

Project no. 211810

**PIREDEU**  
**Providing an Infrastructure for Research on Electoral Democracy in the**  
**European Union**

**WORKPACKAGE 5**

**Media Study**

**Universiteit van Amsterdam and University of Exeter**

**CONTENT ANALYSIS**  
**(DOCUMENTATION)**

## GENERAL INFORMATION

The study was carried out within the framework of PIREDEU ([www.piredeu.eu](http://www.piredeu.eu)), Providing an Infrastructure for Research on Electoral Democracy in the European Union. PIREDEU is funded by the European Union's FP 7 program.

Work package 5, the media study, was carried out by the University of Amsterdam and University of Exeter. The work package leaders were Claes de Vreese (U Amsterdam) and Susan Banducci (U Exeter).

All data within the PIREDEU project will become publicly available. The PIREDEU Steering Committee has decided for a two-stage data release:

- an initial release (March 2010) of the data set, without full documentation and intercoder reliability information
- a final release (December 2010) including full documentation.

## TEXT TO BE USED IN PUBLICATIONS

The data are available for public use and are to be cited as follows:  
EES (2009), European Parliament Election Study 2009, Media Study Data, Advance Release, 31/03/2010, ([www.piredeu.eu](http://www.piredeu.eu)).

The citation of the data should **always** be accompanied by a citation of – at least – this codebook / advance release documentation:

Schuck, Andreas; Xezonakis, Georgios; Banducci, Susan; and de Vreese, Claes H. (2010), *EES (2009) Media Study Data Advance Release Documentation*, 31/03/2010. ([www.piredeu.eu](http://www.piredeu.eu))

Alternatively:

“The media study is part of the European Election Study and the PIREDEU Project (Providing Providing an Infrastructure for Research on Electoral Democracy in the European Union, [www.piredeu.eu](http://www.piredeu.eu)). Details about the the media study can be found in Schuck, A., Xezonakis, G., Banducci, S., & de Vreese, C. H. (2010)”.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ASSISTANCE**

The 2009 EES Media Study would not have been possible without the help of many colleagues, both members of the PIREDEU team and country experts from the wider academic community, who spent valuable time assisting with the codebook, answering questions about national media systems and capturing media content. We would like to acknowledge their work here and thank them warmly.

Valuable assistance in developing coding instructions and digital content capture, training coders and preparing the data was provided by Rachid Azrout, Marketa Biliska, Hajo Boomgaarden, Matthijs Elenbaas, Joost van Spanje and Rens Vliegthart.

Research assistance was provided by Bart Monne (ASCoR ComLab), Judith Moller and Thomas Klausch (student assistants)

### ***Coders***

Samantha Abela, Cristina Alonso, Apostolos Andrikopoulos, Simone Azzopardi, Juulia Baer-Bader, Cecilia Bengtsson, Sandor Blasko, Philip Boven, Vlad Cadar, Emma Callet, Eowyn Castle, Jiri Cermak, Hannah Cooper, Izabella Dabrowska, Patrik Edvardsson, Marta Engere, Jennifer Eurich, Natasha Faust, Lucas Freire, Gilda Fulco, Pedro Geirinhas, Magda Geronikolaki, Rosemary Grain, Neli Ivanova, Plamena Ivanova, Ann-Marie Jordan, Eleni Kanava, Ausra Kasperaviciute, Agnieszka Kazimierczuk, Sarah Kristensen, Madara Laksa, Liisu Lass, Boris Mance, Liesbeth Mann, Marzio Menichetti, Esther Mol, Fernando Morente, Audrey Morliere, Zita Patapovaite, Hugo Pinto, Edward Plant, Jasmin Rocha, Andreas Schütz, Roxane Schwandt, Tewfiq Al-Sharaiyra, Evangelia Sigala, Erika Stenmark, Jiri Svorc, Ewa Urywkow-Tchang, Katalin Toth, Andreja Trdina, Vasilis Tsaousis, Alex Virtanen, Kati Vogt, Erlijn Wenink, Silvie van der Zee, Sandra ten Zijthoff.

### ***Country Collaborators***

Aukse Balcytiene  
Rosa Berganza  
Helen Cook  
Matus Cupka  
Piret Ehin  
Olga Gyarfasova  
Janis Ikstens  
Therese Kaiser  
Constantinos Kakouros  
Sylvia Kritzinger  
Pedro Magalhaes  
Radek Markowski

Inka Salovaara Moring  
Roula Nezi  
Mareike Ott  
Michelle Pace  
Marina Popescu  
Carmen Sammut  
Ligita Sarkute  
Robert Sata  
Joanna Spiterri  
Gabor Toka  
Visvaldis Valtenbergs  
Peeter Vihalemm  
Ewa Zebrowska

### ***PIREDEU Colleagues***

Marcel van Egmond, Sara Hobolt, Jill Wittrock

### **GOAL OF PIREDEU**

The pan-European project is funded by the European Union under the Seventh Framework Program from 2008 - 2011. This three-year design study will assess the feasibility of an upgrade to the European Election Studies that will provide an infrastructure for research into citizenship, political participation, and electoral democracy in the European Union (EU). The scientific and technical feasibility of this infrastructure will be investigated by means of a pilot study conducted in the context of the 2009 elections to the European parliament. If the pilot study is successful the EES will be in a position to request funds to create a comprehensive empirical database that would endow the social science community with the most essential information required for a recurrent audit of the most important aspects of the electoral process in the European Union.

At the same time as providing evidence for a feasibility assessment, the pilot study will provide the basis for a fully-fledged study of the European Parliament elections of 2009, comprising a voters study, a candidate study, a media study, a manifestos study, and a contextual data study.

PIREDEU involves more than 20 participating researchers from some 14 institutions in western and eastern Europe and a large community of affiliated experts from all EU member states

### **GOAL OF WP 5 MEDIA STUDY**

The scientific objectives of the Media team are to:

- carry out a content analysis of the news in the campaign for the 2009 European elections in all 27 member states of the EU.
- ensure that the data can be linked to the other data collected in this design study.

Continuity with media studies conducted in 1999 and 2004 in terms of data sources and methodology (within the framework of the European Election Studies – EES) is crucial. We will explore similar questions on Europeaness of news coverage, agenda setting, economic voting, framing and mobilisation. We intend to build a longitudinal study comprising both 1999 and 2004 and 2009 studies. The substantive innovation

would be including new themes and creating explicit links with the voter and party manifesto components. Methodologically, we will adopt a centralised model of capturing and coding. The study will give due consideration to the aim of building an infrastructure for future studies while evaluating different options and trade-offs between costs and data quality. After the collection and cleaning of data, we will provide a codebook and write a report on the quality of the data, and make the data and its codebook publicly available.

### *Sample:*

The content analysis was carried out on a sample of national news media coverage in all 27 EU member states. We focus on national television and newspapers because these media are consistently listed as the most important sources of information about the EU for citizens in Europe (*Eurobarometer* 54–62). In each country we include the main national evening news broadcasts of the most widely watched public and commercial television stations. We also include two ‘quality’ (i.e. broadsheet) and one tabloid newspaper from each country. For countries without relevant tabloid newspaper the most sensationalist-oriented other daily newspaper was included. These media outlets were selected to provide a comprehensive idea about the news coverage in each country. [REPLACE BY EXACT OUTLETS IF NOT BASED ON ENTIRE SAMPLE]. Our television sample consists of 58 TV networks and our newspaper sample consists of 84 different newspapers. [REPLACE BY EXACT OUTLETS IF NOT BASED ON ENTIRE SAMPLE].

### *Period of study:*

The content analysis was conducted for news items published or broadcast within the three weeks running up to the election. Since election day varied across countries also the coding period varied from e.g. May 14<sup>th</sup>-June 4<sup>th</sup> for some countries up to May 17<sup>th</sup> – June 7<sup>th</sup> for others [REPLACE BY EXACT DATES IF STUDY NOT BASED ON ENTIRE SAMPLE].

### *Data collection:*

All relevant news outlets were collected either digitally (TV and newspapers) or as hardcopies (newspapers). [REPORT MISSING OUTLETS PER COUNTRY IN ENDNOTE]. With regard to story selection, for television, all news items have been coded; for newspapers, all news items on the title page and on one randomly selected page as well as all stories pertaining particularly to the EU and/or the EU election on any other page of the newspaper have been coded (within the Political/News, Editorial/Opinion/Comment, and Business/Economy sections). In total, 52,009 news stories have been coded in all 27 EU-member countries. 19,996 of these news stories dealt specifically with the EU of which 10,978 news stories dealt specifically with the EU election. [REPLACE BY EXACT NUMBERS IF NOT BASED ON ENTIRE SAMPLE]. In order to be classified as EU story the EU or any sort of EU institution, policy or synonym had to be mentioned at least once in the story. In order to be classified as EU election story, the election or the campaign had to be mentioned explicitly at least once in the story. All stories have been coded on the same sub-set of variables, if the story was a EU or EU election story coding continued for another, EU-specific sub-set of variables, and if the story was a EU election story coding continued for a last, EU election-specific set of variables.

#### *Coding procedure:*

Coding was conducted by a total of 58 coders at two locations, the University of Amsterdam (The Netherlands) and University of Exeter (UK). On average, the news coverage in each country was coded by two coders [CHECK FOR EXCEPTIONS IF STUDY IS NOT BASED ON ENTIRE SAMPLE]. Under supervision and in close cooperation with the principal investigators, coding was conducted by trained and supervised coders. All coders were native speakers of the respective languages. All coders received extensive training and participated in a two-weeks intensive coder training course. An inter-coder reliability test based on all coders from both locations on a subset of news items was conducted as part of the coder training and yielded satisfactory results [REPORT]. The unit of analysis and coding unit was the distinct news story. Coding was conducted electronically using an online survey tool in which coders could enter their codes, storing all data automatically in an online data base.

#### *Measures:*

[DESCRIBE THE VARIABLES OF INTEREST, E.G. THE WORDING OF THE VARIABLES AND THE CODING OPTIONS.]

## MEDIA OUTLETS (MATERIAL)

### Outlet Selection (sample)

The main aim of the outlet selection for the 2009 study was to ensure comparability of the data collection with prior EP election media content studies in 2004 and 1999 that were conducted at the Amsterdam School of Communication Research (e.g., de Vreese, Banducci, Semetko & Boomgaarden, 2006<sup>1</sup>). In previous elections, the outlet selection was based on the following criteria: For television the aim was to include the most-widely watched public and commercial television newscast in each country. Priority was given to the public versus commercial television dimension. For newspapers the intention was to balance newspapers in terms of ideological leaning and type. For each country one right-wing and one left-wing broadsheet paper and one tabloid paper were to be included. Since tabloids are not published in all countries, if necessary tabloid was replaced with the most sensationalist-oriented paper.

### *Country peculiarities*

In some countries we deviate from these general rules outlined above to assure comparability with the media content analyses conducted for the 1999 and 2004 EP elections. In particular this concerns the following countries:

Belgium: Belgium was treated as two media systems (one Dutch and one French speaking). Therefore in total ten outlets were coded, 2 Dutch speaking television news outlets, 3 Dutch language newspapers, 2 French speaking television news outlets, 3 French language newspapers.

Germany: Four television news outlets were coded, two public and two commercial.

---

<sup>1</sup> De Vreese, C.H., Banducci, S., Semetko, H. & Boomgaarden, H.G. (2006). The news coverage of the 2004 European Parliamentary Election Campaign in 25 countries. *European Union Politics*, 7(4), 477-504.

Luxembourg: Does not have a public broadcaster, only commercial television news coded.

Spain and Malta: Three television news outlets were coded.

#### *Differences of the media sample between 2004 and 2009*

Due to (1) better availability of certain news outlets in 2009 compared to 2004, and (2) changes in some national media landscapes between 2004 and 2009, the outlet selection in 2009 differs on some points from that in 2004. In sum, 18 outlets were added to the original 2004 sample (10 of which in the new member states Romania and Bulgaria), and 14 outlets were replaced (see Appendix). The final outlet list 2009 (*italics* marks differences from the 2004 list) is included in the Appendix (Appendix B).

#### **Material collection**

Coding was conducted for all newspaper issues and TV newscasts within our coding period, which included the three weeks leading up to the elections. Since the elections took place on different days in different countries (between June 4<sup>th</sup> and June 7<sup>th</sup>) and we replicated the same coding time period of three weeks in each country (including election day), this means that for some countries the coding period ran from May 14<sup>th</sup> to June 4<sup>th</sup> whereas for others it started and consequently also ended at a later date.

