



# TranState Working Papers

'LET'S TALK ABOUT EUROPE'  
EXPLAINING VERTICAL AND  
HORIZONTAL EUROPEANIZATION  
IN THE QUALITY PRESS

Michael Brüggemann  
Katharina Kleinen-v. Königslöw

No. 60

Universität Bremen • University of Bremen  
Jacobs Universität Bremen • Jacobs University Bremen

---

Staatlichkeit im Wandel • Transformations of the State  
Sonderforschungsbereich 597 • Collaborative Research Center 597



*Michael Brüggemann  
Katharina Kleinen-v. Königslöw*

**'Let's talk about Europe'  
Explaining vertical and horizontal  
Europeanization in the quality press**

TranState Working Papers

No. 60

*Sfb597 „Staatlichkeit im Wandel“ – „Transformations of the State“*

Bremen, 2007

[ISSN 1861-1176]

**Michael Brüggemann, and Katharina Kleinen-v. KönigsLöw**

‘Let’s talk about Europe’. Explaining vertical and horizontal Europeanization in the quality press

(TranState Working Papers, 60)

Bremen: Sfb 597 „Staatlichkeit im Wandel“, 2007

ISSN 1861-1176

Universität Bremen

Sonderforschungsbereich 597 / Collaborative Research Center 597

Staatlichkeit im Wandel / Transformations of the State

Postfach 33 04 40

D - 28334 Bremen

Tel.:+ 49 421 218-8720

Fax:+ 49 421 218-8721

Homepage: <http://www.staatlichkeit.uni-bremen.de>

## ***‘Let’s talk about Europe’***

### ***Explaining vertical and horizontal Europeanization in the quality press***

#### **ABSTRACT**

This paper contributes to the ongoing quest for a European public sphere understood as a structural transformation of national media debates. The process of Europeanization has a vertical and a horizontal dimension: an increased focus on the EU as well as more attention for other European countries. A content analysis of quality newspapers in five EU member states covering a period of 20 years reveals common trends across different countries but no convergence over time. Four different patterns of Europeanization can be identified: comprehensive Europeanization, segmented Europeanization, Europeanization aloof from the EU, a parochial public sphere. This paper pushes research in this area ahead by identifying and testing factors which explain these differences in newspaper coverage. In-depth case analysis as well as regression analysis show that the editorial mission of a newspaper and the size of a country have a significant effect on patterns of Europeanization. Contrary to common expectations, the number of correspondents in Brussels and the degree of popular identification with Europe did not significantly affect patterns of Europeanization.

## CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. TOWARDS A THEORETICAL EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENTIAL EUROPEANIZATION OF PUBLIC SPHERES.....	3
Vertical and horizontal Europeanization .....	3
Political factors .....	5
Media factors .....	6
III. THE OVERALL DESIGN OF THE STUDY.....	7
Design of the content analysis: Measuring Europeanization.....	7
Design of the regression analysis: Explaining Europeanization.....	9
IV. FINDINGS I: DISCERNING FOUR PATTERNS OF EUROPEANIZATION .....	10
Common trend: increasing levels of vertical Europeanization.....	10
Different patterns of Europeanization.....	11
<i>Le Monde</i> : Segmented Europeanization .....	12
<i>FAZ</i> : Europeanization aloof from the EU.....	14
<i>Die Presse</i> : Almost comprehensive Europeanization.....	16
<i>The Times</i> : A relatively parochial public sphere .....	18
<i>Politiken</i> : A modestly Europeanized middle-ground.....	20
V. FINDINGS II: EXPLAINING DIFFERENTIAL EUROPEANIZATION .....	21
Vertical Europeanization .....	21
Horizontal Europeanization.....	24
VI. CONCLUSION .....	25
REFERENCES.....	28
BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE .....	34

## **‘Let’s talk about Europe’**

### **Explaining vertical and horizontal Europeanization in the quality press**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>**

The failure of the referenda on a European constitutional treaty in France and the Netherlands revealed a lack of understanding between political elites and citizens on the issue of European integration. While political elites often advocate European integration, citizens remain largely sceptical and seem to be easily mobilized to vote against the European project - if they get the chance in referenda. Furthermore, as Eurobarometer surveys show, citizens habitually claim that they lack information and understanding of what the European Union is all about.<sup>2</sup> This communication deficit (Meyer, 1999) is often attributed to the lack of a European public sphere: Political power has moved to Brussels but this has not been accompanied by opening up national public spheres for Europe: ‘The public sphere lags behind the transnationalization of the political system; it remains nationally bound while politics has been Europeanized’ (Gerhards, 2001: 155).

Following Habermas (1998 [1992]: 436), the idea of a public sphere denotes a network of public discussion fora mediating between the political centre and its periphery. The lack of a Europeanized public sphere deprives the citizens of the chance to inform themselves, reason about and eventually influence policy-making (Habermas, 2001a: 7).<sup>3</sup> Political philosophy provides the normative background for this topic of research (Habermas, 1990 [1962], 1998 [1992]; Peters, 2005b). Mass communication research is able to contribute insights into the empirical substance of a European public sphere as it is constituted mainly by national media and their coverage and debate of European issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper presents results from the research project ‘The Transnationalization of Public Spheres in Europe’ at the German Research Foundation’s Collaborative Research Center 597 ‘Transformations of the State’ at the University of Bremen and the Jacobs University Bremen (formerly International University Bremen). The project is directed by Hartmut Weßler. We thank him and our colleague Stefanie Sifft for valuable feedback for this article. Furthermore, we are greatly indebted to Dennis Niemann, Hans-Gerhard Schmidt, Thorben Köhn and Anne Veghte-Quatravaux for their support while coding the articles. We also thank our former project collaborators Rolf-Hagen Schulz-Forberg and Andreas Wimmel who have contributed to the collection of data for this article. Thank you very much, last but not least, to the anonymous reviewers of this article! To learn more about the research project, please check our web site at URL: <http://www.state.uni-bremen.de/publicsphere>.

<sup>2</sup> The results of different Eurobarometer surveys on this question are relatively stable; see e.g. EB 56.3 at URL: [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/eb\\_special\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb_special_en.htm).

<sup>3</sup> This article published in German has been translated into English and put online at URL: <http://newleftreview.org/A2343>.

Recent research has overcome the diagnosis (asserted a priori without an empirical base) of an impossibility of a European public sphere (Grimm, 1995b; Kielmansegg, 1996) or the mere normative demand for creating one (Habermas, 2001a). The search for pan-European media (Schlesinger, 1999; Schlesinger and Kevin, 2000), which would address all European citizens, has given way to a search for a ‘Europeanization of national public spheres’ (Gerhards, 2001). Different sets of criteria of how the ‘Europeanization of national public spheres’ should be measured have been advanced (Peters et al., 2005; van de Steeg, 2002; Eder and Kantner, 2000; Wessler, 2004). Qualitative as well as quantitative content analysis of quality newspapers has provided some insight into the development and status quo of the European public sphere.<sup>4</sup>

The aim of this paper is to push research in this area to a new stage by focusing on the factors that influence the pattern of Europeanization in the leading national quality newspapers. Whereas most research, so far, had concentrated on assessing the overall degree of Europeanization, our focus lies on identifying different patterns of Europeanization and explaining the differences. We explore why some countries are more Europeanized than others, and which factors are most relevant for the development towards a Europeanization of public spheres.

This goes beyond the current body of literature which offers only very broad assumptions for explaining the current state of the European public sphere. The theory of Europeanization assumes that the process of political integration leads to a re-orientation of national actors who now take into account the constraints and opportunity structures offered by EU governance (e.g. Ladrech 1994; Radaelli 2000). Journalists not unlike other actors in the public sphere are influenced by this process and change their routines of political reporting. This may explain why there is a general drift towards more EU coverage.

The literature also offers general hypotheses why the Europeanization of media content is so slow: The EU is a “system of governance which depoliticizes conflict and obfuscates political accountability” (Meyer 1999: 617). Therefore, EU governance lacks news values (Gerhards 2001: 154). Furthermore, the conditions for a common discourse are not very good in a culturally diversified, multi-lingual continent. A pan-European audience is lacking (Grimm 1995; Hasebrink 2000, 2003) and therefore pan-European

---

<sup>4</sup> There is a multitude of studies. A secondary analysis of some of the literature published until 2003 is provided in Machill et al. (2006). The following list might still not be comprehensive: Grundmann 1999; Gerhards 2000a, b; Semetko and Valkenburg 2000; Trenz 2000, 2004; de Vreese 2001; de Vreese et al. 2001; Kevin 2001; Tobler 2002; Eilders and Voltmer 2003; Kevin 2003; Diez Medrano 2003; Meyer 2005; van de Steeg 2005; EUROPUB 2005; Peters et al. 2005; Brüggemann et al. 2006; Pfetsch and Koopmans 2006, Berkel 2006; Siffert et al. 2007; Wessler et al. 2007.



media can only survive in small niches (Schlesinger 1999)). The PR of the EU is not adequately resourced to succeed in such a difficult communication environment (Gramberger 1997; Brüggemann 2007). The technocratic approach of European integration seems to have started a “vicious circle of (non-) communication: The public, the media and politics are caught in a self-enforcing circle of lack of interest to read, write and talk about EU matters” (Brüggemann 2005: 65). However, all these hypotheses apply to *all* countries under analysis; none of them can contribute to an explanation of the country-specific differences in Europeanization.

This study’s contribution to the ongoing ‘quest for a European public sphere’ is two-fold: (1) We develop a theoretical model for (a) identifying and (b) explaining different patterns of Europeanization of newspaper content. (2) We test this model on newspaper coverage over a period of 20 years.

In contrast to studies that focus just on a single EU event or debate (e.g. Risse and van de Steeg, 2003; Law et al. 2000; de Vreese et al., 2001; Trenz, 2000, 2002), we draw on findings from a longitudinal analysis (1982 – 2003) of daily newspaper debates in five EU member states. This allows us to analyze Europeanization as a process rather than just as a snap shot.

Thereby, we are not only able to offer an analytical framework suited to identify different ways to talk about Europe more systematically but we also move in the direction of explaining these different paths and why they do not converge over time.

## **II. TOWARDS A THEORETICAL EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENTIAL EUROPEANIZATION OF PUBLIC SPHERES**

We conceive the transnationalization of public spheres in Europe as a multi-dimensional long-term process (see Peters et al., 2005). Following Deutsch (1953), *transnationalization* is a process of intensified interaction across borders as opposed to interaction within national borders. *Europeanization* is a form of transnationalization limited to the European continent, or more specifically to the member states of the European Union. The development of our own analytical framework starts with Koopman’s and Erbe’s (2004) observation, that two dimensions can be distinguished: vertical and horizontal Europeanization.

