

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

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

Funded by: 5th Framework Programme of the European Commission

Contract No. HPSE-CT2000-00046
Work package: **WP 3 (Analysis of newspaper editorials)**
WP Coordinator: Barbara Pfetsch
Deliverable number: **D 3.3**

Report **Final case report of analysis of newspaper editorials**

Case report **Germany**

Author: Silke Adam, Barbara Berkel

Date: 23 April 2004

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Part I: Analytic Summary	3
1. The voice of the media in a Europeanised public sphere	3
2. Sample and Methodology	5
3. Results	7
3.1 Initiating events	7
3.2 Commentators as claim-makers	8
3.3 Addressees, Supporters, Opponents	9
3.4 Policy Fields	11
3.5 Object Actors	13
3.6 Frames	14
4. Conclusion	15
Part II: Country report Germany	16
1. Article level: general overview	16
2. Article-level: Initiating events	19
3. Claim-level: Commentators as claimants	26
4. Addressees, Supporters, Opponents	37
5. Positively evaluated addressees and opponents	50
6. Negatively evaluated addressees and opponents	57
7. Issues and aims per newspaper	64
8. Issues and aims per year	79
9. Main aspect commented upon	85
10. Object actors	87
11. Frames	98
<i>References</i>	<i>104</i>

Part I: Analytic Summary

1. The voice of the media in a Europeanised public sphere

The progressive economic and political integration of the EU in which competences are shifted from the national to the supranational and intergovernmental levels is accompanied by the question of democracy within the EU. Scholars have acknowledged that institutional and procedural changes of EU governance structures alone do not solve the democratic deficit of the EU. Necessary is a process of communication, that links the multi-level EU policy making to a wider public and thus contribute to legitimation and integration. The identification of such a communication structure is one of the prime foci in the research on the development of a European public sphere.

Mass media are regarded as the highest and most stable level of public spheres. Linguistic and cultural boundaries make it unlikely that a transnational, European-wide mass media system develops that pushes the formation of a unified European public sphere. The main strand of research therefore has shifted its focus to the idea of a Europeanisation of national, mass-mediated public spheres. For the following analysis Europeanisation will be defined in a relational way (Gerhards 2000, Koopmans & Erbe 2003). This means that one can evaluate the degree of “Europeaness” of public spheres by comparing the salience of different actors, issues and events. Herewith, the degree of “Europeaness” can be seen in the importance of actors from the EU or other member states compared to national actors or those from outside the EU within the debate. On an issue dimension one focuses on the relation of issues and events with a European or EU transnational scope compared to those with a purely national one. This definition resembles the distinction of Koopmans and Erbe (2003) who differentiate between two possible forms of Europeanisation: a vertical form and a horizontal one. The vertical form refers to EU actors and issues with a European scope. The horizontal one focuses on the salience of other member states in the national debates.

It has been questioned whether Europeanisation fits the logic of national mass media. National mass media in contrast were hold responsible for the lack of visibility of European actors and issues (Gerhards 2000). It is argued that the news values of closeness, prominence and conflict do contradict the largely administrative political process in the EU characterized

by complex and intransparent negotiations. Therefore reporting on the EU would be an obstacle for national media organisations to attract a large audience.

The main strand of research seeing the media as scapegoats for the lack of attention for Europe, has neglected to differentiate the role of the media. Media on the one hand are conveyors of information. They are a forum for the exchange of ideas, a medium of self observation for society. In this role, media are strongly bound in their agenda-setting to the available information from political or economic elites that result from strategies directed towards the public. The media as chronicler (Neidhardt 1994) characterise news reporting. On the other side, media are political actors themselves (Page 1996) with a genuine voice. In this role media do not only more actively attribute their own salience to issues and positions in the political arena, but also evaluate them. This role of opinion formation is institutionalized in media commentaries (Koopmans & Pfetsch 2003). It fulfils an orientation function as it complies with people's need for orientation (Vltmer 1998).

So far, these two roles had hardly been differentiated in research. Most studies concentrate on the analysis of the news sections, but conclude about the role of the media for the development of Europeanised public spheres. Herewith it is difficult to differentiate whether Europeanisation or the lack of it results from the role of the media or from the elite's communication strategies regarding Europe. Perhaps a more precise analysis of the media's role regarding the development of Europeanised public spheres would contradict the idea that media are responsible for the lack of EU visibility. In the following the degree and forms of Europeanisation of the explicit voice of the media is under study.

2. Sample and Methodology

The study sets out to analyse commentaries that were published between 2000 and 2002 in four German newspapers. The sample includes two quality newspapers with different political tendencies, “Süddeutsche Zeitung” (left wing oriented) and “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” (right-wing oriented). Additionally, commentaries of one regional newspaper, “Leipziger Volkszeitung”, and of the German tabloid “Bild” were analysed. Selection criterion of the commentaries was a reference to one of the following policy fields: European integration, monetary politics, agricultural politics, troops deployment, immigration, retirement/pension schemes and educational politics.¹

A commentary was analysed as so called instance of claim-making (shorthand: a “claim”) which expresses a unit of strategic communicative action in the public sphere. The strategic communicator, the claimant, of a commentary is the journalist. Thus, journalists in commentaries are regarded as claim-makers which legitimately express their opinions. Claim analysis allows to analyse the structure of the commentaries with regard to the *events* that initiated a commentary, the *commentators* themselves (the claimants), the actors they have addressed (*addressees*), the *policy fields* that were commented upon, the actors that the commentary would affect (*object actors*) and finally the *frames*. This helps to provide a more detailed picture on the argumentative structure of public political communication than traditional methods of media content analysis (Koopmanns and Pfetsch 2003:12).

In order to explain differences regarding the forms and degrees of Europeanisation in commentaries, three independent variables are used in the following analysis: newspapers, issue fields and time. Firstly, we differentiate our analysis according to different newspapers. We are interested in the differences and commonalities in commenting between the newspapers under study. This variable is relevant for the German discourse as commentaries in Germany do normally not reflect a journalist’s individual attitude, but the editorial stance of the newspaper (Neidhardt et al. 1998). For national debates research has shown that the media follow patterns of political preferences reflected in an editorial line (Eilders & Voltmer 2003:11). Editorial lines are normally ranked on a right-left scale. They are an expression of a press-party parallelism. Whether differences on a right-left continuum also apply to commenting on EU affairs, which in Germany are hardly subject to right-left contentions, needs to be shown.

Additionally, this independent variable allows to compare different types of newspapers. The following analysis will allow to answer the question whether the quality press comments differently than the tabloid or regional newspapers.

The second independent variable are the issue fields. One might not expect Europeanisation as a general outcome of public political communication considering the large differences in the actual competencies of the European institutions at their policy making. Thus, the chance of Europeanisation of the media's voice is higher in politically and economically integrated European issue fields, than in debates in issue fields or policy areas that remain largely in the realm of national policy making. Besides the issue of European integration itself, we examine commentaries in strongly Europeanised issue fields like agricultural and monetary politics, in less Europeanised fields like immigration and troops deployment and in fields that are hardly Europeanised at all, like pensions and education. This issue specific approach will allow us to give a more realistic assessment of the degrees and forms of Europeanisation in commentaries compared to studies that compute a summary measure of Europeanisation across all issue fields.

The third independent variable, time, will be referred to only to a limited extent. The sample includes commentaries that appeared between 2000 and 2002 and therefore does not allow for a long-term analysis. Nevertheless, the commentaries reflect short-term issue cycles. Therefore we will sporadically refer to relevant results as the development between 2000 and 2002 is concerned.

The next chapter will present first results of the content analysis. It is based on 1004 commentaries, of which 835 contain a claim (Table 1.5). It will offer a descriptive overview of the initiating events, the commentators, their addressees, issues, object actors and frames. The goal of this report is to provide the basis for further steps of a more elaborated explanatory analysis.

¹ These issue fields have been the basis for the Europub.com project in general. They were chosen along the pillar structure of the European Union.

3. Results

3.1 Initiating events

Most commentaries are triggered by German events (44,0%), followed by EU events (25,5%). This holds for all newspapers under study (Table 2.2a). Surprisingly, the tabloid and regional newspaper focus to an equal degree on European events as the quality press, although the number of correspondents they have in Brussels is much smaller. The quality press, mainly the SZ, shows a less pronounced focus on German events. European events are only noticed by the journalists in the issue fields in which EU competences are high (Table 2.2b). Journalists commenting on issue fields outside the first pillar or European integration itself do not respond to EU events at all. Here they normally are triggered by national events. The only exception is troops deployment, where also bi- and multilateral, supranational and US events are important. Europeanisation of the voice of the media thus results out of a strong shift of competences to EU institutions. Only if material policy making is involved on the EU level, journalists recognize the importance of the EU. On this dimension Europeanisation takes place in a vertical form, less strongly in a horizontal dimension.

Which types of events are commented upon? In all newspapers political events had a stronger impact on the writing of commentaries than communicative events like public speeches, publications, publicity campaigns or press conferences (Table 2.1a). The latter only stimulated commenting in 9% of the cases. One can conclude cautiously that the parliamentary-administrative process with its decisions, meetings and executive actions trigger commenting, whereas an increased level of publicity strategies does not necessarily lead to more attention. Thus the often referred to deficit of public communication of EU institutions must not be the primary factor for the lack of visibility of the EU.

3.2 Commentators as claim-makers

A characteristic of editorials in Germany is their call for change: more than 50% of all editorials in all newspapers request a shift of politics (Table 3.2a). Thus commenting in Germany serves the function of surveillance of politics and criticism. However one must also note that specific formats of requesting political change do imply populist sentiments. For example, societal changes are by far most often demanded by the tabloid newspaper Bild. As regards policy fields, in monetary politics and troops deployment journalists less often call for a change (Table 3.2b). This probably reflects the wide support of the common currency and the role of central banks in Germany. To explain the support for the situation in troops deployment requires a more detailed analysis. Nearly 80% of all commentaries on education politics call for change. This probably reflects the bad results of German pupils in the international comparative evaluation project PISA.

Four conflict lines shape the journalists' discussion of European integration²: the first deals with the relation between the EU and the national level, the second refers to the relation between the member states of the EU themselves, the third considers the relation between the 'insiders' and 'candidate member states' and the fourth focuses on the relation to the US (Table 3.3a). The dominant conflict line within the quality press refers to the power distribution between the EU and the national level. The FAZ more strongly asks for the finalité of the Union: should Europe be a federation or a Europe of nations? The left-wing SZ discusses the relation between the two levels by means of concrete structural questions. The dominant conflict line of the regional newspaper in East Germany is the relation between the actual members of the Union and the upcoming new member states. This probably reflects the fear of an increased competition in an enlarged Union which is probably most virulent in Eastern Germany where unemployment rates are high and where exist borders to the new member states exist. A less prominent conflict line in the quality press is the question, whether the member states should have an equal say and whether those states willing to further integrate should be allowed to do so.

Overall, the German newspapers are very supportive of the European project. They do support *further integration and more rights* for the EU (Table 3.4a). The newspapers obviously support the German political elite's point of view regarding further European integration.. Within this positive climate, the SZ stands out as the most supportive of further European integration,

² The conflict lines had hardly been coded for the other issue fields (see Table 3.3b).

the LVZ as the most critical. In the quality press the support for further European integration has increased between 2000 to 2002. Interestingly this support for an extension of rights and competences for the EU is limited to specific issue fields, namely monetary politics, troops deployment and European integration (Table 3.4b). Regarding agricultural politics, where the EU already holds a most powerful position, the journalists are critical of giving further competences and rights to the Union. The successful introduction of the Euro has changed the editorial lines of German newspapers. One can observe an increase in the support for EU competences in this issue field over the years.

Regarding the journalists' *subjective attitudes towards European integration in general* this positive stance of German newspapers is even more pronounced compared to the support expressed for an increase in EU competences (previous paragraph)- with no differences between left and right, regional, tabloid and quality newspapers (Table 3.5a). Despite the seeming consensus within the German media that the project of European integration is a value per se, the regional newspaper of East Germany reveals declining support of European integration. To take this as an indicator for the erosion of the German media consensus would go too far as there is still a high level of support for the European project per se within all newspapers even in those issue fields where a further shift of competences to the EU is not supported (e.g. in agricultural politics).

3.3a Addressees, Supporters, Opponents

Journalists address German actors most often in their commentaries (Table 4.3a). Actors from the EU are on the second place, whereas actors from other member states are rather unimportant. Europeanisation thus takes place in a vertical form, but less strongly in a horizontal one. On this dimension one can find a clear-cut difference between the quality press and the regional / tabloid newspapers: The quality press more strongly focuses on EU actors than the regional / tabloid press. In contrast, the latter more strongly raises their voice towards national actors. Therein the interests of different readerships of the quality press and the tabloid and regional newspapers are reflected. Regarding the Europeanisation in different issue fields (Table 4.3b), the analysis of addressees' scopes reveals the same characteristics as the study of the initiating events. Within strongly Europeanised issue fields, like monetary and agricultural politics and European integration itself, EU addressees are at least as important as addressees from the nation state. Issue fields in the second or third pillar or fields where only inter-state harmonization is aimed for, do neither show a strong form of vertical, nor horizon-

tal Europeanisation. In most of these fields journalists call upon German actors. The only exception is the field of troops deployment: here the USA is a frequent addressee. In the course of the years the strong form of vertical Europeanisation has decreased on average across all issue fields (Table 4.3c): in 2000 36% of all addressees came from the EU, whereas in 2002 only 20,5% are EU actors. In the same time German actors have gained importance. This development is also reflected by a strong decrease of issues concerning European integration between 2000 and 2002 (see section 5).

German journalists direct their claims mainly towards state and party actors (Table 4.2a). This is common to all types of newspapers analysed. Civil society actors appear only rarely in editorials. Interestingly, they have a relatively strong position in the regional newspaper. If civil society actors are called upon in the newspapers analysed, they are predominantly German (Table 4.3d). The EU civil society is quite marginal. It seems that civil society organisations have difficulties adapting to the multilevel game of politics in the EU. Regarding issue fields, civil society actors do have a stronger standing in agricultural politics, immigration and education compared to the other fields (Table 4.2b). In the fields of European integration and troops deployment civil society actors do not play a role at all. Over the years the focus on state and party actors, mainly the governments, has further increased, whereas civil society actors have lost standing (Table 4.2c).

3.3b The evaluation of addressees, supporters and opponents

The two quality newspapers, FAZ and SZ, support EU actors (nearly) as often as German actors (Table 5.2a). This is surprising as both newspapers attribute much more attention to German than to EU actors. EU institutions thus do get a super-proportional high share of support by the German quality press. These findings are underlined by the fact that the quality press also criticises EU actors less frequently and German actors more often than would be expected by the attention these actors get (Table 6.2a). This exceptional positive picture of the EU combined with criticism of the national actors can only be found in the quality press.³ The regional newspaper in contrast supports German actors more often than would be expected by the attention they give to them. The quality press in Germany thus not only supports the general project of EU integration (Table 3.5a), but also evaluates the EU actors involved in the concrete policy process positively.

³ The Bild-Zeitung's shares of criticism and support for the national and EU level do resemble the respective share of attention. Only regarding the positive evaluations, a superproportional share of support for EU institutions can be observed.

In absolute terms EU actors get more support than national actors in the fields of monetary politics, agricultural politics and EU integration. Only in the latter EU actors are also more strongly criticised than national ones. Putting these figures into relation means to compare the respective shares of attention, support and criticism (Table 4.3b, Table 5.2b, Table 6.2b). This comparison reveals that in monetary politics the EU level is over-proportionally supported and under-proportionally criticised. The contrary applies to national actors. In agricultural politics EU actors get more (positive and negative) evaluations compared to their share of attention, whereas German actors get less evaluations. In the issue field of European integration itself, the EU is underrepresented regarding the share of positive evaluations. (In absolute terms the EU actors do have an outstanding position in this issue field). Here German actors score higher than expected from the attention they get on the support dimension and lower on the criticism. European integration thus is the only issue field where German actors get a higher share of support than attention. In all other issue fields, the absolute levels of attention of specific actors resembles (more or less) their share of support and criticism.

3.4 Policy Fields

Around one third (27,3 %) of the commentaries in all four newspapers made matters of European integration a subject of discussion. Other frequently commented issues were Monetary politics (18,1%), matters of troops deployment (14,6%), retirement and pension schemes (11,6%) and immigration politics (10,4). The least important issues in this row were educational politics (9,7%) and agricultural politics (8,3%) (Table 7.1). This distribution proves that commentators judge the issue of European integration worth to be commented upon. Most pronounced is this emphasis in the quality press, a little less in the regional newspaper and far less in the tabloid Bild (12% compared to 23-32%). In all, the issue agenda of the commentaries by Bild proves to be most divergent. The tabloid is the only newspaper that commented most frequently upon monetary politics, particularly on the Euro. This emphasis reflects a general service and reader orientation of a newspaper that has to compete every day at the newsstand.

Looking at the commentaries about European integration in more detail, the most important aspect that was highlighted by the commentators were matters concerning the process of enlargement of the EU (Table 7.2g). Leipziger Volkszeitung dedicated nearly half of its European integration commentaries on this subissue. The attention of the East German regional

newspaper might partly be caused by the political involvement of the former German Democratic Republic as well as the regional proximity of Leipzig to Eastern Europe. The second and third important subissues in all four newspapers were the discussion of the role of a specific country within the EU and of the relation between EU and national levels. This focus might partly be explained by the so called “Haider conflict” that took place in spring 2000.⁴ It seems that particularly the tabloid Bild exclusively focused its commentaries on this particular conflict.

The importance of this conflict probably also resulted in a general peak of issues of European integration in 2000. In all, the influence of actual political developments are well reflected by issue cycles between 2000 and 2002 (Table 8.1). In this period “Monetary politics” has gained importance. The significant peak in 2002 might have been caused by the introduction of the Euro as cash which might have stimulated the commentators. Agricultural issues were most present in 2000 and 2001, both years that stood out by an outbreak of the animal diseases BSE and foot and mouth disease. The presence of issues of troops deployment in 2001 and in 2002 corresponds to the terrorist attack on the USA in 2001 (“September 11th”), followed by disputed war preparations against Afghanistan and Iraq. Why issues regarding matters of retirement have decreased between 2000 and 2002 needs further analysis. The frequency of issues of immigration and of educational politics seem to have been fairly stable over the years of the study.

With regard to the research question of Europeanisation it is particularly important to analyse the issue scopes of the commentaries. The issue scope refers to the geographical and/or political scope of the substantive content of the commentary. It has to be noted that the issue scope is in principle independent from the scope of the cited addressees, and/or the object actors.⁵ Like the addressees, the issues mainly had European and German scopes. However, whilst the actor scopes were predominantly German, the scope of the issues commented upon were predominantly European (49% EU scopes compared to 33% national ones, see Table 7.3). Especially the quality newspapers emphasised European issues, while the commentators of the regional newspaper and the tabloid paid more attention to purely national issues. This may

⁴ At that time the right extreme party FPÖ under the aegis of Jörg Haider became part of the Austrian government. As reaction 14 EU governments imposed sanctions on Austria to underline that the ideas of this party and particularly of Jörg Haider offend the common values of the EU.

⁵ E.g., if a journalist appealed to the European Court of Justice in protest against the Berlin police's treatment of immigrant suspects, the addressee is European, but the scope of the issue ('The Berlin police's treatment of immigrant suspects') remains local.

result of the pronounced coverage of regional and national issues of the latter newspapers. However, it is surprising, that even the commentators of the quality newspapers more or less ignored issues that solely concern other foreign countries like France or the UK. In all, the issue scopes reflect a distinctive degree of vertical, but a negligible degree of horizontal Europeaness.

With regard to policy field differences, commentaries upon European integration evidently have nearly exclusively European issue scopes (Table 7.4). The issue scopes of the other six policy fields clearly reflect the actual distribution of competencies for decision-making, policy development and implementation between the European and national levels. Monetary politics and agricultural politics, two of the most Europeanised EU policies, have a dominant European scope. Agricultural politics additionally has a strong national scope which may be due to the fact, that some areas like the distribution of financial aid is coordinated on a national level. The European scope of immigration politics and troops deployment, policy areas for which harmonisation of national policies has been explicitly formulated as an aim, are far less present. However, while matters of immigration are presented predominantly in a national light, the question of troops deployment has mainly a supranational, multi- or bilateral scope. Finally, the dominant scope of issues of retirement and education, two policy areas for which harmonisation has not been an explicit aim so far, is evidently a national one. Thus the result that has already been discussed with regard to the initiating events and the addressees can be confirmed: A Europeanised topical communication takes place in the policy fields of monetary and agricultural politics and to a lesser degree in immigration politics and troops deployment.⁶

3.5 Object Actors

The object actors of commentaries are all actors whose interests are, or would be affected positively or negatively by the journalist's claim. This category allows to understand whether the journalists, and if, who they speak on behalf of or against. On average, two thirds of the commentaries contained object actors (Table 10.1a). More than half of all object actors mentioned are either whole polities, e.g. countries, or whole economies or the general public (Table 10.2a). Second important are civil society actors (more than 20 per cent), especially "students, pupils and their parents" and "migrant organisations and groups". Similarly important are state and party actors (20 per cent), especially governmental actors. As differences be-

tween newspapers are rather minor, the object actors types vary greatly across policy fields (Table 10.2b). The object actors of commentaries upon monetary politics and about European integration are mainly general entities or state and party actors. Commentaries upon agricultural policy, immigration policy, retirement and pension schemes or upon educational policy refer most often to general entities and to civil society groups. Agricultural commentaries additionally aim at economic interest groups. Commentaries concerning troops deployment are insofar different as they target most often state and party actors.

In all, nearly 90 per cent of references to object actors were positive (388 positive compared to 56 negative evaluations), i.e. commentaries predominantly aim at positive rather than at negative consequences for certain actors. This might reflect a general tendency of commentators to dun for improvement and less for destruction. Regarding the scope, the commentators especially speak on behalf of German and EU actors (Table 10.3a). Interestingly, the shares in negative evaluations of European actors are bigger in the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* and in *Bild* (Table 10.4a). Object actors of other countries are only very seldom mentioned, whereby object actors of other EU member countries are slightly more important than others. This again is a clear sign that forms of vertical Europeanisation dominate horizontal Europeanisation.

3.6 Frames

About half of the commentaries that referred to the topic of European integration or that had an European issue scope included frames with a reference to European integration (Table 11.1a). An exception is the tabloid *Bild*, where frames only occur rarely. Frames were captured according to four categories: identity frames, instrumental frames, historical frames and frames internal to the European integration process. The first type answers the question: what is the EU and what does it stand for? (e.g. too centralized, over-regulated). The second type answers the question: what is the EU good (or bad) for? (e.g. security). The third type is about positive or negative linkages of the EU to historical periods or experiences (e.g. to enlightenment or to the Cold War). The fourth type refers to frames about (alleged) causal linkages between one aspect of European integration and another (e.g. between enlargement and institutional reforms). In all, identity frames concerning values and matters of constitution/governance, and instrumental economic frames proved to be most important (Table 11.2a).

⁶ In this sense, comments on issues of European integration can be interpreted as form of Europeanisation in

Additionally, it was captured, how the journalist referred to the different ideas or concepts of the single frames, i.e. what the EU is (not) and what the EU should (not) be. Listing the three most important frames each, one gets the following picture of the EU (Tables 11.4a-d). Due to the commentators the EU is democratic, modern and it stands for a community of values. However, it is not efficient, economically stable and it does not prevent inflation. In the commentators' vision, the EU should lead to economic stability, democracy and equality among countries. It should not lead to inflation, equalization among countries and bureaucracy.

4. Conclusion

The descriptive analysis has shown that despite the dominant national focus of German newspapers' commentaries, European actors, issues and opinions play a significant role. Journalists address EU actors second to German actors. And second to German actors they speak on behalf of (resp. against) EU actors. Moreover, nearly half of the commentaries made European issues a subject of discussion. However, actors and issues of other European member states attract only very rarely the attention of German commentators. Europeanisation thus seems to happen on a vertical dimension and not on a horizontal one. The integrative function of EU institutions is reflected by the initiating events. Second to German events it is EU events that triggered the commentaries. Hereby, the newspaper type made no difference. The tabloid and the regional newspaper focus to an equal degree on European events as the quality press.

Overall, the analysed commentaries proved a very supportive stance of German newspapers, particularly of *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, towards the European project. Only within the agricultural sector journalists are critical to giving further competences and rights to the Union. Regarding the journalists' subjective attitudes towards European integration no differences between left and right, regional, tabloid and quality newspapers could be observed. Instead, there seems to be a consensus within the German media landscape that the project of European integration is a value per se. In this sense, the newspapers can be seen as a part of the German elite's support for further European integration.

Part II: Country report Germany

1. Article level: general overview

The following detailed analysis is based on 1004 commentaries in 4 different German newspapers. Commentaries are opinion articles written by a journalist or editor of the analysed newspaper and recognizably representing the newspaper's point of view. Editorials therefore do not include guest commentaries, reprints of editorials from other newspapers, contributions by regular columnists or 'analysis' type articles. As can be seen in table 1.1, most of the commentaries coded appeared in the quality newspapers, 'Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ)' and 'Süddeutsche Zeitung (SZ)' whereas the number of commentaries in the regional newspaper, 'Leipziger Volkszeitung (LVZ)', and the tabloid 'Bild' is much smaller. Within each newspaper there was some variation regarding the number of commentaries in the course of time. But there seems to be no systematic fluctuation across the years and newspapers.

Table 1.1: Number of commentaries coded per year and paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
YEAR	2000	n				321	
		%	28,5	34,1	32,8	38,8	32,0
	2001	n				344	
		%	37,2	34,6	29,1	22,4	34,3
	2002	n				339	
		%	34,4	31,3	38,1	38,8	33,8
	Total	n	393	428	134	49	1.004
		%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Commentaries mainly appear on specific commentary pages within the newspapers under study. The main exception is the 'Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung' traditionally strong in the business and economy section. It is therefore not surprising that the newspaper has specific spots for commentaries in these sections (Table 1.2).

Table 1.2: Number of commentaries per section and paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
SECTION	Mixed international/national news section	n				163	
		%	0,0	29,2	28,4	0,0	16,2
	Regional/local news section	n				2	
		%	0,0	0,0	1,5	0,0	0,2
	Commentary pages	n				616	
		%	84,7	34,6	64,2	100,0	61,4
	Business/Economy section	n				220	
	%	15,0	35,7	6,0	0,0	21,9	
National news section	n				2		
	%	0,0	0,5	0,0	0,0	0,2	
Section unknown	n				1		
	%	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1	
Total	n	393	428	134	49	1.004	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

Table 1.3 indicates that our seven issue fields under study did not make it very often into the main commentary, the ‘Leitartikel’ of the day. Once again, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung has an exceptional role: nearly 40% of the coded commentaries were ‘Leitartikel’. Perhaps this is a first indicator that the FAZ emphasises at least some of the 7 issues under study more than the other newspapers.

Table 1.3: Number of main commentaries coded per paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
MAIN COM	no	n				690	
		%	72,5	60,5	72,4	100,0	68,7
	yes	n				240	
	%	10,4	39,5	22,4	0,0	23,9	
not identifiable / not applicable	n					74	
	%	17,0	0,0	5,2	0,0	7,4	
Total	n	393	428	134	49	1.004	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

Commentaries that have been written in response to or to accompany another article or interview published by the newspaper are hardly existing in Germany (Table 1.4). The analysed newspapers do not set their own agenda.

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

		PAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
CAMP	no	n				997
		%	99,7	99,8	98,5	95,9
yes	n					6
	%	0,3	0,2	1,5	4,1	0,6
Total	n	392	428	134	49	1.003
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

The publication of an editorial is regarded as a strategic action in the public sphere constituting an instance of claims-making, where a political opinion is expressed. The journalist is the one who is making a claim (claimant) in a specific issue field, calling upon an actor (addressee) and speaking for or against somebody (object actor). By definition every commentary contains at maximum one claim of the journalist referring to our issue fields under study. If there are several claims of the journalist in the commentary, the main claim was coded. The following analysis of claims variables in commentaries (starting with chapter 3) is based on 835 commentaries in total (Table 1.5). This means that 16,8% of the coded commentaries did not contain a claim referring to our seven issue fields under study.

Table 1.5: Number of commentaries with and without claims

	Percent	Frequency
no	16,8	169
yes	83,2	835
Total	100,0	1.004

2. Article-level: Initiating events

In this section we are interested in the events that stimulate the writing of an editorial. A comparison between events of the institutionalised political process to communicative events where the political elite actively tries to influence the media agenda reveals that the political process itself has more power to initiate the writing of commentaries. Table 2.1a demonstrates a strong orientation of the journalists towards the institutionalised political process. 19,6% of all editorials are triggered by political decisions and 17,2% by meetings. Communicative events of political actors partly directed to the media, like public speeches / letters, publications or publicity campaigns stimulate 7,6% of all commentaries. Those events only directed to the media like press conferences, interviews or PR stunts of political actors do not successfully influence the voices of the media (0,6%). Media do not seem to be powerless awaiting the communication activities of the political elite. On the other side, media do depend on the political process as commentaries normally comment upon it. Whether the category “unspecified statement” (30,2%) is political in nature or must be regarded as part of the communicative strategies of the actors can not be answered in this preliminary analysis. Summing up, it seems that journalists respond firstly to the decision process of politics, secondly, but weaker, to the communication strategies of political actors and hardly at all to the media agenda itself. Only 0.8% of all commentaries are triggered by other media coverage.

In the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* less commentaries are triggered by non-specified statements compared to the three other newspapers. The SZ seems to give a more precise account of where a statement was made. The *Bild* responds weaker to communicative events that are partly directed towards the media (like public speeches, etc.), but more strongly responds to crisis events. This probably is a characteristic of tabloid journalism.

Table 2.1a: Types of initiating events per paper

		PAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
political decision	n					190
	%	24,3	16,7	14,9	18,4	19,6
executive action	n					26
	%	3,1	2,2	2,2	4,1	2,7
judicial action	n					17
	%	0,8	2,2	3,0	2,0	1,8
non-specified statement	n					293
	%	24,0	35,4	32,8	28,6	30,2
meeting	n					167
	%	21,4	15,0	15,7	6,1	17,2
direct-democratic action	n					6
	%	0,5	0,7	0,7	0,0	0,6
protest action	n					16
	%	1,6	1,7	2,2	0,0	1,6
com. events partly directed to the media	n					74
	%	7,2	8,5	8,2	2,0	7,6
com. events directed only to the media	n					6
	%	0,5	0,5	1,5	0,0	0,6
com. events initiated by the media	n					8
	%	0,8	0,7	0,7	2,0	0,8
external political crisis	n					21
	%	2,1	2,0	2,2	4,1	2,2
natural crisis	n					19
	%	1,6	1,7	2,2	6,1	2,0
economic developments	n					64
	%	5,7	7,2	4,5	14,3	6,6
societal developments	n					3
	%	0,0	0,2	1,5	0,0	0,3
elections	n					32
	%	4,4	1,5	5,2	4,1	3,3
other objective extra-discursive events	n					28
	%	2,1	3,5	2,2	6,1	2,9
54,00	n					1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,1
Total	n	387	401	134	49	971
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Commentaries in monetary politics are - not surprisingly - triggered high above average by economic developments, like the raise in interest rates (Table 2.1b). Monetary politics is highly technocratic as is shown by the unimportance of meetings for stimulating editorials. Commentaries about agricultural politics are also only weakly triggered by meetings, but

more by crisis. Thus media do raise their voice to comment on agricultural politics in times of crisis, but less in times of routine politics.⁷

Table 2.1b: Types of initiating events per issue fields

		POLICY FIELD						Total	
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement / Pensions	Education		European Integration
INITIATING EVENT	political decision	n							190
	%	19,3	20,8	23,3	12,5	33,3	14,0	17,9	19,6
	executive action	n							26
	%	3,4	1,3	2,9	6,9	0,9	3,5	0,4	2,7
	judicial action	n							17
	%	0,0	1,3	3,9	0,6	3,4	2,3	2,0	1,8
	non-specified statement	n							293
	%	27,8	31,2	38,8	38,8	30,8	31,4	21,9	30,2
	meeting	n							166
	%	7,4	6,5	10,7	21,9	17,9	15,1	27,1	17,1
	direct-democratic action	n							6
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,6
	protest action	n							16
	%	0,6	0,0	4,9	1,9	0,0	4,7	1,2	1,6
	com. events partly directed to the media	n							74
	%	8,5	6,5	5,8	3,1	3,4	15,1	10,4	7,6
	com. events directed only to the media	n							6
	%	0,6	2,6	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,8	0,6
	com. events initiated by the media	n							8
	%	0,6	2,6	0,0	1,9	0,9	0,0	0,4	0,8
external political crisis	n							21	
%	0,0	0,0	1,0	10,6	0,0	1,2	0,8	2,2	
natural crisis	n							19	
%	0,0	20,8	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,8	2,0	
economic developments	n							64	
%	27,3	0,0	0,0	0,6	7,7	0,0	2,4	6,6	
societal developments	n							3	
%	0,0	1,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,3	0,0	0,3	
elections	n							32	
%	2,3	0,0	2,9	0,0	1,7	3,5	8,0	3,3	
other objective extra-discursive events	n							28	
%	1,1	5,2	5,8	0,0	0,0	7,0	4,0	2,9	
54,00	n							1	
%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1	
Total	n	176	77	103	160	117	86	251	970
%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

⁷ This partially reflects the issue classification. We coded commentaries referring to subsidies and quotas and those dealing with epidemics.

Protest events influence the voice of the media only in immigration and education politics. In the latter communicative events that are partly directed to the media are more important than average. Editorials about troops deployment do react above average to external crisis and executive actions. Editorials regarding European integration are above average triggered by public speeches and other publications. Additionally, the EU meetings strongly impact the writing of commentaries. Here, non-specified statements are less important than in the other issue fields, whereas the culture of negotiations in the multi-level game of EU politics is reflected in the importance of meetings.

There are only two types of events that regularly trigger the writing of commentaries: German and EU events. The strongest impact on journalists' decision to write a commentary still have events with a German scope, followed by events with an EU scope (Table 2.2a). The scope of the event hereby is defined by the ensemble of actors involved, not by the locality where the event takes place.

The differences between newspapers are not striking. To some degree the quality newspapers do respond less to German events compared to the regional and tabloid newspaper. Here the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* stands out with only 39,2% of commentaries stimulated by German events (compared to 50 / 51% in the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* and *Bild*). Additionally, there seems to be a stronger focus of the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* on US events. Surprisingly, the tabloid and regional newspapers have as strong a focus on European events than the quality press.

Table 2.2a: Scopes of initiating events per paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
SCOPE OF INITIATING EVENT	supranational: UN	n				18	
		%	3,1	0,8	2,2	0,0	1,9
	other supranational	n				15	
		%	2,1	1,3	0,7	2,0	1,6
	EU	n				247	
		%	26,2	25,3	23,9	26,5	25,5
	other European supranational	n				1	
		%	0,0	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,1
	multilateral	n				44	
		%	5,5	4,3	3,0	4,1	4,6
	bilateral	n				91	
		%	9,1	9,8	7,5	14,3	9,4
	germany	n				425	
		%	39,2	45,6	50,0	51,0	44,0
	france	n				6	
		%	1,0	0,5	0,0	0,0	0,6
	uk	n				12	
		%	2,1	0,5	0,7	2,0	1,2
	italy	n				6	
		%	0,3	0,8	1,5	0,0	0,6
	spain	n				5	
		%	0,3	0,8	0,7	0,0	0,5
	netherlands	n				2	
		%	0,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
	other EU-members	n				16	
		%	0,8	2,5	2,2	0,0	1,7
	Switzerland	n				1	
		%	0,0	0,0	0,7	0,0	0,1
	upcoming enlargement countries	n				6	
		%	0,8	0,5	0,7	0,0	0,6
other european countries ex CIS	n				9		
	%	1,0	0,8	1,5	0,0	0,9	
turkey	n				9		
	%	1,3	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,9	
russia	n				3		
	%	0,0	0,5	0,7	0,0	0,3	
USA	n				31		
	%	4,4	2,8	2,2	0,0	3,2	
Japan	n				5		
	%	1,0	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,5	
Middle East	n				4		
	%	0,5	0,5	0,0	0,0	0,4	
Rest of the world	n				11		
	%	0,8	1,5	1,5	0,0	1,1	
Total	n	385	399	134	49	967	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

The commentaries analysed strongly reflect the pillar structure of the European Union. European events trigger editorials in strongly Europeanised issue fields, like monetary politics and agriculture. Monetary politics has additionally a relatively weak German dimension, but a stronger multilateral and US focus. In agricultural politics in contrast, there are only two types of events that trigger the writing of commentaries: EU and national events. In less Europeanised issue fields like immigration and troops deployment, EU events do not play a significant role in stimulating commenting. In the immigration field, German events are the most dominant. Commenting in the field of troops deployment in contrast is triggered by supranational, multilateral and bilateral events. Here, it seems that not a Europeanisation, but another form of transnationalisation is taking place. In the retirement and education field national events prevail. The commenting on European integration issues is strongly influenced by European events. More than half of all commenting directly results from European events.

Table 2.2b: Scope of initiating events per issue fields

		POLICY FIELD						Total	
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education		European Integration
SCOPE OF INITIATING EVENT	supranational: UN	n							18
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	8,8	0,0	2,3	0,8	1,9
	other supranational	n							15
	%	3,4	0,0	1,0	2,5	0,0	1,2	1,2	1,6
	EU	n							247
	%	42,0	41,9	1,9	2,5	0,9	2,3	53,0	25,6
	other European supranational	n							1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4	0,1
	multilateral	n							44
	%	6,8	1,4	2,9	10,7	0,0	0,0	4,4	4,6
	bilateral	n							90
	%	1,7	4,1	6,8	23,3	0,9	0,0	15,5	9,3
	germany	n							425
	%	29,0	48,6	81,6	32,7	96,6	87,2	5,6	44,0
	france	n							6
	%	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,9	0,0	1,2	0,6
	uk	n							12
	%	2,3	1,4	0,0	3,1	0,0	2,3	0,0	1,2
	italy	n							6
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,6
	spain	n							5
	%	0,6	1,4	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,8	0,5
	netherlands	n							2
	%	0,0	0,0	1,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
	other EU-members	n							16
	%	0,6	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,0	2,3	4,8	1,7
	Switzerland	n							1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4	0,1
upcoming enlargement countries	n							6	
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,4	0,6	
other european countries ex CIS	n							9	
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0	3,2	0,9	
turkey	n							9	
%	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,8	0,9	
russia	n							3	
%	0,0	1,4	0,0	0,0	0,9	0,0	0,4	0,3	
USA	n							31	
%	6,8	0,0	0,0	10,7	0,0	0,0	0,8	3,2	
Japan	n							5	
%	1,7	0,0	0,0	0,6	0,0	1,2	0,0	0,5	
Middle East	n							4	
%	0,0	0,0	1,0	1,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4	
Rest of the world	n							11	
%	2,3	0,0	1,0	2,5	0,0	1,2	0,4	1,1	
Total	n	176	74	103	159	117	86	251	966
%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

3. Claim-level: Commentators as claimants

In this section the commentators themselves are under study. Table 3.1a shows the writers of the commentaries within our sample. Within the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (and to a lesser degree within the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*) a bigger variety of journalists are allowed to write commentaries compared to the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* and the *Bild*.

Table 3.1a: Names of commentators per paper

Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild
Piper, Nikolaus (8%)	Frankenberger, Klaus-Dieter (11,7%)	Wonka, Dieter (17,9%)	Martin, Paul C. (14,6%)
Oldag, Andreas (7,9%)	Schmoll, Heike (8,3%)	Kecke, Anita (14,2%)	Gafron, Georg (12,2%)
Prantl, Heribert (5,9%)	Nonnenmacher, Guenther (5,7%)	Bommersheim, Martin (7,5%)	Boenisch, Peter (9,8%)
Bolesch, Cornelia (5,6%)	Kohler, Berthold (5,7%)	Walitzek, Jörg (6,6%)	Henkel, Hans-Olaf (9,8%)
Schumacher, Oliver (5,3%)	Hefty, Georg Paul (5,2%)	Gareis, Andrea (4,7%)	Gösmann, Sven (7,3%)
Kornelius, Stefan (4,7%)	Barbier, Hans D. (5,2%)	Zweigler, Reinhard (3,8%)	Hoeren, Dirk (7,3%)
Schwennicke, Christoph (4,4%)	Goebel, Heike (4,6%)	Schneider, Micha (3,8%)	4,9%: Becker, Ulrich; Haberstock, Sabine; Kleine, Rolf; Koerzdoerfer, Norbert; Lambeck, Martin S.; Quoos, Jörg
Muench, Peter (3,5%)	Dietrich, Stefan (4,3%)	Schanzmann, Sabine (2,8%)	
Rubner, Jeanne (3,2%)	Hort, Peter (3,4%)	Milde, Ulrich (2,8%)	
Kister, Kurt (3,2%)	Reumann, Kurt (3,2%)	Hochstein, Hartwig (2,8%)	
N = 339	N = 349	N = 106	N = 41

Table 3.1b shows clearly that commentators are focused on specific issue fields. Heribert Prantl of the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* for example comments strongly on immigration issues. He also has a share of 3,3% of all editorials within the field of troops deployment. In the other issue fields he does not rank first ten. The issue field of education is the most concentrated one: here Heike Schmoll of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* holds a share of more than 35% of all commentaries. Table 3.1b also makes it clear that the regional newspaper focuses very strongly on agriculture, immigration and retirement: within these issue fields commentators of the regional newspapers are important (see Walitzek, Wonka).

Table 3.1.b: Names of commentators per issue field

Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	European Integration
Piper, Nikolaus (11,3%)	Bolesch, Cornelia (10,1%)	Prantl, Heribert (16,1%)	Frankenberger, Klaus-Dieter (8,2%)	Goebel, Heike (11,3%)	Schmoll, Heike (35,8%)	Frankenberger, Klaus-Dieter (10,5%)
Barbier, Hans D. (6,0%)	Walitzek, Jörg (10,1%)	Wonka, Dieter (10,3%)	Kister, Kurt (8,2%)	Hagelueken, Alexander (7,2%)	Reumann, Kurt (13,6%)	Oldag, Andreas (7,9%)
Einecke, Helga (5,3%)	Schälers, Manfred (7,2%)	Hefty, Georg Paul (10,3%)	Kornelius, Stefan (8,2%)	Wonka, Dieter (7,2%)	Rubner, Jeanne (12,3%)	Nonnenmacher, Guenther (6,1%)
Schumacher, Oliver (5,3%)	Roth, Wolfgang (5,8%)	Hoell, Susanne (6,9%)	Schwennicke, Christoph (7,4%)	Schumacher, Oliver (7,2%)	Kecke, Anita (3,7%)	Kohler, Berthold (5,3%)
Tigges, Claus (5,3%)	Krause, Klaus-Peter (5,8%)	Dietrich, Stefan (5,7%)	Muench, Peter (4,9%)	Barbier, Hans D. (5,2%)	Hefty, Georg Paul (2,5%)	Bolesch, Cornelia (4,4%)
Frankenberger, Klaus-Dieter (4%)	Buender, Helmut (4,3%)	Kohler, Berthold (3,4%)	Kohler, Berthold (3,3%) Perras, Arne (3,3%) Prantl, Heribert (3,3%)	Hefty, Georg Paul (4,1%)		Broessler, Daniel (3,5%)
Welter, Patrick (4%)	2,9%: Bommersheim, Martin; Dietrich, Stefan; Nonnenmacher, Guenther; Oldag, Andreas; Piper, Nikolaus; Stiller, Michael	2,3%: Barbier, Hans D.; Gösmann, Sven; Nienhuysen, Frank; Kecke, Anita; Boenisch, Peter; Deker, Daniel; Drobinski, Matthias	Fried, Nico (2,5%), Kecke, Anita; Klein, Stefan; Nonnenmacher, Günther; Ulfkotte, Udo	Hoffmann, Andreas (4,1%)		Hort, Peter (3,1%)
Oldag, Andreas (3,9%)				Piper, Nikolaus (4,1%)		Bommersheim, Martin (2,6%)
Martin, Paul C. (3,3%)				Zweigler, Reinhard (3,1%)		Kornelius, Stefan (2,6%)
Goebel, Heike (2,6%) Hort, Peter (2,6%)						Schmid, Thomas (2,6%)
N = 151	N = 69	N=87	N = 122	N = 97	N = 81	N = 228

Commentators in all four newspapers use their commenting to call for a change in politics (Table 3.2a). 55,6% of all editorials call for change. In the Bild-Zeitung this attitude is especially strong: here 68,3% call for change.

Table 3.2a: Calls for change per paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
CHANGE	no call for change/not to change expressed by journalist	n					306
		%	37,2	36,7	38,7	26,8	36,6
	call for change	n					464
		%	54,9	54,4	56,6	68,3	55,6
	neutral/ambivalent attitude as to whether change is needed	n					37
	%	5,3	3,7	3,8	4,9	4,4	
	call for the situation to remain as it is	n					28
		%	2,7	5,2	0,9	0,0	3,4
Total	n	339	349	106	41		835
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0		100,0

There are some policy fields where the call for change is weaker (Table 3.2b). These are the field of monetary politics and troops deployment. The strongest call for change is made in the field of education. This probably directly reflects the bad results of German pupils in the PISA study. Additionally, there seems to be a strong disagreement with agricultural policies and to a lesser degree with immigration and retirement. Within European integration there are fewer calls for change.

Table 3.2b: Calls for change per issue field

		POLICY FIELD							Total	
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	European Integration		
CHANGE	no call for change/not to change expressed by journalist	n							306	
		%	47,0	24,6	34,5	45,1	39,2	14,8	36,4	36,6
	call for change	n							464	
		%	41,7	66,7	58,6	47,5	58,8	77,8	55,3	55,6
	neutral/ambivalent attitude as to whether change is needed	n								37
	%	7,3	2,9	4,6	4,1	1,0	1,2	5,7	4,4	
	call for the situation to remain as it is	n							28	
		%	4,0	5,8	2,3	3,3	1,0	6,2	2,6	3,4
Total	n	151	69	87	122	97	81	228	835	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

The commentators refer to specific conflict lines in the discussion regarding the future of Europe (Table 3.3a). Four broad conflict lines are predominantly discussed in the German debate: the relation between the EU and the national level, the relation between the member states, the relation between the “insiders” and “outsiders” within the debate on enlargement and the relation to the US.

The debate on the power distribution between the EU and the national level is the dominant conflict line in the quality press. It is a multi-facet conflict line. The following categories deal with this core question: “Future of Europe”, “Political Levels”, “Decision making within the EU”, “EU Reform”, “Level of problem solving” and “Deepening”. When comparing the quality newspapers it stands out that the FAZ more strongly asks for the finalité of the Union, whether it should be a federation or a Europe of the nations (“Future of Europe”). The SZ discusses the relation between the nation state and the EU within the questions on concrete structural problems: Should the Council or the Commission gain more rights (“EU reforms”)? Should the national veto be maintained (“Decision making within EU”)?

The question of how the relations between the member states should look like is less prominent in the German debate. Still, both quality newspapers ask, whether there should be an equal say between the member states (“Leadership in Europe”) and whether those states that want to proceed with integration should be allowed to do so (“Europe a la carte”).

Finally, all newspapers⁸ strongly discuss the question of widening, whether membership should be kept limited or not (“Widening”) and whether reforms need to be achieved before the enlargement process proceeds (“Reforms and enlargement”). This conflict line dominates the commenting in the LVZ, whereas the quality press more strongly focuses on the power distribution between the national and the EU level. Perhaps this also reflects the fear of new competition of the average people in the economically disadvantaged Eastern part of Germany. The relation of the EU to the US (“Europe and the USA”) is also a concern of all newspapers under study.

⁸ Here the Bild-Zeitung is excluded as the case numbers are too small.

Table 3.3a: Conflict lines of commentator per paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
CONFLICT LINE	Leadership in Europe	n	3	4	0	0	7
		%	4,7	7,1	0,0	0,0	5,0
	Future of Europe	n	4	9	0	0	13
		%	6,3	16,1	0,0	0,0	9,3
	Political levels	n	5	5	2	0	12
		%	7,8	8,9	11,1	0,0	8,6
	Decision making within EU	n	3	0	0	0	3
		%	4,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,1
	EU reform	n	8	2	2	0	12
		%	12,5	3,6	11,1	0,0	8,6
	Values	n	2	1	0	0	3
		%	3,1	1,8	0,0	0,0	2,1
	Citizenship	n	1	2	0	0	3
		%	1,6	3,6	0,0	0,0	2,1
	Political information	n	2	1	0	0	3
		%	3,1	1,8	0,0	0,0	2,1
	Deepening	n	3	5	2	0	10
		%	4,7	8,9	11,1	0,0	7,1
	Widening	n	15	11	5	0	31
		%	23,4	19,6	27,8	0,0	22,1
Identity	n	0	2	0	0	2	
	%	0,0	3,6	0,0	0,0	1,4	
Relations between EU MS	n	1	0	0	1	2	
	%	1,6	0,0	0,0	50,0	1,4	
Type of entity	n	3	1	2	0	6	
	%	4,7	1,8	11,1	0,0	4,3	
EU influence in the world	n	0	0	1	0	1	
	%	0,0	0,0	5,6	0,0	0,7	
Europe and the USA	n	5	4	1	1	11	
	%	7,8	7,1	5,6	50,0	7,9	
Europe a la carte	n	4	3	0	0	7	
	%	6,3	5,4	0,0	0,0	5,0	
Reforms and enlargement	n	1	5	3	0	9	
	%	1,6	8,9	16,7	0,0	6,4	
Level of problem solving	n	4	1	0	0	5	
	%	6,3	1,8	0,0	0,0	3,6	
Total	n	64	56	18	2	140	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

Because of the case numbers, the conflict lines can only be discussed within the issue field of European integration (Table 3.3b).

Table 3.3b: Conflict lines of commentator per issue field

	POLICY FIELD					Total
	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	European Integration	
Leadership in Europe	n					7
	%	11,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,0
Future of Europe	n					13
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	9,3
Political levels	n					12
	%	0,0	20,0	0,0	0,0	8,6
Decision making within EU	n					3
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,1
EU reform	n					12
	%	11,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	8,6
Values	n					3
	%	0,0	0,0	50,0	0,0	2,1
Citizenship	n					3
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,1
Political information	n					3
	%	0,0	20,0	0,0	0,0	2,1
Deepening	n					10
	%	11,1	10,0	0,0	0,0	7,1
Widening	n					31
	%	11,1	0,0	50,0	0,0	22,1
Identity	n					2
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,4
Relations between EU MS	n					2
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,4
Type of entity	n					6
	%	11,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,3
EU influence in the world	n					1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
Europe and the USA	n					11
	%	44,4	0,0	0,0	100,0	7,9
Europe a la carte	n					7
	%	0,0	30,0	0,0	0,0	5,0
Reforms and enlargement	n					9
	%	0,0	10,0	0,0	0,0	6,4
Level of problem solving	n					5
	%	0,0	10,0	0,0	0,0	3,6
Total	n	9	10	2	3	140
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

In the following the commentators' position towards European integration is analysed. Table 3.4a indicates the average position of a newspaper regarding its stance on the question

whether integration should be deepened and rights of the EU extended. Position scores were coded and computed in such a way that a score of $-1,00$ indicates that the newspaper always took a negative position regarding the rights and competences of the EU, while a score of $1,00$ indicates that a positive stance towards more rights and competences is expressed.

The voice of the German media do support further integration and more rights for the EU. The Süddeutsche Zeitung supports the extension of EU rights most (average $0,48$ compared to $0,35$ of the FAZ, $0,32$ of the LVZ and $0,4$ of Bild). The figures for Bild have to be treated cautiously as the results are based on a very small sample. In the course of the years, the SZ, FAZ and Bild pledged more openly for an increase in competences and rights for the EU.

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

		CISPOS1		
PAPER	YEAR	Mean	N	Standard Deviation
Süddeutsche Zeitung	2000	0,45	66	0,706
	2001	0,43	46	0,501
	2002	0,57	42	0,590
	Average	0,48	154	0,618
Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	2000	0,27	59	0,762
	2001	0,38	50	0,602
	2002	0,40	58	0,620
	Average	0,35	167	0,667
Leipziger Volkszeitung	2000	0,36	22	0,727
	2001	0,20	10	0,789
	2002	0,33	15	0,617
	Average	0,32	47	0,695
Bild	2000	0,20	10	0,789
	2001	1,00	1	.
	2002	0,75	4	0,500
	Average	0,40	15	0,737
Total	2000	0,36	157	0,734
	2001	0,39	107	0,579
	2002	0,46	119	0,608
	Average	0,40	383	0,655

Table 3.4b reveals that the position whether the EU should have more or less rights depends on the issue field under study. The voices of the media support the extension of rights and competences of the EU in monetary politics, in troops deployment and in the field of European integration. This is contrasted with the field of agriculture: although this is the policy

field where the EU is politically powerful, the journalists are less supportive of a further increase of EU competences. Table 3.4b also shows clearly that the introduction of the Euro has increased the support for further rights and competences of the EU in this issue field.

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

POLICY FIELD	YEAR	POSITION		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation
Monetary politics	2000	0,34	38	0,71
	2001	0,42	24	0,50
	2002	0,52	48	0,58
	Average	0,44	110	0,61
Agriculture	2000	0,11	19	0,74
	2001	-0,21	14	0,58
	2002	0,20	5	0,84
	Average	0,00	38	0,70
Immigration	2001	0,00	3	0,00
	Average	0,00	3	0,00
Troops deployment	2001	0,67	3	0,58
	2002	0,63	8	0,52
	Average	0,64	11	0,50
European Integration	2000	0,41	100	0,74
	2001	0,52	63	0,53
	2002	0,41	58	0,62
	Average	0,44	221	0,66
Total	2000	0,36	157	0,73
	2001	0,39	107	0,58
	2002	0,46	119	0,61
	Average	0,40	383	0,65

Overall the EU integration process is evaluated strongly positive by the German newspaper journalists. Position scores were coded and computed in such a way that a score of $-1,00$ indicates that the newspaper always evaluated the EU integration negatively, while a score of $1,00$ indicates a consistently positive evaluation. The EU-supporting attitude of German newspapers reached a low point in 2001, but then recovered to the level of 2000 in 2002. An exception is the Leipziger Volkszeitung. Here support for the EU integration project declined over the years. The two quality newspapers do not differ regarding their support for the integration project.

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

		SUBJECTIVE ATTITUDE		
PAPER	YEAR	Mean	N	Standard deviation
Süddeutsche Zeitung	2000	0,65	66	0,511
	2001	0,52	46	0,505
	2002	0,71	42	0,457
	Average	0,63	154	0,498
Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	2000	0,67	61	0,598
	2001	0,58	50	0,609
	2002	0,64	58	0,520
	Average	0,63	169	0,573
Leipziger Volkszeitung	2000	0,77	22	0,429
	2001	0,60	10	0,516
	2002	0,53	15	0,640
	Average	0,66	47	0,522
Bild	2000	0,40	10	0,699
	2001	1,00	1	.
	2002	1,00	4	0,000
	Average	0,60	15	0,632
Total	2000	0,66	159	0,549
	2001	0,56	107	0,552
	2002	0,66	119	0,509
	Average	0,63	385	0,539

All newspapers support the European integration project (Table 3.5b). Even in the field of agricultural politics where support for further competences and rights of the EU had been rather low, journalists support the integration project as a whole. The highest level of support can be found in the field European integration itself – although this support seems to be declining. The absolute level of support is lower in monetary politics, but here support for the EU integration project in general is increasing. Also journalists commenting about agricultural affairs do increasingly support the project of EU integration as a whole.

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

POLICY FIELD	YEAR	SUBJECTIVE ATTITUDE		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation
Monetary politics	2000	0,58	38	0,500
	2001	0,46	24	0,509
	2002	0,69	48	0,512
	Average	0,60	110	0,510
Agriculture	2000	0,37	19	0,684
	2001	0,43	14	0,646
	2002	0,60	5	0,548
	Average	0,42	38	0,642
Immigration	2001	0,00	3	0,000
	Average	0,00	3	0,000
Troops deployment	2001	0,67	3	0,577
	2002	0,63	8	0,518
	Average	0,64	11	0,505
European Integration	2000	0,75	102	0,521
	2001	0,65	63	0,544
	2002	0,66	58	0,515
	Average	0,70	223	0,525
Total	2000	0,66	159	0,549
	2001	0,56	107	0,552
	2002	0,66	119	0,509
	Average	0,63	385	0,539

Table 3.5c indicates the subjective attitude regarding European integration of the most frequent commentators with the different newspapers. Position scores were coded and computed in such a way that a score of $-1,00$ indicates that the newspaper always evaluated the EU integration negatively, while a score of $1,00$ indicates a consistently positive evaluation. All newspapers strongly support European integration. Within the newspapers there is some variation. Nikolaus Piper for example as the most frequent commentator of the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* regarding European integration scores lowest on the support dimension of European integration.

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

Süddeutsche Zeitung		Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung		Leipziger Volkszeitung		Bild	
	Mean		Mean		Mean		Mean
Piper, Nikolaus	0,4	Frankenberger, Klaus-Dieter	0,68	Bommersheim, Martin	0,88	Gafron, Georg	0,75
Bolesch, Cornelia	0,79	Nonnenmacher, Günther	0,56	Kecke, Anita	1,0		
Oldag, Andreas	0,67	Kohler, Berthold	0,38	Walitzek, Jörg	0,5		
Broessler, Daniel	0,63	Hort, Peter	0,82	Gareis, Andrea	1,0		
Schumacher, Oliver	0,71	Barbier, Hans D.	0,86	Milde, Ulrich	0,67		
Kornelius, Stefan	1,0	Kaps, Carola	0,67				
Einecke, Helga	0,33	Schmid, Thomas	0,83				
Schloetzer, Christiane	0,84	Buender, Helmut	0,4				
Ulrich, Stefan	0,83	Goebel, Heike	0,8				
Wernicke, Christian	1,0	Tigges, Claus	1,0				
N = 339		N = 349		N = 106		N = 41	

* Only when at least 4 commentaries had been coded, we indicate the mean.

4. Addressees, Supporters, Opponents

Within each commentary we coded – if possible – an addressee in the strict sense, whom the journalist calls upon, a supporter and an opponent of the journalists' view. As in the following we are only analysing one addressee actor in total per editorial, we have created a new variable 'addressee analysed' that decides which actor is chosen for the analysis. If no addressee was coded, we checked for the supporter and then for the opponent. This is also reflected in table 4.1a: nearly 90% of the actors analysed in this section have been coded as addressees in the strict sense.

Table 4.1a: Presence of addressee by paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
ADDRESSEE ANALYSED	no indirect object	n				14	
		%	0,9	1,4	1,9	9,8	1,7
	addressee	n				747	
		%	91,2	88,0	88,7	90,2	89,5
	supported actor	n				44	
		%	4,7	7,7	0,9	0,0	5,3
	opponent	n				30	
		%	3,2	2,9	8,5	0,0	3,6
Total	n	339	349	106	41	835	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

7,3% of all commentaries in monetary politics do not have an addressee that can be analysed (Table 4.1b). Only in the field of European integration there is a substantial amount of actors other than addressees in the strict sense included in the following analysis.

Table 4.1b: Presence of addressee by issue field

		POLICY FIELD							Total	
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	European Integration		
ADDRESSEE ANALYSED	no indirect object	n							14	
		%	7,3	2,9	0,0	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,0	1,7
	addressee	n							747	
		%	85,4	89,9	94,3	95,1	96,9	92,6	82,9	89,5
supported actor	n								44	
	%	3,3	4,3	3,4	2,5	2,1	6,2	10,1	5,3	
opponent	n								30	
	%	4,0	2,9	2,3	2,5	0,0	1,2	7,0	3,6	
Total	n	151	69	87	122	97	81	228	835	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

State and party actors are the ones to whom journalists direct most of their claims in editorials (Table 4.2a). This is common to all types of newspapers analysed. State and party actors dominate strongest in the Bild-Zeitung (94,6%) compared to the SZ (87,8%), the LVZ (84,6%) and the FAZ (84,3%). Within this category, the governments are referred to most often. The government focus is strongest in the SZ. Civil society actors appear only rarely in editorials. Interestingly, they have the strongest stance in the regional newspaper (LVZ).

Table 4.2a: Addressees by paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
ADDRESSEE ANALYSED	state and party actors	n				708	
		%	87,8	84,3	84,6	94,6	86,2
	politicians	n				52	
		%	4,5	6,1	6,7	24,3	6,3
	former states(wo)men	n				7	
		%	0,3	1,2	1,9	0,0	0,9
	government/executive	n				518	
		%	65,8	61,3	61,5	59,5	63,1
	legislative	n				23	
		%	2,4	3,5	1,9	2,7	2,8
	judiciary	n				12	
		%	0,9	2,3	1,0	0,0	1,5
military	n				6		
	%	0,9	0,6	1,0	0,0	0,7	

central banks	n					51
	%	6,8	6,4	2,9	8,1	6,2
other state executive agencies	n					5
	%	0,6	0,6	1,0	0,0	0,6
political parties	n					34
	%	5,7	2,3	6,7	0,0	4,1
economic interest groups	n					30
	%	3,9	3,8	3,8	0,0	3,7
unions and employees	n					9
	%	1,2	0,9	1,9	0,0	1,1
employers organizations and firms	n					7
	%	0,6	0,9	1,9	0,0	0,9
farmers and agricultural organizations	n					6
	%	1,2	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,7
economists and financial experts	n					8
	%	0,9	1,5	0,0	0,0	1,0
other civil society actors	n					35
	%	3,9	4,1	6,7	2,7	4,3
churches and religious organizations and groups	n					3
	%	0,6	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,4
educational professionals and organizations'	n					10
	%	0,6	2,0	1,0	0,0	1,2
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	n					3
	%	0,6	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,4
students, pupils, and their parents	n					2
	%	0,0	0,3	1,0	0,0	0,2
other professional organizations and groups	n					1
	%	0,0	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,1
consumer organizations and groups	n					5
	%	0,3	0,9	1,0	0,0	0,6
migrant organizations and groups	n					4
	%	0,3	0,3	1,9	0,0	0,5
pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups	n					1
	%	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1
peace movement organizations and groups	n					1
	%	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1
rebel forces/guerrilla	n					2
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
other civil society organizations and groups	n					3
	%	0,3	0,3	0,0	2,7	0,4
general/unknown/unspecified	n					48
	%	4,5	7,8	4,8	2,7	5,8
whole polities	n					48
	%	4,5	7,8	4,8	2,7	5,8
Total	n	336	344	104	37	821
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Within all issue fields state and party actors prevail as addressees of the journalists (Table 4.2b). This dominance of state and party actors is most outstanding in the field of monetary politics, troops deployment, retirement and European integration. In contrast, the fields of agriculture, immigration and education have a weaker focus on state and party actors. In all issue fields governments themselves are the most often referred to addressees. Only in the field of monetary politics has another political institution comparable power: the central banks (35%). Agriculture, Immigration and Education are the issue fields, where economic and other civil society actors play a relatively strong role. In the fields of monetary politics and retirement civil society actors play a weaker role. They do play no role in the field of troops deployment and European integration. In the latter the unspecified category “whole polity” (e.g. the EU as a whole) is an important addressee.

Table 4.2b: Addressees by issue field

		POLICY FIELD							Total
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	European Integration	
state and party actors	n								708
	%	90,7	74,6	81,6	92,6	91,7	72,8	87,7	86,2
politicians	n								52
	%	6,4	4,5	12,6	1,6	3,1	6,2	8,3	6,3
former states(women)	n								7
	%	1,4	0,0	0,0	2,5	0,0	0,0	0,9	0,9
government/executive	n								518
	%	47,1	67,2	51,7	77,9	63,5	60,5	68,9	63,1
legislative	n								23
	%	0,0	1,5	2,3	2,5	7,3	1,2	3,9	2,8
judiciary	n								12
	%	0,7	0,0	1,1	0,8	1,0	1,2	3,1	1,5
military	n								6
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
central banks	n								51
	%	35,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,9	6,2
other state executive agencies	n								5
	%	0,0	1,5	1,1	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,9	0,6
political parties	n								34
	%	0,0	0,0	12,6	2,5	15,6	3,7	0,9	4,1
economic interest groups	n								30
	%	5,0	10,4	6,9	0,0	6,3	3,7	0,4	3,7
unions and employees	n								9
	%	1,4	0,0	2,3	0,0	4,2	1,2	0,0	1,1

employers organizations and firms	n %								7 0,9
		0,7	0,0	3,4	0,0	1,0	1,2	0,4	
farmers and agricultural organizations	n %								6 0,7
		0,0	9,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	
economists and financial experts	n %								8 1,0
		2,9	1,5	1,1	0,0	1,0	1,2	0,0	
other civil society actors	n %	0,7	9,0	6,9	2,5	1,0	17,3	1,8	35 4,3
churches and religious organizations and groups	n %								3 0,4
		0,0	0,0	2,3	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	
educational professionals and organizations'	n %								10 1,2
		0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	12,3	0,0	
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	n %								3 0,4
		0,0	1,5	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4	
students, pupils, and their parents	n %								2 0,2
		0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,5	0,0	
other professional organizations and groups	n %								1 0,1
		0,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	
consumer organizations and groups	n %								5 0,6
		0,0	7,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	
migrant organizations and groups	n %								4 0,5
		0,0	0,0	2,3	0,0	0,0	1,2	0,4	
pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups	n %								1 0,1
		0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4	
peace movement organizations and groups	n %								1 0,1
		0,0	0,0	0,0	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	
rebel forces/guerrilla	n %								2 0,2
		0,0	0,0	0,0	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,4	
other civil society organizations and groups	n %								3 0,4
		0,0	0,0	1,1	0,0	1,0	1,2	0,0	
general/unknown/unspecified	n %	3,6	6,0	4,6	4,9	1,0	6,2	10,1	48 5,8
whole polities	n %								48 5,8
		3,6	6,0	4,6	4,9	1,0	6,2	10,1	
Total	n %	140 100,0	67 100,0	87 100,0	122 100,0	96 100,0	81 100,0	228 100,0	821 100,0

In the course of the years the focus on state and party actors has further increased (Table 4.2c). Whereas 83,8% of all addressees in 2000 had been state and party actors, in 2002 this figure has increased to 88,4%. This can be explained by the stronger focus on government actors (from 54,6% in 2000 to 71,7% in 2002). This trend is accompanied by the fact that civil society actors lose standing. In 2000 4,2% of all addressees had been economic and 5,3% other civil society actors. In 2002 only 1,9% of all addressees had been economic and 3,1% other civil society actors.

Table 4.2c: Addressees by year

		YEAR			Total
		2000	2001	2002	
ADDRESSEE ANALYSED	state and party actors	n			708
		%	83,8	86,7	88,4
	politicians	n			52
		%	10,2	3,9	4,7
	former states(wo)men	n			7
		%	0,7	0,4	1,6
	government/executive	n			518
		%	54,6	63,8	71,7
	legislative	n			23
		%	4,6	1,1	2,7
	judiciary	n			12
		%	1,8	1,8	0,8
	military	n			6
		%	0,0	1,4	0,8
	central banks	n			51
		%	9,2	6,8	2,3
	other state executive agencies	n			5
		%	0,0	0,7	1,2
	political parties	n			34
		%	2,8	6,8	2,7
economic interest groups	n			30	
	%	4,2	4,7	1,9	
unions and employees	n			9	
	%	1,8	0,7	0,8	
employers organizations and firms	n			7	
	%	1,4	0,7	0,4	
farmers and agricultural organizations	n			6	
	%	0,4	1,4	0,4	
economists and financial experts	n			8	
	%	0,7	1,8	0,4	

other civil society actors	n				35
	%	5,3	4,3	3,1	4,3
churches and religious organizations and groups	n				3
	%	0,4	0,7	0,0	0,4
educational professionals and organizations'	n				10
	%	1,4	1,1	1,2	1,2
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	n				3
	%	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4
students, pupils, and their parents	n				2
	%	0,0	0,0	0,8	0,2
other professional organizations and groups	n				1
	%	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,1
consumer organizations and groups	n				5
	%	1,1	0,7	0,0	0,6
migrant organizations and groups	n				4
	%	1,4	0,0	0,0	0,5
pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups	n				1
	%	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,1
peace movement organizations and groups	n				1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,4	0,1
rebel forces/guerrilla	n				2
	%	0,0	0,7	0,0	0,2
other civil society organizations and groups	n				3
	%	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4
general/unknown/unspecified	n				48
	%	6,7	4,3	6,6	5,8
whole polities	n				48
	%	6,7	4,3	6,6	5,8
Total	n	284	279	258	821
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 4.3a indicates whether journalists mainly address actors from the nation state, from the EU, other member countries or from elsewhere. All newspapers call upon German actors most often – followed by actors from the EU. Actors from other member states do not have a important position as addressees in the commentaries analysed. A closer look reveals differences between the quality press and the tabloid / regional newspapers. The FAZ and the SZ more often call upon EU actors (28,3% SZ; 27,5% FAZ) than the regional / tabloid newspapers (22,1% LVZ; 18,9% Bild). The latter more strongly raises their voices on a national level than the quality press (61,% LVZ; 73% Bild; 44,9% SZ; 50,9% FAZ). These results demonstrate, that the Süddeutsche Zeitung is the most strongly transnationalised newspaper in our sample. Regarding vertical and horizontal forms of Europeanisation the SZ resembles the FAZ, whereas the SZ has a stronger focus on the US.

Table 4.3a: Addressee scope by paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
ADDRESSEE ANALYSED	supranational: UN	n				7	
		%	0,6	0,6	2,9	0,0	0,9
	other supranational	n				8	
		%	1,5	0,6	0,0	2,7	1,0
	EU	n				219	
		%	28,3	27,5	22,1	18,9	26,7
	multilateral	n				4	
		%	0,9	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,5
	bilateral	n				3	
		%	0,3	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,4
	germany	n				416	
		%	44,9	50,9	61,5	73,0	50,8
	france	n				19	
		%	2,7	2,6	0,0	2,7	2,3
	uk	n				9	
		%	1,8	0,9	0,0	0,0	1,1
	italy	n				7	
		%	0,0	1,5	1,9	0,0	0,9
	spain	n				5	
		%	0,6	0,3	1,9	0,0	0,6
	netherlands	n				2	
		%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
	other EU-members	n				19	
		%	2,1	2,3	3,8	0,0	2,3
	Switzerland	n				1	
		%	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1
	upcoming enlargement countries	n				11	
		%	1,2	1,8	1,0	0,0	1,3
	other european countries ex CIS	n				10	
		%	1,5	1,2	1,0	0,0	1,2
turkey	n				11		
	%	1,8	1,5	0,0	0,0	1,3	
russia	n				5		
	%	0,3	0,9	0,0	2,7	0,6	
USA	n				40		
	%	7,4	3,5	2,9	0,0	4,9	
Japan	n				3		
	%	0,6	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,4	
Middle East	n				6		
	%	1,2	0,3	1,0	0,0	0,7	
Rest of the world	n				14		
	%	1,5	2,6	0,0	0,0	1,7	
Total	n	336	342	104	37	819	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.3b reveals the different forms of Europeanisation according to different issue fields. The voice of the media reflects the power distribution in the political process to a certain degree. Within strongly Europeanised issue fields, like monetary politics, agricultural politics and European integration itself EU addressees are at least as important as addressees from the nation state. In the field of European integration, German actors hold a pretty weak position (14,9%) compared to EU actors (52,2%). In fields where intergovernmental forms of Europeanisation prevail, like troops deployment and immigration, the journalists do not address EU actors. In immigration policy journalists call predominantly upon German actors, whereas in the field of troops deployment the addressees are from Germany, but also from the US. Troops deployment can thus be described as a transnationalised issue field. Not surprisingly, the issue fields where hardly any political Europeanisation has taken place (education and retirement) reveal a national structure in regard to the addressees: German actors are called upon by the media.

Table 4.3b: Addressee scope by issue field

	POLICY FIELD							Total
	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Pension schemes	Education	European Integration	
supranational: n								7
UN %	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,1	0,0	1,2	0,4	0,9
other supra-national n								8
%	2,9	0,0	1,1	0,8	0,0	2,5	0,0	1,0
EU n								219
%	45,7	40,9	1,1	5,8	0,0	1,2	52,2	26,7
multilateral n								4
%	0,0	0,0	1,1	1,7	0,0	1,2	0,0	0,5
bilateral n								3
%	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,9	0,4
germany n								416
%	30,0	54,5	87,4	49,6	99,0	90,1	14,9	50,8
france n								19
%	2,1	4,5	0,0	0,8	1,0	0,0	4,8	2,3
uk n								9
%	2,1	0,0	1,1	3,3	0,0	1,2	0,0	1,1
italy n								7
%	2,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,3	0,9
spain n								5
%	0,7	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,3	0,6
netherlands n								2
%	0,0	0,0	2,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
other EU-members n								19
%	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	2,5	7,0	2,3
Switzerland n								1
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4	0,1
upcoming enlargement countries n								11
%	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,4	1,3
other european countries ex CIS n								10
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,7	0,0	0,0	3,5	1,2
turkey n								11
%	1,4	0,0	0,0	0,8	0,0	0,0	3,5	1,3
russia n								5
%	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,8	0,6
USA n								40
%	8,6	0,0	0,0	19,0	0,0	0,0	2,2	4,9
Japan n								3
%	1,4	0,0	0,0	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4
Middle East n								6
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,1	0,0	0,0	0,4	0,7
Rest of the world n								14
%	2,1	0,0	0,0	7,4	0,0	0,0	0,9	1,7
Total n	140	66	87	121	96	81	228	819
%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 4.3c: Addressee scope by year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
ADDRESSEE SCOPE	supranational: UN	n			7	
		%	0,4	1,4	0,8	0,9
	other supranational	n			8	
		%	0,7	2,2	0,0	1,0
	EU	n			219	
		%	36,0	23,0	20,5	26,7
	multilateral	n			4	
		%	0,4	0,7	0,4	0,5
	bilateral	n			3	
		%	0,4	0,0	0,8	0,4
	germany	n			416	
		%	45,9	54,3	52,3	50,8
	france	n			19	
		%	2,8	2,2	1,9	2,3
	uk	n			9	
		%	0,7	1,4	1,2	1,1
	italy	n			7	
		%	0,7	0,7	1,2	0,9
	spain	n			5	
		%	0,0	0,7	1,2	0,6
	netherlands	n			2	
		%	0,0	0,0	0,8	0,2
	other EU-members	n			19	
		%	3,5	0,7	2,7	2,3
	Switzerland	n			1	
		%	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,1
	upcoming enlargement countries	n			11	
		%	1,8	0,4	1,9	1,3
	other european countries ex CIS	n			10	
		%	1,1	1,8	0,8	1,2
turkey	n			11		
	%	0,0	1,1	3,1	1,3	
russia	n			5		
	%	1,1	0,7	0,0	0,6	
USA	n			40		
	%	2,1	5,0	7,8	4,9	
Japan	n			3		
	%	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,4	
Middle East	n			6		
	%	0,7	0,4	1,2	0,7	
Rest of the world	n			14		
	%	1,4	2,2	1,6	1,7	
Total	n	283	278	258	819	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

In the course of the years, Europeanisation has decreased if one considers the scope of the addressees (Table 4.3c). 36% of all addressees come from the EU in 2000, whereas 2002 only 20,5% are EU actors. In the same time German actors have gained importance. Additionally, the USA has a much more prominent position in 2002 than in 2000.

Table 4.3d answers the question which types of addressees have which scope. Here it becomes clear that civil society actors from the EU are underrepresented. The place for civil society is still the nation state. 79,3% and 65,7% of all economic and other interest groups are from Germany. In contrast, only 50,4% of all state and party actors come from Germany. After all 27,4% are from the EU. The unspecified category is overrepresented at the EU level: 26,7% of all addressees have an EU scope, whereas 38,3% of the addressees in the category “whole polity / unspecified” have an EU scope. Journalists’ calls upon the EU seem to be rather confuse.

Table 4.3d: Addressee scope by broad addressee category

		summary of ios				Total
		state and party actors	economic interest groups	other civil society actors	general/ unknown/ unspecified	
supranational: UN	n					7
	% of ios	0,8	0,0	0,0	2,1	0,9
other supranational	n					8
	% of ios	0,8	0,0	5,7	0,0	1,0
EU	n					219
	% of ios	27,4	13,8	8,6	38,3	26,7
multilateral	n					4
	% of ios	0,3	0,0	5,7	0,0	0,5
bilateral	n					3
	% of ios	0,3	0,0	2,9	0,0	0,4
germany	n					416
	% of ios	50,4	79,3	65,7	27,7	50,8
france	n					19
	% of ios	2,3	0,0	0,0	6,4	2,3
uk	n					9
	% of ios	1,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,1
italy	n					7
	% of ios	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,9
spain	n					5
	% of ios	0,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,6
netherlands	n					2
	% of ios	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
other EU-members	n					19
	% of ios	2,3	0,0	0,0	6,4	2,3
Switzerland	n					1
	% of ios	0,0	0,0	2,9	0,0	0,1
upcoming enlargement countries	n					11
	% of ios	1,3	0,0	2,9	2,1	1,3
other european countries ex CIS	n					10
	% of ios	1,0	0,0	5,7	2,1	1,2
turkey	n					11
	% of ios	1,3	0,0	0,0	4,3	1,3
russia	n					5
	% of ios	0,4	0,0	0,0	4,3	0,6
USA	n					40
	% of ios	5,1	6,9	0,0	4,3	4,9
Japan	n					3
	% of ios	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4
Middle East	n					6
	% of ios	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
Rest of the world	n					14
	% of ios	1,8	0,0	0,0	2,1	1,7
Total	n	708	29	35	47	819
	% of ios	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

ADDRESSEE SCOPE

5. Positively evaluated addressees and supporters

This section deals with the question which addressees were positively evaluated by the journalists. As the case numbers are relatively small, these results have to be treated with caution. The distribution of positive evaluations strongly depends on the attention the different actors get. If EU actors for example do not appear at all in retirement politics, they of course are not supported in this field either. Therefore the following results need to be contrasted to the share of attention of the specific actors.

Not only did the journalists call most often upon state and party actors (Table 4.2a), but they also support them most often (Table 5.1a). The SZ and FAZ slightly better evaluate state and party actors than other actors. This can be deduced by a comparison between table 4.2a (attention) and table 5.1a (evaluation): State and party actors for example get 87,8% of the attention in the SZ. Regarding positive evaluation they have a share of 91,8%. This result holds for all newspapers except for the Leipziger Volkszeitung. The LVZ gives less support than attention to party and political actors. In contrast to the other newspapers it supports civil society actors more: their share of attention is around 10% in the LVZ, their share of support is more than twice as high.

With the exception of the Bild-Zeitung, journalists attribute more attention than support to governments. The winners on this dimension are the legislatives, the judiciaries and mainly the central banks.

Table 5.1a: Positively evaluated addressees per paper

		PAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	FAZ	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
state and party actors	n					132
	%	91,8	89,1	78,9	100,0	89,2
politicians	n					3
	%	0,0	4,7	0,0	0,0	2,0
former states(wo)men	n					3
	%	0,0	3,1	5,3	0,0	2,0
government/executive	n					89
	%	59,0	60,9	57,9	75,0	60,1
legislative	n					4
	%	4,9	1,6	0,0	0,0	2,7
judiciary	n					6
	%	3,3	4,7	5,3	0,0	4,1
military	n					3
	%	3,3	1,6	0,0	0,0	2,0
central banks	n					19
	%	18,0	9,4	5,3	25,0	12,8
other state executive agencies	n					2
	%	1,6	1,6	0,0	0,0	1,4
political parties	n					3
	%	1,6	1,6	5,3	0,0	2,0
economic interest groups	n					4
	%	0,0	3,1	10,5	0,0	2,7
unions and employees	n					2
	%	0,0	1,6	5,3	0,0	1,4
employers organizations and firms	n					1
	%	0,0	0,0	5,3	0,0	0,7
economists and financial experts	n					1
	%	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,7
other civil society actors	n					9
	%	6,6	4,7	10,5	0,0	6,1
churches and religious organizations and groups	n					2
	%	3,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,4
educational professionals and organizations'	n					2
	%	1,6	1,6	0,0	0,0	1,4
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	n					1
	%	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
consumer organizations and groups	n					1
	%	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,7
migrant organizations and groups	n					3
	%	0,0	1,6	10,5	0,0	2,0
general/unknown/unspecified	n					3
	%	1,6	3,1	0,0	0,0	2,0
whole polities	n					3
	%	1,6	3,1	0,0	0,0	2,0
Total	n	61	64	19	4	148
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

POS. ADRESSEE

State and party actors are evaluated most positively in those issue fields (Table 5.1b) where they also get most attention (Table 4.2b): in monetary politics, troops deployment, retirement / pensions and European integration. In most of them the share of support is higher than the share of attention. In agricultural politics, immigration and education civil society actors do not only get a substantial share of attention, but also of support. Within monetary politics it is striking how strongly the voice of the media do support the central banks. The central banks get more support than the governments, but less attention. Thus if central banks are called upon, they are supported.

Table 5.1b: Positively evaluated Addressees per issue field

		POLICY FIELD						Total		
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education		European Integration	
POS ADDRESSEE	state and party actors	n							132	
		%	96,8	72,7	73,3	93,3	100,0	73,3	94,2	89,2
	politicians	n							3	
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,7	3,8	2,0
	former states(women)	n								3
		%	6,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,9	2,0
	government/executive	n								89
		%	35,5	63,6	53,3	66,7	66,7	60,0	73,1	60,1
	legislative	n								4
		%	0,0	9,1	0,0	6,7	0,0	0,0	3,8	2,7
	judiciary	n								6
		%	0,0	0,0	6,7	0,0	11,1	6,7	5,8	4,1
	military	n								3
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	20,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,0
	central banks	n								19
		%	54,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,8	12,8
other state executive agencies	n								2	
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	11,1	0,0	1,9	1,4	
political parties	n								3	
	%	0,0	0,0	13,3	0,0	11,1	0,0	0,0	2,0	
economic interest groups	n								4	
	%	0,0	9,1	13,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,9	2,7	
unions and employees	n								2	
	%	0,0	0,0	13,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,4	
employers organizations and firms	n								1	
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,9	0,7	
economists and financial experts	n								1	
	%	0,0	9,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7	

other civil society actors	n %	0,0	9,1	13,3	6,7	0,0	20,0	3,8	9 6,1
churches and relig. org.	n %	0,0	0,0	6,7	6,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	2 1,4
educational professionals and org.	n %	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	13,3	0,0	2 1,4
other scientific / research professionals and institutions	n %	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,9	1 0,7
consumer organizations and groups	n %	0,0	9,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1 0,7
migrant organizations and groups	n %	0,0	0,0	6,7	0,0	0,0	6,7	1,9	3 2,0
general/unknown/unspecified	n %	3,2	9,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,7	0,0	3 2,0
whole politics	n %	3,2	9,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,7	0,0	3 2,0
Total	n %	31 100,0	11 100,0	15 100,0	15 100,0	9 100,0	15 100,0	52 100,0	148 100,0

Table 5.2a indicates some interesting results. The two quality newspapers support EU actors nearly as often as German actors. German actors only have a share of 36,1% / 39,7% of the positive evaluation in the SZ and FAZ although their share of attention is much higher (Table 4.3a). These results are contrasted by the regional newspaper LVZ and the tabloid Bild: they strongly support German actors. German actors have a share of 68,4% / 75% of all supported actors. Summing up, the German quality press takes a relatively critical stance towards German actors, whereas they support the EU institutions.

Table 5.2a: Scope of positively evaluated addressees per paper

		PAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
POS. ADDRESSEE	supranational: UN	n				2	
		%	0,0	3,2	0,0	0,0	1,4
	other supranational	n				4	
		%	6,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,7
	EU	n				49	
		%	37,7	33,3	21,1	25,0	33,3
	multilateral	n				1	
		%	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,7
	bilateral	n				1	
		%	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,7
	germany	n				63	
		%	36,1	39,7	68,4	75,0	42,9
	france	n				3	
		%	3,3	1,6	0,0	0,0	2,0
	italy	n				1	
		%	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,7
	spain	n				1	
		%	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,7
	other EU-members	n				5	
		%	3,3	3,2	5,3	0,0	3,4
	upcoming enlargement countries	n				2	
		%	1,6	1,6	0,0	0,0	1,4
	other european countries ex CIS	n				3	
		%	0,0	4,8	0,0	0,0	2,0
	turkey	n				1	
		%	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
	USA	n				8	
		%	6,6	4,8	5,3	0,0	5,4
	Japan	n				1	
		%	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
Middle East	n				1		
	%	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7	
Rest of the world	n				1		
	%	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,7	
Total	n	61	63	19	4	147	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

In absolute terms, EU actors get more support than national actors in the fields of monetary politics, agriculture and EU integration. These are those issue fields (5.2b) where attention is attributed to them (Table 4.3b). In the substantial policy fields (monetary politics and agriculture) EU actors' share of support is higher than the share of attention. This relation changes

when one considers the issue field of European integration itself: here EU actors gain a share of 46,2% of all support in this field, but have a share of 52,2% of all the attention. In contrast, German actors did not get too much of standing in this field at all. But if they get standing they are very often supported (Share of support: 23,1%). In all other issue fields (immigration, troops deployment, retirement and pensions and education) German actors get most attention and support. Only in the field of troops deployment can one find a very substantial type of actor that has not been mentioned yet: the United States. The US is strongly supported in this field – nearly 27% of all supported actors are from the US.

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

	POLICY FIELD							Total
	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	European Integration	
supranational: n								2
UN %	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,7	0,0	0,0	1,9	1,4
other supra-national n								4
%	0,0	0,0	6,7	6,7	0,0	13,3	0,0	2,7
EU n								49
%	61,3	50,0	0,0	6,7	0,0	0,0	46,2	33,3
multilateral n								1
%	0,0	0,0	6,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
bilateral n								1
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,9	0,7
germany n								63
%	19,4	40,0	86,7	46,7	100,0	80,0	23,1	42,9
france n								3
%	3,2	10,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,9	2,0
italy n								1
%	3,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
spain n								1
%	3,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
other EU-members n								5
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,7	7,7	3,4
upcoming enlargement countries n								2
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,8	1,4
other european countries ex CIS n								3
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,8	2,0
turkey n								1
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,9	0,7
USA n								8
%	3,2	0,0	0,0	26,7	0,0	0,0	5,8	5,4
Japan n								1
%	3,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
Middle East n								1
%	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
Rest of the world n								1
%	3,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
Total n	31	10	15	15	9	15	52	147
%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

SCOPE OF POS: ADDRESSEE

6. Negatively evaluated addressees and opponents

This section deals with the question which addressees were negatively evaluated by the journalists. By only focusing on the total numbers of addressees evaluated negatively (424) and comparing it to the addressees evaluated positively (148), it becomes clear that criticism is the characteristic of commentaries. The distribution of criticism strongly depends on the attention the different actors get. If EU actors for example do not appear at all in retirement politics, they of course are not criticised in this field either. Therefore the following results need to be contrasted to the share of attention of the specific actors.

Most criticism is directed towards state and party actors (Table 6.1a). The criticism towards these actors is proportional to their share of attention (Table 4.2a). An exception is the LVZ: here the share of criticism is smaller than the share of attention. This is especially true for government actors. It seems that the LVZ has a government-friendly editorial line⁹, whereas all the other newspapers keep a more critical stance.

The Süddeutsche Zeitung and the Leipziger Volkszeitung critically evaluate party actors. For them the share of attention and support is lower than the share of criticism. In absolute terms, the LVZ gives civil society actors most attention, most support, but also most criticism.

Table 6.1a: Negatively evaluated addressees per paper

		PAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
state and party actors	n					363
	%	86,3	85,8	79,2	92,0	85,6
politicians	n					39
	%	7,4	8,0	12,5	24,0	9,2
former states(wo)men	n					4
	%	0,6	1,1	2,1	0,0	0,9
government/executive	n					265
	%	62,9	65,3	50,0	64,0	62,5
legislative	n					11
	%	2,9	3,4	0,0	0,0	2,6
judiciary	n					3
	%	0,6	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,7

⁹ The governments are also underrepresented on the support dimension in the LVZ.

military	n					1
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
central banks	n					12
	%	2,3	3,4	2,1	4,0	2,8
other state executive agencies	n					3
	%	0,6	0,6	2,1	0,0	0,7
political parties	n					25
	%	8,6	2,8	10,4	0,0	5,9
economic interest groups	n					18
	%	5,7	3,4	4,2	0,0	4,2
unions and employees	n					6
	%	2,3	0,6	2,1	0,0	1,4
employers organizations and firms	n					4
	%	0,6	1,1	2,1	0,0	0,9
farmers and agricultural organizations	n					4
	%	1,7	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,9
economists and financial experts	n					4
	%	1,1	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,9
other civil society actors	n					15
	%	2,9	2,3	10,4	4,0	3,5
churches and religious organizations and groups	n					1
	%	0,0	0,0	2,1	0,0	0,2
educational professionals and organizations'	n					4
	%	0,0	1,7	2,1	0,0	0,9
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	n					2
	%	0,6	0,0	2,1	0,0	0,5
students, pupils, and their parents	n					1
	%	0,0	0,0	2,1	0,0	0,2
other professional organizations and groups	n					1
	%	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,2
consumer organizations and groups	n					1
	%	0,0	0,0	2,1	0,0	0,2
migrant organizations and groups	n					1
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
rebel forces/guerrilla	n					2
	%	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,5
other civil society organizations and groups	n					2
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	4,0	0,5
general/ unknown/ unspecified	n					28
	%	5,1	8,5	6,3	4,0	6,6
whole polities	n					28
	%	5,1	8,5	6,3	4,0	6,6
Total	n	175	176	48	25	424
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

In all issue fields most criticism is directed towards state and party actors (Table 6.2b). In the fields of education and agricultural politics the share of criticism directed towards state and

party actors is bigger than the respective share of attention (Table 4.2b). All the other fields have a balanced account.

A closer look reveals that monetary politics is an interesting case as here the criticism is directed towards government actors, whereas the central banks are only weakly criticized in the light of the attention they get. Also in the field of education governments' share of criticism is higher than their share of attention or support. Government actors have a positive balance in immigration and retirement. Agriculture, troops deployment and European integration are the issue fields where the share of negative evaluation approximately equals the share of attention for government actors.

Economic interest groups are evaluated slightly more critical than other civil society actors in most issue fields. This means that economic interest groups do get a slightly higher share of criticism than attention. For other civil society groups the opposite applies.

Table 6.1b: Negatively evaluated addressees per issue field

		POLICY FIELD						Total		
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education		European Integration	
NEG: ADDRESSEE	state and party actors	n							363	
		%	87,7	78,0	82,0	93,5	88,5	79,6	85,4	85,6
	politicians	n								39
		%	13,8	7,3	16,0	3,2	3,3	8,2	11,5	9,2
	former states(wo)men	n								4
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,8	0,0	0,0	1,0	0,9
	government/executive	n								265
		%	53,8	68,3	44,0	79,0	57,4	65,3	66,7	62,5
	legislative	n								11
		%	0,0	0,0	4,0	0,0	9,8	0,0	3,1	2,6
	judiciary	n								3
		%	1,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,1	0,7
	military	n								1
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
	central banks	n								12
		%	18,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,8
other state executive agencies	n								3	
	%	0,0	2,4	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,0	0,7	
political parties	n								25	
	%	0,0	0,0	16,0	4,8	18,0	6,1	0,0	5,9	
economic interest groups	n								18	
	%	6,2	9,8	6,0	0,0	8,2	4,1	0,0	4,2	

unions and employees	n								6
	%	1,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,6	2,0	0,0	1,4
employers organizations and firms	n								4
	%	1,5	0,0	4,0	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,9
farmers and agricultural organizations	n								4
	%	0,0	9,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,9
economists and financial experts	n								4
	%	3,1	0,0	2,0	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,9
other civil society actors	n								15
	%	1,5	4,9	6,0	1,6	1,6	12,2	1,0	3,5
churches and religious organizations and groups	n								1
	%	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
educational professionals and organizations'	n								4
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	8,2	0,0	0,9
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	n								2
	%	0,0	2,4	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,5
students, pupils, and their parents	n								1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,2
other professional organizations and groups	n								1
	%	1,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
consumer organizations and groups	n								1
	%	0,0	2,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
migrant organizations and groups	n								1
	%	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
rebel forces/guerrilla	n								2
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	1,0	0,5
other civil society organizations and groups	n								2
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,6	2,0	0,0	0,5
general/ unknown/ unspecified	n								28
	%	4,6	7,3	6,0	4,8	1,6	4,1	13,5	6,6
whole polities	n								28
	%	4,6	7,3	6,0	4,8	1,6	4,1	13,5	6,6
Total	n	65	41	50	62	61	49	96	424
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Regarding the scope of negatively evaluated addressees (Table 6.2a) it can be stated that German actors are much more criticized by all newspapers than EU actors or any other actors. This is not surprising as German actors do also get most attention. In relative terms – including a comparison between the respective shares of attention, support and criticism - German actors are subject to an over-proportional share of criticism compared to the attention they get (Table 4.3a) in the quality press. The FAZ for example calls in every second editorial upon German actors. These actors then get a share of 60% of all criticism in the FAZ commenting.

Table 6.2a: Scope of negatively evaluated addressee per paper

		PAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
SCOPE OF NEG: ADDRESSEE	other supranational	n				3
	%	0,6	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,7
	EU	n				92
	%	21,7	21,7	22,9	20,0	21,7
	multilateral	n				3
	%	1,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
	bilateral	n				2
	%	0,6	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,5
	germany	n				243
	%	52,0	60,0	58,3	76,0	57,4
	france	n				4
	%	1,7	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,9
	uk	n				5
	%	2,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,2
	italy	n				6
	%	0,0	2,3	4,2	0,0	1,4
	spain	n				4
	%	1,1	0,0	4,2	0,0	0,9
	netherlands	n				1
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
	other EU-members	n				13
	%	2,9	2,9	6,3	0,0	3,1
	upcoming enlargement countries	n				6
	%	1,1	2,3	0,0	0,0	1,4
	other european countries ex CIS	n				4
	%	1,1	0,6	2,1	0,0	0,9
	turkey	n				5
	%	1,7	1,1	0,0	0,0	1,2
russia	n				3	
%	0,0	1,1	0,0	4,0	0,7	
USA	n				15	
%	6,3	1,7	2,1	0,0	3,5	
Japan	n				1	
%	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,2	
Middle East	n				4	
%	1,7	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,9	
Rest of the world	n				9	
%	2,3	2,9	0,0	0,0	2,1	
Total	n	175	175	48	25	423
%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

The opposite is true for EU actors: in the quality press their share of criticism is substantially under-proportional compared to the attention they get. This push for the EU can only be found

in the elite newspapers, whereas the regional and tabloid newspapers criticize EU and German actors in the way they give attention to them.

In all policy fields except for the field of EU integration, German actors are stronger criticised than EU actors in absolute terms. But once again, the distribution of criticism strongly depends on the attention the actors get. If EU actors are not existent e.g. in retirement politics they of course can not be criticised. Therefore EU actors are criticised in those fields where they get most attention: monetary politics, agriculture and EU integration (Table 6.2b). Their share of negative evaluations is lower in monetary politics, higher in agricultural politics and balanced in the field of EU integration compared to the share of attention (Table 4.3b). German actors are super-proportionally criticised in the fields of monetary politics, immigration and troops deployment compared to the attention they get. Agriculture and European Integration are those fields where the four newspapers under study criticise German actors less than would be expected by the attention they get. In the other fields German actors have a balanced account.

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

		POLICY FIELD						Total		
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education		European Integration	
SCOPE OF NEG. ADDRESSEE	other supra-national	n							3	
		%	4,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
	EU	n								92
		%	33,8	46,3	0,0	1,6	0,0	2,0	51,0	21,7
	multilateral	n								3
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,3	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,7
	bilateral	n								2
		%	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,0	0,5
	germany	n								243
		%	41,5	51,2	92,0	52,5	100,0	91,8	11,5	57,4
	france	n								4
		%	3,1	2,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,0	0,9
	uk	n								5
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,6	0,0	2,0	0,0	1,2
	italy	n								6
		%	4,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,1	1,4
	spain	n								4
		%	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,1	0,9
	netherlands	n								1
		%	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
	other EU-members	n								13
		%	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	2,0	11,5	3,1
	upcoming enlargement countries	n								6
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,3	1,4
	other european countries ex CIS	n								4
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,3	0,0	0,0	2,1	0,9
turkey	n								5	
	%	3,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,1	1,2	
russia	n								3	
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,1	0,7	
USA	n								15	
	%	6,2	0,0	0,0	16,4	0,0	0,0	1,0	3,5	
Japan	n								1	
	%	1,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2	
Middle East	n								4	
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,9	
Rest of the world	n								9	
	%	1,5	0,0	0,0	9,8	0,0	0,0	2,1	2,1	
Total	n	65	41	50	61	61	49	96	423	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

7. Issues and aims per newspaper

The analysis includes all commentaries that appeared on the sample days and that had a reference to one of the seven policy fields under study: Monetary politics, agricultural politics, immigration politics, matters of troops deployment, retirement politics, educational politics or politics of European Integration. Table 7.1 reflects the distribution of the commentaries across those issues. Around a third (27,3 %) of the commentaries in all four newspapers made matters of European Integration a subject of discussion. Other frequently commented issues were Monetary politics (18,1%), matters of troops deployment (14,6%), retirement (11,6%) and immigration politics (10,4). The least important issues in this row were educational politics (9,7%) and agricultural politics (8,3%).

The distribution across newspapers however, reveals different priorities. The two quality newspapers show roughly comparable issue agendas, with the only difference, that “Süddeutsche Zeitung” commented twice as often on the topic of troops deployment, while “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” commented twice as often on matters of educational politics. In comparison, the regional newspaper pays less attention to the issue of monetary politics, but more attention to the issues of agricultural politics, troops deployment and retirement politics. Extremely divergent appears the issue agenda of the commentaries by “Bild”. The tabloid is the only newspaper that commented most frequently upon monetary politics. Compared to the other newspapers it commented only rarely on the topic of European Integration (12% compared to 23-32%).

Table 7.1: Policy Field per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
POLICY FIELD	Monetary politics	n				151	
		%	17,7	18,6	12,3	31,7	18,1
	Agriculture	n				69	
		%	8,0	6,6	13,2	12,2	8,3
	Immigration	n				87	
		%	10,9	7,7	14,2	19,5	10,4
	Troops deployment	n				122	
		%	21,2	10,0	12,3	4,9	14,6
	Retirement and pension schemes	n				97	
		%	10,0	11,5	14,2	19,5	11,6
Education	n				81		
	%	6,2	13,8	11,3	0,0	9,7	
European Integration	n				228		
	%	26,0	31,8	22,6	12,2	27,3	
Total	n	339	349	106	41	835	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

The seven policy fields that were looked at so far are formulated in a very general way. To get a better understanding of the structure of issue agendas different subissues were coded for each policy field. The following tables show the distribution of these subissues Table 7.2a shows which aspects of monetary politics were discussed. Overall, most present in commentaries were issues around the EMU convergence criteria (including the stability pact), the common currency Euro and interest rate adjustments. This reflects the newsworthiness of the new currency Euro. Its introduction presumably created a pronounced need of the reader to get informed about new developments that the journalists have reacted to. While the quality newspapers made a variety of aspects subject of their commentaries, the regional newspaper and the tabloid focused mainly on topics around the Euro itself (and to a lesser degree on convergence criteria and exchange rate interventions). This pictures clearly the service orientation of these two types of newspaper that address a broader and often less educated readership.

Table 7.2a: Subissues within “Monetary politics” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
SUBISSUES	Monetary Politics General	n				5	
		%	5,0	3,1	0,0	0,0	3,3
	Interest Rate Adjustments	n				35	
		%	28,3	26,2	7,7	0,0	23,2
	EMU Convergence criteria and stability pact	n				40	
		%	21,7	30,8	38,5	15,4	26,5
	Exchange rate intervention	n				22	
		%	20,0	10,8	0,0	23,1	14,6
	Independence Central Banks	n				7	
		%	5,0	6,2	0,0	0,0	4,6
Eurozone - outsiders insiders	n				2		
	%	0,0	3,1	0,0	0,0	1,3	
Common currency	n				35		
	%	16,7	15,4	53,8	61,5	23,2	
Other Specific	n				5		
	%	3,3	4,6	0,0	0,0	3,3	
Total	n	60	65	13	13	151	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

Table 7.2b reveals an interesting similarity. The attention on agricultural policy in the commentaries of all four newspapers is focused on animal diseases. Already Table 7.1 has shown a general humble interest of commentators in agricultural policy. Now it becomes obvious that they mainly get attracted to agricultural issues during times of “BSE” or “Foot and Mouth Disease”. More abstract issues as the reform of the system of subsidies (in the course of enlargement) are hardly analysed or discussed by the newspapers under study. The commentators of the tabloid “Bild” even focus exclusively on animal diseases. Their assumption behind might be that readers get interested in matters of agricultural policy when they are directly affected which is definitely the case during times of animal diseases.

Table 7.2b: Subissues within “Agriculture” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
SUBISSUES	Reform of the system of subsidies	n				9	
		%	7,4	17,4	21,4	0,0	13,0
	subsidies and enlargement of the European Union	n				8	
		%	11,1	21,7	0,0	0,0	11,6
	subsidies and international trade	n				1	
		%	3,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,4
	BSE	n				43	
	%	66,7	56,5	64,3	60,0	62,3	
	Foot and Mouth Disease	n				7	
		%	11,1	4,3	14,3	20,0	10,1
	other diseases	n				1	
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	20,0	1,4
Total		n	27	23	14	5	69
		%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 7.2c shows again a relatively similar structure of subissues. Commentaries on immigration policy focus very much on questions of migration programs and quotas. Again, the commentaries of Bild focus even exclusively on this topic. The only exception hereby is “Süddeutsche Zeitung” that pays more attention to general questions of immigration politics.

Table 7.2c: Subissues within “Immigration” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
SUBISSUES	General Immigration politics	n				23	
		%	37,8	25,9	13,3	0,0	26,4
	institutional framework	n				11	
		%	21,6	7,4	6,7	0,0	12,6
	expulsions	n				6	
		%	10,8	7,4	0,0	0,0	6,9
	migration programs and quotas	n				45	
	%	24,3	59,3	80,0	100,0	51,7	
	visa and consular policy	n				1	
		%	2,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,1
	other specific issues	n				1	
		%	2,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,1
Total		n	37	27	15	8	87
		%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 7.2d shows that commentaries on matters of troops deployment deal mainly with the aspect of deployment for military aggression, deployment for peace keeping and deployment in the context of military alliances. The differences across newspapers are relatively small. More important were the differences concerning the amount of commenting (Table 7.1) that show that “Süddeutsche Zeitung” commented twice as often on this issue than “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” and that “Bild” showed hardly no interest at all.

Table 7.2d: Subissues within “Troops deployment” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
SUBISSUES	General reference to deployment of troops	n				6
	%	5,6	2,9	0,0	50,0	4,9
	deployment for military aggression	n				48
	%	43,1	31,4	46,2	0,0	39,3
	deployment for invasion of foreign sovereign territory	n				6
	%	5,6	5,7	0,0	0,0	4,9
	deployment in covert aggressive operations	n				6
	%	4,2	2,9	7,7	50,0	4,9
	deployment for peace keeping	n				26
	%	15,3	25,7	46,2	0,0	21,3
deployment in the context of military alliances	n				20	
%	16,7	22,9	0,0	0,0	16,4	
other specific reference to deployment of troops	n				9	
%	8,3	8,6	0,0	0,0	7,4	
Non EU forms of European integration	n				1	
%	1,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,8	
Total	n	72	35	13	2	122
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Commentaries on retirement policy seem to act on a rather general level. It is mainly general references to pension schemes or the discussion around state versus private pension scheme that have triggered the rare commentaries on this issue.

Table 7.2e: Subissues within “Retirement and pension schemes” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
SUBISSUES	General reference to pension schemes	n				23	
		%	23,5	12,5	33,3	62,5	23,7
	Demographic changes	n				5	
		%	8,8	2,5	6,7	0,0	5,2
	Retirement ages	n				3	
		%	5,9	2,5	0,0	0,0	3,1
	Income levels in retirement	n				4	
		%	8,8	0,0	6,7	0,0	4,1
	State versus private pension schemes	n				25	
		%	20,6	30,0	40,0	0,0	25,8
State pension scheme	n				11		
	%	2,9	20,0	6,7	12,5	11,3	
Private pension scheme	n				12		
	%	14,7	17,5	0,0	0,0	12,4	
Other specific	n				14		
	%	14,7	15,0	6,7	25,0	14,4	
Total	n	34	40	15	8	97	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

The commentaries on educational politics were mainly about structural issues, resource allocation (i.e. salaries) and matters of curricula. Interestingly, these issues did not trigger any commentary in the tabloid “Bild” at all. Table 7.2f shows that “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” presented the relative biggest diversity of subissues in its commentaries.

Table 7.2f: Subissues within “Education” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER			Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	
SUBISSUES	General education n				6
	politics %	14,3	4,2	8,3	7,4
	Structural issues n				26
	%	42,9	22,9	50,0	32,1
	Resource allocation and salaries n				16
	%	4,8	27,1	16,7	19,8
	Private education n				1
	%	0,0	2,1	0,0	1,2
	Administrative power allocation n				2
	%	0,0	4,2	0,0	2,5
	Curriculum n				11
	%	9,5	18,8	0,0	13,6
	Information and communication technologies n				2
%	0,0	4,2	0,0	2,5	
Scholarships and fees n				8	
%	9,5	8,3	16,7	9,9	
Problems at school n				3	
%	4,8	2,1	8,3	3,7	
other specific issues n				6	
%	14,3	6,3	0,0	7,4	
Total n		21	48	12	81
%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Overall, the most important aspect of European Integration that was highlighted by the commentators were matters concerning the process of enlargement of the EU. “Leipziger Volkszeitung” dedicated nearly half of the commentaries on this subissue. The attention of the East German regional newspaper might partly be caused by the political involvement of the former German Democratic Republic as well as the regional proximity of Leipzig to Eastern Europe. The second and third important subissues in all four newspapers were the discussion of the role of a specific country within the EU and of the relation between EU and national levels. This focus might partly be explained by the so called “Haider conflict” that took place in spring 2000. At that time the right extreme party FPÖ under the aegis of Jörg Haider became part of the Austrian government. As reaction 14 EU governments imposed sanctions on Austria to underline that the ideas of this party and particularly of Jörg Haider offend the common values of the EU. Table 7.2g gives the impression that particularly the tabloid “Bild” exclusively focused its commentaries on this particular conflict. Below the distribution of the subissues across years will be analysed in more detail.

Table 7.2g: Subissues within “European Integration” per newspaper

	NEWSPAPER				Total	
	Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
General European integration	n				8	
	%	5,7	1,8	4,2	0,0	3,5
Shared values and Identity	n				2	
	%	0,0	0,9	0,0	20,0	0,9
Role of a specific country in the EU	n				57	
	%	15,9	28,8	33,3	60,0	25,0
Relationship between EU and national levels	n				46	
	%	19,3	25,2	4,2	0,0	20,2
Institutional structure	n				14	
	%	9,1	5,4	0,0	0,0	6,1
Defining the EUs core tasks	n				4	
	%	2,3	1,8	0,0	0,0	1,8
Relationship between EU institutions and public	n				1	
	%	0,0	0,9	0,0	0,0	0,4
Enlargement	n				74	
	%	36,4	27,9	45,8	0,0	32,5
Budget	n				2	
	%	1,1	0,9	0,0	0,0	0,9
other specific EU integration	n				9	
	%	5,7	2,7	4,2	0,0	3,9
Associational agreements between the EU and non EU countries	n				6	
	%	2,3	2,7	4,2	0,0	2,6
Personnel issues	n				4	
	%	2,3	0,9	4,2	0,0	1,8
Non EU forms of European integration	n				1	
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	20,0	0,4
Total	n	88	111	24	5	228
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

With regard to the research question of Europeanisation it is particularly important to analyse the issue scopes of the commentaries. The issue scope refers to the geographical and/or political scope of the substantive content of the commentary. It has to be noted that the issue scope is in principle independent from the scope of the cited addressees, and/or the object actors.¹⁰ Like the scope of addressees (chapter four), the issue scope is highly concentrated. Table 7.3 shows clearly that the issue scopes in the commentaries of the four newspapers under study were primarily European (averagely 49 per cent) and national, i.e. German (averagely 33 per

cent). This means that issues concerning the EU triggered nearly half of the commentaries under study. Compared to the quality newspapers, the commentators of the regional newspaper and the tabloid obviously put a stronger emphasis on national issues. This is not surprising with regard to the pronounced coverage of regional and national issues of these types of newspapers. More surprising however, is that the commentators also of the quality newspapers more or less ignored issues that solely concern other foreign countries like France or the UK.

Table 7.3: Issue scope per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	FAZ	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
ISSUE SCOPE	supranational: UN					27
	%	5,3	0,9	5,7	0,0	3,2
	other supranational					10
	%	1,5	1,4	0,0	0,0	1,2
	EU					406
	%	46,6	51,4	45,3	51,2	48,7
	multilateral					35
	%	8,6	1,7	0,0	0,0	4,2
	bilateral					59
	%	8,3	6,6	4,7	7,3	7,1
	germany					275
	%	26,8	34,8	43,4	41,5	33,0
	france					1
	%	0,0	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,1
	uk					4
	%	0,6	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,5
	italy					1
	%	0,0	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,1
	netherlands					2
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
	other EU-members					4
	%	0,6	0,3	0,9	0,0	0,5
	turkey					1
	%	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1
	USA					6
	%	0,6	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,7
Japan					2	
%	0,3	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,2	
Rest of the world					1	
%	0,0	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,1	
Total	n	339	348	106	41	834
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

¹⁰ E.g., if a journalist appealed to the European Court of Justice in protest against the Berlin police's treatment of immigrant suspects, the addressee is European, but the scope of the issue ('The Berlin police's treatment of immigrant suspects') remains local.

To get a better understanding of the distribution of the scopes it is necessary to look at the policy fields that were commented upon. Table 7.4 shows the highest degree of a European scope within the field of “European Integration” which is logical as these issues by nature have a European scope. With regard to the other six policy fields the issue scopes in the commentaries clearly reflect the actual distribution of competencies for decision-making, policy development and implementation between the European and national levels. “Monetary Politics” and “Agricultural politics”, two of the most Europeanised EU policies, have a dominant European scope. “Agricultural politics” has an additional strong national scope which may be due to the fact, that some areas like the distribution of financial aid is coordinated on a national level. The European scope of “Immigration politics” and “Troops deployment”, policy areas for which harmonisation of national policies has been explicitly formulated as an aim, are far less present. However, while matters of immigration are presented predominantly in a national light, the question of troops deployment has mainly a supranational, multi- or bilateral scope. Finally, the dominant scope of issues of retirement and education, two policy areas for which harmonisation has not been an explicit aim so far, is evidently a national one. Thus the result that has already been discussed with regard to the initiating events and the addressees can be confirmed: A Europeanised topical commentation takes place in the policy fields of Monetary and Agricultural politics and to a lesser degree in immigration politics and “troops deployment”.

Table 7.4: Issue scope per policy field

		POLICY FIELD							Total
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	European Integration	
ISSUE SCOPE	supranational: n								27
	UN %	0,0	0,0	0,0	20,5	0,0	1,2	0,4	3,2
	other supra-national n								10
	%	0,7	0,0	1,1	5,7	0,0	1,2	0,0	1,2
	EU n								406
	%	84,8	58,8	3,4	9,0	0,0	0,0	98,2	48,7
	multilateral n								35
	%	3,3	1,5	3,4	18,9	0,0	2,5	0,4	4,2
	bilateral n								59
	%	0,7	0,0	3,4	44,3	0,0	1,2	0,0	7,1
	germany n								275
	%	3,3	36,8	85,1	1,6	99,0	90,1	0,0	33,0
	france n								1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,1
	uk n								4
	%	0,7	2,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,2	0,0	0,5
	italy n								1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,2	0,0	0,1
	netherlands n								2
	%	0,0	0,0	2,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
	other EU-members n								4
	%	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	1,2	0,9	0,5
	turkey n								1
	%	0,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1
	USA n								6
	%	4,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
	Japan n								2
%	1,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2	
Rest of the world n								1	
%	0,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1	
Total n		151	68	87	122	97	81	228	834
%		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

The following tables prove that the distribution of issue scopes within the different policy fields did not differ very much across newspapers. Table 7.5a shows a very homogenous picture. Whenever any of the newspapers commented upon matters of monetary politics they did it with a European scope. Taking Table 7.2a into consideration it becomes obvious that the majority of commentaries were about original European issues like the Euro itself or the stability pact.

Table 7.5a: Scope of “Monetary Politics” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
ISSUE SCOPE	other supranational	n				1
	%	0,0	1,5	0,0	0,0	0,7
	EU	n				128
	%	88,3	76,9	92,3	100,0	84,8
	multilateral	n				5
	%	5,0	3,1	0,0	0,0	3,3
	bilateral	n				1
	%	0,0	0,0	7,7	0,0	0,7
	germany	n				5
	%	0,0	7,7	0,0	0,0	3,3
	uk	n				1
	%	0,0	1,5	0,0	0,0	0,7
	turkey	n				1
	%	1,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7
	USA	n				6
	%	3,3	6,2	0,0	0,0	4,0
	Japan	n				2
	%	1,7	1,5	0,0	0,0	1,3
	Rest of the world	n				1
	%	0,0	1,5	0,0	0,0	0,7
Total	n	60	65	13	13	151
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 7.5b reveals a similar structure as well. About 60 per cent of the issue scopes of all commentaries upon agricultural matters were European and about 40 were national. The only mentionable exception is the slight share of a British scope within the commentaries of the quality newspapers. Most likely these commentaries were triggered in the time of the foot and mouth disease in spring 2001 that originated in the United Kingdom.

Table 7.5b: Scope of “Agricultural Policy” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
ISSUE SCOPE	EU	n				40	
		%	55,6	59,1	64,3	60,0	58,8
	multilateral	n				1	
		%	3,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,5
	germany	n				25	
		%	37,0	36,4	35,7	40,0	36,8
	uk	n				2	
		%	3,7	4,5	0,0	0,0	2,9
Total							
		n	27	22	14	5	68
		%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 7.5c also shows comparable distributions of issue scopes within commentaries upon immigration politics between all four newspapers.

Table 7.5c: Scope of “Immigration” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total		
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild			
ISSUE SCOPE	other supranational	n				1		
		%	0,0	3,7	0,0	0,0	1,1	
	EU	n				3		
		%	5,4	0,0	6,7	0,0	3,4	
	multilateral	n				3		
		%	5,4	3,7	0,0	0,0	3,4	
	bilateral	n				3		
		%	2,7	3,7	0,0	12,5	3,4	
	germany	n				74		
		%	81,1	85,2	93,3	87,5	85,1	
	netherlands	n				2		
		%	5,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,3	
	other EU-members	n				1		
		%	0,0	3,7	0,0	0,0	1,1	
	Total							
			n	37	27	15	8	87
			%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

The issue scopes of commentaries upon matters of troops deployment vary a lot between the newspapers under study. While “Süddeutsche Zeitung” and “Leipziger Volkszeitung” have emphasised the supranational scope, „Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung“ and „Bild“ have focused on issues with a bilateral scope. The tabloid even focused exclusively on bilateral is-

sues. Additionally “Süddeutsche Zeitung” was the only newspaper that commented upon multilateral issues of troops deployment.

Table 7.5d: Scope of “Troops deployment” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
ISSUE SCOPE	supranational: UN	n				25	
		%	22,2	8,6	46,2	0,0	20,5
	other supranational	n				7	
		%	5,6	8,6	0,0	0,0	5,7
	EU	n				11	
		%	4,2	14,3	23,1	0,0	9,0
	multilateral	n				23	
		%	27,8	8,6	0,0	0,0	18,9
	bilateral	n				54	
		%	37,5	60,0	30,8	100,0	44,3
	germany	n				2	
		%	2,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,6
Total	n	72	35	13	2	122	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

Table 7.5e confirms a clear domination of national issues concerning retirement and pension schemes in all four newspapers.

Table 7.5e: Scope of “Retirement and pension schemes” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
ISSUE SC	germany	n				96	
		%	100,0	97,5	100,0	100,0	99,0
	france	n				1	
		%	0,0	2,5	0,0	0,0	1,0
Total	n	34	40	15	8	97	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

Table 7.5f shows that “Süddeutsche Zeitung” was the only newspaper that commented on educational issues with multilateral, supranational or foreign scopes to a significant degree (nearly 30 per cent). In contrary “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” and “Leipziger Volkszeitung” have (almost) explicitly commented upon national issues. The tabloid Bild (as mentioned above) has not commented on educational issues at all.

Table 7.5f: Scope of “Education” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER			Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung		
ISSUE SCOPE	supranational: UN	n			1	
		%	4,8	0,0	0,0	1,2
	other supranational	n			1	
		%	4,8	0,0	0,0	1,2
	multilateral	n			2	
		%	9,5	0,0	0,0	2,5
	bilateral	n			1	
		%	0,0	2,1	0,0	1,2
	germany	n			73	
		%	71,4	95,8	100,0	90,1
	uk	n			1	
		%	4,8	0,0	0,0	1,2
italy	n			1		
	%	0,0	2,1	0,0	1,2	
other EU-members	n			1		
	%	4,8	0,0	0,0	1,2	
Total	n	21	48	12	81	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

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

Table 7.5g: Scope of “European Integration” per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
ISSUE SCOPE	supranational: UN	n				1	
		%	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4
	EU	n				224	
		%	96,6	100,0	95,8	100,0	98,2
	multilateral	n				1	
		%	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,4
	other EU-members	n				2	
		%	1,1	0,0	4,2	0,0	0,9
	Total	n	88	111	24	5	228
		%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

8. Issues and aims per year

Journalistic products, including commentaries, reflect distinct issue cycles over time that depend on the actual political developments. To analyse these movements the presence of issues will be analysed across the years 2000, 2001 and 2002 (Table 8.1). In this period “Monetary politics” has gained importance. This peak might have been caused by the introduction of the Euro in cash that has caught the attention of readers and of commentators. “Agricultural politics” stimulated more commentaries in 2000 and 2001 than in 2002. This development seems to reinforce the assumption that the animal diseases BSE and the foot and mouth disease and their perks in these years have caught the attention of commentators. The peak of the issue of “troops deployment” in 2001 and in 2002 corresponds to the terrorist attack on the USA in 2001 (“September 11th”), followed by war (preparations) against Afghanistan and Iraq. Why the issue of “retirement and pension schemes” has lost significance between 2000 and 2002 needs further analysis. The peak of matters of “European Integration” in 2000 might be due to the sanctions that the Eu-14 have imposed on Austria in spring 2000. Issues of Immigration and of educational politics seem to have been relatively independent of this time frame. In all years they had a share of averagely 10 per cent.

Table 8.1: Policy field per year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
POLICY FIELD	Monetary politics	n			151	
		%	17,8	12,3	24,6	18,1
	Agriculture	n			69	
		%	9,1	11,6	3,8	8,3
	Immigration	n			87	
		%	8,7	12,0	10,6	10,4
	Troops deployment	n			122	
		%	2,4	20,4	21,6	14,6
	Retirement and pension schemes	n			97	
		%	16,4	10,9	7,2	11,6
	Education	n			81	
		%	10,1	10,2	8,7	9,7
	European Integration	n			228	
		%	35,5	22,5	23,5	27,3
Total	n	287	284	264	835	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

The following tables present the development of the detailed subissues over time. In 2002 particularly the discussion around the EMU convergence criteria and the stability pact has gained the attention of commentators (Table 8.2a).

Table 8.2a: Subissues within “Monetary Politics” per year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
SUBISSUES	Monetary Politics General	n			5	
		%	5,9	2,9	1,5	3,3
	Interest Rate Adjustments	n			35	
		%	27,5	45,7	7,7	23,2
	EMU Convergence criteria and stability pact	n			40	
		%	3,9	8,6	53,8	26,5
	Exchange rate intervention	n			22	
		%	31,4	5,7	6,2	14,6
	Independence Central Banks	n			7	
		%	3,9	5,7	4,6	4,6
	Eurozone - outsiders insiders	n			2	
		%	0,0	2,9	1,5	1,3
	Common currency	n			35	
		%	23,5	20,0	24,6	23,2
	Other Specific	n			5	
		%	3,9	8,6	0,0	3,3
	Total	n	51	35	65	151
		%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

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

Table 8.2b: Subissues within “Agriculture” per year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
SUBISSUES	Reform of the system of subsidies	n			9	
		%	3,8	18,2	20,0	13,0
	subsidies and enlargement of the European Union	n			8	
		%	7,7	6,1	40,0	11,6
	subsidies and international trade	n			1	
		%	3,8	0,0	0,0	1,4
	BSE	n			43	
		%	84,6	51,5	40,0	62,3
	Foot and Mouth Disease	n			7	
		%	0,0	21,2	0,0	10,1
other diseases	n			1		
	%	0,0	3,0	0,0	1,4	
Total	n	26	33	10	69	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

The commentation of immigration politics presents a relatively stable image over time (Table 8.2c).

Table 8.2c: Subissues within “Immigration” per year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
SUBISSUES	General Immigration politics	n			23	
		%	28,0	20,6	32,1	26,4
	institutional framework	n			11	
		%	0,0	23,5	10,7	12,6
	expulsions	n			6	
		%	12,0	0,0	10,7	6,9
	migration programs and quotas	n			45	
		%	52,0	55,9	46,4	51,7
	visa and consular policy	n			1	
		%	4,0	0,0	0,0	1,1
other specific issues	n			1		
	%	4,0	0,0	0,0	1,1	
Total	n	25	34	28	87	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

Table 8.2d shows that share of commentaries on issues concerning the deployment of troops for military aggression increased between 2000 and 2002 by over 30 per cent, while at the same time issues concerning the deployment of troops for peace keeping decreased to a parallel degree.

Table 8.2d: Subissues within “Troops deployment” per year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
SUBISSUES	General reference to deployment of troops	n %	0,0	1,7	8,8	6 4,9
	deployment for military aggression	n %	14,3	32,8	49,1	48 39,3
	deployment for invasion of foreign sovereign territory	n %	14,3	5,2	3,5	6 4,9
	deployment in covert aggressive operations	n %	0,0	5,2	5,3	6 4,9
	deployment for peace keeping	n %	42,9	29,3	10,5	26 21,3
	deployment in the context of military alliances	n %	14,3	20,7	12,3	20 16,4
	other specific reference to deployment of troops	n %	14,3	3,4	10,5	9 7,4
	Non EU forms of European integration	n %	0,0	1,7	0,0	1 0,8
	Total	n %	7 100,0	58 100,0	57 100,0	122 100,0

Table 8.2e shows that in 2000 more commentaries on “retirement and pension schemes” dealt with rather general references. Also the issue of demographic changes has decreased between 2000 and 2002.

Table 8.2e: Subissues within “Retirement and pension schemes” per year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
SUBISSUES	General reference to pension schemes	n %	31,9	19,4	10,5	23 23,7
	Demographic changes	n %	8,5	3,2	0,0	5 5,2
	Retirement ages	n %	2,1	6,5	0,0	3 3,1
	Income levels in retirement	n %	6,4	3,2	0,0	4 4,1
	State versus private pension schemes	n %	23,4	29,0	26,3	25 25,8
	State pension scheme	n %	4,3	12,9	26,3	11 11,3
	Private pension scheme	n %	8,5	16,1	15,8	12 12,4
	Other specific	n %	14,9	9,7	21,1	14 14,4
	Total	n %	47 100,0	31 100,0	19 100,0	97 100,0

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

Table 8.2f: Subissues within “Education” per year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
SUBISSUES	General education politics	n			6	
		%	0,0	13,8	8,7	7,4
	Structural issues	n			26	
		%	10,3	44,8	43,5	32,1
	Resource allocation and salaries	n			16	
		%	37,9	6,9	13,0	19,8
	Private education	n			1	
		%	3,4	0,0	0,0	1,2
	Administrative power allocation	n			2	
		%	0,0	3,4	4,3	2,5
	Curriculum	n			11	
		%	17,2	17,2	4,3	13,6
	Information and communication technologies	n			2	
		%	6,9	0,0	0,0	2,5
	Scholarships and fees	n			8	
		%	17,2	3,4	8,7	9,9
	Problems at school	n			3	
		%	3,4	0,0	8,7	3,7
	other specific issues	n			6	
		%	3,4	10,3	8,7	7,4
Total	n	29	29	23	81	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

Table 8.2g again reveals the influence of the conflict around Austria in spring 2000 which is most probably reflected by a peak of the subissue “role of a specific country in the EU”. Another interesting result is the rise of the issue of enlargement between 2000 and 2002 by nearly 40 per cent. This might be caused by the simple fact that the next steps of enlargement are coming closer. However, to explain this development substantially, further research will be necessary.

Table 8.2g: Subissues within “European Integration” per year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
SUBISSUES	General European integration	n			8	
		%	4,9	1,6	3,2	3,5
	Shared values and Identity	n			2	
		%	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,9
	Role of a specific country in the EU	n			57	
		%	37,3	18,8	11,3	25,0
	Relationship between EU and national levels	n			46	
		%	16,7	32,8	12,9	20,2
	Institutional structure	n			14	
		%	10,8	3,1	1,6	6,1
	Defining the EUs core tasks	n			4	
		%	2,0	3,1	0,0	1,8
	Relationship between EU institutions and public	n			1	
		%	0,0	0,0	1,6	0,4
	Enlargement	n			74	
		%	19,6	28,1	58,1	32,5
	Budget	n			2	
		%	0,0	0,0	3,2	0,9
	other specific EU integration	n			9	
		%	2,9	9,4	0,0	3,9
Associational agreements between the EU and non EU countries	n			6		
	%	2,0	1,6	4,8	2,6	
Personnel issues	n			4		
	%	1,0	1,6	3,2	1,8	
Non EU forms of European integration	n			1		
	%	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,4	
Total	n	102	64	62	228	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

9. Main aspect commented upon

For each commentary it was coded whether the journalist mainly commented upon a substantial subject of an issue (e.g. the pros and cons of deployment of troops) or upon the political process and dispute around that issue (e.g. the commenting upon the parliamentary decision on deploying troops). The goal was to find out whether a journalist focused on one of the seven policy topics under study or whether he presented the policy topic as a political dispute. Table 9.1 shows that the more than 40 per cent of the commentaries in “Süddeutsche Zeitung” focused on aspects of the political dispute while the other newspapers focused much more on the substantial policy field itself. One could have assumed that the tabloid “Bild” would emphasize the entertaining aspects of politics, i.e. the political dispute, but surprisingly almost all its commentaries concentrated on substantial issues. Further analysis is needed about the reasons of this result.

Table 9.1: Aspect commented upon per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
ASPECT	substantial issue	n				585	
		%	57,5	82,8	72,6	97,4	71,9
	political dispute	n				229	
		%	42,5	17,2	27,4	2,6	28,1
Total		n	332	337	106	39	814
		%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

With regard to the policy fields commentaries about “troops deployment” and “retirement and pension schemes” focused quite strongly on aspects of the political dispute while commentaries about “education” and about “monetary politics” focused least on aspects of the political dispute (Table 9.2).

Table 9.2: Aspect commented upon per issue field

		POLICY FIELD						Total		
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education		European Integration	
ASPECT	substantial issue	n							585	
		%	84,5	73,1	67,9	55,8	58,5	86,1	73,9	71,9
ASPECT	political dispute	n							229	
		%	15,5	26,9	32,1	44,2	41,5	13,9	26,1	28,1
Total		n	148	67	84	120	94	79	222	814
		%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

10. Object actors

The object actors of commentaries are all actors whose interests are, or would be affected positively or negatively by the journalist's claim.¹¹ This category allows to understand whether the journalists and if who they speak on behalf of or resp. against.

A commentary does not necessarily contain an object actor. Table 10.1a shows that averagely two thirds of the commentaries contained object actors. In almost all editorials of the tabloid "Bild" object actors were present.

Table 10.1a: Presence of object actor per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
No object actor	n					216
	%	27,4	27,8	23,6	2,4	25,9
Object actor present	n					619
	%	72,6	72,2	76,4	97,6	74,1
Total	n	339	349	106	41	835
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

With regard to policy fields commentaries about "education" and about "troops deployment" had the strongest reference to object actors (Table 10.1b) Object actors were least important in commentaries about "retirement and pension schemes" and in commentaries about "monetary politics".

Table 10.1b: Presence of object actor per policy field

		POLICY FIELD						Total
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	
No object actor	n							216
	%	33,8	24,6	21,8	22,1	36,1	13,6	24,6
Object actor present	n							619
	%	66,2	75,4	78,2	77,9	63,9	86,4	75,4
Total	n	151	69	87	122	97	81	228
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

¹¹ The object actor may be identical with the addressee, e.g., when a journalist calls on the President of the European Central Bank to resign. Here, the President of the ECB is both addressee and object.

The specified categories of object actor types show on behalf of which societal groups resp. against which societal groups journalists speak in their commentaries (Table 10.2a). The most important category is the general one. More than half of all object actors mentioned are either whole polities, e.g. countries as political entities, or whole economies or the general public. The second important category are different civil society actors (more than 20 per cent). The biggest shares have “students, pupils and their parents” and “migrant organisations and groups”. Similarly important are state and party actors as object actors (20 per cent). Hereby it is mainly the government that would be affected by the journalists’ claims. Differences between newspapers are rather minor. Interestingly, “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” speaks most often on behalf of (resp. against) economic interest groups while “Bild” mentions more often general entities and less often state and party actors.

Table 10.2a: Object actor type per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
OBJECT ACTOR	state and party actors	n				124	
	%	19,1	22,2	18,5	15,0	20,0	
	politicians	n				3	
		%	0,4	0,4	0,0	2,5	0,5
	former states(women)	n				1	
		%	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,2
	government/executive	n				67	
		%	11,0	10,7	12,3	7,5	10,8
	legislative	n				7	
		%	0,8	1,2	0,0	5,0	1,1
	judiciary	n				2	
		%	0,0	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,3
	police and internal security agencies	n				2	
		%	0,0	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,3
	military	n				24	
		%	5,3	3,2	3,7	0,0	3,9
	central banks	n				9	
		%	0,8	2,8	0,0	0,0	1,5
	other state executive agencies	n				3	
		%	0,0	0,4	2,5	0,0	0,5
political parties	n				6		
	%	0,8	1,6	0,0	0,0	1,0	
economic interest groups	n				45		
	%	5,7	7,1	13,6	5,0	7,3	
unions and employees	n				16		
	%	2,4	2,0	3,7	5,0	2,6	

employers organisations and firms	n					4
	%	0,4	0,4	2,5	0,0	0,6
farmers and agricultural organisations	n					19
	%	2,4	3,2	6,2	0,0	3,1
economists and financial experts	n					6
	%	0,4	1,6	1,2	0,0	1,0
media and journalists	n					1
	%	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
other civil society actors	n					135
	%	20,7	21,0	29,6	17,5	21,8
educational professionals and organizations	n					14
	%	1,6	3,2	2,5	0,0	2,3
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	n					5
	%	0,8	0,4	2,5	0,0	0,8
students, pupils, and their parents	n					45
	%	5,3	10,3	7,4	0,0	7,3
other professional organisations and groups	n					2
	%	0,4	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,3
consumer organizations and groups	n					22
	%	2,0	4,0	6,2	5,0	3,6
migrant organisations and groups	n					29
	%	7,3	1,6	7,4	2,5	4,7
racist and extreme right organisations and groups	n					2
	%	0,4	0,0	1,2	0,0	0,3
organizations and groups of the elderly	n					13
	%	2,0	0,8	2,5	10,0	2,1
women s organizations and groups	n					1
	%	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
terrorist groups	n					1
	%	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
other civil society organisations and groups	n					1
	%	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,2
general	n					314
	%	54,1	49,6	38,3	62,5	50,7
whole polities	n					186
	%	34,1	28,2	27,2	22,5	30,0
whole economies	n					33
	%	8,5	3,2	1,2	7,5	5,3
the general public	n					95
	%	11,4	18,3	9,9	32,5	15,3
Total	n					619
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

The importance of different object actors types varies greatly across policy fields (Table 10.2b). The object actors of commentaries upon “Monetary politics” and about “European Integration” are mainly general entities or state and party actors. Commentaries upon “Agri-

cultural policy”, “Immigration policy”, “retirement and pension schemes” or upon “Educational policy”, refer most often to general entities and to civil society groups. Agricultural commentaries additionally aim at economic interest groups. Commentaries concerning “Troops deployment” are insofar different as they target most often state and party actors.

Table 10.2b: Object actor type per policy field

		POLICY FIELD							Total	
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	European Integration		
OBJECT ACTOR	state and party actors	n							124	
		%	18,0%	3,8%	11,8%	52,6%	11,3%	1,4%	22,1%	20,0%
	politicians	n								3
		%	1,0	0,0	1,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,6	0,5
	former states(wo)men	n								1
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,6	0,2
	government/executive	n								67
		%	9,0	1,9	4,4	26,3	4,8	1,4	14,5	10,8
	legislative	n								7
		%	0,0	0,0	2,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,9	1,1
	judiciary	n								2
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,2	0,3
	police and internal security agencies	n								2
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,2	0,3
	military	n								24
		%	0,0	0,0	0,0	25,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,9
	central banks	n								9
		%	8,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,6	1,5
	other state executive agencies	n								3
		%	0,0	1,9	0,0	0,0	3,2	0,0	0,0	0,5
	political parties	n								6
		%	0,0	0,0	2,9	1,1	3,2	0,0	0,6	1,0
	economic interest groups	n								45
		%	4,0	34,6	5,9	0,0	17,7	1,4	4,1	7,3
	unions and employees	n								16
		%	0,0	0,0	5,9	0,0	14,5	0,0	1,7	2,6
employers organisations and firms	n								4	
	%	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,2	0,0	0,6	0,6	
farmers and agricultural organisations	n								19	
	%	0,0	34,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,4	0,0	3,1	
economists and financial experts	n								6	
	%	3,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,7	1,0	
media and journalists	n								1	
	%	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2	
other civil society actors	n								135	
	%	6,0	28,8	47,1	2,1	25,8	87,1	1,7	21,8	

educational professionals and organizations	n								14
	%	0,0	0,0	1,5	0,0	1,6	17,1	0,0	2,3
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	n								5
	%	0,0	1,9	0,0	1,1	0,0	4,3	0,0	0,8
students, pupils, and their parents	n								45
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	64,3	0,0	7,3
other professional organisations and groups	n								2
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,6	1,4	0,0	0,3
consumer organizations and groups	n								22
	%	6,0	26,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,2	3,6
migrant organisations and groups	n								29
	%	0,0	0,0	41,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,6	4,7
racist and extreme right organisations and groups	n								2
	%	0,0	0,0	2,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,3
organizations and groups of the elderly	n								13
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	21,0	0,0	0,0	2,1
women s organizations and groups	n								1
	%	0,0	0,0	1,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
terrorist groups	n								1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
other civil society organisations and groups	n								1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,2
general	n								314
	%	71,0	32,7	35,3	45,3	45,2	10,0	72,1	50,7
whole polities	n								186
	%	25,0	9,6	11,8	42,1	3,2	2,9	60,5	30,0
whole economies	n								33
	%	27,0	0,0	5,9	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,2	5,3
the general public	n								95
	%	19,0	23,1	17,6	3,2	41,9	7,1	10,5	15,3
Total	n	100	52	68	95	62	70	172	619
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 10.2a shows the development of object actor types across the years under study. Between 2000 and 2002 the share of state and party actors of object actors has doubled, while the share of economic interest groups halved. At the first sight this development might have been a consequence of the above presented issue cycles. The issue of “troops deployment” has gained prominence between 2000 and 2002 while the issue of “agricultural policy” has lost prominence. As state and party actors have proved to be relevant object actors of commentaries upon “troops deployment” and economic interest groups relevant object actors of commentaries upon “agricultural policy” there might be a coherence.

Table 10.2c: Object actor type per year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
OBJECT ACTOR	state and party actors	n			124	
		%	12,1	23,3	24,4	20,0
	politicians	n				3
		%	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,5
	former states(wo)men	n				1
		%	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,2
	government/executive	n				67
		%	7,0	9,4	16,2	10,8
	legislative	n				7
		%	1,5	0,4	1,5	1,1
	judiciary	n				2
		%	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,3
	police and internal security agencies	n				2
		%	0,0	0,9	0,0	0,3
	military	n				24
		%	0,0	8,1	3,0	3,9
	central banks	n				9
		%	1,5	0,9	2,0	1,5
	other state executive agencies	n				3
		%	0,5	0,9	0,0	0,5
	political parties	n				6
		%	0,0	1,8	1,0	1,0
	economic interest groups	n				45
		%	8,5	9,0	4,1	7,3
	unions and employees	n				16
		%	5,0	1,3	1,5	2,6
	employers organisations and firms	n				4
	%	0,5	0,9	0,5	0,6	
farmers and agricultural organisations	n				19	
	%	2,0	5,8	1,0	3,1	
economists and financial experts	n				6	
	%	1,0	0,9	1,0	1,0	
media and journalists	n				1	
	%	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,2	
other civil society actors	n				135	
	%	22,6	23,3	19,3	21,8	
educational professionals and organizations	n				14	
	%	1,5	3,1	2,0	2,3	
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	n				5	
	%	0,5	1,3	0,5	0,8	
students, pupils, and their parents	n				45	
	%	7,0	7,6	7,1	7,3	
other professional organisations and groups	n				2	
	%	0,0	0,4	0,5	0,3	
consumer organizations and groups	n				22	
	%	5,5	2,7	2,5	3,6	

migrant organisations and groups	n				29
	%	6,0	4,5	3,6	4,7
racist and extreme right organisations and groups	n				2
	%	0,0	0,9	0,0	0,3
organizations and groups of the elderly	n				13
	%	2,0	1,8	2,5	2,1
women s organizations and groups	n				1
	%	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,2
terrorist groups	n				1
	%	0,0	0,0	0,5	0,2
other civil society organisations and groups	n				1
	%	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,2
general	n				314
	%	56,8	43,9	52,3	50,7
whole polities	n				186
	%	25,1	28,7	36,5	30,0
whole economies	n				33
	%	6,0	5,4	4,6	5,3
the general public	n				95
	%	25,6	9,9	11,2	15,3
Total	n	199	223	197	619
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Positively evaluated object actors

The following tables will analyse which object actors were evaluated positively and which were evaluated negatively by the journalist. In all, there were 388 positive references and 56 negative references to object actors. This pictures clearly that the commentaries tend to aim at positive rather than at negative consequences for certain actors. This might be interpreted in the sense that the commentaries' goal is improvement and that they appear to be rather constructive than destructive. Table 10.3a reveals that commentators speak prevailingly on behalf of German and EU actors. Actors of other countries play a negligible role, whereby actors of other EU member countries are slightly more important than others.

Table 10.3a: Scopes of positively evaluated object actor type per newspaper

	NEWSPAPER				Total	
	Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
supranational: UN	n				3	
	%	1,3	0,0	1,8	0,8	
other supranational	n				2	
	%	1,3	0,0	0,0	0,5	
EU	n				119	
	%	32,1	33,1	28,1	30,7	
multilateral	n				18	
	%	7,7	3,5	1,8	4,6	
bilateral	n				1	
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,3	
germany	n				176	
	%	33,3	48,6	57,9	45,4	
italy	n				2	
	%	0,0	0,7	0,0	0,5	
spain	n				1	
	%	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,3	
other EU-members	n				16	
	%	3,2	4,2	7,0	4,1	
upcoming enlargement countries	n				9	
	%	4,5	1,4	0,0	2,3	
other european countries ex CIS	n				13	
	%	4,5	3,5	1,8	3,4	
turkey	n				5	
	%	1,9	1,4	0,0	1,3	
USA	n				8	
	%	1,3	2,8	0,0	2,1	
Middle East	n				8	
	%	4,5	0,0	1,8	2,1	
Rest of the world	n				7	
	%	3,2	0,7	0,0	1,8	
Total	n	156	142	57	33	388
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 10.3b shows that the scopes of positively evaluated object actors varies greatly across issue fields. Differentiated can be four types of object actor structures. Firstly, nationally rooted commentaries upon “retirement and pension schemes” or upon “educational politics” that aim almost exclusively at national object actors. Secondly and in contrary, rather global commentaries upon “troops deployment that have wide spread object actors in mind: important designations are Germany, the Middle East and the United States. Thirdly, European-national commentaries upon “Monetary politics” or upon “agricultural politics” that both fo-

cus on German and EU actors. Hereby, German actors are far more present in agricultural commentaries. Commentaries about aspects of the “European Integration” form an own category as they aim at an significant degree not only at EU actors but also at actors of other EU member countries or of upcoming enlargement countries. German actors play the least important role as object actors in this category.

Table 10.3b: Scopes of positively evaluated object actor type per policy field

	POLICY FIELD							Total	
	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	European Integration		
supranational: UN	n							3	
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	7,3	0,0	0,0	0,8	
other supranational	n							2	
	%	1,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,5	
EU	n							119	
	%	61,8	43,3	0,0	4,9	0,0	0,0	30,7	
multilateral	n							18	
	%	0,0	0,0	28,6	9,8	0,0	3,4	4,6	
bilateral	n							1	
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,3	
germany	n							176	
	%	25,5	56,7	57,1	24,4	100,0	96,6	45,4	
italy	n							2	
	%	1,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,5	
spain	n							1	
	%	0,0	0,0	2,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,3	
other EU-members	n							16	
	%	3,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,1	
upcoming enlargement countries	n							9	
	%	1,8	0,0	2,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,3	
other european countries ex CIS	n							13	
	%	0,0	0,0	2,4	9,8	0,0	0,0	3,4	
turkey	n							5	
	%	1,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,3	
USA	n							8	
	%	1,8	0,0	2,4	12,2	0,0	0,0	2,1	
Middle East	n							8	
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	19,5	0,0	0,0	2,1	
Rest of the world	n							7	
	%	0,0	0,0	4,8	12,2	0,0	0,0	1,8	
Total	n	55	30	42	41	41	59	120	388
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Negatively evaluated object actors

Table 10.4a pictures the structure of negatively evaluated actors per paper. Again, German and EU actors are most important whereby national actors have a bigger share. The tabloid “Bild” is the only newspaper that emphasises EU actors as negatively evaluated object actors (50 per cent). However, this at a first sight very critical stand towards EU actors has to be seen in relation to the sheer number of commentaries: In all, only two commentaries of “Bild” contained a negatively evaluated object actor.

Table 10.4a: Scopes of negatively evaluated object actors per newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
SCOPE	supranational: UN	n				1
	%	0,0	3,8	0,0	0,0	1,8
	EU	n				13
	%	23,8	19,2	28,6	50,0	23,2
	multilateral	n				3
	%	0,0	11,5	0,0	0,0	5,4
	germany	n				18
	%	38,1	23,1	42,9	50,0	32,1
	france	n				3
	%	4,8	7,7	0,0	0,0	5,4
	italy	n				1
	%	0,0	3,8	0,0	0,0	1,8
	other EU-members	n				2
	%	4,8	3,8	0,0	0,0	3,6
	other european countries ex CIS	n				1
	%	4,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,8
	turkey	n				4
	%	4,8	11,5	0,0	0,0	7,1
	russia	n				1
	%	0,0	3,8	0,0	0,0	1,8
Middle East	n				7	
%	14,3	11,5	14,3	0,0	12,5	
Rest of the world	n				2	
%	4,8	0,0	14,3	0,0	3,6	
Total	n	21	26	7	2	56
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 10.4b shows similar scope foci of negatively evaluated object actors across policy fields as those of positively evaluated object actors. Significant differences are that French actors are relatively often negatively affected by agricultural commentaries and that actors of the

Middle East are the dominant category of negatively affected actors by commentaries upon “troops deployment”. But these differences should not be overestimated as there are altogether only few negatively evaluated object actors.

Table 10.4b: Scopes of negatively evaluated object actors per policy field

	POLICY FIELD							Total
	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	Education	European Integration	
SCOPE	supranational: n							1
	UN %	0,0	0,0	0,0	10,0	0,0	0,0	1,8
	EU n							13
	EU %	10,0	50,0	14,3	0,0	0,0	50,0	23,2
	multilateral n							3
	multilateral %	20,0	0,0	14,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,4
	germany n							18
	germany %	60,0	25,0	42,9	10,0	100,0	50,0	32,1
	france n							3
	france %	0,0	25,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,4
	italy n							1
	italy %	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,8
	other EU-members n							2
	other EU-members %	10,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,6
	other european countries ex CIS n							1
	other european countries ex CIS %	0,0	0,0	14,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,8
	turkey n							4
	turkey %	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	7,1
	russia n							1
	russia %	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,8
Middle East n							7	
Middle East %	0,0	0,0	0,0	70,0	0,0	0,0	12,5	
Rest of the world n							2	
Rest of the world %	0,0	0,0	14,3	10,0	0,0	0,0	3,6	
Total n	10	8	7	10	5	2	14	56
Total %	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

11. Frames

For each commentary that referred to the topic of European integration or that had an European issue scope Frames with a reference to European integration were coded. Due to Table 11.1a between 40 and 50 per cent of the commentaries contained Frames. An exception are the commentaries of “Bild” only referred very seldom to frames.

Table 11.1a Presence of frame by newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild	
No Frame	n					257
	%	57,5	47,3	56,5	87,5	54,4
Frame present	n					215
	%	42,5	52,7	43,5	12,5	45,6
Total	n	181	205	62	24	472
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

As only those frames with a reference to European Integration were coded the distribution of Frames across policy fields described by Table 11.1b seems not to be surprising. Frames were most present in commentaries upon “European Integration”, “Agricultural” and “Monetary politics”, less present in commentaries about “Immigration” and “Troops deployment” and even absent in commentaries upon “Retirement and pension schemes”.

Table 11.1b Presence of frame by policy field

		POLICY FIELD						Total
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	Retirement and pension schemes	European Integration	
No Frame	n							257
	%	69,3	56,8	83,3	81,8	100,0	43,5	54,4
Frame present	n							215
	%	30,7	43,2	16,7	18,2	0,0	56,5	45,6
Total	n	150	44	6	11	1	260	472
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Frames were captured according to four categories: identity frames, instrumental frames, historical frames and frames internal to the European integration process. The first type answers the question: what is the EU and what does it stand for? (e.g., too centralized, over-regulated, subsidiarity, Christian values, peace, loss of sovereignty, equality). The second type answers the question: what is the EU good (or bad) for? (e.g., fight unemployment, high taxes, greater weight in international relations, security). The third type is about positive (e.g. to enlightenment or classical antiquity) or negative (e.g. to past national isolation or to the Cold War) linkages of the EU to historical periods or experiences. The fourth type refers to frames about (alleged) causal linkages between one aspect of European integration and another (e.g. between enlargement and institutional reforms).

Due to Table 11.2a identity frames concerning values and matters of constitution/governance and instrumental economic frames were most important.

Table 11.2a Frame type by newspaper

		NEWSPAPER				Total	
		Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Leipziger Volkszeitung	Bild		
FRAME	Identity frames: values	n				56	
		%	29,9	24,1	18,5	66,7	26,0
	Identity frames: constitution and governance	n				62	
		%	26,0	33,3	22,2	0,0	28,8
	Instrumental frames: economy	n				51	
		%	22,1	23,1	29,6	33,3	23,7
	Instrumental frames: other	n				15	
	%	7,8	3,7	18,5	0,0	7,0	
Historical frames	n				17		
	%	3,9	11,1	7,4	0,0	7,9	
Frames internal to the integration process	n				14		
	%	10,4	4,6	3,7	0,0	6,5	
Total	n	77	108	27	3	215	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

In commentaries about “Monetary politics” it was mostly instrumental economic frames that the journalists referred to (Table 11.2b). In agricultural commentaries frames identity frames concerning values and matters of constitution/governance played an additional role. Commentaries about “European Integration” focused mainly on identity frames while instrumental

frames were less visible. Moreover, historical frames played a significant role in these commentaries.

Table 11.2b Frame type by policy field

		POLICY FIELD					Total	
		Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops deployment	European Integration		
FRAME	Identity frames: values	n					56	
		%	8,7	31,6	100,0	0,0	30,6	26,0
	Identity frames: constitution and governance	n					62	
		%	4,3	26,3	0,0	50,0	36,7	28,8
	Instrumental frames: economy	n					51	
		%	78,3	26,3	0,0	0,0	6,8	23,7
	Instrumental frames: other	n					15	
	%	0,0	10,5	0,0	0,0	8,8	7,0	
Historical frames	n					17		
	%	2,2	0,0	0,0	50,0	10,2	7,9	
Frames internal to the integration process	n					14		
	%	6,5	5,3	0,0	0,0	6,8	6,5	
Total	n	46	19	1	2	147	215	
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

In the course of time identity frames have become less important while instrumental economic and historical frames have gained prominence (Tabel 11.2c).

Table 11.2c Frame type by year

		YEAR			Total	
		2000	2001	2002		
FRAME	Identity frames: values	n			56	
		%	29,5	27,1	19,7	26,0
	Identity frames: constitution and governance	n			62	
		%	29,5	33,9	23,0	28,8
	Instrumental frames: economy	n			51	
		%	22,1	20,3	29,5	23,7
	Instrumental frames: other	n			15	
		%	8,4	5,1	6,6	7,0
	Historical frames	n			17	
		%	5,3	5,1	14,8	7,9
	Frames internal to the integration process	n			14	
		%	5,3	8,5	6,6	6,5
	Total	n	95	59	61	215
		%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 11.3 lists the twenty-five most often mentioned frames. In the context with European Integration commentators most often referred to “democracy”, “economic stability”, “equality among countries”, “inflation” and “community of values” (etc.).

Table 11.3 Twenty-five most often mentioned frames

	n	%
democracy	31	14,4
economic stability	26	12,1
equality among countries	12	5,6
inflation	9	4,2
community of values	7	3,3
transparency	6	2,8
institutional reforms before enlargement	6	2,8
social equality	5	2,3
racism	4	1,9
modernization	4	1,9
international understanding	4	1,9
efficiency	4	1,9
Relation with USA	4	1,9
French German cooperation	4	1,9
enlargement before institutional reforms	4	1,9
national identity	3	1,4
free trade	3	1,4
human rights	3	1,4
bureaucracy	3	1,4
credibility	3	1,4
influence in international relations	3	1,4
costs	3	1,4
consumer protection	3	1,4
Nazi rule	3	1,4
terrorist attacks on USA of 2001	3	1,4
Total		74,4

The following tables will analyse more in depth how the journalists referred to these ideas. For each frame it was coded whether the journalist referred to it in the sense that the EU does not lead to this concept, that the EU does lead to this concept, that the EU should not lead to this concept or that it should lead to this concept. Firstly, the commentators stated that the EU does not lead to efficiency, economic stability, inflation, equality among member countries, democracy, etc. (Table 11.4b).

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

	n	%
efficiency	3	10,7
economic stability	3	10,7
inflation	3	10,7
equality among countries	2	7,1
democracy	2	7,1
transparency	2	7,1
credibility	2	7,1
acceptance of the EU	2	7,1
national identity	1	3,6
community of values	1	3,6
Total		75,0

On the other hand, the commentaries described that the EU does lead above all to democracy, to a community of values, to modernization, to increased influence in international relations, etc. (Table 11.b).

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

	n	% of Frames
democracy	15	32,6
community of values	3	6,5
modernization	3	6,5
influence in international relations	3	6,5
national identity	2	4,3
international understanding	2	4,3
cope with transnational social problems	2	4,3
economic stability	2	4,3
national exports	2	4,3
costs	2	4,3
Total		78,3

Concerning the commentators' vision of the EU, they clearly stated that the EU should not lead to inflation, to an equalization of member countries, to bureaucracy, to racism, etc. (Table 11.4a).

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

	n	%
inflation	4	30,8
equality among countries	3	23,1
bureaucracy	2	15,4
racism	1	7,7
democracy	1	7,7
over regulation	1	7,7
unemployment	1	7,7
Total	13	100,0

Instead, the EU should lead to economic stability, democracy, equality among countries, transparency, social equality, etc. (Table 11.4d).

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

	n	% of Frames
economic stability	20	26,3
democracy	12	15,8
equality among countries	5	6,6
transparency	4	5,3
social equality	3	3,9
free trade	3	3,9
consumer protection	3	3,9
community of values	2	2,6
unity	2	2,6
subsidiarity	2	2,6
Total		73,7

Obviously, the sometimes contradicting results regarding the frames have to be analysed in more in depth to get an understanding how their distribution is influenced by different policy fields, newspapers and the course of time.

References:

Eilders, Christiane and Katrin Voltmer (2003): Zwischen Deutschland und Europa. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Europäisierung der meinungsführenden deutschen Tageszeitungen. In: Medien und Kommunikationswissenschaft M&K (Im Druck).

Gerhards, Jürgen (2000): Europäisierung von Ökonomie und Politik und die Trägheit der Entstehung einer europäischen Öffentlichkeit. In: Bach, Maurizio (Hg.): Die Europäisierung nationaler Gesellschaften. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie. Sonderheft: Westdeutscher Verlag. S.277-305

Koopmans, Ruud & Erbe, Jessica (2003). Towards a European Public Sphere? Vertical and Horizontal Dimensions of Europeanised Political Communication. Paper presented at international conference Europeanisation of Public Spheres? Political mobilisation, public communication, and the European Union, Berlin, June 20-22.

Koopmans, Ruud & Pfetsch, Barbara (2003): Towards a Europeanised public sphere? Comparing political actors and the media in Germany. Paper presented at international conference Europeanisation of Public Spheres? Political mobilisation, public communication, and the European Union, Berlin, June 20-22.

Neidhardt, Friedhelm. (1994). Öffentlichkeit, öffentliche Meinung, soziale Bewegung. in Öffentlichkeit, öffentliche Meinung, soziale Bewegung, edited by Friedhelm Neidhardt. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag. 7-41.

Neidhardt, Friedhelm; Christiane Eilder and Barbara Pfetsch (1998). Die Stimme der Medien im politischen Prozeß: Themen und Meinungen in Pressekommentaren. Discussion Paper FSIII 98-106. Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin.

Page, Benjamin (1996): The mass media as political actors. In: Political Science and Politics 29 (1): 20-25.

Voltmer, Katrin (1998): Medienqualität und Demokratie. Eine empirische Analyse publizistischer Informations- und Orientierungsleistungen in der Wahlkampfkommunikation. Baden-Baden.