#### *Television News Programs*

Some of the news broadcasts could be viewed online, others were collected using contacts in the respective countries recording the news broadcasts as they were broadcasted. In the table below, for each television outlet the method of access and retrieval is shown. For the exact title and time of each news show (per country) check the news outlet overview in Appendix B.

For television news we expect them to be broadcast daily, thus expect 21 issues. Due to technical constraints, not all episodes in all countries were available to us. The missing episodes per outlet and country are reported below and their status as missing is due to either a) unavailability online; b) technical problems with downloaded material; c) missing due to external circumstances such as national

holidays etc. In the table below it is shown per country/outlet how the material was collected, how many broadcasts were collected and which dates were missing.

**Table 1: TV outlets per country**

Country	Title	Method collection	Achieved	Missing
<b>Austria:</b>	ORF	Online	21	
	ATV	Local contact	21	
<b>Belgium:</b>	VRT	Online	20	May 18
	VTM	Online	21	
	La Une	Online	21	
	RTL	Online	20	June 5
<b>Bulgaria</b>	BNT	Online	20	June 6
	BTV	Online	21	
<b>Cyprus</b>	ANT	Local contact	21	
	RIK	Local contact	20	June 2
<b>Czech Republic</b>	CESKA	Online	21	
	NOVA	Online	21	
<b>Denmark:</b>	DR1	Online	20	May 17
	TV2	Both	20	June 5
<b>Estonia:</b>	ETV	Online	20	May 18
	KA2	Online	19	May 29, June 6
<b>Finland:</b>	MTV	Online	20	May 31
	YLE	Online	20	May 29
<b>France:</b>	F2	Online	21	
	TF1	Online	21	
<b>Germany:</b>	ARD	Online	21	
	RTL	Online	21	
	SAT1	Local contact	19	May 24, May 31
	ZDF	Online	21	
<b>Greece</b>	Mega	Local contact	19	May 22, May 28
	NET	Local contact	17	May 22, May 24, May 27, May 28
<b>Hungary</b>	M1	Local contact	20	May 26
	RTL	Local contact	21	
<b>Ireland:</b>	RTE	Online	21	
	TV3	Online	17	May 23, May 30, May 31, June 1
<b>Italy:</b>	RAI	Online	20	May 19
	Can5	Online	20	May 26
<b>Latvia:</b>	LNT	Online	19	May 16, May 19
	LTV	Online	20	May 16
<b>Lithuania:</b>	LTV	Local contact	20	May 29
	TV3	Local contact	21	
<b>Luxembourg:</b>	RTL	Online	21	
<b>Malta:</b>	TVM	Local contact	21	
	ONETV	Local contact	21	
	NET	Local contact	21	
<b>Netherlands:</b>	NOS	Online	21	
	RTL	Online	21	
<b>Poland</b>	TVN	Online	19	May 30, June 4
	TVP	Online	16	May 22, June 2, June 3, June 4, June 5

<b>Portugal:</b>	RTP1	Online	21	
	TV1	Online	12	May 17, May 18, May 19, May 21, May 23, May 24, May 30, May 31, June 4
<b>Romania:</b>	TVR1	Local contact	19	May 18, May 28
	PROTV	Local contact	17	May 18, May 25, May 28, June 2
<b>Slovakia:</b>	STV1	Local contact	21	
	TVMARK	Local contact	21	
<b>Slovenia:</b>	POP	Local contact	21	
	TVS	Online	21	
<b>Spain:</b>	ANT	Local contact	20	May 27
	TEL	Online	21	
	TVE	Online	21	
<b>Sweden:</b>	SVT	Online	17	May 22, May 23, May 30, June 6
	TV4	Online	20	June 1
<b>United Kingdom:</b>	BBC	Local contact	20	May 24
	ITV	Local contact	14	May 15, May 19, May 27, May 29, June 1, June 2, June 3

### *Newspapers*

Different actions were taken in order to obtain the different newspaper issues. First, our main source to access and retrieve newspapers (29 titles) was through 'Press Display/Newspaper Direct' (<http://www.pressdisplay.com/pressdisplay/viewer.aspx>), an online service through which one can view and download papers from any different countries on subscription. Second, we were able to collect eleven titles as printed copies via 'Bobbe International', an organization which collects and distributes hardcopies of international newspapers (<http://www.bobbe-online.nl>). Third, we obtained five titles by direct subscriptions (Tageblatt [LUX] in hardcopy and Ilta-Sanomat [FIN], La Derniere Heure, La Libre Belgique and Le Soir [BEL] by digital access). Fourth, we obtained 4 titles by direct download: Fileleytheros, Charvgi and Simerini [Cyprus] and Ta Nea, Eleftherotypia [GR]. All other titles were collected by local contacts, collecting and sending hardcopies to Amsterdam and Exeter. In the table below, the method of collection per news outlet is listed per individual title as well as the total number of issues we obtained (both, 'aimed for (goal)' and 'achieved').

**Table 2: Newspaper outlets per country**

Country	Newspaper	Source	Goal	Achieved
<b>Austria</b>	Der Standard	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	17	17
	Die Presse	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	20	20
	Neue Kronen Zeitung	Personal contact	20	20

<b>Belgium</b>	De Morgen	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	15	15
	De Standard	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	16	16
	Het Laatste Nieuws	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	16	16
	La Dernière Heure	Subscription	20	20
	La Libre Belgique	Subscription	16	16
	Le Soir	Subscription	16	16
<b>Bulgaria</b>	24 Chasa	Personal contact	22	22
	Dnevnik	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	15	15
	Trud	Personal contact	22	22
<b>Cyprus</b>	Charavgi	Direct digital	22	22
	Fileleytheros	Direct digital	22	22
	Simerini	Direct digital	22	22
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Blesk	Personal contact	22	22
	Mlada Fronta	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	19	11
	Pravo	Personal contact	19	19
<b>Denmark</b>	Ekstra Bladet	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	22	22
	Morgenavisen Jyllandsp.	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	21	21
	Politiken	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	21	21
<b>Estonia</b>	Eesti Ekspress Wochenblatt	Personal contact	3	3
	Postimees	Personal contact	18	18
	SL Öhtuleht	Personal contact	18	18
<b>Finland</b>	Helsing Sanomat	Bobbe	22	22
	Aamulehti	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	21	21
	Ilta-Sanomat	Direct digital	17	17
<b>France</b>	Le Figaro	Bobbe	18	18
	Le Monde	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	19	19
	Libération	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	18	18
<b>Germany</b>	Bild	Bobbe	20	20
	FAZ	Bobbe	20	20
	Sueddeutsche Zeitung	Bobbe	16	16
<b>Greece</b>	Eleftherotypia	Direct digital	22	22
	Kathimerini	Direct digital	19	19
	Ta Nea	Direct digital	18	18
<b>Hungary</b>	Blikk	Personal contact	20	20
	Magyar Nemzet	Personal contact	17	17
	Nepszabadsag	Personal contact	17	17
<b>Ireland</b>	Irish Independent	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	22	22
	The Irish Times	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	19	19
	The (Daily) Star	Personal contact	22	22
<b>Italy</b>	Il Corriere della Sera	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	22	22
	Il Giornale	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	22	22
	La Repubblica	Bobbe	22	22
<b>Latvia</b>	Diena	Personal contact	17	17
	Latvijas Avize	Personal contact	17	17
	Vesti segodnya	Personal contact	17	17
<b>Lithuania</b>	Lietuvos rytas	Personal contact	18	18
	Respublika	Personal contact	18	18
	Vakaro zinios	Personal contact	18	18
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Tageblatt	Direct	16	16
	Voix du Luxembourg	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	16	16
	Wort (D')	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	16	16
<b>Malta</b>	Nazzjon	Personal contact	22	21
	Orizzont	Personal contact	22	22
	The Times (engl.)	Personal contact	22	22

<b>Netherlands</b>	De Telegraaf	Bobbe	19	19
	De Volkskrant	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	16	16
	NRC Handelsblad	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	16	16
<b>Poland</b>	Fakt	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	18	18
	Gazeta Wyborcza	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	18	18
	Rzeczpospolita	Personal contact	17	17
<b>Portugal</b>	Correio da Manha	Personal contact	22	22
	Jornal de Noticias	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	22	22
	Publico	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	22	21
<b>Romania</b>	Evenimentul Zilei	Personal contact	18	16
	Jurnalul National	Personal contact	18	13
	Libertatea	Personal contact	18	18
<b>Slovakia</b>	Daily Pravda	Personal contact	18	18
	Nový cas	Personal contact	22	22
	Sme/Práca	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	19	14
<b>Slovenia</b>	Dnevnik	Personal contact	18	18
	Slovenske Novice	Personal contact	18	18
	The Delo	Personal contact	22	22
<b>Spain</b>	El Mundo	Bobbe	22	21,5
	El Pais	Bobbe	22	22
	ABC	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	22	22
<b>Sweden:</b>	Dagens Nyheter	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	20	20
	Svenska Dagbladet	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	20	20
	Aftonbladet	Personal contact	22	22
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Sun	Bobbe	22	22
	The Daily Telegraph	Bobbe	22	20
	Guardian	Press Display/Newspaper Direct	22	22

The only 'partially' missing newspaper outlet (Spain) was one copy of El Mundo (May 24), for which half a page was missing (all other parts of this particular were coded).

Except for the hardcopy newspapers, all material was obtained in digital format or was digitized to ease distribution to coders. For coders coding from within the university, they were made available on a network drive. Coders who were coding at locations where they could not access the material online were provided with DVDs containing the material in digital format. Original (non-digital) material is now stored at both locations, the University of Amsterdam, Kloveniersburgwal 48, 1012 CX, Amsterdam, and the University of Exeter. Digital material is stored on external hard-drives, also at both locations.

Newspaper material was checked by one of the team members at both locations.

- The hardcopies from Bobbe International were delivered twice a week. Immediately when they were delivered it was checked if all issues were there. Once a mistake was made in the delivery, but the right issues were send with the next batch.

- Newspapers from PressDisplay/Newspaper Direct were downloaded automatically. Every few days a check was done to see if all issues were downloaded (which was always the case).
- Newspapers from local contacts were sent to the two universities after the elections. Once they arrived it was checked whether all issues were delivered (which was the case, with the exception of Romania).
- The digital versions of Ilta-Sanomat (FIN), Ta Nea, Eleythrotypia (GR), La Dernière Heure, La Libre Belgique and Le Soir (BEL) and Fileleytheros, Charvgi and Simerini (CYP) needed to be downloaded manually. As there is an extensive archive, downloading every few days was sufficient. No problems in retrieving these outlets occurred.
- The hard-copies of Tageblatt (LUX) arrived every few days. Some issues were missing at first, but through personal contact with the editor-in-chief all outlets could eventually be obtained.

In Amsterdam two student assistants were hired to check the quality of all downloaded audio-visual material continuously. Also at Exeter two persons were responsible for downloading and checking the audiovisual material. Although they could not speak all the different languages, they checked whether a) audio tracks appeared to be audible, b) audio and video appeared synchronous and c) episodes were recorded completely. When a problem with a broadcast was detected, the teams responsible contacted the specific broadcasting station in order to obtain the programs. In most cases new versions of the broadcast could be retrieved this way.

During the coding, some coders reported problems with material which were not discovered previously. At all time, one member of the responsible research team at both locations was designated as contact for the coders and problems with coding material were reported to this team member. In collaboration with the technical assistant in charge the broadcasting companies were contacted for new versions of the broadcasts. In some cases no new version of the respective programs could be obtained from the broadcasting companies so that these issues are reported as 'missing' in the material overview (see Table 1 above).

## **CODEBOOK**

Following an inventory of the content analyses conducted for the EP 1999 and EP 2004 election campaigns a draft codebook was developed and open forum input was provided on the PIREDEU website and integrated into the codebook. Furthermore, a preliminary version of the codebook was tested in a pilot study that was carried out in the period leading up to and including the meeting of the European Council in Brussels, Belgium, on December 11 and 12, 2008. The pilot study was conducted at the University of Amsterdam and included a media content analysis of all major Dutch news media during a two-week period surrounding the Brussels summit. Prior to conducting content analysis, an extensive coder training was organized. Four Dutch coders were recruited and then extensively trained in 4 sessions scheduled within a two-week period. The coder training also included a reliability test which yielded satisfactory results. After examination of the pilot study's media content and reliability test data, a number of variables in the codebook were improved, notably in terms of the wording and coding options. The resulting second, improved version of the codebook was distributed among the EXT and AMS team members. The EXT and AMS teams met face-to-face on two occasions to discuss the codebook. During these meetings (in April and May 2009) both teams also tested the codebook by test-coding a number of news stories. This coding was also tested for inter-coder reliability among those responsible for the coder training at each location. Furthermore, there was a continuous exchange via email and phone. There have been two telephone conference calls in April and two more in May to discuss final solutions for the coding of particular variables. Consequently, the codebook was further refined and then ultimately finalized before the first day of coder training in Exeter. The final version of the codebook was handed out in hard copy to coders during the last coder training session in EXT (for details, see 'Coder Training'). The codebook was not adjusted any further during the AMS coder training to assure later comparability (for full CODEBOOK see below).

