

Codebook European Election Study Longitudinal Data Set, version 15.10.2010

**European Election Study Longitudinal Media Study  
1999, 2004, 2009  
University of Exeter and Universiteit van Amsterdam**

**MEDIA CONTENT ANALYSIS  
DOCUMENTATION  
INITIAL RELEASE**

version 15.10.2010

## GENERAL INFORMATION

The purpose of the longitudinal data set is to:

- Build a unified data set based on the content analysis of the news in the campaign for the 1999, 2004, and 2009 European elections in all the member states of the EU.
- Ensure that the data can be linked to the other data collected in the European Election Study across all three elections.

### *Sample:*

The content analysis was carried out on a sample of national news media coverage in 15 EU member states in 1999, in 24 EU member states in 2004, and in all 27 EU member states in 2009. In all waves, 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 all three waves, we included the main national evening news broadcasts of the most widely watched public and commercial television stations by country. We also include one or 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. In 1999, the data set includes only one national broadsheet newspaper and thus is missing a sensationalist-oriented newspaper. In some countries, the exact outlets coded vary to a certain extent from year to year. The exact outlets in each year are given in the appendix.

### *Period of study:*

In each wave, the content analysis was conducted for news items published or broadcast in the 2 or 3 weeks prior to the election. In 1999, the sample includes TV broadcasts for the 2 weeks prior and a newspaper for the 3 weeks prior. In 2004 and 2009, both TV and newspapers were captured and analyzed for the 3 weeks prior to the election.

### *Data collection:*

All relevant news outlets were collected either digitally (TV and newspapers) or as hardcopies (newspapers). With regard to story selection, for television, all news items have been coded in each wave. In 1999, for newspapers, all news items on the title page were coded. In 2004, all newspaper news stories on the front page, a randomly selected second page and all stories containing information about the **European Union** were coded in the following sections in print media: Political/News section, Editorial (including Opinion/Comment) and Business Section [Sport, Culture, Fashion or Entertainment sections were not coded]. In 2009, all newspaper 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). For comparative analysis across all three elections, we recommend selecting only the front page of the newspaper [see variable NP\_page].

### *Unit of Analysis:*

In all cases the story is the unit of analysis. In total, there are 9,835 news stories from 1999, 45,651 from 2004, and 48,983 from 2009 in the longitudinal data set. In all three years, the units can be identified by medium (television news broadcast or print).

### *Sources of Funding:*

The 1999 study was funded by a grant to Holli Semetko, Klaus Schoenbach and Cees van der Eijk by the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO). The 2004 study was funded by research grants from the Dutch National Science Foundation (NWO), the Halle Foundation, the EU CIVICACTIVE Research Program (FP6), Emory University and the Amsterdam School of Communications Research / University of Amsterdam to the principal investigators – Susan Banducci, Claes H. de Vreese and Holli A. Semetko. The 2009 study was funded through the FP7 project PIREDEU ([www.piredeu.eu](http://www.piredeu.eu)). Maarja Luhiste, who compiled the data, is funded by the FP7 training network ELECDDEM ([www.elecdem.eu](http://www.elecdem.eu)).

### *Acknowledgements:*

There is a long list of coders, researchers, post-doc and others without whom the collection of these data would not have been possible: Jochen Peter, Edmund Lauf in particular for 1999. In 2004 the data were collected and coded by Medien Tenor. We also have a long list of people to thank for 2009 and these have been included in the 2009 documentation referenced below.

*For further details on the individual studies, see the following publications:*

#### **1999**

de Vreese, C. H. (2001). Europe in the News: A cross-national comparative study of the news coverage of key EU events. *European Union Politics*, 2, 283-307.

Peter, J., & de Vreese, C. H. (2003). Another look at the public agenda: A cross-national comparative investigation of nominal and thematic public agenda diversity. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 15 (1), 44-64.

de Vreese, C. H. (2003). Television reporting of second-order elections. *Journalism Studies*, 4 (2), 183-198

Peter, J., Semetko, H. A., & de Vreese, C. H. (2003). Politics on television in Europe: How European is it. *EU Politics*, 4 (3)

#### **2004**

de Vreese, C. H., Banducci, S., Semetko, H. A. & Boomgaarden, H. A. (2006). The news coverage of the 2004 European Parliamentary election campaign in 25 countries. *European Union Politics*, 7 (4), 477-504.

de Vreese, Claes, Susan Banducci, Holli Semetko and Hajo Boomgarden. 2005. "Off-line": European Parliamentary Elections on Television News in the Enlarged Europe" *Information Polity* 10(3/4): 177-188.

de Vreese, C. H., Boomgaarden, H.G, Banducci, S., & Semetko, H. A. (2009). A European publicspace? The media and the legitimacy of the European parliamentary elections (22

p). In J. Thomassen (Ed) *The legitimacy of the European Union after enlargement*. Oxford University Press.