### **Vertical and horizontal Europeanization**

Vertical Europeanization denotes the process of paying closer attention to Brussels. As more and more political power has been transferred to the EU level, enhanced coverage and debate about the EU can be expected to take place. At least with the introduction of the EURO, European integration has quite obviously begun to touch the every-day lives of citizens and therefore will also arouse the interest of the media.

Horizontal Europeanization means increasingly taking account of what happens in other member states of the European Union. Media coverage would not only mention other European countries but actually focus more strongly on the events and debates in these neighbouring countries. In addition, journalists would give speakers from other countries a voice in interviews, guest pieces or extended quotations. We expect this type of Europeanization to occur as nation states are increasingly interdependent in the framework of the European Union.

While vertical and horizontal Europeanization are plausible developments to occur, analytically, we have to take into account the possibility of intervening variables which filter and eventually slow down these trends. Differences between specific media in different political contexts are likely to cause different ways of talking about Europe. And it seems well conceivable that these intervening factors might actually be stronger than the forces of Europeanization set off by the process of political integration.


Analytically speaking, there are four patterns of transnationalization of national public spheres (see figure 1, p. 5): 1. *Comprehensive Europeanization*. This pattern combines high levels of vertical and horizontal Europeanization. 2. *Segmented Europeanization*. This means vertical, but no horizontal Europeanization. Nationally segmented public spheres would pay more attention to Brussels but not to each other. 3. *Europeanization aloof from the EU*. This would mean horizontal without vertical Europeanization: There would be an increasingly intensive communicative exchange among European neighbours but not more attention being paid to the EU as such. 4. *A parochial public sphere*. If there is neither vertical, nor horizontal Europeanization, national media do not adapt in any way to the fact that political competences have been shifted away from national governments and capitals.<sup>5</sup>

What kind of development of the public sphere is likely to occur in different newspapers? An all-encompassing theory leading to hypotheses that predict patterns of Europeanization is not yet available and probably never will be. The number of factors which influence the focus and shape of debates in the media is enormous and will lead to a large degree of contingency. Therefore, any theory consisting of a limited set of hypotheses will only be able to explain a limited amount of variance.

---

<sup>5</sup> While this article focuses on Europeanization, one also has to control for the possibility that Europeanization might be embedded in a more general trend of Westernization (including Europe and North America) or globalization, something that was elaborated in more depth elsewhere (Brüggemann et al. 2006; Siffert et al. 2007).

Figure 1: Four patterns of Europeanization



Drawing on the relatively scarce literature on this topic<sup>6</sup> and theories about news selection, we have identified two bundles of factors which can plausibly be expected to explain differences in levels of horizontal and vertical Europeanization between different newspapers. The first bundle comprises political factors related to characteristics of the country in which the respective newspaper is situated. The second bundle concerns media factors which are related to the profile of the individual newspaper under analysis. Some factors rather explain the level of vertical Europeanization, while others are more likely to effect horizontal Europeanization. These factors lead to hypotheses which are presented in the following paragraphs.

### Political factors

*H1: The more skeptical the public is regarding the EU, the more the media will deal with the contested issue of EU politics (vertical Europeanization).* This hypothesis is derived from news value theory. The theory dating back to Ostgaard (1965) and Galtung and Ruge (1965) assumes that there is a set of criteria (news factors) which guides the selection of topics by journalists. In line with the popular wisdom that ‘only bad news is good news’, negativism is identified as one important news factor (for more extensive research on negativism see e.g. Bohle, 1986). We assume that in countries where the EU is seen as something threatening or negative, news about the EU will

---

<sup>6</sup> Of the fast growing amount of publications on the European public sphere only very few are concerned with possible explanations for country differences: The EUROPUB report by della Porta (2003) assembles an impressive list of hypotheses but then fails to test any of them. Other studies discussing possible explanations are mostly the work of other members of EUROPUB such as Berkel (2006), Adam and Berkel (2004), Firmstone (2004), Guiraudon et al. (2004).

arouse more attention as it constitutes ‘bad news’. Consequently, public scepticism may actually enhance vertical Europeanization.

*H2: The earlier the accession of a country to the EU, the more established is reporting and debating EU policy (vertical Europeanization).* Theories of path dependence (Pierson, 2000) stress self-enforcing cycles of positive feedback mechanisms which develop over time and which constitute the framework for future action. This idea can easily be applied to media production and consumption. Working routines of journalists take time to develop, and the audience gets only slowly used to new topics of discussion like the EU. Over time, audience expectations and journalistic selection criteria might converge towards accepting that the EU is a topic suited for continuous in-depth discussion in newspapers. Thus, ‘old’ member states might have more elaborated coverage of EU affairs than new member states.

*H3: The smaller and less powerful a country is, the more attention it will pay to its neighboring countries (horizontal Europeanization).* Here the line of reasoning is that weak countries depend more heavily on their neighbors politically and economically, so their media outlets will pay more attention to what is going on abroad as well (see also Berkel, 2006: 64 for a related line of thought).

*H4: The more open citizens of a country are towards identifying with communities beyond the nation state, the more the national media will be interested in coverage and discussion of the affairs of other European countries (horizontal Europeanization).* Again, we might fall back on the theory of news values which states that identification is an important news factor. Journalists assume that people will be more interested in news about issues, persons and countries they can identify with (Ostgard, 1965).

## **Media factors**

Following the theory of structuration (Giddens 1986), the hypotheses related to media factors distinguish between actors, resources and rules. Editors (actors) engage in reporting practices such as referring to EU institutions, quoting speakers from abroad, debating EU issues or other European countries’ affairs. Two kinds of resources can plausibly be identified as enabling such reporting practices: the number of journalists available for EU coverage or the coverage of foreign countries as well as the editorial space designated for such coverage. Among the rules that shape reporting, there are of course news values, which we have discussed above. Often, there is also the more or less explicit editorial mission of the individual paper which influences the routines of the daily work of those in charge of selecting the content of the paper. This line of thought leads us to the following four hypotheses.

*H5: A higher share of correspondents in Brussels makes coverage of EU affairs more likely (vertical Europeanization).* If there are more people available for covering EU topics, it should be more likely that there is more coverage. So their share of the

entire journalistic staff of a paper might determine the degree of vertical Europeanization.

*H6: A higher share of correspondents in other European capitals makes coverage of other European countries' affairs more likely (horizontal Europeanization).* The equivalent reasoning applies to correspondents in other European capitals whose share will influence the level of horizontal Europeanization.

*H7: The more editorial space is reserved for the coverage of EU affairs, the more coverage will deal with such topics (vertical Europeanization).* Editorial space, understood as e.g. a daily page for EU coverage, may be regarded as another resource which enables editors to pursue intensive coverage of the EU. The idea is that editorial space dedicated permanently will attract coverage independently of other competing topics of the day.

*H8: The more explicit a European mission is put forward in the newspapers mission statement, the more extensive coverage of EU affairs will occur (vertical Europeanization).* Formal or informal rules in a newspaper organization influence the choices of journalists. One way of finding explicit traces of these rules is looking at mission statements. Are they mentioning EU coverage or are they stressing that national debates have to take notice of the fact that much political power has moved to the decision-making mechanisms in Brussels and Strasbourg? If this is the case, or if there are other clear signs of a European mission of a paper, one could assume that a higher level of vertical Europeanization follows from this mission.

### **III. THE OVERALL DESIGN OF THE STUDY**

Our study comprises (1) a content analysis of quality newspapers which allows us to identify different patterns of Europeanization and (2) a regression analysis which tests our hypotheses explaining different patterns of Europeanization.

#### **Design of the content analysis: Measuring Europeanization**

We focus on quality newspapers in our content analysis for three reasons: 1. As the European public sphere is presumably not existent or only in a nascent status (Gerhards, 2001), we assume that the transnationalization of debates is more likely to evolve there than in tabloids or on TV (as shown by the empirical research by Kevin (2003) and EUROPUB (2005)). 2. We also expect them to have a strong influence on the public sphere of each country: As they are read both by the journalists from other media and by the economic and cultural elite, the topics and views expressed in quality newspapers diffuse to all other fora of the public sphere.<sup>7</sup> 3. The concept of the public sphere

---

<sup>7</sup> This trickle-down-effect of the so-called “Leitmedien” to the rest of the media is supported by the results of a number of both elite and journalist surveys (for example: Weischenberg et al. 1994).

stresses the importance of public debate of political issues as one prerequisite for a functioning democracy (Peters et al., 2006), a debate that should consist of the exchange of opinions, backed up by arguments. This rather demanding form of public discourse is more likely to be found in the quality press. Therefore, we chose the most influential quality dailies of five different European countries for our sample: *Die Presse* for Austria, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ)* for Germany, *The Times* for Great Britain, *Le Monde* for France and *Politiken* for Denmark.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, this selection provides us with enough variance concerning the factors we assume to be relevant for explaining differences in the level of Europeanization. It includes newspapers with a low and a high share of Brussels correspondents in the overall journalistic staff (*The Times* vs. *FAZ*), from small and large countries (*Die Presse/Politiken* vs. *FAZ*), and with populations which identify more or less with Europe (*The Times/Politiken* vs. *Le Monde/FAZ*). In addition, a pre-test was performed comparing the chosen paper to a second quality newspaper from the opposite political camp in each country (*Der Standard*, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, *The Guardian*, *Le Figaro* and *Berlingske Tidende*). This test confirmed that the papers in our sample were the most Europeanized for the majority of our indicators of Europeanization.

In order to trace the *process* of Europeanization, our analysis covers the years 1982, 1989, 1996 and 2003. By building *two ‘constructed weeks’*<sup>9</sup> per year of analysis instead of arbitrarily selecting two weeks, we were able to obtain a representative sample of routine coverage and avoided any potential biases from exceptional events that draw attention towards or away from Europe.

While many studies narrow down their sample to EU articles, our data set has a broader scope. It includes articles in the political sections of newspapers covering *all topics of political discourse*, not just European topics. However, as we concentrate on the analysis of *debate rather than mere news*, we selected articles which are likely to contain some form of exchange of opinions. We included not only editorials, commentaries, political columns but also interviews, guest contributions from external authors and longer news analysis or debate-style articles. Through these sampling steps we obtained a representative sample of 3059 articles.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> This selection does not represent the current EU-27 fully as a newspaper from the new member states from Eastern Europe is lacking. A study on Poland is envisaged for the second phase of our research (2007-2010).