## **DATA ENTRY AND STORAGE**

After the Codebook was formally finalized, it was programmed online in the form of an online survey. This was done by using the *Survey Tool* of the Amsterdam School of Communication Research (ASCoR). The Survey Tool is an online application to

produce electronic surveys. A key advantage of collecting media content data using the Survey Tool is that coders code the news *and* insert these data into an electronic file *all at once*. While coders code the news material online, these data are automatically stored in a database and can be downloaded in various formats and then directly imported into SPSS. Due to this procedure the possibility of mistakes that could occur if coding would have been conducted on paper first and then entered into an electronic database in a subsequent step is excluded. Another important advantage is that media variables can automatically be “skipped” when they are not applicable in a certain coding context (e.g., a first variable coding the main actor of a story and subsequent variables coding the evaluation, number of direct quotes, gender etc. for this actor). This process we subsequently refer to as *routing*.

The Online Coding Tool (OCT) was subject to intense and repeated testing and was significantly refined and customized before it was published online and ready for use by the coders. Technical issues that emerged during the testing phase were solved in cooperation with a technical assistant at ASCoR. The OCT was published online on the final day of the first coder training in Exeter and thus readily available also once coding started in Amsterdam.

## **CODER TRAINING**

### **Coder Recruitment**

Coders did not have to be national citizens of the different countries for which they were coding the material (although they were in their majority), however, they had to be native speakers of the respective national languages. For Belgium, and given our news outlet selection (see ‘material collection/newspapers’), we recruited both Dutch as well as French native speakers. Coders were recruited via poster ads which were distributed across different university departments, the International School for Humanities and Social Sciences in Amsterdam, at language institutes, but also online via the university websites but also Facebook and other social networking sites. Prior experience in coding media coverage or knowledge about the topic (EU) were no requirement to apply for one of the positions given that accepted candidates all participated in a two-week intensive coder training. For those countries for which we received more application than we had available positions we organized individual

formal job interviews at which two members of our research team participated and based on which a final selection of candidates was made.

The final pool of selected coders was split up into two groups. Group 1 ( $n = 22$  coders) was based in Exeter and received training by the Exeter training supervision team (EXT) at the University of Exeter. Group 1 included coders assigned to code material of the following countries: the UK, Ireland, France and Wallonia (BEL), Portugal, Italy, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Romania, Lithuania, and Malta.

Group 2 ( $n = 36$  coders) received training by the Amsterdam team (AMS) at the University of Amsterdam. Group 2 included coders assigned to code material of the following countries: the Netherlands and Flanders (BEL), Germany, Austria, Luxembourg, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Spain, Greece and Cyprus, Hungary, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Poland, Estonia, and Latvia. Group 2 additionally included two coders assigned to the UK for comparative purposes.

### Training Setup

A coder training schedule was designed in advance by both the Amsterdam and the Exeter team, which both the training supervision teams in Exeter and Amsterdam strictly adhered to.

The coder training consisted of five full-day training sessions (8 hours each) spread over a period of two weeks with appropriate intervals for coding homework in between individual sessions. The training periods ran from June 8 to June 19, 2009 in Exeter and from June 29 to July 10, 2009 in Amsterdam and followed the same set-up in terms of structure and content of training (see below). The first three sessions were held during the first week; the remaining two sessions were held in the second and final week (see Table 3).

**Table 3: Training schedule**

Training day	Exeter (EXT)	Amsterdam (AMS)
Day 1	June 8	June 29
Day 2	June 9	June 30
Day 3	June 11	July 2

Day 4	June 16	July 7
Day 5	June 19	July 10

---

*Note:* All dates refer to calendar year 2009

Two members from the Amsterdam team served as coordinators between the Exeter and Amsterdam training teams and as instructors (training supervisors) for the coder training taking place in AMS. In order to ensure that coders trained in different locations received consistently identical training and instructions, and thus avoiding coder training effects across locations, the coordinators not only attended but also performed as trainers in all 10 training sessions and at both locations (both coder trainings in AMS and EXT).

The training supervisors ensured that, after each session, specific problems or issues that came up during training were written down, discussed, and settled between the EXT and AMS teams before the next session. Solutions were communicated to coders at the beginning of the subsequent session. This procedure also meant that adjustments to the codebook and/or particular coding rules which resulted out of the first coder training in Exeter were not further adjusted during the second coder training in Amsterdam to assure comparability and data quality.

All training sessions took place in university class rooms where computers, beamers and projection screens were available for training and instruction purposes.

### **Training Sessions**

*Session #1* was an introduction and welcome meeting in which practical and organizational matters relating to schedule, planning, procedures, and payment were explained and background information about the research project was provided.

*Session #2* was devoted to the actual practice of coding news stories. First, a folder with printed copies of a 35-page codebook and ten appendices (for details about these documents, see Codebook below and Appendix) were handed out to coders. The codebook and appendices were explained at great length from start to finish, which took up approximately 5 hours in total (excluding breaks).

Coders then individually coded one English-language newspaper article in class, followed by a plenary discussion. Coders were provided with the “Master Codes,” i.e. a set of appropriate codes for all variables in the Codebook per news

story. The Master Codes were determined by the two training supervisors from AMS in consultation with the EXT team in advance of the training, following extensive discussion and elaboration. Questions by coders were answered, ambiguities were clarified, discussions were settled, and disagreements were solved.

Finally, coders were provided with coding materials as homework. The homework material included paper copies of three English newspaper stories: one general EU story, one European Election-specific story, and one non-EU story. Coders were requested to code these three news stories in order to further familiarize themselves with the codebook and appendices, and further develop their coding skills.

In *session #3*, the homework was discussed plenary and in detail; story by story, variable by variable. In line with session #2, coders were provided with the Master Codes. Again, questions were answered, ambiguities were clarified, discussions were settled, and disagreements were solved. This procedure was time-consuming but considered necessary in order to optimize inter-coder agreement.

In order to familiarize coders with the distinct practice of coding *television* news, a subsequent and large part of session #3 was devoted to training coders in coding audio-visual information. Coders were requested to code one lengthy English general EU television news story in class. Following that, the coding of this particular news item was discussed extensively in class and Master Codes for the item were distributed to coders.

Finally, coders were provided with a package of new coding materials that served as the material for the *first* inter-coder reliability test. The reliability test material included paper copies of 30 English newspaper stories: 5 general EU stories, 20 European Election-specific stories, and 5 non-EU stories. Coders were instructed to use an electronic Excel coding sheet with pre-designed template (sent to them by email) and return their filled-in sheets to their training supervisors (two days later).

In *session #4*, coders were informed about the main results of the first inter-coder reliability test. The main goal of session #4 was to give coders additional and focused training on variables in the codebook which had shown to be problematic in terms of inter-coder agreement and as a result of the first reliability test. A variable was considered problematic if the level of agreement among coders for that particular

variable as part of the reliability test was unacceptably low (for statistical details, see section on 'Inter-Coder Reliability Test').

Next, coders were requested to code another English language newspaper story in class. Following that, coders were provided with the Master Codes for this item.

Finally, coders were provided with a new package of coding materials for the *second* inter-coder reliability test. The reliability test material included paper copies of 25 English newspaper stories: 2 general EU stories, 20 European Election-specific stories, and 3 non-EU stories. In line with the first test coding procedure, coders were instructed to use the electronic Excel coding sheet with pre-designed template and return their filled-in sheets to their training supervisors by a set deadline (two days later).

In *session #5*, coders were informed about the main results of the second inter-coder reliability test and remaining issues with regard to seemingly problematic variables were discussed. In this final session, coders were instructed how to use the Online Coding Tool (for details about the OCT, see 'Data Entry and Storage'). Coders received a URL link to a test-version of the OCT and were asked to test-code a newspaper story using the OCT so as to familiarize themselves with the practice of coding news material online. Coders were additionally asked to report any coding or technical problems while coding to the training supervisors. Technical problems were solved immediately if necessary and coders had the opportunity to ask questions and comment on the tool.

With regard to the selection of news items to be coded, the general rule applied for coders to code each and every news item in a TV news show as well as on newspaper title pages as well as on one *randomly* selected page as well as all newspaper articles relating to the EU and/or the EU election in the remainder of the newspaper in certain predefined sections (see CODEBOOK below). This meant that coders had to be provided with a system to generate random numbers in order to determine the 'random page' for newspapers which had to be coded in its entirety. For this, and as part of the fifth coder training session, coders were asked to use a random number generator available online (<http://www.random.org/integers/>) and trained how to use this tool and how to generate relevant random numbers within the

range of possible pages which could vary across outlets and issues depending on the number of pages in all relevant sections taken together.

In addition, all other remaining issues were addressed and settled in this final session. For example, coders were instructed how to deal with national media outlet peculiarities, notably with regard to separating newspaper sections and distinguishing between relevant and irrelevant sections.

At the end of this last coder training session each coder was provided with an individual list with the specific outlets and days s/he was assigned to code (for more information see below 'randomizing the order of coding news material' below).

### **INTER-CODER RELIABILITY TEST**

Content analyses data ought to demonstrate reliability. Of the reliability measures available in the content analysis literature, Krippendorff's alpha is increasingly accepted as the standard, i.e. the best suited measure, for testing of inter-coder reliability. Krippendorff's alpha generalizes across different measurement scales, can be used not only with any number of coders, but also with missing data. Unlike other measures, Krippendorff's alpha satisfies crucial criteria for a proper reliability measure.

There is no formally adopted lower-bound acceptable level of inter-coder agreement, but in the light of our research purposes, we conceive of .60 (on a scale from 0.00 to 1.00) as an acceptable lower limit of reliability when Krippendorff's alpha is used.

The reliability tests were conducted at both locations with strictly identical material and training procedures (for exact procedure see 'training sessions' above). Two members of the Amsterdam team participated in the coder training in Exeter to assure comparability. The results of the reliability tests are largely comparable across location, pointing to the absence of training effects and assuring and reaffirming quality control over the coder training procedure. For an overview of the reliability test scores per variable an Appendix will be available.

### **MATERIAL DISTRIBUTION**

Austria, Flanders, Wallonia, France, Cyprus, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Sweden, Ireland, Romania, Italy, Lithuania, Malta and the UK all had two coders. In Exeter, the material from each outlet was split into equal parts (depending on the number of coders) and was distributed to the coders. Coders received their part of newspaper hard copies in random order and were asked (both in training and at distribution) not to code any electronic material in chronological order. In Amsterdam, the division of the material from each country was made by randomly dividing the material per outlet. This was done per outlet to prevent possible coder differences leading outlet differences. Per outlet all issues were given a random number and the issues were sorted by this random number. The first half of the randomly ordered list was assigned to coder 1 of a particular country; the second half of the list was assigned to coder 2 of the same country. When there was an odd number of issues for more outlets, the remaining issues when dividing in half were alternately assigned to coders. To ensure a comparable workload between coders, a check of the randomized division was done to ensure that no coder had significantly more outlets in the last week of the coding period (leading up to the election) than the other (with the assumption that there would be more EU and EP election news in the last week of the campaign). If differences were detected as a result of this procedure, a new randomized division of material was made.

Bulgaria had two coders, one in Amsterdam and one in Exeter. Distribution of material was conducted in the same way as for countries with two coders.

Greece, Poland, Portugal, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Spain all had three coders. The division of the material was conducted in similar fashion as for countries with two coders, dividing each outlet into three even sets of material.

Denmark and Luxembourg both had one coder, coding the entire material for that respective country.

Finland had two coders, however, one coder only joined about halfway into the coding process and received the exact same (but separate) training (individual) based on the same examples and test materials as the large group of coders before. Both Finnish coders received a randomized set of material, however, equal numbers of issues coded per outlet between the two coders were not achieved due to the fact that the second coder who joined later in the process in total spent more time on the coding (due to more time available).

