claims on Troops deployment include an object actor, just 15% of claims on Monetary politics do. Other policy fields in which one finds a relatively high percentage of claims with an object actor are Immigration, Retirement and Pension schemes, and, less frequently, Agriculture, Education, and European integration.

Table 9.1 Presence of object actor by policy field

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| presence of object actor * ISFIELD1 | 1134 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1134 | 100,0% |

presence of object actor * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|-------|
| | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | | |
| presence of object actor | .00 | Count | 200 | 47 | 89 | 1 | 34 | 46 | 225 | 642 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 85,1% | 58,8% | 42,2% | 1,0% | 44,2% | 62,2% | 62,8% | 56,6% |
| 1,00 | Count | 35 | 33 | 122 | 98 | 43 | 28 | 133 | 492 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 14,9% | 41,3% | 57,8% | 99,0% | 55,8% | 37,8% | 37,2% | 43,4% | |
| Total | Count | 235 | 80 | 211 | 99 | 77 | 74 | 358 | 1134 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

As one would expect these object actors are individuals or groups generally affected by policies in those fields. **Table 9.2a** shows, for instance, that farmers and agricultural organizations represent 48.5% of the total object actors in the field of agriculture. Also, migrant organizations and groups represent 73% of the object actors in the field of Immigration while groups of the elderly represent 69.8% of the claims in the field of Retirement and pension schemes. In general, however, the most typical object actor represents “whole politics”. This is especially so in the fields of Monetary Politics, Troops deployment and European Integration. The summary table that follows **Table 9.2a** shows that state and party actors are the most frequent type of object actor in the European Integration field, economic interest groups are the most frequent type of object actor in the field of Agriculture, and other civil society actors are the most frequent type of object actor in the fields of Education, Immigration, and Retirement and pension schemes.

Table 9.2 a Object actor type by policy field

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| OBJ1S * ISFIELD1 | 492 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 492 | 100,0% |
| summary of obj1s * ISFIELD1 | 492 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 492 | 100,0% |

OBJ1S * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | Total |
|--|------------------|--------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | |
| OBJ1S whole polities | Count | 15 | 9 | 15 | 91 | | 2 | 83 | 215 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 42,9% | 27,3% | 12,3% | 92,9% | | 7,1% | 62,4% | 43,7% |
| politicians | Count | | | | | | | 2 | 2 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | | | 1,5% | ,4% |
| government/executive | Count | 3 | 2 | 4 | | | 1 | 27 | 37 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 8,6% | 6,1% | 3,3% | | | 3,6% | 20,3% | 7,5% |
| legislative | Count | | 1 | | | | | 4 | 5 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | 3,0% | | | | | 3,0% | 1,0% |
| police and internal security agencies | Count | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | 3,0% | | | | | | ,2% |
| military | Count | | | | 5 | | | 1 | 6 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | 5,1% | | | ,8% | 1,2% |
| central banks | Count | 2 | | | | 1 | | | 3 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 5,7% | | | | 2,3% | | | ,6% |
| social security executive organisations | Count | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | 2,3% | | | ,2% |
| other state executive agencies | Count | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | 2,3% | | | ,2% |
| political parties | Count | | | | | | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | | 3,6% | 5,3% | 1,6% |
| unions and employees | Count | 1 | | | | 2 | | 1 | 4 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 2,9% | | | | 4,7% | | ,8% | ,8% |
| employers organisations and firms | Count | 2 | | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | 8 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 5,7% | | 1,6% | | 7,0% | 3,6% | | 1,6% |
| churches and religious organisations and group | Count | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 2 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | 3,0% | | | | 3,6% | | ,4% |
| media and journalists | Count | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | ,8% | | | | | ,2% |
| farmers and agricultural organisations | Count | | 16 | | | | | | 16 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | 48,5% | | | | | | 3,3% |
| educational professional and organisations | Count | | | | | | 5 | | 5 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | | 17,9% | | 1,0% |
| economists and financial experts | Count | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | | | ,8% | ,2% |
| students, pupils, and the parents | Count | | | | | | 13 | | 13 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | | 46,4% | | 2,6% |
| other professional organisations and group | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 3 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | ,8% | | 2,3% | | ,8% | ,6% |
| consumer organisations and groups | Count | 2 | 1 | | | | | | 3 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 5,7% | 3,0% | | | | | | ,6% |
| migrant organisations and groups | Count | | | 89 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 93 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | 73,0% | 1,0% | | 7,1% | ,8% | 18,9% |
| organisations and group of the elderly | Count | | | | | 30 | 1 | | 31 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | | | 69,8% | 3,6% | | 6,3% |
| terrorist groups | Count | | | 9 | | | | | 9 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | 7,4% | | | | | 1,8% |
| other civil society organisations and group | Count | 1 | | | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 2,9% | | | | 7,0% | 3,6% | ,8% | 1,2% |
| whole economies | Count | 4 | | | | | | | 4 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 11,4% | | | | | | | ,8% |
| the general public | Count | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 14 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 14,3% | 6,1% | ,8% | 1,0% | 2,3% | | 3,0% | 2,8% |
| Total | Count | 35 | 33 | 122 | 98 | 43 | 28 | 133 | 492 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