## **2009**

Andreas R.T. Schuck, Xezonakis, Georgios , Elenbaas, Matthijs , Banducci, Susan & de Vreese, Claes H.. 2010. Party contestation and Europe on the news agenda: The 2009 European Parliamentary Elections. Working paper (available upon request from authors).

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))

## **CITING THE DATA SET**

The data are available for public use and we ask that the following reference be made when the data are used:

Banducci, Susan, de Vreese, Claes, Semetko, Holli; Boomgarden, Hajo, Luhiste, Maarja,. (2010), *EES Longitudinal Media Study Data Advance Release Documentation*, 15/10/2010. ([www.piredeu.eu](http://www.piredeu.eu))

**LIST AND ORIGIN OF VARIABLES USED IN THE LONGITUDINAL DATA SET**  
 [SEE APPENDIX FOR LIST OF LOCATIONS AND ACTORS]

**coderID      Coder ID**

List of coders

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Coder ID	v1	v3	v3	coderID

**date\_d      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 17th only code “17” for this first variable.

**date\_m      Date (month)**

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

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Date (day)	v3a	v2	v2_d	date_d
Date (month)	v3b	v2	v2_m	date_m

**outlet      News outlet**

List of outlets, see Appendix A.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
News outlet	v4	v1	v1	outlet

**NP\_page      Page on which the newspaper story appears**

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.

In the case of 1999, there is no separate variable. All newspaper stories are coded as front page stories because only front page was coded, in 1999. This variable is then collapsed into frontpage stories (coded as 1) and stories beginning on an inside page (code as 2). There are missing values for

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Page on which the newspaper story appears	NP1	v4b	n.d.	NP_page

**type\_NP      Type of newspaper story**

List of types of newspaper stories. See Appendix A.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Type of newspaper story	NP3	v6	NP5	type_NP

**NPstory\_begins      Newspaper story begins on the upper half / on the lower half of the page**

1 = upper half  
2 = lower half

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Newspaper story begins on the upper half / on the lower half of the page	NP7	v5b(NP)	NP4	NPstory_begins

**TV\_length      Length of TV news item (in seconds)**

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

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Length of TV news item (seconds)	TV1	v5a(TV)	TV4	TV_length

**topic 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 A for the list of topic.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Primary topic of the story	v5a	v7	v5	topic

**topic\_handler Explicitly: who is said as mainly handling, working on or taking care of the primary topic**

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

See Appendix A for the list of main handlers of the topic.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: who is said to as mainly handling, working on or taking care of the primary topic	v5a1	n.d.	v33	topic_handler

**pref\_handler Explicitly: who, according to the story, SHOULD mainly be responsible for handling, working on or taking care of the primary topic**

*Mainly* means in terms of the prominence, the length/ space a story devotes to an actor's desired handling of the topic.

See Appendix A for the list of desired handlers of the topic.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
--	------	------	------	--------------

Explicitly: who, according to the story, SHOULD mainly be responsible for handling, working on or taking care of the primary topic	v5a2	n.d.	v34	pref_handler
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	------	-----	--------------

**location Main location of the story: where does the story mainly take place**

See Appendix A for the list of locations.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Main location of the story: where does the story mainly take place	v11a	v8	v7	location

**location\_imp Main location of the story: which geographical entity is most affected by the story**

See Appendix A for the list of locations.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Main location of the story: which geographical entity is most affected by the story	v11b	n.d.	v8	location_imp

**main\_actor Main actor of the story**

The main actor is 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.

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.

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.

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”



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.

See Appendix A for the list of actors.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Main actor of the story	v14a	v9	v9_main	main_actor

**actor\_eval    Explicitly: the main actor’s evaluation (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”).

In 2004: the source of evaluation is not specified. In 1999 and 2009 actor’s **own** evaluation is coded.

