Codebook

###### *Media Content Analysis*

EUROPEAN ELECTION STUDY 2014

Integrated codebook Netherlands

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

Coder list

Country list

Outlet list

Topic list

Actor list

Etc.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***EP 2014*** | ***NL*** |
| **Countries** | EU 15 (+) | Netherlands |
| **Media** | Newspaper Articles of 3 newspapers (2 quality + 1 tabloid) per country | Newspaper articles of 3 newspapers newspapers (2 quality + 1 tabloid) per country  TV news (NOS journaal & RTL nieuws)  Nu.nl |
| **Material** | All news items: Front page and one randomly chosen page of the sections domestic news, international (foreign) news,  All EU-related items: in sections domestic news, international (foreign) news (every second day) | All news items: Front page and one randomly chosen page of the sections domestic news, international (foreign) news,  All EU-related items: in sections domestic news, international (foreign) news,  TV: Entire newscast |
| **Sampling Period Campaign Phase** | 5th May – 25th May 2014 | December 5th – May 25th  Campaign: April 17th – May 25th |
| **Sampling Period Longitudinal Design** | Front page and randomly selected page are coded every day.  EU stories are coded every second day | **December 5th – April 17th**  8 Dutch news sources are coded every third day in an alternating scheme.  See Appendix x  **April 17th – May 25th**  Front page and randomly selected page are coded every day.  EU stories are coded every second day |

In terms of sampling we distinguish between 2 periods:

The period between December 2013 and April 17, 2014 (survey waves 1-2-3) where the following is coded:

5 NPs, 2 TV programs, 1 online (NU.nl) = 8 outlets.

Front page (core variables only)

First 5 EU stories in each outlet (core and NL variables for that time frame)

Every 3rd day (alternating days)

And the period between April 17 and May 22 (campaign period, w3-4) where the following is coded:

5 NPs, 2 TV programs, 1 online (NU.nl) = 8 outlets.

Front page and random page every day (core variables only).

All EU stories in each outlet, every 2ndday (alternating days), (core and NL variables for that time frame)

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

In many cases we have already identified pages on which the EU is mentioned in the newspapers you are coding through automatic content analysis. In this case you have been provided with a list of pages you should check for articles about the EU. This could be **once or more.** It might also be that none of the articles on the page is about the EU (e.g., if it is about Europe as a geographic unit or Brussels, the capital of Belgium). In that case take a note and proceed to the next page.

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

*in TV:* mentioned at least twice

*in newspapers:* mentioned at least twice

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

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

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

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

# Selection Criteria

***For all newspapers:***

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

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

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

***For all television programs:***

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

## Definition: News story

**Television**

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

Newspapers

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

**V1 Coder ID**01 …  
02 …  
03 …  
04 …  
[🡒 see Appendix A, *not yet available*]

**V2 Story identification number**  
Running number, assign a number in ascending order to each article you code (1,2,3, … 567, 568, 569 etc.). *Note*: Do not start back at “1” when you start coding another newspaper or TV show but continue to assign numbers in ascending order across the outlets you code. Thus, every item you code has to have a unique identification number which is only assigned once for a specific item. *CODER INSTRUCTION*: Before you start coding a story, write down the story id number, and make sure you also do that for the last article you code every day so that you know with which story id number to continue the following day. Do not start back at 1 when you *switch* from coding newspaper articles to TV news items, no matter what medium always type in the next highest running number for each and every subsequent item you code.

**V3a Date (day)**Date is coded in two variables, this first one represents the day (ranging from 1-31); e.g. for a news item published on May 17th only code “17” for this first variable.

**V3b Date (month)**This second variable represents the month (ranging from 1-12); e.g. for a news item published on May 17th only code “05” for this second variable.

**V3c Date (year)**

This third variable represents the year (ranging from 8-14); e.g. for a news item published on May 17th 2008 only code “08” for this third variable.

**V4 News outlet**[🡒 see Appendix B]

**V5 Country**[see Appendix C]

# Newspapers only

**NP1 Page number**  
The number of the page on which the story appeared. In case the story runs over two or more pages write down the page number on which the story begins.

**NP2 Random page**Is the article part of the *randomly chosen* page of the newspaper?

1 = No  
2 = Yes

**NP4 Type of story**

**1 = “News story”**(i.e. most frequent type of story (!), factual news report, report of events etc., of what has happened [when, where, who, what, why?], e.g., party meeting, report on recent events etc.)

**2 = “Reportage” / “background story”**(reportage: feature article, vivid report of a correspondent, named as the author of the article. A “reportage” describes individual experience of the author; often explicitly marked as “reportage”) / (background story: often longer article, not only factual reporting, looking behind the scenes, analytical, indepth – not only descriptive, often explicitly marked as “analysis”, etc.)

**3 = “Portrait” / Interview**(e.g., of a person, group, institution, organization – and nothing more than that. Otherwise it may be a news story or a reportage / see above) //**“Interview”**(The article is an interview – there have to be **at least two interview questions (often in bold or italic)**! *Note:* Interview sections which are part of a “reportage” are not meant here)

**4 = “Editorial”**(typically explicitly marked as editorial, opinion-piece, an article of its own, clearly defined to give evaluations, typically on same page within newspaper each time. It has to be formally distinct from the rest of the page. It clearly expresses a standpoint of the author/editor who again speaks for his newspaper)

**5 = “Column / “commentary”**(column: clearly marked as special column, distinct from regular coverage, most likely always at the same place within newspaper, re-occurring item on a regular basis as fixed part of newspaper coverage, can be written in very personal style) / (commentary: often not written by a journalist but by an external source such as an expert, politician etc., often the official position of the author is given as well; often explicitly marked as “commentary”, e.g. by guest author)

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

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

**8 = “Bullet”**(i.e. mostly on the title page or first page of a section; headline and a short summary – at least one sentence –, which announces a substantial article that can be found inside the newspaper, it is a short summary of an article that stands independent or as a summary, it then often refers to a more in-depth article inside the newspaper)

**9 = “Headline only”**

**10 = “Documentation”**  
(The article is the original text, e.g., of a treaty, constitution, contract, of a letter, speech, official report)

**11 = “Picture/graph/map”**  
(The article is just that, often with a caption)

**12 = “Other”**

**NP5 Length of newspaper story** (FULL story, including photos, figures, tables, etc). If the article continues on a following page, also include these additional parts of the article in your calculation.

1 = up to ¼ of the page  
2= up to ½ of the page  
3 = up to ¾ of a page  
4 = more than ¾ of a page

**NP6 Total number of pages in Political/News section, Editorial section (including Opinion/Comment) and Business (or Economy) section taken together.** Also count full-page ads, stock market pages, and obituaries (but NOT classifieds!) if they are part of these sections! Pages that are partly (e.g. ½) filled with editorial content and partly (e.g. ½) with classifieds should be included.

**NP7 Does the article begin on the top half of the page or on the lower half of the page?**

1 = top half of the page  
2 = lower half of the page

# Television only

ENTIRE PERIOD, NL

**TV1 Length of TV news item** (in seconds), incl. its introduction by the anchorperson.  
*Example*: 1 minute and 58 seconds are coded as 118 seconds!

**TV2 Story number of TV news item**, consecutive count (number), i.e. the number/position of the news item within the overall news cast

# Core variables, no filter

**V6 Primary topic of the story** (i.e. major subject of the story = taking the most space or time – often mentioned in the headline).   
[🡒 see Appendix F]

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

*Note II*: When no topic is the **obvious** main topic of the story, choose the first topic mentioned*.*

*Note III:* If no topic is mentioned twice, choose n/a.

🡒 For NL routing, All topics 🡒 emotionality, immigration 🡒 Rachid Magdalena items -- Both coding instructions are provided at the end of the document

ENTIRE PERIOD, NL

**NL1 a-e** [**TOPIC EMOTION**, vervolg variabele voor het hoofd-onderwerp]: Wordt het thema/onderwerp expliciet met positieve of negatieve emoties verbonden en beschreven? Worden positieve of negatieve emoties gebruikt in de omschrijving van het thema/onderwerp en zijn ze onderdeel van de bewoording en/of plaatsing van het thema/onderwerp?