summary of obj1s * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | |
| summary of obj1s | state and party actors Count | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 41 | 64 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 14,3% | 12,1% | 3,3% | 5,1% | 7,0% | 7,1% | 30,8% | 13,0% |
| | economic interest groups Count | 3 | 16 | 2 | | 5 | 1 | 2 | 29 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 8,6% | 48,5% | 1,6% | | 11,6% | 3,6% | 1,5% | 5,9% |
| | media and journalists Count | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | % within ISFIELD | | | ,8% | | | | | ,2% |
| | other civil society actors Count | 3 | 2 | 99 | 1 | 34 | 23 | 3 | 165 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 8,6% | 6,1% | 81,1% | 1,0% | 79,1% | 82,1% | 2,3% | 33,5% |
| | general/unknown/unspecified Count | 24 | 11 | 16 | 92 | 1 | 2 | 87 | 233 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 68,6% | 33,3% | 13,1% | 93,9% | 2,3% | 7,1% | 65,4% | 47,4% |
| Total | Count | 35 | 33 | 122 | 98 | 43 | 28 | 133 | 492 |
| | % within ISFIELD | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 9.2b reports on trends in the types of object actors referred to in the reported claims. The salience of whole polities, for instance, declines dramatically between 1990 and 2002 (81.5% to 26.9%). Meanwhile, the weight of special interest groups such as farmers and agricultural groups, educational professionals and organizations, and, above all, migrant organizations and groups, increases throughout the period.

Table 9.2b Object actor type by year

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| OBJ1S * CYEAR | 492 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 492 | 100,0% |
| summary of obj1s * CYEAR | 492 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 492 | 100,0% |

OBJ1S * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|-------|---|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| OBJ1S | whole polities | Count | 44 | 18 | 128 | 25 | 215 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 81,5% | 43,9% | 42,1% | 26,9% | 43,7% |
| | politicians | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,7% | | ,4% |
| | government/executive | Count | 1 | 3 | 28 | 5 | 37 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 1,9% | 7,3% | 9,2% | 5,4% | 7,5% |
| | legislative | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 1,9% | 2,4% | ,7% | 1,1% | 1,0% |
| | police and internal security agencies | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,3% | | ,2% |
| | military | Count | | | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,3% | 2,2% | 1,2% |
| | central banks | Count | | | 3 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | | ,6% |
| | social security executive organisations | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,3% | | ,2% |
| | other state executive agencies | Count | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | | 1,1% | ,2% |
| | political parties | Count | 1 | | 7 | | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 1,9% | | 2,3% | | 1,6% |
| | unions and employees | Count | | | 4 | | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,3% | | ,8% |
| | employers organisations and firms | Count | | | 8 | | 8 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,6% | | 1,6% |
| | churches and religious organisations and groups | Count | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 1,9% | | ,3% | | ,4% |
| | media and journalists | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 1,9% | | | | ,2% |
| | farmers and agricultural organisations | Count | | 1 | 10 | 5 | 16 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 2,4% | 3,3% | 5,4% | 3,3% |
| | educational professionals and organisations | Count | | | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,3% | 4,3% | 1,0% |
| | economists and financial experts | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,3% | | ,2% |
| | students, pupils, and their parents | Count | | 1 | 10 | 2 | 13 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 2,4% | 3,3% | 2,2% | 2,6% |
| | other professional organisations and groups | Count | | | 3 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | | ,6% |
| | consumer organisations and groups | Count | | | 3 | | 3 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | | ,6% |
| | migrant organisations and groups | Count | 5 | 7 | 47 | 34 | 93 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 9,3% | 17,1% | 15,5% | 36,6% | 18,9% |
| | organisations and groups of the elderly | Count | | 9 | 13 | 9 | 31 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 22,0% | 4,3% | 9,7% | 6,3% |
| | terrorist groups | Count | | | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 2,0% | 3,2% | 1,8% |
| | other civil society organisations and groups | Count | | | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,6% | 1,1% | 1,2% |
| | whole economies | Count | | | 4 | | 4 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | 1,3% | | ,8% |
| | the general public | Count | | 1 | 12 | 1 | 14 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 2,4% | 3,9% | 1,1% | 2,8% |
| Total | | Count | 54 | 41 | 304 | 93 | 492 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

