

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

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

Funded by: 5th Framework Programme of the European Commission
Contract No. HPSE-CT2000-00046
Work package: **WP 3 (Analysis of newspaper editorials)**
WP Coordinator: Barbara Pfetsch
Deliverable number: **D 3.4**

Integrated Report **The Voice of the Media in European Public Sphere: Comparative Analysis of Newspaper Editorials**

Author: **Barbara Pfetsch**
With the collaboration of Silke Adam, Barbara Berkel, and Juan Diez Medrano,

Date: 15 July 2004

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
1. Introduction	3
2. Mass Media and the Europeanisation of the Public Sphere: Conceptual Approach and Design of the Study	4
2.1. The European Public Sphere as a Diversified Structure of Vertical and Horizontal Communicative Linkages	5
2.2. The Media's Role in the Europeanised Public Sphere	6
2.3. Empirical Desiderates, Methodology and Data	8
3. Issue Field Salience	
4. Levels of Europeanisation in Media Claims Making	15
4.1. Initiating Events	16
4.2. First Issue in the Claim	18
4.3. Addressees	20
4.4. First Object Actor	23
4.5. Multivariate Analysis of European Scopes	25
5. Media Opinions about European Issues and Actors	29
5.1. Positions towards European Issues	30
5.2. Evaluations of European and National Political Actors	35
6. Media Frames of European Integration	42
7. Summary and Conclusion	60
References	63

1. Introduction

In the discussions about the democratic deficit of the European Union, scholars have come to acknowledge that European integration from above must be accompanied by a Europeanisation of public communication in order to overcome the EU's lack of legitimacy and popular involvement. The request for public communication as an indispensable prerequisite for the democratisation of Europe has triggered a vivid scholarly debate about the emergence of a European public sphere. Discussing the conditions for such a forum of communication (Neidhardt et al. 2000), most scholars agree that the mass media is the main arena for the public representation of a European public sphere.

According to theories of the public sphere, the mass media are the institutionalised forum of debate, which serves as a central linkage between the public and the institutional structure. In this function, they are conveyors of information about issues and actors according to their professional norms and values. However, the media are not merely serving other actors as a channel of communication, forum for exchange, and medium of self observation of society. The media must also be seen as political actors in the public sphere who legitimately raise their own voice (Page 1996). They do so in particular by assigning relevance to issues for public debate and by expressing their own opinion.

The dual role of the media - as communication channels of political actors *and* as actors in their own right - is of particular importance to the debate on the Europeanisation of public sphere (Koopmans/Pfetsch 2003). Most studies, that claim to detect processes of Europeanisation in the public sphere on the basis of media analysis (Gerhards 2000, Eilders/Voltmer 2003, Peter/de Vreese 2003, Kevin 2003, Eder/Trenz 2000), fail to assess whether the presence or absence of Europeanisation is the result of the media's own position *or* of the communication strategies of other political actors. Thus, the media's genuine voice in Europeanised public communication is still a desiderate.

The integrated report of WP 3 focuses on the voice of the media in the potentially emerging Europeanisation of the public sphere. According to our theoretical approach to Europeanised public sphere we study the structure of communicative linkages across and beyond national public spaces. Within the framework of the overall Europub.com-project Workpackages 2 and 3 share the notion, that the Europeanisation of public communication should be investigated across countries with reference to the structure of claims making in specific issue fields, taking into account policy areas with both, high and low degrees of political integration on the EU level. However, while WP2 looks at the claims making of all collective political actors that appear in public, WP3 only focuses on the media as actors. In this report, we therefore analyse the communication through which the media themselves make public demands on selected issues including European integration. Since the legitimate format for the expression of media positions is the commentary or opinion section which is sharply set apart from the news coverage in most newspapers, we focus on editorials. In particular, we assess the claims mak-

ing in the editorials of four newspapers in each country under study during the period of 2000-2002.

2. Mass Media and the Europeanisation of the Public Sphere: Conceptual approach and Design of the Study

Since the early 1990, scholars have come to emphasize that the communication flow between Europe and the public depends crucially on the mass media¹. Thus, a significant strand of research highlights the centrality of media in a potentially emerging European public sphere (Gerhards 1993, 2000, Schlesinger 1997, Schlesinger/Kevin 2000, Kunelius/ Sparks 2001, Kevin 2003, Koopmans/Erbe 2003). Concerning a mass-mediated European public sphere and the probability of the development of such a communicative space scholars agree that a genuinely transnational mass media system, that could maintain the political functions of a democratic European public sphere, is rather unlikely. If there are supranational media to be detected, they are confined to a limited audience of political and business elites, who communicate in English, or take the form of non-political media that specialize in sports and music (Kevin 2003: 38-41). Linguistic boundaries, cultural heterogeneity, and the fact that media systems are strongly bound to national mass audiences are crucial and perhaps insurmountable barriers to the formation of a unified European public sphere, which would be a replication on the European level of the structure we know from national media systems.

Since a supranational European public sphere seems rather unrealistic, several scholars (e.g., Gerhards 1993, 2000, Schlesinger/Kevin 2000) argue that the potentially emerging European public sphere must be sought within the national public spheres of the various European countries. This perspective maintains that Europeanisation “is for the most part dependent on the output of the national media” (Kevin 2003: 52). Such Europeanisation of national public spheres would occur when nationally based mass media shift their focus away from the national political arena towards the European level. In this perspective, increasing proportions of European issues and actors in national media and growing references to transnational contexts would be indicative for a Europeanised public sphere.

For studying the Europeanisation of public spheres and assessing the role of the media therein the Europub.com-project further develops and differentiates this approach. Our study maintains that Europeanisation of public communication must be investigated with reference to the interactive nature of public communication, and the horizontal (between member-state) and vertical (between member-states and the EU level) linkages that are made by actors intervening in the public sphere. Further, we recognize and take into account that the level and degree of Europeanisation might vary among policy areas. Finally we conceive of the media in their dual role as we distinguish between the media as forum of exchange for collective political

¹ According to Eurobarometer data, two-thirds of EU citizens consistently identify the media as their most important source of political information (Peter/de Vreese 2003:3).

actors, that raise their voice in publicly, and the media as political actors in their own right.

2.1. The European Public Sphere as a Diversified Structure of Vertical and Horizontal Communicative Linkages

As regards our notion of Europeanisation, the Europub.com-project conceives of an Europeanised public sphere in a relative sense. Following the work of Koopmans and Erbe (2003), we propose that the spatial reach and boundaries of public communication can be determined by investigating patterns of communicative flows and assessing the relative density of public communication within and between different political spaces. The center of this communicative space is the national public sphere of each country. The next level of communication refers to other national European public spaces, which comprise the EU member countries and those countries that are candidates to enter the EU. The third level comprises the transnational, European political space, in which the European institutions and common policies are situated. The degree to which public spheres can be deemed “national”, “transnational”, or “European” depends on the density of communicative linkages within and between these spaces.

It follows from this notion that with regard to Europeanisation of national public spheres the media may engage in two basic forms of geo-political and spatial contextualisation of their public communication:

- *Vertical Europeanisation*, which consists of communicative linkages between the national and the European level.
- *Horizontal Europeanisation*, which consists of communicative linkages between different EU-member states.

In contrast to previous research that considered only vertical Europeanisation, our approach includes the dimension of horizontal Europeanisation. We argue that by looking at vertical and horizontal modes of Europeanisation, our study is well equipped to capture the flow of politically relevant communication within the common European space.

Regarding the nature of Europeanisation, we do not expect Europeanised public communication to penetrate the national public spheres on a general level with regard to all themes of public debate or all policy fields. Considering the large differences in the actual competencies of European institutions among different policy fields, it is unrealistic to expect an overall high and stable degree of European debate across all policy fields and issues. Following a political opportunity structure perspective (e.g., Imig/ Tarrow 1994; Kriesi et al. 1995), we expect patterns of public communication to reflect the actual distribution of power between the various European and the national levels, as well as whether the European decision-making process is primarily intergovernmental or primarily supranational in nature.

Therefore, the Europub.com-project chose to analyse public communication with respect to seven issue fields that represent various settings and levels of national and European governance. In addition to the meta-field of European integration, six substantive policy domains were selected for analysis. The issue fields vary systematically according to their level of formal Europeanisation, reaching from fully integrated to merely coordinated domains: (1) Monetary politics: currency politics and interest rate, and (2) Agriculture: subsidies, livestock and dairy quotas, animal disease control represent issue areas that are characterised by a high degree of EU involvement in national politics, which to an important extent entails supranational powers for EU institutions. (3) Immigration: entry and exit, and (4) Troops deployment mark the policy areas in which we observe increasing EU competencies (or at least attempt to increase the EU's role), but where national decision-making is still predominant and the EU political process is dominated by intergovernmental negotiations. Finally, (5) Retirement and pension schemes and (6) Primary and secondary education are domains that have largely remained under the umbrella of national or regional decision making, and where the role of the EU is very limited.

2.2. The Media's Role in the Europeanised Public Sphere

While scholars agree that the media are a key variable in the Europeanisation of public communication, the previous research suffers from a poor theoretical qualification of the role of the media². In most studies, the media's role as political actors is not set apart from other collective actors, who feed the news production process. Thus, the voice of the media converges with the voice of the media's sources. In contrast to previous studies, the Europub.com project seeks to identify the voice of the media by taking into account their dual function in public sphere. On the one hand, the media act as mediators of information from political actors that develop communication strategies to generate public attention and political support. In this function, they shape information flows that are of crucial importance for polities in national and supranational public spheres, which rely on a free flow of information as the basis of democratic legitimation, responsiveness, accountability and participation. On the other hand, the media are granted a role as actors in their own right which make their own contribution to political agenda-setting and opinion formation. This study focuses explicitly on the latter role of the media as political actors.

In European public sphere, the mass media fulfill crucial functions, which Eilders/Voltmer (2003: 9-10) discuss as (1) agenda setting and second level agenda-setting (or framing); and (2) opinion formation which refers to presenting own positions and evaluations of actors. In their agenda-setting role the media shape the news coverage, which is dependent on external sources and their information. However, if the media act on their own account, they may take the liberty to deviate from the news agenda of other actors. Within the recognized format of editorials and commentaries, they may select issues and assign relevance to them as topics for

² For a detailed discussion and criticism of previous studies see Koopmans/Pfetsch (2003).

public deliberation (Dearing/Rogers 1996, Protesse/McCombs 1991). Thus the issue agenda of the media in the editorial section introduces their own salience in the issue agenda and may not follow the rank order of issues by non-media actors.

The same argument applies to the so-called “second-level agenda-setting” function (Ghanem 1997; McCombs et al. 2000) which refers to a process that scholars of public discourse call “framing”. The concept of framing refers to the contextualization of issues, namely the construction of a framework of interpretative meaning around an issue, which then is taken as a basis for collective opinion formation. The framing approach has emphasized that people’s attitudes and behavior toward objects or problems depend on how they conceive of, frame, or represent them³. “Frames help actors identify problems and specify and prioritize their interests and goals; they point actors toward causal and normative judgments about effective and appropriate policies in ways that tend to propel policy down a particular path and to reinforce it once on that path; and they can endow actors deemed to have moral authority or expert status with added power in a policy field”. (Bleich, 2003: 26-27). In this spirit, one cannot assume, as does most of the literature, that everybody perceives the European integration process and the European Union in the same way. Some representations of the European Union are shared by everybody, across social and national locations. For instance, most people in the European Union conceive of the European Union as a large market. Other representations are more prevalent in specific social locations. Thus, farmers see the European Union through the lenses of the Common Agricultural Policy more than do other social sectors. Yet, other representations are shared more by people with a particular ideological bent. Some leftist individuals, for instance, conceive of the European Union as yet another plot by monopoly capitalists to better exploit the labor force, whereas more conservative individuals think mainly of the economic advantages of a large single market. As Diez Medrano (2003) shows, frames about Europe vary significantly in the national publics of the UK, Germany and Spain.

In mass communication research, studies have tried to integrate the framing tradition into media effect research by investigating how media frame political issues and how frames in the media impact on people’s perception of issues and actors. Since the early empirical studies in this tradition (Iyengar/Kinder 1987) it has been widely acknowledged that the media are effective actors in processes of framing political and social issues and thereby causing political effects. Again, publicly visible frames can be rooted either in the communicative actions of external actors that are conveyed by the media, or stem from the interpretations of the media themselves. If the media’s role is qualified in this way, one can expect that the publicly visible issue agendas and frames that are promoted by the media in editorials must not coincide with the frames by other political actors. The media’s own frames may well emphasize European scopes, while at the same time the agenda and frames of other actors as covered by the media may adhere to a predominantly national perspective.

³ For a conceptualization of the term, see Bateson (1955), Goffman. 1974. Regarding the concept of schema, see also Susan Fiske and Shelley Taylor (1984), Doris Graber (1988). For examples of how frames affect behavior, see Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman (1981), Raymond Boudon (1996), Renaud Fillieule (1996), Siegwart Lindenberg and Bruno S. Frey (1993). For reviews in the field of political science see Sheri Berman (2001) and Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink (2001) and in experimental survey research see William Foddy (1993).

The most genuine and active function of the media as political actors refers to opinion formation. This implies that the media not only report about the positions of other actors, but take their own stance on issues by commenting on the opinions and actions of non-media political actors. This function is the predominant purpose of editorials. Eilders/Voltmer (2003:11) maintain that national media express their political preferences insofar as they expose a more or less stable and coherent commentary line. The commentary line contributes to the identification of a newspaper, television or radio station, and situates it within the spectrum of political cleavages within a specific country. However, European politics and policies in many countries are not strongly linked to the traditional left-right spectrum, so that the national cleavages cannot be transferred to European politics. Thus, while media are usually bound to the left-right spectrum of politics as regards national policies and debates, their positions and stakes as regards European politics leave more room to maneuver. Therefore one would expect that the freedom of the media to come up with their own position in European issues may be higher than for national ones. Finally, another dimension of the media's opinion formation role, which is institutionalized in the media format of editorials, refers to their potential to evaluate and criticise other actors. Thus, the national media may be favorable towards European integration and at the same time yield critical opinions on the performance of the actors involved on the European or national level.

If the media's role in European public sphere is conceptualized according to their dual role as conveyors of external information and as active participants in political discourse, one must conclude that the particular media voice in a potentially emerging European public sphere can only be detected if the genuine claims by the media are distinguished from those of other actors in the news coverage. Consequently, the media's voice can be identified by (1) analyzing the contents of the editorials and press commentaries, which constitute the institutionalized and legitimate format of the media's own position; and (2) by conceptualising the commentator as claimant who explicitly takes stands on political issues and actors in the public debate

2.3. Empirical Desiderates, Methodology and Data

This report presents a cross-national and cross-issue analysis of media's voice relating to Europeanisation in national public spheres. In particular, we assess the role of print media as agenda-setters and opinion makers by investigating their claims in the seven issue fields and countries under study over three years (2000, 2001, 2002). We shall address the question of Europeanisation of the media's claims making along four themes:

- Issue field salience of European integration;
- Levels of Europeanisation in claims making;
- Evaluation of European actors and issues;
- Media frames of European integration.

Our analysis of the press commentaries starts with an investigation of the agenda setting dimension in editorials regarding the salience of issue fields. In the first section, we look at the distribution of media claims in the various issue fields and seek to identify how European integration plays out as a theme on the commentary agenda compared to the other issues.

Regarding Europeanisation of public debate, our analysis moves on to the question to what degree the media constitute themselves as communicative linkage in a transnational public sphere. In the second section we therefore analyse the scopes of initiating events, issues and actor categories that are addressed and cited as supporters or opponents in claims making. According to our theoretical conception of Europeanisation we focus on vertical and horizontal forms of references to EU actors and other EU-countries and contrast them with references to the own country. We also identify the degree to which claims making refers to a supranational level.

The third section addresses the question to what degree the media estimate the European project. This desiderate is discussed with respect to two aspects. First, we look at the position of the media regarding European integration. We analyse the media opinion about whether the EU should be granted more responsibilities and competences and the subjective attitude of the commentators in terms of positive or negative sentiments towards European integration. Second, we analyse the evaluations by the media of European actors as compared to the evaluations of actors from other EU countries and the own country.

The last point in the findings section refers to the media's framing of European integration, since we know that the perceptions of the EU across national publics vary considerably. As the media are one of the major actors to construct the interpretation frames of issues, it is of crucial importance to the process of Europeanisation to learn which notion is most prevalent in the media's voice.