Welke van de volgende emoties spelen bij de beschrijving van het thema/onderwerp in deze bijdrage (in dit item) een rol (de emotie verwijst naar het thema/onderwerp)? Voor dit item hoeft het thema/onderwerp niet noodzakelijk het object van de emotie te zijn, maar mag wel. Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk .

1. *Angst*
2. *Woede*
3. *Afkeer*
4. *Hoop*
5. *Frustratie*
6. *Verassing*

0 = niet genoemd  
1 = genoemd

##### Magdalena & Rachid – MUSLIMS AND POLES EVALUATIONS

FILTER: IF PRIMARY TOPIC (V6) = [0124 | 0501 thru 0507 | 0704 | 1204 | 1603]  
*(Free movement of people. Immigration issues. Religion. Immigrant rights. Potential EU membership Turkey*

FILTER: FROM 6 DECEMBER 2013 – 30 MARCH 2014, NL

**NL2** Are **Muslims, or people originating from Muslim countries** mentioned? [Either a specific individual of whom is explicitly made clear s/he is Muslim or from a Muslim country, a specific group of whom is explicitly made clear they are Muslims or from a Muslim country, or Muslims/people from Muslim countries in general terms.]  
  
Muslims countries are here defined as Arabic countries and/or countries in North Africa (including Mali, Sudan and Somalia) and countries in the Middle East (including Turkey, Afghanistan and Pakistan). Other Muslim countries (e.g., former Soviet states or in South East Asia) should only be coded if the article explicitly mentions the country to be a Muslim country.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | In the Netherlands | In another country | In the “home” country |
| Muslims / followers of Islam | ⧠ | ⧠ | ⧠ |
| Moroccan origins | ⧠ | ⧠ | ⧠ |
| Turkish origins | ⧠ | ⧠ | ⧠ |
| Other national origins | ⧠ | ⧠ | ⧠ |

Checkboxes: Unchecked = 0 = Not mentioned  
 Checked = 1 = Mentioned

FILTER: IF MUSLIMS ETC. ARE MENTIONED

FILTER: FROM 6 DECEMBER 2013 – 30 MARCH 2014

**NL3** How is/are the Muslims(s) in the story evaluated?

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

END MUSLIMS FILTER

FILTER: IF PRIMARY TOPIC (V6) = [0124 | 0501 thru 0507 | 0704 | 1204 | 1603]  
*(Free movement of people. Immigration issues. Religion. Immigrant rights. Potential EU membership Turkey*

FILTER: FROM 6 DECEMBER 2013 – 30 MARCH 2014, NL

**NL4** Are **Poles, people from other specific Eastern or Middle European countries, or people from Eastern and Middle European countries in general** mentioned? [Either a specific individual of whom is explicitly made clear s/he is Polish/from an Eastern or Middle European country, a specific group of whom is explicitly made clear they are Polish/from an Eastern or Middle European country, or Poles/Eastern or Middle Europeans in general terms.]  
  
Middle and Eastern European countries which are member of the EU are Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria.   
  
Eastern European countries which are not member of the EU are Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova [Serbia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia, Kosovo and Albania]. Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia should only be coded when the article explicitly mentions these countries to be European.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | In the Netherlands | In another country | In the “home” country |
| Poles | ⧠ | ⧠ | ⧠ |
| Other specific Middle or Eastern nationals (from the EU) | ⧠ | ⧠ | ⧠ |
| Middle and/or Eastern Europeans in general (from the EU) | ⧠ | ⧠ | ⧠ |
| Eastern European, but not EU (Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova) | ⧠ | ⧠ | ⧠ |

Checkboxes: Unchecked = 0 = Not mentioned  
 Checked = 1 = Mentioned

FILTER: IF POLES ETC. ARE MENTIONED

FILTER: FROM 6 DECEMBER 2013 – 30 MARCH 2014, NL

**NL5** How is/are the **Pole(s)** **(/or other people from Eastern or Middle European countries)** in the story evaluated?

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

END POLES FILTER

**ECONOMY**

Variable **EconProbl**

*Is there a reference to economic problems?*

This variable describes whether the item is discussed with a reference to economic (financial / debt / currency, growth, etc.) problems in general or specifically to the financial crisis in Europe?

*‘reference to economic problems’*

0 = No reference

1 = Yes, general reference to economic problems

2 = Yes, specific reference to the financial crisis in Europe

*Note I*: The reference to the European financial crisis has to be *explicitly* mentioned. If it is not clear if the economic problems are part of the European financial crisis, please code 1 (general reference to economic problems).

*Note II:* Also if only economic problems of one single country (without a reference to the EU) are mentioned, code 1.

*Note III:* If the financial crisis in the US is mentioned, please code 1 (because it is not referring to Europe). If the financial crisis in Greece, Germany etc. is mentioned, please code 2.

**Economic problems *in general*** are indicated by words like: “concerns”, “problems”, “disaster”, “downwards trends”, “debts”, “danger”, “trouble”, “difficulty”, “embarrassments”, “annoyance”, “offence”, “restraints”, “burden”, “charge”, “debit”, “to be unsuccessful”, “to fail”, “to lack something”, “to be ineffective”, possibly also “constraints”, and so forth). Problems are also indicated, if the item is attributed negative attributes (e.g. criticism, accusations) OR denied positive attributes (e.g. rejection of praise or appreciation).

A **specific reference to the *European/EU financial crisis*** may be indicated by words like: “financial crisis”, “financial meltdown”, “fiscal crisis”, “European/EU debts”, “Eurozone crisis”, “Europe-wide anti-recession package”, “Euro crisis”, “crisis of the fiscal union”, “crisis of the currency union”, “European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF)”, “European Stability Mechanism (ESM)”, “Eurobonds”, “European Monetary Fund (EMF)“, “Troika”, “financial crisis in Greece, Spain, etc.” etc.

*Examples:*

* “German universities see *financial constraints* due to fiscal rigidity.”

🡒 *Code:* 1 (general reference, because European financial crisis not explicitly mentioned)

* “German universities see financial constraints due to fiscal rigidity in the financial crisis in the EU.”

*🡒 Code:* 2 (specific reference to the European financial crisis)

* Cable (UK) said “[...] This has prevented unemployment reaching the horrifying levels seen in some other European countries. At a time when we are struggling to escape from the worst **economic crisis** of our lifetime, the last thing we need is the imposition of a new set of regulations potentially costing the economy billions a year.”

*🡒 Code:* EconProb = 2 (specific reference to the European financial crisis, because economic crisis is mentioned with **other European countries** and Britain is part of the EU, although reference to Europe is not explicit.)

* “The economic crisis in the UK has threatened thousands of jobs.“ or “The automobile crisis demands structural reforms in some German federal states” claims a German MP.

*🡒 Code:* EconProb = 1 (general reference, because economic crisis is mentioned but **not** **together** with a reference to other EU countries or the EU in general.)

* An official says “Bank of America's financial crisis costs become a recurring nightmare.”

*🡒 Code*: EconProb = 1 (general reference, financial crisis is mentioned but in relation to the US, which is not an EU member state).

* “As a result of the financial meltdown and its impact on the real economies of Europe…”

🡒 **Code**: EconProb = 2 (specific reference to the European financial crisis, because “financial meltdown” is mentioned together with the “real economies of Europe”).

**V7 ECONOMIC CONDITIONS: Does the item contain an evaluation of whether *national* economic conditions have changed in the recent past?**

*Note:* “National” in “*national* economic conditions” refers to the country of the newspaper you are coding. So a reference to the British economy in a German newspaper does not count as a mentioning of the national economy.

*Note:* In the recent past means a connected period of time up until the moment of the article is written. Thus both “the national economy has grown over the last 10 years” and “the national economy has grown in the last 6 months” count as an evaluation of the national economy in the recent past. But a statement like “the national economy has grown in the 1990s” does not count, as the period which is mentioned ends before the article is written.

