



# IN OR OUT OF THE EU? HOW BRITISH NEWSPAPERS FRAME THE EU REFERENDUM

Bachelor thesis in the Double-Degree  
Programme Public Administration (Special  
Emphasis: European Studies)

Maren Hamelmann

Studentnumber: 1376713  
[m.hamelmann@student.utwente.nl](mailto:m.hamelmann@student.utwente.nl)

University of Twente

MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE  
SUPERV.: ASS. PROF. KOSTAS GEMENIS

EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

Matrikelnummer: 371076  
[m\\_hame01@uni-muenster.de](mailto:m_hame01@uni-muenster.de)

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität  
Münster

INST. FÜR POLITIKWISSENSCHAFT  
SUPERV.: PROF. CHRISTIANE FRANTZ

EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

## Erklärung

Ich versichere an Eides statt, dass ich die nachstehende Arbeit eigenständig und ohne fremde Hilfe angefertigt und mich anderer als der in der Arbeit angegebenen Hilfsmittel nicht bedient habe. Alle Stellen, die sinngemäß oder wörtlich aus Veröffentlichungen übernommen wurden, sind als solche kenntlich gemacht.

Name, Vorname: Hamelmann, Maren

Matrikelnummer: 371076

Ort/ Datum: Münster/ 15.07.2013

Unterschrift: M. Hamelmann

## Table of Contents

<b>Table of tables</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. The British EU Referendum</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Framing Theory</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1. <i>Defining Frames</i>	8
3.2. <i>Conceptual delineation</i>	10
3.3. <i>Frames in EU politics</i>	12
<b>4. Research design</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1. <i>Research Interest and Method</i>	13
4.2. <i>Sampling</i>	15
4.3. <i>Operationalization and coding</i>	16
<b>5. Findings</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1. <i>Which frames do British newspapers use in covering the EU referendum?</i>	19
5.1.1. Frequency of the frame usages	19
5.1.2. Associations between the frames	20
5.1.3. Overall analysis	23
5.2. <i>Are the arguments used by the individual newspapers supporting or opposing the British EU membership?</i>	23
5.2.1. Attitude of the newspapers towards British EU membership	24
5.2.2. Association between the attitude towards EU membership and the frames	26
5.3. <i>Is a general direction discernible, and if so, is it supportive of or opposed to EU membership?</i>	28
5.3.1. Accumulated analysis	28
5.3.2. Comparison	28
<b>6. Conclusion</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>7. Limitations and outlook</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>8. References</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>9. Appendix</b>	<b>35</b>
<i>Appendix A: Article ID List</i>	35
<i>Appendix B: Coding forms</i>	40
<i>Appendix C: Krippendorff's alpha and 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals</i>	44

2013-07-15

*Appendix D: Cross Tabulations*

47

Cross tabulations chapter 5.1.

47

Cross tabulations chapter 5.2.

51

## Table of tables

Table 1: Overview of Krippendorff's alphas .....	18
Table 2: Overview of the associations between the frames .....	20
Table 3: Overview of the associations between the attitude towards British EU membership and the frames .....	26
Table 4: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Conflict Frame).....	44
Table 5: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Strategy Frame) .....	44
Table 6: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Economic Consequences Frame).....	45
Table 7: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Attribution of Responsibility Frame).....	45
Table 8: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Attitude towards British EU membership).....	46
Table 9: Conflict Frame * Attribution of Responsibility Frame .....	47
Table 10: Strategy Frame * Attribution of Responsibility Frame.....	47
Table 11: Conflict Frame * Strategy Frame.....	47
Table 12: Conflict Frame * Economic Consequences Frame .....	47
Table 13: Strategy Frame * Economic Consequences Frame.....	48
Table 14: Conflict Frame * Economic Consequences Frame .....	48
Table 15: Conflict Frame * Attribution of Responsibility Frame .....	48
Table 16: Economic Consequences Frame * Attribution of Responsibility .....	48
Table 17: Strategy Frame * Economic Consequences Frame.....	48
Table 18: Conflict Frame * Strategy Frame.....	49
Table 19: Conflict Frame * Economic Consequences Frame .....	49
Table 20: Strategy Frame * Attribution of Responsibility Frame.....	49
Table 21: Economic Consequences Frame * Attribution of Responsibility Frame.....	49
Table 22: Conflict Frame * Economic Consequences Frame .....	49
Table 23: Strategy Frame * Economic Consequences Frame.....	50
Table 24: Conflict Frame * Strategy Frame.....	50
Table 25: Strategy Frame * Attribution of Responsibility Frame.....	50
Table 26: Economic consequences Frame * Attribution of Responsibility Frame.....	50
Table 27: Conflict Frame * Strategy Frame.....	50
Table 28: Strategy Frame * Economic Consequences Frame.....	51

Table 29: Strategy Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame..... 51

Table 30: Economic Consequences Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame..... 51

Table 31: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Attribution of Responsibility Frame 51

Table 32: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences..... 51

Table 33: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame..... 52

Table 34: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame ..... 52

Table 35: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences Frame..... 52

Table 36: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame ..... 52

Table 37: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame..... 53

Table 38: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences Frame..... 53

Table 39: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame..... 53

Table 40: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame ..... 53

Table 41: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Attribution of Responsibility Frame 53

Table 42: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame..... 54

Table 43: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Attribution of Responsibility Frame 54

Table 44: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences Frame..... 54

Table 45: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame ..... 54

Table 46: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Attribution of Responsibility Frame 55

Table 47: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame ..... 55

Table 48: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences Frame..... 55

Table 49: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame..... 55

## 1. Introduction

*“It is time for the British people to have their say. It is time to settle this European question in British politics. I say to the British people: this will be your decision.”*

It was 8 o’clock in the morning, on January 23<sup>rd</sup> 2013, when the British Prime Minister David Cameron held his long-awaited speech on the European Union (EU) and promised a referendum about British EU membership to be held before 2017. The vast majority of the British people, however, were not able to be present at Bloomberg’s to listen to the speech. Nevertheless, 82% were aware of it (Finkelstein, 2013) as they saw it on television, heard it on the radio, or read it in the newspapers.

Media play an important role in today’s societies as intermediaries between the people and politics. This puts them into the position of influencing public perception about the mediated issues. Media research has found that media are not only able to influence *what* we perceive by selecting the issues which are being mediated, but also *how* we perceive those issues. They do so by framing news in specific contexts, highlighting certain aspects of an issue and downplaying others (Dahinden, 2006). Newspapers seem to show the greatest variation in media content, due to differences in readership, distribution areas and political alignment (Dalton, Beck and Huckfeldt, 1998).

In cases of referendums, where people have the opportunity to directly express their opinion on certain political topics, this position of media gains special political relevance. Opinion on a topic is shaped by one’s perception of it, which in turn is influenced by media coverage.

This thesis aims at analyzing how British newspapers frame the EU referendum. Chapter 2 provides a short overview over the referendum as it has been announced by David Cameron. Chapter 3 elaborates on the concept of framing and provides the theoretical background of this thesis. After considerations about the methodological concept and the research design in chapter 4, chapter 5 analyses which frames are used by British newspapers in covering the EU referendum and the attitude towards British EU membership expressed by these articles. Chapter 6 draws conclusion based on the findings presented in the previous chapter. The thesis is completed by elaborations on the limitations of this study and an outlook on possible research following therefrom (chapter 7).

## **2. The British EU Referendum**

The United Kingdom (UK) is traditionally a country sceptical of European integration. The country did not engage in the talks that established European Coal and Steel Community (Bogdanor, 2012) and did not attempt to join the European Community (EC) before 1963. After the first attempt that was vetoed by France, it was not until 1973 that the UK finally joined the EC (Apa, 2005). Since then the British government negotiated several opt-outs from European Union (EU) treaties (Bogdanor, 2012).

Explanations of the British scepticism for Europe (Euroscepticism) can, on the one hand, be found in the bipolar party system (Gifford, 2008); on the other hand, in the UK's "character of an island nation" (Cameron, 2013; p. 2), a character which has always shaped her relationship with the EU.