### *Randomizing the Order of Coding News Material*

To limit the influence of learning effects during the coding process, coders were instructed to follow the order of a randomized list for the coding of their assigned material which they were provided with following the last coder training session. This list was created by assigning a random number to each issue of that country and sorting all issues according to this random number. Thus, coders have coded their assigned material not in chronological (date) but in random order.

## **CODING AND MONITORING**

The time it took coders to finish the coding varied due to differences in availability of coders (full-time or part-time) and national differences in the amount of EU and EU-election specific coverage. The majority of coders finished coding their assigned material within 4-8 weeks. All coding for all countries was finished within 16 weeks. During the entire coding process coders were asked to write down problems that occurred while coding, e.g. with regard to the coding of particular variables for particular news items or technical problems concerning the data entry tool or incorrect codes entered into the online tool. These so-called 'problem sheets' were collected on a weekly basis via email, and printed and archived in a folder. Immediate problems were solved right away, all other problems were dealt with once coding was finished and as part of the data cleaning process (see 'data cleaning and preparation' below). Throughout the entire coding period coders had an assigned contact person they could turn to in case of questions or immediate problems. Coding progress was monitored continuously based on the coder-specific data entries in the online tool with regard to the time spent coding and the number of items coded.

## **DATA CLEANING AND PREPARATION**

Data cleaning involved a number of steps. First, the data sets created in Exeter and in Amsterdam were merged into one data file, for which then variables and variable values were labeled. Second, 'problem sheets' provided by the coders were

processed in two steps. A common problem was that stories had to be coded anew, because the online data entry program crashed or the internet connection was interrupted during the coding process of a story. These incomplete stories were deleted. Next, mistakes in the coding of particular variables that were noticed by the coder only after the coding of a particular news item was completed and stored in the online data base (after which it could not be accessed and changed anymore by the coder him/herself) were corrected. Common mistakes, in this regard, pertain to the coding of actors and certain frames. An approximate number of 230 problem sheets with some 800 problems were processed.

In a third step value frequencies for all variables were considered. Some 550 cases did contain no, or insufficient data and therefore had to be deleted from the file. About 200 stories had no existing values for date or outlet, which was corrected as far as possible (only 5 of these had to be deleted altogether). About 300 cases contained non-existing actor codes. These were replaced with a code (999999) that represents that an actor was coded, but that it is unknown who the actor is. Other than that, there were some scattered problems with values for the length of television stories, story location and few other variables, which were fixed.

In a final step, combinations of coder IDs, outlet codes and dates were compared with the material that was assigned to coders. Some 350 stories were identified in which this combination was wrong, and these could be corrected by means of the material distribution list.

# Codebook

*Media Content Analysis*

EUROPEAN ELECTION STUDY  
2009

PART OF PIREDEU

Version 31/03/2010

**Additional documents (final versions available):**

**Appendix A. List of Coders (see separate list)**

**Appendix B. List of News Outlets (see separate list)**

**Appendix C. List of Locations (see separate list)**

**Appendix D. List of Actors (see separate list)**

**Appendix E. List of Ethnic Minority Groups (see separate list)**

**Appendix F. List of Topics (see separate list)**

**Appendix G. List of EU-specific Topics (see separate list)**

**Appendix H. List of Political Parties (V49) (see separate list)**

**Appendix I. Problem Sheet (see separate sheet)**

**Appendix J. Hours Sheet (see separate sheet)**

This codebook consists of *three* parts. The *first* part is applied to all relevant news stories (i.e., all items that fall under the selection criteria listed below). For the *second* part, a filter is applied that selects all news stories that deal with the EU specifically or with the EU Parliamentary elections or the campaign (see page 20). Finally, for the *third* part, another filter is applied that selects only those news stories that deal with the EU Parliamentary elections or the campaign specifically (see page 33).

**All stories about the EU or about the EP election campaign in the newspaper are coded in depth.** This means you have to check the following sections of each newspaper for **any (!) EU or EP election stories (i.e., look for ALL EU stories and not only for EU election specific stories)** and code them: Political/News section, Editorial (including Opinion/Comment) and Business (or Economy) Section. Do **not** code Sport, Travel, Housing, Culture, Motor/Auto, Fashion or Entertainment sections.

**About the EU\*** is defined as:

*in TV*: mentioned at least once

*in newspapers*: mentioned at least once

\* Also includes EU institutions and EU policies, or EU synonyms such as “Europe” or “Brussels” (when in fact the EU is meant) etc.

**About the EP election campaign\*** is defined as:

*in TV*: mentioned at least once (anywhere in the whole story)

*in newspapers*: mentioned at least once (anywhere in the whole story)

## **Selection Criteria**

### **For all newspapers:**

- All stories on the front page and all stories on one randomly chosen page are coded.
- All stories mentioning the European Union (EU) or the EP election campaign have to be coded in the following sections: Political/News section, Editorial (including Opinion/Comment) and Business (or Economy) Section. Do **not** code Sport, Travel, Housing, Culture, Motor/Auto, Fashion or Entertainment sections. Magazines that come together with a newspaper are **not** coded.

### **Selection rules for the one randomly chosen page:**

- The randomly chosen page has to be part of one of the following sections: domestic news, international (foreign) news, business/economy news. Full-page ads or stock market figures are never to be taken as randomly chosen page!
- Start on a random page (will be assigned to coders individually) as first randomly chosen page for the first newspaper to be coded and move one page forward for every other newspaper until you reach the last page of the above mentioned sections .
- In case of a full-page advertisement, stock market numbers etc., move one more page forward.
- Once you reach the last page of the sections mentioned above in a specific newspaper start back with page 2 for the subsequent newspaper (random order of newspapers! Do **not** code outlets in chronological order).

### **For all television programs:**

TV newscasts (e.g., BBC 9 o'clock news) have to be coded entirely, i.e. all stories have to be coded, excluding the weather forecast and specific sections of broadcast devoted to sports.

### Definition: News story

A news story (unit of coding) is an article in a newspaper and a news item in a TV newscast.

#### Television

- A news item is defined by its **topic**. It consists of all story elements (films, interviews, statements etc. - see below) that are presented as belonging to the same topic UNTIL the background/backdrop of the anchorperson changes. A clear topic change always defines a new news story (e.g., from Middle East to the EU elections).
- The news story **has to be longer than two sentence(s)**. *Note:* Headlines, summaries, teasers, announcements of other programs and commercials within the newscast are **not** coded.
- Several (sub-)topics may be combined into one "package" about an overarching topic, such as the EU Elections. This package then looks like one long story. For our analysis, however, a new story begins
  - a) once the background/backdrop of the anchorperson changes (e.g., the headline or the graph/photograph) *and/ or*
  - b) once a topic is explicitly announced as different by the anchor: e.g., "Also today," "Now to."
- If it is *unclear* whether there is a new topic (e.g., in news packages and regarding the change of subtopics), you start coding a new news story when the bulletin shows the anchor again. After the film material, the anchor may sometimes make some concluding remarks concerning the story. Make sure that you don't include that when stop-watching the next story, but add that to the story the film material pertains to.

#### Newspapers

- The individual editorial news item (not advertising), including accompanying picture(s), or individual pictures or graphics or cartoons with or without text. There is no minimum length for an item to be considered a news story.
- *Note:* If an article **explicitly** says that this same article is continued on another page, its continuation on the other page has to be coded as well, as one story. *But:* If there is a short story or bullet on the title page that has a beginning and an end, and only refers to another independent article within the newspaper this is coded as two separate stories.
- Articles that only consist of a headline, a short bullet without further concrete reference or are only announced in an index/table of contents (e.g., at the top row of the front page) are **not** coded. However, an exception should be made for big-font-size headlines that take up a (very) large part of the front page. (These articles should be coded '8' for NP3/type of story, also if a "screaming" headline is accompanied with a picture and caption.)
- Letters to the editor are often grouped together on one page, but they sometimes have one overarching headline. *Rule:* Each letter represents a unique news story and should be coded accordingly. But given that the headline does not belong to any letter in particular, the headline is NOT coded, based on bullet point 3 for newspapers (see above).

- *Note:* A “side story” embedded within the body of a larger newspaper article (on the right or left side, or at the center top or bottom of the article) that carries its own headline and constitutes a related but nonetheless separate story vis-à-vis the larger newspaper article has to be treated as a unique story and be coded accordingly.
- *Note:* New headlines **within** the text of an article do **not** constitute a new article.

**V1**      **Coder ID**

01 ...

02 ...

03 ...

04 ...

[see Appendix A, *not yet available*]**V2**      **Story identification number**

Running number, assign a number in ascending order to each article you code (1,2,3, ... 567, 568, 569 etc.). *Note:* Do not start back at “1” when you start coding another newspaper or TV show but continue to assign numbers in ascending order across the outlets you code. Thus, every item you code has to have a unique identification number which is only assigned once for a specific item. **CODER INSTRUCTION:** Before you start coding a story, write down the story id number, and make sure you also do that for last article you code every day so that you know with which story id number to continue the following day. Do not start back at 1 when you *switch* from coding newspaper articles to TV news items, no matter what medium always type in the next highest running number for each and every subsequent item you code.

**V3a**      **Date (day)**

Date is coded in two variables, this first one represents the day (ranging from 1-31); e.g. for a news item published on May 17<sup>th</sup> only code “17” for this first variable.

**V3b**      **Date (month)**

This second variable represents the month (ranging from 1-12); e.g. for a news item published on May 17<sup>th</sup> only code “05” for this second variable.

**V4**      **News outlet**

[see Appendix B]

**Newspapers only****NP1**      **Page number**

The number of the page on which the story appeared. In case the story runs over two or more pages write down the page number on which the story begins.

**NP2**      **Section**

Is the article part of the *first* section of the newspaper? Sections are not meant to be thematic distinctions among the different news pages (e.g., domestic news, foreign news, arts, business, etc.) but **physically separate** sections of the paper (i.e., with separate stapling).

1 = No

2 = Yes

**NP3****Type of story**

- 1 = “News story”**  
(i.e. most frequent type of story (!), factual news report, report of events etc., of what has happened [when, where, who, what, why?], e.g., party meeting, report on recent events etc.)
- 2 = “Column / “commentary”**  
(column: clearly marked as special column, distinct from regular coverage, most likely always at the same place within newspaper, re-occurring item on a regular basis as fixed part of newspaper coverage, can be written in very personal style) / (commentary: often not written by a journalist but by an external source such as an expert, politician etc., often the official position of the author is given as well; often explicitly marked as “commentary”, e.g. by guest author)
- 3 = “Reportage” / “background story”**  
(reportage: feature article, vivid report of a correspondent, named as the author of the article. A “reportage” describes individual experience of the author; often explicitly marked as “reportage”) / (background story: often longer article, not only factual reporting, looking behind the scenes, analytical, in-depth – not only descriptive, often explicitly marked as “analysis”, etc.)
- 4 = “Editorial”**  
(typically explicitly marked as editorial, opinion-piece, an article of its own, clearly defined to give evaluations, typically on same page within newspaper each time. It has to be formally distinct from the rest of the page. It clearly expresses a standpoint of the author/editor who again speaks for his newspaper)
- 5 = “Portrait”**  
(e.g., of a person, group, institution, organization – and nothing more than that. Otherwise it may be a news story or a reportage / see above)
- 6 = “Interview”**  
(The article is an interview – there have to be **at least two interview questions (often in bold or italic)**! *Note*: Interview sections which are part of a “reportage” are not meant here)
- 7 = “Bullet”**  
(i.e. mostly on the title page or first page of a section; headline and a short summary – at least one sentence –, which announces a substantial article that can be found inside the newspaper, it is a short summary of an article that stands independent or as a summary, it then often refers to a more in-depth article inside the newspaper)
- 8 = “Headline only”**
- 9 = “Documentation”**  
(The article is the original text, e.g., of a treaty, constitution, contract, of a letter, speech, official report)
- 10 = “Picture/graph/map”**  
(The article is just that, often with a caption)

11 = **“Letter to the editor”** (including responses from the editor)

12 = **“Question to the newspaper (question and answer/info/quiz)”**

13 = **“Other”**

#### NP4

How many **photographs, visuals, graphs or illustrations** belong to the article?

*Rule:* A picture, sidebar graph, group of bullet points etc typically DOES belong to the article it is presumed to accompany, UNLESS that extra 'sidebar' information (visual or not) clearly constitutes a "side story" that carries its own headline and constitutes a related but nonetheless SEPARATE "STORY" vis-a-vis the larger newspaper article (see definition newspaper story, bullet point 5). In the latter case, it should be treated as a unique story and be coded accordingly.