summary of obj1s * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| summary of obj1s | state and party actors | Count | 3 | 4 | 48 | 9 | 64 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 5,6% | 9,8% | 15,8% | 9,7% | 13,0% |
| | economic interest groups | Count | | 1 | 23 | 5 | 29 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | 2,4% | 7,6% | 5,4% | 5,9% |
| | media and journalists | Count | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 1,9% | | | | ,2% |
| | other civil society actors | Count | 6 | 17 | 89 | 53 | 165 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 11,1% | 41,5% | 29,3% | 57,0% | 33,5% |
| | general/unknown/unspecified | Count | 44 | 19 | 144 | 26 | 233 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 81,5% | 46,3% | 47,4% | 28,0% | 47,4% |
| Total | | Count | 54 | 41 | 304 | 93 | 492 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 9.3a examines whether claims portray object actors as positively or negatively affected by the issues to which the claims refer. On the average, Terrorist groups are the object actors that

the claims portray as most negatively affected (-0.33), followed by political parties (-0.25), and the government (-0.19). In contrast, the general public (0.64), students and their parents (0.62), educational professionals (0.6), groups of the elderly (0.55) and the legislative bodies (0.4) are portrayed as positively impacted by the issues discussed in the claims. The summary table that follows Table 9.3a shows that the state and party object actors are the ones that the claims portray as most negatively affected by the issues being discussed, while civil society object actors and object actors in the general/unknown/unspecific category are portrayed as positively affected by these issues.

Table 9.3 a Evaluation by object actor type

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Included | | Excluded | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| OBJEVAL1 * OBJ1S | 492 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 492 | 100,0% |
| OBJEVAL1 * summary of obj1s | 492 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 492 | 100,0% |

OBJEVAL1 * OBJ1S

| OBJEVAL1 | | | |
|---|-------|-----|----------------|
| OBJ1S | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
| whole polities | ,11 | 215 | ,763 |
| politicians | -1,00 | 2 | ,000 |
| government/executive | -,19 | 37 | ,845 |
| legislative | ,40 | 5 | ,894 |
| police and internal security agencies | -1,00 | 1 | , |
| military | -,17 | 6 | ,753 |
| central banks | ,67 | 3 | ,577 |
| social security executive organisations | 1,00 | 1 | , |
| other state executive agencies | 1,00 | 1 | , |
| political parties | -,25 | 8 | 1,035 |
| unions and employees | -,25 | 4 | ,957 |
| employers organisations and firms | -,13 | 8 | ,835 |
| churches and religious organisations and groups | -1,00 | 2 | ,000 |
| media and journalists | -1,00 | 1 | , |
| farmers and agricultural organisations | ,00 | 16 | ,894 |
| educational professionals and organisations | ,60 | 5 | ,894 |
| economists and financial experts | -1,00 | 1 | , |
| students, pupils, and their parents | ,62 | 13 | ,650 |
| other professional organisations and groups | ,00 | 3 | 1,000 |
| consumer organisations and groups | -,33 | 3 | 1,155 |
| migrant organisations and groups | -,14 | 93 | ,815 |
| organisations and groups of the elderly | ,55 | 31 | ,675 |
| terrorist groups | -,33 | 9 | 1,000 |
| other civil society organisations and groups | ,17 | 6 | ,983 |
| whole economies | ,75 | 4 | ,500 |
| the general public | ,64 | 14 | ,745 |
| Total | ,07 | 492 | ,824 |

OBJEVAL1 * summary of obj1s

| OBJEVAL1 | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-----|----------------|
| summary of obj1s | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
| state and party actors | -,11 | 64 | ,875 |
| economic interest groups | -,10 | 29 | ,860 |
| media and journalists | -1,00 | 1 | , |
| other civil society actors | ,06 | 165 | ,860 |
| general/unknown/unspecified | ,15 | 233 | ,771 |
| Total | ,07 | 492 | ,824 |

Table 9.3b examines to what extent the impact on object actors described or implicit in the reported claims varies according to the object actors' scopes. The results displayed in this table reveal that Germany (0.29), the EU (0.25), the USA (0.20) and the Middle East (0.19), and Spanish object actors (0.16) are described as benefitting from the issues covered by the claims in

which they appear. By way of contrast, French, Russia, upcoming enlargement countries, the UK, and countries in the “rest of the world” category are described as negatively affected by them.