*Note:* Future positive or negative developments of the national economy does not count as an evaluation

0 = mentioned, no evaluation

1 = a lot better

2 = a little better

3 = stayed the same

4 = a little worse

5 = a lot worse

9 = national economy not mentioned

# LOCATION

**V8a Main location** of the story, part 1  
Where does the story or the actions it depicts (mainly) take place (in terms of **prominence** in the story or **length**)?  
🡒 ***List of locations*** [see Appendix C]

*Note:* If there are two equally important locations, code the location where the action took place that started the chain of events described in the article. If not one specific location can be seen as the origin of the events, code the location mentioned *first* in the story.

*Note:* An article may not contain enough information to code this variable. The location should be clear from the article. If it is not clear, code the location as “Not applicable / not determinable” (=code 99).

Don’t try to deduce too much. For instance, a statement by a German politician may be a hint that the location is Germany, but not sufficient to code as such. The location must be explicit, or there should be no room for doubt (e.g., if the British Prime Minister debates a national policy proposal with members of parliament, the location is not explicit this is sufficient to deduce the location to be the parliament, and thus UK). If the location is not explicit, or the article leaves any room for doubt, code the location as “99”.*Example*: An article about a speech held by Gordon Brown in Germany talking about the UK would be coded as “Germany”.

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

**V8b Main location** of the story, part 2  
Explicitly: Which geographical entity is most *affected* by the story or the actions the story depicts (in terms of **prominence** in the story or **length**)?  
🡒 ***List of locations*** [see Appendix C]

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

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

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

*Note:* In many cases no region is affected. Only code if the affect is **explicit**. If the article is not explicit, code as “99”.

# *FILTER VARIABLE!*

**V9 Does the story mention either the European Union (EU)**2**, its institutions or policies or the European Parliamentary elections or the campaign?**

0 = no  
1 = Yes, once   
2 = Yes, twice1 or more

**1** *Note:* He/she/it, him/her/his, who(m)/which do NOT count! The relevant terms have to mentioned *exactly* twice (e.g. EU + EU) or two different relevant terms (e.g. EU + European Parliament) have to be mentioned once each.

*Example*: The **EU** has decided to stop funding social scientists. **It** said this was going to save money. 🡒 Code: 1

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

**ONLY CODE STORIES BEYOND THIS POINT ( / = until next filter) IF THEY ARE ABOUT3 THE EU, ITS INSTITUTIONS, THE EUROPEAN ELECTIONS OR THE CAMPAIGN**

**3 about** *is defined as:*

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

|  |
| --- |
| **FILTER:** All subsequent variables are only coded if **V9 = 2** |

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

***Newspapers****: All EU stories have to be coded in the following sections: Political/News section, Editorial (including Opinion/Comment) and Business (or Economy) Section. Do* ***not*** *code Sport, Travel, Housing, Culture, Motor/Auto, Fashion or Entertainment sections.*

**Filter: NL, VOLKSKRANT AND NRC**

**V9b Type the first five words of the article.**

**ADDITONAL TOPICS (2 to 4)**

Code up to **THREE more** topics per story. These are **additional** to the main topic you coded in V5 (main topics). **Code topics in order of appearance**. Topics have to be referred to/mentioned at least **twice** (in two separate sentences) in the article or newscast and not just mentioned in passing. *Coding rule*: If in doubt, always choose **the more specific topic category.**

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

**V10a-c Code up to three additional topics per story in order of appearance.**

|  |
| --- |
| **FILTER:** Only code **V10b** if V10a is not coded “not applicable”; only code **V10c** if V10b is not coded “not applicable” |

🡒 ***List of topics*** [see Appendix]

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014, NL

**NL6a-d Topic relevant information (Code for each topic!)**

What is the density of relevant information given in the story regarding primary/secondary/.. topic relative to the extent of the total discussion of the topic?

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

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

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

NO FILTER

**V11 Explicitly:** Does the story **evaluate the EU,** and if so, how?‘The EU’here refers to the EU as a political institution as such, not to single, more specific institutions such as the EP or the EC. Also code if synonyms are used which clearly refer to the EU as such, e.g., “Europe” (when in fact the EU is meant / but not if Europe is only referred to as a geographical entity) or “Brussels” (when in fact the EU is meant).

*Note:* Different from the actor coding, in this variable the EU needs to be mentioned only once to code as mentioned.

9 = not applicable / not mentioned

0 = mentioned but not evaluated

1 = negative

2 = rather negative

3 = balanced/mixed

4 = rather positive

5 = positive

*Examples of when the EU is NOT mentioned (🡒 Code: 9):*

“Euroscepticism is booming in the Netherlands.”

“The EU leaders were satisfied with their decisiveness during the Summit.”

*Examples of when the EU is mentioned but NOT evaluated (🡒 Code: 0):*

“The EU signed a historical agreement with the US”

“The Lisbon Treaty will enable the EU to become more democratic.”

“By giving away emission rights for free, the EU does not push industries towards a cleaner production.”

*Examples of when the EU is negatively evaluated (🡒 Code: 1):*

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

**V12 Explicitly:** Does the story **evaluate the European Parliament**, and if so, how?

*Note:* Different from the actor coding, in this variable the EP needs to be mentioned only once to code as mentioned. Also different from the actor coding, also a reference to the EP as a location counts as mentioning the EP.

9 = not applicable / not mentioned

0 = mentioned but not evaluated

1 = negative

2 = rather negative

3 = balanced/mixed

4 = rather positive

5 = positive

**V13 Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention any aspect related to **the state of democracy in the EU**, and if so, how is it evaluated? E.g., does the story mention whether the European Union is **democratic/transparent** or **undemocratic/intransparent**.

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

9 = not applicable / not mentioned

0 = mentioned but not evaluated

1 = negative

2 = rather negative

3 = balanced/mixed

4 = rather positive

5 = positive

# ACTORS

**V14 How many (max 6) actors are mentioned in the story?** Please indicate how many actors you have identified in line with the rules below.

Variables **V15a-V15f Actors**

*Which actors are mentioned (up to 6)?*

🡒 ***Please code according to the list of actors*** [see Appendix]

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

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

**or**

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

**or**

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

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

*NOTE:* If an article in a newspaper is a commentary the journalist who wrote the commentary is coded as an (active) actor! This is also the case for an opinion piece, column, and letter to the editor.

* + - 1. Actors are **not necessarily** **persons**. A government, an institution, an organization, even a country as a whole can be an actor if the story depicts so.

* + - 1. Actors can be **subjects** (active actors) as well as **objects** (passive actors). So an actor does **not necessarily have to act**. Actors can also be **objects** or **targets** of actions - they can be attacked or criticized, for instance.

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

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

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

* + - 1. An *unspecified* group (i.e., a mix of different) of actors referred to in plural form as “they” or “these four companies” etc. (e.g., “The Times, the Sun, and the Guardian all reported today that *they* expect ad revenues to be lower”) does not count as an actor mentioning. However, a story referring to “SPD party members” as “they” does count because it refers to a specified actor (=SPD party members), for example.
      2. **Journalists** are actors *only* if they are **interviewed**, **reported** **about, used as sources.**
      3. An actor can only be coded once – although she/he/it/they may appear at several places and with different functions in the story. Then, choose the category depicting the most important role of that actor in the story. If more than one code applies to one actor, choose the most specific one (e.g., a farmer is not to be coded as ordinary citizen, but as member of a professional group). There may be cases in which the same code has to be assigned to different actors, e.g. when two members of the same party are quarreling with each other. The reference point for deciding how to code an actor is always the story. If, for example, a minister is a *candidate* running for the EP, use the relevant EP Candidate Actor List code. If the story is about the person as member of the government, use the relevant minister code.
      4. **Generic groups of actors such as Europeans, voters, citizens, public, MPs, MEPs, politicians, etc.** have to be mentioned twice with the same descriptive term (e.g., 2x “voters” or 2x “Dutch MEPs”) and are coded according to the codes in the actor appendix.

**“I” or “We”** (e.g. “I think” or “we are”)**,** e.g. in a column or commentary does ***not*** establish the author as an actor and thus does not count as a mentioning of an actor! This rule is not applicable regarding *interviewees* referring to themselves as “I” or “we”, since interviewees can only refer to themselves as “I” or “we” in **quotes**. One or more direct quotes always establish the interviewee as an actor (provided of course he or she is among the first 6 actors of a story).