\_\_\_\_\_ (total number)

#### NP5

**Length of newspaper story** (FULL story, including photos, figures, tables, etc). If the article continues on a following page, also include these additional parts of the article in your calculation.

1 = up to ¼ of the page

2 = up to ½ of the page

3 = up to ¾ of a page

4 = more than ¾ of a page

#### NP6

**Total number of pages in Political/News section, Editorial section (including Opinion/Comment) and Business (or Economy) section taken together.** Also count full-page ads, stock market pages, and obituaries (but NOT classifieds!) if they are part of these sections! Pages that are partly (e.g. ½) filled with editorial content and partly (e.g. ½) with classifieds should be included.

#### NP7

**Does the article begin on the top half of the page or on the lower half of the page?**

1 = top half of the page

2 = lower half of the page

### Television only

#### TV1

**Length of TV news item** (in seconds), incl. its introduction by the anchorperson.

*Example:* 1 minute and 58 seconds are coded as 118 seconds!

#### TV2

**Story number of TV news item**, consecutive count (number), i.e. the number/position of the news item within the overall news cast

### Television AND newspapers

#### V5a

**Primary topic of the story**

(i.e. major subject of the story = taking the most space or time – often mentioned in the headline). Topics have to be referred to/mentioned at least **twice** in the article or newscast and not just mentioned in passing.

→ See Appendix F

*Note:* If there is more than one appropriate category, **always choose the most specific one.**

*NOTE:* Up to 3 topics can be coded. However, a story does not necessarily address more than 1 topic. Thus, do not search for additional topics if there really are no more than 1 or 2 topics discernable!

## V5a1

**FILTER: only code V5a1-V5a2 IF V5a= European integration (topic code); or environment (topic code); or globalization (topic code)**

**Explicitly** (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so): Who is said or depicted as **mainly handling, working on or taking care of the topic?**

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who is typically responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are depicted as equally dealing with the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

## V5a2

**Explicitly** (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so): Who, according to the story, if mentioned at all, **SHOULD** mainly be responsible for handling, working on or taking care of the topic?

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's desired handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who should typically be responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are equally depicted in the sense that they should handle the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, and public administration)

- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

**V5b**      **FILTER: CODE ONLY IF V5a HAS NOT BEEN CODED ‘NOT APPLICABLE’**  
**Secondary topic of the story**

(i.e. second most important subject of the story)

→ See Appendix F

Note: If there is more than one appropriate category, **always choose the most specific one.**

**V5b1**      **FILTER: only code V5b1-V5b2 IF V5b= European integration (topic code); or environment (topic code); or globalization (topic code)**

**Explicitly** (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so): Who is said or depicted as ***mainly handling, working on or taking care of the topic?***

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor’s handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who is typically responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are depicted as equally dealing with the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

**V5b2**      **Explicitly** (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so): Who, according to the story, if mentioned at all, ***SHOULD*** mainly be responsible for handling, working on or taking care of the topic?

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor’s desired handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who should typically be responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are equally depicted in the sense that they should handle the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned

- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

**V5c****FILTER: CODE ONLY IF V5b HAS NOT BEEN CODED ‘NOT APPLICABLE’****Tertiary topic of the story**

(i.e. third most important subject of the story )

→ See Appendix F

Note: If there is more than one appropriate category, **always choose the most specific one.****V5c1****FILTER: only code V5c1-V5c2 IF V5c= European integration (topic code); or environment (topic code); or globalization (topic code)****Explicitly** (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so): Who is said or depicted as **mainly handling, working on or taking care of the topic?***Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor’s handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who is typically responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are depicted as equally dealing with the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

**V5c2****Explicitly** (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so): Who, according to the story, if mentioned at all, **SHOULD** mainly be responsible for handling, working on or taking care of the topic?*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor’s desired handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the

depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who should typically be responsible for the topic.  
If there are two actors who are equally depicted in the sense that they should handle the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

## TOPICS – ATTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY

**FILTER: code V6a1-V6b2 only IF V5a OR V5b OR V5c = [topic code: economic condition / see Appendix F]**

**V6a1** Does the item contain a reference to national [i.e. COUNTRY]’s economic conditions specifically? (Note that “[COUNTRY]” used anywhere in this codebook refers to the country which the coded news outlet belongs to.)

- 1 = No reference to national [i.e. COUNTRY]’s economic conditions
- 2 = Reference to national [i.e. COUNTRY]’s economic conditions

**V6a2** **[IF V6a1=1] ECONOMIC CONDITIONS: Does the item contain an evaluation of whether national economic conditions have changed over the past 12 months?**

- 1 = no evaluation
- 2 = a lot better
- 3 = a little better
- 4 = stayed the same
- 5 = a little worse
- 6 = a lot worse

**V6a3** **[IF V6a1=1] Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/depicts so):** Does the story indicate whether the national government or EU level government has had a positive or negative impact on *national economic conditions*? **NOTE: Sometimes a news story may attribute no or multiple responsibility/ies. If the news story explicitly mentions/depicts or an actor(s) in the story explicitly says there are multiple affects and responsibilities then check all that apply (but only if explicitly mentioned). If no affects and responsibilities are mentioned do not tick any of the below options.**

- 1 = National government/government policy has had a positive effect
- 2 = National government/government policy has had a negative effect
- 3 = National government/government policy has had no effect
- 4 = EU governance/EU policy has had a positive effect
- 5 = EU governance/EU policy has had a negative effect
- 6 = EU governance/EU policy has had no effect

**V6b1** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Who is said or depicted as *mainly* handling, working on or taking care of the *economic conditions*?

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who is typically responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are depicted as equally dealing with the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, national army/troops and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

**V6b2** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Who, according to the story, if mentioned at all, **SHOULD** mainly be responsible for handling, working on or taking care of the *economic conditions*?

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's desired handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who should typically be responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are equally depicted in the sense that they should handle the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, national army/troops and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)

6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

**FILTER: code V7a1-V7b2 only IF V5a OR V5b OR V5c = [topic code: immigration / see Appendix F]**

**V7a1 IMMIGRATION: Does the item contain an evaluation of whether the rate of immigration has changed over the past 12 months?**

- 1 = no evaluation
- 2 = increased a lot
- 3 = increased a little
- 4 = stayed the same
- 5 = decreased a little
- 6 = decreased a lot

**V7a2 [if v7a1<9] IMMIGRATION: Only if the item contains a specific evaluation, does the item suggest that the change in immigration is positive or negative?**

- 1 = no evaluation
- 2 = positive/better
- 3 = negative/worse
- 4 = both positive and negative

**V7a3 Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Does the story indicate whether the national government or EU level government has had a positive or negative impact on *immigration*? **NOTE: Sometimes a news story may attribute no or multiple responsibility/ies. If the news story explicitly mentions/depicts or an actor(s) in the story explicitly says there are multiple affects and responsibilities then check all that apply (but only if explicitly mentioned). If no affects and responsibilities are mentioned do not tick any of the below options.**

- 1 = National government/government policy has had a positive effect
- 2 = National government/government policy has had a negative effect
- 3 = National government/government policy has had no effect
- 4 = EU governance/EU policy has had a positive effect
- 5 = EU governance/EU policy has had a negative effect
- 6 = EU governance/EU policy has had no effect

**V7b1 Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Who is said or depicted as *mainly* handling, working on or taking care of *immigration*?

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the

depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who is typically responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are depicted as equally dealing with the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, national army/troops and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

## V7b2

**Explicitly** (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):  
Who, according to the story, if mentioned at all, **SHOULD** mainly be responsible for handling, working on or taking care of **immigration**?

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's desired handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who should typically be responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are equally depicted in the sense that they should handle the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, national army/troops and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

**FILTER: code V8a1-V8b only IF V5a OR V5b OR V5c = [topic code: interest rates / see Appendix F]**

## V8a1

**INTEREST RATES: Does the item contain an evaluation of whether interest rates have changed over the past 12 months?**

- 1 = no evaluation
- 2 = increased a lot
- 3 = increased a little
- 4 = stayed the same

- 5 = decreased a little
- 6 = decreased a lot

**V8a2** [if v8a1<9] **INTEREST RATES: Only if the item contains a specific evaluation, does the item suggest that the change in interest rates is positive or negative?**

- 1 = no evaluation
- 2 = positive/better
- 3 = negative/worse
- 4 = both positive and negative

**V8a3** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Does the story indicate whether the national government or EU level government has had a positive or negative impact on *interest rates*? **NOTE: Sometimes a news story may attribute no or multiple responsibility/ies. If the news story explicitly mentions/depicts or an actor(s) in the story explicitly says there are multiple affects and responsibilities then check all that apply (but only if explicitly mentioned). If no affects and responsibilities are mentioned do not tick any of the below options.**

- 1 = National government/government policy has had a positive effect
- 2 = National government/government policy has had a negative impact
- 3 = National government/government policy has had no effect
- 4 = EU governance/EU policy has had a positive effect
- 5 = EU governance/EU policy has had a negative effect
- 6 = EU governance/EU policy has had no effect

**V8b** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Who is said or depicted as *mainly* handling, working on or taking care of *interest rates*?

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who is typically responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are depicted as equally dealing with the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, national army/troops and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

**FILTER: code V9a-V9c only IF V5a OR V5b OR V5c = [topic code: health care / see Appendix F]**

**V9a HEALTH CARE: Does the item contain an evaluation of whether health care standards have changed over the past 12 months?**

- 1 = no evaluation
- 2 = a lot better
- 3 = a little better
- 4 = stayed the same
- 5 = a little worse
- 6 = a lot worse

**V9b Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Does the story indicate whether the national government or EU level government has had a positive or negative impact on *health care*? **NOTE: Sometimes a news story may attribute no or multiple responsibility/ies. If the news story explicitly mentions/depicts or an actor(s) in the story explicitly says there are multiple affects and responsibilities then check all that apply (but only if explicitly mentioned). If no affects and responsibilities are mentioned do not tick any of the below options.**

- 1 = National government/government policy has had a positive effect
- 2 = National government/government policy has had a negative impact
- 3 = National government/government policy has had no effect
- 4 = EU governance/EU policy has had a positive effect
- 5 = EU governance/EU policy has had a negative effect
- 6 = EU governance/EU policy has had no effect

**V9c Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Who is said or depicted as *mainly* handling, working on or taking care of *health care*?

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who is typically responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are depicted as equally dealing with the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, national army/troops and public administration)
- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)

- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)  
 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

**FILTER: code V10a-V10c only IF V5a OR V5b OR V5c = [topic code: climate change / see Appendix F]**

**V10a CLIMATE CHANGE: Does the item contain an evaluation of whether climate change has become more or less of a problem over the past 12 months?**

- 1 = no evaluation  
 2 = a lot more of a problem  
 3 = a little more of a problem  
 4 = stayed the same  
 5 = a little less of a problem  
 6 = a lot less of a problem

**V10b Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Does the story indicate whether the national government or EU level government has had a positive or negative impact on *climate change*? **NOTE: Sometimes a news story may attribute no or multiple responsibility/ies. If the news story explicitly mentions/depicts or an actor(s) in the story explicitly says there are multiple affects and responsibilities then check all that apply (but only if explicitly mentioned). If no affects and responsibilities are mentioned do not tick any of the below options.**

- 1 = National government/government policy has had a positive effect  
 2 = National government/government policy has had a negative impact  
 3 = National government/government policy has had no effect  
 4 = EU governance/EU policy has had a positive effect  
 5 = EU governance/EU policy has had a negative effect  
 6 = EU governance/EU policy has had no effect

**V10c Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Who is said or depicted as *mainly* handling, working on or taking care of *climate change*?

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's handling of the topic. Always code this category according to the depiction of the story and not according to your knowledge about who is typically responsible for the topic.

If there are two actors who are depicted as equally dealing with the topic, code the first one mentioned.

- 1 = Not applicable / not mentioned  
 2 = Any national *government/governmental* actors (e.g., head of government, ministry, ministers, prime ministers of federal states, governors of regions, national army/troops and public administration)

- 3 = Any national *non-governmental political* actors (e.g., opposition politicians – also in federal states/regions, political organizations, political institutions other than government)
- 4 = Any national *non-political* actors (e.g., ordinary citizens, non-political organizations)
- 5 = EU or EU-related actors (e.g., EU institutions, EU politicians)
- 6 = Other (e.g., NATO, UN, UN/ NATO and other supranational troops)

## END OF TOPIC – CODING

### V11a

**Main location** of the story, part 1

Where does the story or the actions it depicts (mainly) take place (in terms of **prominence** in the story or **length**)?