Table 9.3b Evaluation by object actor scope

| Case Processing Summary | | | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Included | | Excluded | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| OBJEVAL1 * recoded first object actor scope | 490 | 99,6% | 2 | ,4% | 492 | 100,0% |

Report

OBJEVAL1

| recoded first object | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|---------------------------------|-------|-----|----------------|
| supranational: UN | -,50 | 2 | ,707 |
| EU | ,25 | 68 | ,760 |
| other European supranational | -,33 | 3 | 1,155 |
| multilateral | -,03 | 38 | ,822 |
| bilateral | ,00 | 3 | ,000 |
| germany | ,29 | 7 | ,951 |
| france | -,80 | 5 | ,447 |
| uk | -,14 | 14 | ,864 |
| italy | -1,00 | 1 | , |
| spain | ,16 | 145 | ,871 |
| other pre-1995 EU-members | 1,00 | 2 | ,000 |
| austria, finland, sweden | ,00 | 23 | ,853 |
| Switzerland | 1,00 | 1 | , |
| upcoming enlargement countries | -,17 | 6 | ,983 |
| other european countries ex CIS | ,13 | 16 | ,619 |
| turkey | -,67 | 3 | ,577 |
| russia | -,17 | 12 | 1,030 |
| USA | ,20 | 5 | 1,095 |
| Middle East | ,19 | 58 | ,634 |
| Rest of the world | -,13 | 78 | ,827 |
| Total | ,07 | 490 | ,824 |

Table 9.4a reports the distribution of object actors with different scopes across issue fields. Generally speaking, the largest percentage of object actors (29.6%) has a Spanish scope. The second most frequent scope corresponds to object actors in the “Rest of the World” (15.9%), “EU” (13.9%), and “Middle East” (11.8%) categories. There are differences across the seven fields. In Agriculture (63.6%), Retirement and pension schemes (81.4%), and education (82.1%), for instance, the percentage of object actors with Spanish scope is much larger than in all fields taken together. On the other hand, object actors corresponding to the “Rest of the world” category are the dominant group in the field of Immigration (45.7%).

Table 9.4a Object actor scope by policy field

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first object actor scope * ISFIELD1 | 490 | 99,6% | 2 | ,4% | 492 | 100,0% |

recoded first object actor scope * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | |
| recoded first object actor scope | supranational: UN | Count | | | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 2,1% | | | | ,4% |
| | EU | Count | 8 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 3 | | 41 | 68 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 22,9% | 21,2% | 5,8% | 2,1% | 7,0% | | 30,8% | 13,9% |
| | other European supranational | Count | | | | | | | 3 | 3 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | 2,3% | ,6% |
| | multilateral | Count | 4 | 1 | 25 | 1 | | | 7 | 38 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 11,4% | 3,0% | 20,7% | 1,0% | | | 5,3% | 7,8% |
| | bilateral | Count | | | 1 | 2 | | | | 3 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | ,8% | 2,1% | | | | ,6% |
| | germany | Count | 4 | | | | | | 3 | 7 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 11,4% | | | | | | 2,3% | 1,4% |
| | france | Count | | | 3 | | | | 2 | 5 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 2,5% | | | | 1,5% | 1,0% |
| | uk | Count | 6 | 3 | | | | 1 | 4 | 14 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 17,1% | 9,1% | | | | 3,6% | 3,0% | 2,9% |
| | italy | Count | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | ,8% | | | | | ,2% |
| | spain | Count | 11 | 21 | 17 | 7 | 35 | 23 | 31 | 145 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 31,4% | 63,6% | 14,0% | 7,2% | 81,4% | 82,1% | 23,3% | 29,6% |
| | other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 2,9% | | | | | | ,8% | ,4% |
| | austria, finland, sweden | Count | | | | | | | 23 | 23 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | 17,3% | 4,7% |
| | Switzerland | Count | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | | | ,8% | | | | | ,2% |
| upcoming enlargement countries | Count | | | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 6 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | ,8% | 2,1% | | | 2,3% | 1,2% | |
| other european countries ex CIS | Count | | | 4 | 11 | | | 1 | 16 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 3,3% | 11,3% | | | ,8% | 3,3% | |
| turkey | Count | | | 1 | | | | 2 | 3 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | ,8% | | | | 1,5% | ,6% | |
| russia | Count | | | | 2 | 1 | | 9 | 12 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | | 2,1% | 2,3% | | 6,8% | 2,4% | |
| USA | Count | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 5 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 2,9% | | 1,7% | | 2,3% | 3,6% | | 1,0% | |
| Middle East | Count | | | 3 | 54 | | | 1 | 58 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | | 2,5% | 55,7% | | | ,8% | 11,8% | |
| Rest of the world | Count | | 1 | 55 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 78 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | | 3,0% | 45,5% | 14,4% | 7,0% | 10,7% | 1,5% | 15,9% | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 33 | 121 | 97 | 43 | 28 | 133 | 490 | |
| | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