However, British Euroscepticism is mostly expressed in public opinion polls but is not fully represented in political decision making (Bogdanor, 2012). In his speech on the EU on January 23<sup>rd</sup> 2013, the British Prime Minister David Cameron acknowledged that "public disillusionment with the EU is at an all-time high" (2013, p. 11) and that it was "time for the British people to have their say" (Cameron, 2013, p. 15). To involve the British people more in the way their country is run, he announced a referendum on British EU membership due to take place in the first half of the next parliamentary season, after renegotiations of the EU's settlement (Cameron, 2013).

There have already been several referendums on the EU in different member states. However, these referendums were mostly about accession or treaty ratifications (European No Campaign, 2004a). The accession referendums were mostly decided in favour of accession. Only Norway voted not to join the EC, respectively the EU in two referendums held in 1972 and 1994 (European No Campaign, 2004b/d). The only member state to leave the EC has been Greenland, following a referendum in 1982 (European No Campaign, 2004c).

The treaty ratification referendums have been less successful. In 1992 Denmark initially rejected the Maastricht Treaty, but accepted it in a referendum held in 1993 after renegotiations. In 2001, Ireland voted against the Nice Treaty, but again the Treaty has been ratified after renegotiations. In 2005, France and the Netherlands rejected the EU Constitution. The UK had planned to hold a referendum on the EU Constitution as well, but stalled it after the No votes in France and the Netherlands. The Lisbon Treaty, following the EU Consti-



2013-07-15

tution, was initially rejected by Ireland in 2008. Again, it was ratified a year later in a second referendum (NSD, 2013).

In the UK, there has only been one referendum on European issues to date. After the UK had joined the EC in 1973 without holding a referendum, Prime Minister Harold Wilson decided in 1975 to hold a referendum – after renegotiations – on continued EC membership. The referendum question was phrased in a way equalling the EC with the Common market, thus stressing the economic aspect of the EC. In 1975, the British people voted to stay in the EC with a great majority of 67.2% (Balsom, 1996).

David Cameron's referendum announcement shows several similarities with this first EC referendum. He plans to hold the referendum after negotiating a new settlement with the EU. This new settlement should, in Cameron's eyes, be based on five principles, the first being competitiveness and a further expanded single market. Furthermore, Cameron envisions the EU as a flexible "network" (2013, p. 8) where all member states have the possibility to take steps towards further integration at their own individual speed. As principle no. 3 Cameron postulates in his speech that "power must be able to flow back to Member States" (2013, p. 10), i.e. competences conferred upon the EU should be reviewed and potentially returned to the member states. Alongside this, Cameron argues in favour of more democratic accountability and a stronger role for national parliaments in the EU decision making process. Cameron's fifth principle is "fairness" (2013, p. 11), by which he means that any new arrangements for the Eurozone must also be workable for countries not being member therein.

Cameron announced that the 2015 Conservative Manifesto "will ask for a mandate [...] to negotiate a new settlement with our European partners in the next Parliament" (2013, p. 14) based on the principles outlined above. Subsequently, he plans to hold a referendum on British membership in this new EU settlement by 2017 (Cameron, 2013).

### **3. Framing Theory**

#### **3.1. Defining Frames**

The concept of 'framing' is discussed in a variety of disciplines. However, the definitions differ significantly amongst them.

2013-07-15

One of the first definitions of frames was established in 1972 by the psychologist Gregory Bateson. In his view, frames are social contexts structuring the communication process and guiding comprehension of the message (Bonfadelli, 2002).

Goffman built on this definition of frames in his book *Frame Analysis*, published in 1974. He describes frames as “definitions of situations” (Goffman, 1974, p.10) which provide “the organisation of experience” (p. 13) and answer the essential question of “what is going on here?” (Dahinden, 2006, p. 38). As Goffman applied the concept of framing to individuals and “interpersonal communication” (Dahinden, 2006, p. 38) rather than mass media, this definition is of only limited use for the present thesis.

In the field of political sciences, frames were defined by Converse (1964) who used the term ‘belief system’. Converse (1964, p.297; cited in Dahinden, 2006, p. 52) states:

“We define a belief system as a configuration of ideas and attitudes in which the elements are bound together by some form of constraint or functional interdependence”.

The problems such a fragmentation and disagreement about the concepts as well as the choice of wording pose to interdisciplinary understanding and cooperation in the analysis of framing have been acknowledged in a variety of publications (cf. Dahinden, 2006; Bonfadelli, 2002). In 1993, Robert Entman made an attempt to reduce the “scattered conceptualisation” (Entman, 1993, p. 51) in his publication *Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm*. Entman’s aim was to “identify and make explicit common tendencies among the various uses of the terms and to suggest a more precise and universal understanding of them” (1993, p. 52). In his definition

*‘to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation’* (Entman, 1993, p. 52).

This definition comprises two functions of framing. On the one hand, the *selection* of the information about a topic that is communicated through a text has in itself implications on public perception of that topic. On the other hand, the application of *salience* to selected information within an article means placing it on a more prominent position or putting

2013-07-15

more weight on a certain aspect, thus forming a hierarchy of reported information and leading public opinion towards the more salient aspects of a topic (Entman, 1993).

Problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and treatment recommendation are identified by Entman to be the aspects comprising a frame (1993). According to him, frames identify a problem, assign causal responsibility for that problem to certain “forces” (p. 52), make moral statements and suggest solutions to the problem together with assumptions on their possible effects (Entman, 1993).

Texts contain these aspects of a frame in form of “certain key-words, stock phrases, stereotyped images [and] sources of information” (Entman, 1993, p. 52) which are thematically linked to each other and thus mutually reinforcing.

Empirical research on media framing is similarly divided. Matthes and Kohring (2004) suggested an inductive approach on identifying media frames that builds upon Entman’s (1993) definition. Their approach aims at identifying in a given text the aspects of frames outlined in this definition and analysing them via a hierarchical cluster analysis (Matthes and Kohring, 2004).

Price, Tewskbury and Powers (1997) chose a different approach. They evaluated the impact of media frames on public opinion by presenting four groups of participants with a newspaper article which they had prepared with four different openings and endings, while the main body was the same for all four groups. This indicates a slightly different understanding of frames, as they are seen as literally ‘framing’ articles – being included in the opening and closing sections – rather than being inherent in the whole body of text.

Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), on the other hand, analysed the whole news stories included in their stories by answering 20 questions designed to represent certain frames. This deductive approach was designed to detect those frames in news coverage of European politics (cf. chapter

### **3.2. Conceptual delineation**

Media research has formed several theories concerning media savvy on public opinion, some of which show conceptual similarities to the framing theory. It is, therefore, important to delineate those theories assessing their commonalities and differences, as well as possible interdependencies.

#### *The Agenda-Setting Theory*

The agenda setting theory postulates that media do not depict an ‘objective’ reality but construe it by the selection of issues covered. Thus they influence the importance of certain issues in the public discourse (Bonfadelli and Friemel, 2011). By contrast, the framing theory focuses on the way specific aspects of an issue are depicted. Some authors see this as a logical follow-up of agenda setting and call it “second level agenda setting” (Dahinden, 2006). This approach, however, neglects the different origins and developments of the two theories (Leonarz, 2006).

Both theories share the assumption that the reception of the media content by the recipients is identical with the message intended by the media producers. Another similarity is the concentration on cognitive rather than attitudinal effects (Dahinden, 2006). Differences, however, lie in the central concepts (issues versus frames), as well as the temporal orientation. While the agenda setting theory focuses on short-term effects, the framing theory considers frames to be long-term patterns of interpretation which can be found across differing issues (Dahinden, 2006).

#### *The Priming Theory*

The priming theory originates in American electoral research. Its main assumption is that the concentration of media on certain topics of electoral campaigns leads recipients to evaluate candidates according to their performance in these matters (Leonarz, 2006). An explanation for this effect is the limited receptiveness of people being unable to remember all facts about a candidate and thus remember only the most accentuated ones (Bonfadelli and Friemel, 2011). Miller and Krosnick (1997, p. 271; cited in Leonarz, 2006, p. 83) emphasise the importance of media coverage during electoral campaigns, stating that “[i]f the media focuses on an issue that plays well for the president, his chances of re-election are much greater than if they pay attention to an issue on which he is perceived to have failed”.

2013-07-15

In contrast to framing theory, which can be applied to every news issue, the priming theory focuses predominantly on public actors like individual politicians or presidential candidates (Price, Tewskbury and Powers, 1997). Furthermore, priming does not only consider cognitive effects but also forms evaluation standards, thus having attitudinal effects (Bonfadelli and Friemel, 2011).