As we analyse our data along those four themes we generally stay within the overall design of Europub.com study. This means that we compare across countries, across issue fields, and across newspaper type. In order to be able to completely assess the development of the media claims in the contemporary public debate and thus capture the actual Europeanisation of the media, we decided to concentrate our efforts on the years 2000-2002 and not to go back in time for this work package. For the three years under study we are in the position to refer to changes over time, yet the time span of the study is too short to allow for conclusions about trends. Since our first analyses of the data do not reveal dramatic changes over these three years, we decided for reasons of reducing complexity to not differentiate in every table for the three years of the study, but to collapse the time variable. However, we scrutinized the time variable systematically and also included it as an independent variable in the multivariate analyses.

The general approach to data collection in WP3 as well as in WP2 is quantitative content analysis of newspapers which is based on claims as unit of analysis. Like in WP 2 a claim is

defined as an instance of strategic action in the public sphere. It consists of the expression of a political opinion by some form of physical or verbal action, regardless of the form this expression takes (statement, violence, repression, decision, demonstration, court ruling, etc. etc.).

An act of claims making usually consists of the following elements:

- a subject actor, or *claimant*, who makes a demand, proposal, appeal, or criticism;
- an *addressee*, who is held responsible for implementing the claim, or is the target of criticism or support;
- an *object actor*, whose interests are or would be positively (beneficiary) or negatively affected by the claim;
- the *substantive content* of the claim, stating what is to be done (aim) and why (frame).

In the editorial analysis we treat the commentator as claimant and the main message of the editorial as one claim by the newspaper. Thus, the coding of media claims⁴ recorded the commentator or journalist as claimant who addresses his demands to actors or institutions (addressees) in criticism or support. We also qualified the object actors in whose interests the media claim is made, and the content of the demand and the argumentative framing that supports it. Importantly for determining whether or not we are dealing with Europeanised claims, we coded the geographical or polity level at which the different actors and institutions that are mentioned in the claim are situated (e.g., European or national scope), as well as, in the case of national or subnational actors, the country where they are based (e.g., Germany, France).

During the coding procedure which took place in each country of the study in spring and summer 2003 we conducted a reliability test⁵ for the commentary analysis. The reliability of commentary coding was tested on the basis of a random sample of seven commentaries from the Scotsmen, the Times and the Guardian of the year 2002. At least one coder from each Europub.com team and a total number of 15 coders took part in the test. The total number of decisions per variable that had to be tested for reliability is 105⁶. The reliability analysis is thus based on 14062 decisions in total. The reliability was coded as follows. Every claim-variable, except for the string variables and the variables concerning the cross-references of claims, was tested for reliability. The majority decision within a claim was taken as the norm and every divergent decision was taken as a “mistake”. An overall reliability on the level of single variables was calculated only on the basis of: First initiating event, Journalist, First Addressee, Opponent Actor, Supported Actor, First issue, First Object Actor and First Frame. This limited the variables for an overall reliability to 51. For each variable 105 decisions were analysed. The overall reliability is therefore based on 4545 decisions. The average match of decisions in these 51 variables is 75 percent which corresponds to a reliability correlation of .87.

⁴ The Codebook for content coding of commentaries was developed by Adam et al. (2002). It is available at <https://europub.wz-berlin.de>.

⁵ For a detailed overview of the reliability of all variables see the Europub.com WP3 Reliability Test Report.

⁶ As one coder did miss one claim 104 decisions were tested for reliability per variable.

In contrast to WP2 which looks at claims making by all actors in the public sphere, WP3 only records claims of the journalist that are explicitly expressed in the commentary. Thus, we suppose that each editorial is one claim in the name of the media organisation expressed by the commentator. Since one can assume that the editorials represent the political and ideological commentary line of each newspaper, we take the aggregation of claims by individual commentators as the position of the media organization. In order to capture the range of ideological positions in the media system of each country, the variation in styles of addressing the political public and the regional aspect of the media system, we draw on four daily newspapers of different types in each country under study: a centre-left as well as a centre-right quality newspaper, a tabloid newspaper, as well as a regional newspaper in a region with a specific regional identity. Since not all media systems are able to fit into such a clear cut set of the theoretically defined dimensions, we had to make compromises in the selection of newspapers for the study. While we were able to detect a left and a right quality paper in all countries under study, we faced some difficulties with regard to the tabloids. As the country reports show, there are different cultural notions about tabloids in the various countries and some media systems hardly include newspapers that would fit in the category at all. For instance, not all national media systems reveal such a sharp contrast between quality newspapers and tabloids like in the UK. Thus in countries where the media landscape does not feature a clear cut yellow press, we tried to select newspapers for the study that can be regarded as functional equivalents to the tabloid press. In countries where we could not identify such a functional equivalent newspaper, we chose a second regional press title.

Table 1: Newspapers under study in WP 3

	Quality Press		Regional Press	Tabloid Press
	centre left	center right		
Germany	Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild-Zeitung
Switzerland	Neue Zürcher Zeitung	Le Temps	Le Matin	Blick
Spain	El Pais	Abc	La Vanguardia	El Mundo
Italy	La Repubblica	Il Corriere della Sera	Il Mattino	La Nazione
United Kingdom	The Guardian	The Times	The Scotsman	The Sun
France	Le Monde	Le Figaro	Ouest France	L'Humanite
Netherlands	De Volkskant	Het Algemeen Dagblad	De Limburger	De Telegraaf

Table 1 provides an overview over the newspapers that were chosen for analysis (see also WP3 country reports for detailed arguments about the selection of newspaper in each country). It was easy to identify the tabloid paper for the study in the UK, in Germany and in Switzerland. In the case of the Netherlands, De Telegraaf fits best the Dutch conception of tabloid. In France however, the only newspaper that could in some respect serve as a functional equivalent for a tabloid newspaper was L'Humanite, the official newspaper by the Communist

party. The newspaper is not read by the masses, but claims to speak for the working people and has some “popular” touch. In Italy and Spain, instead of a tabloid, a second regional newspaper was chosen.

Since we intended to study three years and at the same time wanted to restrict the coding effort to manageable proportions, we decided to draw a sample of editorials for analysis. However, sampling commentaries turned out to be difficult, since the number of editorials in the various newspapers under study and - more importantly - in the different countries of the project vary extremely. To reach a sufficient number of commentaries in all countries for coding and still be able to fulfil the workload of coding in those countries with a high number of commentaries, we decided to customize the samples for each country’s setting. As a result of calculating the potential number of commentaries that come up for each country, we decided on the following strategy: In those countries with a low number of commentaries, France, the Netherlands and Switzerland, we selected all items that fit our seven issue fields in all of our four newspapers on every day of the year. In the United Kingdom, Italy and Spain – countries that yield a medium number of commentaries - we select and register the commentaries on every claims day of WP 2. Germany turned out to be the country with most commentaries. Thus we decided here to take only the opinion items that appear on every second claims day as a sample for work package 3. On the days of the sample we looked through the newspapers and selected all commentaries related to our seven issue fields. As to allow for comparison over time, we applied for each country exactly the same sampling scheme as for the year 2000.

Table 2: Distribution of commentaries per country and year

	2000		2001		2002		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DE	321	32.0	344	34.3	339	33.8	1.004	19,0
CH	277	40.7	201	29.5	203	29.8	681	12,9
ES	193	32.4	208	35.0	194	32.6	595	11,2
IT	184	26.5	226	32.6	284	40.9	694	13,1
UK	245	26.9	328	36.0	337	37.0	910	17,2
FR	189	22.9	226	33.3	263	38.8	678	12,8
NL	241	32.9	267	36.3	224	30.6	732	13,8
Total	1650	31.2	1800	34.0	1844	34.8	5.294	100,0

As table 2 indicates, the distribution of commentaries over time is pretty well balanced: We detected around one third of the commentaries in each year. The commentary activity of the media in our seven issue fields remained fairly constant in Germany, Spain and the Netherlands and it slightly increased from 2000-2002 in Italy, UK and France. Only in Switzerland, we notice a decline of commentary activity in the issue fields over the three years. As for the distribution of commentaries across countries, our sampling strategy delivered quite similar numbers of cases. It turned out that German and UK still yielded the highest numbers of commentaries, even if we applied more restrictive sampling rules.

Table 3 shows that the commentary activity in the media varies according to newspaper type in each country. All in all, we found that 62 percent of the commentaries in the overall sample were published in quality newspapers. However, this overall distribution is to a large degree the result of the fact that in Germany and Switzerland there is a sharp distinction between the quality press on the one hand and the regional and tabloid press on the other as regards their proneness to publish opinion pieces. Although we also see that the quality press is more eager to commentate, in Spain, Italy and the UK the discrepancy between the newspaper types is not as large. Only in France and Netherlands, we find fairly equal numbers and shares of commentaries in all newspapers which might be due to the fact that in France and in the Netherlands, our functional equivalent for a tabloid newspaper is idiosyncratic.

Table 3: Distribution of newspaper type per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
quality newspaper	81.8	80.3	51.6	57.9	56.2	48.1	48.5	61.7	3269
regional/tabloid	18.2	19.7	48.4	42.1	43.8	51.9	51.5	38.3	2025
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	1.004	681	595	694	910	678	732	5294	5294

Since the analyses in this report focus on claims making by the media, we shall further only include those commentaries that contain a claim referring to any of the seven issue fields. In the framework of this study, the level and distribution of claims in commentaries can be interpreted as an indicator for the degree to which the media chose to act as claimants in the public debate of the issue fields of the study. Thus it shows the proneness of the press in each country to interfere in the public debate by raising their own voice explicitly.

Table 4: Distribution of commentaries containing claims per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Claim included	83.2	81.9	86.7	97.0	91.8	88.8	98.1	89.5	4737
No claim	16.8	18.1	13.3	3.0	8.2	11.2	1.9	10.5	557
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	1.004	681	595	694	910	678	732	5294	5294

Table 4 indicates that 90 percent of the editorials are dedicated to claims making which indeed confirms our initial assumption that the media use the format of editorials to speak up in political debate. The level of outspokenness of the press is particularly high in Italy and the Netherlands, where almost all commentaries include claims. In contrast, the press in Germany and Switzerland seems to be more cautious to speak up. In these countries almost one fifth of

the commentaries abstain from claims making. One might speculate about the reasons behind this finding, but one explanation could be that in the German speaking journalistic tradition, some writers are particularly prone to the so called “analytic” commentary-style. In this format, the writer is to ponder about the positions of other political actors, yet does not take a stance as far his or her own opinion is concerned.

3. Issue Field Salience

Our inquiry into the role of the media in Europeanisation starts by looking at the issue field salience that is expressed in the commentary activities of the national media. As we presuppose in our research design, the references to European actors and issues as well as to other European countries should vary across the issues that are discussed in the media. In order to get a picture about the policies that shape the media debate in the national public spheres during the time of our study, we first look at the distribution of issue fields in which claims making is observed. As to Europeanisation, the structure of claims making per issue field and country allows us to see the salience of issues that are directly linked to European policy, such as European integration, as compared to policy fields that might reveal a rather national perspective.

Table 5: Distribution of claims making in issue fields per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Monetary politics	18.1	14.8	25.0	18.9	20.6	13.8	11.1	17.4	825
Agriculture	8.3	4.1	9.9	2.8	10.5	9.5	12.1	8.3	394
Immigration	10.4	10.0	14.3	7.1	7.2	6.2	14.3	9.8	465
Troops deployment	14.6	6.6	7.9	18.9	21.8	24.3	13.1	15.8	749
Retirement/pensions	11.6	15.7	4.7	4.3	2.8	9.5	5.0	7.5	354
Education	9.7	9.4	9.9	19.0	21.6	8.2	22.7	14.9	705
European integration	27.3	39.5	28.3	29.0	15.6	28.6	21.6	26.3	1248
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	835	562	516	673	835	601	718	100	4740

Table 5 and Table 6 show that claims making activity of the media concerning policies varies across the seven countries under study. However, we see a clear picture in our data that the meta-issue of European integration is the most salient theme of media claims making in five of the seven countries under study. Interestingly enough, European integration is most frequently represented as claims making domain in Switzerland. By contrast, European integration is rather low in the priority list of the UK media, since it takes only the fourth rank among the seven claims making domains.

Table 6: Rank order issue fields of claims making per country

		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total
1	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	Troops	EU	Educ	EU
2	Money	Pension	Money	Educ	Educ	Educ	Troops	EU	Money
3	Troops	Money	Immig	Money/ Troops	Money	Money	Money	Immig	Troops
4	Pension	Immig	Agri Educ	EU	Agri	Troops	Educ	Agri	Immig
5	Immig	Educ	Troops	Troops	Immig	Agri	Agri	Money	Agri
6	Educ	Troops	Pension	Agri	Immig	Educ	Immig	Pension	Pension
7	Agri	Agri	Pension	Agri	Pension	Immig	Immig	Pension	Pension

If we compare the rank order of the first three issue domains across countries, we detect a general pattern: With the exception of the UK, it is European integration and monetary politics plus - depending on the country - either education, troop deployment, or immigration policies that are leading the list of media claim mentions. In addition to the UK, we also find that the Netherlands deviates from this general pattern. Thus, in the Netherlands the leading claims making field is education, yet it is only one percentage point higher in mention than European integration. Moreover in Dutch media as well as in the Spanish press immigration ranks in the third place of the claims making agenda.

As we presupposed in our study design, European integration and monetary politics do have a high potential of Europeanised claims making, while especially education should rather provoke claims in the realm of national policy making. Interestingly enough, the issue field of agriculture which should also imply good chances of Europeanised claims making ranks rather low in almost all of the countries. Only in France and Spain it is located in a middle position of the ranking. Given this distribution of issue fields across countries, we can expect that the chances of Europeanisation of claims making are rather good in those countries in which the media stress EU Integration and monetary issues, such as Germany, Switzerland, Spain, Italy and France, while they are assumed to be rather moderate to low in the UK and the Netherlands.

4. Levels of Europeanisation in Media Claims Making

The central question of Europeanisation in Media Claims Making is addressed in this study by analyzing the degree to which the commentaries contain communicative linkages that transcend the national public and political arena. Thus, we try to identify whether the media open up in their contribution to public debate to a European perspective. According to our theoretical conception of Europeanisation, we differentiate communicative linkages between the national and EU level of politics as vertical form of Europeanisation, and communicative linkages between national and other EU-countries as horizontal form of Europeanisation. Both types are contrasted with either only national references or supranational linkages. In the fol-

lowing analyses, we look at the distribution of scopes concerning the initiating events of the commentaries, the most important (first) issue mentioned in the opinion articles, the addressees to whom the claim is directed and finally the (first) object actors who are perceived to have stakes in the issue discussed.

4.1. Initiating Events

Regarding the media's voice in public debate the first question is what events stimulate these actors to speak up in their own name. What kind of opportunities trigger media commentary and to what degree do the commentators react to events that include a European scope? Do the media primarily comment on events and situations that are predominantly happening in their own country or do they resonate with events on the EU agenda? In our analysis we tried to capture this dimension of the media's behavior by coding the initiating event of the commentaries. The data that are reported in the country reports reveal a pretty similar picture of the events to which the media react in their commentaries. From the long list of events, four types of events stand out to which the commentators react most frequently: political decisions (23 %), meetings (15 %), unspecified statements (14 %) and communication events that are partly directed to the media (11 %). Thus, 63 % of all claims are based on those four types of events. These data show on the one hand that the commentators in all countries closely follow political decision making and keep track with the meetings of political actors. On the other hand, media opinion is also provoked by less specified occasions when other actors raise their voices in public to draw media attention.

Table 7: Scope of initiating events per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Supranational	3,2	1,6	3,0	8,7	3,0	5,1	1,1	3,7	169
EU-vertical	29,5	15,5	39,3	49,9	13,2	33,3	22,2	28,2	1.307
EU-horizontal	5,2	9,6	10,3	1,0	5,2	7,5	7,8	6,4	295
Own country	43,2	58,9	30,0	25,2	57,6	31,6	59,6	44,8	2073
Other/rest of world	18,9	14,4	17,6	15,2	20,9	22,5	9,3	17,0	786
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
N	804	562	507	670	823	547	717		4.630

Table 7 reveals the findings on the geo-political scope of events that trigger media voice in each country. The data show that one third of all events that lead to commentaries include a vertical or horizontal European dimension. Thus, one out of three occasions that stimulate media opinion is connected with Europe. 28 % of all events refer to the vertical dimension, such as the interaction between national and European actors. Another 6 % include a horizontal dimension which means that the event relates to the linkage between EU-member states. If we compare across countries we find that the Italian, the Spanish and the French press are

particularly prone to feature the vertical dimension in the initiating events. In the Italian media one out of two initiating events refers to the EU level of politics, in the Spanish media it is two out of five and in France it is one out of three initiating events. The Spanish press is also over proportionately open to events in other EU-countries. In contrast, the media in the UK and in the Netherlands seem to be commenting primarily by following up with events in their own country. In a way, the reactions of the Swiss media are interesting, as they feature the typical geo-political situation of the country. On the one hand, the Swiss media are particularly closed up as they comment due to events in their own country over proportionately. On the other hand, they are among the media most open to events that are linked with other EU-countries, among which the Germany and France hold a prominent position.