→ **List of locations – (see Appendix C)**

*Note:* If there are two equally important locations, code the one mentioned *first* in the story.

*Note for newspapers:* Headlines, bullets, cartoons, and pictures/ graphs may not contain enough information to code this category.

*Example:* An article about a speech held by Gordon Brown in Germany talking about the UK would be coded as “Germany”.

*Note:* Only code “EU” (=code 43) if indeed the political institution is meant and not the geographical entity (=code 46). When ‘Brussels’ is the location code 43 if it signifies the EU and code “02” (=Belgium) only when it is referred to as the capital of Belgium but not linked to the EU.

### V11b

**Main location** of the story, part 2

Which geographical entity is most *affected* by the story or the actions the story depicts (in terms of **prominence** in the story or **length**)?

→ **List of locations – (see Appendix C)**

*Note:* If there are two equally important locations, code the one mentioned *first* in the story.

*Example:* example with Gordon Brown – would be coded with UK since he is talking about the UK.

*Note:* Only code “EU” (code 43) if indeed the political institution is meant and not the geographical entity (code 46). When ‘Brussels’ is the location code 43 if it signifies the EU and code “02”(Belgium) only when it is referred to as the capital of Belgium but not linked to the EU.

### V12

**Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):** Does the story mention **the current [NATIONAL] government and if so, how is it evaluated?** “National government’ here refers to the government or “head of government” (but only if explicitly identified as such; “Prime Minister” does not count, only when referred to as ‘head of government’) of the country the news outlet originates from. Does it mention satisfaction or dissatisfaction with it – regardless of

the source of such an evaluation? Does the story or somebody in the story comment on it negatively or positively?

Refers to tendency/bias contained in the presentation by a journalist, protagonist or his partners, competitors, independent sources (e.g. politicians, businessmen, scientists)  
The tendency must be expressed:

- **explicitly**, by using terms of clearly positive or negative **judgment** (e.g., "good", "promising", "ominous", "disappointing").

Per news item you only assign one (overall) code for the explicit evaluation of the current national government in a story. Please note that particular care should be exercised while recording the tendencies and only undoubtedly positive or negative ones should be coded as such.

**All evaluations are judged from the perspective of the current national government, i.e. is the evaluation positive/negative from their perspective!**

In case no tendency can be assumed (i.e. there is no evaluation), then choose **no evaluation** (0). Don't interpret too much or become too subtle, too creative or too subjective.

If your impression is that the evaluation is mixed positive and negative tendencies are exactly in balance, then code **balanced/mixed** (3). If there are *both* positive and negative evaluations but the overall evaluation (or sum of specific evaluations) is, e.g., more positive than negative, then code **rather positive** (4). If it is more negative than positive, then code **rather negative** (2). If there are *either only* positive *OR* negative evaluations, even if it is just one evaluation, then code **positive** (5) or **negative** (1) respectively.

1 = not applicable / not mentioned

2 = mentioned but not evaluated

3 = negative

4 = rather negative

5 = balanced/mixed

6 = rather positive

7 = positive

## **FILTER VARIABLE**

**V13 Does the story mention either the European Union (EU)\*, its institutions or policies or the European Parliamentary elections or the campaign?**

**1 = no**

**2 = yes**

**\* or synonyms such as ‘Brussels’ (when EU is meant), Europe (when EU is meant), EU countries (if explicitly referred to as such), EU member states (if explicitly referred to as such). EU institutions include the European Central Bank (ECB), for instance.**

### SCREENING SELECTION:

THE ABOVE VARIABLES (V1-V13) ARE CODED FOR ALL POLITICAL STORIES IN A TV NEWS PROGRAM OR IN A NEWSPAPER

**ONLY CODE STORIES BEYOND THIS POINT (V14-V46 / =until next filter) IF THEY ARE ABOUT\* THE EU, ITS INSTITUTIONS, THE EUROPEAN ELECTIONS OR THE CAMPAIGN**

*\*About is defined as:*

*TV: mentioned at least once (anywhere in the whole story)*

*Newspapers: mentioned at least once (anywhere in the whole story)*

<b>All subsequent variables are only coded if V13=1</b>
---

**All EU stories in the relevant sections of newspapers need to be coded, not only those on the title page and on the one randomly chosen page. Thus, you have to go through all relevant sections in order to identify and code all news stories about the EU.**

*Newspapers: All EU stories have to be coded in the following sections: Political/News section, Editorial (including Opinion/Comment) and Business (or Economy) Section.*

*Do not code Sport, Travel, Housing, Culture, Motor/Auto, Fashion or Entertainment sections.*

## Actors

### V14a-V14f Actors

#### → List of actors (see Appendix D)

Up to **SIX** different **persons, groups, institutions or organizations** that are

- mentioned verbally at least twice. He/she, him/her, who(m)/which also count. Synonyms or personal pronouns also count (e.g. if Gordon Brown is referred to as “the PM” or “the Incredible Hulk” if that is indeed clearly discernable from the text. An actor should be mentioned verbally at least twice in two separate sentences. Thus, a reference to “Jose Manuel Barroso, the commission’s president” or a single sentence like “Barroso yesterday announced that he wants a second term as Commission president” only counts as *one* mentioning of Barroso, as both his name, his function, and “he” are mentioned within in a single sentence.

**or**

- verbally mentioned once **and** quoted (Brown said: "Britain...") / or quoted without quotation marks (i.e. reported speech: Brown said that...)

**or**

- mentioned verbally at least once **and** depicted at least once.

*Exception:* If an article in a newspaper only consists of a headline/ bullet/ picture, **one** mentioning or depiction of politicians, political groups, institutions or organizations is sufficient! However, cartoon/drawing does not count as a reference to an actor! Also, coding of actors shown on photography or film is limited to *persons* (depictions of logos, buildings of institutions do not count a reference to non-personal actors).

*Note:* If an **actor in a TV news** item is not verbally mentioned / interviewed/ referred to and **only depicted several times**, this does not establish him as an actor.

1. Actors are **not necessarily persons**. A government, an institution, an organization, even a country as a whole can be an actor if the story depicts so.
2. Actors can be **subjects** as well as **objects**. So an actor does **not necessarily have to act**. Actors can also be **objects** or **targets** of actions—they can be attacked or criticized, for instance.

But keep in mind that actors can only be persons, groups, institutions or organizations.

Also a reference to “Gordon Brown’s policy proposals” or “ the government’s goals” or “Tony Blair’s Notting Hill residence” counts as a mentioning of Brown, the government, or Tony Blair as actors. Similarly, a reference to “European Commission proposal” or “EU allies”

counts as a mentioning of European Commission or EU, respectively. Also a reference to the “Eurozone” or “EU member states” counts as EU actor references.

Countries as such are not coded as actors (e.g., “Germany is facing a sharp economic downturn” or “the G20 met in the UK today” does NOT count as actor reference). ONLY code a country as an actor when the country name (or mentioning of the capital of a country) is used as a synonym for the national government (e.g., “the UK yesterday announced to exit the EU” or “Germany has opposed the US proposal to increase the number of troops in Afghanistan”). In these latter cases the country name clearly indicates the national government which is listed with a respective code in the actor appendix.

3. An *unspecified* group (i.e., a mix of different) of actors referred to in plural form as “they” or “these four companies” etc. (e.g., “The Times, the Sun, and the Guardian all reported today that *they* expect ad revenues to be lower”) does not count as an actor mentioning. However, a story referring to “SPD party members” as “they” does count because it refers to a specified actor (=SPD party members), for example.
4. **Journalists** are actors *only* if they are **interviewed, reported about, or used as sources**.
5. An actor can only be coded once – although she/he/it/they may appear at several places and with different functions in the story. Then, choose the category depicting the most important role of that actor in the story. If more than one code applies to one actor, choose the most specific one (e.g., a farmer is not to be coded as ordinary citizen, but as member of a professional group). There may be cases in which the same code has to be assigned to different actors, e.g. when two members of the same party are quarreling with each other. The reference point for deciding how to code an actor is always the story. If, for example, a minister is a *candidate* running for the EP, use the relevant EP Candidate Actor List code. If the story is about the person as member of the government, use the relevant minister code.
6. **Generic groups of actors such as Europeans, voters, citizens, public, MPs, MEPs, politicians, etc. have to be mentioned twice with the same descriptive term** (e.g., 2x “voters” or 2x “Dutch MEPs”) and are coded according to the codes in the actor appendix.
7. **“I” or “We”** (e.g. “I think” or “we are”), e.g. in a column or commentary does not establish the author as an actor and thus does not count as a mentioning of an actor! This rule is not applicable regarding *interviewees* referring to themselves as “I” or “we”, since interviewees can only refer to themselves as “I” or “we” in **quotes**. One or more direct quotes always establish the interviewee as an actor (provided of course he or she is among the first 6 actors of a story).
8. Criteria for selecting actors

*If there is more than **one** actor:*

Actor 1 = the main actor, the most important actor **of the story**.

Indicators of importance are:

- duration, space of information about the actor
- frequency of being mentioned
- visibility (film, photographs etc.)
- quotes, statements of the actor.

**NOTE:** If two actors are equally prominent in the article with regard to the above criteria, then count the number of references to each actor and choose the one who is most often referred to. However, this rule only applies if two actors are really exactly evenly prominent with regard to the above criteria.

*Note:* Actors do **not** become important in a story because of their position, their rank or prestige!

*If there are two or more actors that are sufficiently present (see above) in the story:*  
Code the other actors (except the main actor) **in the order of their appearance in the story.**

*NOTE:* In order to determine the order of appearance in newspaper articles and in order to determine which actor is mentioned *first* it is important to determine what part of the story is the '**coding starting point**'. Starting point is always (1) the headline, followed by (2) the photo and the caption directly following the photograph (if present), followed by (3) the first (intro) paragraph of the article, then (4) the second etc.

**V15a-f** Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so): **Is actor 1-6 evaluated favorably or unfavorably (regardless of the source) from his/her own perspective?**

Refers to tendency/bias contained in the presentation by a journalist, protagonist or his partners, competitors, independent sources (e.g. politicians, businessmen, scientists)  
The tendency must be expressed:

- **explicitly**, by using terms of clearly positive or negative **judgment** (e.g., "good", "promising", "ominous", "disappointing").

Per news item you only assign one (overall) code for the explicit evaluation of an actor in a story. Please note, however, that particular care should be exercised while recording the tendencies and only undoubtedly positive or negative ones should be coded as such.

*NOTE:* Any attribute that is associated with a particular actor (e.g., policy plans, Notting Hill residence, environmental directive) also forms a part of the evaluation of the actor. For example, a "terrible EU health care directive" carries a negative evaluation of the directive, but since the directive is associated with the EU, it counts as an actor reference to the EU and as a negative evaluation of the EU (for the next variable/actor evaluation).

**All evaluations are judged from the perspective of the actor!**

In case no tendency can be assumed (i.e. there is no evaluation), then choose **no evaluation** (0). Don't interpret too much or become too subtle, too creative or too subjective.

If your impression is that the evaluation is mixed positive and negative tendencies are exactly in balance, then code **balanced/mixed** (3).

If there are *both* positive and negative evaluations but the overall evaluation (or sum of specific evaluations) is, e.g., more positive than negative, then code **rather positive** (4). If it is more negative than positive, then code **rather negative** (2).

If there are *either only* positive *OR* negative evaluations, even if it is just one evaluation, then code **positive** (5) or **negative** (1) respectively.

- 1 = no evaluation
- 2 = negative
- 3 = rather negative
- 4 = balanced/mixed
- 5 = rather positive
- 6 = positive

**V16a-f** If the actor is a person: **Is the actor male or female?** If the actor is not a person (e.g., a country or an institution) or the gender is not discernible, code “not applicable” (“9”). However, do code the gender when the actor code goes back to a person as a representative of an institution (e.g., Strauss-Kahn on behalf of the IMF = “male”). In case of a *group* of persons: only code 1 or 2 if it is clearly discernible from the story that the individuals of that group are either *all* male or *all* female. Otherwise, code “9”.

- 1 = male
- 2 = female
- 3 = not applicable

**V17a-f** If the actor is a person: Is the actor **explicitly** referred to as a member of an **ethnic minority group**?