### 3.3. Frames in EU politics

Current research has identified several frames present in news coverage of EU politics. Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) analysed the use of five distinctive frames in Dutch news about the 1997 EU meeting in Amsterdam. The frames included in their analysis were “attribution of responsibility”, “conflict”, “human interest”, “economic consequences” and “morality”. The *attribution of responsibility* frame was seen as assigning responsibility for a problem or the solution thereof to a certain actor (institutions, groups or individuals). The *conflict* frame was defined as “emphasiz[ing] conflict between individuals, groups or institutions as a means of capturing audience interest” (p. 95), often involving a reduction of complex debates into a two-sided conflict. The *human interest* frame was identified as emotionalisation of a topic by focusing on individual stories or experiences. The *economic consequences* frame describes news coverage which predicts (or tries to predict) the economic consequences of an issue on different social groups and actors. The *morality* frame, finally, refers to such news stories that offer a moral evaluation of a problem and give recommendations about its solution (Semetko and Valkenburg, 2000). Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) found the *responsibility* and the *conflict* frames to be the most common frames in Dutch news coverage.

Schuck et al. (2013) focused on frames frequently used in electoral campaign coverage and analysed in how far the usage of these frames was influenced by contextual or country specific conditions. The analysed frames were conflict, strategy, “horse-race” and metacoverage. The researchers described the *conflict* frame as “competition of different ideas” (Schuck et al., 2013, p. 10), not necessarily limited to two positions. The *strategy* frame was found present in news articles covering the “strategic behaviour of political actors” (p. 11). This frame puts more emphasis on the presentation of an issue by politicians than on the issue itself. The “*horse-race*” frame is labelled after the metaphor of political campaigns resembling horse-races, the finish line being the election victory. The presence of this frame can be seen in quotations of public opinion polls showing which candidate or party ‘leads’ in terms of public support. This frame is more salient in majority voting systems than in proportionate electoral systems. The last frame identified in this study is the *metacoverage* frame relating to the media reflecting on their own impact on electoral campaigns and public support of certain candidates. The two most frequent frames identified were the *strategy* frame and the *conflict* frames (Schuck et al., 2013).

2013-07-15

The present study on the British EU referendum is to be seen as an intermediate of the studies drawn upon in this chapter. The referendum is neither an election in terms of nomination of representatives, nor is it directly about EU politics. However, it presents the people with a choice (staying in or leaving the EU) and the policies and politics of the EU play an important role in public debate. Therefore, a combination of the above mentioned frames seems to be worth a scientific evaluation.

The *conflict* frame has been identified by both studies as being frequently used in news coverage on the EU and is hence included in this analysis. The *strategy* frame refers to the efforts of eurosceptics and europhiles alike to influence public opinion. Furthermore, the *economic consequences* frame is expected to be of great importance, since Cameron described the single market as being the most important feature of the EU (Cameron, 2013). Apart from the economic consequences, the EU referendum will have significant political and social consequences for the UK, both internally and externally. On his announcement of the referendum, David Cameron called it “an important choice [...] about our country’s destiny” (2013, p. 15). It is hence interesting to analyse to whom the media assign responsibility for these consequences, as well as for any problems related to the EU referendum. Therefore, the *attribution of responsibility* frame is included in the analysis.

At first glance it seems feasible to also include the *horse-race* frame, as the referendum will be stated in a manner where options are mutually excluding. However, the referendum will not take place before 2015 and depends upon the re-election of the conservative party in the next general elections. Therefore, current public opinion polls are unlikely to have much predicting power.

## **4. Research design**

### **4.1. Research Interest and Method**

The research interest guiding this study is twofold: firstly, the identification of frames British newspapers used in covering the EU referendum and, secondly, the evaluation of arguments employed by these newspapers as supporting or opposing British EU membership. The latter interest can be divided in the assessment of individual newspapers and the aggregation of these findings to discern a general direction in the British newspaper landscape. From these considerations three research questions arise:

1. Which frames do British newspapers use in covering the EU referendum?

2013-07-15

2. Are the arguments used by the individual newspapers supporting or opposing the British EU membership?
3. Is a general direction discernible, and if so, is it supportive of or opposed to EU membership?

To answer these questions, a content analysis is employed. Krippendorff defines content analysis as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contents of their use” (2004, p. 18). In a first step, frames likely to be found in British EU referendum coverage are derived from literature about news frames in EU politics (cf.: chapter 0). These frames are operationalized on the basis of this literature. After the selection of British newspapers included into the analysis, the articles of these newspapers are sampled according to their relevance for answering the research questions (cf.: chapter 0.). The sampled articles are then coded in accordance with the coding scheme developed in chapter 4.3.

In order to assure reliability, a random subsample of the selected articles was coded by two independent coders and inter-coder reliability was assessed using Krippendorff’s alpha.

To answer the first research question, a deductive approach is chosen. Therefore, frames that are frequently linked to European politics are derived from literature (Semetko and Valkenburg, 2000; Schuckel al., 2013) (cf. chapter



2013-07-15

Frames in EU politics). Subsequently, the occurrence of these frames in the sampled newspaper articles is analysed using the conceptualisation suggested by the literature chosen. Although by concentrating on frames already identified possibly new frames cannot be assessed, this approach is more effective and less time-consuming than an inductive approach (Leonarz, 2006) and is, thus, adequate to this thesis.

The second research question is to be answered by coding the articles of the individual newspapers as supporting or opposing EU membership of the UK. My methodological considerations are derived from Dalton, Beck and Huckfeldt (1998). Dalton et al. evaluated the favourability or lack of favourability of US newspapers towards the candidates during the 1992 presidential election campaigns.

The third research question is answered by accumulating the findings on the individual newspapers into an overall analysis.

## 4.2. Sampling

To cover the majority of newspaper readers in the UK, five high circulating newspapers are included into the analysis:<sup>1</sup>

- *The Sun* is a conservative daily tabloid With an estimated circulation of 2,281,990 it is deemed the most wide-spread newspaper in the UK
- *The Daily Telegraph* is a conservative daily quality newspaper with a circulation of 541,036
- *The Times* is a conservative quality newspaper which many people regard as the best British quality newspaper. Its circulation figure in February 2013 was 393,814
- *The Guardian* is a left-liberal daily quality newspaper with a circulation of 193,586
- *The Independent* is a liberal daily quality newspaper with a circulation figure of 75,125

This newspaper selection covers both tabloids and quality newspapers, and takes into account the entire political spectrum of the UK.

My research covers articles published in these five newspapers on the EU referendum between January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013 and February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013. As my research interest focuses on the coverage by these newspapers, “Letters to the editor”, and, thus, readers’ opinions, are not included in the sample.

The articles are sampled using the relevance sampling technique (Krippendorff, 2004). In a first step online databases of the relevant newspapers are searched using the key words ‘EU’ and ‘referendum’. In a first reading, the so retrieved articles are then analysed in accordance with their relevance for answering the research question. Only those articles relevant for the research are included in the sample. The total number of articles thus sampled is 108 (n=108). From these, 21 articles were published in the Sun, 22 articles in the *Daily Telegraph*, 21 articles originate from the *Times*, 25 articles from the *Guardian* and 19 articles from the *Independent*.

As the articles are deliberately sampled for their relevance to the specific research questions of this study, generalizability is limited to the units, e.g. the EU referendum coverage of all British newspapers, and the settings, e.g. other cases where EU member states offer referendums about their EU membership. However, the analysed frames are derived from

---

<sup>1</sup> The descriptions of the newspapers and circulation figures (February 2013) are taken from Eurotopics (2013a-e) and *The Guardian* (2013).

2013-07-15

literature about other EU policies. Therefore research additionally suggests generalizability over the outcomes, e.g. the presence of these frames in news articles about the EU.

### **4.3. Operationalization and coding**

The coding scheme builds upon the operationalization of the included frames introduced by the research this study is based on. In their studies on framing of EU politics and EU parliamentary election Semetko and Valkenburg and Schuck et al. already distinguished indicators for the frames used in their respective studies and showed their adequacy in measuring the frames (Semetko and Valkenburg, 2000; Schuck et al., 2013). These indicators have been rephrased to reflect the specific focus of this thesis.

The coding units are the articles. For each article the frames are coded as 1=present or 0=absent. A single article may contain more than one frame.