The findings on the scope of initiating events across countries are closely linked with the policies that are debated in each country. Thus, Table 8 which compares the scope of initiating events across issue fields, clearly shows that almost all initiating events in the domain of pension and retirement policies and in education are confined to the national level. Thus, if education policies are most frequently used as domain of claims making of the media in a country, such is the case in the Netherlands and to a lesser degree in the UK, the initiating events stay within the domestic arena most frequently.

Table 8: Scope of initiating events per issue field

	Monetary	Agricult	Immigrat	Troops	Pension	Education	EU-Inte-gration	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Supranational	1,9	2,1	1,8	15,4	1,8	0,7	1,2	3,7	169
EU vertical	50,0	30,7	7,5	5,4	4,1	2,1	56,0	28,2	1307
EU horizontal	6,8	5,8	7,0	2,1	1,2	1,1	13,0	6,4	295
Own country	25,7	55,8	65,1	23,5	90,2	93,9	18,3	44,8	2072
Other/rest of world	15,7	5,6	18,6	53,6	2,7	2,1	11,4	17,0	786
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	798	378	456	727	338	700	1.232		4.629

Table 8 also indicates that the initiating events in those issue fields that include high competences and involvement of the EU, European integration, monetary politics and agriculture, are quite naturally featuring the highest proportion of vertical scopes in initiating events. However, agriculture policies also seem to produce a considerable share of domestic events that are used as an occasion for the media to raise their voice. Finally, we see in the data that initiating events in the area of troop deployment deviate in their scope from those in all other policy fields. Commentary action here is way over proportionately bound to events in countries outside Europe. What we find here is that mostly events in the US stimulate the media to voice their opinion. Finally, if we look at the variation of initiating events according to newspaper type and year of event, we find that neither variable produces strong contrasts.

4.2. First Issue in the Claim

As we intended to study the nature of political debate in the media, we recorded the issues at the core of each claim. The issue variable⁷ refers to the substantial topic of the media claim which was recorded with respect to the policy fields under study. Regarding the core question of this report, we wanted to know to what degree the issues in the commentaries are discussed with reference to Europe. This question is answered by analysing the issue scope of the most important issue in the claim.

The findings which are depicted in Table 9 reveal a quite clear cut picture which resembles the structure of initiating events to some degree. Now, if we compare the issue scopes across countries, we notice a quite high level of vertical Europeanisation in the media debate. Almost one out of two claims features a vertical issue scope, while only one third of all claims contain a purely national issue scope. The data in Table 9 point to a pattern of variation where two countries yield significantly higher European issue scopes and two countries deviate in the other direction from the average. Thus, while in Italian and Spanish media the debate reveals high vertical issue scopes, they are way lower in the media of the UK and the Netherlands. Media claims in Germany, Switzerland and France fit into the average pattern described above. Regarding the type of issue scopes it is most telling, that hardly any national media contain horizontal references. This means that the political debate in national media does not picture issue contents by including or pointing to other EU countries. Either the debate stays confined to the issues in the perspective of the own national arena or refers to the linkage of national and EU governance.

Table 9: First issue scope per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Supranational	4,4	3,0	3,3	6,6	6,6	7,4	7,9	5,7	271
EU-vertical	48,7	50,0	62,1	54,5	35,4	50,8	41,1	47,9	2264
EU-horizontal	1,4	1,1	0,4	0,3	0,2	1,0	0,7	0,7	35
Own country	33,0	34,5	21,1	25,8	39,9	23,3	40,3	32,0	1511
Other/rest of world	12,5	11,4	13,1	12,8	17,8	17,4	10,0	13,7	646
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
N	834	562	512	670	835	596	718		4727

The reason for this clear cut dual structure of issue scopes lies in the nature of debate within the seven issue fields of the study. Thus, we see in Table 10, that each of the policy fields maintains a quite specific constellation of issue scopes. It is almost self evident that European integration is a policy field that cannot but be discussed by referring to almost one hundred

⁷ Although, for each claim more than one issue could be coded, we followed the hierarchical rule that the variable “first issue” records the most important topic of the claim. Thus, if we analyse the first issue of each claim we can tell about the core contents of political debate to which media opinion is raised.

percent to the interaction national and EU politics. In addition, we also see that debates in financial and monetary politics turn out to be almost completely de-nationalised. 82 percent of the claims here include vertical issue scopes with respect to the EU. On the other end of the typology we find the policy fields pensions/retirement and education. The debates in both issue domains stay almost completely within national boundaries.

Table 10: First issue scope per issue field

	Monetary	Agricult	Immigrat	Troops	Pension	Education	EU-Inte-gration	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Supranational	0,5	3,3	2,4	31,5	0,3	0,3	0,4	5,7	271
EU vertical	81,6	47,6	20,0	6,8	5,9	1,7	98,7	47,9	2.264
EU horizontal	0,1	2,0	2,2	0,0	1,1	1,0	0,4	0,7	35
Own country	9,3	44,2	57,4	1,6	90,7	93,6	0,2	32,0	1.511
Other/rest of world	8,5	2,8	18,1	60,0	2,0	3,4	0,2	13,7	646
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	821	391	465	745	354	704	1.247		4.727

The claims making in three issue fields deviates from this clear cut patterns of political debates. It is evident from Table 10 that agricultural issues are discussed in the media with strong references to both, European and national levels of governance. Thus, even if the competences on this policy field has shifted to the European level on a large scale, a significantly high share of claims in the media (44 %) refers to the national sphere only. In contrast to agriculture, the debate about immigration seems to open up to a more European perspective. While still the majority of 57 % of the claims in immigration reveal a national scope, at least another 20 % of the claims deal with references to an EU issue scope. Finally, the issue of troops deployment stands out completely, since the dominant issue scope here is neither national nor European. The vast majority of claims in the domain of troop deployment connect to multilateral and bilateral issue scopes and another 32 % of the claims in this issue field relate to the supranational level of politics. Thus, the angle of international politics seems to be paramount in the debate of troop deployment and this reaches far beyond the traditional level of national foreign policy. This picture is particularly dominant in the UK where the issue is quite salient in the commentary agenda. It contrasts with Italy where one fourth of the media claims in the issue area of troop deployment refers to the EU.

If we look whether the type of the newspaper and the variance over the three years in time plays a role in the variation of issue scopes, we hardly find any effect. Over the three years of the study we notice a small increase of supranational and multilateral issue scopes at the cost of a slight decline of both national and European issue scopes.

4.3. Addressee Scope

The nature of political debate in each country and policy field is essentially characterized by the ensemble of actors who are held responsible for implementing the claim. Thus we recorded in the claims analysis the collective actors to whom the call for political action is targeted. Regarding our central question of Europeanisation we wanted to know to what degree the distribution of addressee actors refers to communicative linkages towards actors on the European level, be it EU political actors (vertical Europeanisation) or collective actors in other EU countries (horizontal Europeanisation).

Concerning the types of actors that are addressed in the issue fields under study; we see that the overwhelming majority of claims is targeted towards government. As Table 11 shows clearly, two thirds of all claims are directed to the executive. In the UK, France, Italy, almost three thirds of all claims involve the government being called upon. Only in Switzerland and Spain, “only” every second claims targets the government. Surprisingly low is the proportion of political parties among the addressees: Overall not even four percent of all addresses are political parties. The exception here is Switzerland where political parties make it up for 10 %. Thus in the Swiss political system, the comparatively low proportion of the executive as addressee is compensated by a comparatively high share of political parties. Interestingly enough, we see that civil society groups are more prominent as addressees than political parties. Another feature that stands out in the ensemble of addressees is that economic actors, such as the Central banks and economic interest groups are quite visible as targets of claims. Central banks are over proportionately present in Switzerland and in Spain. Economic interest groups are slightly more visible in the Netherlands than elsewhere. If we look to which degree the whole society and civil society is held responsible for the implementation of claims, we see that 1 in 10 claims calls upon the civil community as addressees. Again, these actors are more frequently named as addressees in Switzerland and Spain. Finally, we recognize in the data of Table 11 that the media almost never direct claims to themselves.

Table 11: Type of Addressee per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Government/executive	63.1	48.5	55.1	73.5	74.6	73.5	66.7	66.3	3003
Political Parties	4.1	9.8	4.8	0.0	4.0	1.7	3.0	3.7	167
Other state/Party Actors	12.8	15.8	9.0	14.6	7.2	8.2	15.0	11.8	534
Central Banks	6.2	9.8	11.6	3.5	4.9	2.9	3.1	5.5	251
Economic Interest Groups	3.7	3.8	1.9	1.1	2.0	3.7	4.9	3.0	137
Other Civil society	4.3	6.8	2.4	5.3	6.2	4.7	6.6	5.3	240
Whole Polities	5.8	5.0	14.7	0.9	0.6	5.2	0.7	4.0	182
Media and Journalists	0.0	0.6	0.5	1.2	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.4	18
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	821	501	421	663	819	596	711		4.532

As the government is the major target in media claims making, the question regarding Europeanisation is whether the government is seen as actor within a network of European politics or alternatively as actor in the context of the own country only. Table 12, that depicts the distribution of actor scopes per country shows that on average 30 % of all addressee references include a European dimension while 57 % remain within national boundaries. Comparing across countries, we see a clear pattern that the UK, the Netherlands and Switzerland are most strongly focused on actors in their own countries as target of claims. In contrast, the media are quite open to direct claims to European actors in Spain and France. Germany and Italy take a position between those two groups of countries. Regarding European addressee scopes, the data show that France, Spain, Italy and Germany are relatively keen to point to the vertical linkage between national and European actors with up to one third of all addressee scopes within each country. Particularly weak in vertical EU actor scope is the UK, where the interaction between national and EU actors is not even present in 10 % of the media claims. It seems that in Britain, the press either marginalises or plays down the connection between national and EU political actors. Concerning the horizontal perspective in addressee scopes, we find two groups of countries. Relatively open to other EU countries are Spanish editorials, followed by editorials of Switzerland and Germany. Among the countries whose media mention of addressees rather neglect other EU countries are the UK, Italy and France.

Table 12: Addressee scope per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
supranational	1,8	1,6	1,4	2,3	3,2	4,2	1,4	2,3	105
EU-vertical	26,7	15,8	30,2	28,1	9,3	34,8	19,5	22,8	1.033
EU-horizontal	8,8	9,8	11,7	3,3	3,2	5,4	6,3	6,5	295
Own country	50,8	65,3	43,3	52,6	72,2	41,7	66,9	57,2	2.588
Other/rest of world	11,8	7,6	13,3	13,6	12,2	13,9	5,8	11,2	505
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	819	501	420	661	819	595	711		4.526

If we look at the addressee scope across issue fields, we find a quite clear cut picture which explains the differences across countries to a large degree. Thus the media debates in the domains of education and pensions are almost 100 percent commented upon by targeting national actors. Also, the claims making in immigration is overwhelmingly characterised by national actors which make up for 77 % of the addressees. As we recognized with regard to issue scopes, that troop deployment fails to fit into the cleavage of national vs. European actors. With regard to addressee scopes we see that policies around the question of troop deployment is largely characterized by equal proportions of national and supranational or multinational addressees.

As regards actors in agricultural policies, which is characterised by a high degree of Europeanised decision making, less than a third of the media claims refer to European scopes while

almost two thirds the media claims mention national addressees. The only issue fields in which vertical EU-addressee scopes equal or surpass the national references are monetary politics and EU integration. In the issue field of monetary policies, 41 % of the claims are addressed to national actors only, while 40 % target the linkage of national and EU actors and an additional 6 % point to actors in other EU countries. Finally it comes without surprise that the issue field of EU integration is largely determined by Europeanised actor scopes which make up for 60 % of all claims in this field. 45 % of all actor scopes in EU integration policies refer to the linkage between national and European actors, and even 15 percent focus on addressee scopes in other EU-countries. Thus, the debate on EU integration policies is most open to perspectives of actors in the neighbouring EU countries. On the other hand, even in the policy field of EU integration, one third of the targeted actors in the media still are confined in the national arena.

Table 13: Addressee scope per issue field

	Monetary	Agricult	Immigrat	Troops	Pension	Education	EU-Inte-gration	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
supranational	0,8	1,6	1,6	10,8	0,6	0,6	0,2	2,3	105
EU vertical	40,0	26,1	10,7	5,4	2,4	0,6	44,5	22,8	1033
EU horizontal	6,2	5,1	4,0	2,3	1,5	1,6	14,9	6,5	295
Own country	40,8	64,9	77,3	40,4	95,0	96,2	34,8	57,2	2588
Other/rest of world	12,2	2,4	6,5	41,1	0,6	1,0	5,7	11,2	505
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	757	376	449	725	339	682	1.198		4526

The nature and development of addressee scopes in the media claims finally vary according to newspaper type and the media. If we compare the addressee scopes in the quality press to the tabloids and the regional press, we see that the latter are more focused in their claims to national actors only: 63% of the actor scopes in the tabloids and regional press contain national references only compared to 54 % in the quality media. On the other hand, the level of European dimensions in addressee scopes in the quality press is 33 % compared to 25 % in the tabloid and regional press.

Finally, we found that the distribution of addressee scopes varies over time. EU-scopes of the addressees are most frequently found in 2000 when 35 % of all addressee scopes include a vertical or horizontal EU reference. This level decreases in 2001 to 23 % and raises again in 2002 to 29 %. While EU addressee scopes seem to fluctuate, the national addressee scope does not compensate for the ups and downs of EU references. Instead, we find that between 2000 and 2002 the proportion of supranational and multilateral non EU-scopes increase from 7% to 17% which largely reflects the discussion in the issue fields of troops deployment.

If we are to conclude the findings on addressee scopes in the media we might well ask whether the share of overall 30 percent EU-related addressee references allows us to talk

about high or low levels of Europeanisation in the actor ensemble of political debate in the media. On the first glance and without further context, this question resembles the problem to determine whether a glass is half full or half empty. However, we are in a slightly better position, since we can confront our findings with earlier studies that investigated the visibility of European issues and actors in the media. Although these studies work with rather simple measures which cannot exactly be compared with the measures in the Europub.com project, they capture some form of vertical dimension of Europeanisation. According to this research, European dimensions are rather marginal⁸ and vastly neglected in the media during the 1990s. Thus, if we find in our data that more than one in four addressee mentions is related to a European dimension, we might conclude that the glass is half full. Even if we speak with great caution, we cannot but notice that relations between national and European actors are a quite visible dimension of media claims that cannot be ignored in public political debate.

4.4. First Object Actor

The reference to actors in public discourse is not restricted to addressees. Collective actors can also be cited in public claims making as objects which are positively or negatively affected by the claim. Thus, even if the media address only actors in the own nation state, they can still point out that EU actors or actors from other European countries might suffer or benefit from the issue. We accounted for this public discourse dimension by coding for each claim a so called object actor whose interests are involved in the claim. Thus, a European dimension appears, if the claim refers to object actors that stand for the EU level of politics or from other European countries.

Table 14 depicts the data for the scope of the first object actor across countries which stand for the most important object actor in the claim. Here we notice a pattern that we are already familiar with from the analysis of addressees. The media in three countries turn out as extremely focused on their own political arena, so that the actor whose interest is involved in the claim is predominantly national: the UK, the Netherlands and Switzerland. Again, UK is by far the most leading country as regards the parochial nature of the object actor ensemble, since 63 % of all object actors in editorials are from the national arena. The press in Switzerland exposes 59 % of own country object actors and in the Netherlands the proportion is 51 %. It is also evident from the data that the higher the share of national object actors the lower the vertical and horizontal to European object actors. The contrasting group is formed by the media in France and Italy which feature about 40 percent of Europeanized object actor scopes, which almost exclusively stem from the EU level of politics (France: 36 % vertical and 5 % horizontal; Italy 38 % vertical and 2 % horizontal). Germany and Spain also feature media that are over proportionately making a reference to the interest of European actors. Interest-

⁸ Peter/de Vreese (2003) found that between 5 and 10 % of all stories in the television news of France, the UK, Germany, the Netherlands and Denmark are related to European dimensions. For the German quality press, Gerhards (2000: 294-295) and of Eilders/Voltmer (2003: 16-17) speak of a representation of EU issues at the most 7 % of all issues and a mere of 2 percent of actors and institutions.

ingly enough, among the Europeanised object actor scopes (37 % in German media, 31 % Spanish media) the horizontal dimension is way above average (7-8%). Thus, the German and Spanish editorials stand out by pointing out that the interest of the EU or other countries is involved in the claim. An interesting feature regarding the object actor scope is obvious with respect to the category “rest of the world”. Here we coded for instance the United States or Russia as global political players as well as multinational coalitions. It is evident from Table 14 that one out of five media claims opens up such an object actor perspective and that Spanish and French newspapers are particularly prone to argue in this way.