Over the years, the share of claims with object actors that have a Spanish scope has risen (**Table 9.4b**). This is partly due to the increase in the percentage of claims in the field of immigration, which generally have a Spanish scope. Combined with the findings on indirect object actors, we can conclude that in the fields studied the Spanish public sphere seems more aware of the effects the European integration process, and therefore turns to the European Union actors for answers. Table 9.4.b shows a gradual but irregular increase in the percentage of claims with object actors with a EU scope. The average percentage for the entire period is 13.9%, but this masks an

upward trend from the 1990s to years 2000 and 2002 (from an average of 8% in 1990-1995 to an average of 15% in 2000-2002).

Table 9.4b Object actor scope by year

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| recoded first object actor scope * CYEAR | 490 | 99,6% | 2 | ,4% | 492 | 100,0% |

recoded first object actor scope * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2002 | |
| recoded first object actor scope | supranational: UN | Count | | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within CYEAR | | | ,7% | | ,4% |
| EU | Count | 5 | 3 | 50 | 10 | 68 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 9,3% | 7,3% | 16,5% | 10,9% | 13,9% | |
| other European supranational | Count | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | | ,6% | |
| multilateral | Count | 4 | | 34 | | 38 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 7,4% | | 11,2% | | 7,8% | |
| bilateral | Count | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | 2,4% | ,7% | | ,6% | |
| germany | Count | 2 | | 4 | 1 | 7 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,7% | | 1,3% | 1,1% | 1,4% | |
| france | Count | | | 5 | | 5 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 1,7% | | 1,0% | |
| uk | Count | | | 13 | 1 | 14 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 4,3% | 1,1% | 2,9% | |
| italy | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,3% | | ,2% | |
| spain | Count | 3 | 8 | 98 | 36 | 145 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 5,6% | 19,5% | 32,3% | 39,1% | 29,6% | |
| other pre-1995 EU-members | Count | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,7% | | ,4% | |
| austria, finland, sweden | Count | | | 23 | | 23 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 7,6% | | 4,7% | |
| Switzerland | Count | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | ,3% | | ,2% | |
| upcoming enlargement countries | Count | 3 | | 3 | | 6 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 5,6% | | 1,0% | | 1,2% | |
| other european countries ex CIS | Count | 2 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 16 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,7% | 19,5% | 1,3% | 2,2% | 3,3% | |
| turkey | Count | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| | % within CYEAR | | | 1,0% | | ,6% | |
| russia | Count | 2 | 1 | 9 | | 12 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,7% | 2,4% | 3,0% | | 2,4% | |
| USA | Count | 2 | | 3 | | 5 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 3,7% | | 1,0% | | 1,0% | |
| Middle East | Count | 27 | 6 | 18 | 7 | 58 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 50,0% | 14,6% | 5,9% | 7,6% | 11,8% | |
| Rest of the world | Count | 4 | 14 | 25 | 35 | 78 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 7,4% | 34,1% | 8,3% | 38,0% | 15,9% | |
| Total | Count | 54 | 41 | 303 | 92 | 490 | |
| | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | |

► **Frames**

The last section of the report focuses on the different frames claimants use. The analysis here examines claims about European integration or with a European issue scope only. It also focuses on only the first coded frame for each claim. The analysis is based on a total of 228 such frames. They correspond to 14.1% of the subset of claims analyzed here (**Table 10.1a**). As one would

expect, the percentage of claims with a frame is highest in claims about European integration (21.8%).

Table 10.1 a Presence of frame by policy field

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| presence of frame * ISFIELD1 | 1612 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1612 | 100,0% |

presence of frame * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------|------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Retirement and pension schemes | Education | European Integration | | |
| presence of frame | ,00 | Count | 381 | 179 | 74 | 20 | 16 | 11 | 703 | 1384 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 94,3% | 99,4% | 92,5% | 95,2% | 100,0% | 91,7% | 78,2% | 85,9% |
| | 1,00 | Count | 23 | 1 | 6 | 1 | | 1 | 196 | 228 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 5,7% | ,6% | 7,5% | 4,8% | | 8,3% | 21,8% | 14,1% |
| Total | | Count | 404 | 180 | 80 | 21 | 16 | 12 | 899 | 1612 |
| | | % within ISFIELD1 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

The group of actors who linked their claims to a frame most frequently (**Table 10.1b**) were other civil society actors (34.8%), followed by the media and journalists (26%).