On the basis of Schuck et al. (2013), the conflict frame is defined as present in an article, if the article

- shows two or more sides of the EU referendum,
- directly mentions a conflict or disagreement between two or more actors about the EU referendum, or
- features a personal attack or accusation of actors against each other.

The strategy frame is defined as present in an article, if it

- covers an actor's presentation or style,
- evaluates an actor's actions as being strategic to obtain that actor's objectives concerning the EU referendum, or
- uses "metaphors from the language of games, sport, and or war" (Schuck et al., 2013, p. 15).

On the basis of Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), the economic interest frame is seen as present, if an article

- elaborates on the cost or expenses involved in the EU referendum,
- makes presumptions about the degree of financial gains or losses related to the EU referendum, or
- mentions economic consequences of possible referendum outcomes.

2013-07-15

The attribution of responsibility frame is defined as being present, if the article

- mentions a problem related to the EU referendum requiring a solution and
- identifies an actor as being responsible for the problem, or
- expects an actor to have the ability to solve the problem (Semetko, Valkenburg, 2000).

The attitude towards British EU membership is coded as 1=supporting, 0=balanced, -1=opposing and 9=indifferent. There are explicit and implicit ways of showing support or opposition, such as quotes of arguments by influential actors or stating aspects of an issue in a favourable or unfavourable light. Accordingly, articles are defined as

- supporting the British EU membership, if they
  - directly or indirectly quote an argument supporting EU membership,
  - provide own arguments supporting EU membership, or
  - offer a positive evaluation of the EU and/or hitherto EU membership.
- balanced, if they offer both positive and negative arguments concerning British EU membership
- opposing British EU membership, if they
  - directly or indirectly quote an argument opposing EU membership,
  - provide own arguments opposing EU membership, or
  - offer a negative evaluation of the EU and/or hitherto EU membership.
- Indifferent, if they do not convey any arguments about British EU membership.

## **5. Findings**

The objective of this study is to identify frames used by British daily newspapers in regard to the announced EU referendum, as well as to analyse, whether these newspapers are supporting or opposing the British EU membership, thereby indirectly recommending a specific referendum outcome.

The coding process showed that many articles do not solely cover the EU referendum but rather combine the referendum coverage with other issues of national importance, such as the general economic development. To be able to answer the research questions accurately, these other issues were left aside when coding the articles. For the second research question, articles not covering advantages or disadvantages of EU membership and not conveying any attitude towards EU membership were coded as 'indifferent', as the concentration

on purely national impacts of the referendum announcement may also have an empirical significance.

Since the data in content analyses is usually collected by human coders assigning values to the analysed texts, it is generally open to interpretation. In order to be able to derive authoritative conclusions from these data, their trustworthiness has to be determined. One way of reaching that goal is to assess the reproducibility of the data, which means that different coders code the text in similar ways independently of each other. This reproducibility is also called inter-coder reliability (Hayes and Krippendorff, 2007). Krippendorff's alpha has been recommended by Hayes and Krippendorff (2007) as standard reliability measurement, since it "generalizes across scales of measurement; can be used with any number of observers, with or without missing data; and it satisfies all of the important criteria for a good measure of reliability" (Hayes and Krippendorff, 2007, p. 78). Furthermore it can be easily calculated by a free macro for SPSS that can be downloaded at <http://www.afhayes.com/spss-sas-and-mplus-macros-and-code.html>.

To assess inter-coder reliability, a randomly sampled subsample of ten of the 108 articles was coded by two independent coders. In analysing the inter-coder reliability of the frames, the nominal Krippendorff's alpha has been computed. In analysing inter-coder reliability of the attitude towards British EU membership, the ordinal Krippendorff's alpha was computed. **Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.** presents an overview of the respective Krippendorff's alphas.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 1: Overview of Krippendorff's alphas**

Frame	Krippendorff's alpha
Conflict Frame	0.548 (nominal)
Strategy Frame	0.240 (nominal)
Economic Consequences Frame	0.791 (nominal)
Attribution of Responsibility Frame	0.374 (nominal)
Attitude towards British EU membership	0.496 (nominal with missing values as a discrete category, 1 if ordinal with missing values)

While this shows a modest degree of reliability for the conflict frame and the economic consequences frame, as well as for the attitude towards EU membership, reliability for the strategy frame and the attribution of responsibility frame is quite low. Low reliability poses the problem of non-reproducibility of data and, therefore, a limited verifiability of the analysis. However, restating the coding instructions in a more restrictive way in order to

<sup>2</sup> For the exact tables of Krippendorff's alpha and the 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals see Appendix C: Krippendorff's alpha and 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals.

2013-07-15

enhance reliability would risk constraining the freedom of interpretation of these frames, thus limiting the richness of analysis (Krippendorff, 2004). Other measures to enhance the reliability of these frames, such as coder training or coding by more coders, would go beyond the scope of a bachelor's thesis. Therefore, the analysis is conducted including the two frames, keeping in mind the low degree of reliability and the problems arising therefrom.

### **5.1. Which frames do British newspapers use in covering the EU referendum?**

To answer the first research question, the frequency in which the different frames were used in the individual newspapers was assessed. Moreover, correlation between the frames was analysed to show possible links between the usages of these frames. Since the frames are measured as binary variables, Cramér's  $V$  is chosen as association coefficient. Cramér's  $V$  is based on the chi square test, but it is easier to interpret in terms of strength of an association, since it has a definite maximum of 1 (Kühnel and Krebs, 2010). Furthermore, Fisher's exact test is conducted to better assess the significance of found associations. Fisher's exact test is used in 2x2 tables with expected cell frequencies lower than five, as the chi square test is less reliable with such small numbers of observations (Bower, n.d.).

#### *5.1.1. Frequency of the frame usages*

The frame most frequently used in the *Sun* was the attribution of responsibility frame, which was found in 71.4% of the analysed articles. The conflict frame was present in 66.7% of the articles, while the strategy frame and the economic consequences frame were used in 28.6% and 14.3% of the articles, respectively.

This shows a special awareness of the question of responsibility for problems related with the referendum and suggests a concentration on the national implications of the referendum and its announcements, as well as political debate. The strategy of political actors and possible economic consequences of the referendum are of less importance.

The *Daily Telegraph* most frequently used the conflict frame (68.2%). The strategy frame was present in 45.5% of the articles and the economic consequences frame in 36.4% of the articles. The attribution of responsibility frame was only used in 31.8% of the articles in the *Daily Telegraph*.

2013-07-15

This points to a focus on political debate and the style of the political actors. Economy also plays an important role in the referendum coverage of the *Daily Telegraph*, while attribution of responsibility for referendum problems is not prominently placed in the coverage.

In the referendum coverage of the *Times*, the conflict frame is present in 71.4% of the analysed articles. It is followed by the strategy frame and the attribution of responsibility frame, both used in 47.6% of the articles. The frequency of the economic consequences frame is 33.3%.

As in the *Daily Telegraph*, political debate plays a major role in the referendum coverage of the *Times*. The strategy of political actors and attribution of responsibility for problems of the referendum are also important, whereby the economic consequences seem to be of less interest.

The *Guardian* also used the conflict frame most frequently (76%). 56% of the articles contained the strategy frame and 48% the attribution of responsibility frame. The economic consequences frame was found in 36% of the articles.

The *Independent* employed both the conflict and the strategy frame in 68.4% of the articles relevant to this study. The attribution of responsibility frame can be found in 47.4% of the articles, whereas the economic consequences frame is present in 36.8%.

This newspaper's coverage shows a greater weight being put on the strategy and style of political actors than the other analysed newspapers. However, the weighing of the other frames stays relatively constant.

### 5.1.2. Associations between the frames

An overview of the associations between the frames is presented in **Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.** The 2x2 tables can be found in Appendix D: Cross Tabulations.