* + - 1. Actors are only coded as actors if they act or are acted upon, but **not** if they are mentioned as a **location**. For instance the European Parliament can be an actor (e.g., the EP demands certain policies), but can also be a location (e.g., MEPs were debating an issue in the EP). Do ***not*** count a reference of such an actor when actually the location is meant.
      2. Criteria for selecting actors

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

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

Indicators of importance are:

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

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

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

*If there are* ***two*** *or more actors that are sufficiently present (see above) in the story:*

Code the other actors (except the main actor) **in the order of their appearance in the story**.

*NOTE III:* In order to determine the order of appearance in newspaper articles and in order to determine which actor is mentioned *first* it is important to determine what part of the story is the **'coding starting point'**.

Newspaper articles: Starting point is always (1) the headline, followed by (2) the photo and the caption directly following the photograph (if present), followed by (3) the first (intro) paragraph of the article, then (4) the second etc.

Spots: Starting point is the first sequence of the spot (second 1).

**V16a-f** Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says/ depicts so): **Is actor 1-6 evaluated favorably or unfavorably (regardless of the source) from his/her own perspective?**

Refers to tendency/bias contained in the presentation by a journalist, protagonist or his partners, competitors, independent sources (e.g. politicians, businessmen, scientists) The tendency must be expressed:   
**explicitly**, by using terms of clearly positive or negative **judgment** (e.g., ”good”, ”promising”, ”ominous”, ”disappointing”).

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

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

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

In case no tendency can be assumed (i.e. there is no evaluation), then choose **no evaluation** (1). Don’t interpret too much or become too subtle, too creative or too subjective.

If your impression is that the evaluation is mixed positive and negative tendencies are exactly in balance, then code **balanced/mixed** (4).

If there are *both* positive and negative evaluations but the overall evaluation (or sum of specific evaluations) is, e.g., more positive than negative, then code **rather positive** (5). If it is more negative than positive, then code **rather negative** (3).

If there are *either only* positive *OR* negative evaluations, even if it is just one evaluation, then code **positive** (6) or **negative** (2) respectively.

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

ALL Variables after this point are only coded in the Netherlands

FILTER: alleen als actor = ACTOR=EU (code=200) OR Jose Manuel Barroso (code=150) OR EU Commission as a whole (code=201) OR European Council/EU summit (code=204) OR Van Rompuy (code=207) OR Council of Ministers (code=208) OR European Parliament as a whole (code=250) OR Martin Schulz (code=254) OR (all) EU politicans in general (code=298) OR EU parties in general (as a whole) (code=299)

ENTIRE PERIOD

**NL7a-e** Welke van de volgende emoties worden expliciet in de bijdrage (in dit item) of iemand in de bijdrage in verbinding gebracht met de EU (**OF** EU-politici of EU-instellingen!) of gebruikt in de beschrijving daarvan? *[Emoties verwijzen naar de EU: de EU is het object van de emotie]*

1. *Angst*
2. *Woede*
3. *Afkeer*
4. *Hoop*
5. *Frustratie*
6. *Verassing*

0 = niet genoemd

1 = genoemd

FILTER IF ACTOR = 280800 OR 280801 OR 280810 OR 280815

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL8a-e Legitimiteit PVV**

**a.** Wordt in het item besproken of de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus zich (misschien) niet aan de wet houdt, of juist wel? “De wet” is de Nederlandse wet, niet b.v. interne regels binnen een politieke partij; er hoeft niet expliciet te staan dat er een inbreuk op de wet is, een inbraak is bijvoorbeeld tegen de wet, zoals de meeste mensen wel weten.  
**b.** Wordt in het item besproken of de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus (misschien) niet het recht heeft om macht uit te oefenen, of juist wel? Specifiek, het moet expliciet gaan over het uitoefenen van een bepaalde bevoegdheid, bijvoorbeeld iemand ontslaan.  
**c.** Wordt in het item besproken of de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus (misschien) niet de regels van de Nederlandse democratie respecteert, of juist wel? Bijvoorbeeld dat de politicus een democraat is of juist dat de politicus zich als een dictator gedraagt; er moet een link zijn met politiek (bv binnen een partij) of met bepaalde politieke zaken (bv politieke participatie)  
**d.** Wordt in het item besproken of de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus zich (misschien) niet houdt aan gedragsregels die in onze samenleving gelden, of juist wel? “Gedragsregels” ruim interpreteren: het gaat om algemene maatschappelijke fatsoensnormen. Dus ook coderen als de wet wordt overtreden (behalve in uitzonderingssituaties), het gaat om algemene regels voor het sociale verkeer.

0=niet besproken  
1=besproken, waarbij alleen wordt gezegd: (misschien) niet  
2=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd, maar vooral: (misschien) niet   
3=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd; in balans  
4=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd, maar vooral: (misschien) wel  
5=besproken, waarbij alleen wordt gezegd: (misschien) wel

FILTER IF NL8a ≠ 0 | NL8b ≠ 0 | NL8c ≠ 0 | NL8d ≠ 0

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL9a-e** **Wie zegt dit over de (voormalige) PVV(‘er)(s)?** *(for each one of the above)*

**1.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) een andere partij  
**2.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) van de PVV zelf  
**3.** Journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist  
**4.** Burger/Publieke opinie  
**5.** Anders, namelijk …

NOTE: in deze en volgende vragen met deze antwoordopties, gelieve alleen de derde categorie (“journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist”) aan te vinken indien het daadwerkelijk de journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist is die het zegt of schrijft; niet als de journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist verslag doet van wat een politicus of burger zegt of vindt. Als een journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist rapporteert wat een politicus of burger zegt of vindt, gebruik optie 1, 2 of 4. Antwoordoptie 5 kan een belangenorganisatie zijn, of de rechter b.v.

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL10a-d** **Effectiviteit PVV**

**a.** Wordt in het item besproken of 50PLUS (misschien) geen stabiele organisatie is, of juist wel? “Stabiele organisatie” gaat over verleden, heden of toekomst. Bijvoorbeeld: hoe is het tot nu toe gegaan; hoe gaat het nu en hoe lang gaat dit nog goed? “Stabiel” ruim interpreteren; een partij is niet stabiel als deze een puinhoop of chaos is of in crisis. Maar als er één lid opstapt dan is de stabiliteit van een partij nog niet in gevaar. Dus niet extreem ruim interpreteren.  
**b.** Wordt in het item besproken of de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus (misschien) iets niet kan bereiken voor degenen die op de partij stemmen, of juist wel? Het onderdeel “voor kiezers” moet er echt in zitten, bijvoorbeeld: iets niet kunnen bereiken voor “Henk en Ingrid” of: het vertrouwen van de kiezer niet waard zijn dat er iets gaat gebeuren.  
**c.** Wordt in het item besproken of de PVV (misschien) geen efficiënte organisatie is, of juist wel? Ook coderen als niet efficiente organisatie als een partij “in chaos” of “in crisis” is.  
**d** Wordt in het item besproken of de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus zijn/haar doelen (misschien) niet zal bereiken, of juist wel? Specifiek, dus er moet een bepaald doel worden genoemd waarvan wordt gezegd dat deze al dan niet zal worden bereikt.