Coding has to be based on explicit reference such as e.g. German politician “of Turkish decent” or as being part of (specified or unspecified) ethnic minority; a reference of e.g. a German politician being referred to as being “of Turkish descent” is enough of a reference to be coded (thus the term “ethnic minority” as such does not have to be there explicitly), note that a story about “Moroccan government” in Morocco is *not* coded as ethnic minority.

If the ethnic minority status is not discernible, code “not discernible” (code=0). If the actor is not a person, code “not applicable” (code=99). In the case of a *group* of actors: if the group of actors consists of *persons*, only code “1” if this group of actors is in fact explicitly referred to as an ethnic minority group (otherwise code “not discernible”). If the group of actors consists of *organizations*, code “not applicable” (“99”).

- 0 not discernible
- 1... see list [*appendix E*]
- 99 not applicable

**V18a-f** **How many times is the actor directly quoted?** Count the number of quotation marks divided by two. Thus, quotes that are interrupted by short text fragments are counted as separate quotes. Only direct quotes count; paraphrasing does not!

Groups or institutions can also be quoted (e.g.: “The EU Commission yesterday announced that they ‘were not amused’ by the statement of the Polish president.”), but *not* if e.g. a spokesman is delivering the quote *on behalf of* the group or institution (for that quote belongs to the spokesman, which establishes *him* as an actor if referred to more than once).

*NOTE:* For interviews on TV, any interruption during a longer interview constitutes a new quote (i.e. code the number of sound-bites as separate quotes).

\_\_\_\_\_ times (count number of direct quotes; if there are no direct quotes code “0”).

**V19a-f** **Is the actor being shown on photography or in film?** A cartoon/drawing does not count as a depiction of an actor! The coding of actors shown on photography or film is limited to *persons* (depictions of logos, buildings of institutions, etc. do not count). Inanimate non-human depictions of impersonal actors (institutions, groups, organizations) are NOT coded as 1, BUT they are coded as “1” if they are depicted by humans, persons (e.g., trade union members protesting on the streets).

- 1 = no
- 2 = yes

- V20A-F **DOES THE JOURNALIST OR COLUMNIST (=WRITER/AUTHOR OF THE ARTICLE) CHALLENGE ANY STATEMENT(S) OF POSITION(S) OF THIS ACTOR IN THE STORY? DOES THE JOURNALIST INDICATE THAT RE-EXAMINATION OF THIS ACTOR'S POSITION OR STATEMENT MIGHT BE REQUIRED? FOR EXAMPLE: WHEN A JOURNALIST, AFTER QUOTING OR PARAPHRASING A POLITICIAN, WRITES: "HOWEVER, THIS IS NOT NECESSARILY THE CASE." OR "EVEN SO (OR TRUE AS THAT MAY BE), THE FACTS TELL A DIFFERENT STORY." ON TV, IF A JOURNALIST (ANCHORMAN) DISAGREES WITH AN INTERVIEWEE DURING AN INTERVIEW, ALSO CODE "YES."**
- 1 = no  
2 = yes

## END OF ACTOR CODING

**The following variables are coded for each topic**

### EU Topics

Code up to **five EU-specific** topics per story. These can be (but do not have to be) identical with the topics you coded earlier on as part of V5 (main topics). **Code topics in order of appearance.** Topics have to be referred to/mentioned at least **twice** (in two separate sentences) in the article or newscast and not just mentioned in passing. *Coding rule:* If in doubt, always choose **the more specific topic category.**

*Only* code topics that are *EU-specific*. Non-EU topics, even if they dominate the story, should be ignored and not coded.

*Up to 5* EU-specific topics can be coded. However, a story does not necessarily address more than 1 topic. Thus, *do not search* for additional topics if there really are no more than 1 or 2 topics discernable!

**V21a-e** Code up to five EU-specific topics per story in order of appearance.

**FILTER:** Only code V21b if V21a is not coded "not applicable"; only code V21c if V21b is not coded "not applicable"; only code V21d if V21c is not coded "not applicable"; only code V21e if V21d is not coded "not applicable"

**→ List of EU-specific topics – (see Appendix G)**

### Topic Specific Coding

**V22a-e** **Topic discussion (Code for each topic!)**  
What is the extent of discussion of the topic **relative to the total length of the story?**

1 = Mentioned briefly. The topic appears briefly such as in one or two sentences with no further discussion.

- 2 = Discussed extensively, but not the main focus. The topic is discussed in several sentences, but is not the focus of the story  
 3 = Focal or key topic. The topic serves as the central point of discussion in the story and will be discussed at length generally throughout the story.

### **V23a-e Topic relevant information (Code for each topic!)**

What is the density of relevant information given in the story regarding this topic **relative to the extent of the total discussion of the topic?**

Some stories contain a great deal of relevant in-depth, factual information, others contain only little relevant in-depth, factual information and some stories do not contain any in-depth, factual information. Example: A story on the role of the EU parliament could either contain a lot of information (content/substance) regarding, for example, the competences or composition of the parliament (code=2), or - in passing - briefly mention only the main function of the parliament (code=1), or just mention the parliament without any substantial further information (code=0).

As a coding rule, “0” should be coded if there is virtually no factual information on the topic readers/viewers would be able to learn from; “1” is coded if there is some basic descriptive information readers/viewers would be able to learn from; “2” is coded if there is extensive discussion of relevant content/information readers/viewers would be able to learn from. ‘Topic-relevant information’, in general, is defined as facts, figures, numbers etc. / More informally, the basic distinction to be made here is between “content/substance” and “irrelevant/fluff”.

- 1 = No topic-relevant information mentioned  
 2 = Low density of topic-relevant information  
 3 = High density of topic-relevant information

### **V24a-e Public’s satisfaction with topic (Code for each topic!)**

Does the story explicitly mention satisfaction/dissatisfaction of the general public (e.g., Dutch, Irish public, can also be individuals e.g. man in the street being interviewed) with the current state of affairs regarding the topic?

- 1 = no evaluation of public (dis-)satisfaction  
 2 = Very dissatisfied (problems)  
 3 = Somewhat dissatisfied  
 4 = Both satisfied/dissatisfied/mixed  
 5 = Somewhat satisfied  
 6 = Very satisfied (no problems)

### **V25a-e Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so):**

**Does the story mention what the development on the topic has been in terms of ‘good’ and ‘bad? (Code for each topic! Do not code in relation to specific actors but only code with regard to specific topics!).** “Development” also includes decision making, new legislation, etc. Examples (code=1): “We shouldn’t have allowed Bulgaria and Romania to join the EU in 2007; that was a mistake.” OR (when the topic is campaigning): “The PvdA campaign has gotten into trouble.” However, “the European Parliament has gotten more powers over the years” does not count, since this is not an explicit evaluation of the development in terms of good or bad (thus code=9).

- 1 = no evaluation

- 2 = situation has gotten worse
- 3 = situation has gotten better
- 4 = situation is ambivalent (gotten worse and gotten better)

**END OF Topic Specific Coding**  
**The following variables are coded for the story in general**

**V26**

**Explicitly:** Does the story **evaluate the EU**, and if so, how? ‘The EU’ here refers to the EU as a political institution as such, not to single, more specific institutions such as the EP or the EC. Also code if synonyms are used which clearly refer to the EU as such, e.g., “Europe” (when in fact the EU is meant / but not if Europe is only referred to as a geographical entity) or “Brussels” (when in fact the EU is meant).

Examples of when the EU is NOT mentioned (code=9):

- “Euroscpticism is booming in the Netherlands.”
- “The EU leaders were satisfied with their decisiveness during the Summit.”

Examples of when the EU is mentioned but NOT evaluated (code=0):

- “By giving away emission rights for free, the EU does not push industries towards a cleaner production.”
- “The EU signed a historical agreement with the US.”
- “The Lisbon Treaty will enable the EU to become more democratic.”

Examples of when the EU is negatively evaluated:

- “The EU is *failing* to push industries towards a cleaner production.”

- 1 = not mentioned
- 2 = mentioned but not evaluated
  
- 3 = negative
- 4 = rather negative
- 5 = balanced/mixed
- 6 = rather positive
- 7 = positive

**V27**

**Explicitly:** Does the story **evaluate the European Parliament**, and if so, how?

- 1 = not mentioned
- 2 = mentioned but not evaluated
  
- 3 = negative
- 4 = rather negative
- 5 = balanced/mixed
- 6 = rather positive
- 7 = positive

**V28**

**Explicitly:** Does the story **evaluate the potential (=future!) enlargement of the EU (in general)?** *NOTE:* The term ‘enlargement’ needs to explicitly mentioned as a more general political process for it to be coded 1-5. If a story refers to potential

membership of one or more specific countries (e.g. Turkey), code “mentioned but not evaluated” here. If there is an evaluation of the potential membership of either Turkey, Croatia, or Switzerland code “mentioned but not evaluated” here (since the story does deal with enlargement) but only code the evaluation here if it specifically refers to “future enlargement IN GENERAL”, if it refers to one of the specific countries code this evaluation in one of the following country-specific variables.

- 1 = not mentioned
- 2 = mentioned but not evaluated
  
- 3 = negative
- 4 = rather negative
- 5 = balanced/mixed
- 6 = rather positive
- 7 = positive

**V29a**      **Explicitly:** Does the story **evaluate the potential membership of CROATIA in the EU?**

- 1 = not mentioned
- 2 = mentioned but not evaluated
  
- 3 = negative
- 4 = rather negative
- 5 = balanced/mixed
- 6 = rather positive
- 7 = positive

**V29b**      **Explicitly:** Does the story **evaluate the potential membership of SWITZERLAND in the EU?**

- 1 = not mentioned
- 2 = mentioned but not evaluated
  
- 3 = negative
- 4 = rather negative
- 5 = balanced/mixed
- 6 = rather positive
- 7 = positive

**V29c**      **Explicitly:** Does the story **evaluate the potential membership of TURKEY in the EU?**

- 1 = not mentioned
- 2 = mentioned but not evaluated
  
- 3 = negative
- 4 = rather negative
- 5 = balanced/mixed
- 6 = rather positive
- 7 = positive

**V30a-f**

Does the story contain explicit factual information about the following (note that “[COUNTRY]” used anywhere in this codebook refers to the country which the coded news outlet belongs to):

- a. The total number of member states in the EU (only code “yes” if the specific number mentioned is **27**).
- b. The number of representatives one or more member state(s) elect(s) in the European Parliament (either before or after the EP elections) (the number must refer to the total number of MEPs of a country as a whole; numbers for specific parties of a certain country do not count)
- c. The rotation of the presidency of the Council of the European Union (every six months) (i.e., the fact it rotates)
- d. The minimum age limit for standing as a candidate for the [COUNTRY] general elections
- e. The total number of MPs in [COUNTRY] national parliament
- f. The number of seats the European Parliament will have **after** the 2009 election

- 1 = no
- 2 = yes

**V31**

**Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention any aspect related to **the state of democracy in the EU**, and if so, how is it evaluated? E.g., does the story mention whether the European Union is **democratic/transparent** or **undemocratic/intransparent**.

*For example:* Does the story suggest that most things are dealt with behind closed doors, most things discussed were decided in advance, or that the EU does not respect the will of the citizens, or that the EP has little power; or on the contrary does the story emphasize the transparency and democratic character of the European Union? “The European Parliament is irrelevant” does not count here because it is not an explicit evaluation of the state of EU democracy.

- 1 = not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = mentioned but not evaluated
- 3 = negative
- 4 = rather negative
- 5 = balanced/mixed
- 6 = rather positive
- 7 = positive

**V32**

If the story or somebody in story mentions referendums on matters of European integration, is the story rather **supportive of holding referendums on matters of EU integration** or does it **oppose referendums on matters of EU integration**?

- 1 = not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = mentioned but not evaluated
- 3 = negative/opposed
- 4 = rather negative
- 5 = balanced/mixed
- 6 = rather positive
- 7 = positive/supportive

## FRAMES

**V33**      **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says depicts so):** Does the story (or somebody in the story) mention **two or more sides** of (i.e., not two separate arguments of but **two or more distinct perspectives** on) a problem or issue?

*Note:* These “sides” do not necessarily indicate a conflict or disagreement. Example:  
 “The tax increase might look good on the budget but it might slow down demand as citizens will be left with less money to spend”

1 = no  
 2 = yes

**V34a**      **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention any conflict/disagreement? *Note:* There needs to be reference to two opposing sides (e.g., “he supports , but she opposes this policy”). An expression of a one-sided opinion (e.g., “I doubt that...”; “I disagree on ...”) or discontent does not constitute a conflict. Neither does, for example, a cartel watchdog “expressing concern” about a potential merger between two big companies. Also code “1” for references to conflicts that are anticipated, i.e. conflicts that are *expected* to emerge. For example, a reference to a government party being “on collision course” with another government party would count as a reference to conflict.