Table 2: Overview of the associations between the frames

Newspaper	Frame	Cramér's V	Fisher exact test (two-tailed)
The Sun	Conflict by Strategy	0.224 (0.306)	(0.354)
	Conflict by Economy	0.289 (0.186)	(0.521)
	Conflict by Responsibility	0.447 (0.040)	(0.061)
	Strategy by Economy	0.043 (0.844)	(1.0)

	Strategy by Responsibility	0.400 (0.067)	(0.123)
	Economy by Responsibility	0.043 (0.844)	(1.0)
The Daily Telegraph	Conflict by Strategy	0.036 (0.867)	(1.0)
	Conflict by Economy	0.498 (0.020)	(0.052)
	Conflict by Responsibility	0.371 (0.081)	(0.145)
	Strategy by Economy	0.500 (0.019)	(0.031)
	Strategy by Responsibility	0.036 (0.867)	(1.0)
	Economy by Responsibility	0.295 (0.166)	(0.343)
The Times	Conflict by Strategy	0.241 (0.269)	(0.361)
	Conflict by Economy	0.224 (0.306)	(0.613)
	Conflict by Responsibility	0.030 (0.890)	(1.0)
	Strategy by Economy	0.472 (0.031)	(0.063)
	Strategy by Responsibility	0.145 (0.505)	(0.670)
	Economy by Responsibility	0.135 (0.537)	(0.659)
The Guardian	Conflict by Strategy	0.257 (0.199)	(0.350)
	Conflict by Economy	0.749 (<0.001)	(<0.001)
	Conflict by Responsibility	0.022 (0.910)	(1.0)
	Strategy by Economy	0.342 (0.087)	(0.115)
	Strategy by Responsibility	0.116 (0.561)	(0.695)
	Economy by Responsibility	0.113 (0.571)	(0.688)
The Independent	Conflict by Strategy	0.218 (0.342)	(0.605)
	Conflict by Economy	0.049 (0.829)	(1.0)
	Conflict by Responsibility	0.036 (0.876)	(1.0)
	Strategy by Economy	0.655 (0.004)	(0.010)
	Strategy by Responsibility	0.263 (0.252)	(0.350)
	Economy by Responsibility	0.150 (0.515)	(0.650)

**Note: Entries in parentheses are p values**

The analysis of the *Sun*'s referendum coverage shows that the conflict frame and attribution of responsibility frame were more often used together in one article than separately. The conflict frame and the strategy frame were only rarely used together. The strategy frame was only used in articles also containing the attribution of responsibility frame, while the attribution of responsibility frame was more often used separate from the strategy frame. The economic consequences frame is only used in articles also containing the conflict frame. However, the conflict frame is more often used in articles not containing the economic consequences frame. Only the association between the conflict frame and the attribution of responsibility frame shows some significance under Fisher's exact test.

What is remarkable on the referendum coverage of the *Daily Telegraph* is that the association between the two most commonly used frames, namely the conflict frame and the strategy frame, is very weak. Descriptions of conflicts or debates about the referendum seem not to be linked to discussions about the presentation, style or objectives of the political actors. The strategy frame and the economic consequences frame, as well as the conflict frame and the economic consequences frame, and the conflict frame and the attribution of



2013-07-15

responsibility frame are mostly used separately of each other. Articles covering the attribution of responsibility frame are only slightly more likely to also cover the economic consequences frame. Fisher's exact test shows a significance of the association between the conflict frame and the economic consequences frame, as well as between the strategy frame and the economic consequences frame.

In the *Times*, the strategy frame and the economic consequences frame, as well as the strategy frame and the attribution of responsibility frame, are more often used in separate articles. While the strategy frame is more often used in combination with the conflict frame, the conflict frame is more often used on its own. This can be explained by the greater occurrence of the conflict frame in the articles. The same is true for the conflict frame and the economic consequences frame. Furthermore, the attribution of responsibility frame is more often used separately of the economic consequences frame, whereas the economic consequences frame is more often used in combination with the attribution of responsibility frame. Again, this discrepancy can be explained by the greater usage of the attribution of responsibility frame. The association between the strategy frame and the economic consequences frame is found to be significant.

The *Guardian's* EU referendum coverage indicates that the conflict frame and the economic interest frame are nearly mutually excluding. Most articles cover either political conflict or debate or the economic consequences of the referendum. The strategy frame and the economic consequences frame are also more often used separately from each other. The strategy frame and the conflict frame are mainly used together. Articles covering political debate are also likely to cover the style or strategy of the involved actors. The strategy frame is slightly more often used without the attribution of responsibility frame than in combination with it, while the economic consequences frame is more often used in combination with the attribution of responsibility frame. However, the attribution of responsibility frame is more often used separately from the economic consequences frame. There is a very strong significance of the association between the conflict frame and the economic consequences frame.

In the *Independent's* referendum coverage, the conflict frame and the strategy frame are most often used in combination, which reinforces the finding that they are used in the same percentage of articles. The strategy frame and the economic consequences frame are nearly mutually exclusive. While the strategy frame is more often used in articles not covering the attribution of responsibility frame, the attribution of responsibility frame is more often

2013-07-15

used in combination with the strategy frame. The economic consequences frame is more often used in combination with the attribution of responsibility frame. However, the opposite is true for the attribution of responsibility frame. Association between the strategy frame and the economic consequences frame is significant.

### 5.1.3. Overall analysis

Taking into account the findings for all newspapers analysed, one can say that the conflict frame is most frequently used in British newspaper coverage of the EU referendum, followed by the strategy and the attribution of responsibility frame. In every individual newspaper the economic consequences frame was the least frequently used. This partly reflects the findings by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) and Schuck et al. (2013), who found the conflict frame to be among those most frequently used in EU political coverage. However, in their studies the attribution of responsibility frame (Semetko, Valkenburg, 2000) and the strategy frame (Schuck et al., 2013) were found to be even more present. This deviance can be explained by the conflict-laden atmosphere on EU matters specific to the UK. The prevalence of the attribution of responsibility frame in the *Sun*'s referendum coverage is, however, likewise contradicting the findings of Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), who found this frame to be more present in quality news coverage. The low presence of the economic consequences frame seems to be surprising, given the strong priority allocated to the single market as the most important feature of the EU by David Cameron (2013).

One of the striking aspects of the association between the frames is that between the economic consequences frame and the attribution of responsibility frame. This association is affirmed by findings of all individual newspapers except the *Sun*, where it is very weak. Findings show that in British newspapers responsibility is mainly assigned to economic consequences or problems, rather than political ones. Another association found in every individual newspaper is a negative correlation between the strategy frame and the economic interest frame. These two frames appear to be rarely used within the same articles. The same is true for the conflict frame and the economic consequences frame.

Fisher's exact test revealed that most of the significant associations contain the economic consequences frame with either the conflict frame or the strategy frame.

## **5.2. Are the arguments used by the individual newspapers supporting or opposing the British EU membership?**

2013-07-15

The second research question is answered by analysing the articles of the individual newspapers for their evaluative content on British EU membership or the EU as such. Therefore, the percentages of supporting, balanced, opposing or indifferent arguments employed in the articles are compared. As articles indifferent to EU membership do not allow inferences about a newspaper's preferences concerning the referendum, the statistical mean is calculated in a second step without those values. A positive mean represents a mostly positive evaluation, whereas a negative mean indicates a rather Eurosceptic attitude. Finally, association between the frames identified above and the attitude towards EU membership is assessed. Again, Cramér's V is chosen as association coefficient.

### *5.2.1. Attitude of the newspapers towards British EU membership*

A large majority of 47.6% of the articles published in the *Sun* was indifferent about British EU membership. This indicates that a possible referendum outcome was deemed less important than domestic political consequences following the announcement of the referendum. Supporting and opposing arguments amount to 23.8% each, whereas only 4.8% of the articles were balanced.

Overall, the *Sun*'s referendum coverage was perfectly balanced. This balance is expressed by a statistical mean of 0.0. However, this balance did not arise from the single articles being balanced in their covering, but from the evenly distribution of supporting and opposing articles. This suggests that the newspaper does not have a distinct attitude towards the EU. On the other hand, the great number of articles not covering the benefits or disadvantages of EU membership at all hints at a rather low importance attached to that issue, whereas domestic issues arising from the referendum announcement – such as a party's chances in the general election, politicians' and people's support for the referendum as such or the likelihood of the referendum happening – received greater attention. The results also show a clear partition between Europhiles and Eurosceptics, with only a few articles providing arguments for both attitudes towards Europe.

The *Daily Telegraph* shows a quite different distribution in its referendum coverage. 36.4% of the analysed articles supported EU membership. 31.8% expressed a balanced view on EU membership and merely 18.2% were indifferent towards that issue. A minority of 13.6% of the articles opposed a continued EU membership.