0=niet besproken  
1=besproken, waarbij alleen wordt gezegd: (misschien) niet  
2=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd, maar vooral: (misschien) niet   
3=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd; in balans  
4=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd, maar vooral: (misschien) wel  
5=besproken, waarbij alleen wordt gezegd: (misschien) wel

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF NL10a ≠ 0 | NL10b≠ 0 | V10c ≠ 0 | V11d ≠ 0

**NL11a-d** **Wie zegt dit over de (voormalige) PVV(‘er)(s)?** *(for each one of the above)*

**1.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) een andere partij  
**2.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) van de PVV zelf  
**3.** Journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist  
**4.** Burger/Publieke opinie  
**5.** Anders, namelijk …

NOTE: NL8 t/m NL11 coderen als het NIET wordt gezegd en ook als het WEL wordt gezegd dus bv als er (alleen) wordt gezegd dat Wilders een “democraat in hart en nieren” is dan NL8c=5

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL12a-d Ridiculisering PVV**

**a** Wordt in het item spottend gesproken over de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus? “Spotten” omvat ook honen en schamperen. Alléén coderen als spottend als het er echt dik bovenop ligt, niet voor andere uitleg vatbaar, bijvoorbeeld “wat een pubers” of “wat een soap” (niet “despoot” of “Oekraïense methoden,” want dat kan ook anders dan spottend bedoeld zijn, maar “wat een kleine generaal” zou dan weer duidelijk spottend bedoeld zijn).  
**b.** Wordt in het item de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus gekleineerd? “Kleineren” omvat ook denigreren, minachten en geringschatten.  
**c.** Wordt in het item de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus weggezet als ‘niet serieus te nemen’? “Niet serieus” hoeft niet expliciet maar kan ook via vergelijkingen, bijvoorbeeld met een kind, zwakzinnige of verslaafde of met een nutteloze bezigheid of komische zaak.  
**d.** Worden in het item grappen gemaakt over de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus? “Grappen” kan ook zijn: één grap. Slechte grappen tellen ook mee!

0 = nee  
1 = ja

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF NL12a = 1 | NL12b = 1 | NL12c = 1 | NL12d = 1

**NL13a-d** **Wie schrijft of praat er zo over de (voormalige) PVV(‘er)(s)?** *(for each one of the above)*

**1.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) een andere partij  
**2.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) van de PVV zelf  
**3.** Journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist  
**4.** Burger/Publieke opinie  
**5.** Anders, namelijk …

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL14a-d Stigmatisering PVV**

1. Worden in het item EXPLICIET genoemd: discriminatie, extreemrechts, radicalisme, extremisme, fascisme, neonazisme, racisme, en/of discriminerende, extreemrechtse, radicale, extremistische, fascistische, neonazi, racistische en/of antisemitische ideeën, groepen of partijen?

0 = nee  
1 = ja

1. Wordt in het item de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus op enigerlei wijze in verband gebracht met discriminatie, extreemrechts, radicalisme, extremisme, fascisme, neonazisme, racisme, en/of met discriminerende, extreemrechtse, radicale, extremistische, fascistische, neonazi, racistische en/of antisemitische ideeën, groepen of partijen?

*Het gaat om het “in verband brengen met” dus NIET nodig is dat ze expliciet zo worden genoemd. Hierbij hoeft GEEN directe link worden gelegd door één en dezelfde bron. Een vergelijking met een historisch persoon als Hitler of Mussolini of een partij als de Nazi-partij telt hier ook. Het gaat hier om de associatie. Voldoende is als er slechts een vergelijking wordt gemaakt zonder oordeel of zelfs als de associatie wordt ontkend: “Wilders werkt samen met partijen die ontkennen extreemrechts te zijn” telt dus ook. NIET voldoende is het alleen noemen van een niet-historisch persoon (zoals Marine le Pen) of partij (zoals b.v. het Front National) zonder dat er wordt gesuggereerd dat die persoon of partij extreemrechts o.i.d. is.*

0 = nee  
1 = ja

1. Wordt in het item de PVV en/of een (voormalig) PVV-politicus EXPLICIET extreemrechts, discriminerend, racistisch, radicaal, extremistisch, fascistisch, neonazi en/of antisemitisch genoemd?

*Het gaat om het “noemen,” dus ALLEEN als ze EXPLICIET zo worden genoemd.*

0 = nee  
1 = ja

1. Worden in het item PVV-aanhangers of (politici of bestuurders van) partijen die samenwerken met de PVV (zoals Vlaams Belang, het Franse Front National, de Italiaanse Lega Nord of de Oostenrijkse FPÖ) afgeschilderd als extreemrechts, discriminerend, racisten, radicalen, extremisten, fascisten, neonazi’s en/of antisemieten?

*Het gaat om het “afschilderen als” dus niet nodig is dat ze expliciet zo worden genoemd. NIET voldoende is alleen het noemen van b.v. het Front National zonder dat er wordt gezegd dat die partij extreemrechts o.i.d. is.*

0 = nee  
1 = ja

*NOTE: bij deze vier items (14a tot en met 14d) gaat het ALLEEN om de acht genoemde stigma’s, niet om labels als populistisch, xenofoob, anti-Islam, eurosceptisch, of Islamofoob. Deze en andere mogelijke kwalificeringen van de PVV tellen NIET mee.*

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF NL14a = 1 | NL14b = 1 | NL14c = 1 |NL14d = 1

**NL15a-d** **Wie schrijft of praat er zo over de (voormalige) PVV(‘er)(s)?** *(for each one of the above)*

**1.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) een andere partij  
**2.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) van de PVV zelf  
**3.** Journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist  
**4.** Burger/Publieke opinie  
**5.** Anders, namelijk …

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF ACTOR = 281900 OR 281910 OR 281915

**NL16a-d Legitimiteit 50PLUS**

**a.** Wordt in het item besproken of 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder zich (misschien) niet aan de wet houdt, of juist wel? “De wet” is de Nederlandse wet, niet b.v. interne regels binnen een politieke partij; er hoeft niet expliciet te staan dat er een inbreuk op de wet is, een inbraak is bijvoorbeeld tegen de wet, zoals de meeste mensen wel weten.  
**b.** Wordt in het item besproken of 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder (misschien) niet het recht heeft om macht uit te oefenen, of juist wel? Specifiek, het moet expliciet gaan over het uitoefenen van een bepaalde bevoegdheid, bijvoorbeeld iemand ontslaan.  
**c.** Wordt in het item besproken of 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder (misschien) niet de regels van de Nederlandse democratie respecteert, of juist wel? Bijvoorbeeld dat de politicus of -bestuurder een democraat is of juist dat de politicus of -bestuurder zich als een dictator gedraagt; er moet een link zijn met politiek (bv binnen een partij) of met bepaalde politieke zaken (bv politieke participatie).  
**d.** Wordt in het item besproken of 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder zich (misschien) niet houdt aan gedragsregels die in onze samenleving gelden, of juist wel? “Gedragsregels” ruim interpreteren: het gaat om algemene maatschappelijke fatsoensnormen. Dus ook coderen als de wet wordt overtreden (behalve in uitzonderingssituaties), het gaat om algemene regels voor het sociale verkeer.

0=niet besproken  
1=besproken, waarbij alleen wordt gezegd: (misschien) niet  
2=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd, maar vooral: (misschien) niet   
3=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd; in balans  
4=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd, maar vooral: (misschien) wel  
5=besproken, waarbij alleen wordt gezegd: (misschien) wel

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF NL16a ≠ 0 | NL16b ≠ 0 | NL16c ≠ 0 | NL16d ≠ 0

**NL17a-d Wie zegt dit over (de voormalige) 50Plus(ser)(s)?** *(for each one of the above)*

**1.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) een andere partij  
**2.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) van 50Plus zelf  
**3.** Journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist  
**4.** Burger/Publieke opinie  
**5.** Anders, namelijk …

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL18a-d Effectiviteit 50PLUS**

**a.** Wordt in het item besproken of 50PLUS (misschien) geen stabiele organisatie is, of juist wel? “Stabiele organisatie” gaat over verleden, heden of toekomst. Bijvoorbeeld: hoe is het tot nu toe gegaan; hoe gaat het nu en hoe lang gaat dit nog goed? “Stabiel” ruim interpreteren; een partij is niet stabiel als deze een puinhoop of chaos is of in crisis. Maar als er één lid opstapt dan is de stabiliteit van een partij nog niet in gevaar. Dus niet extreem ruim interpreteren.  
**b.** Wordt in het item besproken of 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder (misschien) iets niet kan bereiken voor degenen die op de partij stemmen, of juist wel? Het onderdeel “voor kiezers” moet er echt in zitten, bijvoorbeeld: iets niet kunnen bereiken voor ouderen of: het vertrouwen van de kiezer niet waard zijn dat er iets gaat gebeuren.  
**c.** Wordt in het item besproken of 50PLUS (misschien) geen efficiënte organisatie is, of juist wel? Ook coderen als niet efficiente organisatie als een partij “in chaos” of “in crisis” is.  
**d.** Wordt in het item besproken of 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder zijn/haar doelen (misschien) niet zal bereiken, of juist wel? Specifiek, dus er moet een bepaald doel worden genoemd waarvan wordt gezegd dat deze al dan niet zal worden bereikt.