Table 14: Scope of object actor per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
supranational	1,6	0,6	0,0	1,5	2,2	1,4	1,2	1,4	57
EU-vertical	29,1	16,2	23,6	38,4	8,8	36,4	23,4	24,7	1028
EU-horizontal	7,8	6,9	7,4	2,0	2,9	4,9	5,2	4,9	205
Own country	41,9	59,4	33,4	35,1	62,7	30,0	51,3	46,3	1928
Other/rest of world	19,6	16,8	35,5	23,0	23,5	27,3	19,0	22,0	945
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	618	493	296	653	865	590	679		4.163

Table 15 shows that the reference to multilateral object actor scopes is especially pertinent if the issue of troop deployment or immigration politics is concerned. Thus, if the media are eager to pick up on those issues, they do so with making a reference to the interests of the United States or to multilateral or international coalitions across countries beyond the EU. As for the European scopes in connection with object actors, we see the already familiar pattern that the issue of EU integration and monetary policies are most likely to be debated with EU object actor references. In contrast stands pension and education policies that are only discussed in the media with respect to object actors from within the own national arena.

Table 15: Object actor scope per issue field

	Monetary	Agricult	Immigrat	Troops	Pension	Education	EU-Inte-gration	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
supranational	0,1	0,9	0,0	5,8	0,3	0,0	1,0	1,4	57
EU vertical	45,4	25,9	6,0	2,7	1,4	0,1	54,7	24,7	1027
EU horizontal	5,3	3,5	1,7	1,1	1,4	0,4	12,7	4,9	205
Own country	36,3	61,4	31,3	23,3	96,2	98,1	22,8	46,3	1.928
Other/rest of world	12,8	8,4	61,0	70,09	0,7	1,3	8,8	22,0	945
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	678	347	418	701	288	669	1.061		4.162

Finally, we learn from the data also with respect to the object actor scope that quality papers are significantly more prone to cite European object actors. Thus, one third of all object actor scopes (33 %) in the quality press are European compared to 25% of object actor scopes in the tabloid press and the regional media. Regarding the development over time we find the same pattern as for the addressee scopes between 2000 and 2002. The European scopes decrease from a level of 35 % in 2000 to 24 % in 2001, and 30 % in 2002. Also the own country scope of object actors falls from 50 % in 2000 to 48 % in 2001 and 41 % in 2002. The decrease in national and European scopes is compensated by a raise of multilateral scopes from 13 % in 2000 to 26 % in 2001 to 27 % in 2002. This fluctuation has to do with the debate on troop deployment and immigration which are pertinent in 2001 and 2002.

4.5. Multivariate Analysis of European Scopes

Our analyses have so far looked at Europeanisation in terms of levels of European scopes in the various dimensions of media claims making. In order to get an encompassing picture about the overall level of Europeanisation of media claims in the countries and issue fields in our study, we computed a summary score for the European references on every dimension so far discussed. The variable Summary EU scope takes the value of 0 if neither the initiating event for the claim, nor the issue scope or addressee or object actor scope refers to horizontal or vertical EU linkages. In contrast, the variable scores 4 if a European scope is present in the media claims on all dimensions.

Table 16, that depicts the distribution of Summary EU scopes across countries, highlights in a nutshell what we have so far demonstrated. Namely that the UK press is by far the most parochial voice in the chorus of the national media: 63 percent of all claims refer to non EU-dimensions. Thus the vast majority of public media statements is completely restricted to national and sometimes supranational aspects, but does exclude any European dimension. The outsider role of the UK media is also corroborated if we look at the share of claims that contain all European dimensions. Only 5 % of the media claims are fully Europeanised. Next to the UK, yet with a big distance, we can position the Dutch media. However, they are not as self referential as the British press. The 56 % of all claims in the media in the Netherlands are restricted to non European aspects, even though their claims with all EU scopes score average (20%). A pretty similar pattern is evident for media in Switzerland that are in 49 % of all claims self contained, even if they are average on the all EU scopes category (18 %).

A sharp contrast appears between this group of national media and the press in France. The French media are by far most open to European dimensions of claims making. 29 % of all claims in the editorials of France contain all 4 EU scopes simultaneously, followed by the press in Italy (24%), in Germany (24%) and in Spain (23%) whose share of fully Europeanised claims dimensions is about the same. Thus, we see nicely that France, Italy, Spain and Germany maintain media that are prone to register what is happening on the EU level and other EU countries. At least one in four claims is fully Europeanized.

Table 16: Summary EU Scope per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
No EU-Scope	47,0	48,6	41,2	41,3	63,0	42,5	56,3	50,2	1970
1 EU-Scope	8,4	21,5	9,9	4,7	14,1	7,8	10,0	10,7	421
2 EU-Scopes	8,9	5,7	11,5	12,3	10,3	8,0	6,1	8,9	351
3 EU Scopes	12,0	6,1	14,4	17,7	7,2	13,3	7,6	10,8	426
All EU-Scopes	23,6	18,1	23,0	24,1	5,3	28,5	20,1	19,3	759
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
Means (1-4)	1.56	1.23	1.68	1.79	0.77	1.77	1.25	1.38	
N	593	442	243	644	806	527	672		3.927

Our conclusions about the prominence of EU aspects in media claims across country to some degree mirror the salience of the issue field of EU integration in the press. In order to get a picture about the level of Europeanisation in policy fields that are not a priori defined by a high EU reference, we compare the Summary EU Scope across countries for all issue fields but EU integration.

Table 17 gives the results which yield the same structure of claims making across the media in the various countries except for the fact the level of European scopes is lower. Whereas the level of Non-European scopes is 50 % on average if EU Integration is included, it is 68 % if this issue is excluded. On the other end of the scale, claims with all EU-scopes make up for about 20% if EU Integration is contained in the picture, while it is half as much if EU integration is not assessed. Again the UK, the Netherlands and Switzerland form the group of countries where non EU-scopes are most prominent. On the other hand, Spain, Italy, France and Germany feature a considerable share of EU scopes in the media debate, even if EU integration is excluded from the picture.

Table 17: Summary EU Scope per country (without EU integration)

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
No EU-Scope	65.8	80.5	54.6	58.5	74.8	61.0	70.2	67.6	1968
1 EU-Scope	7.8	5.6	10.4	6.2	12.4	7.9	9.5	8.9	259
2 EU-Scopes	6.1	1.5	10.9	11.7	6.2	6.5	4.8	6.7	195
3 EU Scopes	7.1	3.4	11.5	9.7	4.3	10.1	5.0	6.8	197
All EU-Scopes	13.2	9.0	12.6	13.9	2.4	14.4	10.4	10.0	291
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Means (1-4)	.94	.55	1.17	1.14	.47	1.09	.76	.83	
N	424	267	183	453	679	367	537		2910

If we compare the EU summary scope across issue fields, we see again the texture of the media debates that we have already discussed. Once again we notice in Table 18 that pension and

education in media claims are completely self contained within national debate. Immigration and troop deployment are high in Non EU scope as well, yet as we have seen earlier, the level of supranational and multilateral scopes – at least in troop deployment – is comparatively high and still above average in immigration. The most critical issue with respect to EU scopes is agriculture, since the media claims are equally split between only national scopes and EU scopes, with almost about 20 % of claims that are completely Europeanised.

Table 18: Summary EU Scope per issue field

	Monetary	Agricult	Immigrat	Troops	Pension	Education	EU-Inte-gration	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
No EU-Scope	16,6	45,1	73,9	85,3	91,3	96,0	0,2	50,2	1970
1 EU-Scope	17,9	13,1	10,1	6,7	3,4	2,0	15,9	10,7	421
2 EU-Scopes	15,1	10,1	5,8	5,2	1,5	1,2	15,3	8,9	351
3 EU Scopes	17,9	12,8	5,8	2,6	1,1	0,3	22,5	10,8	426
4 EU-Scopes	32,4	18,9	4,5	0,3	2,6	0,5	46,0	19,3	759
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
Means (1-4)	2.32	1.47	.57	.26	.20	.07	2.98	1.38	
N	614	328	398	659	265	646	1.017		3.927

The data in Table 18 corroborate that in addition to education and pension policies, the issue fields of Troop deployment and Immigration largely exclude European scopes. The issue field of agriculture is the most critical domain in claims making: Although EU competences in the political decision making are pretty high in agriculture, still every second claim is confined to the national debate. On the other hand, Table 18 stresses again that monetary policies and European integration issues cannot but be debated with European references.

Table 19: Summary EU Scope per newspaper type

	Quality press	Regional and Tabloid Press	Total	N
	%	%	%	
No EU-Scope	48.4	52.9	50.2	1970
1 EU-Scope	9.8	12.1	10.7	421
2 EU-Scopes	8.7	9.4	8.9	351
3 EU Scopes	12.0	9.0	10.8	426
All EU-Scopes	21.2	16.5	19.3	759
Total	100	100	100	
Means (1-4)	1.48	1.24	1.38	
N	2378	1549		3927

As we have noticed some variation in European and national scopes across newspaper types with respect to addressees and object actors, we also compare the Summary EU scope across the different categories of press titles under study. Table 19 shows that the variation is rather moderate. Although we notice that the national quality press is more inclined to stress Euro-

pean dimensions than the regional newspapers and the tabloids, the discrepancy does not exceed 5 percentage points. Thus, we can assume that the differences in terms of country and issue fields by far outweigh the variation across newspaper types.

The same conclusion holds true if we look at the variation over time. Table 20 confirms once again that Non-EU Scopes have increased between 2000 and 2002, yet the amount of variance lies less than 10 percentage points and should therefore not impact the picture of findings so far described.

Table 20: Summary EU Scope per Year

	Year			Total	N
	2000	2001	2002		
	%	%	%		
No EU-Scope	44.2	57.1	49.1	50.2	1970
1 EU-Scope	11.8	10.4	10.1	10.7	421
2 EU-Scopes	7.7	8.4	10.7	8.9	351
3 EU Scopes	9.8	10.8	11.9	10.8	426
All EU-Scopes	26.5	13.4	18.3	19.3	759
Total	100	100	100	100	
Means (1-4)	1.63	1.13	1.40	1.38	
N	1284	1310	1333		3927

Our discussion of findings so far concludes with the point that the level of Europeanisation in the media debate vastly varies across the countries and issue fields. Since we described the data in bivariate terms, we have only been speculating which one of the factors does yield the more powerful effects on the scopes in claims making. In order to assess the strength of the factors that lead to variation in the level of European scopes, we computed a multivariate Analysis of variance for each single scope variable as well as for the Summary scope variable.

Table 21: Multivariate Analysis of European Scopes (MCA)

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables				Strength of each model
	Country	Issue field	Paper type	Year	
	Beta	Beta	Beta	Beta	R-square
Scope of Initiating event	.215	.573	.027	.081	.39
First issue scope	.086	.809	n.s.	.052	.67
Addressee Scope	.179	.496	.049	.063	.29
First object actor Scope	.220	.603	.075	.048	.42
EU Summary scope	.230	.745	.072	.125	.60

Table 21 gives an overview over the results of the five Multiple Classification Analyses which show that the strongest effect on each single scope dimension is caused by the variation of issue fields. However, the variation across countries also yields highly significant coefficients in each case. The data corroborate our interpretation, that the scope of debates is first of all dependent on the issue fields. Yet at the same time, we see a significant variation across countries, even if the issue field effect far exceeds the country effect. Not surprisingly the impact of the issue field on scope is best explained with respect to issue scope (R-square .67). In the three other models, which also confirm our interpretation that the nature of perspectives in media claims making is vastly a direct effect of the issue fields, we also have good explanatory power with R-squares between .29 and .41. The general nature of media claims making regarding European and national scopes is perfectly pictured if we look at the model in which the EU summary scope is explained. We can explain 60 % of the variance of the level of European scopes with a highly significant and stark effect of issue field. Yet, we also find a quite strong effect of the country in which the media claims making is observed. Compared to these two main sources of variation of levels of European scope, the newspaper type and the year hardly yields an effect on European scopes. Thus, we find that the national media in each country share their perceptions as regards the reference framework of political issues in public debate. Moreover, the media voice was pretty stable over time in all countries.

5. Media Opinions about European Issues and Actors

The level to which the media address and portray political issues and actors as Europeanized can be regarded as dimension of their agenda setting function. Thus if the media highlight European scopes they support the salience of European dimensions in the political debate. However, a high level of European scopes does not necessarily mean that the European project is supported at the same time. For instance, we cannot be sure that the French media really appreciate the EU even if they expose a high level of European scopes. We might neither assume that the Dutch media hate Europe as political project even though they are low in European scopes. With regard to support or opposition to Europe, the second media function comes into play, namely the expression of opinions. Editorials are the legitimate media format in which the journalists take a positive stance or express their dismay with specific policies. Moreover, we might keep in mind that the single journalist who writes the opinion piece is seen as the claimant in the commentary who speaks in the name of the specific newspaper that he or she represents. Providing that the journalist's attitude stands for the opinion of his or her newspaper, we shall further analyse the evaluation of the European project. This analysis focuses on two dimensions of positive or negative positions: First, we look at the opinion about two European issues, such as (a) the positions about the rights and political competences of the EU, and (b) the support or opposition to European integration. The second dimension of our analysis of media opinions refers to the evaluation of European actors which we compare with the evaluation of national actors.

5.1. Positions towards European Issues

The first aspect in our analysis of media opinions about the European project refers to the question whether the press in each country supports the further deepening of European integration in the sense of further extending the rights and competences of the EU. Thus if the commentator takes a positive position regarding the further increase of decision making power of the EU, we coded +1. If the commentary expresses a negative attitude in this matter we coded -1. If the journalists either ponders about positive and negative aspects or does not give an opinion, we coded 0.

Table 22 depicts the findings on the media's opinion about the extension of political power to the EU. The comparison across countries shows that 55 % of all claims feature a positive or negative attitude, while 45% are mixed or ambivalent in this issue. Moreover, the overall distribution clearly indicates that the media are generally more positive than negative about the further deepening of European integration. In the media's voice we notice twice as many positive evaluations than negative ones (36 % vs. 19 %). However, since the data reveal a strong variation across the national media, this overall picture is not indicative.

Table 22: Media Position to further EU competences per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Negative	9,4	10,4	6,0	35,6	36,5	27,3	11,5	19,7	438
Mixed/ambivalent	41,3	52,2	71,8	21,5	52,0	17,0	45,8	42,4	945
Positive	49,3	37,4	22,2	42,9	11,5	55,7	42,7	37,9	844
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
Positive-negative (%)	39,9	27,0	16,2	7,3	-25,0	28,4	31,2	18,2	
Means	0,40	0,27	0,16	0,07	-0,25	0,28	0,31	0,18	
N	383	278	316	368	296	300	286		2.227

As a helpful indicator for assessing the stance of the press in each country we deducted the share of claims including negative evaluations from the share of claims including positive evaluations. According to this measure, we find that the positive evaluations in the media of only four out of seven countries clearly override negative ones. Thus, Table 22 indicates that the press in Germany (40%), in the Netherlands (31%), in France (28%) and in Switzerland (27%) expose substantially more positive than negative attitudes towards the deepening of EU integration. Interestingly enough, we find that the Dutch media and the Swiss press which stood out by low levels of European scopes, are clearly in favor of the political project Europe. Moreover, the data corroborate the clear outsider position of the UK press in the chorus of media voices. The British newspapers do not only yield the by far lowest level of European scopes, it is also obvious that the media opinion in the UK is dominantly negative. Britain is the only country in which the media express three times as many negative positions than positive positions about the enlargement of EU competences. Finally, the Spanish and the

Italian media that exposed a quite high level of EU scopes are characterised by idiosyncratic evaluations. Despite a remarkable European scope in their claims, the media opinion in Spain is characterized by a high level of mixed or undecided positions, so that the overall positive stance towards increasing European competences is comparatively weak (16%). In Italy, the media are quite polarised in their opinion about the political project EU. The share of 36% negatively evaluated claims is almost compensated by 43% positively evaluated claims, so that the overall positive turnout is moderate.