The *Daily Telegraph* attaches greater importance to the question of EU membership than to domestic problems related to the referendum. Simultaneously, the partition between

2013-07-15

Eurosceptics and Europhiles is less pronounced than in the *Sun*'s referendum coverage. A statistical mean of 0.278 highlights the supportive attitude towards EU membership already conveyed in the distribution of arguments above. The fact that nearly a third of the articles are taking a balanced position, however, hints at a more reflective and critical approach towards this issue.

Strikingly, not a single article of the *Times* included in this analysis was found to be directly opposing British EU membership. This is surprising, as *eurotopics.net*, a website of the Federal agency for Civic Education ("Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung") covering the news coverage of major newspapers of the European member states, characterises it as being sceptical towards European integration (eurotopics, 2013c). However, 42.9% of the articles analysed supported a continued British EU membership. 28.6% expressed a balanced view, while another 28.6% were indifferent towards this question.

With a statistical mean of 0.6 the *Times* shows to be considerably more euro-friendly than the *Daily Telegraph* or the *Sun*. However, the percentage of balanced coverage of EU membership is smaller than that of the *Daily Telegraph*, and negative views are only expressed where they are counterweighted by positive arguments. The *Times*' referendum coverage, therefore, appears to be quite biased towards staying in the EU. Moreover, the percentage of indifferent articles suggest a considerable attention being paid to domestic issues concerning the referendum announcement, although the question of a possible referendum outcome can be seen as more important.

The *Guardian* supported EU membership in 44% of the analysed articles. 32% of the articles were indifferent towards EU membership. While 20% of the articles were written in a balanced manner, only 4% were found to be opposing EU membership.

The *Guardian* shows an even greater degree of support towards continued EU membership than the *Times*. This support is slightly countered by a small amount of eurosceptic coverage, though there is still a pro-European bias discernible. Accordingly, the statistical mean is 0.588, which is lower than that of the *Times*, but still distinctly euro-friendly. Balanced coverage amounts to only half of the articles explicitly supporting EU membership, pointing towards a less reflective approach than found in the *Daily Telegraph* coverage. Almost a third of the articles were indifferent towards a continued EU membership. This suggests that the *Guardian* is aware of domestic issues concerning the referendum. Yet, benefits of the EU membership receive a greater attention.

2013-07-15

Of all the analysed newspapers, the Independent shows the greatest bias towards supporting EU membership. More than half of the articles (52.6%) explicitly argued in favour of staying in the EU, while a minority of 10.5% opposed that stance. Only 5.3% of the articles expressed a balanced view on the issue by providing both supporting and opposing arguments. 31.6% of the articles expressed no view towards EU membership.

As in the *Guardian*, nearly a third of the articles concentrated on domestic issues regarding the referendum. From the remaining articles, however, an overwhelming majority supported a continued membership, the statistical mean is 0.615. Negative views were expressed solely in subjective statements, while a balanced view was hardly expressed at all. Whereas the other newspapers to a varying degree presented arguments for both positions, although clearly favouring a certain referendum outcome, the Independent did not communicate substantive arguments opposing EU membership and does not seem to reflect on this topic.

#### 5.2.2. Association between the attitude towards EU membership and the frames

**Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.** contains an overview of the associations found between the attitude towards EU membership and the frames used by the individual newspapers (). The 2x2 tables can be found in Appendix D: Cross Tabulations.

**Table 3: Overview of the associations between the attitude towards British EU membership and the frames**

Newspaper	Frame	Cramér's V
The Sun	Attitude by Conflict	0.671 (0.084)
	Attitude by Strategy	0.516 (0.231)
	Attitude by Economy	0.715 (0.060)
	Attitude by Responsibility	0.828 (0.023)
The Daily Telegraph	Attitude by Conflict	0.318 (0.402)
	Attitude by Strategy	0.356 (0.319)
	Attitude by Economy	0.363 (0.306)
	Attitude by Responsibility	0.066 (0.961)
The Times	Attitude by Conflict	0.320 (0.215)
	Attitude by Strategy	0.289 (0.264)
	Attitude by Economy	0.327 (0.205)
	Attitude by Responsibility	0.218 (0.398)
The Guardian	Attitude by Conflict	0.394 (0.267)
	Attitude by Strategy	0.301 (0.464)
	Attitude by Economy	0.340 (0.374)
	Attitude by Responsibility	0.379 (0.296)
The Independent	Attitude by Conflict	0.240 (0.688)
	Attitude by Strategy	0.320 (0.514)
	Attitude by Economy	0.267 (0.629)
	Attitude by Responsibility	0.469 (0.239)

2013-07-15

Note: Entries in parentheses are p values

In the *Sun's* referendum coverage, the attribution of responsibility was mainly present in articles opposing EU membership, while it was absent in those supporting it. The economic consequences frame was only present in articles balanced or supporting EU membership. However, the number of articles containing the economic consequences frame was so small, that this finding might not be reliable. Also the conflict frame has been used more frequently in articles supporting EU membership. Moreover, a higher frequency in the usage of the strategy frame in articles opposing EU membership can be detected.

The *Daily Telegraph* used the economic consequences frame and the conflict frame more often in articles supporting EU membership than in those opposing it. The strategy frame has most frequently been used in balanced articles. However, it was found to be absent in most articles supporting EU membership.

Analysis of the *Time's* referendum coverage indicates that the economic consequences frame, as well as the strategy frame, has been slightly more often used in articles expressing a balanced view on EU membership. The conflict frame has been more frequently used in articles supporting EU membership. Furthermore, the usage of the attribution of responsibility frame was evenly distributed between balanced and supporting articles. It was, however, more often absent in supporting articles.

In the *Guardian*, the conflict frame has again been mainly used in articles supporting EU membership. Cross tabulation shows the attribution of responsibility frame being absent in the majority of supporting articles, while being present in nearly all balanced articles and the one article being opposed towards British EU membership. This could lead towards a tendency towards opposition of EU membership. However, half of the articles containing the attribution of responsibility frame were supporting EU membership, which suggests the previous mentioned tendency to be at least partly due to the small percentage of articles containing this frame. Findings for the economic consequences frame are very similar to those for the attribution of responsibility frame. Furthermore, the strategy frame has been mostly used in articles supporting EU membership.

The attribution of responsibility frame was found to be present in a majority of the *Independent's* articles supporting EU membership. However, it was also found in both articles opposing EU membership, which renders the evaluation of this frame ambiguous. The strategy frame and the conflict frame were mainly found in articles supporting EU mem-

2013-07-15

bership. The economic consequences frame was very evenly distributed within the analysed articles. Therefore, a characterisation of this frame as being more supporting or more opposing EU membership is not possible.

### **5.3. Is a general direction discernible, and if so, is it supportive of or opposed to EU membership?**

To answer this question, data from the individual newspapers was accumulated into a single data set. On this data set the same analysis is applied as was on the individual data sets, analysing the percentages of supporting, balanced, opposing and indifferent articles and assessing the statistical mean, not taking into account the indifferent articles. Afterwards, the findings on the individual newspapers are compared to the accumulated findings to detect any significant deviances.

#### *5.3.1. Accumulated analysis*

A majority of 39.8% of all analysed articles supported the British EU membership. 31.5% of the articles were indifferent towards this question and focused on domestic issues in relationship with the EU referendum. 18.5% expressed a balanced view, while a mere 10.2% opposed EU membership.

Overall, support of British EU membership appears to be a common trend with British newspapers. The statistical mean of the accumulated data is 0.432. Simultaneously, findings hint at a great importance of domestic issues with no direct links to EU membership. The referendum as such – and the announcement thereof – is seen as eminent news of its own, not necessarily leading to a discussion of its possible outcomes. Arguments opposing EU membership are most commonly introduced in balanced articles, where they are contrasted with arguments supporting it. Only a minority of the articles forthrightly opposes British EU membership and suggest exit.

#### *5.3.2. Comparison*

A comparison of the statistical means of the individual newspapers with that of the accumulated data hints at a division of the newspapers into two distinctive groups: one group, whose mean exceeds that of the accumulated data – including the *Guardian*, the *Times* and the *Independent* – and one, whose mean lies below that of the accumulated data - including the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Sun*.

2013-07-15

This seems to indicate a distinction between liberal and conservative newspapers. However, the highly euro-friendly attitude of the *Times*, which is a conservative newspaper, contradicts this assumption.