Table 10.1b Presence of frame by broad actor scope

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| presence of frame * summary of act1s | 1612 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 1612 | 100,0% |

presence of frame * summary of act1s Crosstabulation

| | | summary of act1s | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------|------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| | | state and party actors | economic interest groups | media and journalists | other civil society actors | general/unknown/unspecified | | |
| presence of frame | ,00 | Count | 1107 | 87 | 111 | 30 | 49 | 1384 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 87,2% | 93,5% | 74,0% | 65,2% | 90,7% | 85,9% |
| | 1,00 | Count | 162 | 6 | 39 | 16 | 5 | 228 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 12,8% | 6,5% | 26,0% | 34,8% | 9,3% | 14,1% |
| Total | | Count | 1269 | 93 | 150 | 46 | 54 | 1612 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

From **Table 10.2a** one gathers that the most frequent frames are those concerning constitutional and governance issues (36.8). Other frequent frames concern identity, normative and value frames (33.3%), and frames internal to the integration process (10.1%). The least frequent frames are historical ones (5.3%). The presence of particular frames varies by issue field. For instance,

in monetary politics claims the most frequent frames are economic (34.8%), whereas in European integration claims, the most frequent ones refer to constitutional and governance issues (26.1%).

Table 10.2 a Frame type by policy field

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| summary of frame1s * ISFIELD | 228 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 228 | 100,0% |

summary of frame1s * ISFIELD1 Crosstabulation

| | | | ISFIELD1 | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------------|
| | | | Monetary politics: currency and interest rate | Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control | Immigration: entry and exit | Troops deployment | Education | | European Integration |
| summary of frame1s | identity, normative and value frames | Count % within ISFIELD | 1 4,3% | 1 100,0% | 6 100,0% | 1 100,0% | 1 100,0% | 66 33,7% | 76 33,3% |
| | constitutional and governance frames | Count % within ISFIELD | 6 26,1% | | | | | 78 39,8% | 84 36,8% |
| | economic frames | Count % within ISFIELD | 8 34,8% | | | | | 11 5,6% | 19 8,3% |
| | other instrumental frames | Count % within ISFIELD | 3 13,0% | | | | | 11 5,6% | 14 6,1% |
| | historical frames | Count % within ISFIELD | | | | | | 12 6,1% | 12 5,3% |
| | frames internal to the integration process | Count % within ISFIELD | 5 21,7% | | | | | 18 9,2% | 23 10,1% |
| | Total | Count % within ISFIELD | 23 100,0% | 1 100,0% | 6 100,0% | 1 100,0% | 1 100,0% | 196 100,0% | 228 100,0% |

Table 10.2b displays trends in the type of frames invoked in the reported claims. In particular, identity, normative and value frames increase from representing a low 5.9% of claims in 1990 to 33.3% in 2000. By way of contrast, one observes a steep decline in the percentages of claims with integration frames, from 23.5% in 1990 to 2.9% in 2002.

Table 10.2b Frame type by year

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| summary of frame1s * CYEAR | 228 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 228 | 100,0% |

summary of frame1s * CYEAR Crosstabulation

| | | | CYEAR | | | | | Total |
|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | |
| summary of frame1s | identity, normative and value frames | Count | 1 | 7 | 41 | 15 | 12 | 76 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 5,9% | 33,3% | 35,7% | 36,6% | 35,3% | 33,3% |
| | constitutional and governance frames | Count | 8 | 5 | 44 | 15 | 12 | 84 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 47,1% | 23,8% | 38,3% | 36,6% | 35,3% | 36,8% |
| | economic frames | Count | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 19 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 5,9% | 14,3% | 7,0% | 9,8% | 8,8% | 8,3% |
| | other instrumental frames | Count | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 14 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 5,9% | 19,0% | 2,6% | 9,8% | 5,9% | 6,1% |
| | historical frames | Count | 2 | | 5 | 1 | 4 | 12 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 11,8% | | 4,3% | 2,4% | 11,8% | 5,3% |
| | frames internal to the integration process | Count | 4 | 2 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 23 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 23,5% | 9,5% | 12,2% | 4,9% | 2,9% | 10,1% |
| Total | | Count | 17 | 21 | 115 | 41 | 34 | 228 |
| | | % within CYEAR | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 10.2c reports the distribution of frames by type of actor. The only significant contrast is the greater propensity by economic interest groups to use economic frames.