Table 23: Media Position to further EU competences per issue field

	Monetary	Agricult	Immigrat	Troops	Pension	Education	EU-Inte-gration	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Negative	23,1	16,6	6,7	29,4	15,0	41,7	18,7	19,7	438
Mixed/ambivalent	48,6	58,0	55,1	33,3	40,0	33,3	36,5	42,4	945
Positive	28,3	25,4	38,2	37,3	45,0	25,0	44,7	37,9	844
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
Positive-negative (%)	5,2	8,8	31,5	7,9	30,0	-16,7	26,0	18,2	
Means	0,05	0,09	0,31	0,08	0,30	-0,17	0,26	0,18	
N	640	181	89	51	20	12	1.234		2.227

Table 23 shows that there is also considerable variation in media positions about further EU rights and competences if we compare across issue fields. It is evident from our data that the media support the further increase of political power of the EU particularly in the issue field of EU integration (26%). Thus, the press is particularly supportive to the deepening of EU integration. While it is not surprising that the media would not be positive about strengthening EU rights and competences in the field of education (-17%), it is all the more striking that increasing political power is judged with mixed feelings in monetary policies and agriculture. In these issue fields we see that positive attitudes override negative attitudes only moderately (5 % monetary, 9 % agriculture). The most interesting findings as regards the evaluation of the idea of further political power of the EU relate to the issue fields of immigration, pension and troop deployment. Despite the low levels of European scopes in these issue fields, the media would like to see the deepening of European integration especially here. Thus, in immigration (32%) and social policy (30%) the positive evaluations by far override the negative attitudes. Press opinion also supports more EU political power with regard to issues such as the deployment of troops in situations of international crises.

Regarding the media that are in favor of more political power of the EU, we learn from Table 24 that the quality or broadsheet press is the main carrier of positive opinions towards the EU. In the tabloid press and in the regional newspapers, the positive attitudes override the negative ones by only 6 percentage points. By contrast, the broadsheets not only are more positive about the political project EU, they are also less negative. All in all, the newspapers with a

high standard of reporting and commentating welcome the deepening of the European integration.

Table 24: Media Position to further EU competences per newspaper type

	Quality press	Regional and Tabloid Press	Total	N
	%	%	%	
Negative	16,0	25,9	19,7	438
Mixed/ambivalent	42,8	41,9	42,4	945
Positive	41,3	32,2	37,9	844
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	
Positive – negative (%)	25,3	6,3	18,2	
Means	0,25	0,06	0,18	
N	1401	826		2227

The second indicator of evaluations of European issues is the subjective attitude of the commentator towards European integration. Thus, we coded whether the commentator is overall sympathetic to European integration which we regard as an indicator for the overall newspaper support of this issue and its potential implications. If we look at Table 25 we see that a majority of claims (55%) is published in which the writers definitely support European integration. Except for the UK, the average of negative claims about European integration is below five percent. If we compare across countries, the most positive attitudes towards European integration are found in Italian and French media. More than 80 percent of the media claims in Italy and 78 percent of media claims in France are in favor of European integration. It seems that in the two countries there is a strong consensus in the media that EU integration is an overall positive project. By contrast, the British journalists seem to utterly hate European integration. The majority of claims in the UK press (49%) stands out by an overt negative attitude.

Table 25: Subjective Position of Commentator to EU integration per country

	DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Negative	2,9	4,0	0,3	1,1	49,0	3,0	6,7	9,0	200
Mixed/ambivalent	30,9	45,7	69,0	14,4	34,8	18,7	41,4	35,6	794
Positive	66,2	50,4	30,7	84,5	16,2	78,3	51,9	55,4	1.234
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
Positive – negative (%)	63,3	46,4	30,4	83,4	-32,8	75,3	45,2	46,4	
Means	0,63	0,46	0,30	0,83	-0,33	0,75	0,45	0,46	
N	385	278	316	368	296	300	285		2.228

The attitudinal space between the most positive and most negative media is filled by a group of rather positive media in Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands. In the Swiss and Dutch media the positive voices override the negative ones by 46 percentage points, in the German press the difference amounts to even 63 percentage points. Finally, the Spanish press is most idiosyncratic regarding the attitudes of the commentators towards European integration. Although the media in Spain rank among the most Europeanised media in terms of scopes, the vast majority of opinions (69%) are mixed, undecided or ambivalent. In addition, the share of 31% of claims with positive attitudes is moderate in the Spanish press if we compare it with other national media.

Table 26: Subjective Position of Commentator to EU integration per issue field

	Monetary	Agricult	Immigrat	Troops	Pension	Education	EU-Inte-gration	Total	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Negative	12,2	8,8	3,4	2,0	5,0	0,0	8,2	9,0	200
Mixed/ambivalent	42,5	55,8	48,3	31,4	60,0	50,0	27,9	35,6	794
Positive	45,3	35,4	48,3	66,7	35,0	50,0	64,0	55,4	1.234
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
Positive – negative (%)	33,1	26,6	44,9	64,7	30,0	50,0	55,8	46,4	
Means	0,33	0,27	0,45	0,65	0,30	0,50	0,56	0,46	
N	640	181	89	51	20	12	1.235		2.228

It is hardly surprising that positive evaluations by journalists predominantly concentrate on the debates in the issue field of European integration. As table 26 shows, two thirds of claims here are accompanied by positive opinions. It is also quite plausible that the issue fields that are typical for a predominantly national debate, namely pension and education, are characterized by a high level of mixed or undecided attitudes regarding European integration. The highest levels of claims featuring positive sentiments are discovered in monetary policies, immigration and troop deployment. Particularly in the latter issue field journalists agree with the involvement of the EU. Regarding the evaluations of journalists, the most critical issue field is agriculture. In this issue field with far reaching EU competences we see almost 60 % of undecided or ambivalent sentiments of journalists. Moreover, facing 9 % of claims with negative media attitudes, the critical potential is comparatively high.

The journalists who speak up in support of European integration are predominantly based in the quality press. We see in Table 27 that the majority of journalists' claims in the quality press is positive (60%) and only 5 % percent are negative. In contrast, the proportion of negative claims in the regional and the tabloid press is four times as high, as we see 16 percent of claims opposing European integration compared to 47 % supporting it.

Table 27: Subjective Position of Commentator to EU integration per newspaper type

	Quality press	Regional and Tabloid Press	Total	N
	%	%	%	
Negative	4,6	16,4	9,0	200
Mixed/ambivalent	35,1	36,6	35,6	794
Positive	60,3	47,0	55,4	1.234
Total	100	100	100	
Positive- negative (%)	55,7	30,6	46,4	
Means	0,56	0,31	0,46	
N	1.403	825		2.228

In order to find out which factors determine the media positions to European issues we conducted a Multivariate Classification Analysis in which the country, the issue field, the newspaper type and the year were introduced as independent variables. The findings in Table 28 reveal that the explanatory power of our model explaining media positions to further EU competences is rather weak (R square .08). However, we see that strongest effect on the media evaluation of EU competences is the country. Thus, we can conclude that our interpretation of national media differences is highly valid and significant. The variation of issue fields and paper types yield only weak effects. So provided the overall weakness of the general model, we find a moderate, rather weak variation according to issue fields and newspaper types only. Moreover, as the year is not significant we see that our picture of media voices between 2000 and 2002 is pretty stable.

Table 28: Multivariate Analysis of Evaluation of European Issues (MCA)

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables				Strength of each model
	Country	Issue field	Paper type	Year	
	Beta	Beta	Beta	Beta	R-square
Media Position to further EU competences	0,229	0,118	0,086	n.s.	.08
Subjective Position of Commentator to EU integration	0,506	0,189	0,128	0,061	.32

In contrast to media position to further EU competences, we find that the subjective position of the commentator can be very well explained by our model. The four independent variables in our model account for 32 % of the variance (R-square). Table 28 shows that the effect of the country is by far the strongest and most dominant source for variation. This means that the attitudes of the journalists towards European integration depend predominantly on the country in which his or her newspaper is published. Thus, if we see that UK journalists hate European integration while French journalists support it, we capture a crucial cleavage in the media induced public sphere in Europe.

5.2. Evaluations of European and National Political Actors

Mass media not only express their opinion by supporting or opposing political issues and policies, such as European integration. Their potential of influencing public opinion might be even more powerful, when they evaluate political actors. Regarding the question of Europeanisation, it is therefore important to ask how they judge on European actors as compared to national actors. As an indicator for the opinion about actors we look at how the media evaluate the addressees in their claims making. Table 29 depicts the distribution and direction of evaluations of collective actors who are addressed in the editorials. If we first look at the distribution of evaluations, we learn that almost two thirds of addressee evaluations concentrate on own country actors. Thus, the national media are particular keen to voice judgments about actors of their own country. If we compare across nations we notice again that the British press is most parochial in their evaluation of actors, since almost 80% of all actors that are subject to opinions are British. The same pattern is evident for the Dutch and the Swiss newspapers which focus their evaluations to 70 % on national actors. This finding comes without surprise, since we have seen that the media of these countries are quite occupied with political issues and debates that are confined within the national boundaries of each country. The contrasting groups are the French and the Spanish media. They are least nationally focused but extend their opinions to EU actors and actors from other EU countries. Regarding EU actors that are the second largest group of evaluated actors in the press, the French media are clearly leading. Thus, 40 % of all evaluated actors in the French newspapers are directed towards the European level of politics. Opinions about EU actors are also quite widespread in Italian and Spanish media which devote about one third of all evaluations to these actors. As regards actors from other EU countries, we see that the media in Spain, Germany and Switzerland are most frequently expressing evaluations, while the press in the other countries of the study seems to be hesitant in this respect. The level of evaluations of EU member countries' actors does reach between 10 % and 16 % at the most. Finally, there are hardly any evaluations about supranational actors in the editorials of our study.

In order to interpret the attitudinal direction of actor's evaluations correctly, we need to interpret the comparison of European and national actors' evaluations in Table 29 in the context of the general level of criticism against all actors in the media of each country. Thus, we notice that the level of negativism across all actors varies across countries considerably. By far most critical against actors are the German media (-0.49). The level of negativism is also quite pronounced in the Italian (-0.36) and Dutch media (-0.30), while the British (-0.19) and Swiss newspapers (-0.23) seem to be more moderate in their criticism. Only the French (+0.09) and the Spanish newspapers (+0.15) are generally positive in their actors' evaluations.

Table 29: Evaluation of National and European Addressees per country¹⁾

		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	total
Own country actors	Means	-0.59	-0.31	0.11	-0.50	-0.14	-0.02	-0.28	-0.28
	N	306	235	141	255	310	203	344	1794
	%	60.4	69.7	51.1	59.9	78.7	48.7	70.6	63.1
EU actors	Means	-0.31	0.00	0.30	-0.10	-0.62	0.21	-0.42	-0.09
	N	141	58	86	142	52	167	100	746
	%	27.8	17.2	31.2	33.3	13.2	40.1	20.5	26.2
EU-member country	Means	-0.53	-0.03	-0.02	-0.53	-0.10	-0.03	-0.20	-0.20
	N	51	39	45	17	20	29	35	236
	%	10.1	11.6	16.3	4.0	5.1	7.0	7.2	8.3
Supranational actors	Means	0.33	-0.60	(0.50)	-0.33	0.17	0.56	0.25	0.18
	N	9	5	4	12	12	18	8	68
	%	1.8	1.5	1.5	2.8	3.1	4.3	1.6	2.4
All actors	Means	-0.49	-0.23	0.15	-0.36	-0.19	0.09	-0.30	-0.22
	N	507	337	276	426	394	417	487	2844
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

¹⁾ Scale of -1 = negative, +1 = positive

Against the background of a general negativism of the media in five out of seven countries, it is indicative to learn that the criticism of the media is largely directed towards political actors in the own country. Thus, we find that in five out of seven countries under study, the media judge on EU-actors more positive than on national actors. This means that in the newspapers in Germany, Switzerland and Italy, EU actors are less negatively portrayed than national actors. In Spain and France, political actors from the EU are evaluated more positive than national actors. The evident exceptions from the pattern of generally more positive EU actor's evaluations are the British and the Dutch press. In the UK and the Dutch newspapers, which are generally quite negative across all actors, the EU actors are judged considerably more negative than national actors.

The data in Table 29 also shed light on the level of criticism regarding horizontal Europeanisation. Thus, we notice that actors from other EU member states are negatively portrayed in the media of all countries under study. Interestingly enough, the level of negativism of other EU member country actors reaches almost the same level of criticism as the own country actors and is therefore more negative than the evaluations regarding the vertical dimension of Europeanisation. Finally we learn from our findings, that the most positively evaluated group of addressees are actors from the supranational level. Although the evaluations of supranational actors must be interpreted with great caution due to the small number of cases, we find a tendency that the media hold rather positive opinions about supranational actors in all countries under study, except for Switzerland and Italy.

Table 30: Evaluation of Single National and European Addressees per country

		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	total
Own country actors									
Government/executive	Mean	-0.56	-0.15	0.05	-0.41	-0.25	-0.09	-0.29	-0.28
	N	192	104	101	176	220	151	204	1148
Political parties	Mean	-0.78	-0.81	-0.45		0.06	0.43	-0.25	-0.50
	N	27	42	11		17	7	16	120
Other state and party	Mean	-0.63	-0.50	0.50	-0.87	0.24	-0.44	-0.25	-0.41
	N	43	32	12	47	21	18	61	234
Whole polity	Mean	-0.80	-0.60	0.75		(1.00)	(1.00)	(-1.00)	-0.11
	N	10	5	8		1	2	1	27
Central bank	Mean	(1.00)	0.50	(1.00)	(1.00)	0.80			0.71
	N	3	12	1	2	10			28
Economic interest	Means	-0.76	-0.50	(-0.33)	(-1.00)	0.11	0.23	-0.59	-0.42
	N	17	12	3	3	9	13	29	86
Civil Society	Means	-0.43	-0.20	0.60	-0.36	-0.14	0.67	-0.03	-0.09
	N	14	25	5	22	28	12	33	139
Media	Means		(0.33)		(-1.00)	(0.00)			-0.33
	N		3		5	4			12
EU-actors									
EU commission	Means	-0.08	0.40	0.56	0.16	-0.56	-0.47	-0.41	-0.04
	N	37	10	18	19	9	15	17	125
EU Council	Means	-0.38	-0.67	0.33	0.20	(1.00)	0.13	-0.68	-0.14
	N	16	6	9	5	2	48	25	111
EU Parliament	Means	(0.0)		(1.00)	(-0.33)			(-1.00)	-0.33
	N	2		1	3			3	9
EU Central Bank	%	0.04	1.00	0.14	-0.33	-0.85	-0.56	0.38	0.01
		23	10	35	12	13	9	13	115
EU civil society	Means	(0.33)		(-1.00)	(-1.00)		1.00		0.54
	N	3		1	1		8		13
EU economic interest	Means	(-1.00)		(1.00)	(-1.00)		1.00	(-1.00)	0.17
	N	3		2	1		5	1	12
EU other actors	Means	-0.58	-0.31	0.30	-0.11	-0.64	0.34	-0.46	-0.16
	N	57	32	20	101	28	82	41	361
EU-Member States Actors									
Government	Means	-0.47	-0.14	0.13	-0.60	-0.43	-0.08	-0.19	-0.23
	N	34	28	23	15	14	26	32	172
Other State & Party	Means	-0.67	0.67	-0.14	(0.00)	(1.00)	(0.00)	(-1.00)	-0.15
	N	12	6	14	2	2	2	2	40
Other actors	Means	-0.60	-0.20	-0.25		0.50	(1.00)	(1.00)	-0.08
	N	5	5	8		4	1	1	24
Supranational Actors									
All supranatl. actors	Means	0.33	0.60	(0.50)	-0.33	0.17	0.56	0.25	0.18
	N	9	5	4	12	12	18	8	68
Total									
	Means	-0.49	-0.23	0.15	-0.36	-0.19	0.09	-0.30	-0.22
	N	507	337	276	426	394	417	487	2844

If we differentiate the actors' categories like in Table 30, we see that the critical attitude of the media within and across countries varies considerably. For instance, looking at the evaluation within countries, we see that political parties and economic interest groups like labour unions are judged in a more negative manner than the executive in Germany, Switzerland and Spain. On the other hand, other civil society groups are evaluated more positively than the government, parties and interest groups. The picture is different in the UK and France where media opinion on political parties and economic interest groups is more favourable than on the government. Moreover, we see a very positive stance towards civil society groups in French media, while those organisations are judged rather critical in the UK. In the Netherlands, there are no differences between in the rather negative evaluations of the national government and the political parties. The most critical evaluations in the Dutch media concern economic interest groups; the least negative attitude is issued regarding civil society actors.

Comparing across countries one would expect that the press is treating the governments of other countries more critically than the government in its own country. Yet, with exception of the UK and Italy, we find quite the contrary. In Germany, Spain and the Netherlands, the press is less negative about the executive in other EU member states than about the executive in their own country. In Switzerland and France we find the same level of negative attitudes for both, the national and other countries' government. Only in the UK and Italy, we see that the media are more judgmental with respect to the executive of other countries.