A more promising approach is to draw a distinction between the newspapers that support EU membership – the *Independent*, the *Times*, the *Guardian* and the *Daily Telegraph* – and the *Sun*, which has a rather ambiguous stand in that issue. This, in fact, proves to be a distinction between quality and tabloid newspapers. The peculiarity of the *Sun* has already been identified in the analysis of the first research question (see Overall analysis) where it was found to be the newspaper to use the attribution of responsibility frame most frequently. A distinction between the *Sun* and the other newspapers analysed, therefore, seems legitimate.

## **6. Conclusion**

This research focused on the frames used by British newspapers in their coverage of the EU referendum announced by David Cameron on January 23<sup>rd</sup> 2013. After a short introduction to the background of the referendum announcement, the framing theory was illustrated and delineated from related theories in media research. Recent studies on framing in media coverage of EU politics and the European parliamentary election in 2009 were assessed to derive identified frames valuable to the study at hand. Articles of five British major daily newspapers were sampled for their relevance to answer the research questions and coded for the presence or absence of the included frames, as well as for containing arguments supporting or opposing British EU membership.

Analysis showed that all of the frames that have been derived from literature were used by the newspapers in their referendum coverage. The most frequently used frame was the conflict frame, followed by the strategy frame. The attribution of responsibility frame was also employed by many articles, while the economic consequences frame was found to be the frame least frequently used in referendum coverage. These findings were observed to be largely consistent with the results of the studies used as basis for the determination of the analysed frames. The greater prevalence of the conflict frame has been explained by country-specific attitude towards the EU. In assessing the associations between the frames those between the economic consequences frame and the attribution of responsibility frame, as well as between the strategy frame and the economic interest frame and the conflict frame and the economic consequences frame have been identified as most striking.



2013-07-15

Furthermore, the newspapers were found to be largely supporting British EU membership. Articles expressing a balanced view or opposing EU membership were found to be employed to a varying degree by the different newspapers. One of the most striking findings was that the *Times* did not publish any article forthrightly opposing EU membership. Moreover, domestic issues related to the referendum announcement appeared to receive great attention, as every newspaper published a series of articles indifferent to the referendum outcome.

The *Sun* occupied a special stance in the group of analysed newspapers. Firstly, it was the only newspaper using the attribution of responsibility frame more often than any other frame including the conflict frame. Secondly, a majority of her articles were found to be indifferent towards EU membership. This proved a focus on domestic referendum implications which is greater than that of the other analysed newspapers. Furthermore, the *Sun*'s referendum coverage showed a strong partition between supporters of and opponents to British EU membership, as supporting and opposing articles were equally frequent, with only a few articles expressing a balanced view. This peculiarity of the *Sun* has been assigned to her being the only tabloid newspaper in the analysed sample.

In evaluating the associations between the frames and the attitude towards British EU membership expressed in the articles using the frames it is striking that the conflict frame was associated with support for British EU membership in all analysed newspaper. The other frames were not so strongly linked to one attitude, but there is still a direction discernible for most of them. The economic consequences frame was associated more with a positive view on the EU membership than a negative one, whereas the attribution of responsibility frame was more linked to articles opposing EU membership. Only the Strategy frame was evenly used in articles supporting and opposing EU membership.

The newspapers' probability of effectively influencing public perception of the EU referendum depends on several conditions. One of them is the distribution of the newspaper, the circulation figure being the most reliable measure. In this term the *Sun* would have the greatest impact, as its circulation figure outnumbers that of all other analysed newspapers counted together. However, circulation figures allow no inferences about the actual readership of a newspaper and are, therefore, inappropriate as sole measurement of newspaper influence. Researchers found the composition of messages published by a newspaper as also having an effect on its persuasive powers. They argue that uniform messages are more persuasive than differentiated ones, as they provide readers with fewer arguments to

2013-07-15

weight against each other (Dalton, Beck and Huckfeldt, 1998). In this term the *Sun* is at a disadvantage as the supporting and opposing arguments contrast each other. The *Independent*, employing only few opposing and even less balanced articles would presumably have a greater influence in this respect. The *Daily Telegraph*, showing a relatively balanced coverage and having medium circulation figures assumedly has the most constant probability of influencing public perception of the referendum.

## **7. Limitations and outlook**

This thesis was designed as a case study on newspaper coverage of the British EU referendum. As the articles were deliberately sampled for their relevance to that study, generalizations are only possible on the British newspaper landscape as a whole or, to a more limited extend, on other EU member states holding a referendum on EU membership. Such a referendum is, however, not planned in any other member state at the moment. Nevertheless, this research offers valuable insights on the ways British newspapers frame their coverage of the referendum and, thus, form public opinion on this matter. Although the referendum will not be held before 2017, this is a question important for the future development of the EU. Moreover, findings show that frames which have already been identified in news coverage of EU politics and European parliamentary elections can also be found in this referendum coverage. This confirms a general use of these frames in news coverage concerning the EU.

Another limitation of this study is that with the chosen deductive approach only those frames could be found which were inferred from theoretical assumptions, thus neglecting new frames that might be present in the referendum coverage. Nevertheless, this approach has been chosen as an inductive approach identifying new frames in the coverage would have gone beyond the scope of a bachelor's thesis. This research can be seen as a starting point into a deeper analysis of the topic.

Lastly, inter-coder reliability of the strategy frame and the attribution of responsibility frame were found to be quite low. A stricter wording of the coding instruction in order to enhance inter-coder reliability would have, however, considerably limited the room for interpretation and constrained the richness of the analysis and has therefore been dismissed. Other measures to enhance reliability would have gone beyond the restraints of a bachelor's thesis, so that the analysis was conducted with the data at hand.

2013-07-15

The findings of this research point to other interesting questions to be analysed in follow-up studies.

As indicated above, an inductive approach could provide an even greater insight about the ways British newspaper frame the EU referendum and shape public opinion on this issue. Matthes and Kohring (2004) suggested a method of inductively analysing news frames that builds upon Entman's (1993) frame definition. This seems to be a promising approach to that question.

Furthermore, this study focused in the aspect of media presentation of the EU referendum. Following that, an analysis of the actual impact media coverage had on recipients' perception and, ultimately, referendum decision, holds great promise. Such a study, however, could not be conducted before the referendum is actually held.

A first possibility for analysing both media coverage and its impact on public opinion is the 2015 general election. Here, media coverage on the election campaigns of the different parties could be analysed. Important questions would focus on the role the referendum played in the electoral campaign and the media coverage thereof, on which frames were employed by the media and whether the media favoured a special election outcome. Afterwards, voters could be asked to answer questions about their voting behaviour, news reception (e.g. which newspaper they read) and whether the news influenced their voting decision.

To this point, however, this research provides valuable insight into the character of the debate taking place in the UK that will influence the future restructuring of the European Union.

## 8. References

Austria Presse Agentur (2005). *Von der EGKS zur EU: Die Gründung der Europäischen Gemeinschaft im Überblick!*. Retrieved May 17, 2013, from <http://www.news.at/articles/0550/11/128466/von-egks-eu-die-gruendung-europaeischen-gemeinschaft-ueberblick>.

Balsom, D. (1996). The United Kingdom: constitutional pragmatism and the adoption of the referendum. In M. Gallagher & P. V. Uleri (eds.). *The Referendum Experience in Europe* p.209-225. Macmillan Press LTD, London.

Bogdanor, V. (2012). *British Euroscepticism*. Retrieved May 17, 2013, from <http://www.social-europe.eu/2012/04/british-euroscepticism/>.

Bonfadelli, H. (2002). *Medieninhaltsforschung*. UKV, Konstanz.

Bonfadelli, H. & Friemel, T. N. (2011). *Medienwirkungsforschung*. 4<sup>th</sup>, completely revised edition, UVK, Konstanz.

Bower, K. M. (n.d.). *When to use Fisher's exact test*. Retrieved July 13, 2013, from [http://www.minitab.com/uploadedFiles/Shared\\_Resources/Documents/Articles/fisher\\_exact\\_test.pdf](http://www.minitab.com/uploadedFiles/Shared_Resources/Documents/Articles/fisher_exact_test.pdf).

Cameron, D. (2013). *Speech EU speech at Bloomberg*. Retrieved May 17, 2013 from <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/eu-speech-at-bloomberg>.