<sup>9</sup> For building constructed weeks the sample dates are stratified by day of the week: i.e. for each year we sampled all newspaper articles of two randomly selected Mondays, two Tuesdays, and so on. For an account of the effectiveness of this method see Riffe, Aust and Lacy (1993).

<sup>10</sup> *FAZ* 769, *Le Monde* 534, *The Times* 598, *Die Presse* 604 and *Politiken* 554 articles.

We measure vertical and horizontal Europeanization by using two indicators for each dimension (see Table 1). Vertical Europeanization is analyzed in terms of (a) the visibility of EU institutions and (b) the focus of articles on EU politics. Horizontal Europeanization is measured by looking for articles (a) focusing on other EU countries<sup>11</sup> and (b) featuring extended quotes of voices from other EU countries. A reliability test preceded the content analysis and proved the framework to be reliable.<sup>12</sup>

*Table 1: Dimensions of Europeanization*

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Operationalization</b>
<i>Vertical</i>	Visibility of EU institutions	Are EU institutions mentioned in the text?
	Focus on EU politics	Are EU policies/politics the main subject of an article?
<i>Horizontal</i>	Focus on other EU countries	Are other EU member states the main subject of an article?
	Extended quotations of speakers from other EU countries	Are speakers from other EU countries quoted extensively (direct and indirect quotes of more than one sentence within an article)?

### **Design of the regression analysis: Explaining Europeanization**

In order to test our hypotheses concerning the potential influence factors on the level of vertical and horizontal Europeanization, we first had to establish comparative index values concerning all independent variables for each newspaper. To determine these values, we conducted short telephone interviews with journalists from all the newspapers in our sample. In addition, we used data gathered from the existing literature and from Eurobarometer surveys<sup>13</sup> (see Table 1).

A regression analysis was used to test the explanatory power of the different potential influence factors on each of our indicators of Europeanization. As our dependent variables are dichotomous variables (for example an article either focuses on EU politics or not), we had to employ logistic regression analysis. Whereas a linear regression model would predict how an independent variable influences, for example, the number of articles on European politics, a logistic regression model predicts how the independent variables influence the chances of the article being on European politics or not.

<sup>11</sup> Although we are interested in discursive exchange among EU member states, we had to define Europe as Western Europe for methodological reasons. In contrast to the changing shape of EC/EU-Europe, this allows us to work with a stable concept of Europe throughout the whole period of analysis. So, when we refer to European countries in the text, this means basically the countries which are part of Western Europe, mainly the old EU-15 member states.

<sup>12</sup> The test showed satisfactory values for all variables relevant to the analysis: institutions (kappa 0.79), subject of article (kappa 0.75), geographical focus (kappa 0.80) and origin of extensive quotations (kappa 0.70).

<sup>13</sup> We are using the ‘Mannheim Eurobarometer Trend File’ which covers the years 1973 – 2002. We thank the GESIS/ZA (Central Archive for Empirical Social Research) for preparing and providing the data.

Table 2: Possible influence factors

Type	Factor	Comparative index value based on	Europ.
<i>Political</i>	Popular EU scepticism (H1)	Average net support for EU membership (Eurobarometer)	vertical
	Date of accession (H2)	Date of accession	vertical
	Power/Size (H3)	GDP and population <sup>14</sup>	horizontal
	Europeanized identity (H4)	Average share of people identifying not with “nation only”, but at least partly with Europe (Eurobarometer)	horizontal
<i>Media</i>	Brussels correspondents (H5)	Share of Brussels correspondents compared to full-time journalist staff (interviews)	vertical
	Foreign correspondents (H6)	Share of foreign correspondents in EU countries compared to full-time journalist staff (interviews)	horizontal
	Editorial mission to cover EU (H7)	Whether the newspaper understands itself as only national or also claims any European mandate (information material from newspapers, newspaper design, interviews, secondary analysis of the literature)	vertical
	Editorial space reserved for EU coverage (H8)	Are regular sections of the newspaper devoted to EU coverage (and since when) (information material from newspapers, interviews, secondary analysis of the literature)	vertical

The results of our analysis shall be presented in two steps: In section IV we offer a detailed description of the findings of our content analysis both in general and for each newspaper, as well as a more qualitative discussion of the influence the different factors may have had on the particular pattern of Europeanization. In section V, we discuss the results of the systematic test of our hypotheses across all newspapers in our sample.

#### IV. FINDINGS I: DISCERNING FOUR PATTERNS OF EUROPEANIZATION

Our content analysis finds a common trend in all newspapers but the differences between different patterns of Europeanization in different newspapers remain and there is no indication that they are becoming any smaller over time.

##### **Common trend: increasing levels of vertical Europeanization**

The common and statistically significant trend that we observe in all newspapers reveals increasing levels of vertical Europeanization. National discussions focus increasingly on the EU but there are no indications of increasing horizontal exchange. EU institutions are mentioned more often and there are also more articles focusing on EU policies across all countries. At the same time, mutual observation in terms of focusing on other

<sup>14</sup> The figures are taken from Weidenfeld/Wessels (2006: 458) and are based on data provided by the Federal Statistical Office in Germany.



EU countries is not increasing. Also, there is no intensified discursive exchange. We find stagnating levels of extended quotations of voices from other EU countries (see for more details Sifft et al., 2007).

While there is this common trend of vertical Europeanization without horizontal Europeanization, it should be not mistaken as convergence. In fact, the trend of vertical Europeanization serves as a source of divergence instead of convergence since it is much stronger in *Le Monde* than in all other newspapers. Thereby, this uneven rise of attention paid to the EU actually increases the variance between the newspapers in 2003 as compared to 1982.


Apart from the case of *Le Monde*, the differences in the level of vertical and horizontal Europeanization between the different countries remain about the same. A distinct pattern of Europeanization has evolved for each of them and there is no evidence that these patterns are converging over time.

### **Different patterns of Europeanization**

In section II we established four patterns of Europeanization (comprehensive Europeanization, segmented Europeanization, Europeanization aloof from the EU, and parochial public spheres). In contrast to the section above which paid attention to trends, these patterns refer to the average levels of Europeanization, so that the word Europeanization does not refer to the process here but to the results of the process, i.e. a certain level of Europeanization achieved over time on the two dimensions under analysis.

Figure 2 shows where the five countries are located in our analytical framework. The deviation of each country from the mean level of Europeanization in all countries determines the place of the country in the framework. We can see that *Le Monde* is positioned far away from the other countries in the quadrant called ‘segmented Europeanization’. The *FAZ* and *Die Presse* reveal a pattern of ‘Europeanization aloof from the EU’. *The Times* and *Politiken* are in the quadrant of a relatively ‘parochial public sphere’ with *Politiken* tending more towards a middle ground. The only pattern that we do not find empirically is ‘comprehensive Europeanization’, although *Die Presse* comes somewhat close to this pattern. The wide spread of the different countries over figure 2 also shows that it is worthwhile to look at each newspaper individually in more detail. The following discussion will also try to explain the individual cases by providing information on the political and media factors that we have assumed to play a role in shaping Europeanization. These qualitative case-specific attempts to gain explanations will still have to prove their validity for all countries in the regression analysis (see section V).

Figure 2: Different levels of Europeanization



Basis: average deviation from mean for both indicators of vertical Europeanization (visibility of EU institutions/ focus on EU politics) or horizontal Europeanization (focus on other EU countries/extended quotations of speakers from other EU countries).

Table 3: Levels of Europeanization - Deviations from mean

Measuring Europeanization	F	D	A	GB	DK
Visibility of EU institutions <sup>1</sup>	11.4	-5.2	1.7	-2.8	-2.3
Focus on EU politics <sup>1</sup>	6.0	-1.4	-2.1	-0.3	-1.1
<b>Mean vertical Europeanization</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>-3.3</b>	<b>-0.2</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>-1.7</b>
Focus on other EU countries <sup>2</sup>	-2.4	7.5	6.9	-8.9	-5.9
Extended quotations of speakers from other EU countries <sup>3</sup>	-4.2	0.7	11.9	-8.2	2.5
<b>Mean horizontal Europeanization</b>	<b>-3.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>-8.6</b>	<b>-1.7</b>
All values are percentages					
Basis: <sup>1</sup> All articles in the sample (n=2964), <sup>2</sup> all articles incl. press reviews (n=3059), <sup>3</sup> all extensive quotations (n=2640).					

### **Le Monde: Segmented Europeanization**

The coverage of *Le Monde* is a clear-cut example of the pattern that we have called ‘segmented Europeanization’: There is an outstanding level of discussion about the EU (8.7 percentage points above average) and a relatively low level of attention paid and editorial space dedicated to speakers and politics in other EU countries (3.3 percentage points below average).

The high level of vertical Europeanization concerns the mere mentioning of EU institutions as well as devoting whole articles to the EU. On average a third of all articles selected from *Le Monde* mention the EU and more than ten percent actually focus on

EU issues. This role as a front-runner in talking about EU governance is only achieved however, through the outstanding level of Europeanization achieved in 2003. While *Le Monde* always had the greatest share of articles mentioning EU institutions, it was not until 2003 that the paper dedicated so much more in depth coverage to the EU than all other newspapers. In 2003, every fifth article focused on EU affairs. In almost every second article, an EU institution was mentioned. This finding of the French discourse as being exceptionally Europeanized is confirmed by other research (Koopmans, 2004; Trezn, 2004).

This change is related to the French debate surrounding the Convention for a European constitutional treaty which started in 2003. In the French case, Habermas' (2001) hope that the process of constitution-making would become a catalyst of a more vivid European public sphere seems to have worked. It might have mattered that the convention was held under the auspices of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing who is a well-known French politician. This might partly explain the French exceptionism found in our sample. It is also worth mentioning, that *Le Monde* used to have only one correspondent in Brussels. Since 2001, there is an office of four correspondents. In Paris there is a European editor responsible for channeling the input from Brussels into the newspaper (Guiraudon et al., 2004: 2). In 2002 an EU page has been introduced which appears several times a week. All these measures have apparently contributed to establishing routine coverage of EU events which ranges solidly above the levels reached in other European newspapers. Furthermore, EU coverage is also part of *Le Monde*'s editorial mission. In its self-portrait the newspaper stresses: 'La plupart des événements, ne peuvent se comprendre à l'intérieur du seul cadre national' (*Le Monde*, 2003). In research interviews, journalists from *Le Monde* acknowledge: 'The newspaper is pro-European' (Baisnée and Frinault, 2006: 49). So, in the case of *Le Monde*, resources (correspondents in Brussels), editorial space reserved for EU coverage and an explicit transnational editorial mission are likely to have an effect on media coverage. Apparently the EU is not doomed to be neglected by national public discussions, as some political scientists have argued (Moravcsik, 2002: 615). It seems to need, however, a specific constellation of factors to open the door for discussing EU issues.