Table 10.2c Frame type by broad actor type

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| summary of frame1s * summary of act1s | 228 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 228 | 100,0% |

summary of frame1s * summary of act1s Crosstabulation

| | | | summary of act1s | | | | | Total |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| | | | state and party actors | economic interest groups | media and journalists | other civil society actors | general/unknown/unspecified | |
| summary of frame1s | identity, normative and value frames | Count | 53 | 1 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 76 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 32,7% | 16,7% | 38,5% | 31,3% | 40,0% | 33,3% |
| | constitutional and governance frames | Count | 61 | 1 | 12 | 8 | 2 | 84 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 37,7% | 16,7% | 30,8% | 50,0% | 40,0% | 36,8% |
| | economic frames | Count | 12 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | 19 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 7,4% | 33,3% | 10,3% | 6,3% | | 8,3% |
| | other instrumental frames | Count | 12 | | 1 | 1 | | 14 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 7,4% | | 2,6% | 6,3% | | 6,1% |
| | historical frames | Count | 11 | | | | 1 | 12 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 6,8% | | | | 20,0% | 5,3% |
| | frames internal to the integration process | Count | 13 | 2 | 7 | 1 | | 23 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 8,0% | 33,3% | 17,9% | 6,3% | | 10,1% |
| Total | | Count | 162 | 6 | 39 | 16 | 5 | 228 |
| | | % within summary of act1s | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Table 10.3 shows that the most frequently mentioned frames in claims reported in the Spanish press are those on democracy; the frames “Community of values” and “transparency” are second and third respectively (17 and 13 times).

Table 10.3 Twenty-five most often mentioned frames

Statistics

| FRAME1S | | |
|---------|---------|-----|
| N | Valid | 228 |
| | Missing | 0 |

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Democracy | 22 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 |
| Community of values | 17 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 17.1 |
| Transparency | 13 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 22.8 |
| Equality among countries/member states/regions | 12 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 28.1 |
| Institutional reforms> enlargement | 10 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 32.5 |
| Other | 9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 36.4 |
| Federalism | 8 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 39.9 |
| Solidarity | 7 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 43.0 |
| Human Rights | 6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 45.6 |
| Sovereignty | 6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 48.2 |
| (Social) equality | 5 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 50.4 |
| Peace | 5 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 52.6 |
| Other | 5 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 54.8 |
| Efficiency, competence | 5 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 57.0 |
| French-German co-operation in the postwar period | 5 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 59.2 |
| (neo-)liberalism | 4 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 61.0 |
| Subsidiarity | 4 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 62.7 |
| Influence/weight in international relations | 4 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 64.5 |
| Unemployment | 4 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 66.2 |
| Intercultural, international understanding | 3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 67.5 |
| Bureaucracy | 3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 68.9 |
| Participation | 3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 70.2 |
| Strength in global competition | 3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 71.5 |
| Economic growth | 3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 72.8 |
| Economic stability | 3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 74.1 |
| Social standards/social security | 3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 75.4 |
| Fascist/Nazi rule | 3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 76.8 |

Just as important as the frequency with which frames are present in reported claims is the sense in which they are used. **Tables 10.4a to 10.4d** report the frequencies with which particular frames are used to indicate 1) what the EU is or how it should evolve and, alternatively 2) what the EU is not or how it should not evolve. Frames such as centralization, federalism, racism/xenophobia, Fascist/Nazi rule, and the division of Germany are frequently used examples of what the EU should avoid. Also, frames such as transparency, sovereignty, fascism/nazism, and racism/xenophobia are used as examples of what the EU is not. By way of contrast, the frames of equality amongst countries/member states/regions, democracy and transparency are used as traits that the EU should strive for. Also, the frames of community of values, democracy, guarantee of human rights are used as examples of what the EU is.