See Appendix A for the list of evaluations of actor.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: the main actor's evaluation from his/her own perspective	v15a	v9c_exp	v21 + v27	actor_eval

**gender    Gender of the main actor**

If the actor is not a person (e.g., a country or an institution) or the gender is not discernible, code “not applicable” (“3”).

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

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Gender of the main actor	v16a	v9b	n.d.	gender

**quoted**      **Number of times the main actor has been directly quoted**

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).

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Number of times the main actor has been directly quoted	v18a	n.d.	v15	quoted

**EU\_eval**      **Explicitly: story evaluating the EU**

‘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).

See Appendix A for the list of evaluations.

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story evaluating the EU	v26	v39_exp	n.d.	EU_eval

**two\_sides**      **Explicitly: story mentions two or more sides of 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”

0 = no

1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story mentions two or more sides of a problem or issue	v33	v34	v46	two_sides

**conflict**      **Explicitly: story mentions any conflict / disagreement**

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 “0” 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.

0 = no

1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story mentions any conflict / disagreement	v34a	v35	v47	conflict

**criticize**      **Explicitly: story says that one actor reproaches / blames / criticizes another**

0 = no

1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story says that one actor reproaches / blames / criticizes another	v36a	v36	v48	criticize

**EPelection** Is the story about the EP election and/or campaign?

**In 2009:** all EU specific and election and campaign related stories in a news program or in a newspaper.

\*About the European Parliamentary elections and/or the campaign *is defined as:*  
*TV: mentioned once*  
*Newspapers: mentioned at least once*

**In 2004:** it is a derived variable from the main topic of the story. This means that only news stories in which EP election and campaign was the main topic are coded as the story is about the EP election and/or campaign.

**In 1999:** only an explicit mentioning of the campaign or EP election was coded as “yes”.

0 = no  
1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Is the story about the EP election and/or the campaign	v46	Derived variable from v7	v62	EPelection

**poll** **Explicitly: story mentions opinion poll results predicting the outcome of the EP elections in [country]**

0 = no  
1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story mentions opinion poll results predicting the outcome of the EP elections in [country]	v47	v29	v38	poll

**voxpopuli** **Explicitly: story mentions 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)?

0 = no  
1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story mentions interviews of persons in the street (vox populi)	v50	v29a	n.d.	voxpopuli

**win\_lose**      **Explicitly: actor(s) calles (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.

0 = no  
1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: actor(s) called (potential) 'winners' or 'losers'	v51	v30	v39	win_lose

**style**      **Explicitly: story mentions actor’s presentation and style**

How, in which way, in which manner they handle an issue? (e.g., competently, nervously, proudly, elegantly, badly, ill-prepared, hastily etc.).

0 = no  
1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story mentions actor's presentation and style	v52	v31	v40	style

**stabilize**      **Explicitly: the story mentions that an action of a person or organization was taken in order to stabilize his position or in order to make him 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?

0 = no

1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: the story mentions that an action of a person or organization was taken in order to stabilize his position or in order to make him look better in public opinion or in the political arena	v53	v32	v41	stabilize

**metaph**      **Explicitly: story uses 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.)

These metaphors are country specific.

0 = no

1 = yes

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story uses metaphors from the language of games, sport, and/or war	v54	v33	v42 + v43	metaph

**boring\_exc**      **Explicitly: story mentions the EP election campaign is boring / exciting**

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

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story mentions the EP election campaign is boring / exciting	v55	v44	v62a	boring_exc

**turnout      Explicitly: story mentions the turnout in the EP election (in country)**

In 1999 and in 2004, any reference to turnout in the EP election was coded as one category. In 2009, there was a distinction between mentioning the turnout EU-wide or in a specific country. In the longitudinal data base the country-specific variable is used for 2009.

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

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story mentions the turnout in the EP election	v56	v45	v62b	turnout

**interest      Explicitly: story mentions people’s interest in the campaign or in the election itself**

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

	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: story mentions people's interest in the campaign or in the election itself	v58	v46	v62c	interest

**Media\_role** Explicitly: The story mentions any aspect relating to the role of the media in or media coverage of the election campaign or political affairs in general (2009) / The story mentions the issue of the impact and / or role played by the media in the campaign (2004)

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.”

0 = no

1 = yes

Variable/Value label	2009	2004	1999	Longitudinal
Explicitly: The story mentions any aspect relating to the role of the media in or media coverage of the election campaign or political affairs in general	v59	v43	n.d.	media_role