Regarding actors on the EU level, the press is divided in two groups: On the one hand, the newspapers in Switzerland, Spain and Italy hold positive opinions about the EU commission. The media in the UK, the Netherlands and – interestingly enough in France - are quite negative about the EU commission on the other hand. Germany's press is slightly negative, yet provided the overall negativism about all actors, the less critical attitude against the EU commission is rather moderate. Regarding the EU council, the press in all countries seems to be rather reluctant to express their opinion and the small number of cases allows for only careful interpretations. However, we can learn from Table 30 that in four out of seven countries, the press is more negative or less positive about the EU council than about the EU commission. The media in Germany, Switzerland, Spain and Netherlands are quite negative about the council of country leaders. Only in Italy and France, the EU council is treated more positively than the EU commission. Finally, regarding EU institutions we see that the British media hate the EU Central Bank which is judged most negatively from all actors in the UK press. The EU central bank is also portrayed quite critically in French and Dutch editorials, the level of negativism is less drastic than in the UK though. The media in all other countries seem to hold positive opinions about the EU Central Bank.

Assessing the relationship between newspaper type and actor evaluations, Table 31 corroborates for the quality press as well as for regional newspapers and tabloids that there is a clear ranking in actor evaluations: Actors from the country where the newspapers are published draw the highest amount of criticism. The next rank in the negativity ranking order is filled by actors from EU member countries. While EU actors rank better than national actors, they still

draw slightly negative evaluations. Only supranational actors are affiliated with overall positive media opinions. In the ranking of actor's evaluations we find no differences between newspaper types. What is surprising instead is that the level of negative qualifications of actors is generally higher in quality newspapers than in the regional or even tabloid press. Thus, we see that the function of criticising political actors is more evident in the broadsheet press. Regarding the level and direction of evaluations per newspaper type, Table 31 indicates two points: The regional and tabloid press tends to be more parochial insofar as they focus their evaluations more on actors from their own country. More than two thirds (68 %) of all actors evaluations in the regional and tabloid newspapers are directed towards own country actors, compared to 60 % of the quality press. In addition to the stronger focus on national actors, we see that these actors are commented on in a less negative tone in the regional and tabloid press than in the quality press. However, as we have already indicated, the contrast in the evaluations between the newspaper types applies to all actor categories in the same way.

Table 31: Evaluation of National and European Addressees per newspaper type

		Quality	Regional/ Tabloid	Total
Own country actors	Means	-0.31	-0.24	-0.28
	N	1030	764	1794
	%	0.0	67.8	63.1
<hr/>				
EU actors	Means	-0.14	-0.02	-0.09
	N	480	266	746
	%	28.0	23.6	26.2
<hr/>				
EU-member country	Means	-0.22	-0.17	-0.20
	N	161	75	236
	%	9.4	6.7	8.3
<hr/>				
Supranational actors	Means	0.09	0.36	0.18
	N	46	22	68
	%	2.7	2.0	2.4
<hr/>				
All actors	Means	-0.25	-0.17	-0.22
	N	1717	1127	2844
	%	100	100	100

The finding that the broadsheets are more critical than the regional and tabloid press is disturbing at first glance, since one would expect that the tabloid press, that tends to hook up on rather populist sentiments, is more negative in their evaluations than the quality press. However, since we collapsed the tabloids into the same category with the regional newspapers that tend to be more affirmative in their opinions and since not all media systems in the countries under study features a clear cut yellow press, the overall tone in evaluations might be less negative.

In order to test our assumption that the tabloid press is more critical towards political actors than broadsheets, especially if those actors are affiliated with European politics, we look at

the addressee evaluations of the UK press in Table 32. Interestingly enough, the assumption that the tabloid press is more negative about political actors than broadsheets can only be confirmed with regard to European actors. While there is no differences in their evaluation of own country actors between the yellow press and the quality newspapers in Britain, we find rather strong contrasts with regard to EU actors and actors from other EU-member states. Thus, we clearly see for the British press that the tabloids are the frontrunners in terms of negativity against European actors. However, as regards EU level actors, editorial of both media types are extremely negative in their opinion. Concerning actors of other EU member states we see that the tendency of opinion goes in different directions regarding newspaper type: While those actors are still treated negatively in the tabloids, they are judged upon positively in the broadsheets.

Table 32: Evaluation of National and European Addressees per newspaper type in the UK

		Quality	Regional/ Tabloid	Total
Own country actors	Means	-0.14	-0.13	-.14
	N	140	170	310
	%	73.7	83.3	78.7
<hr/>				
EU actors	Means	-0.53	-0.73	-0.62
	N	30	22	52
	%	15.8	10.8	13.2
<hr/>				
EU-member country	Means	0.09	-0.33	-.10
	N	11	9	20
	%	5.8	4.4	5.0
<hr/>				
Supranational actors	Means	0.11	(0.33)	.17
	N	9	3	12
	%	4.7	1.5	3.0
<hr/>				
All actors	Means	-0.18-	-0.20	-.19
	N	190	204	394
	%	100	100	100

In addition to the findings about the British media, Table 33 indicates that there are few exceptions to the rule that broadsheets are more critical or negative in addressing collective actors than tabloids and regional newspapers. These exceptions concern the central banks of nation states and on the EU level. Thus, we see a consistent pattern that the broadsheets stand out by evaluating the central banks overtly positive while the tabloids and the regional press are more reluctant to judge in a beneficial way. A second exception is evident for civil society actors and for the whole polity, both on the national level. According to our analyses it seems that the quality press is particularly addressing those actors that are at the periphery of the political system in an overall positive way. Concerning civil society actors, we see the tabloids and the regional press again are less positive in their opinion. The same applies to the general category of actors that represent the political community: The broadsheets are more favourable towards the whole polity than the regional and tabloid press.

Table 33: Evaluation of Single National and European Addressees per newspaper type

		Quality Paper	Regional/Tabloid	total
Own country actors				
Government/executive	Mean	-0.31	-0,22	-0,28
	N	680	468	1148
Political parties	Mean	-0.71	-0.22	-0.50
	N	69	51	120
Other state and party	Mean	-0.43	-0.38	-0.41
	N	130	104	234
Whole polity	Mean	0.05	-0.50	-0.11
	N	19	8	27
Central bank	Mean	0.81	0.43	0.71
	N	21	7	28
Economic interest	Means	-0.63	-0.25	-0.42
	N	38	48	86
Civil Society	Means	0.00	-0.19	-0.09
	N	70	69	139
Media	Means	(0.33)	-0.56	-0.33
	N	3	9	12
EU-actors				
EU commission	Means	-0.05	-0.02	-0.04
	N	76	49	125
EU Council	Means	-0.17	-0.08	-0.14
	N	72	39	111
EU Parliament	Means	(0.33)	-0.33	-0.33
	N	3	6	9
EU Central Bank	%	0.02	-0.03	0.01
		84	31	115
EU civil society	Means	(0.33)	0.60	0.54
	N	3	10	13
EU economic interest	Means	-0.20	0.43	0.17
	N	5	7	12
EU other actors	Means	-0.22	-0.05	-0.16
	N	237	124	361
EU-Member States Actors				
Government	Means	-0.22	-0.25	-0.23
	N	121	51	172
Other State & Party	Means	-0.15	-0.15	-0.15
	N	26	14	40
Other actors	Means	-0.28	0.20	-0.08
	N	14	10	24
Supranational Actors				
All supranatl. actors	Means	0.09	0.36	0.18
	N	46	22	68
Total	Means	-0.25	-0.17	-0.22
	N	1717	1127	2844

6. Media Frames of European integration

The positions of newspapers towards European issues and actors are closely connected with the broader interpretations of European politics within each country. In fact, Díez Medrano (2003) points out that divergent frames in the public underlie the cross-national contrasts in support of European integration. We therefore analysed the frames used in editorials directly or indirectly connected to the European integration policy field. Since we are particularly interested in interpretative context within which European politics is portrayed in the media, our analysis excludes the claims in any of the six policy fields as long as they do not refer to European integration.

There are large and statistically significant contrasts between countries with respect to the presence or absence of frames in newspaper editorials. This contrast matters for frames, as noted above, play an important role in conforming attitudes toward European integration. The data in Table 34 show that one in two editorials include frames. Furthermore, we see that French editorials contain frames more often than do other countries' editorials, whereas Swiss editorials contain frames considerably less often than do other countries'. Spanish editorials include frames considerably less often than do German and British editorials and the differences are statistically significant. This result is consistent with Díez Medrano's (2003) findings, even though he used a different sample design, a different number of years, and a different methodology⁹.

Table 34: Presence of frame per country

									Total
		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	
No Frame	N	257	272	220	255	103	95	98	1300
	%	54,4	82,7	64,1	67,6	32,8	28,5	32,0	52,5
Frame present	N	215	57	123	122	211	238	208	1174
	%	45,6	17,3	35,9	32,4	67,2	71,5	68,0	47,5
Total	N	472	329	343	377	314	333	306	2474
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 35 classifies the frames along the previously described categories in the coding scheme: Identity frames focused on values, identity frames referring to constitutional and governance issues, economic frames, other instrumental frames, historical frames, and frames internal to the integration process. The largest proportions of frames concern the first three topics in the list. There are also moderate to large and statistically significant contrasts across countries regardless of the type of frame. Identity value frames, for instance, are less often found in the British press (14 %) than in other national media (average 23 %). The UK media, on the other

⁹ Díez Medrano's (2003) analysis calculates the mean number of frames per article and organizes the analysis around a list of preset frames derived from ordinary citizens' frames.

hand, include constitutional and governance frames more often (32 %) than the media in other countries (average 25 %). French editorials stand out for seldom including editorials of this sort (12 %). The Swiss, Italian, and French media include economic frames less often (14 %, 11 %, and 13 % respectively) than the press in other countries (average 20 %), especially when compared to Dutch editorials (28 %). British media stand out for their large proportion of editorials with frames in the category “Other Instrumental Frames” (22 %) compared with an average of 13 % and in sharp contrast to German editorials (7 %). Historical frames figure rarely in editorials on European integration or with a European scope. Nonetheless, some differences are discernable. For instance, French and German commentaries include them more frequently (13 % and 8 %) compared to an average of 6 %. The press in Switzerland only rarely includes historical frames (2 %). Finally, the opinion items in Swiss, Spanish, and French media tend more frequently than other nationalities’ editorials to include frames that are internal to the integration process.

Table 35: Frame type per country

		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total
Identity frames: values	N	56	14	26	36	30	66	45	273
	%	26,0	24,6	21,1	29,5	14,2	27,7	21,6	23,3
Identity frames: constitution and governance	N	62	16	31	34	67	29	58	297
	%	28,8	28,1	25,2	27,9	31,8	12,2	27,9	25,3
Instrumental frames: economy	N	51	8	25	13	49	30	59	235
	%	23,7	14,0	20,3	10,7	23,2	12,6	28,4	20,0
Instrumental frames: other	N	15	6	11	19	46	37	18	152
	%	7,0	10,5	8,9	15,6	21,8	15,5	8,7	12,9
Historical frames	N	17	1	6	3	6	30	10	73
	%	7,9	1,7	4,9	2,5	2,8	12,6	4,8	6,2
Frames internal to the integration process	N	14	12	24	17	13	46	18	144
	%	6,5	21,1	19,5	13,9	6,2	19,3	8,7	12,3
Total	N	215	57	123	122	211	238	208	1174
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

On the basis of our findings, we can distinguish countries by the frequency with which they include various types of frames in their editorials. Swiss media, for instance, show a lesser tendency than does the press in other countries to include economic frames and a greater tendency to include frames internal to the integration process. Spanish editorials reveal a tendency to refer to frames internal to the integration process more frequently than do other countries’ commentaries. Italian media display a pattern to include economic frames less often than do other countries’. British editorials stand out for their lower propensity to include identity, normative, and value frames and for their greater propensity to feature other instrumental frames. The French press is characterised by their lower propensity to contain constitutional and governance frames and economic frames in their opinion section. Finally, Dutch

editorials include economic frames more often than do editorials in other countries' newspapers.

Unpacking the content of the general frames above is beyond this report's scope. One can focus, however, on certain aspects that have been examined in previous work on frames of European integration. Díez Medrano (2003) points out that a fear of losing one's identity and sovereignty distinguishes the British population and British newspaper editorials from those of other countries in the European Union. However, our findings seem to suggest just the opposite. According to Table 35, editorials with "Identity value frames" appear less often in the UK press than in other countries' media. If one unpacks this category of frames, however, as well as the category "constitutional and governance" frames and focuses on editorials with frames specifically referring to national identity, sovereignty, independence, and self-determination, it turns out that 6 % of the British editorials for which the presence or absence of frames and the type of frames have been coded include a frame of this sort¹⁰. This compares with an average of 2% in all other countries taken together. The main contrast occurs in the categories "sovereignty" and "independence", whereas in the category "national identity" the proportion of Dutch editorials is actually somewhat greater. The latter, however, must again be taken with care, for when one examines the actual content of "national identity" frames in each country, it turns out that while the majority of the seven British editorials using this frame refer to the threat to national identity implied by the European Union. Many editorials that use this frame in other countries do it with slightly different connotations.

For instance, a typical "national identity" frame in the UK can be summarized as follows: "They think we should all be grateful to them for giving us the chance to throw ourselves into a giant melting pot that destroys our identities." In the Netherlands, one among other editorials with a "national identity" frame reads something like "Denen kozen nadrukkelijk voor hun nationale identiteit en tegen de EU (Danes have chosen for national identity and against the EU) ". In Spain, an editorial coded as containing a frame about "national identity" reads as follows: "Las expectativas de progreso en la UE se basan en la perdurabilidad de esas 15 conciencias nacionales. Más aún, en su potenciación.' El concepto de europeidad nace de la suma de 15 conciencias nacionales, que no mueren en ningún caso. (The idea of European-ness derives from adding these 15 national identities, which in any case do not die)". Some frames refer indeed to the loss of identity presumably entailed by the European Union, but not as systematically as do British editorials.

Another way of assessing the relative importance of different frames is to examine what are the specific frames that are mentioned most often. The analysis here concentrates on the first frame in the editorials that have been coded. Table 36 shows that basic economic frames such as "economic growth" and "stability" frequently appear in editorials on or indirectly related to

¹⁰ In contrast to the results on most of the analysis in this section, these percentages have been computed based on information about the first, second, and third frames mentioned in the editorials for which frames have been coded.

European integration. This is particularly so in the media of countries like Germany, where the economic stability frame predominates (12 % of the claims include this frame), and in France and the UK, where both appear frequently. The welfare tradition in Europe, which attaches great significance to balancing growth with equality, may play a role in the moderate presence of the “equality among countries” frame (3 % of the editorials contain this frame). On the institutional side of the European Union, a dominant preoccupation, as expressed through the media’s frames, is democracy. The “democracy” frame and the related frame “acceptance of EU by citizens” appear in 9 % and 3 % of the editorials respectively, making this the most frequently type of frames one finds. The democracy frame is particularly frequent in German and Swiss media, while the “acceptance of EU by citizens” is particularly prevalent in the UK press. Governance is a third referent in the framing of claims about European integration in the press. While 6 % of the editorials contain the frame “institutional reforms before enlargement”, 3 % include the frame “efficiency”. Institutional reform makes relatively more frequent appearances in Swiss and French media, whereas efficiency is referred to in all countries alike.

According to Table 36, the distribution of power and functions between national states and the European Union is a fifth salient theme in editorials directly or indirectly related to European integration. Thus, “sovereignty” appears in 3 % of the editorials whereas “federalism” is found in 3 % of the commentaries. Again, British editorials are the most likely to feature such frames. Other relevant frames because of their relatively high frequency are “community of values”, “racism”, and “relations with the USA”, which appear in 5 %, 2 %, and 4% of the editorials respectively. Economy, welfare state, democracy, efficiency, sovereignty, community, exclusion, and relations with the USA are thus significant keywords present in discussions of the European Union in the press. More concretely, economic wellbeing, democracy, and identity and political boundaries play a significant role in structuring discourse about European integration.