The mission of *Le Monde* does not only stress the importance of coverage of EU affairs but of international coverage in general. Nevertheless, there is not that much horizontal Europeanization. Other EU countries play an important role in 16 percent of all articles, 13 percent of extended quotations emanate from fellow-European speakers. Both indicators remain relatively stable over time. This takes place in the context of a moderately internationalized debate: compared to the other countries, there is an average focus on international affairs and international speakers. This finding might be explained by looking at the political factors we have identified as possibly explaining

horizontal Europeanization: France is one of the bigger and more powerful member states of the EU. Moreover, the country's self-perception is still haunted by the idea of being 'la grande nation'. This makes it more likely to focus on one-self than on the European neighbour-states. The case of the *FAZ* will show that this subjective dimension of self-perception of power is indeed relevant.

Table 4: Overview of results for *Le Monde*

Measuring Europeanization	1982	1989	1996	2003	mean
Visibility of EU institutions <sup>1</sup>	15.9	32.0	32.7	45.2	32.5
Focus on EU politics <sup>1</sup>	3.2	9.7	6.4	22.0	11.4
Focus on other EU countries <sup>2</sup>	15.0	11.7	21.2	14.5	15.5
Extended quotations of speakers from other EU countries <sup>3</sup>	14.0	12.0	13.0	13.5	13.2
All values are percentages. Basis: <sup>1</sup> All articles in <i>Le Monde</i> (n=507), <sup>2</sup> all articles incl. press reviews (n=534), <sup>3</sup> all extensive quotations (n=438). The table shows that, for instance, in 2003 45.2 percent of all articles mentioned EU institutions and 22.0 percent focused on EU politics.					
Explaining Europeanization					
Popular EU scepticism/support (Eurobarometer 1982-2002, average, percent)	Net support for EU membership: 46.5 Deviation from mean: +18				
Date of EU/EG accession	Founding member, 1958				
Power/Size (2002)	GDP in billion EUR: 1.500 Population in million: 60				
Exclusive nationalism/Europeanized identity (Eurobarometer 1992-2002, average, percent)	Citizens identifying with "nation only": 31 Deviation from mean: -14				
Brussels correspondents (full-time, excluding free-lancers)	Correspondents in Brussels: 4 Total number of full-time journalists: 320 Share: 1.3				
Foreign correspondents	Correspondents in Europe (without Brussels): 5 Total number of correspondents: 20 Share correspondents in Europe/all journalists: 1.6				
Europeanized editorial space	(Almost) daily EU page introduced in 2002				
Europeanized editorial mission	Yes. To be found in self-description and confirmed in interviews with journalists from LM.				

### **FAZ: Europeanization aloof from the EU**

While *Le Monde* showed much vertical and not much horizontal Europeanization, the German *FAZ* shows the opposite pattern: relatively low levels of vertical and relatively high levels of horizontal Europeanization.

Vertical Europeanization is 3.3 percentage points below average: The EU is mentioned less frequently than in other newspapers (in 16 percent of the articles from *FAZ*) and there is an average number of articles focusing on the EU (4 percent). So, the *FAZ* contains fewer references to the EU but rather more in depth coverage of the EU. There is a continuous rise of both over time. The relatively low level is at odds with the number of six correspondents in Brussels: The *FAZ* has more correspondents in Brussels

than any other newspaper in our sample but this does not lead to more EU coverage in the newspaper. When looking for a case specific explanation for the *FAZ*, the editorial mission seems to serve as an intervening variable. In contrast to *Le Monde*, the image that the *FAZ* wants to convey in its mission statement on its website refers to the motto which has been on the front page since its foundation in 1949 ‘Zeitung für Deutschland’. The *FAZ* claims that this mission of being the ‘newspaper for Germany’ is still valid today and that the main purpose of the paper remains to ‘mirror’ Germany.<sup>15</sup> Nothing is said about the importance of e.g. covering what happens in Brussels.

In the horizontal dimension the *FAZ* is way above average in covering foreign EU countries (by 7.5 percentage points) and defends this position continually since 1982. It is striking, however, that this seems to take place often without quoting speakers from these countries: Here the *FAZ* is only average. So the specific pattern of the Europeanization in the *FAZ* is more one of intensive observation of what is going on abroad than a model which makes foreign speakers part of the national debates by quoting them or opening up room for guest contributions.

The *FAZ*’s coverage is generally speaking the most transnationalized of all papers under analysis with high attention being paid to international affairs and foreign countries. So, in the case of the *FAZ*, we find a high degree of transnationalization, in which Europeanization is embedded. This might explain the somewhat puzzling pattern of high levels of ‘Europeanization’ aloof from the EU.

This high level of transnationalization is reflected in the high number of foreign correspondents of the *FAZ*. The *FAZ* has a total of 46 correspondents; this is twice as many as for *Le Monde*. The high percentage of foreign coverage seems to be in contrast to our hypothesis, however, that the big and powerful countries will pay less attention to what is going on abroad. Germany might be a special case in this respect, - a case which shows that ‘perceived’ size and power matter as much as ‘real’ size and power. Germany has been rightly called the ‘tamed power’ (Katzenstein, 1997). Germany’s self-image is not one of being the biggest and most powerful country in the EU but rather one of being an equal partner to the European neighbor-states. So ‘feeling big’ might be more important than actual size (in terms of population and GDP) for determining the degree of transnational observation in media discourse.

---

<sup>15</sup> The text reads in its OV: ‘[...] An der Absicht, das ganze Deutschland zu spiegeln, hat sich bis heute nichts geändert’. URL: <http://www.FAZ.net>.

Table 5: Overview of results FAZ

Measuring Europeanization	1982	1989	1996	2003	mean
Visibility of EU institutions <sup>1</sup>	8.3	14.5	18.7	23.3	16.0
Focus on EU politics <sup>1</sup>	2.5	3.5	3.9	6.3	4.0
Focus on other EU countries <sup>2</sup>	27.1	27.6	25.5	21.9	25.5
Extended quotations of speakers from other EU countries <sup>3</sup>	20.3	18.2	18.9	14.6	18.2
All values are percentages. Basis: <sup>1</sup> All articles in <i>FAZ</i> (n=721), <sup>2</sup> all articles incl. press reviews (n=769), <sup>3</sup> all extensive quotations (n=672). The table shows that for instance in 2003 23.3 percent of all articles mentioned EU institutions and 6.3 percent focused on EU politics.					
Explaining Europeanization					
Popular EU scepticism (Eurobarometer 1982-2002, average, per cent)	Net support for EU membership: 42.5 Deviation from mean: + 14				
Date of EU/EG accession	Founding member, 1958				
Power/Size (2002)	GDP in billion EUR: 2.100 Population in million: 82.5				
Exclusive nationalism/Europeanized identity (Eurobarometer 1992–2002, average, per cent)	Citizens identifying with “nation only”: 41 Deviation from mean: -4				
Brussels correspondents (full-time, excluding free-lancers)	Correspondents in Brussels: 6 Total number of full-time journalists: 286 Share: 2.1				
Foreign correspondents	Correspondents in Europe (without Brussels): 7 Total number of correspondents: 46 Share correspondents in Europe/all journalists: 2.4				
Europeanized editorial space	Weekly “Europe” page				
Europeanized editorial mission	No explicit mission statement but journalists claim European mission in interviews.				

### **Die Presse: Almost comprehensive Europeanization**

*Die Presse* shows a pattern of Europeanization similar to the one in the *FAZ*. We find a much higher level of horizontal than vertical Europeanization. Again this high level of observation of other countries and discursive exchange with other EU member states is embedded in a highly transnationalized coverage. As the level on both dimensions of Europeanization is higher than in the *FAZ*, *Die Presse* comes closest to what was called a comprehensive pattern of Europeanization in our analytical framework. Unfortunately, a closer look reveals that it should rather be called ‘almost comprehensive Europeanization’.

This is due to a specific pattern of Europeanization on the vertical dimension. *Die Presse* is just above average (by 1.7 percentage points) in mentioning EU institutions but it does not perform well on the more demanding criterion of focusing on EU politics (2.1 percentage points below average). This indicates a rather superficial treatment of the EU. It is mentioned but does not become an important topic in the national discourse: on average 3.4 percent of all articles focus on the EU. It is interesting to note that this level has not increased in 1996 after the accession of Austria. However, becom-

ing an EU member did have a major effect on mentioning the EU, which rose from 19 percent of all articles in 1989 to 31 percent in 1996. It seems that our hypothesis holds true that it takes a long time for a public sphere to Europeanize and therefore, countries that have joined the EU earlier will have more in depth discussion of EU issues.

Taking all indicators together, *Die Presse* still is the most Europeanized of all newspapers. This is due to the outstanding level of horizontal Europeanization (9.4 percentage points above average). In nearly every third article a fellow European is quoted extensively. The affairs of other European countries are at the heart of every fourth article while there are enormous fluctuations on these variables from year to year following the drifts of world politics.

An easy explanation for the high level of horizontal Europeanization in *Die Presse* is the language shared with Germany and their geographical and cultural proximity. Many extended quotations stem from German speakers. *Die Presse* refers to Germany or quotes Germans more often than it does with respect to all other nations. In all other newspapers, the US is the country which is referred to most often and whose speakers are quoted the most in national discourse. However, even without the German contributions, *Die Presse* retains the highest share of European quotations (21 percent on average). It should also be noted that the importance of German discussants in the Austrian debate has declined continuously during our period of analysis: from 13 percent in 1982 to 9 percent in 2003, while other European countries have increasingly been referred to in public discourse.