Table 10.4a What the EU should not be/lead to

Statistics

| FRAME1S | | |
|---------|---------|---|
| N | Valid | 9 |
| | Missing | 0 |

FRAME1S

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | national identity | 1 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 11,1 |
| | racism/xenophobia | 1 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 22,2 |
| | self-determination | 1 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 33,3 |
| | centralization | 1 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 44,4 |
| | federalism | 1 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 55,6 |
| | transparency | 1 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 66,7 |
| | other | 1 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 77,8 |
| | Fascist/Nazi rule | 1 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 88,9 |
| | division of Germany - the wall | 1 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 9 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 10.4b What the EU is not/does not lead to

Statistics

| FRAME1S | | |
|---------|---------|----|
| N | Valid | 24 |
| | Missing | 0 |

FRAME1S

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | | | | |
| sovereignty | 3 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 12,5 |
| transparency | 3 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 25,0 |
| fascism/nazism | 2 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 33,3 |
| unemployment | 2 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 41,7 |
| racism/xenophobia | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 45,8 |
| (neo-)liberalism | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 50,0 |
| independence | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 54,2 |
| solidarity | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 58,3 |
| democracy | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 62,5 |
| civil society, active citizenship | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 66,7 |
| federalism | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 70,8 |
| efficiency, competence | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 75,0 |
| other | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 79,2 |
| influence/weight in international relations | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 83,3 |
| other | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 87,5 |
| economic growth | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 91,7 |
| social standards/social security | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 95,8 |
| communist/stalinist rule in Eastern Europe | 1 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 100,0 |
| Total | 24 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 10.4c What the EU is/leads to

Statistics

FRAME1S

| | | |
|---|---------|----|
| N | Valid | 87 |
| | Missing | 0 |

FRAME1S

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid community of values | 16 | 18,4 | 18,4 | 18,4 |
| democracy | 11 | 12,6 | 12,6 | 31,0 |
| human rights | 6 | 6,9 | 6,9 | 37,9 |
| French-German co-operation in the postwar period | 5 | 5,7 | 5,7 | 43,7 |
| (neo-)liberalism | 3 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 47,1 |
| (social) equality | 3 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 50,6 |
| peace | 3 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 54,0 |
| bureaucracy | 3 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 57,5 |
| economic stability | 3 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 60,9 |
| freedom, liberty | 2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 63,2 |
| solidarity | 2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 65,5 |
| equality among countries/member states/regions | 2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 67,8 |
| other | 2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 70,1 |
| other | 2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 72,4 |
| security | 2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 74,7 |
| economic growth | 2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 77,0 |
| unemployment | 2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 79,3 |
| socialism/social democracy | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 80,5 |
| other | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 81,6 |
| tolerance | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 82,8 |
| intercultural, international understanding (Völkerverständig | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 83,9 |
| unity | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 85,1 |
| sovereignty | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 86,2 |
| federalism | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 87,4 |
| efficiency, competence | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 88,5 |
| participation | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 89,7 |
| opportunity space for citizens (working, studying, living ab | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 90,8 |
| national interest | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 92,0 |
| environmental protection | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 93,1 |
| other | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 94,3 |
| strength in global competition | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 95,4 |
| inflation | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 96,6 |
| Fascist/Nazi rule | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 97,7 |
| perestroika, glasnost | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 98,9 |
| common historical roots - traditions (general) | 1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 87 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Table 10.4d What the EU should be/should lead to

Statistics

FRAME1S

| | | |
|---|---------|----|
| N | Valid | 79 |
| | Missing | 0 |

FRAME1S

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid equality among countries/member states/regions | 10 | 12,7 | 12,7 | 12,7 |
| democracy | 10 | 12,7 | 12,7 | 25,3 |
| transparency | 8 | 10,1 | 10,1 | 35,4 |
| federalism | 5 | 6,3 | 6,3 | 41,8 |
| solidarity | 4 | 5,1 | 5,1 | 46,8 |
| subsidiarity | 3 | 3,8 | 3,8 | 50,6 |
| efficiency, competence | 3 | 3,8 | 3,8 | 54,4 |
| influence/weight in international relations | 3 | 3,8 | 3,8 | 58,2 |
| Christianity/(judeo-)christian values | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 60,8 |
| (social) equality | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 63,3 |
| intercultural, international understanding (Völkerverständig) | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 65,8 |
| peace | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 68,4 |
| other | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 70,9 |
| credibility (in citizens perspective) | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 73,4 |
| participation | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 75,9 |
| legitimacy | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 78,5 |
| strength in global competition | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 81,0 |
| social standards/social security | 2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 83,5 |
| national identity | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 84,8 |
| community of values | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 86,1 |
| nationalism | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 87,3 |
| globalization | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 88,6 |
| (social) justice | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 89,9 |
| tolerance | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 91,1 |
| responsibility | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 92,4 |
| linguistic diversity | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 93,7 |
| diversity (general) | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 94,9 |
| pluralism | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 96,2 |
| civil society, active citizenship | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 97,5 |
| European - a countrys relation with USA | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 98,7 |
| consumer protection | 1 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 100,0 |
| Total | 79 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |