

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

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

Funded by: 5th Framework Programme of the European Commission

Contract No. HPSE-CT2000-00046
Work package: **WP 3 (Analysis of newspaper editorials)**
WP Coordinator: Barbara Pfetsch
Deliverable number: D3.3

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

Case report **United Kingdom**

Author: Julie Firmstone

Date: 19 April 2004

Table of Contents

Part I: Analytic Summary	3-15
Part II: Commented Tables	16-113
Appendix: Sample scheme	114-123
Bibliography	124

Part I: Analytic summary

Aims and research questions

This work package focuses on the role of print media as an ‘opinion-leader’ and ‘agenda-setter’ on issues relating to Europeanisation in the national public sphere. On the basis of the political claims made by newspapers on European related issues over a three-year period the report aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the construction of opinion on Europe by the media in the national public domain. In order to build a picture of how the British press communicates its opinion on European integration, the report focuses on three central research questions. The first analyses what kinds of viewpoints on Europe and Europeanisation are evident in the opinion of the press. Here we consider what level of editorial importance newspapers place on European issues by assessing the salience of European topics in opinion leading articles. In addition we look at the types of actors that newspapers construct as being important in the debate by considering which political actors are the focus of newspapers’ claims on European issues. The second research question investigates the ways in which newspapers evaluate EU policies and institutions in editorial articles. This is achieved through the analysis of specific factors such as the position and subjective attitude of newspapers on Europe. The report demonstrates whether newspapers take pro- or anti-European stances, and whether their stance is consistent across issues and policy domains. In addition, we analyse newspapers’ evaluations of European actors. In doing this the report will assess the nature of European integration as a cleavage in the UK press. The final question focuses on the way in which British newspapers communicate their opinion on European integration by analysing the interpretive framing of claims in editorials. Throughout the report comparisons are made between different categories of newspapers sampled in the study (left/right political affiliation; regional/national; tabloid/broadsheet) in order to determine the variations in viewpoints on Europe voiced by different types of newspaper.

The media and Europe

As stated in the Europub project proposal “if politics is based on mediated information, then the mass media is the vital link between the political actors who hold power, the collective actors who challenge them, and the constituencies of the public who provide them with legitimacy”(Koopmans and Statham 2002). As key opinion leaders and agenda setters, the media occupy a potentially powerful place in the political debate over European integration in the public sphere. Through interpretative, evaluative and potentially persuasive content the media provide orientation to the process of opinion formation by making judgements regarding policy, political actors and political decisions (Eilders 2000). Editorial comment represents a newspaper’s decision to first of all select a specific issue on which it wishes to contribute an opinion, and an opportunity for the newspaper to choose to present its opinion on the issue in a particular way. Newspapers intentionally use editorials as an outlet in which to identify issues as key concerns and to make direct calls for action to political actors in a way that is purposively distinct from day-to-day ‘objective’ news coverage in the rest of the newspaper (Firmstone 2003).

Hypotheses and theoretical directions

In the project proposal we hypothesise that the degree and form of Europeanisation evident in the UK public sphere is likely to vary according to certain key factors, such as by actor type, among countries, by policy field, and over time (Koopmans and Statham 2002). While this hypothesis principally applies to the political claims making of actors in the public sphere, it is also relevant to suggest that the degree and form of Europeanisation commented on by newspapers through their editorial voice will vary according to the same key factors. Although it is not applicable to measure for variations between the forms of Europeanisation projected into the public sphere by actor categories, since all newspapers are classified as media actors, it is important to look for differences between newspaper types. We would expect to find variations in the opinions on Europeanisation communicated by each of the four newspapers chosen for the study due to their differences in format and market orientation (broadsheet/tabloid), geographical scope (national/regional) and political affiliation/partisanship (left/right).

Koopmans and Statham (2002) state “differences in the newsworthiness of EU policies and institutions may be expected to occur [between countries] as a function of the degree to which EU integration is a controversial issue in national politics”. Given that European integration has been described as ‘one of the most divisive issues of domestic British politics over the past 50 years’ (Baker 2001) our second hypotheses would be that we would expect to find evidence of Europe as a contentious issue in newspaper opinion leading. Newspapers’ positions, subjective attitudes, evaluations of EU actors and positioning of themselves along cleavages relating to European integration will be taken as indicators of the controversial status of Europe in newspaper opinions. Also drawing on the concept of newsworthiness, a third hypothesis is that we would expect to find differences in the degree and forms of media selection of Europeanised issues for comment across policy domains. Clearly, policy fields where the EU has considerable competences vis-à-vis the national level can be expected to be discussed by newspapers within a European context more than policy fields where the EU has less or no powers. This means that for the policy fields sampled in the study, it would be expected that, in addition to the obvious field of European integration, monetary politics and agriculture would prompt fairly high levels of comment about EU-related issues. Where the EU has some limited responsibilities, as in immigration and troops deployment, we can suppose that fewer issues are likely to be discussed within a European context, and where the EU has little or no relevance, as in retirement and pensions politics or education, hardly any issues are likely to be EU-related. Lastly, a fourth hypothesis is that we believe that Europeanisation is likely to vary across time. Overall, we would expect increased levels of Europeanisation as a consequence of advancing European integration. However, since this section of the project focuses on a three year period (2000-2002), such changes are unlikely to be visible over this relatively short time span.

Drawing on theories developed in the project proposal (Koopmans and Statham 2002) and Koopmans and Erbe’s (2003) recent work on the Europeanisation of the German public sphere, we hypothesise that two different forms of Europeanisation may be communicated by newspapers. The first form relates to vertical Europeanisation, in which case newspapers would increasingly refer to EU-level institutions and policies. Alternatively, newspapers may be carriers of a horizontal Europeanisation through

opinion leading that increasingly refers to actors and policies from other European countries.

The report uses the principles of agenda setting to inform its account of the way that newspapers provide opinions on European integration. According to theories of agenda setting, the agenda setting function of editorials can be seen to operate in two distinct ways. The original concept of agenda setting (McCombs and Shaw 1972), relates to the selection of an issue for editorial comment and the subsequent increase in the salience of the issue in the media. “An agenda is a set of issues communicated in a hierarchy of importance at a point in time”(Dearing and Rogers 1996). In a further stage, termed the “second level agenda setting function”, certain attributes of the issue are communicated and made salient (McCombs, Llamas et al. 1997). McCombs, Shaw and Weaver (1997) have suggested that the concept of ‘framing’ can be considered as an extension of agenda setting (McCombs, Shaw et al. 1997). The report draws on both ‘original’ and ‘second-level’ theories of agenda setting in order to address two of the research questions. First, we analyse what kinds of viewpoints on Europe and Europeanisation are evident in the opinion of the press by examining the salience of the issue of Europe and European actors in editorials using the original concept of agenda setting. Secondly, the theory of second-level agenda setting is drawn on to investigate the interpretive frames used by newspapers to describe European integration. In accordance with the hypotheses referred to earlier, the report considers whether the salience of different viewpoints of Europeanisation varies among issue fields and by newspaper type. In addition, the salience of references to different forms of Europeanisation, vertical and horizontal, will be measured for in newspapers’ opinions.

1. Newspapers as carriers of viewpoints on Europe

Here we give an overview of the kinds of viewpoints on Europe and Europeanisation that are evident in the opinion of the British press. First we consider what level of editorial importance newspapers place on European issues by assessing the salience of European issues in opinion leading articles (1a). Next we will look at the types of actors that newspapers construct as being important in the debate by considering which political actors are the focus of newspapers' claims on European issues (1b).

1.a Issue Salience

Overall, the three most common issue fields commented on by British newspapers were monetary politics, troops deployment and education. These three issues were equally salient in the newspapers' commentaries. European integration was the fourth most salient issue. Pensions and immigration politics were discussed in very few editorials.

Although the field of European integration is fourth in priority of newspapers' editorial agendas, it should be highlighted that a large proportion of UK newspapers' comment on monetary politics relates to European monetary issues. The focus of almost half of all monetary politics editorials is on the common currency and a further 10.5% of claims are on a sub issue connected to the euro – campaigns over the euro. Editorial opinion on issues related to European integration by the British press is mainly spread across four sub issues: the relationship between the EU and national levels, the role of a specific country in the EU, enlargement, and defining the EU's core tasks. Of these sub issues, discussions relating to the role of a specific country in the EU account for almost a quarter of newspapers' editorial comment on integration (24.6%). Looking in more detail at the content of newspapers' claims on this sub issue, the data show that newspapers provided opinion on a range of specific issues. The most common issue was the place of Britain in the EU in terms of the benefits to the UK of EU membership. Also included was the boycotting of Austria by other EU members after the election of Haider, the role of Italy in the EU during its Presidency, the changing nature of the relationship between France and Germany in the EU, and. Just over one fifth of editorial comment on integration was made with reference to the relationship between the EU and national levels (21.5%). Rather than relate specifically to one or other member states, editorials on this sub issue gave opinion on the nature of European integration as a whole in terms of the degree of integration, the nature of future integration, the desirability of the EU forming a federal superstate or not, the issue of qualified majority voting, the possible removal of vetoes, and the Convention on the future of Europe. 17.7% of editorials on European integration gave opinion on the enlargement process. These articles most often related to the need to set a timetable for enlargement and Turkey's bid to join the EU. The fourth most common European topic for comment was discussion of what the EU's core tasks should be. Editorials on this issue related to a range of specific questions including whether the EU should have a rapid reaction force, the role of EU in foreign policy, and whether the EU should restrict itself to being a free trade area rather than becoming further integrated.

Other European integration sub issues such as shared values and identity, institutional structures, relationships between EU institutions and public, budget issues, associational agreements between the EU and non EU countries, personnel issues and non-EU forms of European Integration received little attention in UK opinion leading articles. UK editorial comment therefore focused on the ‘big issues’ of integration to the exclusion of the technicalities and practicalities of running the EU. Discussion of the notion of the creation of shared values and a European identity were notably absent from UK editorials. Therefore, the issue of European integration was of medium salience in UK newspaper opinion and, with the exception of monetary politics, few other policy fields were discussed in an EU context. British newspaper opinion leading is dominated by discussion of the development of European integration and the question of Britain joining the euro rather than specific policy fields where the EU has competencies. Clearly, the euro is a contentious and current issue for the UK in a way that it is not for the other countries in the Europub project that have, with the exception of Switzerland, already joined the single currency. Therefore, we would not expect the concentration of editorial comment on the single currency to be replicated in the newspaper opinion leading of other countries in the project.

The data demonstrated that there are variations in the level of editorial priority given to each issue field and issue scope by individual newspapers. Overall, issues sampled by the Europub project were more salient in the national broadsheets than in the tabloid and regional paper. Each newspaper differed in the level of editorial attention it gave to each issue field. The data showed that with the exception of the Guardian, one particular policy field dominates the editorial agenda in each newspaper: troops deployment (Times), monetary policy (Sun), and education (Scotsman). The two most common issues commented on by the Guardian - education and troops deployment - were almost equal in salience. European integration was not the most commonly commented on issue in any of the newspapers. There are considerable differences in the focus and intensity of comment on each specific sub issue between each paper.

Issue scope salience

The data presented enabled us to see how much of newspapers’ editorial agendas are devoted to providing opinion on issues relating to the European Union in comparison to national UK issues and issues with other scopes. The majority of editorials are focused on issues that have either a national UK scope (39.9%) or a European EU scope (35.4%). Newspapers gave almost no comment on issues in other nation states, and very little comment on issues with scopes higher than the EU. In editorials that did refer to European issues, we saw a far greater degree of reference to vertical forms of Europeanisation (an EU issue scope) than to horizontal forms (issues in other member states). The lack of editorials referring to horizontal Europeanisation can be explained when we consider that any discussion related to issues or in other EU members states would appear in the data as having an EU scope. Therefore discussions of the common currency in terms of issues in other member states such as the Danish referendum and the effect of the euro in Germany would be coded as EU issues.

The Europeanisation of newspaper opinion leading varies significantly by issue field. As would be expected, the main policy fields discussed in the context of the EU in the four newspapers sampled were European integration, monetary politics, and

agriculture. With the exception of the field of European integration, monetary politics is the policy field discussed in the most Europeanised context in the UK. A high proportion (three quarters) of monetary policy editorials had a European scope¹.

The Sun is the only newspaper sampled to comment more on EU issues than on national UK issues. This is due to the high priority given to comment on the euro in the Sun's editorial agenda. The Guardian, Times and Scotsman published similar quantities of editorial comment on issues with an EU scope, with the regional paper giving it least attention. This overview of the balance of the editorial agendas of each newspaper demonstrates the salience of issues is very similar in the two national broadsheet newspapers, but that the tabloid and regional newspaper do not have comparable agendas. More specifically, the tabloid newspaper is biased towards issues with an EU scope and the regional newspaper has a higher than average focus on giving comment on national UK issues.

Initiating events

Dearing and Rogers stress the importance of 'triggering events' in getting an issue onto the media agenda. They define a trigger event as a "cue to action that occurs at a point in time and serves to crystallize attention and action regarding an issue's salience" (Dearing and Rogers 1996). Taking newspaper opinion leading in all policy domains, we can see that the UK press is surprisingly outward looking in the scope of the events that instigate their editorial comment. Although events in the UK national sphere (57.8%) were the most likely to initiate editorial comment in UK newspapers, a surprising proportion of events outside the UK instigated editorial comment from newspapers. In discussing the potential Europeanisation of the public debate represented in UK newspapers it is important to note that just over a tenth of editorials were written in response to an event occurring at the EU level. Specifically considering the field of European integration, it should be noted that a significant proportion of editorials on integration were prompted by events occurring at the national UK level (21.8%). This underlines the continued importance of national politics in the coverage of EU issues in the UK press. British newspapers editorial comment on European integration is structured around patterns of EU organised events such as summits and institutional decision-making. Opinion leading on the integration process in the UK press is therefore event driven. Looking overall at the initiating events for all issue fields, there are few differences in the types of initiating events that prompt individual newspapers to publish an editorial on an issue. Newspapers are most likely to publish an editorial in response to political decisions, communication events partly directed at the media (publications) and non-specified statements.

1.b Actor salience

Overall, state and party actors are the most important actors that UK newspapers feel should be called on to take action or who papers wish to support or criticise on the range of political issues studied. Within the field of European integration almost all claims made by newspapers on the topic are addressed to state and party actors

¹ It should be noted that any discussion related to the common currency either at a national UK level or in other EU member states appears in the data as having an EU scope.

(97.7%). Although there are a number of active pro- and anti-European campaign organizations in the UK², newspapers did not direct any claims at these groups in the field of European integration. A tiny number of claims (6%) were addressed to pro- and anti-European campaign groups in editorials on issues relating to monetary policy. This reflects the focus of UK pro- and anti-European campaign organizations on the specific issue of Britain's membership of the euro rather than other debates relating more generally to the European integration process. On issues inherent to the process of European integration, these interest groups are not seen as important actors to be addressed, supported or criticized by the press.

Overall, newspapers' claims affect the interests of a wide range of actors coming from three main groups: state and party actors, general actors, and civil society actors. Civil society actors are addressed on more occasions on the issue of education (16.1%) than in all other policy fields. This reflects newspapers' claims addressed at educational professionals and organisations. Over half of the actors affected by newspapers' claims on European integration are state and party actors, with the majority of these being government/executive actors. The next most common affected group by newspapers' claims on European integration are general actors, and within this group whole polities in particular. When UK newspapers present opinions on how specific aspects of integration may affect whole polities, they are most likely to give opinion on the benefits and disadvantages of integration to the UK national polity. There are differences in the types of actors most likely to be affected by claims by individual newspapers. For instance, the Sun makes a higher level of claims that affect general actors and the Guardian and the Scotsman make more claims that affect civil society groups. In conclusion, UK newspaper opinion on European issues is orientated around discussion of issues in terms of the actions of state and party actors.

What type of Europeanisation?

A number of conclusions can be made about the scope of the political actors addressed by newspapers. National UK actors are the focus of nearly three quarters (72.2%) of UK newspapers' political claims. Overall EU actors are addressed in 9.3% of claims and only addressed in significant proportions in three issue fields: European integration, monetary politics, and agriculture. EU actors are not the target of any newspaper claims on education or pensions, and feature only in a tiny number of editorials on immigration and troops deployment. These fields are dominated by claims addressed at national actors. Although at least a third of claims in the field of European integration are addressed to EU actors (30.5%), UK newspapers are still more likely to address demands to British national actors (54.5%) than EU actors. Very few, if any, claims about integration are aimed at national actors in other EU countries or in enlargement countries. Therefore, in terms of the actors than newspapers construct as being important in the debate, we can see that a moderate level of vertical Europeanisation is communicated in UK newspaper opinion but almost no horizontal Europeanisation is visible. A large proportion of newspaper commentary constructs a view of European integration that is dominated by UK actors.

² For more details on UK based European campaign groups see: Gray, E. (2003). "Waiting for the Starting Signal: the UK's pro- and anti- euro campaigns." *Working Paper 3/03, EurPolCom, University of Leeds*. Access at - http://newmedia.leeds.ac.uk/eurpolcom/discussion_papers.cfm.

Newspapers operating in different market sectors vary in the scopes of actors that they address. The most striking variation is in the greater proportion of claims addressed at UK national actors by the UK tabloid and regional newspapers (approximately 80%). They focus their claims on UK national actors to a greater degree than the national broadsheets (approximately 66%). This reflects the smaller number of claims addressed at supranational UN, other supranational and national US actors by the Sun and the Scotsman in comparison to the broadsheets. We can conclude that the editorial agenda of UK national broadsheets extends beyond the national arena to a greater extent than tabloids and regional newspapers. This is also reflected in the higher level of resources that broadsheets allocate to newsgathering outside the UK in terms of foreign correspondents.

The calls made by newspapers regarding the way a situation should be dealt with are an additional indicator of the viewpoints of Europeanisation given by newspapers in their editorial comment. The data showed that, with the exception of monetary politics, UK newspapers are less likely to make calls for change in the field of European integration than in other policy areas. In addition, newspapers make less clear and well-defined demands for a situation to change or not to change with regard to European integration than other policy areas. This suggests that UK newspapers make fewer proposals and have fewer expectations for how problems and issues in the field of European integration should be dealt with. Their opinion is less likely to be constructed around concepts of how the issue they are commenting on should be dealt with than on other issues.

2. Newspaper evaluations of Europe

The second research question investigates the ways in which newspapers evaluate EU policies and institutions in editorial articles. Through analysis of specific factors such as the position and subjective attitude of newspapers, the following section demonstrates whether newspapers take pro- or anti-European stances, and whether this stance is consistent across issues and policy domains (2a and b). In addition, newspapers' evaluations of EU actors are discussed (2c).

2a. Position and subjective attitude

Two variables were analysed to measure the specific positions and overall attitudes taken by newspapers' in their evaluations of the integration process: position and subjective attitude. The analysis demonstrated that both the mean position and mean subjective attitude of the UK press towards the issue of integration is a negative one. The overall mean subjective attitude towards the European integration process for all newspapers over the three year period is more strongly negative (-0.33) than the overall mean position of the papers on specific issues (-0.25). The position and attitude of three out of the four newspapers was negative towards the deepening of European integration and the extensions of the rights and positions of European institutions and regulations. Only one newspaper - the left wing broadsheet the Guardian gave a positive evaluation of issues that contribute to the deepening of European integration and the extensions of the rights and positions of European institutions and regulations. However, it is important to highlight two points about the Guardian's evaluation of European integration issues. First, the paper's overall positive evaluation is relatively weak, especially in comparison to the strength of the negative evaluations made by other newspapers. Secondly, the paper's positive position is not consistent across all years as in two of the three years studied the Guardian's mean position was neutral or ambivalent at 0.00. In conclusion, the Guardian only provides a weak opinion on European integration and on many specific issues does not take a clear position for or against the policy or issue.

When newspapers' positions on the issue of EU related monetary politics and the issue of integration were analysed separately we saw that the strength of newspapers' negative positions were greater on monetary politics than on European integration itself. This is important for the UK case and is indicative of the strength of the anti euro sentiment in the in the UK press and the dominance of the issue as a focus for opinion leading on European issues. Unfortunately, it was not possible to analyse newspapers positions towards policy fields other than European integration and monetary politics due to a low quantity of European scope articles in these fields. However, based on the positions demonstrated in the low number of editorials available, it is possible to speculate that UK newspapers may comment on specific issues with a European scope in the fields of agriculture and immigration politics in a more positive way than for issues specifically related to the process of European integration and monetary union.

There were notable differences in the strength of negative evaluations by each newspaper. Both in terms of position and subjective attitude The Sun was identified as the most strongly anti EU paper, followed by the Times and lastly the Scotsman was seen to be the least negative of the three papers opposed to a deepening of the EU. The positions and attitudes of the newspapers were also shown to vary over time.

Notably, the patterns of highs and lows in newspapers' evaluations did not occur in the same years. These temporal variations suggest that even newspapers positioned on the same side of the debate do not follow the same agenda in their editorial comment. Rather, the strength of editorial opinion of each newspaper varies in a unique way. This supports the hypothesis that newspapers use editorials to express their views as autonomous political actors (Eilders 2000). UK newspapers were seen to be acting independently of each other and of the issue of European integration because each of the three anti European newspapers varied enormously in the strength and fluctuations of their negative positions over time. We do not see British newspapers giving evaluative opinions on the EU in the same way at the same points in time, and can therefore not describe UK newspaper opinion leading on Europe as forming a consensual public sphere.

2.b Conflict Lines

The analysis of conflict lines provides evidence of the existence of a cleavage on monetary union in British political debates on European integration. Our initial analysis excluded the specific conflict line relating to monetary union and established that there is a low level of editorial opinion structured along conflict lines related European integration in UK newspapers. However, when the conflict line developed to measure cleavages in opinion on monetary union was included in the analysis the results were very different. The analysis revealed the overwhelming dominance of the monetary union cleavage in UK newspapers' discussions. Three out of the four newspapers studied provided opinion along the cleavage that states are better off outside the euro. In addition to the high proportion of editorials constructed along the monetary union conflict line (60.1%), the analysis showed there to be three main European integration cleavages on which newspapers occasionally provide opinion: the future of Europe(7.1%); enlargement (8.2%); Europe and the USA (5.5%). With regard to the future of Europe, none of the newspapers supported the notion of a federal European Union.

Further analysis uncovered an interesting feature of newspapers' positions on specific aspects of European integration. Some newspapers that aligned themselves on right/conservative/traditional lines (against monetary union) also positioned themselves along left/liberal/progressive conflict lines with respect to widening/enlargement. This demonstrates an important aspect of UK newspaper opinion leading on European integration - even though newspapers may not be in favour of one aspect of European integration such as the euro, this does not result in them taking a negative position towards other aspects of European integration such as enlargement. In particular, the ambiguity of the opinion presented in editorials by the only pro euro UK newspaper, the Guardian, is highlighted by its ambivalent/no evaluation alignment in a significant proportion of editorials constructed along the monetary union cleavage.

2.c Evaluations of EU actors

The data enables us to assess the way in which newspapers evaluate actors in the field of European integration and actors operating at the EU level. Twice as many actors were addressed negatively in the fields of European integration and monetary politics than were addressed positively. This demonstrates that the overall balance of opinion given by newspapers about actors operating in these fields is a negative one. Overall, the actors that newspapers tend to support or address in a positive sense are

concentrated in the UK national sphere. In the specific field of European integration the vast majority of actors addressed either positively or negatively are from the national UK level. Outside of the national domain, only actors in the USA and at the EU level are supported or addressed positively to any great degree. National actors from other countries and actors from a supranational, multilateral or bilateral level are seldom supported. EU level actors were three times as likely to be addressed negatively as they were to be supported by UK newspapers. In contrast, newspapers were almost as likely to give a positive evaluation of a UK national actor, as they were to give a negative evaluation. In general, UK newspapers address a greater degree of negative comment to political actors than positive evaluations. Overall, the tables show a noteworthy balance in newspaper opinions that is more in favour of political actors from the USA than EU level actors. National USA actors were positively assessed in nearly three times as many cases as EU level actors were supported. Furthermore, EU level actors are nearly four times more likely than national USA actors to be to be critically addressed.

Summarising the findings on the differences in the scopes of object actors evaluated positively and negatively in each policy field we can see that few national actors outside the UK and few actors operating beyond the nation state benefit from British newspapers' claims. Overall, EU level actors are three times as likely to be affected negatively by newspapers claims than they are to be affected positively. The interests of EU level actors are only affected positively by claims in two fields – monetary politics and European integration. The importance of national UK actors in newspapers' opinion leading over Europe is apparent from the high proportion of claims in the field that have positive consequences for national UK actors in comparison to EU level actors.

There are notable differences in the evaluations of European actors by each newspaper. While none of the papers address EU actors positively in high numbers, the Guardian is more likely than the other papers to do so. Although the Sun addresses few EU level actors in any sense, it does not address *any* European Union actors positively, and in the few instance when EU actors are addressed they are evaluated negatively. As we would expect of an anti-European title, the Times showed only slightly more than the Sun's zero level of support for EU level actors, and was the most critical of all the newspapers of EU level actors. The fact that EU level actors are not very visible in newspaper opinion leading on Europe has implications for the UK publics' identity with EU leaders and their perception of the EU as a whole. The Guardian was responsible for almost all of the criticism of national USA actors visible in the four newspapers studied. The Scotsman was much more likely than any other newspaper to be critical of UK national actors. In addition, there are differences in the scope of actors positively affected by the editorial claims of individual newspapers. The Times and the Guardian make claims that positively affect a greater proportion of actors operating at a range of scopes other than the UK national sphere.

3. Newspaper framing of Europe

The final research question focuses on the way in which British newspapers communicate their opinion on European integration by analysing the interpretive framing of claims in editorials. Here the report draws on the concept of second level agenda setting to discuss the types of frames most commonly used by UK newspapers to describe European issues. As we would expect for the debate in the UK, the data established that the majority of frames referring to European issues are found in editorials commenting on the policy fields of monetary policy and European integration. Overall, UK newspapers predominantly present their opinion on Europe using three types of frames: constitutional and governance frames, economic frames, and instrumental frames. Constitutional and governance frames most often included specific frames such as federalism, sovereignty, democracy, bureaucracy, legitimacy, corruption and credibility. When newspapers use constitutional and economic frames they are most likely to construct the issue of Europe in the context of the implications for Britain. Economic frames common to UK editorials include descriptions of European integration or the single currency in terms of its implications for the national economy, economic growth, and economic stability. Instrumental frames used in UK editorials most often referred to discussion of the acceptance of the EU by citizens, relations with the USA, and the consequences of European issues for the national interest. Overwhelmingly, British newspapers frame European integration by describing what the EU stands for and what it is good or bad for in terms of the UK, rather than the EU as a whole. With regard to the popular use of specific frames, the tables demonstrated four frames to be common across the UK newspapers: federalism, sovereignty, common currency leads to political integration, and relations with the USA.

The second focus of the discussion was an analysis of the differences between the framing of European integration by individual newspapers. Some of the newspapers were more likely than others to use frames to construct their opinion on European issues. The Sun and the Times used framing more often than the Scotsman and the Guardian. Importantly for our understanding of the way UK newspapers provide opinion on Europe, the data showed there were significant differences between the categories of frames employed by each newspaper. Each of the papers differed in terms of the range of frames used and the dominance of certain categories of frames over others. For instance, The Sun and the Guardian are over twice as likely than the Times and the Scotsman to construct their opinion in terms of economic arguments (24.5% and 34.6% respectively).

4. Overview of opinion leading on Europe by individual newspapers

National tabloid – The Sun

The mean position -0.60 identifies the Sun as the UK newspaper most opposed to European integration.

The focus of the Sun's agenda on Europe is evident from a number of factors:

- The Sun is the only newspaper sampled to comment more on EU issues than on national UK issues.
- The main focus of the Sun's editorial agenda is on monetary politics (37.6%) and it published slightly more than other newspapers on European integration (19.9%). It published more than twice as many editorials on monetary policy than the other newspapers and the majority of opinion on monetary policy given by the Sun related to the euro (62.9%).
- The Sun published a higher number of editorials in reaction to an EU scope initiating events in comparison to the other newspapers (18.8%).

The Sun is twice as likely than other newspapers to position itself along a conflict line in relation to European issues. Thus, relative to other newspapers the Sun constructs its anti European views in a more overt style. On the specific conflict line of monetary union, almost all (97%) of the Sun's editorials that contain a position on the single currency clearly state its attitude against the euro. However, the paper makes fewer calls for action than other newspapers, which suggests that the demands made in opinion pieces do not make clear suggestions for outcomes. This is indicative of the differences in styles of argumentation in British tabloid newspapers in comparison to broadsheets. In addition, the Sun tends to voice its opinion in a way that concentrates on being critical of political actors and issues rather than providing suggestions for solutions to problems. This is evident in the higher proportion of criticised addressees (Table 4.1a), and the lower than average proportion of object actors identifiable in claims by the Sun (see Table 10.1a).

Regional broadsheet – The Scotsman

The Scotsman's mean position of -0.06 on European integration demonstrates that it is the least strongly negative of the three anti European newspapers. The Scotsman is the least likely of all the papers to have published an editorial with a European scope initiating event (6.4%). In addition, the Scotsman is much more likely than other newspapers to publish an editorial in reaction to a national UK event. This can be accounted for by the focus of the Scotsman's agenda on British national issues with a bias towards issues that effect Scotland. Overall, the editorial agenda of the Scotsman focuses on education (32.6%) more than on other policy fields.

National right leaning broadsheet – The Times

The Times was against the single currency in three quarters of the editorials where it gave a position on the monetary union conflict line. The Times has an overall negative position of -0.23 towards European integration. Overall, the editorial agenda of the Times focuses on troops deployment (27.6%) rather than other policy fields. The distribution of the Times' editorial comment on other policy fields is broadly similar to the other broadsheet newspaper the Guardian. The Times was the most critical of all the newspapers of EU level actors.

National left leaning broadsheet – The Guardian

The mean position of 0.10 of the Guardian demonstrates the weakness of the newspaper's positive stance towards European integration. The ambiguity of the opinion presented in editorials by the Guardian (the only pro euro UK newspaper) is highlighted by its ambivalent/no evaluation alignment in a significant proportion of editorials constructed along the monetary union conflict line. Unlike the other newspapers, the Guardian's editorial agenda is spread between the seven issue fields and is not dominated by coverage of any one particular issue. While none of the newspapers address EU actors positively in high numbers, the Guardian is more likely than the other papers to do so. The Guardian uses a greater variety of frame to construct the issue of Europe than the other newspapers.

PART II: Commented Tables

Article-level: General overview

To ensure the compatibility of this work package with data collected in other work-packages (WP2 and WP6), and to allow for cross national comparisons to be made, we measured the editorial agenda communicated in the same four newspapers as have been analysed in other parts of the Europub project. For the UK these were:

- One quality broadsheet newspaper of public record with a (moderate) left-wing political leaning: *The Guardian*
- One quality broadsheet newspaper of public record, with a (moderate) right-wing political leaning: *The Times*
- One tabloid or tabloid-style newspaper catering to a mass, non-elite audience: *The Sun*
- One regional newspaper with a sub-national geographical location in the country: *The Scotsman*

In order to focus on opinion leading by the media, articles were selected only from the daily editorial column of each newspaper. Editorials are defined as the daily leading article representing the collective opinion of the newspaper rather than that of any individual journalist or guest commentator. Unlike in some other European countries, UK newspaper editorials are easily identifiable as they are always located in the opinion or commentary section, and are written anonymously with the title, and often crest, of the newspaper at the top of the column. For instance, in the Sun the editorial is ‘The Sun Says’ and in the Guardian it is the ‘leading article’. In British newspapers an average of three editorial articles are published each day. Editorials relevant to the Europub project’s seven issue fields were selected according to a sample scheme using the Lexis Nexis database. The sample scheme³ required the editorial column of each of the four newspapers to be searched approximately every other day for the years 2000, 2001, and 2002. The following section provides details of the number of editorials collected and coded from each newspaper over the three-year period.

Table 1.1 shows the number of editorials relevant to one of our seven issue fields was higher in 2001 and 2002 than in the year 2000. There were more relevant claims made by the two broadsheet newspapers than by the tabloid and regional paper. It is likely that this can be accounted for by difference in priority given to commenting on political issues by newspapers positioned in different sectors of the market. For instance, in comparison to broadsheet newspapers, populist tabloid newspapers such as the Sun do not provide the same quantity of news or opinion on political issues. As a regional newspaper aimed predominantly at a Scottish readership, the Scotsman publishes less editorials providing comment on the issues included in the project.

³ For the full UK sample scheme see appendix.

Table 1.1: number of commentaries coded per year and paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
2000	25.8	25.5	35.0	22.3	26.9	245
2001	39.5	38.4	26.4	38.1	36.0	328
2002	34.7	36.1	38.6	39.6	37.0	337
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
N	248	263	197	202	910	

As already described, editorial articles are always published in the commentary pages of UK newspapers. They do not appear in any other section of the newspaper. Therefore, Table 1.2 shows that all of the editorials coded were selected from the commentary pages.

Table 1.2: number of commentaries coded per section and paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Commentary pages	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
N	248	263	197	202	910	

The positioning of UK editorial articles in a specific part of the paper and the format that this section takes means that it is not relevant to distinguish between types of editorial articles. Therefore, none of the editorials were recorded as being main commentaries and were all coded as ‘not applicable’. This variable was designed to apply to the newspapers of the other countries in the Europub project.

Table 1.3: number of main commentaries coded per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Not identifiable / not applicable	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
N	248	263	197	202	910	

Editorials where we can see that the newspaper is actively setting its own agenda by running a campaign on an issue have been identified. Campaigns are taken to be instances when it is clear that an editorial has been written in response to/or in order to accompany another article or interview published by the newspaper. For instance, when the paper secures an exclusive interview with Tony Blair in the main section of the newspaper about when Britain is going to join the euro, and the paper then publishes an editorial comment on the contents of that interview. Equally, if the Sun decides to launch a campaign to increase the rights of asylum seekers (but not in response to a government bill or speech or any other political act) then this is defined as a campaign. Running a campaign is evidence of the important status assigned to an issue by a newspaper. It is an attempt by the newspaper to push an issue higher up the news agenda than it would otherwise be. As is clear from Table 1.4, newspapers do not run campaigns often. Therefore, a newspaper’s decision to campaign on an issue signals the significance attached to providing an opinion on the issue by the newspaper’s editorial board. Table 1.4 demonstrates that the Sun has run its own

campaigns on approximately twice as many occasions as the other newspapers. Nearly one in five of the editorials selected were part of the Sun’s campaigning strategy. This is indicative of a ‘bolder’ style of reporting and opinion leading which is a more common characteristic of UK tabloids than broadsheets. The Guardian, Times and Scotsman run significantly fewer campaigns on the issues selected for the project.

Table 1.4: number of newspapers’ own campaigning in commentaries per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
No	91.5	93.5	80.7	94.1	90.3	822
Yes	8.5	6.5	19.3	5.9	9.7	88
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
N	248	263	197	202	910	

Table 1.5 shows that the vast majority of editorials selected did contain a claim by the newspaper. This confirms that newspapers do use their editorial columns to voice their opinion and make their political claims clear.

Table 1.5: number of commentaries with and without a claim

	Frequency N	Percent
No claim	75	8.2
Yes contains claim	835	91.8
Total	910	100.0

Article-level: Initiating events

Editorials are used by newspapers to voice their opinion or stance on an issue rather than as a means of reporting the issue as a news item. Within the British press news reporting and commentating are kept separate from one another through two mechanisms. First, news reports and comment/analysis/editorial articles are placed in different sections of the newspaper. Secondly, in the majority of cases, journalistic function of reporting and commentating are clearly demarcated. The decision to publish an editorial is not necessarily based on the same kind of news agenda that influences news reporting. It was therefore necessary to design a variable to measure what kinds of political or communication events or occurrences stimulate the writing of the editorial. The analysis of these initiating events can answer several questions: What types of event initiate an issue onto a newspaper's editorial agenda? What is the proximity to the UK of the events that prompt a newspaper to comment on an issue?

Table 2.1 demonstrates that in the vast majority of articles it is possible to identify a political or communication act that prompted the newspaper to publish an editorial comment on the subject. In a very small number of articles it was not possible to identify an initiating event (1.3%). Table 2.1a and 2.1b establish the most common initiating event for an editorial article is a political decision (19.7%). This category includes proposals for legislation, parliamentary votes, administrative decisions, and rulings. The second event most likely to prompt comment from a newspaper is a communication event partly directed at the media (18.7%). These are events such as a public speech, a (public) letter, the publication of a book, research reports or leaflets, the presentation of a survey or opinion poll, or a publicity campaign. Non-specified statements are the third most likely type of event to prompt a newspaper to comment (15.2%). For the main part the data is similar across all four newspapers, showing few variations in the types of events or occurrences that prompt newspapers to comment on an issue. The main differences can be seen between the tabloid newspaper and the broadsheets. The Table shows a higher quantity of initiating events attributed to non-specified statements (29.4%) and larger proportion of articles in which no initiating event could be identified (3.6%) in the Sun than in the other newspapers. This category would include comments made by politicians and/or spokesmen where it is not possible to identify when or where the comments were made. For example, if an editorial commented a statement made last week by the Prime Minister but did not identify the particular meeting or event at which he made the statement, then it would be coded as this. The high proportion of editorials based on non-specified statements in Sun editorials is due to the writing style and lack of factual information in the Sun's editorial column. In comparison to broadsheet newspapers, editorial articles in tabloid newspapers are shorter and provide less detailed information. Due to the lack of space, less emphasis is given to providing contextual information about the issue being commented on. Table 2.1a also shows that the Guardian and the Scotsman are more likely than the other two newspapers to comment on issues or events that have been partly directed at the media such as the publication of research reports or presentation of opinion polls.

Table 2.1a Types of initiating events per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
None	1.2	.4	3.6	.5	1.3	12
Political decision	19.4	28.1	13.7	14.9	19.7	179
Executive action	5.6	3.8	.5	4.5	3.7	34
Judicial action	1.2	0	1.0	2.0	1.0	9
Non-specified statement	9.7	12.5	29.4	11.4	15.2	138
Meeting	14.9	17.9	8.1	11.9	13.6	124
Direct-democratic action	3.2	.8	4.6	1.5	2.4	22
Protest action	.8	1.1	.5	1.5	1.0	9
Com. events partly directed to the media	22.6	15.2	14.7	22.3	18.7	170
Com. events directed only to the media	2.4	3.4	1.5	4.0	2.9	26
Com. events initiated by the media	6.0	2.3	7.1	2.0	4.3	39
External political crisis	1.6	3.8	2.5	4.5	3.1	28
Internal political crisis	0	0	0	.5	.1	1
Natural crisis	1.2	2.3	2.5	3.5	2.3	21
Economic developments	4.0	2.7	6.6	5.0	4.4	40
Societal developments	0	.8	0	0	.2	2
Biographical political events	.4	0	1.0	1.0	.5	5
Elections	2.0	2.7	1.5	3.5	2.4	22
Other objective extra-discursive events	3.6	2.3	1.0	5.9	3.2	29
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
N	240	263	197	202	910	

The types of initiating events that prompt a newspaper to give its opinion on an issue vary substantially between issue fields as shown in Table 2.1b. Focusing specifically on the field of European integration we can see that the event most likely to stimulate newspaper comment is a meeting (27.1%). This reflects the increase in attention paid to European integration by the media during EU summits and other meetings organised by European Union institutions. Apart from European integration, meetings are only a common prompting event for one other issue area - troops deployment. This is likely to reflect the editorial comments made in relation to UN summits and

other meetings of trans-national bodies with competences in the field of defence such as NATO. The second most frequent event to initiate comment from the newspapers is a political decision made on European integration policies and issues (19.5%). Political decisions are generally common initiating events in all policy areas, particularly the few editorials published on pensions. In fact, overall we can see that approximately one in five opinion leading editorials are brought about by political decisions. Communication events partly directed at the media – which are mainly the publications of one sort of another - are also identifiable as a prompt for an editorial on European integration in 14.3% of the cases. As in all the issue fields, non-specified statements initiate quite a lot of editorials on European integration (12%).

Table 2.1b Types of initiating events per issue fields (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agri- culture	Immi- gration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
None	2.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	4.0	.5	.8	1.3	12
Political Decision	20.9	25.3	20.9	12.2	44.0	19.7	19.5	19.7	179
Executive Action	2.0	1.0	0	10.2	4.0	3.6	.8	3.7	34
Judicial Action	0	0	3.0	.5	0	2.1	1.5	1.0	9
Non-Specified Statement	15.3	6.1	22.4	17.3	12.0	17.6	12.0	15.2	138
Meeting	6.6	11.1	9.0	21.8	4.0	7.3	27.1	13.6	124
Direct- Democratic Action	5.1	3.0	1.5	.5	0	2.6	1.5	2.4	22
Protest Action	1.5	2.0	0	.5	0	.5	1.5	1.0	9
Com. Events Partly Directed To The Media	15.8	24.2	17.9	17.3	16.0	23.8	14.3	18.7	170
Com. Events Directed Only To The Media	4.6	3.0	0	3.0	4.0	1.6	3.0	2.9	26
Com. Events Initiated By The Media	3.1	1.0	6.0	1.5	8.0	8.3	5.3	4.3	39
External Political Crisis	0	0	9.0	10.2	0	.5	.8	3.1	28
Internal Political Crisis	0	0	0	0	0	0	.8	.1	1
Natural Crisis	.5	19.2	1.5	0	0	0	0	2.3	21
Economic Developments	18.4	0	1.5	0	4.0	0	1.5	4.4	40
Societal Developments	0	0	0	0	0	.5	.8	.2	2
Biographical Political Events	.5	0	1.5	0	0	1.0	.8	.5	5
Elections	3.1	1.0	1.5	1.0	0	1.0	7.5	2.4	22
Other Objective Extra- Discursive Events	.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	0	9.3	.8	3.2	29
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
N	196	99	67	197	25	193	133	910	

Over half (57.8%) of the editorials in the UK are prompted by events from the national UK agenda as shown in Table 2.2a. Two fifths of the editorial articles coded were initiated by events outside the UK political agenda (42.2%). About half of these editorials were prompted by events at a level above the nation state: 12.2% were initiated by European scope events, 4.9% by multilateral events, 5.5% by bilateral

events, 1.5% by both supranational UN and other supranational events. The remaining articles commented on events occurring in other countries such as the USA (5.2%), France (2%), Germany (1.2%), the Middle East (1.5%) and the rest of the world (1.6%). Interestingly, events in the USA are more likely than events in other EU nation states to initiate an opinion piece from a UK newspaper. Table 2.2a therefore demonstrates that events initiated either in the UK or at a trans-national⁴ level are far more likely to stimulate newspapers to give an editorial opinion on an issue than events occurring in other countries.

However, looking more closely at Table 2.2.a we can see that the editorial agendas of individual newspapers differ in terms of the scope of events that initiate comment from the paper. The broadsheet newspapers the Guardian and the Times are more influenced by supranational events than the other papers. Each of the newspapers has published a differing number of articles where the initiating event has been identified as having a European scope. The focus of the Sun's agenda on Europe is evident from the high number of editorials it published after a European scope initiating event in comparison to the other newspapers (18.8%). The Guardian and the Times have produced a similar quantity of editorials with a European initiating event – 13.7% and 10.3% respectively. The Scotsman is the least likely of all the papers to have published an editorial with a European scope initiating event (6.4%). In addition, the Scotsman is much more likely than the newspapers to write an editorial in reaction to a national event. This can be accounted for by the focus of the Scotsman's agenda on national issues with a bias towards issues that effect Scotland. The Guardian was unusual in that it published a higher than average number of editorials initiated by events in the USA (7.7%).

⁴ Here the term transnational is used to refer to events with a supranational UN, other supranational, EU, multilateral or bilateral scope.

Table 2.2a Scopes of initiating events per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
No Event	1.2	.4	3.6	.5	1.3	12
Supranational: UN	1.6	1.9	1.5	1.0	1.5	14
Other Supranational	2.0	3.4	0	0	1.5	14
EU	13.7	10.3	18.8	6.4	12.2	111
Multilateral	5.6	6.1	1.5	5.9	4.9	45
Bilateral	4.8	8.0	4.6	4.0	5.5	50
Germany	.4	2.7	1.0	.5	1.2	11
France	1.2	1.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	18
UK	55.2	52.9	57.4	67.8	57.8	526
Italy	0	.4	.5	.5	.3	3
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	.4	.4	1.0	.5	.5	5
Other EU-Members	.8	1.1	.5	2.0	1.1	10
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming Enlargement Countries	0	.4	0	0	.1	1
Other European Countries Ex CIS	.4	.4	0	.5	.3	3
Turkey	.4	.4	.5	0	.3	3
Russia	0	1.9	0	.5	.7	6
USA	7.7	4.2	4.6	4.0	5.2	47
Japan	.4	0	.5	0	.2	2
Middle East	2.4	1.5	.5	1.5	1.5	14
Rest Of The World	1.6	2.3	1.0	1.5	1.6	15
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
N	248	263	197	202	910	

Table 2.2b indicates that the majority of initiating events to prompt editorial comment on one of the seven issue areas are national in scope. Only editorials on two of the issue areas – troops deployment and European integration - are more likely to be brought about by an initiating event outside of the national UK political debate than an event within it. Editorial comment on two of policy areas – education and pensions – is almost entirely initiated by national events. Initiating events with a European scope are the most common type of event for only one field: European integration itself (45.1%). European scope events are the second most common initiating event for the fields of monetary policy (18.9%) and agriculture (11.1%). It is interesting to note the relatively high number of editorials in the field of European integration that are initiated by national UK events (21.8%). This highlights the importance of the national UK political agenda to editorial opinion leading on European integration. If considered together, events in Germany, France and other EU countries are more important in bringing about newspapers’ comment on issues related to European integration than in other policy fields. Having said that, events occurring in countries other than the UK elicit a similar proportion of editorial comment on monetary politics. The Table shows that the most trans-nationalised issue field is that of troops deployment –nearly a third of all editorials on troops deployment are initiated by multilateral or bilateral events whereas only 24.9% are initiated by national events. This can be explained by restriction of this policy field to issues regarding the deployment of troops across borders i.e. non national instances of troops deployment.

Table 2.2b Scopes of initiating events per issue fields (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agri-culture	Immig-ration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
No event	2.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	4.0	.5	.8	1.3	12
Supranational: UN	0	3.0	0	5.6	0	0	0	1.5	14
Other Supranational	1.5	4.0	0	2.5	0	0	1.5	1.5	14
EU	18.9	11.1	3.0	.5	0	0	45.1	12.2	111
Multilateral	1.5	1.0	6.0	16.8	0	.5	2.3	4.9	45
Bilateral	1.0	0	7.5	16.8	0	0	7.5	5.5	50
Germany	2.6	0	0	1.0	0	0	3.0	1.2	11
France	3.1	1.0	3.0	1.0	0	0	5.3	2.0	18
UK	57.7	75.8	68.7	24.9	96.0	98.4	21.8	57.8	526
Italy	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	.8	.3	3
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	1.0	0	1.5	0	0	0	1.5	.5	5
Other EU-Members	1.5	1.0	1.5	0	0	0	3.8	1.1	10
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming Enlargement Countries	0	0	0	0	0	0	.8	.1	1
Other European Countries Ex CIS	0	0	0	1.0	0	0	.8	.3	3
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.3	.3	3
Russia	0	0	1.5	2.0	0	0	.8	.7	6
USA	6.1	2.0	0	14.7	0	.5	2.3	5.2	47
Japan	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.2	2
Middle East	0	0	1.5	6.6	0	0	0	1.5	14
Rest Of The World	1.0	0	4.5	5.1	0	0	0	1.6	15
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	910
N	196	99	67	197	25	193	133	910	

Section summary:

Looking overall at the initiating events for all issue fields, there are few differences in the types of initiating events that prompt individual newspapers to publish an editorial on an issue. Newspapers are most likely to publish an editorial in response to political decisions, communication events partly directed at the media (publications) and non-specified statements. The publishing of much editorial opinion on European integration in response to meetings and summits suggests that opinion leading on the integration process in the UK press is event driven. Political decisions are also identified as common occurrences on which newspapers make political claims. British newspapers' editorial comments on European integration is structured around patterns of EU organised events such as summits and institutional decision-making. Taking newspaper opinion leading in all policy domains, we can see that the UK press is surprisingly outward looking in the scope of the events that instigate their editorial comment. Although events in the UK national sphere (57.8%) were the most likely to initiate editorial comment in UK newspapers, a surprising proportion of events outside the UK events instigated editorial comment from newspapers. Especially in discussing the potential Europeanisation of the public debate represented in

newspapers it is important to note that approximately a fifth of the editorials were initiated by events occurring at a level higher than the nation state – EU, supranational etc. In particular, just over a tenth of editorials were written in response to an event occurring at the EU level. Specifically considering the field of European integration, it should be noted that a not insignificant proportion of editorials on Europe were prompted by events occurring the national UK level (21.8%). This underlines the continued importance of national politics in the coverage of EU issues in the UK press.

Claim-level: Commentators

As previously explained, all British editorials are written by anonymous journalists on behalf of the newspaper. Therefore Table 3.1a and 3.2b show that all editorials in each newspaper and in each issue field are anonymous.

Table 3.1a names of commentators per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Anonymous	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	228	243	186	173	835	

Table 3.1b names of commentators per issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agri-culture	Immig-ration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
Anonymous	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	172	88	60	182	23	180	130	835	835

This measure evaluates attempts by newspapers to make suggestions to political actors in the public domain about how an issue should be dealt with. Tables 3.2a and 3.2b aim to measure the distribution of newspaper opinions on whether a situation should change, not change or whether the newspaper was ambivalent in its opinion on the needs for change or did not communicate a relevant opinion. We can see from Table 3.2a that, with the exception of the Sun, each of the newspapers uses its editorial voice to provide an opinion on whether a situation should change or not in nearly four out of five of its editorial articles. The Sun is more than twice as likely as the other papers not to express a call for change through its editorial column (50%). As previously mentioned in discussion of Table 2.1a, editorial articles in tabloid newspapers present less factual information and detail than editorial articles in broadsheet papers. These differences from other newspapers reflect the incomplete nature of many of the claims made by the Sun as will become evident throughout the discussion. The paper does not necessarily make it clear which actors their claim would affect or benefit (lack of object actor), and does not make suggestions for how a situation could be changed. With the exception of the difference in editorial style of the Sun, each of the other newspapers are alike in their use of the paper's editorial voice to make suggestions for solutions to issues or calls for action.

Table 3.2a calls for change per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
No call for change/not to change expressed by journalist	22.4	22.2	50.0	21.3	28.3	236
Call for change	67.1	62.1	29.0	64.6	56.6	473
Neutral/ambivalent attitude as to whether change is needed	7.0	6.6	11.3	7.9	8.0	67
Call for the situation to remain as it is	3.5	9.1	9.7	6.2	7.1	59
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	228	243	186	178	835	

Although three out of the four newspapers were very similar in the proportion of editorials in which they called for change or not for change, the proportion of editorials in which papers make these calls differs across issue fields (Table 3.2b). With the exception of monetary politics the newspapers make calls for change in at least half of their editorials. The papers are most likely to make calls for change in the fields of immigration (78.3%), pensions (78.3%), and education (70%). Monetary politics stands out as an issue field where the newspapers are most likely to call for the situation to remain the same (16.9%). It is to be expected that these claims relate mainly to the sub issue of interest rates where newspapers often call on the Bank of England to leave interest rates unchanged. The newspapers use their editorial voice to call for the situation to change in relation to European integration less often than in other policy areas apart from monetary politics.

Table 3.2b calls for change per issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
No call for change/not to change expressed by journalist	36.6	20.5	13.3	34.6	13.0	20.6	33.8	28.3	236
Call for change	36.0	58.0	78.3	58.2	78.3	70.0	48.5	56.6	473
Neutral/ambivalent attitude as to whether change is needed	10.5	14.8	6.7	5.5	8.7	5.0	8.5	8.0	67
Call for the situation to remain as it is	16.9	6.8	1.7	1.6	0	4.4	9.2	7.1	59
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	172	88	60	182	23	180	130	835	

Conflict Lines

The conflict line variable enables us to analyse whether newspapers take a position on side or another of a set of political cleavages common to the debate about Europeanization. These positions are broadly representative of the traditional right/conservative/traditional and left/liberal/progressive cleavages common to politics. Over twenty conflict lines were specifically developed to evaluate the position of newspapers on political cleavages intrinsic to the issues over which the European Union and European integration is contested. Each conflict line was designed to measure different ways in which newspapers suggest a particular political end should be accomplished. For example, how does the newspaper give an opinion of what a fully functioning EU should look like in the future (end): as a ‘Europe of the nations’ where intergovernmental organisation predominates; or as a ‘Federal Europe’ where supranational organisation predominates. Conflict lines were developed to capture the cleavages in the debate over European integration and, in addition, other specific aspects of Europeanisation such as monetary union, and other cleavages relevant to the study’s six substantive issue fields. In order to focus the analysis in national reports on newspapers’ viewpoints on European integration, Tables 3.3a and 3.3b only present data on cleavages specific to European integration rather than conflict lines relating to the other six substantive issue fields.

Table 3.3a conflict lines of commentator per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Leadership in Europe	3.4	0	0	0	1.4	1
Involvement in the European Project	10.3	6.7	10.5	0	8.2	6
Future of Europe	6.9	26.7	26.3	20.0	17.8	13
Political levels	0	0	26.3	0	6.8	5
Decision making within EU	6.9	6.7	5.3	20.0	8.2	6
EU reform	6.9	0	0	0	2.7	2
Values	0	0	0	0	0	0
Citizenship	10.3	0	5.3	0	5.5	4
Political information	3.4	0	0	0	1.4	1
Deepening more/less integration	0	6.7	5.3	30.0	6.8	5
Widening - enlargement	20.7	46.7	0	20.0	20.5	15
Identity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relations between EU MS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Type of entity – economic/political/social	3.4	0	5.3	0	2.7	2
EU influence in the world	3.4	0	5.3	0	2.7	2
Europe and the USA	24.1	0	10.5	10.0	13.7	10
Europe a la carte	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reforms and enlargement	0	6.7	0	0	1.4	1
Level of problem solving	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	73
N	29	15	19	10	73	

Table 3.3 b conflict lines of commentator per issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	European integration	Total	N
Leadership in Europe	0	1.6	1.6	1
Involvement in the European Project	8.3	8.2	8.2	6
Future of Europe	8.3	19.7	17.8	13
Political levels	8.3	6.6	6.8	5
Decision making within EU	8.3	8.2	8.2	6
EU reform	0	3.3	2.7	2
Values	0	0	0	0
Citizenship	16.7	3.3	5.5	4
Political information	0	1.6	1.4	1
Deepening	0	8.2	6.8	5
Widening	0	15	20.5	15
Identity	0	0	0	0
Relations between EU MS	0	0	0	0
Type of entity	0	3.3	2.7	2
EU influence in the world	8.3	1.6	2.7	2
Europe and the USA	41.7	8.2	13.7	10
Europe a la carte	0	0	0	0
Reforms and enlargement	0	1.6	1.4	1
Level of problem solving	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100	73
N	12	61	73	

Analysing the full sample of 835 editorials, Table 3.3a demonstrates that very few UK claims in editorials were made in a way that positioned newspapers along a European integration specific conflict line – 9%⁵. Even when this calculation is applied to editorials where newspapers are most likely to position themselves along European integration specific conflict lines such as all editorials with an EU scope, only one quarter of these editorials contained conflict lines⁶. Taking into account the unique nature of the debate surrounding European integration in the UK and the dominance of the question of monetary union in the debate, it should be considered that UK newspapers may communicate their opinion in terms of conflict lines other than the specific European integration conflict lines analysed in tables 3.3.a and 3.3b. Indeed, a more detailed analysis of the data showed that an overwhelming majority of UK editorials did position themselves along a conflict line not included in the original analysis – monetary union. This extra analysis showed that apart from the European integration specific and monetary union conflict lines, opinion in editorials was constructed along very few other conflict lines. Thus for the UK, where it is virtually impossible to separate the debate on European integration from the debate on monetary union, it would misrepresent the structure of newspaper opinion leading if the conflict line for the single currency was not included in our analysis. Therefore, a new analysis of the UK data was conducted in order to include the significant number of articles that were positioned according to the monetary union conflict line. This extra data is presented in tables 3.3ax and 3.3bx and will be the focus of the following discussion of conflict lines.