0=niet besproken  
1=besproken, waarbij alleen wordt gezegd: (misschien) niet  
2=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd, maar vooral: (misschien) niet   
3=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd; in balans  
4=besproken, waarbij zowel het een als het ander wordt gezegd, maar vooral: (misschien) wel  
5=besproken, waarbij alleen wordt gezegd: (misschien) wel

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF NL18a ≠ 0 | NL18b ≠ 0 | NL18c ≠ 0 | NL18d ≠ 0

**NL19a-d** **Wie zegt dit over (de voormalige) 50Plus(ser)(s)?** *(for each one of the above)*

**1.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) een andere partij  
**2.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) van 50Plus zelf  
**3.** Journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist  
**4.** Burger/Publieke opinie  
**5.** Anders, namelijk …

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL20a-d Ridiculisering 50PLUS**

**a.** Wordt in het item spottend gesproken over 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder? “Spotten” omvat ook honen en schamperen. Alléén coderen als spottend als het er echt dik bovenop ligt, niet voor andere uitleg vatbaar, bijvoorbeeld “wat een pubers” of “wat een soap” (niet “despoot” of “Oekraïense methoden,” want dat kan ook anders dan spottend bedoeld zijn, maar “wat een kleine generaal” zou dan weer duidelijk spottend bedoeld zijn).  
**b.** Wordt in het item 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder gekleineerd? “Kleineren” omvat ook denigreren, minachten en geringschatten.  
**c.** Wordt in het item 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder weggezet als ‘niet serieus te nemen’? “Niet serieus” hoeft niet expliciet maar kan ook via vergelijkingen, bijvoorbeeld met een kind, zwakzinnige of verslaafde of met een nutteloze bezigheid of komische zaak.  
**d.** Worden in het item grappen gemaakt over 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder? “Grappen” kan ook zijn: één grap. Slechte grappen tellen ook mee!

0 = nee  
1 = ja

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF NL20a = 1 | NL20b = 1 | NL20c = 1 | NL20d = 1

**NL21a-d Wie schrijft of praat er zo over (de voormalige) 50Plus(ser)(s)?** *(for each one of the above)*

**1.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) een andere partij  
**2.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) van 50Plus zelf  
**3.** Journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist  
**4.** Burger/Publieke opinie  
**5.** Anders, namelijk …

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL22a-d Stigmatisering 50PLUS**

**a.** Wordt in het item 50PLUS bestempeld als intern verdeeld? Het is dus de partij zelf die expliciet zo moet worden gekarakteriseerd. De woorden “intern verdeeld” hoeven niet letterlijk in de tekst te staan.  
**b.** Wordt in het item een link gelegd tussen 50PLUS en/of een (voormalig) 50PLUS-politicus of -bestuurder en onderlinge ruzie? Hierbij moet er een directe link worden gelegd door één en dezelfde bron. Het gaat hier om de associatie, ook als deze wordt ontkend: “vandaag geen onderlinge ruzie bij 50Plus” telt dus ook. De woorden “onderlinge ruzie” hoeven niet letterlijk in de tekst te staan.  
**c.** Wordt in het item 50PLUS in verband gebracht met interne verdeeldheid? Hierbij is ook een directe link nodig door één en dezelfde bron. Het gaat hier om de associatie, ook als deze wordt betwijfeld of zelfs ontkend: “50Plus ontkent interne verdeeldheid” telt dus ook. De woorden “interne verdeeldheid” hoeven niet letterlijk in de tekst te staan.  
**d.** Wordt in het item de partij 50Plus, of 50Plus-politici, -leden of -bestuurders IN HET ALGEMEEN afgeschilderd als onderlinge ruziemakers? Alléén coderen als de hele partij, of de leden/politici/bestuurders van die partij IN HET ALGEMEEN worden afgeschilderd als onderlinge ruziemakers, niet als het om individuen gaat. De woorden “onderlinge ruzie” hoeven niet letterlijk in de tekst te staan.

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF NL22a = 1 | NL22b = 1 | NL22c = 1 | NL22d = 1

**NL23a-d** **Wie schrijft of praat er zo over (de voormalige) 50Plus(ser)(s)?** *(for each one of the above)*

**1.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) een andere partij  
**2.** (Voormalig) (politicus of bestuurder van) van 50Plus zelf  
**3.** Journalist, politiek analist, commentator of columnist  
**4.** Burger/Publieke opinie  
**5.** Anders, namelijk …

ENTIRE PERIOD

**NL24 Explicitly:** Does the story **evaluate the potential membership of TURKEY in the EU?**

9 = not applicable/not mentioned  
0 = mentioned but not evaluated  
1 = negative  
2 = rather negative  
3 = balances/mixed  
4 = rather positive  
5 = positive

*EU ATTITUDES*

ENTIRE PERIOD

**NL25** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention any aspect related to **future strengthening of the EU or its institutions**, and if so, how is it evaluated? E.g., does the story mention whether the European Union is **should become one country/integrate much further** or **integrate much less**?

*For example:* Does the story suggest that there is a shift in power between the national and the European level?

*Note 1:* Strengthening only refers here to vertical integration (division of power between national and EU level), not horizontal integration (i.e., enlargement).

*Note 2:* Evaluations need to be explicit. This could be either by the use of explicit sentences (e.g., “further integration is negative”), or by the explicit use of positive/negative keywords (“further integration fails the needs of EU citizens”).

*Note 3:* For this variable, strengthening of the Eurozone (Euro) or a specific EU institution (e.g., the European Parliament or the European Commission) should be considered as strengthening of the EU. This includes discussions of whether to drop the Euro (e.g. how we benefited from having the Euro), and whether the European Central Bank should have more or less powers to act. When the article refers to “Europe”, code as EU when EU is meant (i.e., is this also about Norway and Switzerland? If yes, it refers to Europe as a continent; if no, code as EU).

*Note 4:* A neutral statement about whether a country should leave or stay in the EU (e.g., “het debat gaat over de vraag of Nederland al dan niet in de EU moet blijven”) is to be coded as a mentioning of EU strengthening. A mentioning of being in favour of exiting the EU is to be coded as a negative evaluation of EU strengthening, as apparently the source prefers less EU integration. A mentioning of being in favour of staying in the EU does not necessarily show a preference for more integration, so is not necessarily coded as a positive evaluation.

*Note 5:* Where the following dimensions include references about different policy fields, EU strengthening is only coded when it is about integration related topics. I.e., future references of what the immigration policy should look like is not a mentioning of EU strengthening, unless the article explicitly says that for that particular policy, the EU should have more/less powers.

9 = not applicable/not mentioned  
0 = mentioned but not evaluated  
1 = negative (less integration)  
2 = rather negative  
3 = balances/mixed  
4 = rather positive  
5 = positive

**NL26** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention any aspect related to **past effects of the EU (on citizens, own country, Europe)**, and if so, how is it evaluated? E.g., does the story mention whether **the own country has benefitted from EU membership or not**, or whether the European Union has **brought peace and stability** **or** **not**?

*For example:* Does the story suggest that the Netherlands has contributed several million Euro to the EU budget (0), and this has had negative consequences for the Netherlands (1).

*Note 1:* Only code this variable to be mentioned when effects should be applicable to the reader (e.g., the group or nation the reader is likely to belong to). So in the Dutch case, the effects should be on Dutch citizens, the Netherlands, Western Europe, the EU, Europe, etc.

*Note 2:* Evaluations need to be explicit. This could be either by the use of explicit sentences (e.g., “we have profited from the EU”), or by the explicit use of positive/negative keywords (“through the EU we have succeeded in improving living standards”).

*Note 3:* For this variable, utilitarian effects of the Eurozone should be considered as effects of the EU. As a general rule, when a specific EU institution has an effect, this should be coded as an effect of the EU (e.g., if we benefitted from policies from the European food and safety agency, code as benefitted from the EU). As a result, benefits on very specific policy fields are also coded as benefits from the EU, as long as these benefits are the result from the EU or one of its institutions.

*Note 4:* EU utility is about whether we have benefitted from the EU in the past. The past, however, may lead up until now. So a statement about how much economic activity we have thanks to the EU in the previous year, but also today should be coded as EU utility present (i.e., we are still benefitting from the EU).

9 = not applicable/not mentioned  
0 = mentioned but not evaluated  
1 = negative (not benefitted from the EU)  
2 = rather negative  
3 = balances/mixed  
4 = rather positive  
5 = positive

**NL27** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention any aspect related to **current performance of the EU**, and if so, how is it evaluated? Performance here is both about democratic performance and effectiveness.

**Only in the presence, no future evaluations.**

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

*Note 1:* Evaluations need to be explicit. This could be either by the use of explicit sentences (e.g., “the EU functions well”), or by the explicit use of positive/negative keywords (“the EU successfully reduced crime rates”).

*Note 2:* For this variable, performance of the Eurozone should be considered as performance of the EU. As a general rule, when a specific institution performs well, this should be coded as the EU performing.

*Note 3:* Performance is about acts of the EU (or its institutions). Thus, EU performance is about whether the EU performs some expected act well. It is not about the effect this act may have (as this effect is part of EU utility).

9 = not applicable/not mentioned  
0 = mentioned but not evaluated  
1 = negative (bad performance)  
2 = rather negative  
3 = balances/mixed  
4 = rather positive  
5 = positive

ENTIRE PERIOD

**NL28a** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention any aspect related to **EU identity**, and if so, how is it evaluated?

*Note 1:* This variable should be coded is present when the article refers to (or denies) a common identity. Are we just a group of countries working together, or are we one Europe? The descriptive term ‘identity’ is not necessary to be coded as present. For instance, “our shared civilization” (if “our” refers to EU citizens/states) should be coded as positive reference of EU identity.

*Note 2:* Also, a clash between “the national” and “the European” signifies the presence of EU identity dimension, with preference for “the national” as a negative evaluation of EU identity and a preference for “the European” as a positive evaluation of EU identity. For instance, of the article reports that the EP elections are not European but national elections, this is coded as a negative evaluation of EU identity. Or, when an article describes how national interests prevail over European interests, this is coded as a negative evaluation.

*Note 3:* Evaluations need to be explicit. This could be either by the use of explicit sentences (e.g., “there is a strong EU identity”), or by the explicit use of positive/negative keywords (“national interests outweigh European interests”).

9 = not applicable/not mentioned  
0 = mentioned but not evaluated  
1 = negative (denial of EU identity/inferior to national identity)   
2 = rather negative  
3 = balances/mixed  
4 = rather positive  
5 = positive

ENTIRE PERIOD

**NL28b** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention any aspect related to **EU solidarity**, and if so, how is it evaluated? Do actors from different EU member states show solidarity, or not?

*Note 1:* This variable should be coded is present when the article refers to (or denies) solidarity between actors from different EU member states. This could refer to all kind of actors, as long as it is solidarity between two or more different EU countries (most likely, the actors will either be governments actors, other politicians, or citizens).

*Note 2:* The descriptive term ‘solidarity’ is not necessary to be coded as present. For instance, “the northern European countries need to help the southern European countries” should be coded as positive reference of EU identity. Or, “In Duitsland werd hardop ­gesproken over de optie Griekenland maar te laten vallen” should be coded as a negative evaluation.

*Note 3:* Evaluations need to be explicit. This could be either by the use of explicit sentences (e.g., “there is a strong solidarity among EU nations”), or by the explicit use of positive/negative keywords (“we need to help our fellow Europeans”).

9 = not applicable/not mentioned  
0 = mentioned but not evaluated  
1 = negative (denial of existence of European solidarity/should not show solidarity)  
2 = rather negative  
3 = balances/mixed  
4 = rather positive  
5 = positive

ENTIRE PERIOD

**NL29** Does the story contain explicit factual information about the following (note that “[COUNTRY]” used anywhere in this codebook refers to the country which the coded news outlet belongs to)**:**

1. The total number of member states in the EU (only code “yes” if the specific number mentioned is **28**).
2. The number of representatives of the Netherlands in the European Parliament (either before or after the EP elections).
3. The official duration of the electoral cycle in the Netherlands (4 years).
4. The president of the European parliament in the past two years (Martin Schulz)
5. The name of the minister of foreign affairs (Frans Timmermans)
6. Information about the names and party affiliation of the candidates for the EU presidency
7. Possibly added later

0 = no  
1 = yes

ENTIRE PERIOD

**NL30** If the story or somebody in story mentions referendums on matters of European integration, is the story rather **supportive of holding referendums on matters of EU integration** or does it **oppose referendums on matters of EU integration**?

**Integration here is both vertical as well as horizontal**

9 = not applicable / not mentioned  
0 = mentioned but not evaluated  
1 = negative/opposed  
2 = rather negative  
3 = balanced/mixed  
4 = rather positive  
5 = positive/supportive

ENTIRE PERIOD

**NL31** Wordt **de jeugd of een jeugd-specifiek onderwerp**/probleem in de tekst genoemd?

*Note:* Groepen van jongeren (studenten, scholieren, jongeren organisaties, de volgende generatie) tellen als benoemingen. Enkele jongeren (groepen kleiner dan 10) tellen niet mee.

*Note:* Jeugd specifieke onderwerpen/probleem zijn bijvoorbeeld jeugdwerkeloosheid, maar ook de EO jongerendag.

0 = Nee  
1 = Ja

ENTIRE PERIOD

**NL32a-g** Are there **online sources** mentioned in the news article? In other words, is information/text  included that originates from an online source**?**

*For example:*Vanmiddag meldt Tijn Sadée, onze correspondent in Brussel, op Twitter: "Chaos groot binnen eurofractie PVV. Na opstappen Stassen nu verklaring europarlementariër Lucas Hartong Radio1: ‘Drive is er steeds minder"

*Multiple answers are possible:*

* No
* Yes, Twitter
* Yes, Facebook
* Yes, LinkedIn
* Yes, YouTube
* Yes, online news website (such as [nu.nl](https://webmail.uva.nl/owa/redir.aspx?C=KfjfYVjxSEq4wp15yWab6tdI3EzUJtEI0qGurBpPV6EsnIRgRwQCN3jMoRD8FEryzN98xWDmD1c.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fnu.nl), [nos.nl](https://webmail.uva.nl/owa/redir.aspx?C=KfjfYVjxSEq4wp15yWab6tdI3EzUJtEI0qGurBpPV6EsnIRgRwQCN3jMoRD8FEryzN98xWDmD1c.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fnos.nl), [news.google.nl](https://webmail.uva.nl/owa/redir.aspx?C=KfjfYVjxSEq4wp15yWab6tdI3EzUJtEI0qGurBpPV6EsnIRgRwQCN3jMoRD8FEryzN98xWDmD1c.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fnews.google.nl))
* Yes, online comments under newsarticles
* Yes, party website
* Yes, politician
* Yes, blog
* Yes, email
* Yes, governmental website
* Yes, other social media
* Yes, other online media, i.e.:

**NL33** *IS THE STORY* **ABOUT\*** *THE* **EUROPEAN PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS AND/OR THE CAMPAIGN?**

**0= no  
1 = yes**

SCREENING SELECTION:

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

**ONLY CODE STORIES BEYOND THIS POINT (NL34-end) IF THEY ARE ABOUT\* THE EU PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS AND/OR THE CAMPAIGN**

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

*TV: mentioned once  
Newspapers: mentioned once*

**FRAMES**

FILTER: ALL VARIABLES BELOW ARE ONLY CODED WHEN NL33=1

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL34** **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says depicts so):** Does the story (or somebody in the story) mention t**wo or more than two sides** of (i.e., not two separate arguments of but **two or more distinct perspectives** on) a problem or issue?

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

0 = no  
1 = yes, two sides  
2 = yes, three or more

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL35 Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Are one or more *actors* (only actors, though not necessarily one of actors 1-6!) called(potential) **“winners”** or **“losers”**? (e.g., “The winner of the day was politician/party X”).

*Note:* Has to be mentioned explicitly – not victims, refugees that are not **called** “losers” or dictators that are not **called** “winners”, for instance.

0 = no  
1 = yes

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL36 Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention a person’s, group’s, institution’s or organization’s **presentation and style –** of how, in which way, in which manner they handle an issue? (e.g., competently, nervously, proudly, elegantly, badly, ill-prepared, hastily etc.).

0 = no  
1 = yes

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL37 Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention that an action of a person, group, institution or organization was taken in order to **stabilize,** **consolidate or enhance his/her/its position,** in order to make him/her/it look better in public opinion or in the political arena? I.e., does the story mention **a tactical, calculated or strategic move with a certain motivation**?

0 = no  
1 = yes

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL39 Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention that the European Parliamentary election campaign is boring, the turnout is expected to be low, and people are not interested in the elections or the campaign **or** that the election campaign is exciting, turnout is expected to be high and people are interested in the campaign? If there is equal reference to both code “3”; if both are mentioned but one is given more prominence code the respective code (either “1” or “2”).

9 = not applicable / not mentioned  
1 = boring, low turnout, or people are not interested  
2 = exciting, high turnout, people are interested  
3 = both, boring and exiting

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL40** Does the story, or somebody quoted in the story, mention *predictions of the outcome* of the European Parliamentary elections?

*Note:* Code ‘2’ if the story refers to an expected outcome in general, e.g. “The labour party will certainly be doing well in the elections”, or “[Labour politician X] expects to gain a seat”.

Code ‘3’ if the story includes a verbal/textual description of a poll AND a prediction of the outcome of the election, e.g. “The labour party is leading in the polls” (note: the story should not include actual numbers (in which case the story should be coded as ‘4’), rather it NEEDS to include some explicit *reference to opinion polls*). A poll mentioning is considered general if it does not contain numbers, it does not matter whether the poll is about a specific party at a specific point in time or just about the general trend of a party in the polls, both can be coded as ‘3’ (or ‘4” if they contain actual numbers).

Code ‘4’ if the story refers to opinion polls and actual numbers are mentioned, e.g. “15% of the votes” of “30 seats” of “1 seat less than last week” count as actual numbers.

0= No  
1 = Yes, but polls are NOT mentioned explicitly   
2 = Yes, polls are mentioned in general  
3 = Yes, polls and actual poll results are mentioned

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF NL40 = [2,3,4]

**NL41** If predictions of the outcome of the elections are mentioned, how well or poorly are the following parties expected to perform **in the European Parliamentary elections**?

**a.** VVD  
**b.** PvdA  
**c.** CDA  
**d.** D66  
**f.** PVV  
**g.** SP

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

0 = Not applicable/no prediction  
1 = Worse   
3 = About the same, i.e. no change  
5 = Better  
9 = Both, better and worse

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL42a** Does the story mention any of the following Dutch political parties? Only tick if the PARTY is mentioned. (multiple apply, answer not compulsory)

**a.** VVD  
**b.** PvdA  
**c.** CDA  
**d.** D66  
**f.**PVV  
**g.** SP

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER: NL42=coded, for each party coded above

**NL42b** *Voor elke partij uit NL42a*  
Welke van de volgende emoties worden expliciet in de tekst (of in dit nieuwsitem) in verband gebracht met deze partij, of gebruikt in de beschrijving van deze partij:

*Note: De emotie kan of door de verteller van het verhaal worden beschreven, maar ook door een actor (bijvoorbeeld de partij, een politicus, journalist of derde persoon zijn) die in het verhaal wordt aangehaald. De emotie hoeft NIET noodzakelijk betrekking te hebben op de beschrijving van de kansen van deze partij voor de verkiezingen, maar als dat WEL zo is, dan zeker ook coderen! Codeer "verrassing: Wel genoemd” als er gerapporteerd wordt over iets onverwachts in verband met een partij, over iets wat de partij heeft gedaan, vindt, of is, (bijvoorbeeld: “Tegen de verwachting in groeit de PVV in de peilingen” of “Roemer komt met verrassend nieuw standpunt over…”).*

1. *Angst*
2. *Woede*
3. *Afkeer*
4. *Hoop*
5. *Frustratie*
6. *Verassing*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Emotie | Niet benoemd | Wel benoemd |
| Angst |  |  |
| Woede |  |  |
| Afkeer |  |  |
| Hoop |  |  |
| Frustratie |  |  |
| Verrassing |  |  |

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL43**  Worden er issues in EU context of in Nederlandse context genoemd?

0.      Nee, geen issues

1.

Ja, in EU context

2.

Ja, in Nederlandse context

3.

Beide, in EU én Nederlandse context

Artikelen over issues zijn: artikelen over de inhoud of consequenties van beleid, over problemen/oplossingen gerelateerd aan beleidsonderwerpen, of over de standpunten van politieke actoren op beleidsonderwerpen. Het gaat hier niet om de specifieke topics, maar of er *in het algemeen* inhoudelijke issues worden besproken. *Voorbeeld:* Een artikel over asielbeleid kan worden besproken in EU context, waarin de *Europese* afspraken omtrent asielbeleid worden genoemd. Maar het kan ook worden besproken in Nederlandse context, waarin plannen van de *Nederlandse* regering omtrent asielbeleid worden genoemd.

Let op:

- De issues hoeven niet het belangrijkste topic van het artikel te zijn. Codeer 1, 2 of 3 als er *minimaal één paragraaf* aan issues wordt besteed. Als issues slechts in een bijzin worden genoemd: codeer 0.

- Ga er bij issues vanuit dat ze in Nederlandse context staan, tenzij er een duidelijke verwijzing naar de EU bij staan (EU, Europarlementariër, Europese afspraken, Brussel, etc.). Een verwijzing naar alleen 'Europese verkiezingen' is niet voldoende voor codering als “EU context”.

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL44** Wordt in het artikel door een van de actoren, of door de journalist zelf, actief of passief, verwezen naar het (Nederlandse) volk? Hierbij zijn tal van synoniemen relevant: „de mensen (in het land/ op straat)“, „de kiezers“, „de bevolking“, „de (gewone) Nederlander(s)“, „de maatschappij“, „het publiek“, „de burgers“, „inwoners van Nederland/Amsterdam/Groningen“, „de brede massa“, „de zwijgende meerderheid“, „Henk en Ingrid“, etc. Als er een duidelijke verwijzing inzit, dan ook „We/ Wij“.

0 = nee  
1 = ja

FILTER IF NL44 = [2]

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL45** Als naar het volk wordt verwezen, gaat het over een benadeling van het volk (ten opzichte van anderen)? Mogelijke synoniemen zijn: het volk wordt benadeeld, het volk wordt bedrogen en/ of belogen, er wordt niet genoeg naar het volk geluisterd, de belangen van het volk worden niet behartigd, etc.

0 = nee  
1 = ja

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

**NL46** Wordt in het artikel door een van de actoren, of door de journalist / columnist (etc.) zelf, actief of passief, verwezen naar de gevestigde politieke orde, op nationaal en internationaal niveau? Het gaat hierbij om algemene verwijzingen, niet om specifieke personen of partijen, maar over „de politici“ „de grote politiek“ „Den Haag (als duidelijk betrekking op Haagse politiek)“ „de (andere) partijen“, „de politieke klasse“ het politieke establishment“ „de politieke vertegenwoordigers“ (in voorgaande gevallen moet het uitdrukkelijk niet gaan over de regering ten opzichte van de oppositie), maar ook over "de Europese Unie", "Brussel" of "Europa" (betrekking hebbend op Europese politiek) .

0 = nee  
1 = ja

FILTER: FROM 17 APRIL 2014

FILTER IF NL46 = [2]

**NL47** Als er naar de gevestigde politieke orde wordt verwezen, wordt er dan duidelijk negatief gesproken over de gevestigde politieke orde? Het gaat hier ook over het afstand nemen van, het zich afzetten tegen, kritiek hebben op.

0 = nee  
1 = ja

NO FILTER, This variable also for core study. Answer long string, no answer needed

V17 Did you have any problems while filling in the coding sheet?