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Last week: Europeanisation of German parties

- No European parties
- Europeanisation strengthens party elites (PM, ministers) vis-a-vis party organisation
- Party organisation try to control elites but cannot
- May contribute to fragmented German bargaining position

German parties and Europe

- Most relevant German parties very pro-integration
- Course of European integration (i.e. market liberalisation) presents left parties with dilemma
- So: what kind of integration → potential left-right conflict
Today: Europe and the (German) media

- Part of the democratic deficit: European space dominated by national actors → no European ‘Demos’
  - Few European identities
  - No European parties
  - No Europeanised discourses because no European media

- Reasons:
  - Public media operate on national/subnational basis
  - Private media operate in linguistically separated markets (Language barriers)
  - Nation state is and remains frame of reference for citizens/journalists

- Non-Europeanised (and Euro-sceptic?) media contribute to problem

- Media really bad?

Two faces of media Europeanisation

1. Emergence of truly European media/media system unlikely (But:
   - Resurrection of the ‘European’, other websites
   - Bi-/multi-lateral newspaper co-operations
   - CNN Europe, France 24, Euronews . . .)

2. Europeanisation of national media
The media and European politics

▶ Visibility of European issues in national media deemed low
▶ Because media focus on
  ▶ Personalities
  ▶ Conflict
  ▶ Emotions
▶ European politics
  ▶ Normally involves none of the above
  ▶ Actors do not seek/avoid publicity
  ▶ Does not easily fit into left-right schema
The media and politics

- ‘Conveyors of external information’
- ‘Political actors in their own right’
- Political effects
  1. Agenda setting and priming (what is newsworthy)
  2. ‘Second-order agenda setting’ (context, framing)
  3. Explicit opinion making (comments, editorials)

Research question

- How Europeanised are the German (print) media . . .
- Compared to other actors?
- Sub-dimensions
  1. Attention to policy domains
  2. Attention to European institutions
  3. Attention to actors in other countries
  4. Evaluation
Counting ‘claims’

- Unit of the analysis
- A political statement (strategic communication focusing on demands)
- Five elements
  1. Claimant (who?)
  2. Addressee (implementation)
  3. Object actor (p/n affected by claim)
  4. Substantive content (what?)
  5. Frame (why?)
- Can be made by
  - Politicians/parties
  - Interest groups/civil society actors
  - Media
- Reported by . . .

Study design

- Sample from (mostly national) print media
  - SZ, FAZ, Bild
  - plus Leipziger Volkszeitung
- News coverage and editorials 2000-2002
- 2184 issues in total
- Coded: elements of claim as above plus geographical/polity level
Not all domains created equal

- Seven domains/dimensions
  1. EU integration (meta)
  2. Monetary policies
  3. Agriculture
  4. Immigration
  5. Security policies
  6. Pensions
  7. Education

Table 1. *Issue agenda in claim-making of German news media and political actors, 2000 and 2002 (percent).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SZ</th>
<th>FAZ</th>
<th>LVZ</th>
<th>Bild</th>
<th>Total German media actors</th>
<th>German state and party actors</th>
<th>German civil society actors</th>
<th>All German non-media actors</th>
<th>All German actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary politics</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troop deployment</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions/retirement</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU integration</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1,537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vertical Europeanisation

- Press more likely to make claims w ref to European actors
- (In some domains where the EU is active)
- Media are *not* ignoring Europe (troop deployment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europeanisation/German Politics</th>
<th>The Media (14/20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Obstacles or motors?&quot;</td>
<td>Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>&quot;Obstacles or motors?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Data &amp; methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Horizontal Europeanisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Percentage of claims by German actors with a horizontal European frame of reference, by actor and issue field, 2000 and 2002 (percent)².</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troop deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions/retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages based on less than five cases are in brackets.

- Press more likely to make claim w ref to foreign actors (in some domains)
- Civil society more parochial than media, contra neo-func (?)
Evaluation: Integration and actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General position regarding European integration</th>
<th>General position regarding European institutions and actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Party</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Süddeutsche Zeitung</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDP (Liberal Democrats)</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bild-Zeitung</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepoiger Völkszeitung</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD (Social Democrats)</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All media actors</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDU (Christian Democrats)</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All state and party actors</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundesbank (Federal Bank)</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All non-media actors</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts and professionals</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundestag (Federal Parliament)</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All civil society actors</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and local governments</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Bavarian Christian Democrats)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour unions</td>
<td>−.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The scale ranges from +1 very positive to −1 very negative.

- Press more pro-integration and less sceptic than many other actors

Frames

- Frames provide context for argument (‘integration is good because it promotes our shared values’)
- Two broad classes
  - Identity frames (principles, norms, values, governance) (ends)
  - Instrumental frames (political/economic advantages) (means)
- Press uses (proportionally) fewer instrumental frames than interest groups
Assumptions:

- European politics does not fit media selection criteria
- Media play to national audiences
- Media euro-sceptic

No evidence for that

- Put more emphasis on EU integration in general
- Refer more often to European/foreign players than other actors
- Are rather pro-European
- Are less instrumental than civil society actors

Meanwhile: Spitzencandidating: UK vs. German Media

Chart 1: Number of articles in German and UK press citing both “Juncker” and “Schulz”, weekly from 31 March 2014

Note: Derived from Library Press Display searches.

Chart 2: Number of articles in German and UK press citing each candidate for EU Commission

Full story by Simon Hix and Stuart Wilks-Heeg: http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europblog/2014/06/09/
Class questions

- In pairs: Can you identify any claims in the Spiegel International text?
- In groups of five students, discuss the following questions
  - Twelve years on, is Koopmans’/Pfetsch’s description still valid?
  - How do electronic media differ from that image?