The first important point to make is that the inclusion of claims constructed along a monetary union conflict lines raises the proportion of UK editorials with an EU issue scope containing a conflict line from 25% to 61%⁷. Clearly, this is a considerable increase and is ample justification for the inclusion of monetary union conflict lines in the analysis of UK opinion leading. The presence of monetary union conflict lines in so many editorials further emphasizes the magnitude of the issue of the single currency in the national debate over Europe in the UK. Table 3.3.ax illustrates the dominance of monetary policy conflict lines in 60.1% of the editorials. A wide variety of other conflict lines are present in the opinion leading, but most are used in very few articles indeed. Three European integration specific conflict lines appear in higher proportions than the other conflict lines: Widening the EU: enlargement (8.2%), the Future of Europe (7.1%), Europe and the USA (5.5%).

Secondly, Table 3.3ax demonstrates that although all newspapers predominantly position themselves on monetary union, each newspaper varies in the extent to which it communicates its position along other conflict lines. It should also be noted that some newspapers are more likely than others to have published an editorial containing a position on a conflict line. For instance, the Sun positioned itself along a conflict line in far more editorials than the other newspapers: Sun (n=79), Guardian (n=42), Times (n=36), Scotsman (n=26). These relatively small total numbers of editorials

⁵ Calculated by dividing the total number of editorials with conflict lines by the total number of editorials in sample.

⁶ Calculated by dividing the total number of editorials with conflict lines by the total number of editorials with an EU issue scope (total number of editorials with an EU scope= 296. See Table 7.3).

⁷ Calculated by dividing the total number of editorials with EU integration or monetary union conflict lines (n=182) by the total number of editorials with an EU issue scope (total number of editorials with an EU scope= 296. See Table 7.3).

containing conflict lines should be remembered in considering the following evaluation. In instances when newspapers have taken a position on Europe that can be measured using the conflict lines, all of the papers except the Guardian have positioned themselves on monetary union in over 58% of their editorials. The Guardian's comment is constructed along a greater variety of conflict lines than other papers: it uses twelve out of a possible twenty conflict lines. The data show that the Guardian's opinion is divided between three main issue cleavages: –monetary union (31%), widening/enlargement (14.3%), and Europe and the USA (16.7%). The Times and the Scotsman are alike in that they use a smaller variety of conflict lines than the Guardian and the Sun. The majority of editorials in both the Times and the Scotsman communicate their position on monetary union (58.3% and 61.5% respectively). Editorial opinion in the Times is only constructed along two other conflict lines: widening/enlargement (19.1%) and the future of Europe (11.1%). The low number of articles containing conflict lines in the Scotsman means that although it appears that a relatively large number of its editorials give a position on the deepening of the EU (11.5%), this figure only refers to a very small quantity of editorials (3). Therefore, it is more relevant to restrict discussion of the Scotsman's conflict lines to the larger number of editorials structured along the monetary union cleavage (61.5%). Although the Sun positions itself along a variety of conflict lines, the vast majority of its editorials are positioned on the monetary union cleavage (75.9%). In the few other editorials where it has given an alternative position, it is most likely to have done so on cleavages related to the future of Europe (6.3%) and political levels in the EU (6.3%).

Table 3.3ax conflict lines of commentator per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Leadership in Europe	2.4	0	0	0	.5	1
Involvement in the European Project	7.1	2.8	2.5	0	3.3	6
Future of Europe	4.8	11.1	6.3	7.7	7.1	13
Political levels	0	0	6.3	0	2.7	5
Decision making within EU	4.8	2.8	1.3	7.7	3.3	6
EU reform	4.8	0	0	0	1.1	2
Values	0	0	0	0	0	0
Citizenship	7.1	0	1.3	0	2.2	4
Political information	2.4	0	0	0	.5	1
Deepening more/less integration	0	2.8	1.3	11.5	2.7	5
Widening - enlargement	14.3	19.4	0	7.7	8.2	15
Identity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relations between EU MS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Type of entity - economic/political/social	2.4	0	1.3	0	1.1	2
EU influence in the world	2.4	0	1.3	0	1.1	2
Europe and the USA	16.7	0	2.5	3.8	5.5	10
Europe a la carte	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reforms and enlargement	0	2.8	0	0	.5	1
Level of problem solving	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monetary union	31.0	58.3	75.9	61.5	60.1	109
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	182
N	42	36	79	26	182	

In addition to identifying which types of conflict lines are taken by the different newspapers it is important to analyse what side of the cleavage a newspaper positions itself on – right/conservative/traditional or left/liberal/progressive. Taking into account the above evaluation of the proportion of conflict lines in each newspaper, the following analysis of these positions will be restricted to the four most common cleavages in the newspapers: monetary union; future of Europe; enlargement; Europe and the USA. The discussion will focus on the most dominant conflict line, monetary union.

The conflict line for monetary union states opinion on how to achieve the ‘end’ of strong economies and is structured along two cleavages: 1) states are better off outside the euro and not joining the euro is more beneficial to national economies/the EU economy than joining it; 2) monetary union strengthens EU economies – joining it represents the best monetary policy option for EU states and/or the EU in general. Table 3.3x demonstrates that a total of 109 editorial articles were identified where newspapers presented their claim in terms of the political cleavage on monetary union. The analysis shows that three quarters (75%) of the editorials positioned themselves along the anti single currency conflict line that states are better off outside the euro. Only 4% of all editorials positioned a newspaper as supporting the view that

states are better off inside the euro, 7% were ambivalent and 14% made no evaluation along the conflict lines but did refer to the issue in the editorial. Looking at how individual newspapers position themselves along this cleavage we can clearly see the difference in opinion between the pro euro Guardian and the other anti-euro newspapers. The Table also allows us to evaluate the relative strength of newspapers opinion leading on the issue. Here it is interesting to note that nearly all of the editorials in the Sun containing a position on monetary union clearly state its attitude against the euro (97%) with only 3% giving no evaluation. However, while none of the editorials in the Scotsman state a support for the euro, the paper does not state a position in nearly a third of editorials (31%). This has important implications for the strength of the opinion and arguments given by the newspapers. These implications are perhaps even more important when we consider the relative strength of the position put forward by the only pro euro newspaper in the sample, the Guardian. It does not take a consistent positive position in relation to the euro because it gives an ambivalent evaluation of the issue or no evaluation of the issue in over two thirds of its editorials containing an opinion on this conflict line.

Table 3.3x Monetary union conflict lines (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
States are better off outside the euro	0	76	97	56	75	82
Monetary union strengthens EU economies	31	0	0	0	4	4
Ambivalent	31	10	0	13	7	8
No evaluation	38	14	3	31	14	15
Total	100	100	100	100	100	109
N	13	21	59	16	109	

The second most common conflict line that the newspapers position themselves on after monetary union is widening the EU. This cleavage refers to the end vision of an appropriately sized EU with regional stability and is divided between two alternative positions: 1) Don't widen the EU - membership should be kept limited, with other states staying outside the EU structure; and 2) widen the EU – an enlarged EU is beneficial, and non-EU states should be integrated into the EU structure if they meet the convergence criteria. As is shown in Table 3.3ax, only three out of the four newspapers gave a position on this conflict line. Opinion was positive towards widening the EU in fourteen out of the fifteen articles that gave the position a newspaper towards enlargement. In one of the fifteen editorials no evaluation was given.

The third most common conflict line that the newspapers position themselves on after monetary union is the Future of Europe. This cleavage refers to the end concept of a fully functioning EU in the future and is divided between two alternative positions: 1) a 'Europe of the nations' where intergovernmental organisation predominates; and 2) a 'Federal Europe' where supranational organisation predominates, an 'ever closer union'. As with the conflict line on widening the EU, the newspapers only positioned themselves on this cleavage in a small number of editorials (n=13). However, in twelve out of these thirteen articles the newspapers all aligned themselves on the same side of the cleavage: a 'Europe of the nations' where intergovernmental organisation

predominates. None of the newspapers supported the notion of a federal European Union.

The relationship between Europe and the USA is a conflict line used more in Guardian editorials than in other papers (see Table 3.3ax). The end vision of this cleavage is of Europe's position in the world relative to the USA and is divided between two opinions: 1) the USA as sole economic/political superpower – the EU cannot/should not try to equal it; and 2) Europe as effective rival for US – through deeper integration, the EU can be a strong social/economic/political rival to the USA. Although there were only ten editorials published between the Guardian (n=7), the Sun (n=2) and the Scotsman (n=1), it is never the less interesting to point out the differences between the positions of each newspaper. In the opinion of the Guardian the EU should attempt to be an effective rival for US, where as the Sun position was the opposite, and the Scotsman was ambivalent.

Finally, it is appropriate to briefly comment on a conflict line on which the Sun positions itself relatively often but other newspapers do not give a position on: political levels. As shown in Table 3.1.ax, the Sun gives its opinion on how it thinks the EU should function in order to be a competent political organisation (end) in 6.3% of its editorials containing a conflict line. This cleavage is between the positions of: 1) Sovereignty – politics and policymaking are carried out most effectively at nation-state level; and 2) Supra-nationality – shifting competences to the supranational level is necessary for EU politics to function effectively. In all of the editorials giving a position on this cleavage the Sun supports the concept that politics and policymaking are carried out most effectively at nation-state level.

Positions and subjective attitudes towards EU Integration

The following section allows us to analyse the positions and attitudes taken by newspapers on European integration. We can demonstrate the specific positions and overall attitudes taken by newspapers' in their evaluations of the integration process by analysing editorials on European integration or other issues with a European scope. This was done in two ways. First, the position of newspaper opinion on the deepening of European integration and the extensions of the rights and positions of European institutions and regulations was measured. The position was measured for particular aspects of the integration process, so was recorded for each specific sub issue discussed in the editorial. The data on newspaper positions is presented in Tables 3.4a-3.4x. Secondly, a more general evaluation of newspapers' editorial stances towards European integration was also measured to give an indication of the subjective attitude of the newspaper towards the integration process as a whole, rather than on a specific issue. This data is presented in Tables 3.5a-3.5c.

Media positions on issues relating to European integration

Table 3.4a shows the mean position of each newspaper on European integration in each of the three years studied. The positions vary between newspapers: the Guardian assumes a positive stance and the three other papers communicate negative positions. Notably, the cumulative mean position on Europe projected into the public sphere by the four newspapers shown in the total column is negative (-0.25). The cumulative negative position represented by the total mean evaluation of each of the four newspapers only varies slightly between 2000 and 2002.

Focusing on the differences in strength and direction of the positions taken by individual newspapers, the table demonstrates that each newspaper evaluates the issue of European integration in a different way. While the Sun, Times and Scotsman each assume a negative position towards of European integration, there are variations in the strength of their negative evaluations. The Sun's position is consistently negative over the three-year period and the mean of -0.60 shows the high strength of the newspaper's negativity towards European integration. The mean -0.60 identifies the Sun as the paper most opposed to European integration. With a mean of -0.23 the Times also takes a position against issues or policies that would imply a deepening of European integration and/or extensions of the rights and positions of European institutions. The Scotsman's overall mean position of -0.06 towards European integration makes it the least negative of the anti European newspapers. The Guardian is the only newspaper to provide a positive opinion on the issue of European integration (0.10). However, it is important to highlight two points about the Guardian's evaluation of European integration issues. First, the paper's overall positive evaluation is relatively weak, especially in comparison to the strength of the negative evaluations made by other newspapers. Secondly, the paper's positive position is not consistent across all years as in two of the three years studied the Guardian's mean position was neutral or ambivalent at 0.00. In conclusion, the Guardian only provides a weak opinion on European integration and on many specific issues does not take a clear position for or against the policy or issue. Looking at the changes in position among all the newspapers by year then we can see that the strength of each newspaper's position changes each year. It is interesting that the changes in the strength of the mean evaluations by each paper do not occur in the

same years. For instance, the negative evaluation of the Times is strongest in 2000, where as the evaluations of the Scotsman and the Sun are strongest in 2001. Further, the position of the Times goes down from a high strength of -0.38 in 2000 to a low strength of -0.10 in 2001 and rises again to -0.17 in 2002. However, the Sun's position follows a different pattern of change – it rises from a position of -0.47 in 2000 to a high of -0.79 in 2001 and then falls to -0.65 in 2002. Each of the newspapers varies greatly in the strength of their evaluations and the patterns of changes in these positions year to year. This suggests that the editorial opinion of the each newspaper varies in a unique way.

Table 3.4a Position regarding European integration by paper and year

	Year	Mean	N
Guardian	2000	.00	24
	2001	.29	24
	2002	.00	25
	Total	.10	73
Times	2000	-.38	26
	2001	-.10	21
	2002	-.17	24
	Total	-.23	71
Sun	2000	-.47	49
	2001	-.79	24
	2002	-.65	31
	Total	-.60	104
Scotsman	2000	-.05	19
	2001	-.13	8
	2002	-.05	21
	Total	-.06	48
Total	2000	-.29	118
	2001	-.19	77
	2002	-.25	101
	Total	-.25	296

Table 3.4b shows the mean positions taken by newspapers on European scope issues from each of the policy fields. The table demonstrates that although the total mean position of the newspapers is negative (-0.25) they do make positive evaluations in some policy fields. For example, positive positions are assumed for issues with a European scope in the fields of agriculture (0.18) and immigration (0.43). Unfortunately, the calculations of the mean evaluations in these policy fields are based on an extremely low number of editorials. Therefore, it is not possible to make reliable assessments of newspapers' positions on specific policy fields other than European integration and monetary politics. However, it is plausible to make a tentative suggestion that UK newspapers construct their opinion on specific issues with a European scope in the fields of agriculture and immigration politics in a more positive way than for issues specifically related to the process of European integration and monetary union. The table shows that on the two main issues where newspapers comment about the EU, European integration and monetary policy, the press take a negative position (-0.18 and -0.43). Importantly for the UK case, the strength of anti European opinion among newspapers on EU related monetary politics was greater than the negatively evaluations of European integration itself. This is indicative of the strength of the anti euro sentiment in the in the UK press and the dominance of the issue as a focus for opinion leading on European issues. An explanation for the high

level of negative opinion among the newspapers in 2000 (-0.61) compared to other years (2001=-0.30 and 2002= -0.36) may be that newspapers' positions against Britain joining the euro were particularly strong around the launch of the euro as virtual currency in 2000. In contrast to the pattern of a fall in strength of negative evaluations by newspapers on European monetary politics over the three-year period, opinion on European integration and the deepening of the EU rises each year to an overall high of -0.26 in 2002.

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

	Year	Mean	N
Monetary politics	2000	-.61	46
	2001	-.30	37
	2002	-.36	47
	Total	-.43	130
Agriculture	2000	.50	4
	2001	.14	7
	2002	.09	11
	Total	.18	22
Immigration	2000	1.00	1
	2001	1.00	2
	2002	.00	4
	Total	.43	7
Troops	2000	N/a	0
	2001	-.33	3
	2002	.00	1
	Total	-.25	4
Pensions	2000	N/a	0
	2001	N/a	0
	2002	.00	3
	Total	.00	3
Education	2000	N/a	0
	2001	N/a	0
	2002	N/a	0
	Total	N/a	0
European integration	2000	-.13	67
	2001	-.21	28
	2002	-.26	35
	Total	-.18	130
Total	2000	-.29	118
	2001	-.19	77
	2002	-.25	101
	Total	-.25	296

In order to compare the viewpoints of European integration provided by individual newspapers in editorials it is necessary to analyse the positions taken by each paper. Table 3.4c does this for those policy areas where it is possible to measure newspapers' positions in a significant number of editorials: the fields of European integration and monetary policy. Overall and individually, it is clear that opinion in British newspapers is more strongly expressed on European monetary politics (-0.43) than issues relating to European integration itself (-0.18). Monetary union is the focus of UK newspapers' predominantly negative evaluations of the deepening of European integration. The strength of evaluations of monetary union given in editorials varies

between newspapers. The most forceful anti euro position is taken by the Sun at – 0.79, with the Times (-0.29) and the Scotsman (-0.18) assuming somewhat weaker but nevertheless negative positions. On the opposite side of the debate, the Guardian communicates a moderately positive evaluation of the European monetary politics: - 0.07. When compared to the strength of anti single currency opinion given in the Sun, Times and Scotsman, the Guardian’s pro-euro position seems fairly weak. Whilst it is not possible to generalise about the consequences of this for the anti euro debate in the whole of the British press, it is important to note the weak position of one of only five British newspapers that support Britain’s membership of the euro⁸. Furthermore, while the Guardian is often assumed to be a pro European newspaper, we can see from its position on specific issues related to European integration that it is actually neutral or ambivalent in its evaluation of integration. In fact, in two out of the three years studied the Guardian’s evaluations of European integration were predominantly negative (2000= -0.19 2002=-0.29). Similarly, the Scotsman’s anti European monetary politics stance is not replicated in its position towards European integration (0.00). In all years the Scotsman does not communicate a strong position either positively or negatively on integration. Only the Times is (approximately) as strongly negative in its evaluation of European integration (-0.23) as it is of European monetary policy (-0.29).

Table 3.4bx Position regarding European integration by policy field, year and newspaper

	Year	Guardian		Times		Sun		Scotsman		Total	
		Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Monetary politics	2000	.00	5	-.63	8	-.73	30	-.33	3	-.61	46
	2001	.08	12	.00	7	-.92	12	-.17	6	-.30	37
	2002	.09	11	-.22	9	-.79	19	-.13	8	-.36	47
	Total	.07	28	-.29	24	-.79	61	-.18	17	-.43	130
European integration	2000	-.19	16	-.29	17	-.05	19	.00	15	-.13	67
	2001	.63	8	-.22	9	-1.00	9	.00	2	-.21	28
	2002	-.29	7	-.15	13	-.56	9	.00	6	-.26	35
	Total	.00	31	-.23	39	-.41	37	.00	23	-.18	130

The subjective attitude of newspapers towards the integration process as a whole is shown in Table 3.5a. The mean evaluation of each newspaper’s attitude towards European integration is consistent with their mean position on specific policy issues related to European integration demonstrated in Table 3.4a above. Therefore the evaluation of the overall attitude of the Times, the Sun and the Scotsman towards the process of European integration is negative and the mean evaluation of the Guardian is positive. However, in each case the strength of the mean subjective attitude evaluation, both negative and positive, is greater. As a result, the overall mean subjective attitude towards the European integration process for all newspapers over the three year period is more strongly negative (-0.33) than the overall mean position of the papers on specific issues (-0.25) (see Table 3.4a).

⁸ Other pro-euro newspapers are the Express, Mirror, Independent and Financial Times.

Similar variations to those seen in the positions of newspapers can be seen in the patterns of changes in the strength of newspapers' subjective attitudes towards European integration over the three years. For instance, the Guardian's and the Time's evaluations of integration each vary in strength year by year.

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

	Year	Mean	N
Guardian	2000	.50	24
	2001	.67	24
	2002	.56	25
	Total	.58	73
Times	2000	-.62	26
	2001	-.38	21
	2002	-.46	24
	Total	-.49	71
Sun	2000	-.90	49
	2001	-.54	24
	2002	-.97	31
	Total	-.84	104
Scotsman	2000	-.32	19
	2001	-.25	8
	2002	-.43	21
	Total	-.35	48
Total	2000	-.46	118
	2001	-.09	77
	2002	-.36	101
	Total	-.33	296

For the same reasons as discussed with regard to Table 3.4b it is not possible to make reliable assessments of newspaper's subjective attitudes on specific policy fields other than European integration and monetary politics. This is due to the low number of editorials in which newspapers take positions on European scope issues within the fields of immigration, agriculture and pensions politics as shown in Table 3.5b. The figures presented in Table 3.5b for monetary politics and European integration will therefore be discussed in relation to Table 3.5bx below. This table provides information detailed about individual newspapers' subjective evaluations of these fields.

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

	YEAR	Mean	N
Monetary politics	2000	-.76	46
	2001	-.05	37
	2002	-.36	47
	Total	-.42	130
Agriculture	2000	.25	4
	2001	-.43	7
	2002	-.55	11
	Total	-.36	22
Immigration	2000	.00	1
	2001	.50	2
	2002	.00	4
	Total	.14	7
Troops	2000	N/a	0
	2001	.33	3
	2002	-1.00	1
	Total	.00	4
Pensions	2000	N/a	0
	2001	N/a	0
	2002	.00	3
	Total	.00	3
Education	2000	N/a	0
	2001	N/a	0
	2002	N/a	0
	Total	N/a	0
European integration	2000	-.30	67
	2001	-.14	28
	2002	-.34	35
	Total	-.28	130
Total	2000	-.46	118
	2001	-.09	77
	2002	-.36	101
	Total	-.33	296

Table 3.5bx shows two main findings about newspapers' subjective attitudes on European integration. First, as with newspaper positions on specific issues, the mean subjective attitude given by newspapers in editorials evaluates European monetary politics (-0.42) more negatively than European integration (-0.28). Secondly, the strength of newspapers' total mean attitude on both these policy fields is greater than the mean total strength of their position on the same issue fields as shown in Table 3.4bx. In addition to the subjective attitudes of the newspapers towards European integration being stronger than their position towards European integration three of the four papers give more prominent attitudes on European integration than on monetary politics. For instance, the Guardian's subjective attitude to monetary politics is strongly positive (0.54), but is even more strongly positive towards European integration. Similarly, the Scotsman's attitude towards European integration is more negative than its attitude to European monetary politics.

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

	Year	Guardian		Times		Sun		Scotsman		Total	
		Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Monetary politics	2000	.20	5	-.75	8	-.97	30	-.33	3	-.76	46
	2001	.58	12	-.14	7	-.58	12	-.17	6	-.05	37
	2002	.64	11	-.33	9	-1.00	19	-.25	8	-.36	47
	Total	.54	28	-.42	24	-.90	61	-.24	17	-.42	130
European integration	2000	.69	16	-.65	17	-.79	19	-.33	15	-.30	67
	2001	.88	8	-.44	9	-.67	9	-.50	2	-.14	28
	2002	.86	7	-.54	13	-.89	9	-.50	6	-.34	35
	Total	.77	31	-.56	39	-.78	37	-.39	23	-.28	130

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

Due to the fact that editorials in British newspapers are anonymous, there are no relevant data to show the subjective attitude regarding European integration by individual commentator (refer back to Table 3.1 a for further details). This Table therefore replicates the results from Table 3.5a.

	YEAR	Mean	N
Guardian		.58	73
	Total	.58	73
Times		-.49	71
	Total	-.49	71
Sun		-.84	104
	Total	-.84	104
Scotsman		-.35	48
	Total	-.35	48
Total		-.33	296
	Total	-.33	296

Section summary:

The above discussion has explored four variables that enable us to comment on the way in which newspapers construct their political claims on the issue of European integration. Several important points should be highlighted. First, the discussion of the instances where newspapers express opinions calling for change on an issue showed that UK newspapers are less likely to make such calls in the field of European integration than in other fields (with the exception of monetary politics). Newspapers make less clear and well-defined demands for a situation to change or not to change with regard to European integration than other policy areas. This suggests that newspapers make fewer proposals and have fewer expectations for how problems and issues in the field of European integration should be dealt with. Their opinion is less likely to be constructed around concepts of how the issue they are commenting on should be dealt with than on other issues.

The analysis of conflict lines provided evidence of the existence of a cleavage on monetary union in British political debate on European integration. The original analysis, which excluded the monetary union conflict line, established that there is a low level of editorial opinion structured along conflict lines related European integration in UK newspapers. The inclusion of the conflict line developed to measure cleavages in opinion on monetary union in the analysis revealed the overwhelming dominance of the cleavage over the euro in newspapers' discussions. Three out of the four newspapers studied provided opinion along the cleavage that states are better off outside the euro. In addition to the massive proportion of editorials constructed along the monetary union conflict line (60.1%), the analysis showed there to be three main European integration cleavages on which newspapers provide opinion: the future of Europe; enlargement; Europe and the USA. With regard to the future of Europe, none of the newspapers supported the notion of a federal European Union. Further analysis uncovered an interesting feature of newspapers' positions on specific aspects of European integration. Some newspapers that aligned themselves on right/conservative/traditional lines (against monetary union) also positioned themselves along left/liberal/progressive conflict lines with respect to widening/enlargement. This demonstrates an important aspect of newspapers' opinion leading on European integration - even though newspapers may not be in favour of one aspect of European integration such as the euro, this does not result in them taking a negative position towards other aspects of European integration such as enlargement. The ambiguity of the opinion presented in editorials by the only pro euro UK newspaper, the Guardian, is highlighted by its ambivalent/no evaluation alignment in a significant proportion of editorials constructed along the monetary union cleavage.

Two variables were analysed to measure the specific positions and overall attitudes taken by newspapers' in their evaluations of the integration process: position and subjective attitude. The analysis demonstrated that both the mean position and mean subjective attitude of the UK press towards European integration is a negative one. The overall mean subjective attitude towards the European integration process for all newspapers over the three year period is more strongly negative (-0.33) than the overall mean position of the papers on specific issues (-0.25). The position and attitude of three out of the four newspapers was negative towards the deepening of European integration and the extensions of the rights and positions of European

institutions and regulations. Only one newspaper - the left wing broadsheet the Guardian – evaluated issues that would contribute to the deepening of European integration and the extensions of the rights and positions of European institutions and regulations positively. However, in two out of the three years studied the Guardian does provide a clear position for or against European policies or issues. As with the ambivalent position of the newspaper on monetary union conflict lines, this results in an overall weak positive stance. Importantly for the UK case, the strength of anti European opinion among newspapers on EU related monetary politics was greater than the negatively evaluations of European integration itself. This is indicative of the strength of the anti euro sentiment in the in the UK press and the dominance of the issue as a focus for opinion leading on European issues.

There were notable differences in the strength of negative evaluations by each newspaper. Both in terms of position and subjective attitude The Sun was identified as the most strongly anti EU paper, followed by the Times and lastly the Scotsman was seen to be the least negative of the three papers opposed to a deepening of the EU. The positions and attitudes of the newspapers were also shown to vary over time. Notably, the patterns of highs and lows in newspapers' evaluations did not occur in the same years. These temporal variations suggest that even newspapers positioned on the same side of the debate do not follow the same agenda in their editorial comment. Rather, the strength of editorial opinion of each newspaper varies in a unique way.

Addressees, Supporters and Opponents

Analysis of the tables in this section demonstrates what type of actors are communicated as being important in the public debate over Europe by newspapers in their opinion leading articles. By looking at the type of actors that are the target of political claims made by newspapers in their editorial columns we can see who newspapers aim the debate at. An actor is the target or object of a newspaper's claim when the newspaper directly addresses them by calling on them or appealing to them to do or leave something. By addressing an actor in this way newspapers direct their opinion at actors who they think should be held responsible for implementing their claim. These actors can be addressed positively or negatively. In addition, newspapers sometimes do not call upon an actor to do anything, but use their editorial voice to criticize or support an actor. With the exception of Table 4.1a, the following tables 4.1b - 4.3d present aggregated data for all addressees and therefore do not distinguish between actors who have been addressed positively (supported) and actors who have been addressed negatively (criticized). Tables showing disaggregated data for supported and criticized actors will be discussed later (Tables.1b – 6.2b).

Table 4.1a shows the proportion of editorials which contain claims by newspapers targeted at an addressee (either positively or negatively), the quantity of actors who are supported or criticised (opponent) and the cases where no actors were addressed. Very few editorials do not contain a claim by a newspaper that can be identified as being directed at an actor (1.9%). The vast majority of editorials target specific actors and hold them responsible or expect them to act on an issue (86.5%). The two national broadsheet newspapers do not differ in the overall way in which they direct their claims at actors. In contrast, the table highlights some differences in the way the tabloid and Scotsman papers direct their claims to actors. Both newspapers are less likely than the national broadsheets to clearly identify actors whom they expect to act on an issue. Although they do identify addressees in the majority of editorials (79% and 84.3% respectively), they are more likely than the broadsheets to demonstrate support or criticism for an actor. However, it is possible that the higher proportion of supported and opposed actors in editorials by the Sun and the Scotsman is indicative of the higher quantity of actors referred to in their articles. For instance, if more than two addressees were found in an article, the additional actors would be coded as either supported or opponent actors. Therefore, the greater number of opponents and supported actors in Sun and Scotsman may be as a result of a greater number of actors in general being referred to by the newspapers. It is better to postpone further discussion of these differences until subsequent tables that will provide more detailed data on supported and opposed actors.

Table 4.1a: presence of addressee by paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
No indirect object	1.3	2.5	1.6	2.2	1.9	16
Addressee	90.4	90.1	79.0	84.3	86.5	722
Supported actor	7.0	5.8	12.9	9.6	8.5	71
Opponent	1.3	1.6	6.5	3.9	3.1	26
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	228	243	186	178	835	

Table 4.1b shows there are only small differences between the issue fields in terms of newspapers' claims being targeted at specific actors who are expected to act/held responsible. Looking specifically at European integration, we can see that newspapers are just as likely to make claims directed at an addressee about integration as they are about the other issue fields. The fact that there is no difference in the way newspapers demand action from actors on the issue of European integration than on national issues is indicative of the importance of Europe in national UK politics. Further analysis in later tables will allow for more explicit evaluation of the nature of the newspapers' claims.

Table 4.1b: presence of addressee by issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
No indirect object	2.9	5.7	0	1.6	0	.6	1.5	1.9	16
Addressee	80.8	86.4	88.3	86.8	95.7	88.3	88.5	86.5	722
Supported actor	9.9	6.8	5.0	10.4	4.3	10.0	5.4	8.5	71
Opponent	6.4	1.1	6.7	1.1	0	1.1	4.6	3.1	6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	172	88	60	182	23	180	130	835	

Table 4.2a demonstrates the overall proportions of different types of actors targeted by newspapers and, in addition allows for a comparison of these actors between newspapers. Looking at the overall picture for all four papers, we can see that the vast majority, over 90%, of claims made in editorials are addressed at state and party actors. Non-state actors are very rarely the target of newspapers' opinions, with civil society actors accounting for 6.2% addressees, economic interest groups addressed in 2% of editorials, media and journalists in 0.5% of cases, and more general actors such as whole polities in 0.6% of articles. State and party actors are clearly the most important actors who newspapers feel should be called on to take action or who papers wish to support or criticise on the range of political issues studied. Within the category of state actors the government and its executive are most likely to be the target of newspapers' claims. Nearly three quarters (74.6%) of claims are aimed at government/executive actors, with remainder of claims being addressed at political parties, legislative actors (including MPs), central banks, other state executive agencies and central banks.

Although minimal, there are some interesting differences in the types of actors addressed by each newspaper shown in Table 4.2a. For example, the Sun addresses a slightly wider range of actors from different categories than the other newspapers. It is the only newspaper to address the media and journalists (3.3%), and is more likely than the other papers to target its claims at whole polities (2.2%). Particularly relevant to opinion leading on European integration, the Sun is the most likely out of all the papers to address a claim at a pro or anti European campaign group (3.8%). The Scotsman's editorial interest in education is reflected in the slightly above average number of claims it addresses at educational professionals (5.2%) and students, pupils and their parents (1.7%).

Table 4.2a: addressees by paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Politicians	.4	.4	1.6	0	.6	5
Former states(wo)men	.4	0	1.1	0.6	0.5	4
Government/executive	80.4	75.5	71.0	69.5	74.6	611
Legislative	3.1	.4	2.2	8.6	3.3	27
Judiciary	.9	0	.5	0	.4	3
Military	1.8	1.7	.5	0	1.1	9
Central banks	0	3.1	8.4	4.4	2.9	40
Social security organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	0	0	2.1	.5	2.9	11
Political parties	2.7	4.2	4.9	4.6	4.0	33
Sub-total: state and party actors	92.9	92.8	86.9	89.1	90.7	743
Unions and employees	1.8	.4	1.1	1.1	1.1	9
Employers organizations and firms	0	0	1.1	.6	.4	3
Farmers/agricultural organizations	0	.8	.5	0	.4	3
Economists and financial experts	0	0	.5	0	.1	1
Sub-total: economic interest groups	1.8	1.3	3.3	1.7	2.0	16
Media and journalists	0	0	2.2	0	.5	4
Sub-total: media and journalists	0	0	2.2	0	.5	4
Churches and religious groups	0	.4	0	.6	.2	2
Educational professionals & organizations	1.8	3.4	.5	5.2	2.7	22
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	1.8	0	0	0	.5	4
Students, pupils, and their parents	0	0	0	1.7	.4	3
Other professional organizations	.4	0	0	0	.1	1
Consumer organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Migrant organizations and groups	0	.4	0	0	.1	1
Pro- & anti-European campaign groups	.4	.8	3.8		1.2	10
Welfare organizations	0	.4	0	0	.1	1
Racist and extreme right groups	0	0	0	.6	.1	1
Peace movement organizations	0	0	.5	0	.1	1
Organizations of the elderly	.4	0	0	0	.1	1
Solidarity & human rights groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Women's organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	0	0	.6	.1	1
Rebel forces/guerrilla	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil society groups	0	.4	.5	.6	.4	3
Sub-total: other civil society actors	4.9	5.9	5.5	9.2	6.2	51
Whole polities	.4	0	2.2	0	.6	5
Whole economies	0	0	0	0	0	0
General public	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	.4	0	2.2	0	.6	5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	819
N	225	237	183	174	819	

A comparison of the types of actor addressed in each issue field is made in Table 4.2b. Within the field of European integration almost all claims made by newspapers on the topic are addressed to state and party actors (97.7%). The only other two types of actors addressed over the issue are the media and journalists (1.6%) and educational professionals, but there are very few claims indeed addressed to these actors. Surprisingly no claims are directed at pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups in this issue field. In considering how newspapers present an opinion on Europe this is a significant finding of the report. On issues inherent to the process of European integration, these interest groups are not seen as important actors to be addressed, supported or criticized by the press. However, a small number of claims (6%) are addressed to pro- and anti-European campaign groups in editorials on issues relating to monetary policy. These claims are most likely to be made in relation to EU monetary policy such as the single currency. This reflects the focus of UK pro- and anti-European campaign organizations on the specific issue of Britain's membership of the euro rather than other debates relating more generally to the European integration process.

Table 4.2b: addressees by issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agri-culture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
Politicians	.6	1.2	0	1.1	0	0	.8	.6	5
Former states(wo)men	0	0	0	.6	0	1.1	.8	.5	4
Government/executive	58.7	80.7	71.7	87.2	73.9	64.8	89.1	74.6	611
Legislative	1.8	4.8	5.0	.6	0	7.8	1.6	3.3	27
Judiciary	0	2.4	1.7	0	0	0	0	.4	3
Military	0	0	1.7	3.9	4.3	0	0	1.1	9
Central banks	22.2	0	0	.6	0	0	1.6	4.9	40
Social security organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	0	3.6	5.0	0	0	2.8	0	1.3	11
Political parties	6.6	0	6.7	2.8	13.0	2.8	3.9	4.0	33
Sub-total: state and party actors	89.8	92.8	91.7	96.6	91.3	79.3	97.7	90.7	743
Unions and employees	.6	0	1.7	0	4.3	3.4	0	1.1	9
Employers organizations and firms	1.2	0	0	0	0	.6	0	.4	3
Economists and financial experts	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Farmers/agricultural organizations	0	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	.4	3
Sub-total: economic interest groups	2.4	3.6	1.7		4.3	3.9	0	2.0	16
Media and journalists	.6	0	0	.6	0	0	1.6	.5	4
Sub-total: media and journalists	.6	0	0	.6	0	0	1.6	.5	4
Churches and religious groups	0	0	1.7	.6	0	0	0	.2	2
Educational professionals & organizations	0	0	0	0	0	11.7	.8	2.7	22
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	.6	1.2	0	0	0	1.1	0	.5	4
Students, pupils, and their parents	0	0	0	0	0	1.7	0	.4	3
Other professional organizations	0	0	0	0	0	.6	0	.1	1
Consumer organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Migrant organizations and groups	0	0	1.7	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Pro- & anti-European campaign groups	6.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	10
Solidarity & human rights groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welfare organizations	0	0	0	0	0	.6	0	.1	1
Racist and extreme right groups	0	0	1.7	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Peace movement organizations	0	0	0	.6	0	0	0	.1	1
Organizations of the elderly	0	0	0	0	4.3	0	0	.1	1
Women's organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	0	0	.6	0	0	0	.1	1
Rebel forces/guerrilla	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil society groups	0	1.2	0	.6	0	.6	0	.4	3
Sub-total: other civil society actors	6.6	2.4	5.0	2.2	4.3	16.2	.8	6.2	51
Whole polities	.6	1.2	1.7	.6	0	.6	0	.6	5
Whole economies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

General public	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	.6	1.2	1.7	.6	0	.6	0	.6	5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	819
N	167	83	60	179	23	179	128	819	

Showing the types of actors addressed by newspapers in each of the years sampled, Table 4.2c shows there are no major differences in the types of actors addressed each year.

Table 4.2c: addressees by year (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
Politicians	0	.7	1.0	.6	5
Former states(wo)men	.4	.4	.7	.5	4
Government/executive	73.0	71.9	78.3	74.6	611
Legislative	3.7	4.0	2.3	3.3	27
Judiciary	.8	0	.3	.4	3
Military	.8	1.4	1.0	1.1	9
Central banks	1.7	7.6	5.0	4.9	40
Social security organizations	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	1.7	2.2	.3	1.3	11
Political parties	5.4	4.0	3.0	4.0	33
Sub-total: state and party actors	87.6	92.1	92.0	90.7	743
Unions and employees	.8	1.4	1.0	1.1	9
Employers organizations and firms	1.2	0	0	.4	3
Farmers and agricultural organizations	0	1.1	0	.4	3
Economists and financial experts	.4	0	0	.1	1
Sub-total: economic interest groups	2.5	2.5	1.0	2.0	16
Media and journalists	.8	0	.7	.5	4
Sub-total: media and journalists	.8	0	.7	.5	4
Churches and religious groups	.4	0	.3	.2	2
Educational professionals & organizations	3.7	2.2	2.3	2.7	22
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	.4	.7	.3	.5	4
Students, pupils, and their parents	.8	0	.3	.4	3
Other professional organizations	.4	0	0	.1	1
Consumer organizations	0	0	0	0	0
Migrant organizations and groups	.4	0	0	.1	1
Pro- & anti-European campaign groups	2.1	.4	1.3	1.2	10
Solidarity & human rights groups	0	0	0	0	0
Welfare organizations	0	.4	0	.1	1
Racist and extreme right groups	0	.4	0	.1	1
Peace movement organizations	0	0	.3	.1	1
Organizations of the elderly	.4	0	0	.1	1
Women's organizations	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental groups	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	0	.3	.1	1
Rebel forces/guerrilla	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil society groups	0	.4	.7	.4	3
Sub-total: other civil society actors	8.7	4.3	6.0	6.2	51
Whole polities	.4	1.1	.3	.6	5
Whole economies	0	0	0	0	0
General public	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	.4	1.1	.3	.6	5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	819
N	241	278	300	819	

The predominantly national scope of actors addressed by newspapers in editorials is shown in Table 4.3a. Nearly three quarters of all actors who newspapers call upon or actively criticise or support are those operating at the national UK level (72.2%). Although not addressed anywhere near as regularly, EU actors and national US actors are the next most common types of actors to be targeted by newspapers' political claims (9.3% and 7.8% respectively). Interestingly, actors from EU institutions are more likely to be addressed by newspapers than national actors from other European Union member states. National actors from countries elsewhere in the world are very rarely the commented on by British newspapers.

There are some notable differences in the scope of actors addressed by each newspaper. The most striking variation is in the greater proportion of claims addressed at UK national actors by the tabloid (79.2%) and the regional (79.9%) newspapers in comparison with the national broadsheets (66.2% and 66.9%). This reflects the smaller number of claims addressed at supranational UN, other supranational and national US actors by the Sun and the Scotsman in comparison to the broadsheets. The Guardian and the Times address more claims at trans-national actors - supranational UN, other supranational, EU, multilateral and bilateral – than the other papers. In particular, the Guardian addresses a high level of claims at EU actors in comparison to the other newspapers. In terms of national actors from other countries, all of the papers address national US actors to a greater degree than national actors from any other country. The Guardian and the Times target more claims at US national actors than the Sun or the Scotsman.

Table 4.3a addressee scope by paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	1.3	2.1	1.6	2.9	2.0	16
Other supranational	1.8	2.5	0	0	1.2	10
EU	14.2	8.1	7.7	6.3	9.3	76
Multilateral	1.8	.8	1.1	.6	1.1	9
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	.4	1.7	1.1	.6	1.0	8
France	0	.8	2.2	1.7	1.1	9
UK	66.2	66.9	79.2	79.9	72.2	591
Italy	.4	.4	0	0	.2	2
Spain	0	.4	0	0	.1	1
Netherlands	.4		0	0	.1	1
Other EU-members	.4	.8	0	.6	.5	4
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	.4	0	0	.1	1
Other European countries ex CIS	.4	0	0	0	.1	1
Turkey	.9	.8	.5	0	.6	5
Russia		.8	0	0	.2	2
USA	8.9	11.0	3.8	6.3	7.8	64
Japan	0	0	.5	0	.1	1
Middle East	1.3	1.3	0	.6	.9	7
Rest of the world	1.3	.8	2.2	.6	1.2	10
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	818
N	225	236	183	174	818	

An explanation for the relatively high proportion of claims directed at national US actors is visible in Table 4.3b. This table compares the scope of actors addressed by newspapers across policy fields. Looking at the issue fields in which claims were directed at US national actors, it is clear that the vast majority of these claims were made in the field of troops deployment. The claims in this field reflect the calls made by newspapers on US actors in relation to the war in Afghanistan and ‘war on terror’. This is confirmed by the increased level of claims addressed at US national actors in 2001 and 2002 (both years when key events involving the USA in troops deployment took place) shown in Table 4.3c. The majority of calls aimed at supranational UN and other supranational actors by newspapers were also made with reference to troops deployment. Again, an increased level of claims addressed at supranational UN and other supranational actors is visible in 2001 and 2002 and is shown in Table 4.3c.

Looking specifically at the policy fields where EU actors are the target of newspaper opinion leading, we can see that EU actors are only addressed in significant proportions in three issue fields: European integration (30.5%); monetary politics (3.2%); agriculture (12%). EU actors are not the target of any newspaper claims on education or pensions, and feature only in a tiny number of editorials on immigration (3.4%) and troops deployment (1.7%). Even in the field of European integration EU actors are called on in less than a third of editorials (30.5%), where as national UK actors are addressed in over half of the editorials on the topic (54.7%). Very few, if any, claims about integration are aimed at national actors in other EU countries or in enlargement countries. Therefore, in terms of newspapers being carriers of viewpoints on Europeanization only the field of European integration itself could be said to be europeanised in the UK press.

Table 4.3b addressee scope by issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
Supranational :UN	0	2.4	1.7	7.3	0	0	0	2.0	16
Other supranational	0	3.6	1.7	2.8	0	0	.8	1.2	10
EU	13.2	12.0	3.4	1.7	0	0	30.5	9.3	76
Multilateral	.6	0	0	4.5	0	0		1.1	9
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	3.1	1.0	8
France	.6	3.6	1.7	.6	0	0	2.3	1.1	9
UK	77.2	75.9	86.4	43.0	100.0	99.4	54.7	72.2	591
Italy	.6	0	0	0	0	0	.8	.2	2
Spain	0	0	0	.6	0	0	0	.1	1
Netherlands	0	0	1.7	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Other EU-members	1.8	0	0	0	0	0	.8	.5	4
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0	.8	.1	1
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	.6	0	0	0	.1	1
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.9	.6	5
Russia	0	0	1.7	.6	0	0		.2	2
USA	3.0	2.4	0	29.6	0	.6	2.3	7.8	64
Japan	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Middle East	0	0	0	3.9	0	0	0	.9	7
Rest of the world	0	0	1.7	5.0	0	0	0	1.2	10
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	818
N	167	83	59	179	23	179	128	818	

Charting the scopes of actors addressed in editorials in individual years, Table 4.3c shows a slight increase in the quantity of editorials that target their claims at EU level actors over the three-year period from 7.9% to 11%. Although one could take this increase to indicate a rise in the Europeanization of claims making by British newspapers, we must be cautious of making such statements due to the relatively small changes involved. Larger changes are apparent in the number of national UK actors addressed in editorials, which has fallen by about 15% over the three-year period from 80.8% in 2000 to 63.3% in 2002. This move away from addressing national UK actors reflects the increase in actors from the US national sphere targeted in editorials as discussed above.

Table 4.3c: addressee scope by year (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
Supranational: UN	.8	.4	4.3	2.0	16
Other supranational	.8	1.8	1.0	1.2	10
EU	7.9	8.6	11.0	9.3	76
Multilateral	0	1.8	1.3	1.1	9
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	2.1	.4	.7	1.0	8
France	.8	.4	2.0	1.1	9
UK	80.8	74.5	63.3	72.2	591
Italy	0	0	.7	.2	2
Spain	0	0	.3	.1	1
Netherlands	0	0	.3	.1	1
Other EU-members	.8	0	.7	.5	4
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	.3	.1	1
Other European countries ex CIS	0	.4	0	.1	1
Turkey	0	.4	1.3	.6	5
Russia	.8			.2	2
USA	2.9	11.2	8.7	7.8	64
Japan	.4	0	0	.1	1
Middle East	.8	.4	1.3	.9	7
Rest of the world	.8	0	2.7	1.2	10
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	818
N	240	278	300	818	

Table 4.3d demonstrates that all claims targeted at EU actors by newspapers are directed at state and party actors. UK newspapers do not address any comments at non-state actors such as economic interest groups or civil society actors operating at the EU level. In fact, as the Table demonstrates very few non-state actors are addressed by newspapers outside of the UK national sphere.

Table 4.3d: addressee scope by broad addressee category (in %)

	State and party actors	Economic interest groups	Media and journalists	Other civil society actors	General/unknown/unspecified	Total	N
Supranational: UN	2.2	0	0	0	0	2.0	16
Other supranational	1.2	0	0	2.0	0	1.2	10
EU	10.2	0	0	0	0	9.3	76
Multilateral	.9	0	0	4.0	0	1.1	9
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	.9	6.3	0	0	0	1.0	8
France	1.1	0	0	0	20.0	1.1	9
UK	70.9	87.5	100.0	88.0	40.0	72.2	591
Italy	.3	0	0	0	0	.2	2
Spain	.1	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	20.0	.1	1
Other EU-members	.4	0	0	2.0	0	.5	4
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	.1	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Other European countries ex CIS	.1	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Turkey	.7	0	0	0	0	.6	5
Russia	.3	0	0	0	0	.2	2
USA	8.3	0	0	2.0	20.0	7.8	64
Japan	0	6.3	0	0	0	.1	1
Middle East	.9	0	0	0	0	.9	7
Rest of the world	1.2	0	0	2.0	0	1.2	10
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	818
N	743	16	4	50	5	818	

Positively and negatively evaluated Addressees, Supporters and Opponents

The following tables allow for a more detailed discussion on how newspapers present different actor types in terms of positive or negative evaluations. To simplify the analysis and presentation, information from positively addressed addressees and supported actors is combined. Likewise information from negatively addressed addressees and opposed actors is combined. It should be noted that cases where actors were not addressed either positively or negatively (no evaluation), or where a combination of expressions of support and criticism were made by newspapers (ambivalent) are not included in these tables. In addition, to enable comparisons between positively and negatively addressed actors, the following tables are commented on out of sequence. They are discussed in an order that allows comparisons to be made between identical tables for both supported and opponent addresses.

Table 5.1a Positively evaluated Addressees per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Politicians	0	0	1.9	0	.5	1
Former states (wo)men	2.4	0	0	0	.5	1
Government/executive	71.4	70.4	62.3	58.1	65.6	126
Legislative	0	0	5.7	9.3	3.6	7
Judiciary	2.4	0	0	0	.5	1
Military	4.8	3.7	1.9	0	2.6	5
Central banks	4.8	13.0	1.9	4.7	6.3	12
Social security organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	0	1.9	0	4.7	1.6	3
Political parties	2.4	1.9	7.5	9.3	5.2	10
Sub-total: state and party actors	88.1	90.7	81.1	86.0	86.5	166
Unions and employees	2.4	1.9	1.9		1.6	3
Employers organizations and firms	0	0	1.9	2.3	1.0	2
Farmers and agricultural organizations	0	0	1.9	0	.5	1
Economists and financial experts	0	0	1.9	0	.5	1
Sub-total: economic interest groups	2.4	1.9	7.5	2.3	3.6	7
Media and journalists	0	0	3.8	0	1.0	2
Sub-total: media and journalists	0	0	3.8	0	1.0	2
Churches and religious organizations and groups	0	0	0	2.3	.5	1
Educational professionals and organizations'	2.4	5.6	0	4.7	3.1	6
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	7.1	0	0	0	1.6	3
Students, pupils, and their parents	0	0	0	4.7	1.0	2
Other professional organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0

Migrant organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups	0	1.9	1.9	0	1.0	2
Solidarity and human rights organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welfare organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Racist and extreme right organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peace movement organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Organizations and groups of the elderly	0	0	0	0	0	0
Women's organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rebel forces/guerrilla	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil society organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: other civil society actors	9.5	7.4	1.9	11.6	7.3	14
Whole polities	0	0	5.7	0	1.6	3
Whole economies	0	0	0	0	0	0
General public	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	0	0	5.7	0	1.6	3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	192
N	42	54	53	43	192	

An initial observation, also shown in Table 4.2b, is the high proportion of positive and negative claims addressed at state and party actors (shown in Table 5.1b and 6.1b). Table 5.1b demonstrates that state and party actors are the most likely actors to be positively addressed in all issue fields. By comparing tables 5.1b and 6.1b, and looking specifically at the field of European integration we can see that twice as many actors were addressed negatively (n=54) than were addressed positively (n=22) in this field. This is also true of claims addressed at actors in the field of monetary politics (negatively addressed = 63; positively addressed = 32). This demonstrates that the overall balance of opinion given by newspapers about actors operating in these fields is a negative one. All political actors evaluated negatively by newspapers in relation to European integration are state and party actors (100%), and the vast majority are government executive actors (96.3%). While the majority of actors addressed positively by the press are also state and party actors, the newspapers' positive evaluations are spread across a wider range of state and party actors. For instance, only 59.1% of actors supported over European integration are government/executive actors, 13.6% belong are aimed at non-governing political parties and 9.1% address legislative actors. This is indicative of the important role of political parties and members of parliament (coded as legislative) in the UK debate over European integration.

Table 5.1b Positively evaluated Addressees per issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agri-culture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
Politicians	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.5	.5	1
Former states(wo)men	0	0	0	0	0	2.1	0	.5	1
Government/executive	34.4	81.3	53.3	89.7	0	60.4	59.1	65.6	126
Legislative	6.3	0	0	0	0	6.3	9.1	3.6	7
Judiciary	0	0	6.7	0	0	0	0	.5	1
Military	0	0	0	6.9	100.0	0	0	2.6	5
Central banks	34.4	0	0	1.7	0	0	0	6.3	12
Social security organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	0	0	6.7	0	0	4.2	0	1.6	3
Political parties	6.3	0	20.0	0	0	4.2	13.6	5.2	10
Sub-total: state and party actors	81.3	81.3	86.7	98.3	100.0	77.1	86.4	86.5	166
Unions and employees	3.1	0	6.7	0	0	2.1	0	1.6	3
Employers organizations and firms	3.1	0	0	0	0	2.1	0	1.0	2
Farmers and agricultural organizations	0	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	.5	1
Economists and financial experts	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	.5	1
Sub-total: economic interest groups	9.4	6.3	6.7	0	0	4.2	0	3.6	7
Media and journalists	0	0	0	0	0	0	9.1	1.0	2
Sub-total: media and journalists	0	0	0	0	0	0	9.1	1.0	2
Churches and religious groups	0	0	6.7	0	0	0	0	.5	1
Educational professionals & organizations	0	0	0	0	0	10.4	4.5	3.1	6
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	0	6.3	0	0	0	4.2	0	1.6	3
Students, pupils, and their parents	0	0	0	0	0	4.2		1.0	2
Other professional organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Migrant organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pro- & anti-European campaign groups	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	2
Solidarity & human rights groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welfare organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Racist and extreme right groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peace movement organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Organizations of the elderly	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Women's organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rebel forces/guerrilla	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil society groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: other civil society actors	6.3	6.3	6.7	0	0	18.8	4.5	7.3	14
Whole politics	3.1	6.3	0	1.7	0	0	0	1.6	3

Whole economies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
General public	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	3.1	6.3	0	1.7	0	0	0	1.6	3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	192
N	32	16	15	58	1	48	22	192	

Table 6.1a Negatively evaluated Addressees per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Politicians	0	0	0	0	0	0
Former states (wo)men	0	0	0	0	0	0
Government/executive	80.3	82.1	74.6	72.9	77.6	201
Legislative	0	0	0	8.5	1.9	5
Judiciary	1.5	0	1.5	0	.8	2
Military	0	1.5	0	0	.4	1
Central banks	4.5	9.0	6.0	0	5.0	13
Social security organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	0	0	1.5	0	.4	1
Political parties	4.5	3.0	0	6.8	3.5	9
Sub-total: state and party actors	90.9	95.5	83.6	88.1	89.6	232
Unions and employees	3.0	0	1.5	1.7	1.5	4
Employers organizations and firms	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farmers and agricultural organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economists and financial experts	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: economic interest groups	3.0	0	1.5	1.7	1.5	4
Media and journalists	0	0	3.0	0	.8	2
Sub-total: media and journalists	0	0	3.0	0	.8	2
Churches and religious organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational professionals and organizations'	1.5	1.5	1.5	3.4	1.9	5
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	1.5	0	0	0	.4	1
Students, pupils, and their parents	0	0	0	1.7	.4	1
Other professional organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Migrant organizations and groups	0	1.5	0	0	.4	1
Pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups	1.5	0	7.5	0	2.3	6
Solidarity and human rights organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welfare organizations	0	1.5	0	0	.4	1
Racist and extreme right organizations and groups	0	0	0	1.7	.4	1
Peace movement organizations and groups	0	0	1.5	0	.4	1
Organizations and groups of the elderly	0	0	0	1.7	.4	1
Women's organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	0	1.5	1.7	.8	2
Other civil society organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rebel forces/guerrilla	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: other civil society actors	4.5	4.5	11.9	10.2	7.7	20
Whole polities	1.5	0	0	0	.4	1
Whole economies	0	0	0	0	0	0

General public	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	1.5	0	0	0	.4	1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	259
N	66	67	67	59	259	

Table 6.1b Negatively evaluated Addressees per issue(in %)

	Monetary Politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
Politicians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Former states(wo)men	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Government/executive	63.5	91.7	81.0	82.2	100.0	56.8	96.3	77.6	201
Legislative	1.6	0	0	0	0	9.1	0	1.9	5
Judiciary	0	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	.8	2
Military	0	0	0	2.2	0	0	0	.4	1
Central banks	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	3.7	5.0	13
Social security organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	0	0	0	0	0	2.3	0	.4	1
Political parties	4.8	0	4.8	6.7	0	4.5	0	3.5	9
Sub-total: state and party actors	87.3	100.0	85.7	91.1	100.0	72.7	100.0	89.6	232
Unions and employees	0	0	0	0	0	9.1	0	1.5	4
Employers organizations and firms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farmers and agricultural organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economists and financial experts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: economic interest groups	0	0	0	0	0	9.1	0	1.5	4
Media and journalists	1.6	0	0	2.2	0	0	0	.8	2
Sub-total: media and journalists	1.6	0	0	2.2	0	0	0	.8	2
Churches and religious groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational professionals & organizations	0	0	0	0	0	11.4	0	1.9	5
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	.4	1
Students, pupils, and their parents	0	0	0	0	0	2.3	0	.4	1
Other professional organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Migrant organizations and groups	0	0	4.8	0	0	0	0	.4	1
Pro- & anti-European campaign groups	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.3	6
Solidarity & human rights groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welfare organizations	0	0	0	0	0	2.3	0	.4	1
Racist and extreme right groups	0	0	4.8	0	0	0	0	.4	1
Peace movement organizations	0	0	0	2.2	0	0	0	.4	1
Organizations of the elderly	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Women's organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	0	0	2.2	0	0	0	.4	1

Rebel forces/guerrilla	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil society groups	0	0	0	2.2	0	2.3	0	.8	2
Sub-total: other civil society actors	11.1	0	9.5	6.7	0	18.2	0	7.7	20
Whole polities	0	0	4.8	0	0	0	0	.4	1
Whole economies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
General public	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	0	0	4.8	0	0	0	0	.4	1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	259
N	63	24	21	45	8	44	54	259	

Table 5.2a demonstrates that, overall, the type of actors that newspapers tend to support or address in a positive sense are concentrated in the UK national sphere (69.8%). Outside of the national domain, only actors in the USA and at the EU level are supported or addressed positively to any great degree (14.6% and 5.2% respectively). National actors from other countries and actors from a supranational, multilateral or bilateral level are seldom supported (each in less than 3% of editorials). In noting the latter point, it should however be remembered that the actors with these scopes are not addressed in large proportions by UK newspapers in any case, positively or negatively – refer back to Table 4.3a.

Table 5.2a Scope of positively evaluated Addressees per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	2.4	1.9	0	4.7	2.1	4
Other supranational	0	5.6	0	0	1.6	3
EU	11.9	3.7	0	7.0	5.2	10
Multilateral	2.4	0	0	0	.5	1
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	0	1.9	1.9	2.3	1.6	3
France	0	0	1.9	0	.5	1
UK	71.4	55.6	83.0	69.8	69.8	134
Italy	0	1.9	0	0	.5	1
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	2.4	3.7	0	0	1.6	3
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	1.9	0	0	.5	1
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	7.1	22.2	11.3	16.3	14.6	28
Japan	0	0	1.9	0	.5	1
Middle East	2.4	1.9	0	0	1.0	2
Rest of the world	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	192
N	42	54	53	43	192	

Table 6.2a shows a similar pattern for criticised actors. The majority of negatively addressed actors are located in the UK national sphere (68.2%). Again, the only types of actors negatively addressed in proportions meriting comment are those operating at the EU level (16.3%) or national actors from the USA (4.3%). Looking specifically at EU level actors, we can see that they are three times as likely to be addressed negatively (16.3%) than they are to be supported (5.2%) by UK newspapers. National actors from other EU member states are not a focus for criticism for the UK press and are almost never addressed negatively by newspapers (each 1.6% or less). Other than EU actors, actors at the trans-national and supranational level are rarely addressed negatively (each 1.6% or less).

Interesting differences in the way in which individual newspapers present their opinion on actors operating at different levels can be seen by comparing the data for positively addressed actors in Table 5.2a with data for criticised actors in Table 6.2a. Each of the papers vary in the extent to which they have expressed support for EU actors. Notably, the Sun does not address *any* European Union actors positively over the three years sampled (0%). However, when it does address EU level actors it tends to do so negatively (17.9%). In fact, the tabloid addresses very few actors other than national UK actors in a positive sense in comparison to the other newspapers. Over four fifths of the Sun's claims evaluate national actors positively (83%), and the remaining positive assessments are aimed at national USA actors (11.3%). The paper does not evaluate any national USA actors negatively. The Sun neither criticises nor supports actors at the trans-national level, and in most cases does not give *any* evaluation of actors operating above the nation state –positive or negative.

As is common in the editorials of all the newspapers the majority of positively addressed actors in Guardian articles are from the UK national sphere (71.4%). While none of the papers address EU actors positively in high numbers, the Guardian is more likely than the other papers to do so (11.9%). Somewhat surprisingly, it is critical of a slightly higher proportion of EU level actors (13.6%). In addition to positively addressing national UK and EU level actors, the Guardian demonstrated low levels of support for other actors and was the least likely of all the newspapers to positively evaluate national actors from the USA (7.1%). Turning to the types of actors criticised by the Guardian in its editorials, we can see in Table 6.2a that the paper negatively addressed a wider range of actors. Of the actors it negatively evaluated only 57.6% were UK national actors – the lowest proportion of negative UK addressees among all the papers. The Guardian was responsible for almost all of the criticism of national USA actors (15.2%) visible in the four newspapers studied. This reflects the paper's well-known opposition to the US president, George Bush's, approach to the 'war on terrorism'.

Out of all the newspapers, the Times was most likely to give positive evaluations of non UK actors, and, in contrast to the Guardian, demonstrates the highest level of support for national USA actors of all the papers (22.2%). Only just over half (55.6%) of Times actors supported in Times editorials were UK national actors. The Times made almost no criticisms of national USA actors (1.5%). As we would expect of a broadly anti-European title, the Times showed only slightly more than the Sun's zero level of support for EU level actors (3.7%), and was the most critical of all the newspapers of EU level actors (21.2%). In line with the evaluations of each of the

other newspapers the positive assessments of actors by the Scotsman were mainly related to national UK (69.8%), national USA actors (16.3%), or EU level actors (7%). The majority of actors addressed critically by the Scotsman are at either the national UK level (83.1%) or the EU level (11.9%). The Scotsman was much more likely than any other newspaper to be critical of UK national actors. Along with the Times and Sun who also demonstrated support for USA national actors the Scotsman did not address any negative comment to USA national actors.

Table 6.2a Scope of negatively evaluated Addressees per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	0	4.5	1.5	0	1.6	4
Other supranational	1.5	0	0	0	.4	1
EU	13.6	21.2	17.9	11.9	16.3	42
Multilateral	1.5	1.5	0	1.7	1.2	3
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	0	3.0	1.5	0	1.2	3
France	0	0	4.5	1.7	1.6	4
UK	57.6	63.6	70.1	83.1	68.2	176
Italy	1.5	0	0	0	.4	1
Spain	0	1.5	0	0	.4	1
Netherlands	1.5	0	0	0	.4	1
Other EU-members	0	0	0	1.7	.4	1
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	1.5	0	0	0	.4	1
Turkey	1.5	0	1.5	0	.8	2
Russia	0	1.5	0	0	.4	1
USA	15.2	1.5	0	0	4.3	11
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	1.5	1.5	0	0	.8	2
Rest of the world	3.0	0	3.0	0	1.6	4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	258
N	66	66	67	59	258	

Table 5.2b Scope of positively evaluated Addressees per issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agri-culture	Immi-gration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
Supra-national: UN	0	0	0	6.9	0	0	0	2.1	4
Other supra-national	0	6.3	0	3.4	0	0	0	1.6	3
EU	6.3	18.8	0	1.7	0	0	18.2	5.2	10
Multilateral	0	0	0	1.7	0	0	0	.5	1
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	9.1	1.6	3
France	0	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	.5	1
UK	65.6	68.8	100.0	44.8	100.0	97.9	59.1	69.8	134
Italy	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	.5	1
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	4.5	1.6	3
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.5	.5	1
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	12.5	0	0	37.9	0	2.1	4.5	14.6	28
Japan	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	.5	1
Middle East	0	0	0	3.4	0	0	0	1.0	2
Rest of the world	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	192
N	32	16	15	58	1	48	22	192	

Tables 5.2b and 6.2b illustrate the distribution of the positively and negatively addressed claims of the newspapers between actors operating at different levels in each issue field. Looking firstly at the way in which EU level actors are evaluated in each issue field, Table 5.2b demonstrates that very few EU level actors who are positively addressed (5.2%). Moreover, EU level actors are only supported in three of the seven issue areas: Monetary politics (6.3%), agriculture (18.8%), and European integration (18.2%). EU level actors are not addressed at all in the fields of immigration, pensions and education. All positive assessments of political actors in these policy fields are addressed to UK national actors. Positive evaluations of actors involved in the deployment of troops are addressed to either UK national actors (44.8%), USA national actors (37.9%) or in very few cases, supranational UN (6.8%), other supranational (3.4%), EU level (1.7%), multilateral (1.7%) and Middle East actors (3.4%). Looking at both tables 5.2b and 6.2b for the field of European integration, we can see that EU level actors are negatively evaluated (40.7%) by newspapers twice as often as they are positively evaluated (18.2%). In addition, the vast majority of actors addressed either positively or negatively in this field are from the national UK level (59.1% and 51.9% respectively). This reflects the dominance of the question of Britain's involvement in Europe in the UK national debate over

European integration. EU level actors are supported (18.8%) and criticised (20.8%) by newspapers to the same extent in relation to claims in the policy field of agriculture, and are the second most common type of actor to be addressed over agriculture focussed issues. Finally, while newspapers do not positively address many EU level actors over issues regarding monetary policy (6.3%), they are very critical of EU actors in this field (23.8%). Interestingly, national USA actors are twice as likely (12.5%) as EU level actors (6.3%) to be supported by newspapers in editorials on monetary policy.

Table 6.2b Scope of negatively evaluated Addressees per issue field (in %)

	Monetary Politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European integration	Total	N
Supranational: UN	0	4.2	0	6.7	0	0	0	1.6	4
Other supranational	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.9	.4	1
EU	23.8	20.8	0	0	0	0	40.7	16.3	42
Multilateral	1.6	0	0	4.4	0	0	0	1.2	3
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	3
France	0	8.3	5.0	2.2	0	0	0	1.6	4
UK	68.3	62.5	80.0	48.9	100.0	100.0	51.9	68.2	176
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.9	.4	1
Spain	0	0	0	2.2	0	0	0	.4	1
Netherlands	0	0	5.0	0	0	0	0	.4	1
Other EU-members	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	.4	1
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	2.2	0	0	0	.4	1
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.7	.8	2
Russia	0	0	5.0	0	0	0	0	.4	1
USA	0	4.2	0	22.2	0	0	0	4.3	11
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	4.4	0	0	0	.8	2
Rest of the world	0	0	5.0	6.7	0	0	0	1.6	4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	258
N	63	24	20	45	8	44	54	258	

Section summary:

Discussion in this section has presented the findings on what type of political actors newspapers address their claims at:

Actor type: Overall, state and party actors are the most important actors who newspapers feel should be called on to take action or who papers wish to support or

criticise on the range of political issues studied. Within the field of European integration almost all claims made by newspapers on the topic are addressed to state and party actors (97.7%). Although there are a number of active pro- and anti-European campaign organizations in the UK, newspapers did not direct any claims at these groups in the field of European integration. A tiny number of claims (6%) were addressed to pro- and anti-European campaign groups in editorials on issues relating to monetary policy. This reflects the focus of UK pro- and anti-European campaign organizations on the specific issue of Britain's membership of the euro rather than other debates relating more generally to the European integration process. Therefore, on issues inherent to the process of European integration, these interest groups are not seen as important actors to be addressed, supported or criticized by the press.

Actor scope: A number of conclusions can be made about the scope of the political actors addressed by newspapers. EU actors are only addressed in significant proportions in three issue fields: European integration, monetary politics, and agriculture. EU actors are not the target of any newspaper claims on education or pensions, and feature only in a tiny number of editorials on immigration and troops deployment. These fields are dominated by claims addressed at national actors. Although at least a third of claims are addressed to EU actors, UK newspapers are more likely to address demands to British national actors than EU actors in the field of European integration. Very few, if any, claims about integration are aimed at national actors in other EU countries or in enlargement countries.

Evaluations of actors: The tables enabled us to assess the way in which newspapers evaluate actors in the field of European integration and actors operating at the EU level. Twice as many actors were addressed negatively in the fields of European integration and monetary politics than were addressed positively. This demonstrates that the overall balance of opinion given by newspapers about actors operating in these fields is a negative one. Overall, the types of actors that newspapers tend to support or address in a positive sense are concentrated in the UK national sphere. In the specific field of European integration the vast majority of actors addressed either positively or negatively are from the national UK level. Outside of the national domain, only actors in the USA and at the EU level are supported or addressed positively to any great degree. National actors from other countries and actors from a supranational, multilateral or bilateral level are seldom supported. EU level actors were three times as likely to be addressed negatively than they are to be supported by UK newspapers. In contrast, newspapers were roughly as likely to give a positive evaluation of a UK national actor, as they were to give a negative evaluation. In general, UK newspapers address a greater degree of negative comment to political actors than positive evaluations. Overall, the tables show an interesting balance in newspaper opinions that is more in favour of political actors from the USA than EU level actors. National USA actors were positively assessed in nearly three times as many cases as EU level actors were supported. Furthermore, EU level actors are nearly four times more likely than national USA actors to be to be critically addressed.

Comparisons between newspapers: The most striking variation is in the greater proportion of claims addressed at UK national actors by The UK tabloid and regional newspapers focussed their claims on UK national actors to a greater degree than the national broadsheets. This reflects the smaller number of claims addressed at

supranational UN, other supranational and national US actors by the Sun and the Scotsman in comparison to the broadsheets. There are notable differences in the evaluations of European actors by each newspaper. While none of the papers address EU actors positively in high numbers, the Guardian is more likely than the other papers to do so. Although the Sun addresses few EU level actors in any sense, it does not address *any* European Union actors positively, and in the few instance when EU actors are addressed they are evaluated negatively. As we would expect of a broadly anti-European title, the Times showed only slightly more than the Sun's zero level of support for EU level actors, and was the most critical of all the newspapers of EU level actors. The Guardian was responsible for almost all of the criticism of national USA actors visible in the four newspapers studied. The Scotsman was much more likely than any other newspaper to be critical of UK national actors.

Issues and aims per paper

The following section reports on several main features of the way in which different policy fields are commented on by UK newspapers in editorial articles. The first table (7.1) analyses the proportion of claims made by each newspaper in each policy field. The next two tables focus specifically on two issue fields where there has been most discussion of European issues in the UK public sphere – monetary policy and European integration (7.2a and 7.2g). The tables show the distribution of claims made by each newspaper in relation to the specific sub issue areas in these two policy fields. Table 7.3 allows us to examine the overall proportion of comment given by newspapers in relation to issues with different scopes. Here we can see how much of each newspaper's editorial agenda is given to providing opinion on issues relating to the European Union in comparison to national UK issues and issues with other scopes. The next Table (7.4) demonstrates the proportion of newspapers' claims in editorials that refer to European issues. Here we can assess the degree of Europeanisation of UK newspapers' opinion leading in each field. Next, a set of tables gives the same information on scope separately for each policy field and allows for the differences in opinion leading by individual newspapers to be investigated (7.5a-g). Finally, several tables show the changes in specific sub-issues commented on by the press over the three year period sample in the project (8.2a-g).

Table 7.1 shows the distribution of editorial comment in each policy field by each newspaper. The data illustrate that three issue fields - monetary politics, troops deployment and education - were the focus of almost two thirds of newspaper editorials between 2000-2002. Overall, these three fields were equally salient in the newspapers' commentary and each of the three policy areas were addressed in approximately a fifth of the editorial agenda - 20.6%, 21.8% and 21.6% respectively. European integration was the next most salient issue and was commented on in 15.6% of newspaper editorials. The least salient issues in newspapers' opinion leading were agriculture (10.5%), immigration (7.2%) and pensions (2.8%).

There are several notable variations among newspapers in the proportion of editorial articles published on each policy field. Given that the editorials were collected from each newspaper on exactly the same days⁹, the differences between papers show the variation in editorial priority given to each issue. Looking at the total number of editorials published by each paper on any one of the seven issue fields, we can see that the Times and the Guardian made a greater level of claims than the Sun and Scotsman. The Table demonstrates that each newspaper pursued a different agenda in terms of what issues it chose to give its opinion on in editorials. For example, while the four issues of monetary politics, troops deployment, education and European integration were popular issues on the editorial agenda of all the newspapers, they were given different levels of attention by each paper. The Guardian gave a similar proportion of attention to giving comment on education (24.1%), troops deployment (21.9%), and monetary politics (17.5%). European integration was the fourth most common issue on the Guardian's agenda (13.6%). The Times was principally concerned with providing opinion on troops deployment. It commented on troops deployment in over quarter of its editorial articles (27.6%) – more than any of the other newspapers. The policy areas of education (18.5%), monetary politics (16%),

⁹ See appendix 2 for sample scheme.

and European integration (16%) account for a roughly equal proportion of Times editorials. In comparison to the other newspapers a substantial amount of the Sun’s editorial comment is devoted to giving opinion on monetary policy (37.6%). European integration is the second most common issue for editorial comment in the Sun (19.9%). Although the Scotsman is similar to the Guardian in the order of editorial attention paid to each issue – education (32.6%), troops deployment (20.8%), monetary politics (12.9%), European integration (12.9%) – comment on education accounts for a much larger proportion of the Scotsman’s editorial comment (32.6%) than the Guardian, or indeed any other newspaper. The data show that with the exception of the Guardian, one particular policy field dominates the editorial agenda in each newspaper: troops deployment (Times), monetary policy (Sun), education (Scotsman). To summarise, there are differences in the proportion of claims made in each policy field by individual newspapers. In some policy fields these difference are relatively small (immigration, pensions, European integration), where as in other fields the differences between newspapers are more notable (monetary politics, agriculture, troops deployment, and education). In considering the view of Europe given in editorials, it is important to highlight the ‘average’ level of attention given to the field of European integration by each of the newspapers placed the issue in the middle of the hierarchy of issues commented on in each of newspapers agendas with the exception of the Sun.

Table 7.1 policy field per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Monetary politics	17.5	16.0	37.6	12.9	20.6	172
Agriculture	10.5	13.6	5.9	11.2	10.5	88
Immigration	7.9	5.8	8.1	7.3	7.2	60
Troops	21.9	27.6	15.1	20.8	21.8	182
Pensions	4.4	2.5	1.6	2.2	2.8	23
Education	24.1	18.5	11.8	32.6	21.6	180
European Integration	13.6	16.0	19.9	12.9	15.6	130
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	228	243	186	178	835	

Table 7.2a illustrates that claims made by the UK press in the policy field of monetary politics have been concentrated in two main sub-issue areas: – the common currency (48.3%) and interest rate adjustments (29.7%). Therefore the focus of almost half of all monetary politics editorials is on the common currency and a further 10.5% of claims are on a sub issue connected to the euro – the dynamics of euro campaigns. The high place of these issues on newspapers’ agendas reflects the dominance of the debate surrounding the question of Britain’s membership of the single currency in the UK public sphere. The relative paucity of claims by all newspapers in the specific policy areas of EMU convergence criteria and the stability pact, and the independence of central banks are due to the place of the UK outside the euro zone. These issues are therefore less relevant to the UK than to the other countries in the Europub project. In addition, because this work package analyses editorials from the recent time period of 2000-2002, there are almost no claims relating to the issue of EMS/ERM which was only a relevant part of the debate in the early 1990s.

Looking in more detail at the distribution of editorial comment on each sub issue by newspaper, it is clear that the mean total of editorials commenting on sub issues

relating to the euro is heightened by the above average number of editorials published by one newspaper – the Sun - on the two issues of the euro and euro campaigns. As has been shown in Table 7.1, monetary politics is the central focus of the Sun's editorial agenda. Table 7.2a shows that the vast majority of the Sun's editorial comment on monetary policy relates to either the euro or the dynamics of euro campaigns and accounts for a total of 82.9% of the Sun's claims in this field. The regional anti European newspaper the Scotsman also devotes a larger than average proportion of its editorial comment to the common currency (52.2%). It should be noted that both the Sun and the Scotsman are positioned against European integration (see Table 3.4a and 3.3cx), and more specifically against Britain's membership of the euro. The fact that both newspapers publish nearly twice as many editorials on the euro than the pro European newspaper in the sample (the Guardian) has important implications for the nature of opinion leading on the euro in the British press. Despite being affiliated to different political cleavages (left/right), and positioned on opposite sides of the debate over European integration (pro/anti), the salience of specific sub issues is similar in the two broadsheet newspapers. Both the Guardian and the Times provide a higher proportion of editorial content on interest rate adjustments than do the Sun and the Scotsman. Indeed, adjustments to interest rates are the focus of their opinion leading on monetary policy.

Tables 7.2a Sub issues within policy fields per paper – Monetary politics (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
General unspecific	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interest Rate Adjustments	40.0	48.7	12.9	30.4	29.7	51
EMU Convergence criteria and stability pact	5.0	5.1	0	4.3	2.9	5
EMS/ERM	0	0	1.4	0	.6	1
Exchange rate intervention	15.0	5.1	1.4	4.3	5.8	10
Independence central banks	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eurozone - outsiders insiders	2.5	2.6	0	0	1.2	2
Common currency	30.0	38.5	62.9	52.2	48.3	83
Dynamics of euro campaigns	7.5	0	20.0	4.3	10.5	18
Other Specific	0	0	1.4	4.3	1.2	2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	172
N	40	39	70	23	172	

Tables 7.2b Sub issues within policy fields per paper – Agriculture (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Reform of the system of subsidies	8.3	15.2	9.1	10.0	11.4	10
Subsidies and enlargement of the European Union	0	0	0	5.0	1.1	1
Subsidies and international trade	16.7	15.2	0	15.0	13.6	12
BSE	25.0	12.1	18.2	15.0	17.0	15
Foot and Mouth Disease	50.0	54.5	72.7	55.0	55.7	49
Other diseases	0	3.0	0	0	1.1	4
Quotas for livestock and dairy production	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	88
N	24	33	11	20	88	

Tables 7.2c Sub issues within policy fields per paper – Immigration (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
General Immigration politics	11.1	28.6	33.3	30.8	25.0	15
Institutional framework	22.2	21.4	6.7	15.4	16.7	10
Entry and border controls	16.7	14.3	6.7	7.7	11.7	7
Expulsions	11.1	14.3	26.7	7.7	15.0	9
Migration programs and quotas	33.3	14.3	6.7	23.1	20.0	12
Role of third parties in preventing migration	0	0	6.7	0	1.7	1
Visa and consular policy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Actions relating to smuggling	0	0	13.3	7.7	5.0	3
Other specific issues	5.6	7.1		7.7	5.0	3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	60
N	18	14	15	13	60	

Tables 7.2d Sub issues within policy fields per paper – Troops deployment (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
General reference to deployment of troops	2.0	0	0	5.4	1.6	3
Deployment for military aggression	60.0	62.7	21.4	89.2	61.0	111
Deployment for invasion of foreign sovereign territory	14.0	6.0	71.4	0	17.0	311
Deployment in covert aggressive operations	0	4.5	0	2.7	2.2	4
Deployment for peace keeping	18.0	20.9	0	2.7	13.2	24
Deployment to rescue civilians	2.0	0	7.1	0	1.6	3
Deployment in times of crisis	0	1.5	0	0	.5	1
Deployment for non-military humanitarian purposes	0	3.0	0	0	1.1	2
Deployment in the context of military alliances	4.0	1.5	0	0	1.6	3
Other specific	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	182
N	50	67	28	37	182	

Tables 7.2e Sub issues within policy fields per paper – Pensions and retirement (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
General	0	0	0	0	0	0
Demographic changes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retirement ages	30.0	16.7	0	0	17.4	4
Income levels in retirement	20.0	0	0	0	8.7	2
State vs private pensions	0	0	0	0	0	0
State pension scheme	40.0	66.7	0	25.0	39.1	9
Private pension scheme	10.0	16.7	66.7	75.0	30.4	7
Other specific	0	0	33.3	0	4.3	1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	23
N	10	6	3	4	23	

Tables 7.2f Sub issues within policy fields per paper – Education (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
General education politics	3.6	6.7	4.5	8.6	6.1	11
Structural issues	7.3	26.7	4.5	5.2	11.1	20
Resource allocation and salaries	41.8	11.1	4.5	13.8	20.6	37
Private education	1.8	4.4	0	5.2	3.3	6
Administrative power allocation	0	6.7	0	6.9	3.9	7
Curriculum	10.9	0	22.7	3.4	7.2	13
Information and communication technologies	0	2.2	0	0	.6	1
Scholarships and fees	10.9	2.2	22.7	3.4	7.8	14
Problems at school	5.5	6.7	9.1	10.3	7.8	14
Other specific issues	18.2	33.3	31.8	43.1	31.7	57
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	180
N	55	45	22	58	180	

Table 7.2g¹⁰ demonstrates that comment by the British press is mainly spread across four of sub issues within the field of European integration. These sub issues are: the relationship between the EU and national levels, the role of a specific country in the EU, enlargement, and defining the EU's core tasks.

Of these four policy areas, discussions relating to the role of a specific country in the EU account for almost a quarter of newspapers' editorial comment on integration (24.6%). Looking in more detail at the content of newspapers' claims on this sub issue, the data show that newspapers provided opinion on a range of specific issues relating to this area. These included the – the role of a specific country in the EU: boycotting of Austria by other EU members after the election of Haider, the role of Italy in the EU during its Presidency, the changing nature of the relationship between France and Germany in the EU, and most commonly the place of Britain in the EU in terms of the benefits to the UK of EU membership. Just over one fifth of editorial comment on integration was made with reference to the relationship between the EU and national levels (21.5%). Rather than relate specifically to one or other member state, editorials on this sub issue gave opinion on the nature of European integration as a whole in terms of the degree of integration, the nature of future integration, the desirability of the EU forming a federal superstate or not, the issue of qualified majority voting, the possible removal of vetoes, and the Convention on the future of Europe. 17.7% of editorials on European integration gave opinion on the enlargement process. These articles most often related to the need to set a timetable for enlargement and Turkey's bid to join the EU. The fourth most common topic for comment in editorials was discussion of what the EU's core tasks should be. Editorials on this issue related to a range of specific questions including whether the EU should have a rapid reaction force, the role of EU in foreign policy, and whether the EU should restrict itself to being a free trade area rather than becoming further integrated. On the whole, other issues such as shared values and identity, institutional structures, relationships between EU institutions and public, budget issues, associational agreements between the EU and non EU countries, personnel issues and non-EU forms of European Integration received little attention in opinion leading articles.

There are some interesting differences in the sub issues that each newspaper has chose to give its opinion on. The Guardian was less focused on the relationship between EU and national levels (16.1%) than other papers and was more likely to give comment on the relationship between the EU and the public (16.1%). The role of a specific country in the EU and issues related to enlargement feature equally high up on its agenda (both 22.6%). Similarly, enlargement is a focus for comment in the Times and is the topic of nearly 30% of its editorials on European integration. In fact, the Times is far more likely to publish an editorial on enlargement in comparison to the other newspapers. Almost a third of all editorials published by the Sun in the field of European integration look at the relationship between the EU and national levels (32.4%). A major difference between the Sun and the other newspapers is the lack of attention given to enlargement by the Sun. In the three years covered by the report, the Sun only made enlargement the focus of its opinion leading on one occasion (2.7%).

¹⁰ Tables 7.2b-7.2f showing the distribution of sub issues for other policy fields have not been commented on and are presented in the appendix.

By far the most common sub issue commented on by the Scotsman is the role of a specific country in the EU (34.8%). The regional paper published more articles on the relationship between the EU and national levels than the national broadsheets (26.1%), but was less likely to comment on enlargement (17.4%).

Table 7.2g Sub issues within policy fields per paper – European Integration (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
General European integration	0	2.6	8.1	4.3	3.8	5
Shared values and Identity	3.2	2.6	2.7	0	2.3	3
Role of a specific country in the EU	22.6	20.5	13.5	34.8	21.5	28
Relationship between EU and national levels	16.1	23.1	32.4	26.1	24.6	32
Institutional structure	6.5	2.6	2.7	4.3	3.8	5
Defining the EUs core tasks	12.9	7.7	13.5	8.7	10.8	14
Relationship between EU institutions and public	16.1	5.1	0	4.3	6.2	8
Enlargement	22.6	28.2	2.7	17.4	17.7	23
Budget	0	0	2.7	0	.8	1
Other specific EU integration	0	2.6	13.5	0	4.6	6
Associational agreements between the EU and non EU countries	0	0	5.4	0	1.5	2
Personnel issues	0	5.1	2.7	0	2.3	3
Non-EU forms of European Integration	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	130
N	31	39	37	23	130	

The data representing the total for all newspapers in Table 7.3 demonstrates that editorial comment is distributed between issues with six different types of scope - supranational UN(4.1%), other supranational (2.5%), multilateral (12.7%), bilateral (4.2%), EU (35.4%), and national UK (39.9%). With the exception of a negligible amount of articles relating to the USA, the newspapers do not choose to comment on national issues in relation to countries elsewhere in the world or in other EU member states. Therefore, the opinion leading agendas of UK newspapers are almost entirely centred on British national issues and issues with scopes higher the nation state.

However, looking only at the average totals for each category of scope obscures the major differences in the balance of editorial focus on issues with a supranational UN, other supranational, multilateral, EU, and national UK scope between individual newspapers. The following discussion will examine these differences. There were very few editorials published on issues with a supranational UN (4.1%) or other supranational scope (2.5%) over the three-year period studied (also shown in Table 7.4). This makes sense if one considers that the competences of the United Nations and other supranational institutions tends to be on issues which fall outside the remit of most of the policy fields chosen for the Europub project apart from troops deployment. While all the newspapers gave very little comment on issues with scopes higher than the EU, there were variations in the salience of such issues between newspapers. In particular, The Times published more articles than the other papers on

issues with a supranational UN or other supranational scope (6.6% and 6.3% respectively). This suggests that international issues are given higher priority in the Time's editorial agenda than by other newspapers. Each of the newspapers gave a roughly equal amount of attention to editorial comment on multilateral issues. The subject under comment is the debate in 2001 and 2002 over the deployment of troops to Afghanistan and the Gulf. The deployment involved armed forces from a number of countries, most often the USA and the UK.

Looking at the total average figures for all four newspapers shows the majority of editorials are focused on issues that have either a national UK scope (39.9%) or a European EU scope (35.4%). Although issues with an EU scope are the second most commented on issues for all four papers, the higher than average proportion of editorial articles with an EU scope published by the Sun heightens the total mean value (35.4%). Over half of the Sun's editorials refer to an EU issue (55.9%), while only a quarter (26.3%) have a national UK issue as the focus. The EU focus of the Sun is unusual, and it is the only newspaper sampled to comment more on EU issues than on national UK issues. This demonstrates the high salience of specific issues with a European scope on the Sun's editorial agenda, such as the monetary policy fields of the common currency and the dynamics of euro campaigns, and the overall field of European integration. Here it is important to note the nature of the European issues discussed in the Sun. Although issues with an EU scope discussed in comment articles in the Sun are integral to the process of European integration and the EU, they are mostly commented on in the context of national UK debates on the issues. For example, the editorials in the Sun on the common currency and dynamics of euro campaigns are dominated by the debate over whether the UK should join the currency and what effect joining would have on the UK rather than discussion of the euro in terms of what it means for the EU as a whole. In addition, Table 7.2g demonstrates that the majority of comment on European integration in the Sun refers to the role of a specific country in the EU and the relationship between the EU and national levels. In the same way as editorials on the euro are nationally focussed, comment on these aspects of European integration are fixed in terms of the UK's role in the EU. They consider the relationship between the UK and the EU rather than more general discussion of how the EU should operate.

Moving on to discuss the other newspapers, Table 7.3 shows the Guardian, Times and Scotsman published similar quantities of editorial comment on issues with an EU scope, with the regional paper giving it least attention. The Scotsman's editorial agenda is heavily biased towards articles with a national UK issue scope, and it publishes far more editorials on national issues than any of the other newspapers (51.7%). Although a further breakdown would be necessary, this national focus can be accounted for by the likely bias of the Scotsman's editorial agenda to issues specific to Scotland and with a regional scope. Unlike any of the national newspapers, in addition to coverage of UK national and international issues, the Scotsman's remit includes coverage of regional and local matters relevant to the Scottish nation. The paper's higher than average editorial comment on national issues is therefore not surprising.

Table 7.3 - Issue scope by paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	1.3	6.6	3.2	5.1	4.1	34
Other supranational	2.6	6.2	0	0	2.5	21
EU	32.0	29.2	55.9	27.0	35.4	296
Multilateral	12.3	13.6	9.7	15.2	12.7	106
Bilateral	6.1	5.3	3.2	1.1	4.2	35
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	.5	0	.1	1
UK	43.9	37.9	26.3	51.7	39.9	333
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	.5	0	.1	1
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	.9	1.2	.5	0	.7	6
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rest of the world	.9	0	0	0	.2	2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	228	243	186	178	835	

It is clear from Table 7.4 that Europeanisation of newspaper opinion leading varies significantly by issue field. Clearly, policy fields where the EU has considerable competences vis-à-vis the national level can be expected to be discussed by newspapers within a European context more than policy fields where the EU has less or no powers. This means that for the policy fields sampled in the study, it would be expected that, in addition to the obvious field of European integration, monetary politics and agriculture would exhibit fairly high levels of EU-related issues. Where the EU has some limited responsibilities, as in immigration and troops deployment, we can suppose that some issues are likely to be discussed within a European context, and where the EU has little or no relevance, as in retirement and pensions politics or education, hardly any issues are likely to be EU-related. As would be expected, the main policy fields discussed in the context of the EU in the four newspapers sampled were European integration (100%), monetary politics (75.6%), and agriculture (25%). The discussion will continue with reference to the overall data for each policy field given in Table 7.4, but will also draw on more detailed tables which allow a comparison of the editorial focus of individual newspapers on each field.

Table 7.4 issue scope per policy field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European Integration	Total	N
Supranational : UN	0	2.3	3.3	16.5	0	0	0	4.1	34
Other supranational	0	5.7	1.7	8.2	0	0	0	2.5	21
EU	75.6	25.0	11.7	2.2	13.0	0	100.0	35.4	296
Multilateral	0	0	3.3	57.1	0	0	0	12.7	106
Bilateral	0	0	15.0	13.7	0	.6	0	4.2	35
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	1.7	0	0	0	0	.1	1
UK	22.1	65.9	61.7	1.1	87.0	98.9	0	39.9	333
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	1.7	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	2.3	1.1	0	.5	0	0	0	.7	6
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rest of the world	0	0	0	.5	0	.6	0	.2	2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	172	88	60	182	23	180	130	835	

With the exception of the field of European integration, monetary politics is the policy field discussed in the most Europeanised context in the UK out of all the policy areas studied in the project. Newspaper editorials are divided between European scope issues (75%) and national UK issues (22.1%), with a tiny minority of articles referring to national issues in the USA (2.3%). None of the editorials refer to monetary politics at the supranational level or in the context of other nation states. When we consider that any discussion related to the common currency either at a national UK level or in other EU members states would appear in the data as having an EU scope, then the lack of editorials referring to other countries is logical. Monetary politics editorials with an EU scope have included discussions of the common currency in terms of issues in other member states such as the Danish referendum and the effect of the euro in Germany. The high percentage of editorial comment on monetary policy issues with an EU scope is a result of the dominance of matters related to the common currency and the dynamics of euro campaigns in newspapers' opinion leading as shown earlier in Table 7.2a. Moving to Table 7.5a it is clear that issues with a European scope appear very high on the editorial agenda of the Sun (87.1%) in comparison with the other newspapers. In addition, national UK monetary politics is given a far smaller amount of editorial attention by the Sun than by other papers (11.4%). Despite being positioned against Britain joining the euro, discussion of which accounts for many of the editorials published with a European scope, the Times, Sun and Scotsman varied in the amount of editorial space they devoted to monetary issues with an EU scope. The small amount of comment made on monetary policy in the USA was published almost entirely by the Times (7.7%).

Table 7.5a Issue scope per paper – Monetary Politics (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other supranational	0	0	0	0	0	0
EU	70.0	61.5	87.1	73.9	75.6	130
Multilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	0	0	0	0
UK	30.0	30.8	11.4	26.1	22.1	38
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	0	7.7	1.4	0	2.3	4
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rest of the world	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	172
N	40	39	70	23	172	

Although the majority of newspapers' claims about agriculture were national in scope (66.9%), a quarter of editorials commented on agricultural issues in terms of the EU (25%). Not including the field of European integration, this makes agriculture the second most common policy field to be discussed by newspapers in a European context. Agriculture is also one of the few policy fields to be commented on in terms of trans-national issues, although this occurs on *very* few occasions - supranational UN 2.3% and supranational 5.7%. A range of issues where the EU was directly involved in farming matters were commented on by the newspapers. These included reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, the role of the Commission in getting France to lift its ban on British beef due to fears over BSE, and the role of the Commission in the UK foot and mouth crisis. Looking at Table 7.5b, we can see that the broadsheet newspapers, the Guardian and the Times, published almost the same proportion of editorials on agricultural issues in each scope category. It is also clear that these two newspapers were responsible for all of the supranational discussion of agricultural issues. The regional and tabloid newspapers did not publish any editorials with this issue scope. The Sun and, to a larger extent the Scotsman, produced a higher quantity of editorials on European agricultural issues than the national broadsheets (27.3% and 35% respectively). However, it is interesting to note that they differed in the specific issues that they gave an opinion on. The Sun's comments on EU scope agricultural issues were on a range of topics: CAP, foot and mouth and the French ban on British beef. Whereas the EU scope claims by the Scotsman all related to tariffs and subsidies, and reform of the CAP in particular.

Table 7.5b Issue scope per paper – Agriculture (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	4.2	3.0	0	0	2.3	2
Other supranational	4.2	12.1	0	0	5.7	5
EU	20.8	21.2	27.3	35.0	25.0	22
Multilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	0	0	0	0
UK	66.7	63.6	72.7	65.0	65.9	58
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	4.2	0	0	0	1.1	1
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rest of the world	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	88
N	24	33	11	20	88	

The bulk of the press’s comment on immigration was made in relation to national issues (61.7%), with the remainder of comment divided between issues with a bilateral (15%) or EU scope (11.7%). Comment on bilateral issues was equally divided between claims referring to the Sangatte refugee camp in France and specific agreements between the UK and a variety of other countries relating to the deportation of immigrants. The general policy direction of a possible common EU approach to asylum was the topic of the majority of the editorials with an EU scope. Table 7.5c shows that discussion of immigration issues in Europeanised terms is not consistent across all newspapers. For instance, The Times did not make any comment at all on European aspects of immigration politics, and gave far more of their editorial agenda over to commenting on bilateral immigration issues than the other newspapers. The Guardian (22.2%) was much more likely than the Scotsman (7.7%) and the Sun (13.3%) to comment on an EU aspect of immigration policy. Here we can see that the Europeanised view of immigration politics presented by the UK press varies enormously between individual newspapers.

Table 7.5c Issue scope per paper – Immigration (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	0	7.1	0	7.7	3.3	2
Other supranational	5.6	0	0	0	1.7	1
EU	22.2	0	13.3	7.7	11.7	7
Multilateral	5.6	0	6.7	0	3.3	2
Bilateral	11.1	28.6	13.3	7.7	15.0	9
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	6.7	0	1.7	1
UK	55.6	64.3	53.3	76.9	61.7	37
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	6.7	0	1.7	1
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rest of the world	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	60
N	18	14	15	13	60	

Hardly any (2.2%) of claims made by newspapers in the field of troops deployment were European in scope. This is less surprising when one considers the narrow focus of the articles selected for this issue field that is concentrated on troops deployment rather than defence politics. The sample for troops deployment relates exclusively to the deployment of troops across borders for a variety of reasons. As such it does not include any discussions referring to defence or military policy unless they relate to the specific subject of deployment of troops across borders. Any discussion of a common European foreign or defence policy or the rapid reaction force would therefore not be included in this issue field. In addition, because the sample is restricted to deployment

of troops across borders there are almost no claims with a national scope (1.1%). The field of troops deployment is the most trans-nationalised out of all the issue fields studied. Almost all (98.9%) of the newspapers' claims are multilateral (57.1%), supranational UN (16.5%), bilateral (13.7%), other supranational (8.2%) or European in (2.2%) issue scope. Here it is helpful to take a detailed look at which sub issues of troops deployment were commented on by the press. Referring to Table 7.2d, the deployment of troops for military aggression was the focus of the majority of newspapers' comment on troops deployment (61%), and the deployment of troops for peacekeeping was the second most common theme (13.2%). Newspapers' claims on issues with a multilateral dimension mainly related to discussion surrounding the deployment of troops for military aggression by the USA and UK following George Bush's declaration of a 'war on terror' and subsequent military missions to Afghanistan and Iraq. These missions were also the focus of editorial comments with a bilateral scope. Editorial comment on issues with a supranational UN scope related both to the deployment of troops for peacekeeping to Sierra Leone in 2000, and to the deployment of troops for aggression in Afghanistan and Iraq. A large proportion of comment with a supranational scope but not involving the UN related to the deployment of troops for peacekeeping in Macedonia.

Table 7.5d Issue scope per paper – Troops deployment (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	4.0	20.9	21.4	21.6	16.5	30
Other supranational	8.0	16.4	0	0	8.2	15
EU	4.0	1.5	3.6	0	2.2	4
Multilateral	54.0	49.3	60.7	73.0	57.1	104
Bilateral	24.0	11.9	14.3	2.7	13.7	25
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	0	0	0	0
UK	2.0	0	0	2.7	1.1	2
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	2.0	0	0	0	.5	1
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rest of the world	2.0	0	0	0	.5	1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	182
N	50	67	28	37	182	

It is surprising that newspapers' opinion leading on pension and retirement politics appears to refer to issues with an EU scope in 13% of editorials. However, the particularly small number of editorials coded on pensions (23) should be recognised. This low total of articles means that the figure of 13% of retirement and pensions claims having an EU scope actually represents a total of 3 editorials over the three year period. Each of the three editorials on pensions with an EU scope referred to the same issue and were published in the same newspaper: a European Commission directive that required the UK government to ban age discrimination. The fact that that all three of the European scope editorials were published in the Guardian is a further important point to note (see Table 7.5e). The few claims made by the other three newspapers relating to retirement and pensions schemes were all made in a national context (see Table 7.5e).

Table 7.5e Retirement and pension schemes (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other supranational	0	0	0	0	0	0
EU	30.0	0	0	0	13.0	3
Multilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	0	0	0	0
UK	70.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.0	20
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rest of the world	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	23
N	10	6	3	4	23	

Predictably, the discussion of education policies and topics is almost entirely nationally focused (98.9%), with no claims being made with a European scope. The national focus of editorial comment on education is consistent across all the newspapers (see Table 7.5f).

Table 7.5f Education (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other supranational	0	0	0	0	0	0
EU	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bilateral	0	2.2	0	0	.6	1
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	0	0	0	0
UK	98.2	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.9	178
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rest of the world	1.8	0	0	0	.6	1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	180
N	55	45	22	58	180	

By definition all editorial discussions on issues directly relating to European integration were coded as having an EU level scope. Therefore Table 7.5g shows that all claims by newspapers on European integration have an EU scope.

Table 7.5g European Integration (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other supranational	0	0	0	0	0	0
EU	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	130
Multilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	0	0	0	0
UK	0	0	0	0	0	0
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rest of the world	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	130
N	31	39	37	23	130	

Issues and aims per year

The following data enable us to assess whether there were any changes in the level of editorial comment given by newspapers on each policy field during the three years studied. Table 8.1 demonstrates some notable variations in the proportions of editorial claims made by the press in three policy fields: agriculture, troops deployment and European integration. Tables detailing annual changes in the sub issues commented on for these three issues will be discussed further in order to present explanations for the variations in levels of editorial comment. In addition, due to the importance of the field of monetary politics in the debate over Europe in the UK, a detailed Table showing the proportion of sub issues commented on each year will also be discussed. The small changes in the quantity of editorials published on the other three policy fields - immigration, pensions and education – do not necessitate further discussion¹¹.

¹¹ Tables 8.2 c, d, e, f, are not commented on here and are presented in the appendix.

Table 8.1 Policy field by year (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
Monetary politics	23.3%	17.8%	21.1%	20.6%	172
Agriculture	6.1%	18.8%	6.3%	10.5%	88
Immigration	6.1%	9.4%	5.9%	7.2%	60
Troops deployment	9.4%	21.6%	32.0%	21.8%	182
Retirement and pension schemes	2.4%	1.4%	4.3%	2.8%	23
Education	25.3%	21.3%	18.8%	21.6%	180
European Integration	27.3%	9.8%	11.6%	15.6%	130
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	835
N	245	287	303	835	

Table 8.1 does not show any major changes in the overall level of editorial comment made by newspapers on monetary politics over the three-year period. Table 8.2a demonstrates that although the overall levels did not alter dramatically, newspapers commented on certain issues to a larger extent in some years than others. For instance, the common currency was discussed in a larger number of editorials in 2000 than in other years. This was due to a high level of debate in the UK national sphere about Britain joining the pound. Several UK specific statements or events were the focus of much of newspapers comments on the euro in 2000. These included discussions on the UK government strategy on joining the euro, statements by a number of organisations and companies – DTI, TUC, Nissan, Honda, Nestle - on Britain joining the euro, and the general debate surrounding the question of Britain’s membership. In addition, the newspapers published editorial opinion on the referendum on Danish membership of the euro. Editorials in 2001 commented less on the debate over euro membership in the UK. The launch of the euro as cash currency across the eurozone in 2002 prompted the level of editorial comment on Britain’s membership of the euro to rise again in 2002. Once the currency had been launched, editorials used the experiences of the adoption of the euro by other countries as examples in their discussion of Britain joining the euro, and often referred to the possibility of a UK referendum on Britain’s membership. The other discrepancy between the sub issues discussed in each year is seen in the huge increase in the proportion of claims made about interest rate adjustments in 2001 and 2002. The increase in editorial comment on this topic reflects a rise in the number of newspapers choosing to comment on changes to interest rates by the European Central Bank. In 2000, claims on this sub issue related only to the altering of interest rates by the Bank of England, where as in 2001 and 2002 the additional topic of rates set by the ECB was commented on.

Tables 8.2a Sub-issues within policy field – Monetary Politics (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
General unspecific	0	0	0	0	0
Interest Rate Adjustments	8.8	51.0	31.3	29.7	51
EMU Convergence criteria and stability pact	0	2.0	6.3	2.9	5
EMS ERM	0	0	1.6	.6	1
Exchange rate intervention	10.5	2.0	4.7	5.8	10
Eurozone - outsiders insiders	1.8	2.0	0	1.2	2
Common currency	66.7	31.4	45.3	48.3	83
Dynamics of euro campaigns	8.8	11.8	10.9	10.5	18
Other Specific	3.5	0	0	1.2	2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	172
N	57	51	64	172	

Table 8.1 showed the percentage of editorials published on agriculture issues tripling from 6.1% in 2000 to 18.8% in 2001, and returning to 6.3% in 2002. Table 8.2b clearly demonstrates the cause of this increase to be the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in the UK in 2001 (87%). While Table 8.1 showed similar levels of comment 2000 and 2002, Table 8.2b shows that there was a difference in the focus of newspapers' comment in each years. For instance, while the majority of editorials in 2000 related to BSE, there was less discussion of this in 2002 and more discussion of subsidies and international trade.

Tables 8.2b Sub-issues within policy field – Agriculture (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
Reform of the system of subsidies	6.7	5.6	31.6	11.4	10
Subsidies and enlargement of the European Union	0	0	5.3	1.1	1
Subsidies and international trade	13.3	3.7	42.1	13.6	12
BSE	73.3	3.7	10.5	17.0	15
Foot and Mouth Disease	0	87.0	10.5	55.7	49
Other diseases	6.7	0	0	1.1	1
Quotas for livestock and dairy production	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	15	54	19	88	

The increase in newspapers' claims in the field of troops deployment in 2001 and 2002 is explained by the increase in editorial attention given to discussion surrounding the deployment of troops for military aggression by the USA and UK following George Bush's declaration of a 'war on terror' after the September 11th attacks and the subsequent military missions to Afghanistan and Iraq.

Tables 8.2c Sub-issues within policy field – Immigration (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
General Immigration politics	26.7	25.9	22.2	25.0	15
Institutional framework	13.3	18.5	16.7	16.7	10
Entry and border controls	6.7	11.1	16.7	11.7	7
Expulsions	33.3	0	22.2	15.0	9
Migration programs and quotas	13.3	29.6	11.1	20.0	12
Role of third parties in preventing migration	0	3.7	0	1.7	1
Visa and consular policy	0	7.4	5.6	5.0	3
Actions relating to smuggling	0	7.4	5.6	5.0	3
Other specific issues	6.7	3.7	5.6	5.0	3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	60
N	15	27	18	60	

Tables 8.2d Sub-issues within policy field – Troops deployment (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
General reference to deployment of troops	8.7	0	1.0	1.6	3
Deployment for military aggression	8.7	69.4	68.0	61.0	111
Deployment for invasion of foreign sovereign territory	17.4	6.5	23.7	17.0	31
Deployment in covert aggressive operations	0	6.5	0	2.2	4
Deployment for peace keeping	52.2	11.3	5.2	13.2	24
Deployment to rescue civilians	13.0	0	0	1.6	3
Deployment in times of crisis	0	1.6	0	.5	1
Deployment for non-military humanitarian purposes	0	3.2	0	1.1	2
Deployment in the context of military alliances	0	1.6	2.1	1.6	3
Other specific	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	182
N	23	62	97	182	

Table 8.1 shows a considerable reduction in the proportion of newspapers' editorial comment on European integration in from a high of 27.3% in 2000, to 9.8% in 2001 and 11.6% in 2002. Table 8.2g demonstrates considerable variations in the priority given to commenting on specific issues in each year by the press. The greater amount of attention given to providing opinion on the relationship between the EU and national levels in 2000 was due to discussion of the European Union Charter of Fundamental Rights and the Nice treaty. The higher level of editorial comment on definitions of the EU's core tasks in 2001 (32.1%) refers to debate surrounding EU security and defence arrangements, and in particular the formation of an EU rapid reaction force. The table shows that the issue of enlargement only became a relevant topic for editorial comment in 2002 when it was the most popular European integration issue commented on in UK newspapers (34.3%). The increase in attention from newspapers was due to discussions of enlargement following the Laeken Declaration of December 2001 and prior to EU accession negotiations at the Copenhagen summit in December 2002.

Tables 8.2e Sub-issues within policy field – Pensions and retirement (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
General	0	0	0	0	0
Demographic changes	0	0	0	0	0
Retirement ages	0	0	30.8	17.4	4
Income levels in retirement	0	25.0	7.7	8.7	2
State vs private pensions	0	0	0	0	0
State pension scheme	83.3	50.0	15.4	39.1	9
Private pension scheme	16.7	25.0	38.5	30.4	7
Other specific	0	0	7.7	4.3	1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	23
N	6	4	13	23	

Tables 8.2f Sub-issues within policy field – Education (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
General education politics	6.5	6.6	5.3	6.1	11
Structural issues	3.2	11.5	19.3	11.1	20
Resource allocation and salaries	16.1	31.1	14.0	20.6	37
Private education	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.3	6
Administrative power allocation	4.8	4.9	1.8	3.9	7
Curriculum	9.7	6.6	5.3	7.2	13
Information and communication technologies	1.6	0	0	.6	1
Scholarships and fees	9.7	6.6	7.0	7.8	14
Problems at school	8.1	4.9	10.5	7.8	14
Other specific issues	37.1	24.6	33.3	31.7	57
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	180
N	62	61	57	180	

Tables 8.2g Sub-issues within policy field – European Integration (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
General European integration	7.5	0	0	3.8	5
Shared values and Identity	3.0	0	2.9	2.3	3
Role of a specific country in the EU	25.4	10.7	22.9	21.5	28
Relationship between EU and national levels	31.3	14.3	20.0	24.6	32
Institutional structure	3.0	7.1	2.9	3.8	5
Defining the EUs core tasks	4.5	32.1	5.7	10.8	14
Relationship between EU institutions and public	4.5	14.3	2.9	6.2	8
Enlargement	13.4	7.1	34.3	17.7	23
Budget	0	0	2.9	.8	1
Other specific EU integration	7.5	0	2.9	4.6	6
Associational agreements between the EU and non EU countries	0	7.1	0	1.5	2
Personnel issues	0	7.1	2.9	2.3	3
Non-EU forms of European Integration	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	130
N	67	28	35	130	

Tables 9.1 and 9.2 illustrate the data for the ‘aspect’ variable. This variable was designed to evaluate the way in which a newspaper comments on an issue. More specifically it measures whether the newspaper comments on the substantial subject of issue or whether it focuses on the political dispute surrounding the issue. However, for the UK team, this variable is not reliable as it was interpreted in a different way by each coder. Therefore, the tables are not discussed.

Table 9.1 Aspect commented upon per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
No (substantial issue is commented upon)	72.4	34.6	62.9	43.3	53.1	443
Yes (political dispute is commented upon)	27.6	65.4	37.1	56.7	46.9	392
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	228	243	186	178	835	

Table 9.2 Aspect commented upon per issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European Integration	Total	N
No (substantial issue is commented upon)	58.1	60.2	61.7	36.8	65.2	70.0	34.6	53.1	443
Yes (political dispute is commented upon)	41.9	39.8	38.3	63.2	34.8	30.0	65.4	46.9	392
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	172	88	60	182	23	180	130	835	

Section summary:

Issue salience: Overall, the three most common issue fields commented on by newspapers were - monetary politics, troops deployment and education. These three issues were equally salient in the newspapers’ commentaries. European integration was the fourth most salient issue. Although the field of European integration is fourth in priority of newspapers’ editorial agendas, it should be highlighted that a large proportion of newspapers’ comment on monetary politics relates to European monetary issues. The focus of almost half of all monetary politics editorials is on the common currency and a further 10.5% of claims are on a sub issue connected to the euro – campaigns over the euro. Editorial opinion on issues related to European integration by the British press is mainly spread across four sub issues: the relationship between the EU and national levels, the role of a specific country in the EU, enlargement, and defining the EU’s core tasks. Other sub issues such as shared values and identity, institutional structures, relationships between EU institutions and public, budget issues, associational agreements between the EU and non EU countries, personnel issues and non-EU forms of European Integration received little attention in opinion leading articles.

Issue scope salience: The data presented enabled us to see how much of newspapers' editorial agendas are devoted to providing opinion on issues relating to the European Union in comparison to national UK issues and issues with other scopes. The majority of editorials are focused on issues that have either a national UK scope or a European EU scope. Newspapers gave very little comment on issues in other nation states or on issues with scopes higher than the EU. Europeanisation of newspaper opinion leading varies significantly by issue field. As would be expected, the main policy fields discussed in the context of the EU in the four newspapers sampled were European integration, monetary politics, and agriculture. With the exception of the field of European integration, monetary politics is the policy field discussed in the most Europeanised context in the UK. Three quarters of monetary policy editorials had a European scope¹².

Temporal changes in salience: There were changes in the salience of specific sub-issues in editorials on monetary politics and European integration between 2000 and 2002. These changes reflect the timetable of events in the development of the EU and monetary union.

Comparisons between individual newspaper agendas: The data demonstrated that there are variations in the level of editorial priority given to each issue field and issue scope by individual newspapers. Overall, issues sampled by the Europub project were more salient in the national broadsheets than in the tabloid and regional paper. Each newspaper differed in the level of editorial attention it gave to each issue field. The data showed that with the exception of the Guardian, one particular policy field dominates the editorial agenda in each newspaper: troops deployment (Times), monetary policy (Sun), and education (Scotsman). The two most common issues commented on by the Guardian - education and troops deployment - were almost equal in salience. European integration was not the most commonly commented on issue in any of the papers. There are considerable differences in the focus and intensity of comment on each specific sub issue between each paper. The Sun is the only newspaper sampled to comment more on EU issues than on national UK issues. The Guardian, Times and Scotsman published similar quantities of editorial comment on issues with an EU scope, with the regional paper giving it least attention. This overview of the balance of the editorial agendas of each newspaper demonstrates the salience of issues is very similar in the two national broadsheet newspapers, but that the tabloid and regional newspaper do not have comparable agendas. More specifically, the tabloid newspaper is biased towards issues with an EU scope and the regional newspaper has a higher than average focus on giving comment on national UK issues.

¹² It should be noted that any discussion related to the common currency either at a national UK level or in other EU member states would appear in the data as having an EU scope.

Object actors:

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

Table 10.1a establishes that claims made by newspapers in editorial articles can be seen to have an affect on an actor in the vast majority of cases (96.2%). This is true for each of the newspapers, although the Sun is less likely than other newspapers to make a claim in which an actor who will be affected can be identified (89.2%). Table 10.1b shows the variations in the presence of object actors between the policy fields. Object actors are slightly less likely to be present in the fields of monetary politics and European integration than other fields.

Table 10.1a Presence of object actor per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Not present	4.8	.4	10.8	0	3.8	32
Present	95.2	99.6	89.2	100.0	96.2	803
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	228	243	186	178	835	

Table 10.1b Presence of object actor per policy field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European Integration	Total	N
Not present	11.0	3.4	0	1.1	0	0	6.2	3.8	32
Present	89.0	96.6	100.0	98.9	100.0	100.0	93.8	96.2	803
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	835
N	172	88	60	182	23	180	130	835	

Table 10.2a shows the distribution of object actors between different types of political actors. In contrast to the types of actors newspapers address their claims at (see section on addressees), newspapers claims tend to affect the interests of a wide range of actors coming from three main groups: state and party actors (35%), general actors (33.9%), and civil society actors (23.8%). The Table shows some interesting differences in the types of actors affected by the claims of each newspaper. Claims made by the Times are more likely to affect the interests of state and party actors (42.6%), particularly government executive actors (33.5%) than claims made by other newspapers. The Guardian makes more claims that affect the interests of economic

interest groups than other newspapers (11.1%). In addition, the Guardian (30.4%) and the Scotsman (26.4%) make more claims that affect civil society groups than the Sun (19.3%) and Times (19%) do. This reflects the larger amount of editorial comment published by the Guardian and the Scotsman on education because claims made by newspapers on education politics are likely to affect the interests of educational professionals and students, pupils and their parents. The Sun makes more slightly claims than the other papers that affect pro and anti European campaign groups (4.6%). In addition, the Sun makes a higher level of claims that affect general actors such as whole polities (23.5%), whole economies (7.2%) and the general public (12%) than other papers.

Table 10.2a Object actor type per paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Politicians	0	0	0	0	0	0
Former states(wo)men	0	0	0	0	0	0
Government/executive	26.7	33.5	22.3	26.4	27.8	223
Legislative	0	.8	1.2	.6	.6	5
Judiciary	0	0	.6	.1	1	1
Military	2.3	3.7	3.0	1.7	2.7	22
Central banks	0	.4	1.2	0	.4	3
Social security organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	0	.4	.6	.6	.4	3
Political parties	.9	3.7	3.0	4.5	3.0	24
Sub-total: state and party actors	30.0	42.6	31.3	34.3	35.0	281
Unions and employees	.9	0	.6	.6	.5	4
Employers organizations and firms	5.1	.8	3.6		2.4	19
Farmers and agricultural organizations	4.6	4.5	1.2	5.1	4.0	32
Economists and financial experts	.5	.4	0	0	.2	2
Sub-total: economic interest groups	11.1	5.8	5.4	5.6	7.1	57
Media and journalists	0	0	1.2	0	.2	2
Sub-total: media and journalists	0	0	1.2		.2	2
Churches and religious groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational professionals & organizations	12.9	9.5	2.4	11.2	9.3	75
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students, pupils, and their parents	8.3	6.6	9.0	12.4	8.8	71
Other professional organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer organizations	0	0	.6	0	.1	1
Migrant organizations and groups	6.0	.4	4.8	1.7	3.1	25
Pro- & anti-European campaign groups	.5	.4	2.4	0	.7	6
Solidarity & human rights groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welfare organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Racist and extreme right	0	0	0	0	0	0

groups						
Peace movement organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Organizations of the elderly	1.8	1.2	0	.6	1.0	8
Women's organizations	.5	0	0	0	.1	1
Environmental groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	.4	0	.6	.2	2
Rebel forces/guerrilla	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil society groups	.5	.4	0	0	.2	2
Sub-total: other civil society actors	30.4	19.0	19.3	26.4	23.8	191
Whole polities	16.1	19.4	23.5	16.9	18.8	151
Whole economies	7.4	10.3	7.2	4.5	7.6	61
General public	5.1	2.9	12.0	12.4	7.5	60
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	28.6	32.6	42.8	33.7	33.9	272
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	803
N	217	242	166	178	803	

Focusing on European integration, we can see from Table 10.2b that over half of the actors affected by newspapers' claims on European integration are state and party actors (52.5%), with the majority of these being government/executive actors (43.1%). The next most common affected group are general actors (42.6%), and within this group whole polities (32.8%) in particular. The presence of such a large proportion of general actors as object actors of newspapers claims is interesting because these types of actors are not addressed in the same proportion in newspapers' claims (see addressee section). Further analysis of the data reveals that newspapers' claims on European integration are likely to affect the interests of the national UK polity in the majority of cases (65%). Therefore, in editorials on European integration where newspapers present opinions on how specific aspects of integration may affect whole polities, British papers are most likely to give an opinion on the benefits and disadvantages of integration to the UK national polity. The interests of civil society actors are not affected by any claims on European integration and economic and interest groups are only marginally affected (3.3%). The dominance of the question of Britain's membership of the euro in UK discourse over Europe is evident in the concentration of pro or anti European campaign group actors affected by newspaper claims on monetary politics. The interests of European campaign group actors are not identified as being affected by newspapers claims in the field of European integration or any policy area other than monetary politics. Even in editorials on monetary politics, the affect of newspapers' claims is rarely to the benefit or detriment of European campaign groups (3.9%).

Table 10.2b Object actor type by policy field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European Integration	Total	N
Politicians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Former states(wo)men	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Government/executive	18.3	22.4	18.3	53.9	13.0	6.7	43.4	27.8	223
Legislative	0	0	0	1.7	0	.6	.8	.6	5
Judiciary	0	0	0	0	0	0	.8	.1	1
Military	0	0	0	10.6	4.3	0	1.6	2.7	22
Central banks	.7	0	0	0	0	0	1.6	.4	3
Social security organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	0	0	0	0	0	1.7	0	.4	3
Political parties	5.2	2.4	1.7	2.2	4.3	1.7	4.1	3.0	24
Sub-total: state and party actors	24.2	24.7	20.0	68.3	21.7	10.6	52.5	35.0	281
Unions and employees	1.3	0	0	0	8.7	0	0	.5	4
Employers organizations and firms	7.8	1.2	1.7		13.0	0	1.6	2.4	19
Economists and financial experts	.7	0	0	0	0	0	.8	.2	2
Farmers and agricultural organizations	0	36.5	0	0	0	0	.8	4.0	32
Sub-total: economic interest groups	9.8	37.6	1.7	0	21.7	0	3.3	7.1	57
Media and journalists	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.6	.2	2
Sub-total: media and journalists	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.6	.2	2
Churches and religious groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational professionals & organizations	.7	0	0	0	0	41.1	0	9.3	75
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students, pupils, and their parents	0	0	0	0	0	39.4	0	8.8	71
Consumer organizations	.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	.1	1
Other professional organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Migrant organizations and groups	0	0	41.7	0	0	0	0	3.1	25
Solidarity & human rights groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pro- & anti-European campaign groups	3.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	.7	6
Welfare organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Racist and extreme right groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peace movement organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Organizations of the elderly	0	0	0	0	34.8	0	0	1.0	8
Women's organizations	0	0	0	0	4.3	0	0	.1	1
Environmental groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	0	0	1.1	0	0	0	.2	2
Rebel forces/guerrilla	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil society groups	0	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	.2	2
Sub-total: other civil society actors	5.2	2.4	41.7	1.1	39.1	80.6	0	23.8	191
Whole politics	18.3	15.3	25.0	24.4	0	6.1	32.8	18.8	151
Whole economies	32.0	8.2	1.7	0	0	1.1	1.6	7.6	6

General public	10.5	11.8	10.0	6.1	17.4	1.7	8.2	7.5	60
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	60.8	35.3	36.7	30.6	17.4	8.9	42.6	33.9	272
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	803
N	153	85	60	180	23	180	122	803	

Table 10.2c Object actor type by year (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
Politicians	0	0	0	0	
Former states(wo)men	0	0	0	0	
Government/executive	15.7	25.7	39.3	27.8	223
Legislative	0	1.1	.7	.6	5
Judiciary	.4	0	0	.1	1
Military	4.8	2.1	1.7	2.7	22
Central banks	0	1.1	0	.4	3
Social security executive organizations	0	0	0	0	0
Other state executive agencies	1.3	0	0	.4	3
Political parties	3.5	2.8	2.8	3.0	24
Sub-total: state and party actors	25.8	32.7	44.5	35.0	281
Unions and employees	.4	.4	.7	.5	4
Employers organizations and firms	4.4	.7	2.4	2.4	19
Economists and financial experts	.9	0	0	.2	2
Farmers and agricultural organizations	1.3	7.0	3.1	4.0	32
Sub-total: economic interest groups	7.0	8.1	6.2	7.1	57
Media and journalists	.9	0	0	.2	2
Sub-total: media and journalists	.9	0	0	.2	2
Churches and religious organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	
Educational professionals and organizations'	8.7	11.6	7.6	9.3	75
Other scientific and research professionals and institutions	0	0	0	0	
Students, pupils, and their parents	13.1	6.3	7.9	8.8	71
Other professional organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer organizations and groups	0	0	.3	.1	1
Migrant organizations and groups	1.7	3.5	3.8	3.1	25
Pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups	.9	.4	1.0	.7	6
Solidarity and human rights organizations	0	0	0	0	0
Welfare organizations	0	0	0	0	0
Racist and extreme right organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0
Peace movement organizations and groups	0	0	0	0	0

Organizations and groups of the elderly	1.7	.4	1.0	1.0	8
Women's organizations and groups	0	0	.3	.1	1
Environmental organizations	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorist groups	0	.4	.3	.2	2
Rebel forces/guerrillas	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil society organizations and groups	.4	0	.3	.2	2
Sub-total: other civil society actors	26.6	22.5	22.8	23.8	191
Whole polities	23.6	18.3	15.5	18.8	151
Whole economies	6.1	9.2	7.2	7.6	61
The general public	10.0	9.2	3.8	7.5	60
Sub-total: general/unknown/unspecified	39.7	36.6	26.6	33.9	272
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	803
N	229	284	290	803	

Positively and negatively evaluated object actors

The following discussion focuses on the scopes of object actors that are positively or negatively evaluated by newspapers. Object actors who are neither positively or negatively evaluated (ambivalent or no evaluation) are not included in these tables. Analysis of Tables 10.3a and 10.4a enables us to see what type of actors benefit from newspapers' political claims and what type of actors are affected negatively by newspapers' claims. In order to understand the representation of Europe and the EU by newspapers it is useful to look at the way in which newspapers' claims affect EU level actors as compared to national UK actors.

Taking the total for all newspapers in Table 10.3a we can see that the majority of newspaper claims positively affect object actors with a national UK scope (72.6%). With the exception of a small proportion of claims positively evaluating EU level actors (5.8%), newspapers' claims do not often benefit actors operating beyond the nation state – supranational UN (0.6%), supranational other (0.6%), multilateral (0.6%), and bilateral (0.3%). Actors from the Middle East and the rest of the world are more often positively affected by claims than national actors from other EU countries, but on the whole, few national actors outside the UK benefit from newspapers' claims. There are differences in the scope of actors positively affected by the editorial claims of individual newspapers. For instance, claims made by the Sun (89.8%) and the Scotsman (80.8%) benefit a higher proportion of national UK actors than claims made by the Guardian (67.5%) or the Times (61.8%). Consequently The Times and the Guardian make claims that positively affect a greater proportion of actors operating at a range of scopes other than the UK national sphere. Furthermore, the Sun and the Scotsman make fewer claims that positively evaluate actors operating at the level of the EU than the Guardian and the Times – 1.7% and 2.7% respectively.

Table 10.3a Scopes of positively evaluated object actors by paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	.8	1.1	0	0	.6	2
Other supranational	.8	1.1	0	0	.6	2
EU	8.7	6.7	1.7	2.7	5.8	20
Multilateral	.8	1.1	0	0	.6	2
Bilateral	0	0	1.7	0	.3	1
Germany	0	1.1	0	0	.3	1
France	0	0	0	1.4	.3	1
UK	67.5	61.8	89.8	80.8	72.6	252
Italy	0	1.1	0	0	.3	1
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	3.4	0	1.4	1.2	4
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	1.6	0	0	1.4	.9	3
Turkey	2.4	2.2	0	0	1.4	5
Russia	0	3.4	0	0	.9	3
USA	0	3.4	3.4	5.5	2.6	9
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	6.3	6.7	0	1.4	4.3	15
Rest of the world	11.1	6.7	3.4	5.5	7.5	26
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	347
N	126	89	59	73	347	

A comparison of the total number editorials in which newspapers' claims positively or negatively affect the interests of political actors illustrates the tendency of newspapers to make claims that will be to the benefit of actors rather than their detriment. A total of 347 newspaper editorials make claims that positively affect the object actor of the claim. Only 142 editorials make claims that negatively affect the object actor of the claim. Table 10.4a demonstrates that when newspapers do make claims that can be seen to negatively affect the interests of an actor, their claim is most likely to reflect the interests of UK national actors (42.3%). However, in contrast to the dominance of national UK actors among the type of actors most likely to benefit from newspaper claims, a wider range of non-UK actors have their interests negatively affected by opinion presented in newspaper editorials. In particular, newspapers made a large proportion of claims that negatively evaluated actors from the Middle East (19.7%). A logical explanation for this is presented in Table 10.4b, which shows all Middle East actors were negatively affected by claims made in the field of troops deployment. This mainly reflects negative evaluations of Saddam Hussain and Osama Bin Laden in newspaper editorials commenting on the 'war on terror'. Comparing the proportion of EU level actors negatively evaluated in editorials (15.5%) with the number of EU actors that benefited from newspapers' claims establishes the negative bias of the press towards EU actors (5.8%). Looking at the affect of claims by individual newspapers on EU actors, we can see that more editorials by the Times (22.2%) have negative consequences for the interests of EU level actors than editorials in the other newspapers. It is surprising that the Guardian, Sun and Scotsman make an equal proportion of claims that affect EU level actors negatively.

Table 10.4a Scopes of negatively evaluated object actors by paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Supranational: UN	0	0	2.2	0	.7	1
Other supranational	8.0	0	2.2	0	2.1	3
EU	12.0	22.2	13.3	13.9	15.5	22
Multilateral	0	5.6	0	0	1.4	2
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	0	11.1	4.4	0	4.2	6
France	0	0	2.2	5.6	2.1	3
UK	48.0	41.7	40.0	41.7	42.3	60
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	5.6	0	0	1.4	2
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	2.8	0	0	.7	1
USA	16.0	0	2.2	0	3.5	5
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	12.0	8.3	20.0	36.1	19.7	28
Rest of the world	4.0	2.8	13.3	2.8	6.3	9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	142
N	25	36	45	36	142	

Table 10.3b Scopes of positively evaluated object actors by issue fields (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European Integration	Total	N
Supranational :UN	0	0	0	3.1	0	0	0	.6	2
Other supranational	0	0	0	3.1	0	0	0	.6	2
EU	17.2	0	3.2	0	0	0	25.7	5.8	20
Multilateral	1.7	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	.6	2
Bilateral	0	0	3.2	0	0	0	0	.3	1
Germany	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	.3	1
France	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	.3	1
UK	69.0	82.9	64.5	39.1	100.0	99.1	45.7	72.6	252
Italy	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	.3	1
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	8.6	1.2	4
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	3.1	0	0	2.9	.9	3
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.3	1.4	5
Russia	0	0	0	3.1	0	0	2.9	.9	3
USA	1.7	2.4	0	10.9	0	0	0	2.6	9
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle East	0	0	0	23.4	0	0	0	4.3	15
Rest of the world	3.4	12.2	29.0	14.1	0	.9	0	7.5	26
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	347
N	58	41	31	64	11	107	35	347	

Tables 10.3b and 10.4b present data on the scope of actors positively and negatively evaluated in each issue field. The interests of EU level actors are only affected positively by claims in two fields – monetary politics and European integration – as shown in Table 10.3b. The importance of national UK actors in newspapers’ opinion leading over Europe is apparent from the high proportion of claims in the field that have positive consequences for national UK actors (45.7%) in comparison to EU level actors (25.7%). The fact that 14.3% of the political actors positively evaluated in the field of European integration are from Turkey, and no Turkish actors are negatively evaluated, suggests that newspapers have given a supportive view of Turkey’s application for membership of the EU in editorials. EU level actors are twice as likely to be negatively evaluated (50%) as they are to be positively evaluated (25.7%) in newspapers claims on European integration. In the field of monetary politics, newspapers claims are most likely to affect the interests of UK national actors either positively (69%) or negatively (67.7%). EU level actors are just as likely to be negatively evaluated (12.9%) as they are to be positively evaluated (17.2%) in newspapers claims on monetary policy. While no EU level actors benefit from the claims made by newspapers in the field of agriculture, 22% of actors negatively evaluated in the field are those operating at the EU level.

Table 10.4b Scopes of negatively evaluated object actors by issue fields (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European Integration	Total	N
Supranational : UN	0	0	0	2.1	0	0	0	.7	1
Other supranational	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.0	2.1	3
EU	12.9	22.2	0	2.1	0	0	50.0	15.5	22
Multilateral	3.2	0	0	2.1	0	0	0	1.4	2
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Germany	9.7	0	0	4.3	0	0	3.3	4.2	6
France	0	11.1	0	0	0	0	6.7	2.1	3
UK	67.7	66.7	44.4	10.6	0	100.0	26.7	42.3	60
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other EU-members	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upcoming enlargement countries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other European countries ex CIS	0	0	0	4.3	0	0	0	1.4	2
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	11.1	0	0	0	0	.7	1
USA	0	0	0	8.5	0	0	3.3	3.5	5
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Middle East	0	0	0	59.6	0	0	0	19.7	28
Rest of the world	6.5	0	44.4	6.4	0	0	0	6.3	9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	142
N	31	9	9	47	0	16	30	142	

Section summary:

Overall, newspapers' claims affect the interests of a wide range of actors coming from three main groups: state and party actors, general actors, and civil society actors. There are differences in the types of actors most likely to be affected by claims by individual newspapers. Over half of the actors affected by newspapers' claims on European integration are state and party actors, with the majority of these being government/executive actors. The next most common affected group by newspapers'

claims on European integration are general actors, and within this group whole polities in particular. When newspapers present opinions on how specific aspects of integration may affect whole polities, British papers are most likely to give an opinion on the benefits and disadvantages of integration to the UK national polity.

The findings show the tendency of UK newspapers to make a higher proportion of claims that will be to the benefit of political actors rather than to their detriment. Summarising the findings on the differences in the scopes of object actors evaluated positively and negatively in each policy field we can see that few national actors outside the UK and few actors operating beyond the nation state benefit from British newspapers' claims. Overall, EU level actors are three times as likely to be affected negatively by newspapers claims than they are to be affected positively. The interests of EU level actors are only affected positively by claims in two fields – monetary politics and European integration. The importance of national UK actors in newspapers' opinion leading over Europe is apparent from the high proportion of claims in the field that have positive consequences for national UK actors in comparison to EU level actors.

There are differences in the types of actors most likely to be affected by claims by individual newspapers. For instance, the Sun makes a higher level of claims that affect general actors and the Guardian and the Scotsman make more claims that affect civil society groups. In addition, there are differences in the scope of actors positively affected by the editorial claims of individual newspapers. The Times and the Guardian make claims that positively affect a greater proportion of actors operating at a range of scopes other than the UK national sphere.

Frames:

In this section we look at the way in which newspapers construct the claims they make in editorial articles by using interpretive frames. This enables us to analyse the way newspapers give opinions on European integration and the different ways in which they describe the issue. Frames were developed in order to be able to measure six different ways in which newspapers may describe European integration in editorial articles: the first two types of frames – ‘Identity, normative and value’ frames and ‘constitutional and governance’ frames - relate to the way newspapers describe what the EU is and what it stands for; the third and fourth categories of frames - ‘economic’ frames and ‘other instrumental’ frames - describe what the EU is good or bad for e.g., fight unemployment, high taxes, greater weight in international relations, security; the fifth type of frame – ‘historical’ frames – refer to when a newspaper relates European integration to historical events or periods; the final category of frame – frames ‘internal to the integration’ process - refer to possible causal linkages between one aspect of European integration and another, e.g. between enlargement and institutional reforms. The following discussion will concentrate on looking at what types of frames are most commonly used by UK newspapers in opinion leading articles and the differences between the framing of European integration by each newspaper.

In order to focus the analysis on the framing of European issues, frames were only coded for editorials that gave opinion in the field of European integration or on another issue with European issue scope. Out of a total of 835 editorials containing claims, 314 articles were published in this category. Of these, it was possible to identify frames in 211 or 67.2% of editorials. Two characteristics in newspapers’ presentation of opinion on European issues should be noted. First of all, the newspapers did not publish an equal amount of editorials in the field of European integration or on another issue with European issue scope. As has been discussed earlier, European integration and issues with an EU scope are more common on the editorial agenda of the Sun than the other newspapers and the Scotsman publishes the fewest number of articles on the issue (see Table 7.1 and 7.3). Secondly, as is evident in Table 11.1a the newspapers differ in the extent to which frames can be measured in the content of their editorial articles. We can see that framing is used more often by the Sun and the Times, who are 10% more likely to frame their opinion on European issues.

Table 11.1a Presence of frame by paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
None	39.5	28.4	28.4	38.0	32.8	103
Frame/s	60.5	71.6	71.6	62.0	67.2	211
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	314
N	81	74	109	50	314	

As we would expect for the debate in the UK, Table 11.1b establishes that the majority of frames are found in editorials commenting on the policy fields of monetary policy and European integration. For the few editorials with an EU scope in the field of agriculture there are just over 40% of claims containing a frame. There are even fewer editorials with an EU scope in other policy fields such as immigration, troops, pensions, education and claims in these fields are rarely framed in terms of Europeanisation.

Table 11.1b Presence of frame by issue field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European Integration	Total	N
None	39.3	59.1	28.6	50.0	100.0	100.0	19.5	32.8	103
Frames	60.7	40.9	71.4	50.0	0	0	80.5	67.2	211
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	314
N	145	22	7	4	3	3	133	314	

Note: The following tables only present data for editorials containing a frame.

Overall, Table 11.2a shows that UK newspapers predominantly present their opinion on Europe using three types of frames: Constitutional and governance frames (31.8%), economic frames (23.2%), and other instrumental frames (21.8%). Frames internal to the integration process (6.2%) and historical frames are rarely employed by the UK press (2.8%). Identity, normative and value frames such as freedom, peace, national identity, and globalization are not commonly found in UK newspaper opinion either (14.2%). Importantly for our understanding of the way UK newspapers provide opinion on Europe, Table 11.2a reveals a number of large differences between the categories of frames employed by each newspaper. Each of the papers differ in terms of the range of frames used and the dominance of certain categories of frames over others. In addition, as was shown in Table 11.1a, the newspapers use frames in their editorial discussions to varying degrees. For instance, the Sun uses frames to construct its opinion in a far greater number of articles than other papers (n=78). The Guardian uses the widest range of different types of frames, and the majority of its frames are distributed between three categories: economic (24.5%), identity (22.4%) and constitutional (22.4%). Further analysis of the five most common specific frames used by each paper presented in Table 11.2ax also demonstrates that the Guardian does not use the same frames repeatedly to the same extent as the other newspapers – the five most mentioned frames for the Guardian represent only approximately a third (32.5%) of the range of frames employed by the paper. In contrast, the top five frames for the other papers represent nearly half of the range of frames used. Opinion in the Times is mainly composed using instrumental (39.6%) or constitutional (34%) frames. Table 11.2ax shows the Time’s editorials are most likely to frame the issue in terms of acceptance of the EU by citizens and the national interest (instrumental frames) or federalism and sovereignty (constitutional frames). Interestingly, federalism and sovereignty are absent from the top five mentioned frames in the pro European Guardian, but are common frames in the other two anti European newspapers, the Sun and the Scotsman. There are also clear differences between the papers in the proportion of editorials framing Europe in economic terms. The Sun and the Guardian are over twice as likely than the Times and the Scotsman to construct their opinion in terms of economic arguments (24.5% and 34.6% respectively). Nearly half of the

editorials framing Europe in the Scotsman do so in reference to constitutional and governance issues (45.2%) such as sovereignty, federalism and centralization. The framing of Europe by the Sun is most often in either economic (34.6%) or constitutional terms (30.8%). Therefore, looking at Table 11.2ax we can see four specific frames that are common across the UK press as a whole: federalism, sovereignty, common currency leads to political integration, and relations with the USA.

Table 11.2a Frame type by paper (in %)

	Guardian	Times	Sun	Scotsman	Total	N
Identity, normative and value frames	22.4	11.3	11.5	12.9	14.2	30
Constitutional and governance frames	22.4	34.0	30.8	45.2	31.8	67
Economic frames	24.5	11.3	34.6	12.9	23.2	49
Other instrumental frames	16.3	39.6	12.8	22.6	21.8	46
Historical frames	4.1	1.9	1.3	6.5	2.8	6
Frames internal to the integration process	10.2	1.9	9.0	0	6.2	13
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	211
N	49	53	78	31	211	

Table 11.2ax Five most often mentioned frames by newspaper - Guardian

Guardian			Times		
	Frequency	%		Frequency	%
Democracy	4	8.2	Acceptance of the EU by citizens	7	13.2
Economic growth	4	8.2	National interest	7	13.2
Self determination	3	6.1	Federalism	4	7.5
Common currency before political integration	3	6.1	Sovereignty	3	5.7
Community of values	2	4.1	Efficiency	3	5.7
Other Frames	33	67.3	Other Frames	29	54.7
Total	49	100	Total	53	100
Sun			Scotsman		
	Frequency	%		Frequency	%
Federalism	9	11.5	Acceptance of the EU	4	12.9
National economy	9	11.5	Sovereignty	3	9.7
Sovereignty	6	7.7	Federalism	3	9.7
Common currency before political integration	6	7.7	Centralization	2	6.5
Relation with USA	5	6.4	Relation with USA	2	6.5
Other Frames	43	55.2	Other Frames	17	54.7
Total	78	100	Total	31	100

Table 11.2b demonstrates that newspapers frame their editorial opinion of monetary politics and European integration in different ways. Nearly half of all discussion of European scope monetary politics issues, predominantly the common currency, is framed in economic terms. Somewhat surprisingly the issue is not framed only in economic terms. Constitutional (20.5%) and instrumental (17%) frames are also employed by newspapers to frame the issue of the single currency. This reflects several characteristics of the debate over monetary union in the UK national sphere.

First it highlights the strong link between public discussions of the question of Britain’s membership of the euro with questions related to the European Union as a whole. In other words, the debate over membership of the euro is not conducted in isolation from other broader issues related to the European project such as sovereignty and democracy (constitutional frames), and the effect on the national interest (instrumental frame). Economic frames are rarely employed by newspapers on European integration issues other than monetary union (7.5%). Constitutional frames (42.1%) such as federalism and sovereignty are most often used to frame European integration, along with identity (22.4%) and instrumental frames (22.4%).

Table 11.2b Frame type by policy field (in %)

	Monetary politics	Agriculture	Immigration	Troops	Pensions	Education	European Integration	Total	N
Identity, normative and value frames	3.4	22.2	0	50.0	0	0	22.4	14.2	30
Constitutional and governance frames	20.5	44.4	0	0	0	0	42.1	31.8	67
Economic frames	45.5	11.1	0	0	0	0	7.5	23.2	49
Other instrumental frames	17.0	22.2	80.0	50.0	0	0	22.4	21.8	46
Historical frames	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	3.7	2.8	6
Frames internal to the integration process	11.4	0	20.0	0	0	0	1.9	6.2	13
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0	0	100.0	100.0	211
N	88	9	5	2	0	0	107	211	

Looking in more detail at which specific types of frames are most commonly used by UK newspapers in Table 11.3 gives us a more precise understanding of the framing of European issues by UK newspapers. Rather than showing aggregate data for the six different categories of frames, Table 11.3 gives a breakdown of the twenty-five most often mentioned frames. From this we can see that the framing of Europe in constitutional and governance terms (31.8%) refers to newspapers’ expressions of opinion about Europe in terms of concepts such as federalism, sovereignty, democracy, bureaucracy, legitimacy, corruption and credibility. The economy is a frequent theme in editorials (23.2%) with newspapers often describing European integration or the single currency in terms of its implications for the national economy, economic growth, and economic stability. In addition to the effects on the economy, newspapers regularly use ‘other instrumental’ frames to construct their view of what the EU is good or bad for (21.8%). These include discussion of the acceptance of the EU by citizens, relations with the USA, and the consequences of European issues for the national interest.

The most common way that Europe is framed in the UK press is in terms of federalism, and more specifically, the opinion is given that integration is perceived as moving towards federalism. Common viewpoints include condemnation of the reported desire of European leaders to create a 'European superstate' or a 'United States of Europe', and an overall resistance to federal rule. The acceptance (or in the UK's case, lack of acceptance) of the EU by its citizens is the second most common framing of the European issues by the press. Rather than framing the lack of acceptance of the EU by citizens regarding one particular aspect of integration, newspapers employ this frame with reference to a range of specific issues. These included concerns about enlargement, general disaffection with the EU project, public hostility to economic and monetary union in Denmark following the 'no' vote and continued scepticism in the UK, and the problem of the distance of EU leadership from the citizens or 'democratic deficit'. Another common frame related to the acceptance of the EU by citizens and used in reference to the issues discussed in the framing of the EU in this way is 'democracy'. When framing the EU in terms of democracy, UK newspapers most often implied that the EU was undemocratic (citing the Irish vote on the Nice treaty as an example), unaccountable and suffered from a 'democratic deficit'. The negative consequences of further integration and monetary union on Britain's sovereignty are the third most common framing of Europe in the UK press. The loss of Britain's sovereignty was often stated as one of the consequences of Europe's development into a federal superstate and also cited as an undesirable implication of monetary union. The cost to the UK national economy was equally often repeated in editorials. Newspapers were predominantly of the opinion that joining the euro would have negative consequences on Britain's economy and used the experiences of other countries in the eurozone to argue that the UK's economy is better off outside the euro. Focusing further on the single currency, some of the papers used their editorials to suggest that the relationship between the common currency and further political integration was an inevitable one – 'Common Currency Before Political Integration'. Given the dominance of the question of Britain's membership of the euro in editorial articles, it is not surprising that this was the only frame from the category of frames that link one aspect of integration to another to be used by UK newspapers. Here newspapers were keen to give prominence to their view that Britain's decision to join the euro was as much a political as an economic decision. Where other economic frames were used to discuss 'Europe's economy' rather than Britain's national economy they mainly highlighted negative aspects such as the downturn in growth across the eurozone (economic growth and stability), and rising unemployment in Germany. These were then given as good reasons for Britain to remain outside the single currency. Therefore, newspapers most often used constitutional and economic frames to construct the issue of Europe in the context of the implications for Britain. Overwhelmingly, British newspapers frame European integration by describing what the EU stands for and what it is good or bad for in terms of the UK, rather than the EU as a whole.

Table 11.2c Frame type by year (in %)

	2000	2001	2002	Total	N
Identity, normative and value frames	10.3	15.5	18.2	14.2	30
Constitutional and governance frames	35.6	32.8	25.8	31.8	67
Economic frames	21.8	22.4	25.8	23.2	49
Other instrumental frames	19.5	20.7	25.8	21.8	46
Historical frames	2.3	6.9	0	2.8	6
Frames internal to the integration process	10.3	1.7	4.5	6.2	13
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	211
N	87	58	66	211	

Table 11.3 Twenty-five most often mentioned frames

Frame:	Frequency	%
Federalism	16	7.6
Acceptance Of The EU by citizens	14	6.6
Sovereignty	13	6.2
(Own) National Economy	13	6.2
Democracy (joint 5th)	10	4.7
Relation With USA (joint 5th)	10	4.7
Common Currency Before Political Integration (joint 5th)	10	4.7
Economic Growth	9	4.3
National Interest	8	3.8
Economic Stability	7	3.3
Influence In International Relations	6	2.8
Unemployment	6	2.8
Free Trade	5	2.4
Efficiency	5	2.4
Centralization	4	1.9
Bureaucracy	4	1.9
Legitimacy	4	1.9
National Identity	3	1.4
Community Of Values	3	1.4
Independence	3	1.4
Self Determination	3	1.4
Corruption	3	1.4
Credibility	3	1.4
Cope With Transnational Social Problems	3	1.4
Prices	3	1.4

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

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Federalism	4	26.7	26.7
Centralization	3	20.0	46.7
Racism	1	6.7	53.3
Christian Values	1	6.7	60.0
Sovereignty	1	6.7	66.7
Efficiency	1	6.7	73.3
Cross-Border Transport	1	6.7	80.0
Taxes	1	6.7	86.7
Nazi Rule	1	6.7	93.3
Economic Integration Before Political Integration	1	6.7	100.0
Total	15	100.0	

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

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Acceptance Of The EU	10	11.5	11.5
Sovereignty	9	10.3	21.8
Democracy	8	9.2	31.0
National Economy	8	9.2	40.2
Relation With USA	5	5.7	46.0
Economic Growth	5	5.7	51.7
Economic Stability	5	5.7	57.5
National Interest	4	4.6	62.1
Influence In International Relations	4	4.6	66.7
10- National Identity	3	3.4	70.1
Efficiency	3	3.4	73.6
Independence	2	2.3	75.9
Transparency	2	2.3	78.2
Credibility	2	2.3	80.5
Legitimacy	2	2.3	82.8
Foreign Investments	2	2.3	85.1
Community Of Values	1	1.1	86.2
Nationalism	1	1.1	87.4
Collectivism	1	1.1	88.5
Free Trade	1	1.1	89.7
Participation	1	1.1	90.8
Cross-Border Transport	1	1.1	92.0
Other	1	1.1	93.1
Strength In Global Competition	1	1.1	94.3
Taxes	1	1.1	95.4
Prices	1	1.1	96.6
Colonialism	1	1.1	97.7
Holocaust	1	1.1	98.9
Terrorist Attacks On USA Of 2001	1	1.1	100.0
Total	87	100.0	

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

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Federalism	10	22.2	22.2
Unemployment	5	11.1	33.3
Common Currency Before Political Integration	5	11.1	44.4
Bureaucracy	4	8.9	53.3
Corruption	3	6.7	60.0
Peace	2	4.4	64.4
Prices	2	4.4	68.9
Community Of Values	1	2.2	71.1
Sovereignty	1	2.2	73.3
Centralization	1	2.2	75.6
Other	1	2.2	77.8
Acceptance Of The EU	1	2.2	80.0
National Interest	1	2.2	82.2
Security	1	2.2	84.4
Political Stability	1	2.2	86.7
Cope With Transnational Social Problems	1	2.2	88.9
Economic Growth	1	2.2	91.1
National Economy	1	2.2	93.3
Inflation	1	2.2	95.6
Wastefulness	1	2.2	97.8
Enlargement Before Institutional Reforms	1	2.2	100.0
Total	45	100.0	

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

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Relation With USA	4	11.4	11.4
Self Determination	3	8.6	20.0
Free Trade	3	8.6	28.6
Legitimacy	2	5.7	34.3
Acceptance Of The EU	2	5.7	40.0
Cope With Transnational Social Problems	2	5.7	45.7
Economic Growth	2	5.7	51.4
Economic Stability	2	5.7	57.1
National Economy	2	5.7	62.9
Community Of Values	1	2.9	65.7
Liberalism	1	2.9	68.6
Freedom	1	2.9	71.4
Collectivism	1	2.9	74.3
Diversity	1	2.9	77.1
Unity	1	2.9	80.0
Equality Among Countries	1	2.9	82.9
Democracy	1	2.9	85.7
Credibility	1	2.9	88.6
National Interest	1	2.9	91.4
Consumer Protection	1	2.9	94.3
Roman Empire	1	2.9	97.1
Institutional Reforms Before Enlargement	1	2.9	100.0
Total	35	100.0	

Section summary:

The findings discussed the types of frames that are most commonly used by UK newspapers in opinion leading articles. As we would expect for the debate in the UK, the data established that the majority of frames are found in editorials commenting on the policy fields of monetary policy and European integration. Overall, UK newspapers predominantly present their opinion on Europe using three types of frames: Constitutional and governance frames, economic frames, and other instrumental frames. Constitutional and governance frames most often included specific frames such as federalism, sovereignty, democracy, bureaucracy, legitimacy, corruption and credibility. Newspapers most often used constitutional and economic frames to construct the issue of Europe in the context of the implications for Britain. Economic frames common to UK editorials include descriptions of European integration or the single currency in terms of its implications for the national economy, economic growth, and economic stability. Other instrumental frames used in UK editorials most often referred to discussion of the acceptance of the EU by citizens, relations with the USA, and the consequences of European issues for the national interest. Overwhelmingly, British newspapers frame European integration by describing what the EU stands for and what it is good or bad for in terms of the UK, rather than the EU as a whole. With regard to the popular use of specific frames, the tables demonstrated four frames to be common across the UK newspapers: federalism, sovereignty, common currency leads to political integration, and relations with the USA.

The second focus of the discussion was an analysis of the differences between the framing of European integration by individual newspapers. Some of the newspapers were more likely than others to frame their opinion on European issues. Framing was used more often by the Sun and the Times, than in the Scotsman and the Guardian. Importantly for our understanding of the way UK newspapers provide opinion on Europe, the data showed there were significant differences between the categories of frames employed by each newspaper. Each of the papers differed in terms of the range of frames used and the dominance of certain categories of frames over others.

Appendix

WP3 - Sampling scheme: editorials coding – UK CASE

Relevant editorials were selected from all 4 UK newspapers (Guardian, Times, Sun, Scotsman) on each of the following days:

2000

January		
03.01.00	Monday	
05.01.00	Wednesday	
07.01.00	Friday	
11.01.00	Tuesday	
13.01.00	Thursday	
15.01.00	Saturday	
17.01.00	Monday	
19.01.00	Wednesday	
21.01.00	Friday	
25.01.00	Tuesday	
27.01.00	Thursday	
29.01.00	Saturday	
31.01.00	Monday	
February		
02.02.00	Wednesday	
04.02.00	Friday	
08.02.00	Tuesday	
10.02.00	Thursday	
12.02.00	Saturday	
14.02.00	Monday	
16.02.00	Wednesday	
18.02.00	Friday	
22.02.00	Tuesday	
24.02.00	Thursday	
26.02.00	Saturday	
28.02.00	Monday	
March		
01.03.00	Wednesday	
03.03.00	Friday	
07.03.00	Tuesday	
09.03.00	Thursday	
11.03.00	Saturday	
13.03.00	Monday	
15.03.00	Wednesday	
17.03.00	Friday	
21.03.00	Tuesday	
23.03.00	Thursday	
25.03.00	Saturday	
27.03.00	Monday	
29.03.00	Wednesday	
31.03.00	Friday	
April		
04.04.00	Tuesday	
06.04.00	Thursday	
08.04.00	Saturday	
10.04.00	Monday	
12.04.00	Wednesday	
14.04.00	Friday	
18.04.00	Tuesday	

20.04.00	Thursday	
22.04.00	Saturday	
24.04.00	Monday	
26.04.00	Wednesday	
28.04.00	Friday	
May		
02.05.00	Tuesday	
04.05.00	Thursday	
06.05.00	Saturday	
08.05.00	Monday	
10.05.00	Wednesday	
12.05.00	Friday	
16.05.00	Tuesday	
18.05.00	Thursday	
20.05.00	Saturday	
22.05.00	Monday	
24.05.00	Wednesday	
26.05.00	Friday	
30.05.00	Tuesday	
June		
01.06.00	Thursday	
03.06.00	Saturday	
05.06.00	Monday	
07.06.00	Wednesday	
09.06.00	Friday	
13.06.00	Tuesday	
15.06.00	Thursday	
17.06.00	Saturday	
19.06.00	Monday	
21.06.00	Wednesday	
23.06.00	Friday	
27.06.00	Tuesday	
29.06.00	Thursday	
July		
01.07.00	Saturday	
03.07.00	Monday	
05.07.00	Wednesday	
07.07.00	Friday	
11.07.00	Tuesday	
13.07.00	Thursday	
15.07.00	Saturday	
17.07.00	Monday	
19.07.00	Wednesday	
21.07.00	Friday	
25.07.00	Tuesday	
27.07.00	Thursday	
29.07.00	Saturday	
31.07.00	Monday	
August		
02.08.00	Wednesday	
04.08.00	Friday	
08.08.00	Tuesday	
10.08.00	Thursday	
12.08.00	Saturday	
14.08.00	Monday	
16.08.00	Wednesday	
18.08.00	Friday	
22.08.00	Tuesday	

24.08.00	Thursday	
26.08.00	Saturday	
28.08.00	Monday	
30.08.00	Wednesday	
September		
01.09.00	Friday	
05.09.00	Tuesday	
07.09.00	Thursday	
09.09.00	Saturday	
11.09.00	Monday	
13.09.00	Wednesday	
15.09.00	Friday	
19.09.00	Tuesday	
21.09.00	Thursday	
23.09.00	Saturday	
25.09.00	Monday	
27.09.00	Wednesday	
29.09.00	Friday	
October		
03.10.00	Tuesday	
05.10.00	Thursday	
07.10.00	Saturday	
09.10.00	Monday	
11.10.00	Wednesday	
13.10.00	Friday	
17.10.00	Tuesday	
19.10.00	Thursday	
21.10.00	Saturday	
23.10.00	Monday	
25.10.00	Wednesday	
27.10.00	Friday	
31.10.00	Tuesday	
November		
02.11.00	Thursday	
04.11.00	Saturday	
06.11.00	Monday	
08.11.00	Wednesday	
10.11.00	Friday	
14.11.00	Tuesday	
16.11.00	Thursday	
18.11.00	Saturday	
20.11.00	Monday	
22.11.00	Wednesday	
24.11.00	Friday	
28.11.00	Tuesday	
30.11.00	Thursday	
December		
02.12.00	Saturday	
04.12.00	Monday	
06.12.00	Wednesday	
08.12.00	Friday	
12.12.00	Tuesday	
14.12.00	Thursday	
16.12.00	Saturday	
18.12.00	Monday	
20.12.00	Wednesday	
22.12.00	Friday	
26.12.00	Tuesday	

28.12.00	Thursday	
30.12.00	Saturday	

2001

January		
3.1.01	Wednesday	
5.1.01	Friday	
9.1.01	Tuesday	
11.1.01	Thursday	
13.1.01	Saturday	
15.1.01	Monday	
17.1.01	Wednesday	
19.1.01	Friday	
23.1.01	Tuesday	
25.1.01	Thursday	
27.1.01	Saturday	
29.1.01	Monday	
31.1.01	Wednesday	
February		
2.2.01		
6.2.01	Tuesday	
8.2.01	Thursday	
10.2.01		
12.2.01		
14.2.01	Wednesday	
16.2.01	Friday	
20.2.01		
22.2.01	Thursday	
24.2.01	Saturday	
26.2.01	Monday	
28.2.01		
March		
2.3.01	Friday	
6.3.01	Tuesday	
8.3.01		
10.3.01	Saturday	
12.3.01	Monday	
14.3.01	Wednesday	
16.3.01		
20.3.01	Tuesday	
22.3.01	Thursday	
24.3.01		
26.3.01		
28.3.01	Wednesday	
30.3.01	Friday	
April		
3.4.01		
5.4.01	Thursday	
7.4.01	Saturday	
9.4.01	Monday	
11.4.01		
13.4.01	Friday	
17.4.01	Tuesday	
19.4.01		
21.4.01	Saturday	
23.4.01	Monday	
25.4.01	Wednesday	

27.4.01		
May		
1.5.01	Tuesday	
3.5.01	Thursday	
5.5.01		
7.5.01		
9.5.01	Wednesday	
11.5.01	Friday	
15.5.01		
<u>17.5.01</u>	Thursday	
<u>19.5.01</u>	Saturday	
<u>21.5.01</u>	Monday	
<u>23.5.01</u>		
25.5.01	Friday	
<u>29.5.01</u>	Tuesday	
<u>31.5.01</u>		
June		
2.6.01	Saturday	
4.6.01	Monday	
6.6.01	Wednesday	
8.6.01		
12.6.01	Tuesday	
14.6.01	Thursday	
16.6.01		
18.6.01		
20.6.01	Wednesday	
22.6.01	Friday	
26.6.01		
28.6.01	Thursday	
30.6.01	Saturday	
July		
2.7.01	Monday	
4.7.01		
6.7.01	Friday	
10.7.01	Tuesday	
12.7.01		
14.7.01	Saturday	
16.7.01	Monday	
18.7.01	Wednesday	
20.7.01		
24.7.01	Tuesday	
26.7.01	Thursday	
28.7.01		
30.7.01		
August		
1.8.01	Wednesday	
3.8.01	Friday	
7.8.01		
9.8.01	Thursday	
11.8.01	Saturday	
13.8.01	Monday	
15.8.01		
17.8.01	Friday	
21.8.01	Tuesday	
23.8.01		
25.8.01	Saturday	
27.8.01	Monday	
29.8.01	Wednesday	

31.8.01		
September		
4.9.01	Tuesday	
6.9.01	Thursday	
8.9.01		
10.9.01		
12.9.01	Wednesday	
14.9.01	Friday	
18.9.01		
20.9.01	Thursday	
22.9.01	Saturday	
24.9.02	Monday	
26.9.01		
28.9.01	Friday	
October		
2.10.01	Tuesday	
4.10.01		
6.10.01	Saturday	
8.10.01	Monday	
10.10.01	Wednesday	
12.10.01		
16.10.01	Tuesday	
18.10.01	Thursday	
20.10.01		
22.10.01		
24.10.01	Wednesday	
26.10.01	Friday	
30.10.01		
November		
1.11.01	Thursday	
3.11.01	Saturday	
5.11.01	Monday	
7.11.01		
9.11.01	Friday	
13.11.01	Tuesday	
15.11.01		
17.11.01	Saturday	
19.11.01	Monday	
21.11.01	Wednesday	
23.11.01		
27.11.01	Tuesday	
29.11.01	Thursday	
December		
1.12.01		
3.12.01		
5.12.01	Wednesday	
7.12.01	Friday	
11.12.01		
13.12.01	Thursday	
15.12.01	Saturday	
17.12.01	Monday	
19.12.01		
21.12.01	Friday	
25.12.01	Tuesday	
27.12.01		
29.12.01	Saturday	
31.12.01		

2002

January		
2.1.02	Wednesday	
4.1.02		
8.1.02	Tuesday	
10.1.02	Thursday	
12.1.02		
14.1.02		
16.1.02	Wednesday	
18.1.02	Friday	
22.1.02		
24.1.02	Thursday	
26.1.02	Saturday	
28.1.02	Monday	
30.1.02		
February		
1.2.02	Friday	
5.2.02	Tuesday	
7.2.02		
9.2.02	Saturday	
11.2.02	Monday	
13.2.02	Wednesday	
15.2.02		
19.2.02	Tuesday	
21.2.02	Thursday	
23.2.02		
25.2.02		
27.2.02	Wednesday	
March		
1.3.02	Friday	
5.3.02		
7.3.02	Thursday	
9.3.02	Saturday	
11.3.02	Monday	
13.3.02		
15.3.02	Friday	
19.3.02	Tuesday	
21.3.02		
23.3.02	Saturday	
25.3.02	Monday	
27.3.02	Wednesday	
29.3.02		
April		
2.4.02	Tuesday	
4.4.02	Thursday	
6.4.02		
8.4.02		

<u>10.4.02</u>	Wednesday	
<u>12.4.02</u>	Friday	
<u>16.4.02</u>		
18.4.02	Thursday	
20.4.02	Saturday	
22.4.02	Monday	
24.4.02		
26.4.02	Friday	
30.4.02	Tuesday	
May		
2.5.02		
4.5.02	Saturday	
6.5.02	Monday	
8.5.02	Wednesday	
10.5.02		
<u>14.5.02</u>	Tuesday	
16.5.02	Thursday	
<u>18.5.02</u>		
<u>20.5.02</u>		
22.5.02	Wednesday	
<u>24.5.02</u>	Friday	
28.5.02		
30.5.02	Thursday	
June		
1.6.02	Saturday	
3.6.02	Monday	
5.6.02		
7.6.02	Friday	
11.6.02	Tuesday	
13.6.02		
15.6.02	Saturday	
17.6.02	Monday	
19.6.02	Wednesday	
21.6.02		
25.6.02	Tuesday	
27.6.02	Thursday	
29.6.02		
July		
1.7.02		
3.7.02	Wednesday	
5.7.02	Friday	
9.7.02		
11.7.02	Thursday	
13.7.02	Saturday	
15.7.02	Monday	
17.7.02		
19.7.02	Friday	
23.7.02	Tuesday	

25.7.02		
27.7.02	Saturday	
29.7.02	Monday	
31.7.02	Wednesday	
August		
2.8.02		
6.8.02	Tuesday	
8.8.02	Thursday	
10.8.02		
12.8.02		
14.8.02	Wednesday	
16.8.02	Friday	
20.8.02		
22.8.02	Thursday	
24.8.02	Saturday	
26.8.02	Monday	
28.8.02		
30.8.02	Friday	
September		
3.9.02	Tuesday	
5.9.02		
7.9.02	Saturday	
9.9.02	Monday	
11.9.02	Wednesday	
13.9.02		
17.9.02	Tuesday	
19.9.02	Thursday	
21.9.02		
23.9.02		
25.9.02	Wednesday	
27.9.02	Friday	
October		
1.10.02		
3.10.02	Thursday	
5.10.02	Saturday	
7.10.02	Monday	
9.10.02		
11.10.02	Friday	
15.10.02	Tuesday	
17.10.02		
19.10.02	Saturday	
21.10.02	Monday	
23.10.02	Wednesday	
25.10.02		
29.10.02	Tuesday	
31.10.02	Thursday	
November		
2.11.02		

4.11.02		
6.11.02	Wednesday	
8.11.02	Friday	
12.11.02		
14.11.02	Thursday	
16.11.02	Saturday	
18.11.02	Monday	
20.11.02		
22.11.02	Friday	
26.11.02	Tuesday	
28.11.02		
30.11.02	Saturday	
December		
2.12.02	Monday	
4.12.02	Wednesday	
6.12.02		
10.12.02	Tuesday	
12.12.02	Thursday	
14.12.02		
16.12.02		
18.12.02	Wednesday	
20.12.02	Friday	
24.12.02		
26.12.02	Thursday	
28.12.02	Saturday	
30.12.02	Monday	

Bibliography

- Baker, D. (2001). "Britain and Europe: The Argument Continues." Parliamentary Affairs **54**: 276-288.
- Dearing, J. W. and E. M. Rogers (1996). Agenda Setting. Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Eilders, C. (2000). "Media as Political Actors? Issue Focussing and Selective Emphasis in the German Quality Press." German Politics **9**(3): 181-206.
- Firmstone, J. (2003). Framing 'Britain in Europe': a comparative analysis of the British media agenda on Europe. 2nd ECPR General Conference, Marburg, Germany.
- Gray, E. (2003). "Waiting for the Starting Signal: the UK's pro- and anti- euro campaigns." Working Paper 3/03, EurPolCom, University of Leeds. Access at - http://newmedia.leeds.ac.uk/eurpolcom/discussion_papers.cfm.
- Koopmans, R. and P. Statham (2002). Research Proposal: The Transformation of Political Mobilisation and Communication in European Public Spheres. Berlin, WZB.
- McCombs, M., J. P. Llamas, et al. (1997). "Candidate images in Spanish elections: Second-level agenda-setting effects." Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly **74**(703-717).
- McCombs, M. and D. Shaw (1972). "The agenda-setting function of the mass media." Public Opinion Quarterly **36**(176-187).
- McCombs, M., D. Shaw, et al. (1997). Communication and Democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda setting theory. Mahwah, NJ, Erlbaum.