1 = no  
 2 = yes

**V34b**      **[FILTER: IF V34a=1] EU-COUNTRY conflict:** Does the story mention any kind of conflict, differences of opinion, diverging points of view, disagreement over proposed policy measures between **the [COUNTRY] or the [NATIONAL] government** (incl. formal government representatives [government officials/spokespersons] or “Germany” when in fact the German government is meant) **and** (one or more political actors representing) **the European Union or the European Commission** (e.g., a EU commissioner, President of the European Commission)? For example: “According to the European Commission, Croatia is ready to join the EU. But the position of the Dutch government is and remains: ‘Croatia must do more to prevent corruption. Croatia will not join anytime soon. We will use our veto if necessary,’ said Frans Timmermans, the Dutch EU affairs minister.”

1 = no  
 2 = yes

**V35**      **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention a **personal attack** between two or more actors? Personal attacks *primarily* but not exclusively focus on persons and personal characteristics and not on issue content, or substance. One politician stating that he disagrees with another politician on a certain policy or issue does not constitute a ‘personal attack’. This is only fulfilled if the attack contains a reference to the person/personality/personal characteristics of the other politician at the expense of content-related considerations. Furthermore, personal attacks are often unsubstantiated, i.e. not backed up with factual information. Example: “These leftist politicians don’t know what they’re talking

about.” OR “Politician X said yesterday that the arrogance of politician Y would simply be unbearable”, OR: “A called B a ‘liar’ in response to his earlier statement.”

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V36a** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story say that one person, group, institution or organization **reproaches/blames/criticizes** another?

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V36b** **[FILTER: IF V36a=1] EU-COUNTRY reproach:** Does the story say that (one or more political actors representing) the [COUNTRY] or the [NATIONAL] **government reproaches/blames/criticizes** (one or more political actors representing) **the European Union or the European Commission** (e.g., a EU commissioner, President of the European Commission) **or vice versa?** E.g. the Dutch government said: The EC is wrong: Croatia should not join.

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V37** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the author or any kind of actor mentioned in the article express/argue that one’s country has had any kinds of **benefits from the EU** (generally or specific) or that the situation in one’s country has improved or will (potentially) improve because of the EU? (*Note:* This does not only refer to EU membership of a country but also benefits with regard to the process of EU integration, EU enlargement etc.)

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V38** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the article present **numbers, figures, statistics that indicate that one’s country has benefited from the EU?** (*Note:* This does not only refer to EU membership of a country but also benefits with regard to the process of EU integration, EU enlargement etc.)

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V39** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the author or any kind of actor mentioned in the article express/argue that one’s country has had any kind of **disadvantages from the EU** (generally or specific) or that the situation in one’s country has been negatively affected or will (potentially) be negatively affected because of the EU? (*Note:* This does not only refer to EU membership of a country but also disadvantages with regard to the process of EU integration, EU enlargement etc.)

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V40** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the article present **numbers, figures, statistics that indicate that one’s country has been**

**negatively affected by the EU?** (*Note: This does not only refer to EU membership of a country but also disadvantages with regard to the process of EU integration, EU enlargement etc.*)

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V41** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story make any kind of **negative** reference to a particular **distance or ‘gap’ between the EU and its citizens?** Example: If a story refers to citizens feeling not represented/understood by the EU (also includes citizen indifference, disinterest towards EU).

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V42** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story make any kind of **positive** reference to the **responsiveness of the EU towards its citizens?** Example: If a story mentions that the EU makes efforts to address concerns of citizens (responding, reaching out, listening to EU citizens, etc.; also includes Plan D for Democracy initiative by European Commission)

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V43** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story **contrast** the people/ the masses/ the electorate (as a collective entity) and the interest of the people/ the masses/ the electorate against political or economic authorities/ elites/ power holders and their interests? Does the story **contrast/juxtapose** the will/position of elites and the will/position of the general public? E.g., "politicians do not voice the will of the people", "parties have interests different from those of the man in the street", "the elections will be a means of sticking two fingers up at the political establishment."

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V44** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story in general display **criticism or negativity** towards political or economic authorities/ elites/ power holders from the perspective of the public/people/citizens? E.g., bank managers are corrupt and selfish, European civil servants are self-centered etc. However, "politicians do not voice the will of the people", "parties have interests different from those of the man in the street" are mere observations and do not contain explicit elements of criticism (and would thus be coded as 0).

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V45** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says depicts so):** Does the story mention aspects relating to women as a group or gender differences? For example, does the story focus on gender differences or women candidates, women as voters or women's issues in the campaign. For example, the story may focus on the gender gap in turnout, the number of female candidates or the story may focus on the training of women political candidates.

1 = no  
2 = yes

## ***FILTER VARIABLE***

### EU ELECTION AND CAMPAIGN STORIES ONLY

**V46**      ***IS THE STORY ABOUT\* THE EUROPEAN  
PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS AND/OR  
THE CAMPAIGN?***

**1 = no**  
**2 = yes**

#### SCREENING SELECTION:

THE ABOVE ARE CODED FOR ALL EU SPECIFIC AND ELECTION AND CAMPAIGN  
RELATED STORIES IN A NEWS PROGRAM OR IN A NEWSPAPER

**ONLY CODE STORIES BEYOND THIS POINT (V47-V60) IF THEY ARE ABOUT\*  
THE EU PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS AND/OR THE CAMPAIGN**

**\*About the European Parliamentary elections and/or the campaign is defined as:**

*TV: mentioned once*

*Newspapers: mentioned at least once*

**All subsequent variables are only coded if V46=1**

### POLLS

**V47**      **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention opinion poll results predicting the **outcome** of the European Parliamentary elections in **[COUNTRY]** (=survey results about vote choice intentions)? **Only code 1, 2 or 3** if a poll is (1) **conducted in the country which the news outlet belongs to** and (2) reports poll results about **vote choice intentions** (i.e., outcome predictions/ parties' shares of the national EP vote at a particular point in time). **Only code 2 or 3 if the poll results include actual numbers** such as a party's exact share of the vote (e.g. latest polls predict the Labour party to get 10% of

the vote) or increases or decreases of that share (e.g. “Labour has lost ground; their share of the vote dropped 5 %”). If, for example, a story in a Dutch newspaper mentions that “the Dutch Eurosceptic parties are expected to do well in the EP elections”, code “1” (for this reference does not include actual numbers). **Only code 3 if the story mentions the source** of the poll results.

1 = No

2 = Yes, public opinion polls mentioned in general

3 = Yes, specific opinion poll result mentioned without source

4 = Yes, specific opinion poll result mentioned with source (e.g., polling organization)

#### **V48 FILTER: ONLY IF V47 > 0**

**From which country is the news paper/TV broadcast?**

[LIST OF LOCATIONS # 1 - # 27]

#### **V49 FILTER: ONLY IF V47 > 0**

**Explicitly (only if explicitly mentioned in the text):** If opinion polls are mentioned, how well or poorly are the following parties expected to perform **in the European Parliamentary elections?**

*Note:* Poll needs to be about the EU elections (not national elections). Prediction needs to be explicitly mentioned/referred to in the text, do **not** just read the polls/graphs and interpret the numbers yourself. Percentages that are only part of a graph/illustration are not sufficient to be coded.

**Only code 1, 2, 3 or 4 if the story EXPLICITLY mentions a REFERENCE POINT;** something like "Labour has dropped to 5 pct" is NOT sufficient. There needs to be a reference point (any previous election but also, for example, any previous poll, the number of seats in the present national parliament or any kind of previous prediction or expectation by the media). However, the coding is independent of *which* reference point the prediction refers to (e.g., last EP election or last regional or national election). **The reference point MUST be present in the TEXT.** Reference points that are ONLY presented in ILLUSTRATIONS (e.g. graph comparing current results to '04 outcome) are NOT sufficient.

For example: an article that states that party A is expected to gain vote shares compared to the last EP election is coded as “1”; an article that states that party A is expected to gain vote shares compared to last national election is also coded as “1”. Category “4” (both) is only coded if there is the *exact* same amount of positive and negative predictions regarding a certain party (e.g., losing with regard to last EP election but gaining with regard to last national election).

All parties contesting the EPE in [COUNTRY].

[see APPENDIX H)

1 = not applicable / no prediction

2 = better

3 = about the same, i.e. no change

4 = worse

5 = both, better and worse

#### **V50**

**Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention **interviews of persons in the street** (= vox populi) (i.e., an actual statement, quote from a person in the street; paraphrasing does not count, neither does a reference by a politician to a remark made by e.g. Joe the Plumber)?

1 = No  
2 = Yes; people interviewed in the street

<b>FRAMES</b>
---------------

**V51**      **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Are one or more *actors* (only actors, though not necessarily one of actors 1-6!) called (potential) **“winners”** or **“losers”**? (e.g., “The winner of the day was politician/party X”).  
*Note:* Has to be mentioned explicitly – not victims, refugees that are not **called** “losers” or dictators that are not **called** “winners”, for instance.

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V52**      **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention a person’s, group’s, institution’s or organization’s **presentation and style** – of how, in which way, in which manner they handle an issue? (e.g., competently, nervously, proudly, elegantly, badly, ill-prepared, hastily etc.).

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V53**      **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention that an action of a person, group, institution or organization was taken in order to **stabilize, consolidate or enhance his/her/its position**, in order to make him/her/it look better in public opinion or in the political arena? I.e., does the story mention a **tactical, calculated or strategic move with a certain motivation**?

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V54**      **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story use one or more metaphors from the **language of games, sport and/or war**? (e.g., race, fight, clash, blow up, bombing, battle, attack, throwing in the towel, betting on the right horse, taking the bull by the horns, a good team-player, a good sportsman, a kick in the teeth, a kicking, a political gun for hire, etc.)  
*Note:* Every country has its own sports metaphors. Please take them into account. Also note that a reference to the “war in Iraq” does not count, for example, because it is not used as a metaphor.

1 = no  
2 = yes

**V55**      **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention that the European Parliamentary election campaign is boring and/or exciting? If there is equal reference to both code “3”; if both are mentioned but one is given more prominence code the respective code (either “1” or “2”).

1 = not applicable / not mentioned  
2 = boring (incl. “not exciting”)  
3 = exciting (incl. “not boring”)  
4 = both, boring and exiting

**V56** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention that turnout in the European Parliamentary elections in [COUNTRY] will be low and/or high? If there is equal reference to both code “3”; if both are mentioned but one is given more prominence code the respective code (either “1” or “2”). Note that “boring” does not include references to citizen indifference and disinterest (for that, see V58).

- 1 = not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = low
- 3 = high
- 4 = both, low and high

**V57** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention that turnout in the European Parliamentary elections [EU-wide] will be low and/or high? If there is equal reference to both code “3”; if both are mentioned but one is given more prominence code the respective code (either “1” or “2”).

- 1 = not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = low
- 3 = high
- 4 = both, low and high

**V58** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention that people are not interested and/ or interested in either the campaign or the election itself? If there is equal reference to both code “3”; if both are mentioned but one is given more prominence code the respective code (either “1” or “2”).

- 1 = not applicable / not mentioned
- 2 = don't care, are not interested, apathetic, indifferent
- 3 = care, are interested, excited
- 4 = both, not interested, apathetic and interested, not excited

**V59** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says depicts so):** Does the story mention any aspect relating to the *\*role of the media\** in or media coverage of the election campaign or political affairs in general (e.g., press presence, behaviors, and influence)? Examples: The (news) media are a technical transmitter of campaign events. / The (news) media are a journalistic platform of campaign events. / The (news) media are a important/influential actor in the election/campaign/game of politics./ The (news) media try to live up to standards of democratic performance. Also includes political campaigns or candidates complaining about media treatment, e.g.: “the media should take us, the MEPs, more seriously.”

- 1 = No
- 2 = Yes

**V60** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says depicts so):** Does the story mention any aspect relating to one or more *\*publicity* efforts of political actors/campaigns towards the media\*? Political publicity involves the *promotion* of, and/or the *management of perceptions* about, a particular political candidate, party, and/or institution. For example, a news story that refers to political advertising, politicians' media strategies (e.g., media appearances), spin doctors or image management strategies of politicians in which the media feature a certain role would be coded as “1”. Also includes, for example: “Brussels is making huge efforts to boost

participation: an advertisement is being screened on the national television networks of almost all member states.”

1 = No  
2 = Yes