Table 36: Twenty-five most often mentioned frames by country

FRAME									Total
		DE	CH ¹⁾	ES ^{2) 3)}	IT	UK	FR	NL ⁴⁾	
democracy	N	31	8	7	5	10	8	16	85
	%	14,4	17,0	5,7	4,1	4,7	3,4	7,7	9,0
economic stability	N	26	1		3	7	5	9	51
	%	12,1	2,1		2,5	3,3	2,1	4,3	5,4
equality among countries	N	12	2	2	4		4	4	28
	%	5,6	4,3	1,6	3,3		1,7	1,9	3,0
Inflation	N	9						9	18
	%	4,2						4,3	1,9
community of values	N	7	2	3	9	3	14	4	42
	%	3,3	4,3	2,4	7,4	1,4	5,9	1,9	4,5
transparency	N	6		2					8
	%	2,8		1,6					0,9
institutional reforms before enlargement	N	6	9		7		30	8	60
	%	2,8	19,1		5,7		12,6	3,8	6,4
social equality	N	5							5
	%	2,3							0,5
Racism	N	4		4			8	6	22
	%	1,9		3,3			3,4	2,9	2,3
modernization	N	4							4
	%	1,9							0,4
international understanding	N	4			2				6
	%	1,9			1,6				0,6
efficiency	N	4		3		5	4	12	28
	%	1,9		2,4		2,4	1,7	5,8	3,0
Relation with USA	N	4	1	4	6	10	8	4	37
	%	1,9	2,1	3,3	4,9	4,7	3,4	1,9	3,9
French German co-operation	N	4		3			15		22
	%	1,9		2,4			6,3		2,3
enlargement before institutional reforms	N	4					4	4	12
	%	1,9					1,7	1,9	1,3
national identity	N	3		2	3	3		6	17
	%	1,4		1,6	2,5	1,4		2,9	1,8
free trade	N	3				5			8
	%	1,4				2,4			0,9
human rights	N	3	2	4					9
	%	1,4	4,3	3,3					1,0
bureaucracy	N	3		2		4		4	13
	%	1,4		1,6		1,9		1,9	1,4
credibility	N	3	1	2		3		5	14
	%	1,4	2,1	1,6		1,4		2,4	1,5
influence in international relations	N	3	1		4	6	5		19
	%	1,4	2,1		3,3	2,8	2,1		2,0
Costs	N	3						7	10
	%	1,4						3,4	1,1

Table 36 cont.

FRAME								Total
		DE	CH ¹⁾	ES ^{2) 3)}	IT	UK	FR	
consumer protection	N	3		3		4	4	14
	%	1,4		2,4		1,7	1,7	1,5
Nazi rule	N	3						3
	%	1,4						0,3
terrorist attacks on USA of 2001	N	3						3
	%	1,4						0,3
Unity	N		2	5			5	12
	%		4,3	4,1			2,4	1,3
subsidiarity	N		2					2
	%		4,3					0,2
economic growth	N		2	4	2	9	14	36
	%		4,3	3,3	1,6	4,3	5,9	2,4
national exports	N		2				5	7
	%		4,3				2,4	0,7
Islam	N		1					1
	%		2,1					0,1
social justice	N		1			8		9
	%		2,1			3,4		1,0
solidarity	N		1	4		5		10
	%		2,1	3,3		2,1		1,1
Peace	N		1		2		4	7
	%		2,1		1,6		1,7	0,7
civil society	N		1					1
	%		2,1					0,1
corruption	N		1			3		4
	%		2,1			1,4		0,4
legitimacy	N		1			4		5
	%		2,1			1,9		0,5
acceptance of the EU by citizens	N		1		3	14	7	25
	%		2,1		2,5	6,6	2,5	2,7
national interest	N		1			8	6	15
	%		2,1			3,8	2,5	1,6
political stability	N		1				5	6
	%		2,1				2,4	0,6
cope with trans-national social problems	N		1	2		3		6
	%		2,1	1,6		1,4		0,6
national economy	N		1		2	13		16
	%		2,1		1,6	6,2		1,7
strength in global competition	N			8	6			14
	%			6,5	4,9			1,5
sovereignty	N			4	5	13	3	29
	%			3,3	4,1	6,2	1,3	1,9
federalism	N			3	6	16	6	31
	%			2,4	4,9	7,6	2,5	3,3

Table 36 cont.

FRAME								Total
		DE	CH ¹⁾	ES ^{2) 3)}	IT	UK	FR	
inflation	N			3				3
	%			2,4				0,3
modernization	N			2				2
	%			1,6				0,2
participation	N			2				2
	%			1,6				0,2
competition in Europe	N			2				2
	%			1,6				0,2
institutional reforms before enlargement	N			18				18
	%			14,6				1,9
rule of law	N				4			4
	%				3,3		1,9	0,9
political integration before common currency	N				4			4
	%				3,3			0,4
political integration before economic integration	N				3			3
	%				2,5			0,3
Americanization	N				2			2
	%				1,6			0,2
freedom	N				2			2
	%				1,6			0,2
pluralism	N				2			2
	%				1,6			0,2
security	N				2			2
	%				1,6			0,2
environmental protection	N				2		8	10
	%				1,6		3,4	1,1
social integration before economic integration	N				2			2
	%				1,6			0,2
common currency before political integration	N					10		10
	%					4,7		1,1
unemployment	N					6		6
	%					2,8		0,6
centralization	N					4		4
	%					1,9		0,4
independence	N					3		3
	%					1,4		0,3
self determination	N					3		3
	%					1,4		0,3
history of the EU	N						10	10
	%						4,2	1,1
communist rule in eastern Europe	N						4	4
	%						1,7	0,4

Table 36 cont.

FRAME		DE	CH ¹⁾	ES ^{2) 3)}	IT	UK	FR	NL ⁴⁾	Total
General spill-over arguments	N							5	5
	%							2,4	0,5
liberalism	N						6		6
	%						2,5		0,6
Fascism	N						3		3
	%						1,3		0,3
public sphere	N							4	4
	%							1,9	0,4
collectivism	N							5	5
	%							2,4	0,5
other	N				30				30
	%				24,6				3,2
prices	N					3		9	12
	%					1,4		4,3	1,3
Total	N		47	98	122		193		941
	%	74,4	92,1	79,7	100,0		81,1		100,0

¹⁾ The following frames are also mentioned once: competition in Europe, social standards, cold war, common currency ¹before political integration

²⁾ The following frames also appear twice: unemployment, common currency before political integration

³⁾ "other frames" (that means frames which were not included in the code book) were mentioned five times.

⁴⁾ "other frames" (that means frames which were not included in the code book) were mentioned four times

Another way to analyse the interpretations that underlie the media claims of European integration is to differentiate frames based on the context in which they appear. Tables 36 to 39 are the outcome of this approach. In the media claims we distinguishing frames that cover four dimensions of European debate. The dimension of the boundaries and finality of the EU is captured by frames about (1) what the EU is not/does not lead to; and (2) what the EU is/leads to. The dimension of normative objectives is examined by looking at frames about (3) what the EU should not be/lead to, and (4) what the EU should be/should lead to. All these classifications involve few cases, especially when one cross classifies by country. Our comments thus focus only on the most salient results of this analysis.

Table 37 shows that the "democracy" frame is the one most often used in connection to what the EU is not/does not lead to. It is especially found in Dutch editorials. Other salient frames present in comments about what the EU is not/does not lead to in specific countries are "efficiency", "economic stability", and "inflation" in Germany, "credibility" and "racism" in France, "sovereignty" in the UK, and "racism" in the Netherlands. Switzerland, Spain, and Italy are excluded here, because of the small number of cases.

Table 37: What the EU is not be/does not lead to: ten most often mentioned frames by country

FRAME								Total	
		DE	CH ¹⁾	ES	IT ³⁾	UK	FR		NL
Efficiency	N	3		1		3		4	11
	%	10,7		7,7		3,4		10,3	7,3
economic stability	N	3				5			8
	%	10,7				5,7			5,3
Inflation	N	3							3
	%	10,7							2,0
national interest	N					4	2		6
	%					4,6	7,7		4,0
equality among countries	N	2			1		1		4
	%	7,1			17,0		3,8		2,6
Democracy	N	2				8	2	4	16
	%	7,1				9,2	7,7	10,3	10,6
Transparency	N	2		1					3
	%	7,1		7,7					2,0
Credibility	N	2		1			3		6
	%	7,1		7,7			11,5		4,0
acceptance of the EU	N	2				10	2		14
	%	7,1				11,5	7,7		9,3
national identity	N	1		1		3		2	7
	%	3,6		7,7		3,4		5,1	4,6
community values	N	1					1		2
	%	3,6					3,8		1,3
institutional reforms before European identity	N		1						1
	%		50						0,7
Other	N		1						1
	%		50						0,7
Sovereignty	N			2		9	1	2	14
	%			15,4		10,3	3,8	5,1	9,3
Racism	N			1			6	4	11
	%			7,7			23,1	10,3	7,3
Federalism	N			1					1
	%			7,7					0,7
Accountability	N			1					1
	%			7,7					0,7
Participation	N			1					1
	%			7,7					0,7
influence in international relations	N			1		4			5
	%			7,7		4,6			3,3

Table 37 cont.

FRAME		DE	CH ¹⁾	ES	IT ³⁾	UK	FR	NL	Total
public sphere	N				1				1
	%				17,0				0,7
legitimacy	N				1				1
	%				17,0				0,7
strength in global competition	N				1				1
	%				17,0				0,7
solidarity	N						2		2
	%						7,7		1,3
liberalism	N						1	1	2
	%						3,8	2,6	1,3
economic growth	N					5	1		6
	%					5,7	3,8		4,0
social justice	N						1		1
	%						3,8		0,7
opportunity space for citizens	N						1		1
	%						3,8		0,7
collectivism	N							2	2
	%							5,1	1,3
Unity	N							2	2
	%							5,1	1,3
cosmopolitanism	N							1	1
	%							2,6	0,7
National Economy	N					8			8
	%					9,2			5,3
Relation With USA	N					5			5
	%					5,7			3,3
nationalism	N						2	1	3
	%						7,7	2,6	2,0
Total	N	21	2	11	4	64	26	23	151
	%	75,0	100,0	84,6	100,0	73,6	100,0	59,1	100,0

¹⁾ There are only two cases.

²⁾ The following items were also mentioned once: 1990 Balkan's wars, other.

³⁾ The table lists the 4 most often mentioned frames because they represent the total number of frames of such types we found

“Democracy”, again, and “community of values” are frequent frames in the context of what the EU is/leads to. The data in Table 38 indicate that the “democracy” frame is especially salient in Germany whereas the “community of values” frame is prevalent in France. Other country specific salient frames within this context are “human rights” in Spain, and “federalism” in the United Kingdom.

Table 38: What the EU is/leads to: ten most often mentioned frames by country

FRAME									Total
		DE	CH ¹⁾	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	
democracy	N	15		7	2		1	4	29
	%	32,6		18,4	9,5		2,2	8,3	13,9
community of values	N	3		2	4	1	13	3	26
	%	6,5		5,3	19,0	2,2	28,3	6,3	12,4
modernization	N	3					1		4
	%	6,5					2,2		1,9
influence in international relations	N	3					1		4
	%	6,5					2,2		1,9
national identity	N	2							2
	%	4,3							1,0
international understanding	N	2			1				3
	%	4,3			4,8				1,4
cope with transnational social problems	N	2		2		1			5
	%	4,3		5,3		2,2			2,4
economic stability	N	2					4	3	9
	%	4,3					8,7	6,3	4,3
national exports	N	2							2
	%	4,3							1,0
Costs	N	2						3	5
	%	4,3						6,3	2,4
human rights	N			4					4
	%			28,9					1,9
strength in global competition	N			3					3
	%			7,9					1,4
Solidarity	N			2					2
	%			5,3					1,0
Unity	N			2				2	4
	%			5,3				4,2	1,9
equality among countries	N			2			1		3
	%			5,3			2,2		1,4
French German co-operation	N			2					2
	%			5,3					1,0
Relation with USA	N			2					2
	%			5,3					1,0
Pluralism	N				2				2
	%				9,5				1,0
acceptance of the EU by citizens	N				2	1			3
	%				9,5	2,2			1,4
cosmopolitanism	N				1				1
	%				4,8				0,5

Table 38 cont.

FRAME		DE	CH ¹⁾	ES	IT ³⁾	UK	FR	NL	Total
responsibility	N				1		1		2
	%				4,8		2,2		1,0
Freedom	N				1				1
	%				4,8				0,5
globalization	N				1		1		2
	%				4,8		2,2		1,0
Peace	N				1	2	4		7
	%				4,8	4,4	8,7		3,3
economic growth	N					1	4		5
	%					2,2	8,7		2,4
liberalism	N						3		3
	%						6,5		1,4
christian values	N						2		2
	%						4,3		1,0
federalism	N					10	2		12
	%					22,2	4,3		5,7
competition in Europe	N						2		2
	%						4,3		1,0
free trade	N						1		1
	%						2,2		0,5
centralization	N					1	1		2
	%					2,2	2,2		1,0
bureaucracy	N					4	1	4	9
	%					8,9	2,2	8,3	4,3
environmental protection	N						1		1
	%						2,2		0,5
rule of law	N							2	2
	%							4,2	1,0
prices	N					2		4	6
	%					4,4		8,3	2,9
political stability	N					1		4	5
	%					2,2		8,3	2,4
general spill-over arguments	N							2	2
	%							4,2	1,0
inflation	N							2	2
	%							4,2	1,0
other	N				5	1			6
	%				23,8	2,2			2,9
unemployment	N					5			5
	%					11,1			2,4
Common currency before political integration	N					5			5
	%					11,1			2,4
corruption	N					3			3
	%					6,7			1,4

Table 38 cont.

FRAME								Total	
		DE	CH ¹⁾	ES	IT ³⁾	UK	FR		NL
sovereignty	N					1			1
	%					2,2			0,5
national interest	N					1			1
	%								0,5
Security	N					1			1
	%					2,2			0,5
national economy	N					1			1
	%					2,2			0,5
Inflation	N					1			1
	%					2,2			0,5
wastefulness	N					1			1
	%					2,2			0,5
enlargement before institutional reforms	N					1			1
	%					2,2			0,5
tolerance	N						2		2
	%						4,3		1,0
Total	N				21	45	46	33	209
	%	78,3		73,7	100,0	100,0	100,0	68,9	100,0

1) There is no case.

Few frames are included in commentary about what the EU should not be/lead to. This is why it suffices to focus on general presence and forego the analysis of country-specific contrasts. According to Table 39 the most salient frame in this respect is “inflation”, mentioned in Germany and the Netherlands only. The number of frames increases substantially in the last context considered here, that is, what the EU should be/should lead to. According to Table 39 “economic stability” and “democracy” are the most frequently found frames in this category, with Germany emphasizing the former and both Germany and the Netherlands stressing the latter relative to other countries. “Economic growth” is another relatively salient frame, but only for France. Since the media in Switzerland and Spain included too few cases, we abstain from interpretations.

Table 39: What the EU should not be/lead to: ten most often mentioned frames by country

FRAME									Total
		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL ¹⁾	
Inflation	N	4						5	9
	%	30,8						19,2	10,5
Equality among countries	N	3	2				1		6
	%	23,1	28,6				6,7		7,0
bureaucracy	N	2							2
	%	15,4							2,3
Racism	N	1		2		1	2	2	8
	%	7,7		28,6		6,7	13,3	7,7	9,3
Democracy	N	1	2						3
	%	7,7	28,6						3,5
over regulation	N	1			1				2
	%	7,7			33,3				2,3
unemployment	N	1		1			1		3
	%	7,7		14,3			6,7		3,5
unity	N		2						2
	%		28,6						2,3
social justice	N		1						1
	%		14,2						1,2
christian values	N			1		1			2
	%			14,3		6,7			2,3
sovereignty	N			1	2	1			4
	%			14,3	66,7	6,7			4,7
bureaucracy	N			1					1
	%			14,3					1,2
Prices	N			1				3	4
	%			14,3				11,5	4,7
Liberalism	N						2		2
	%						13,3		2,3
Fascism	N						3		3
	%						20,0		3,5
Americanization	N						1		1
	%						6,7		1,2
globalization	N						1		1
	%						6,7		1,2
Federalism	N					4	1		5
	%					26,7	6,7		5,8
relation with USA	N						1		1
	%						6,7		1,2
national interest	N						1		1
	%						6,7		1,2
national exports	N							3	3
	%							11,5	3,5

Table 39 cont.

FRAME		COUNTRY							Total
		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL ¹⁾	
free trade	N							2	2
	%							7,7	2,3
Costs	N							3	3
	%							11,5	3,5
national identity	N							1	1
	%							3,8	1,2
Corruption	N							1	1
	%							3,8	1,2
national economy	N							1	1
	%							3,8	1,2
wastefulness	N							1	1
	%							3,8	1,2
cold war	N							1	1
	%							3,8	1,2
division of Germany	N							1	1
	%							3,8	1,2
centralization	N					3			3
	%					20,0			3,5
Efficiency	N					1			1
	%					6,7			1,2
cross-border transport	N					1			1
	%					6,7			1,2
Taxes	N					1			1
	%					6,7			1,2
economic integration before political integration	N					1			1
	%					6,7			1,2
Other	N							2	2
	%							7,7	2,3
Nazi rule	N					1	1		2
	%					6,7	6,7		2,3
Total	N	13	7	7	3	15	15	26	86
	%	100	100	100	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

¹⁾ "Other frames" (that means frames which were not included in the code book) were mentioned two times.