Table 6: Overview of results for *Die Presse*

Measuring Europeanization	1982	1989	1996	2003	mean
Visibility of EU institutions <sup>1</sup>	9.2	18.5	30.5	30.1	22.9
Focus on EU politics <sup>1</sup>	0.8	4.5	3.2	4.5	3.4
Focus on other EU countries <sup>2</sup>	27.5	21.0	32.3	18.8	24.8
Extended quotations of speakers from other EU countries <sup>3</sup>	31.0	20.9	42.7	22.5	29.3
All values are percentages. Basis: <sup>1</sup> All articles in <i>Die Presse</i> (n=586), <sup>2</sup> all articles incl. press reviews (n=604), <sup>3</sup> extensive quotations (n=368). The table shows that, for instance, in 2003 30.1 percent of all articles mentioned EU institutions and 4.5 percent focused on EU politics.					
Explaining Europeanization					
Popular EU scepticism (Eurobarometer 1995-2002, average, per cent)	Net support for EU membership: 10.8 Deviation from mean: -18				
Date of EU/EG accession	1995				
Power/Size (2002)	GDP in billion EUR: 223 Population in million: 8.1				
Exclusive nationalism/Europeanized identity (Eurobarometer 1995–2002, average, per cent)	Citizens identifying with “nation only”: 49 Deviation from mean: +/- 0				

Explaining Europeanization	
Brussels correspondents (full-time, excluding free-lancers)	Correspondents in Brussels: 1 Total number of full-time journalists: 87 Share: 1.1
Foreign correspondents	Correspondents in Europe (without Brussels): 1 Total number of correspondents: 3 Share correspondents in Europe/all journalists: 1.1
Europeanized editorial space	EU page several times a week, but not daily
Europeanized editorial mission	EU flag printed on the cover but no explicit statement of European mission

### ***The Times*: A relatively parochial public sphere**

Great Britain is an island – not only geographically but also considering its communicative linkages with the continent. Britain, at least as it is presented in the political discourse of *The Times*, is more self-centered than any other nation under analysis and pays not much attention to what is going on abroad - wheresoever. Following our definition, however, it does not represent a completely parochial public sphere, as the coverage and discussion of the EU and its policies are not so weak if compared to the other newspapers in our sample.

The level of vertical Europeanization is above that of the *FAZ* but 1.5 percentage points below average. While *The Times* is not very good at mentioning the EU, the paper is just about average in focusing on EU politics (5 percent of all articles). This focus on EU politics is partly due to BSE which triggered a lot of discussion about the EU in 1996 (11 percent of all articles) with a lower level before and after the height of the BSE crisis. The number of articles merely mentioning the EU is gradually but continually increasing over time. So one could argue, just as Great Britain is not any more completely free of canine madness, it was not able to keep Europeanization completely away from its shores. As we know from other research, the British press is the ‘most parochial voice’ in Europe (Pfetsch, 2004: 25), it is actually quite surprising to see at least moderate levels of attention being paid to EU politics. This is especially surprising since *The Times* does not even have a single fulltime correspondent in Brussels (only a ‘super stringer’) and there is no editorial space reserved for EU coverage in the form of a regular EU page. In contrast, the *FAZ* has six fulltime correspondents in Brussels and a regular Europe page - but lower levels of Europeanization. Thus, the resources available to newspapers do not automatically determine their editorial profile. News values might be a powerful intervening variable: For *The Times* the EU is a subject that might be interesting precisely because the public is more skeptical towards the EU than on the continent. The EU constitutes a good source for bad news.

On the horizontal dimension of Europeanization our data fully supports the findings of other researchers that British discourse is ‘to a large extent an internal debate among British actors about Europe, rather than a genuinely Europeanized debate among European actors’ (Koopmans, 2004: 20). On both variables used to measure horizontal Eu-



Europeanization, *The Times* is more than 8 percentage points below average. Only every tenth article focuses on other European countries or quotes foreign actors extensively.

We might speculate that *The Times* focuses on other foreign countries (e.g. the US) instead of Europe, but this is not true. In order to measure the degree of self-centeredness, we calculated the share of articles focusing on one's own nation. *The Times* devotes 12 percentage points more articles to exclusively British affairs than the average newspaper in our sample devotes to its home affairs. Apparently, the geographical feature of being an island which traditionally set Great Britain apart from the rest of the world has now turned into a cultural island scheme. Modern communication technology and logistics reduce the relevance of being an island for the 'objective' degree of interdependency with other countries but the national discourse is slow to catch up. Wallace's description of the British identity as 'a free England defying an unfree continent' (Wallace, 1991: 70) might still be relevant for explaining the low levels of discursive interaction across the channel (see also Medrano (2003: 215) for a depiction of the British 'myth of difference' that prevents close interaction with its European neighbors).

Table 7: Overview of results for *The Times*

Measuring Europeanization	1982	1989	1996	2003	mean
Visibility of EU institutions <sup>1</sup>	11.1	19.8	21.0	21.4	18.4
Focus on EU politics <sup>1</sup>	1.4	4.3	10.9	4.5	5.2
Focus on other EU countries <sup>2</sup>	6.3	8.0	13.0	9.1	9.0
Extended quotations of speakers from other EU countries <sup>3</sup>	4.2	9.8	10.8	9.3	9.2
All values are percentages. Basis: <sup>1</sup> All articles in <i>The Times</i> (n=552), <sup>2</sup> all articles incl. press reviews (N=598), <sup>3</sup> all extensive quotations (n=554). The table shows that for instance in 2003 23.3 percent of all articles mentioned EU institutions and 6.3 percent focused on EU politics.					
Explaining Europeanization					
Popular EU scepticism (Eurobarometer 1982-2002, average, per cent)	Net support for EU membership: 16.5 Deviation from mean: -12				
Date of EU/EG accession	1973				
Power/Size (2002)	GDP in billion EUR: 1600 Population in million: 59.3				
Exclusive nationalism/Europeanized identity (Eurobarometer 1992-2002, average, per cent)	Citizens identifying with "nation only": 60 Deviation from mean: +15				
Brussels correspondents (full-time, excluding free-lancers)	Correspondents in Brussels: 1 Total number of full-time journalists: 445 Share: 0.2				
Foreign correspondents	Correspondents in Europe (without Brussels): 4 Total number of correspondents: 17 Share correspondents in Europe/all journalists: 0.9				
Europeanized editorial space	No.				
Europeanized editorial mission	No.				

### **Politiken: A modestly Europeanized middle-ground**

Even though *Politiken* is in the same quadrant of our framework as *The Times* (see the beginning of section IV), it is located much more at the centre of our graph which implies that the pattern of Europeanization found in *Politiken* forms some kind of middle-ground. However, it is quite modestly Europeanized.

On the vertical axis *Politiken* shows a level of Europeanization a little below average (1.7 percentage points). The place of the EU in the coverage of *Politiken* is nevertheless increasing over time. This rise is reflected in the introduction of a weekly Europe page in 2002 and the introduction of a rotation system in which journalists from the national newsroom rotate to Brussels for a couple of months.

Looking at horizontal Europeanization, *Politiken* shows little interest in the coverage of other EU countries (5.9 percentage points below average) which is in line with findings showing that Danish political discourse is generally not very much outward-oriented (Branner, 2000). Keeping this in mind, *Politiken* performs surprisingly well in quoting speakers from other EU countries (2.5 percentage points above average). What factors might help explain the apparent paradox? Why does the ‘small country’- effect that we could already observe for *Die Presse* not consistently come into play for both indicators of horizontal Europeanization in *Politiken*? First-of-all, one explanation might be that its national identity stresses that Denmark is a *small, but strong* state (Ostergaard, 2000: 140) just as German identity conception downplays the size and power of the country. Nevertheless, for the actual public debate the rather small ensemble of national speakers might be rather incomplete to discuss all questions of interests: For some questions, Denmark might simply not have enough experts of its own and *Politiken* therefore may have to resort to foreign European speakers.

Table 8: Overview of results for *Politiken*

<b>Measuring Europeanization</b>	<b>1982</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>mean</b>
Visibility of EU institutions <sup>1</sup>	13.4	23.6	14.9	21.9	18.8
Focus on EU politics <sup>1</sup>	1.7	1.4	5.2	8.4	4.3
Focus on other EU countries <sup>2</sup>	14.3	11.8	9.7	12.7	12.1
Extended quotations of speakers from other EU countries <sup>3</sup>	21.9	23.3	19.5	15.2	19.9
All values are percentages. Basis: <sup>1</sup> All articles in <i>Politiken</i> (n=552), <sup>2</sup> all articles incl. press reviews (n=554), <sup>3</sup> all extensive quotations (n=608). The table shows that for instance in 2003 23.3 percent of all articles mentioned EU institutions and 6.3 percent focused on EU politics.					
<b>Explaining Europeanization</b>					
Popular EU scepticism (Eurobarometer 1982-2002, average, per cent)	Net support for EU membership: 25.6 Deviation from mean: - 3				
Date of EU/EG accession	1973				

<b>Explaining Europeanization</b>	
Power/Size (2002)	GDP in billion EUR: 189 Population in million: 5.4
Exclusive nationalism/Europeanized identity (Eurobarometer 1992–2002, average, per cent)	Citizens identifying with “nation only”: 47 Deviation from mean: +4
Brussels correspondents (full-time, excluding free-lancers)	Correspondents in Brussels: 2 Total number of full-time journalists: 140 Share: 1.4
Foreign correspondents	Correspondents in Europe (without Brussels): 2 Total number of correspondents: 8 Share correspondents in Europe/all journalists: 1.4
Europeanized editorial space	Weekly Europe page since 2002
Europeanized editorial mission	No.

As we have seen, each newspaper reveals its own peculiarities with respect to talking about Europe. The case studies have generated some indications of the relevance of some of the factors which we expected to determine Europeanization. It remains to be seen whether the correlations found in specific cases prove to be valid as general influence factors on Europeanization across different newspapers. We shall, therefore, attempt to go beyond unique cases and into testing our hypotheses in a more quantitative design.

## **V. FINDINGS II: EXPLAINING DIFFERENTIAL EUROPEANIZATION**

This section tests the validity of our hypotheses systematically across all countries of our sample using comparative index values as independent and our indicators of Europeanization as dependent variables in a regression analysis. As the purpose of the analysis was to test the validity of our hypotheses concerning the influence of political and media factors on the level of Europeanization, the year of analysis was included as a control variable in all regression models. In order to control for the influence of the subject of the article on the dependent variables, EU politics as the focus of the articles was also used as a control variable in three of the models (except for the model where it was the dependent variable). We will first discuss the results of the logistic regression analysis for the indicators of vertical Europeanization and then proceed to a depiction of the models for the indicators of horizontal Europeanization.