Table 40: What the EU should be/should lead to: ten most often mentioned frames by country

FRAME									Total
		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	
economic stability	N	20	1			2	1	4	28
	%	26,3	7,7			5,7	1,4	6,3	9,2
democracy	N	12	2		3	1	5	7	30
	%	15,8	15,4		4,2	2,9	7,0	11,1	9,8
equality among countries	N	5			3	1		2	11
	%	6,6			4,2	2,9		3,2	3,6
transparency	N	4		1					5
	%	5,3		3,8					1,6
social equality	N	3					1		4
	%	3,9					1,4		1,3
free trade	N	3				3			6
	%	3,9				8,6			2,0
consumer protection	N	3				1	3		7
	%	3,9				2,9	4,2		2,3
community of values	N	2	1		5	1			9
	%	2,6	7,7		7,0	2,9			2,6
Unity	N	2		3		1			6
	%	2,6		11,5		2,9			2,0
subsidiarity	N	2		1					3
	%	2,6		3,8					1,0
Economic growth	N		2	3		2	9	4	20
	%		15,4	11,5		5,7	12,7	6,3	6,5
national exports	N		2						2
	%		15,4						0,7
corruption	N		1						1
	%		7,7						0,3
national interest	N		1			1	3		5
	%		7,7			2,9	4,2		1,6
political stability	N		1						1
	%		7,7						0,3
national economy	N		1			2			3
	%		7,7			5,7			1,0
competition in Europe	N		1						1
	%		7,7						0,3
strength in global competition	N			3	5		3		11
	%			11,5	7,0		4,2		3,6
modernization	N			2					2
	%			7,7					0,7
solidarity	N			2			2		4
	%			7,7			2,8		1,3
efficiency	N			2			4	7	13
	%			7,7			5,6	11,1	4,2

Table 40 cont.

FRAME		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	Total
national identity	N			1				2	3
	%			3,8				3,2	1,0
community of values	N			1					1
	%			3,8					0,3
federalism	N				5		3		8
	%				7,0		4,2		2,6
rule of law	N				4				4
	%				5,6				1,3
Relation with USA	N				4	4	2		10
	%				5,6	11,4	2,8		3,3
influence in international relations	N				4		4		8
	%				5,6		5,6		2,6
Americanization	N				2				2
	%				2,8				0,7
sovereignty	N				2				2
	%				2,8				0,7
environmental protection	N						7		7
	%						9,9		2,3
social justice	N						5		5
	%						7,0		1,6
acceptance of the EU	N					2	5		7
	%					5,7	7,0		2,3
history of the EU	N						4		4
	%						5,6		1,3
French German cooperation	N						3		3
	%						4,2		1,0
cope with transnational social problems	N					2	2		4
	%					5,7	2,8		1,3
humanism	N						1		1
	%						1,4		0,3
human rights	N						1		1
	%						1,4		0,3
civil society	N						1		1
	%						1,4		0,3
other	N				34		1		35
	%				47,9		1,4		11,5
credibility	N					1		5	6
	%					2,9		7,9	2,0
public sphere	N							4	4
	%							6,3	1,3
institutional reforms before enlargement	N					1		4	5
	%					2,9		6,3	1,6
collectivism	N					1		2	3
	%					2,9		3,2	1,0

Table 40 cont.

FRAME									Total
		DE	CH	ES	IT	UK	FR	NL	
self determination	N					3			3
	%					8,6			1,0
legitimacy	N					2			2
	%					5,7			0,7
Freedom	N					1			1
	%					2,9			0,3
Diversity	N					1			1
	%					2,9			0,3
roman empire	N					1			1
	%					2,9			0,3
public services	N						1		1
	%						1,4		0,3
Total	N	56	13	19	71	35	71	41	306
	%	73,7	100	73,1	100,0	100,0	100,0	58,6	100,0

The analysis above helps to clarify the role of particular frames in discourse about the European Union. One sees, for instance, that democracy in the European Union is a controversial frame, since it appears both in comments about what the European Union is/leads to/should be/should lead to and in comments about what the European Union is not/does not lead to. It seems that scepticism about the democratic character of the European Union is more pronounced in the media of the Netherlands and least pronounced in the German press. German editorials also displays a relatively salient interest in the economic aspects of the European Union, (as well as a pessimistic outlook on this matter), hinted at by the frequency with which the frame “economic stability” appears both in comments about what the European Union is not/does not lead to and in comments about what the European Union should be/should lead to. The relative frequency with which the frame “inflation” appears in German commentary about what the European Union should not be/lead to reinforces this impression. Our analysis also clarifies the relative emphasis on topics such as “sovereignty” and “federalism” in the United Kingdom. It shows that “sovereignty” frequently appears in comments about what the European Union is not/does not lead and the latter in comments about what the European Union is/leads to. The British media present the European Union as impinging on sovereignty and as a federal super state. To a lesser extent, they portray it as impinging on national identity – an interpretation which is also found in the Dutch media. Finally, the classification of frames by context and country suggests that whereas German editorials are concerned about the economic aspects of the European Union and British editorials emphasize sovereignty and identity issues, French editorials emphasize the contribution of the European Union to unite Europe at the cultural level, whether by promoting a community of values or eroding racism. More detailed analysis should clarify these issues. Meanwhile, more detailed analysis of the context for Swiss, Italian, and Spanish frames, because of relatively few cases, demands data reduction into a smaller number of broader frame categories.

7. Summary and Conclusion

The analysis of newspaper editorials in Work package 3 of the Europub.com project highlights that the media's voice cannot be dismissed in the debate about emerging a European public sphere. The media play a significant role as political actors as they use the format of editorials for claims making, thereby assigning relevance and frames to political issues and introducing their own opinions into public discourse and political debate. In their dual role as communication channels of political actors and as actors in their own right they constitute the major communicative linkages within and between national public spaces which are a basic prerequisite for the Europeanisation of public sphere.

This report on the comparative analysis of the newspaper editorials across seven countries and issue fields intended to discern the voice of the media by focussing on four dimensions of Europeanisation of mass mediated public sphere: the salience of European integration, the levels of Europeanisation, the evaluations of European issues and actors, and the framing of media claims on European integration.

The overall picture that we can draw from our findings is that - contrary to previous research - there is a remarkable level of European debate in the media of the countries under study and an even greater potential to further develop transnational communicative linkages within the public space of the European Union. This conclusion can be reached not only from the salience of European integration on the issue agenda, but also from the analysis of European scopes in media claims making. Moreover, the evaluations of European issues and actors point to the fact that the political project of Europe is welcome and that European integration is supported by the media of most countries under study. Eventually, in the majority of the countries, the media hold more positive or at least less negative attitudes about EU political actors than about actors from their own country. While this general conclusion is true for six of our seven countries under study, there is one exception. The British press deviates in almost all dimensions from the general picture, as European integration is played down on the issue agenda, as European scopes are neglected, as European issues are opposed and European actors are portrayed in the most negative light ever.

Against the background of this general conclusion, we find of course more or less stark contrasts between the national media that point to the fact that each media culture does feature its idiosyncrasies that are also prevalent in their voice about Europe. For instance, we find that the propensity to open up to European scopes depends largely on whether the media engage in the debates in issue fields that are characterised by strong political competences of the EU. Thus, if the media concentrate on issues like education or social policy which are decided foremost on the national level, there is not much room left for representing European perspectives. On the other hand, if the press is eager to engage in discussing monetary politics or the issue of European integration, there is space to overcome the parochial perspective. What we can conclude from the analysis of EU scopes is that the more the national debates recognize

issue fields with strong political competences of the EU, the more the media open up to transnational perspectives.

While the openness of mediated political debate to EU scopes is largely a residual of the issue fields under discussion, the evaluation of EU issues and actors in editorials depends on the country where the newspaper is published. It seems that the medias' opinion about Europe resonate with the position of the national political elites and at the same time reinforces it. For instance, the media in France and Germany are most open to EU scopes and most supporting of the integration and the deepening of the EU, while the British press opposes the political project of Europe strongly. Even the Dutch and the Swiss media, that turned out to be rather reluctant to open up to European scopes, are in favour of EU integration. And while the Italian and Spanish media are most open to European perspectives in their editorials, their opinions about European issues are either mixed or indifferent. Finally, we see that the British press is not only most parochial in their scope but also overall negative about European issues and actors.

As we have emphasized in the report many times, the British media are the clear outsider in the chorus of the national media that are studied in the Europub.com project. The British media seem to try hard to ignore European scopes whenever possible. They are the most self-referential with respect to their own country. The UK press is opposing the political project of Europe and the attitudes of journalists towards European integration are overwhelmingly negative. Eventually the media in Britain stand out by their deviant pattern of evaluating political actors: Thus, the UK press is one out of two in the sample in which national actors are more positively portrayed than EU actors. Not surprisingly, we find that the frontrunners in negativism are the British tabloids. Finally, European integration in the UK editorials is interpreted with strong references to instrumental frames.

There could be no stronger contrast than the contrast between the British and the French press. Our analysis clearly shows that French editorials are most open to European scopes from all national media. Moreover, there is strong support for the enlargement of EU political competences and for EU integration in general. Interestingly enough, the French media are rather assertive in their evaluations of political actors, whereby EU actors are judged in an overall positive manner. Finally, the French press stresses normative identity frames and values in their interpretation of European integration.

The German newspapers resemble the French media voices insofar as they are rather open to transnational EU perspectives. They also support the deepening of the political EU and a very large majority of commentators hold most favourable opinions about European integration. Yet, the German press is quite negative towards political actors of all levels. Against the background of widespread criticism, we find that EU actors are being treated less critically than national political actors. Concerning the framing of European integration, the media in the Federal Republic focus on identity frames as regards both values and governance as well as on economic frames.

The Spanish media share with the French and the German media their proneness to include European scopes in their editorials. The level of EU scopes is high on all dimensions of claims making. However, the media in Spain are ambivalent in their evaluations of EU issues. Concerning the political project of Europe and European integration we find a widespread indifference or mixed feelings of Spanish journalists. On the other hand, if we look at the evaluation of political actors, EU actors fare much better than own country's political actors. The latter are basically portrayed negatively, while EU actors are evaluated positively. As regards the interpretations of EU integration, the Spanish media more than other media stress frames internal to the EU integration process.

Incoherence also characterizes the media in Italy. Like the Spanish press, the newspapers in Italy are among the national newspapers that most eager to represent European perspectives. We find a quite high level of completely Europeanized claims dimensions. However, concerning the opinions of the Italian media about European issues and actors, the picture is not consistent. On the one hand, the Italian editorials are highly polarized in opposing or supporting the deepening of the EU. On the other hand, Italian journalists seem to be most supportive of European integration. In addition, concerning the evaluations of political actors, the press in Italy is quite negative about actors from its own country and far less negative about EU actors. Eventually, the interpretation of European integration in the Italian press emphasizes identity frames with respect to normative dimensions of belonging and values.

In the period of 2000-2002, the Dutch media were strongly occupied with issues in the national political domain, so that they rank rather low in European scopes. The media in Netherlands seem to be reluctant to open up to European perspectives. They are second most self centred in their claims making and reveal a profound tendency to be sceptical about European actors. Although half of the claims in the Dutch press are supportive to EU integration and further EU political competences, EU political actors are judged in an overall negative fashion. Like the editorials in Britain, the commentaries in the Netherlands hold positive opinions of their own country's political actors, while EU actors are characterized with an overall critical tone. Finally, European integration is interpreted against the background of governance and constitutional frames.

The Swiss media share with the Dutch media a rather strong reluctance to include EU scopes. The vast majority of claims in the Swiss media do not contain any reference to the EU. The rather strong focus on national matters is all the more plausible as Switzerland has not decided yet to join the EU. The same reason might account for the finding, that the press in Switzerland is indifferent about further EU competences. On the other hand, regarding the opinions about European integration, we find that every second commentator of the Swiss press under study is favourable towards European integration. Moreover, we also observe in the media in Switzerland that EU actors are less negatively judged on than own countries' actors. The most prevalent angle through which European integration is interpreted are constitutional and government frames.

References:

- Adam, Silke, Berkel, Barbara, Firmstone, Julie, Gray, Emily, Koopmans, Ruud, Pfetsch, Barbara, Statham, Paul (2002) Codebook for content coding of commentaries/editorials, <https://europub.wz-berlin.de>
- Bleich, Erik (2003): *Race and Politics in Britain and France: Ideas and Policymaking since the 1960s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dearing, James W. and Everett M. Rogers (1996): *Agenda-Setting*. Communication Concepts 6. Thousand Oaks/London, Sage.
- Díez Medrano, Juan (2003): *Framing Europe: Attitudes to European Integration in Germany, Spain, and the United Kingdom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Eder, Klaus and Hans Jörg Trenz (2000): *The Making of a European Public Space: An inquiry into Relating Supranational Politics and Transnational Spaces of Communication. The Case of Justice and Home Affairs*. Paper presented to the "Linking EU and National Governance" Conference, Mannheim, June 1-3.
- Eilders, Christiane and Katrin Voltmer (2003): "Zwischen Deutschland und Europa. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Europäisierung der meinungsführenden deutschen Tageszeitungen." In: *Medien und Kommunikationswissenschaft* 51, 2, 250-270
- Gerhards, Jürgen (1993): "Westeuropäische Integration und die Schwierigkeiten der Entstehung einer europäischen Öffentlichkeit." In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 22: 96ff.
- Gerhards, Jürgen (2000): *Europäisierung von Ökonomie und Politik und die Trägheit der Entstehung einer europäischen Öffentlichkeit*. In: Maurizio Bach: *Die Europäisierung nationaler Gesellschaften*. Sonderheft der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie. Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag. 40: 277-305.
- Ghanem, S. (1997): *Filling the Tapestry: The Second-Level of Agenda-Setting*. In: Maxwell McCombs, Donald L. Shaw and David Weaver: *Communication and democracy : exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory*. Mahwah, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 3-14.
- Imig, Doug and Sidney Tarrow (2000): "Political Contention in a Europeanising Polity." In: *West European Politics* 23(4): 73-93.
- Iyengar, Shanto and Kinder, Donald R. (1987): *News that Matters. Television and American Opinion*. Chicago/ London: University of Chicago Press.
- Kevin, Deirdre (2003): *Europe in the Media: A Comparison of Reporting, Representation, and Rhetoric in National Media Systems in Europe*. Mahwah/London, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Koopmans, Ruud and Jessica Erbe (2003): *Towards a European public sphere? Vertical and horizontal dimensions of Europeanised political communication*. Berlin.
- Koopmans, Ruud and Pfetsch, Barbara (2003): *Towards a Europeanised Public Sphere? Comparing Political Actors and the Media in Germany*. ARENA Working Paper, No 23, December 2003.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Koopmanns, Ruud, Duyvendak, Jan Willem and Giugni, Marco (1995): *New Social Movements in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*. Minneapolis:

University of Minnesota Press.

- Kunelius, Risto and Colin Sparks (2001): "Problems with a European Public Sphere: An Introduction." In: *The public.javnost. Journal of the European Institute for Communication and Culture* VIII(1): The European Public Sphere; Dreams and Realities: 5-20.
- McCombs, Maxwell, Esteban Lopez-Escobar and Juan Pablo Llamas (2000): "Setting the Agenda of Attributes in the 1996 Spanish General Election." In: *Journal of Communication* 50:77-92.
- Neidhardt, Friedhelm, Ruud Koopmans and Barbara Pfetsch (2000): *Konstitutionsbedingungen politischer Öffentlichkeit : der Fall Europa*. In: *WZB-Jahrbuch*. Berlin, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung: 263-293.
- Page, Benjamin (1996): "The Mass Media as Political Actors." In: *Political Science and Politics* 29(1): 20-25.
- Peter, Jochen and Claes H. de Vreese (2003): *In search of Europe: The European Union in national television news*. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, San Diego.
- Protest, David L. and Maxwell McCombs, Eds. (1991): *Agenda Setting. Readings on Media, Public Opinion, and Policymaking*. Hillsdale, N.J., Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schlesinger, Philip (1997): "From cultural defence to political culture: media, politics and collective identity in the European Union." In: *Media, Culture & Society* 19(3): 369-391.
- Schlesinger, Philip and Deirdre Kevin (2000): *Can the European Union become a sphere of publics?* In: Erik Oddvar Eriksen and John Erik Fossum: *Democracy in the European Union: Integration through deliberation?* London/ New York, Routledge: 206-229.