### **Vertical Europeanization**

In the vertical dimension two indicators of Europeanization (articles referring to EU institutions and articles with EU politics as the focus of the article) were regressed on four possible influence factors: popular EU scepticism (H1), date of accession (H2), correspondents in Brussels (H5), and an index combining the editorial mission to cover EU and the editorial space reserved for EU coverage (H7 and H8).<sup>16</sup>

<sup>16</sup> The original index values for these variables correlated too strongly ( $r=0.86$ ) for both of them to be included in

Table 9: Logistic regression of influence factors on articles referring to EU institutions<sup>17</sup> (N=2964)

Potential influence factors	$e^{\beta}$	$e^{\beta}_{stand}$
Year of analysis	1.30***	1.35***
EU politics as focus of the article	177.62***	3.25***
Index EU mission and space	1.63***	1.80***
Popular EU scepticism	1.65***	1.56***
Date of accession	-	-
Correspondents in Brussels	-	-
Constant	0.01***	0.25***

Notes. Logistic regression: Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup> adj.= 0.27  
 $e^{\beta}$  - logistic effect coefficient,  $e^{\beta}_{stand}$  - standardized logistic effect coefficient  
 \* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001 (Wald)

As common sense would suggest, the control variable ‘EU politics as focus of the article’ had by far the strongest impact on the chances of an article referring to EU institutions. As already established in the discussion of the results of the content analysis (section IV), the odds of an article referring to EU institutions also increase with each year of analysis (by a factor of 1.30).

Apart from the control variables, only two factors have a positive impact on the level of vertical Europeanization: (1) The more a newspaper defines its mission as ‘European’ and the more editorial space it routinely dedicates to the coverage of the EU, the more likely it will mention EU institutions in any of its articles. (2) Newspapers in countries with an EU-sceptical population also appear to discuss EU institutions more often. However, this effect is weaker than the impact of the EU mission/space, with a slightly lower standardized effect coefficient of 1.56 as compared to 1.80.

Neither the date of accession of the country nor the share of Brussels correspondents has an impact on the odds of articles referring to EU institutions. The mere mentioning of EU institutions does apparently not require a long-standing EU membership; it is also not related to the number of EU correspondents. Apparently, the total number of refer-

the same regression model.

<sup>17</sup> Nagelkerkes R<sup>2</sup> is comparable to the R<sup>2</sup> in a linear regression, it can be interpreted as the percentage of explained variance of the dependent variable: i.e. a Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup> of 0.054 means that five percent of the variance of (or changes in) the variable “articles on EU politics (yes/no)” can be explained by the specified regression model. It should be noted that in general the explained variance in logistic regression models is far lower than for linear models. The logistic effect coefficient ( $e^{\beta}$ ) should be understood in the following way: If the independent variable (e.g. the year) changes by one unit, the odds of the article being on European politics change by the value of the coefficient (e.g. by 1.61 for each year of analysis). A coefficient below 1 therefore denotes a decrease in odds, a coefficient above 1 an increase in odds. An effect coefficient of 1 indicates zero effect. When comparing the impact of different influence factors (with differing range and variance), the standardized effect coefficient ( $e^{\beta}_{stand}$ ) should be used.

ences to the EU depends much more on the organizational culture of the respective paper. Whether Journalists incorporate references to the EU in their articles depends rather on the editorial mission of the respective paper than on the number of correspondents in Brussels.

Table 10: Logistic regression of influence factors on articles on EU politics (N=2964)

Influence factors	$e^{\beta}$	$e^{\beta}_{stand}$
Year of analysis	1.61***	1.72***
Date of accession	1.52**	1.37**
Index of EU mission and space	1.28**	1.34**
Correspondents in Brussels	0.56***	0.69***
Popular EU scepticism	-	-
Constant	0.01***	0.05***

Notes. Logistic regression: Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup> adj. = 0.07  
 $e^{\beta}$  - logistic effect coefficient,  $e^{\beta}_{stand}$  - standardized logistic effect coefficient  
 \* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001 (Wald)

Another significant influence factor on the *level* of vertical Europeanization is the date of accession: Newspapers in countries that have long been assimilated in the EU tend to discuss EU politics more often as both journalists and readers have become more habitualized to this subject. It is striking that the duration of membership does not have an influence on the weak criterion of mentioning EU institutions but that it rather shapes stronger forms of Europeanization, shifting EU politics into the centre of attention. The odds of an article focusing on EU politics also increase for newspapers that claim for themselves a mission to promote the EU or devote more regular pages to the coverage of EU affairs.

It is quite surprising, however, that the share of Brussels correspondents compared to the number of overall full-time journalists does not have the expected positive influence. On the contrary, it actually appears to diminish the chances of EU politics being the main subject of articles with a standardized effect coefficient lower than 1 ( $e^{\beta}_{stand} = 0.69$ ). A positive contribution of the number of Brussels correspondents (H5) can clearly be ruled out by the results of our analysis, other factors such as the self-image of the newspaper, the news priorities of the editors etc. seem to intervene. The key question seems to be whether the Brussels correspondents are successful in placing their pieces in the paper. It might be relevant, as in the case of *Le Monde*, whether there is someone at the headquarters who is responsible for and advocates the placement of EU topics in the paper.

In contrast to the findings on mentioning EU institutions discussed above, EU politics as a main subject of articles does not seem to be affected positively by EU scepticism. While newspapers in countries with a euro-skeptical population appear to mention EU institutions more often, they do not focus on EU politics more often. In other words: the EU is merely used as a rhetorical reference but there is no in-depth discussion of EU

issues. Austria is a good example of this phenomenon: There is a very EU-skeptical population and *Die Presse* mentions the EU more often than the newspapers in the other countries, but the treatment of the EU as the main topic is way below average.

### Horizontal Europeanization

The results for both of our indicators of horizontal Europeanization (articles focusing on other EU countries and extensive quotations from European speakers) are very similar as tables 11 and 12 show. As for our first control variable, the year, we observe no increase in horizontal Europeanization over time in line with our findings discussed in section IV. The second control variable has a positive impact on both indicators: Articles that discuss EU politics also have a greater chance of focusing on other EU countries or of quoting European speakers extensively. The discussion of EU affairs offers far more opportunities for including speakers from other EU countries than other topics. This reveals an interesting link between vertical and horizontal Europeanization: The first tends to promote the latter but as we have observed above this does not mean that they automatically go hand in hand in each case.

*Table 11: Logistic regression of influence factors on articles on other EU countries (N=3059)*

Influence factors	$e^{\beta}$	$e^{\beta}_{stand}$
Year of analysis	0.89*	0.88*
EU politics as focus of the article	5.80***	1.49***
Size/power of a country	1.15***	1.27***
Correspondents in EU nations	1.88***	1.43***
Europeanized identity	-	-
Constant	0.06***	0.18***

Notes. Logistic regression: Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup> adj. = 0.07  
 $e^{\beta}$  - logistic effect coefficient,  $e^{\beta}_{stand}$  - standardized logistic effect coefficient  
 \* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001 (Wald)

*Table 12: Logistic regression of influence factors on extended quotations from European speakers (N=2640)*

Influence factors	$e^{\beta}$	$e^{\beta}_{stand}$
Year of analysis	0.84**	0.83**
EU politics as focus of the article	9.67***	1.78***
Size/power of a country	1.38***	1.61***
Correspondents in EU nations	1.82***	1.40***
Europeanized identity	-	-
Constant	0.04***	0.18***

Notes. Logistic regression; Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup> adj. = 0.14  
 $e^{\beta}$  - logistic effect coefficient,  $e^{\beta}_{stand}$  - standardized logistic effect coefficient  
 \* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001 (Wald)

The regression models for the levels of horizontal Europeanization tested three potential influence factors (H3: ‘power/size’, H4: ‘Europeanized identity’ and H6: ‘foreign correspondents’). Both models (tables 11 and 12) confirm the influence of the size/power of

the country as predicted by H3: Newspapers in smaller and less powerful countries appear to discuss the affairs of neighbouring European countries more often and especially tend to include more European speakers in the national discussion ( $e^{\beta_{\text{stand}}}$  of 1.27 and 1.61 respectively). This difference in the standardized effect coefficient shows that small countries' newspapers may actually cover other EU countries more often than large countries but the more powerful effect of their 'small-ness' is that they do integrate foreign speakers into their debates. A good example of this pattern is Denmark (see p. 16): *Politiken* is actually much below the average percentage of articles focusing on other EU countries but it is above average by including speakers from other EU countries in its coverage.

The level of horizontal Europeanization is higher for those newspapers employing a high number of correspondents in other European nations (compared to their overall full-time journalistic staff). In contrast to their colleagues in Brussels, these correspondents seem to be more successful in placing their issues or quotes in their newspaper: If they were not there to cover their respective countries, the overall coverage of these countries would actually diminish.

The openness of the public to identify with a European community beyond their own nation (H4) has no impact on the chances of articles discussing other European countries or on the origins of the extensive quotations. In neither model that we tested the influence factor had a significant effect coefficient. So, conversely, identifying exclusively with one's nation does apparently not automatically translate into a lower interest for other countries or a less integrative discourse.

## VI. CONCLUSION

This paper pursued two aims: (1) to develop a framework suited to identify and explain different patterns of Europeanization, (2) to test the influence factors put forward in our theory in order to move towards a better explanation of these different patterns of Europeanization.

In line with other research, the newspapers under analysis (*Le Monde*, *FAZ*, *The Times*, *Politiken*, *Die Presse*) showed different patterns of Europeanization. While the existence of differences was what could plausibly be expected, our analysis showed that over time, contrary to expectations of convergence, these differences do not become any smaller. Each newspaper has developed its own and unique pattern of Europeanization which is relatively stable over time.

*Le Monde* shows a pattern of segmented Europeanization. It is the fore-runner in vertical Europeanization but shows below average levels of horizontal Europeanization. The *FAZ* on the other side of the analytical spectrum revealed a pattern of Europeanization aloof from the EU with high levels of attention to other EU countries and below average levels of attention for the EU as such. The Austrian case is similar to the Ger-

man one, albeit with much higher levels of horizontal Europeanization. Taking all indicators together, this earns *Die Presse* the highest score of Europeanization - in spite of the level of attention being paid to the EU, which was only average. As it rather mentions the EU than really focusing on EU politics, *Die Presse* is not quite a case for a comprehensive pattern of Europeanization. *The Times* and *Politiken* on the other hand are below average on both dimensions of Europeanization and therefore represent relatively parochial public spheres. Having said that, one should also note that both newspapers show different forms of being parochial. *Politiken* neglects the EU and the coverage of other countries, but offers foreign speakers discursive room in the form of extended quotations. *The Times* tends to ignore what is going on and who is saying what on the continent but the coverage of the EU is only just below average. So there is no case of either plain parochialism or comprehensive Europeanization.

What have we learned about the influence factors which we hypothesized to explain the different patterns of Europeanization? We have tested our hypotheses on two indicators for each dimension. Table 13 shows an overview of the results. Four of our eight factors have proven to have a significant explanatory power on both indicators tested. The editorial mission as well as the editorial space reserved for EU coverage explain high levels of vertical Europeanization. The size of a country and the number of foreign correspondents deployed to EU countries result in high levels of horizontal Europeanization.

Table 13: Explaining Europeanization – Overview of tested hypotheses

<b>Vertical Europeanization</b>			
<b>Type</b>	<b>Hypotheses</b>	<b>Indicator 1</b> (Visibility of EU institutions)	<b>Indicator 2</b> (Focus on EU politics)
Political	Popular EU scepticism (H1)	true	false
	Date of accession (H2)	false	true
Media	Brussels correspondents (H5)	false	false
	Editorial mission to cover EU (H7)	true	true
	Editorial space reserved for EU coverage (H8)	true	true
<b>Horizontal Europeanization</b>			
<b>Type</b>	<b>Hypotheses</b>	<b>Indicator 1</b> (Focus on other European countries)	<b>Indicator 2</b> (Ext. quotations from other Eur. countries)
Political	Power/Size (H3)	true	true
	Europeanized identity (H4)	false	false
Media	Foreign correspondents (H6)	true	true

Two influence factors for vertical Europeanization have significant impact only on one indicator tested. This is the case for high popular EU scepticism and an early date of accession. If public opinion is skeptical towards the EU, the chances for articles to mention the EU are higher, but not the chances for articles to focus on the EU. So scepticism



goes hand in hand only with superficial interest in the EU. Long-standing EU membership has just the opposite effect: The longer a country has been a member of the EU, the bigger the chances are to find articles which focus on the EU, but there is no increased mentioning of EU institutions.

Just as important in this process is the falsification of two other hypotheses which seemed perfectly plausible a priori. The share of Brussels correspondents of all fulltime journalists in a newspaper does neither translate into more frequent mentioning of the EU, nor into more in-depth coverage of the EU. Other factors intervene and determine whether more correspondents in Brussels actually lead to more EU coverage. A Europeanized editorial mission of a paper or the presence of a regular EU page has a much more direct influence on vertical Europeanization. Also, the role of identity has to be reviewed. There is no direct correlation between identifying more with Europe and actually getting more coverage of other European countries in one's newspapers. Again there are two factors which might intervene and prove more powerful in predicting the degree of horizontal Europeanization: the size of a country and the number of correspondents deployed to other EU member states.

The stable factors which determine the degree of Europeanization such as the size and power of a country and the date of accession explain why the coverage of Europe does not converge over time. Nevertheless, other factors such as the editorial culture of a newspaper and the presence of editorial space reserved for EU coverage are variable. So under what circumstances could we expect a convergence of the patterns of Europeanization in our newspapers?

The four factors which proved to have a significant impact on both indicators tested are decisive to respond to this question. In the case of vertical Europeanization, only two significant influence factors could be expected to change and thereby cause an increase of Europeanization in the newspapers that are lacking behind: the editorial mission and closely linked with this the editorial space reserved for EU coverage. Only a change in the editorial stance of newspapers towards the EU could lead to a closure of the gap between highly Europeanized newspapers such as *Le Monde* and parochial papers like *The Times*. As far as horizontal Europeanization is concerned, the power/size of the newspaper's home country proved to be significant but this obviously is a stable factor. The only significant influence factor that could be subject to change is the number of foreign correspondents in other European capitals. However, as we have learnt from the case of the Brussels correspondents, it does not appear to be the number of correspondents alone that has an impact on the level of Europeanization, but how they are integrated into the editorial culture of the newspaper. The foreign correspondents have mostly been an established part of the newspaper structure for a long time. Reporting about other European countries has a long-standing tradition. It remains to be seen

whether this tradition also establishes a ceiling effect for more coverage of other European countries even if more foreign correspondents were sent to other EU countries.

However, the impact of vertical Europeanization on the level of horizontal Europeanization should not be forgotten: We have proved above that the coverage of EU topics also includes more references to other European countries. So if the trend of vertical Europeanization continues, it is plausible that horizontal Europeanization catches up. As increasing vertical Europeanization is driven by changes in the editorial mission of a paper, this would probably also be the factor which stands chances of provoking a convergence of the patterns of Europeanization of quality newspapers in the EU.

As an agenda for future research on this topic we thus propose to take a closer look at what is going on within the newsrooms in different European countries' newspapers: How exactly can editorial cultures be understood that turned out to be a key in explaining Europeanization of media debates? What are the mechanisms that give some correspondents in Brussels a lot of room to write and mute others? How does this editorial culture interact with traditional news values and with broader cultural traditions in each country? Questions abound that call for better explanations of Europeanization as well as explanations of the transnationalization of journalism in a broader perspective.

## REFERENCES

- Adam, Silke and Barbara Berkel (2004) 'Final case report of on communication strategies of the media. Case report: Germany', Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, Berlin, at <http://europub.wz-berlin.de>.
- AIM Research Consortium and Erich Brost Institute for Journalism in Europe (2006) *Understanding the Logic of EU Reporting in Mass Media*. Bochum / Freiburg: projekt verlag.
- Baisnée, Olivier and Thomas Frinault (2006) 'The Case of France', pp. 49-67 in AIM Research Consortium and Erich Brost Institute for Journalism in Europe (eds.) *Understanding the Logic of EU Reporting in Mass Media. Analysis of EU media coverage and interviews in editorial offices in Europe*. Bochum / Freiburg: projekt verlag.
- Berkel, Barbara (2006) *Konflikt als Motor europäischer Öffentlichkeit. Eine Inhaltsanalyse von Tageszeitungen in Deutschland, Frankreich, Großbritannien und Österreich*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Bohle, Robert H (1986) 'Negativism as news selection predictor', *Journalism Quarterly* 63: 789-796.
- Branner, Hans (2000) 'The Danish Foreign Policy Tradition and the European Context', pp. 185-220 in Hans Branner and Morten Kelstrup (eds.) *Denmark's Policy towards Europe after 1994: History, Theory and Options*. Odense: Odense University Press.
- Brüggemann, Michael (2005) 'How the EU Constructs the European Public Sphere: Seven Strategies of Information Policy', *Javnost / The Public* 12 (2): 57-74.
- Brüggemann, Michael (2007) 'Europäische Öffentlichkeit durch Öffentlichkeitsarbeit? Die Informationspolitik der Europäischen Kommission' PhD dissertation manuscript, submitted at the Department for Social Sciences, University of Hamburg.

- Brüggemann, Michael, Stefanie Sifft, Katharina Kleinen-v. KönigsLöw, Bernhard Peters and Andreas Wimmel (2006) 'Segmentierte Europäisierung. Die Transnationalisierung von Öffentlichkeit in Europa: Trends und Muster', pp. 214-231 in Michael Latzer and Florian Saurwein (eds.) *Medialer Wandel und Europäische Öffentlichkeit*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Dahl, Robert A. (1989) *Democracy and its Critics*. New Haven / London: Yale University Press.
- de Vreese, Claes (2001) 'Frames in Television News: British, Danish, and Dutch Television News Coverage of the Introduction of the Euro', *Media, culture and Society* 23 (1): 179-193.
- de Vreese, Claes H., Jochen Peter and Holli A. Semetko (2001) 'Framing Politics at the Launch of the Euro. A Cross-National Comparative Study of Frames in the News', *Political Communication* 18 (2): 107-122.
- della Porta, Donatella (2003) 'The Transformation of Political Mobilisation and Communication in European Public Spheres. Report: Dimensions fo Political Opportunities and the Europeanisation of Public Spheres', Berlin: at <http://europub.wz-berlin.de/Default.htm>.
- Deutsch, Karl W. (1953) *Nationalism and Social Communication. An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT-Press.
- Diez Medrano, Juan (2003) 'Qualitätspresse und europäische Integration', pp. 191-212 in Ansgar Klein, Ruud Koopmans, Hans-Jörg Trenz, Ludger Klein, Christian Lahusen and Dieter Rucht (eds.) *Bürger-schaft, Öffentlichkeit und Demokratie in Europa*. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.
- Eder, Klaus and Cathleen Kantner (2000) 'Transnationale Resonanzstrukturen in Europa. Eine Kritik der Rede vom Öffentlichkeitsdefizit', pp. 307-331 in Maurizio Bach (ed.) *Die Europäisierung nationaler Gesellschaften. Sonderheft 40 der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Eilders, Christiane and Katrin Voltmer (2003) 'Zwischen Deutschland und Europa. Eine empirische Untersuchung zum Grad von Europäisierung und Europa-Unterstützung der meinungsführenden deutschen Tageszeitungen', *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft* 51 (2): 250-270.
- EUROPUB (2005) 'The Transformation of Political Mobilisation and Communication in European Public Spheres. Final Report', Berlin, at <http://europub.wz-berlin.de>.
- Firmstone, Julie (2004) 'Final case report on communication strategies of the media. Case report: United Kingdom', Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, Berlin, at <http://europub.wz-berlin.de>.
- Galtung, Johan and Mari Holmboe Ruge (1965) 'The Structure of Foreign News', *Journal of Peace Research* 2 (1): 65-91.
- Gerhards, Jürgen (2000a) 'Das Öffentlichkeitsdefizit der EU: Theoretische Überlegungen und empirische Befunde', pp. 46-60 in Barbara Baerns and Juliana Raupp (eds.) *Information und Kommunikation in Europa: Forschung und Praxis*. Berlin: Vistas.
- Gerhards, Jürgen (2000b) 'Europäisierung von Ökonomie und Politik und die Trägheit der Entstehung einer europäischen Öffentlichkeit', pp. 277-305 in Maurizio Bach (ed.) *Die Europäisierung nationaler Gesellschaften. Sonderheft 40 der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

- Gerhards, Jürgen (2001) 'Missing a European Public Sphere', pp. 145-158 in Martin Kohli and Mojca Novak (eds.) *Will Europe Work? Integration, Employment and the Social Order*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Giddens, Anthony (1986) *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley / Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Grimm, Dieter (1995) 'Does Europe need a Constitution?' *European Law Journal* 1 (3): 282 - 302.
- Grundmann, Reiner (1999) 'The European Public Sphere and the Deficit of Democracy', pp. 125-146 in Dennis Smith and Sue Wright (eds.) *Whose Europe? The Turn Towards Democracy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guiraudon, Virginie, Olivier Baisnée and Olivier Grojean (2004) 'Final case report of on communication strategies of the media. Case report: France', Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, Berlin, at <http://europub.wz-berlin.de>.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1990 [1962]) *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1998) 'Die postnationale Konstellation', pp. 91-169 in Jürgen Habermas (ed.) *Die postnationale Konstellation. Politische Essays*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1998 [1992]) *Faktizität und Geltung. Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaats*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Habermas, Jürgen (2001) 'Warum braucht Europa eine Verfassung?' in *Die Zeit*, Hamburg: 28.6.2001, p. 7.
- Hasebrink, Uwe (2000) 'Europäische Öffentlichkeit: Zur Konstruktion von Kommunikationsräumen in Europa durch Medienpublika', pp. 97-109 in Werner Faulstich and Knut Hickethier (eds.) *Öffentlichkeit im Wandel*. Bardowick: Wissenschaftler-Verlag.
- Hasebrink, Uwe (2003) 'Gibt es ein europaweites Medienpublikum und damit einen europäischen Markt für Medien?', pp. 305-324 in Pierre Albert, Ursula E. Koch, Rémy Rieffel, Detlef Schröter and Philippe Viallon (eds.) *Die Medien und ihr Publikum in Frankreich und in Deutschland*. Paris: Editions Pantheon-Assas.
- Katzenstein, Peter (1997) *Tamed Power. Germany in Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kevin, Deirdre (2001) 'Coverage of the European Parliament Elections of 1999: National Public Spheres and European Debates', *Javnost / The Public* 8 (1): 21-38.
- Kevin, Deirdre (2003) *Europe in the Media. A Comparison of Reporting, Representation, and Rhetoric in National Media Systems in Europe*. Mahwah, New Jersey / London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kielmannsegg, Peter Graf (1996) 'Integration und Demokratie', pp. 49 -71 in Markus Jachtenfuchs and Beate Kohler-Koch (eds.) *Europäische Integration*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Koopmans, Ruud and Jessica Erbe (2004) 'Towards a European Public Sphere? Vertical and Horizontal Dimensions of Europeanised Political Communication', *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 17 (2): 97 - 118.
- Ladrech, Robert (1994) 'Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 32 (1): 69-88.

- Laffan, Brigid (2001) 'The European Union polity: a union of regulative, normative and cognitive pillars', *Journal of European Public Policy* 8 (5): 709-727.
- Law, Marianne, David Middleton and Jerry Palmer (2000) 'The Press Reporting of European Economic and Monetary Union in Four European Countries', pp. 88-100 in Barbara Baerns and Juliana Raupp (eds.) *Information und Kommunikation in Europa/ Transnational Communication in Europe*. Berlin: Vista Verlag.
- Le Monde (2003) 'Dossier. Portrait d'un quotidien', Paris, at [http://medias.lemonde.fr/medias/flash\\_obj/portraitquo0302.swf](http://medias.lemonde.fr/medias/flash_obj/portraitquo0302.swf).
- Machill, Marcel, Markus Beiler and Corinna Fischer (2006) 'Europe-Topics in Europe's Media. The Debate about the European Public Sphere: A Meta-Analysis of Media Content Analysis', *European Journal of Communication* 21 (1): 57-88.
- Marcussen, Martin, Thomas Risse, Daniela Engelmann-Martin, Hans Joachim Knopf and Klaus Roscher (1999) 'Constructing Europe? The evolution of French, British and German nation state identities', *Journal of European Public Policy* 6 (4): 614-633.
- Meyer, Christoph (1999) 'Political Legitimacy and the Invisibility of Politics: Exploring the European Union's Communication Deficit', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 37 (4): 617-639.
- Meyer, Christoph (2005) 'The Europeanization of Publicised Debates: A Study of Quality Press Coverage of Economic Policy Coordination since Amsterdam', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 43 (1): 121-148.
- Moravcsik, Andrew (2002) 'In Defence of the "Democratic Deficit"', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (4): 603-624.
- Ostergaard, Uffe (2000) 'Danish National Identity : Between Multinational Heritage and small state nationalism', pp. 139-185 in Hans Branner and Morten Kelstrup (eds.) *Denmark's policy towards Europe after 1945: History, Theory and Options*. Odense: Odense University Press.
- Östgaard, Einar (1965) 'Factors Influencing the Flows of News', *Journal of Peace Research* 2: 39-63.
- Peters, Bernhard (2005) 'Public Discourse , Identity, and the Problem of Democratic Legitimacy', pp. 84 - 123 in Erik O. Eriksen (ed.) *Making the European Polity. Reflexive Integration in the EU*. London: Routledge.
- Peters, Bernhard, Stefanie Sifft, Andreas Wimmel, Michael Brüggemann and Katharina Kleinen-von Königslöw (2005) 'National and transnational public spheres: the case of the EU', *European Review* 13 (Supp. No. 1): 139-160.
- Peterson, Sophia (1981) 'International news selection by the elite press: A case study', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 45: 143-163.
- Pfetsch, Barbara, Silke Adam, Barbara Berkel and Juan Diez Medrano (2004) 'The Voice of the Media in European Public Spheres: Comparative Analysis of Newspaper Editorials', Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, Berlin, at <http://europub.wz-berlin.de>.
- Pfetsch, Barbara and Ruud Koopmanns (2006) 'Unter falschen Verdacht - Massenmedien und die Europäisierung der politischen Öffentlichkeit in Deutschland', pp. 179 - 191 in Wolfgang R. Langenbucher

- and Michael Latzer (eds.) *Europäische Öffentlichkeit und medialer Wandel. Eine transdisziplinäre Perspektive*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Pierson, Paul (2000) 'Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics', *American Political Science Review* 94 (2): 251-269.
- Radaelli, Claudio M. (2000) 'Whither Europeanization? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change', *European Integration online Papers (EioP)* 4 (8). URL: <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-008a.htm> (3.5.2007).
- Riffe, Daniel, Charles F. Aust and Stephen R. Lacy (1993) 'The Effectiveness of Random, Consecutive Day and Constructed Week Sampling in Newspaper Content Analysis', *Journalism Quarterly* 70 (1): 133-139.
- Risse, Thomas and Marianne van de Steeg (2003) 'An Emerging European Public Sphere? Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Clarifications', Paper presented at the conference "Europeanization of Public Spheres, Political Mobilisation, Public Communication and the European Union", 20.6. 2003, Berlin, at [http://web.fu-berlin.de/atasp/texte/030624\\_europeanpublicsphere.pdf](http://web.fu-berlin.de/atasp/texte/030624_europeanpublicsphere.pdf).
- Schlesinger, Philip R. (1999) 'Changing Spaces of Political Communication: The Case of the European Union', *Political Communication* 16 (3): 263-280.
- Schlesinger, Philip R. and Deirdre Kevin (2000) 'Can the European Union Become a Sphere of Publics?' pp. 206-229 in Erik Oddvar Eriksen and John Erik Fossum (eds.) *Democracy in the European Union. Integration through Deliberation?* London/ New York: Routledge.
- Semetko, Holli A. and Patty M. Valkenburg (2000) 'Framing European Politics. A Content Analysis of Press and Television News', *Journal of Communication* 50 (3): 93-109.
- Sifft, Stefanie, Michael Brüggemann, Katharina Kleinen-von Königslöw, Bernhard Peters and Andreas Wimmel (2007) 'Segmented Europeanization. Exploring the Legitimacy of the European Union from a Public Discourse Perspective', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 45 (1): 127-155.
- Tobler, Stefan (2002) 'Transnationale Kommunikationsverdichtungen im Streit um die internationale Steuerpolitik', *Berliner Debatte Initial* 13 (5/6): 67-78.
- Trenz, Hans-Jörg (2000) 'Korruption und politischer Skandal in der EU. Auf dem Weg zu einer politischen Öffentlichkeit?' pp. 332-359 in Maurizio Bach (ed.) *Die Europäisierung nationaler Gesellschaften. Sonderheft 40 der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Trenz, Hans-Jörg (2002) 'Ein Rauschen geht durch den Blätterwald. EU-Präsident Prodi und die Entstehung einer europäischen Publizistik.' *Berliner Debatte Initial* 13 (5/6): 24-35.
- Trenz, Hans-Jörg (2004) 'Media Coverage on European Governance. Exploring the European Public Sphere in National Quality Newspapers', *European Journal of Communication* 19 (3): 291-319.
- van de Steeg, Marianne (2002) 'Rethinking the Conditions for a Public Sphere in the European Union', *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (4): 499-519.

- van de Steeg, Marianne (2005) 'The Public Sphere in the European Union. A Media Analysis of Public Discourse on EU Enlargement and on the Haider Case. Doctoral Thesis', European University Institute, Florence.
- Wallace, William (1991) 'Foreign policy and national identity in the United Kingdom', *International Affairs* 67 (1): 65-80.
- Weidenfeld, Werner and Wolfgang Wessels (2006) *Europa von A bis Z. Taschenbuch der europäischen Integration*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Weischenberg, Siegfried, Martin Löffelholz and Armin Scholl (1994) 'Merkmale und Einstellungen von Journalisten', *Media Perspektiven* 1994 (4): 154-167.
- Weßler, Hartmut (2004) 'Europa als Kommunikationsnetzwerk. Theoretische Überlegungen zur Europäisierung von Öffentlichkeit', pp. 13-28 in Lutz M Hagen (ed.) *Europäische Union und mediale Öffentlichkeit*. Köln: Herbert von Halem Verlag.
- Weßler, Hartmut, Michael Brüggemann, Katharina Kleinen-von Königslöw, Stefanie Sifft and Andreas Wimmel (2007) 'The Quest for a European Public Sphere: News Media and Democratic Legitimacy', pp. in Joan DeBardeleben and Achim Hurrelmann (eds.) *Democratic Dilemmas of Multilevel Governance: Legitimacy, Representation and Accountability in the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

## **BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE**

**Michael Brüggemann** and **Katharina Kleinen-v. Königslöw** are research fellows at the Collaborative Research Center “Transformations of the State”, University of Bremen.

### **Michael Brüggemann**

*Telephone:* +49 421 200 – 34 54

*Fax:* +49 421 200 – 33 03

*E-Mail:* michael@bruegge.net

*Address:* Jacobs University Bremen, Campus Ring 1, 28759 Bremen

### **Katharina Kleinen-v. Königslöw**

*Telephone:* +49 421 200 3457

*Fax:* +49 421 218-8721

*E-Mail:* k.kleinen@jacobs-university.de

*Address:* Jacobs University Bremen, Campus Ring 1, 28759 Bremen