Dahinden, U. (2006). *Framing. Eine integrative Theorie der Massenkommunikation*. UVK, Konstanz.

Dalton, R. J., Beck, P. A. & Huckfeldt, R. (1998): Partisan Cues and the Media: Information Flows in the 1992 Presidential Election. *The American Political Science Review* 92(1), 111-126.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing. Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of communication* 43, 51 – 58.

European No Campaign (2004a). *Referendums on European issues*. Retrieved July 01, 2013, from [www.europeannocampaign.com/175.html](http://www.europeannocampaign.com/175.html).

European No Campaign (2004a). *The Seventies*. Retrieved July 01, 2013, from [www.europeannocampaign.com/176.html](http://www.europeannocampaign.com/176.html).

European No Campaign (2004b). *Referendums on European issues*. Retrieved July 01, 2013, from [www.europeannocampaign.com/175.html](http://www.europeannocampaign.com/175.html).

European No Campaign (2004c). *The Eighties*. Retrieved July 01, 2013, from [www.europeannocampaign.com/177.html](http://www.europeannocampaign.com/177.html).

European No Campaign (2004d). *The Nineties*. Retrieved July 01, 2013, from [www.europeannocampaign.com/178.html](http://www.europeannocampaign.com/178.html).

Eurotopics.net (2013a). *The Sun*. Retrieved June 11, 2013, from [http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media\\_articles/?frommedia=28028](http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media_articles/?frommedia=28028).

2013-07-15

Eurotopics.net (2013b). *The Daily Telegraph*. Retrieved June 11, 2013, from [http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media\\_articles/?frommedia=515](http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media_articles/?frommedia=515).

Eurotopics.net (2013c). *The Times*. Retrieved June 11, 2013, from [http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media\\_articles/?frommedia=245](http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media_articles/?frommedia=245).

Eurotopics.net (2013d). *The Guardian*. Retrieved June 11, 2013, from [http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media\\_articles/?frommedia=250](http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media_articles/?frommedia=250).

Eurotopics.net (2013e). *The Independent*. Retrieved June 11, 2013, from [http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media\\_articles/?frommedia=266](http://www.eurotopics.net/de/home/medienindex/media_articles/?frommedia=266).

Finkelstein, D. (2013, January 25). Big moment with risks attached. *The Times*, London.

Gifford, C. (2008). *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain. Identity and Economy in a Post-Imperial State*. Retrieved May 17, 2013, from <http://www.cui-zy.cn/Recommended/Nature&glabolization/UKEUEmpire.pdf>.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. Harper and Row, New York.

Hayes, A. F. & Krippendorff, K. (2007). Answering the Call for a Standard Reliability Measure for Coding Data. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 1(1), 77-89. Retrieved July 15, 2013, from <http://www.afhayes.com/public/cmm2007.pdf>.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis. An introduction to its methodology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Sage Publ., Thousand Oaks.

Kühnel, S.-M. & Krebs, D. (2010). *Statistik für die Sozialwissenschaften*. 5th edition, Rowohlt, Hamburg.

Leonarz, M. (2006). *Gentechnik im Fernsehen. Eine Framing-Analyse*. Konstanz.

Matthes, J. & Kohring, M. (2004): Die empirische Erfassung von Medienframes. In: *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 52, 56-75.

Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD) (2013). EU related referendums. In: *European Election Database*. Retrieved July 01, 2013, from [www.nsd.uib.no/european\\_election\\_database/election\\_types/eu\\_related\\_referendums.html](http://www.nsd.uib.no/european_election_database/election_types/eu_related_referendums.html).

Price, V., Tewskbury, D. & Powers, E. (1997). Switching trains of thought. The impact of news frames on readers' cognitive responses. In: *Communication Research* 24, 481-506.

Schuck, A. R. T., Vliegthart, R., Boomgaarden, H. G., Elenbaas, M., Azrout, R., Van Spanje, J. & De Vreese, C. H. (2013). Explaining Campaign News Coverage: How Medium, Time, and Context Explain Variation in the Media Framing of the 2009 European Parliamentary Elections. In: *Journal of Political Marketing* 12(1), 8-28.

Semetko, H., A. & Valkenburg, P., M. (2000). Framing European Politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News. In: *Journal of Communication* 50(2), 93-109.

The Guardian (2013). *ABCs: National daily newspaper circulation February 2013*. Retrieved June 11, 2013, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/table/2013/mar/08/abc-national-newspapers>.

2013-07-15

## 9. Appendix

### Appendix A: Article ID List

*The Sun*

S1	"Eu promise." Sun [London, England] 27 Jan. 2013: 16. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S2	"NIC EU 'HYPOCRITE' JIBE." Sun [London, England] 26 Jan. 2013: 2. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S3	"EU referendumb." Sun [London, England] 27 Jan. 2013: 15. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S4	"Well it's no wonder we're all confused." Sun [London, England] 26 Jan. 2013: 11. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S5	"David's master of the European balancing act; Tough, outspoken and sharp." Sun [London, England] 27 Jan. 2013: 29. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S6	"Time to talk tough on economy now." Sun [London, England] 28 Jan. 2013: 8. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S7	"Cam in EU fight on terror." Sun [London, England] 27 Jan. 2013: 2. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S8	"'TORY OBAMA' PLOTTERS." Sun [London, England] 27 Jan. 2013: 2. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S9	"BROTHERLY SHOVE." Sun [London, England] 30 Jan. 2013: 2. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S10	"David 'in Ed Euro poll veto'." Sun [London, England] 30 Jan. 2013: 2. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S11	"Brits' EU ditch poll is blasted." Sun [London, England] 24 Jan. 2013: 2. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S12	"WE ARE SICK OF EU LOT." Sun [London, England] 24 Jan. 2013: 13. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S13	"IN OR OUT? ..EU DECIDE." Sun [London, England] 23 Jan. 2013: 4. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S14	"IN OR OUT? ..EU DECIDE; FINALLY, PM REVEALS 2017 POLL." Sun [London, England] 23 Jan. 2013: 4. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S15	"Bungling Mili says 'never' to Euro poll." Sun [London, England] 24 Jan. 2013: 9. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S16	"TOP MERKS; PM'S LANDMARK REFERENDUM PLEDGE; Merkel backs new EU deal with Cameron; Europe divided but Brits want In-Out vote." Sun [London, England] 24 Jan. 2013: 8. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S17	"Game changer." Sun [London, England] 23 Jan. 2013: 8. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S18	"It's EUr shout." Sun [London, England] 24 Jan. 2013: 8. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S19	"EURO WARZONE." Sun [London, England] 24 Jan. 2013: 2. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S20	"IN OR OUT? ..EU DECIDE." Sun [London, England] 23 Jan. 2013: 4. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.
S21	"EU CONVINCED?" Sun [London, England] 24 Jan. 2013: 11. Infotrac custom newspapers. Web. 6 May 2013.

2013-07-15

*The Daily Telegraph*

DT1	Evans-Pritchard, Ambrose (2013, February 1). Guerilla warfare looms in Europe over City's influence. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business p. 4.
DT2	Dominiczak, Peter; Waterfield, Bruno (2013, February 1). Law and order powers will go back to EU, says Clarke. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , News p. 2.
DT3	N.n. (2013, January 31). A No vote would be fatal mistake, warns Clarke. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , News p. 2.
DT4	Wilson, Harry (2013, January 30). EU exit 'may hit British standards of living'. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business p. 1.
DT5	Riddell, Mary (2013, January 30). Britain badly needs a Lincoln who will think big and act big; MPs in both parties are yearning for a leader who will show courage and imagination. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Editorial; Opinion, Columns; Pg. 18.
DT6	Dominiczak, Peter (2013, January 30). Poland thanks Blair for the jobs. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , News; Front page, p.1.
DT7	Evans-Pritchard, Ambrose (2013, January 28). David Cameron has one great ally - the people of Europe; Comment. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business, p. 2.
DT8	Johnson, Boris (2013, January 28). Only a coward would deny the people their voice on Europe; The Labour leader's rejection of an in-out EU referendum is blatantly undemocratic. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Editorial; opinion, columns, p. 16.
DT9	Winnett, Robert (2013, January 28). We may leave EU if we do not get powers back, top Tory warns. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business, p. 2.
DT10	Johnson, Daniel (2013, January 26). MERKEL WILL HAVE THE LAST WORD; Germany is happy for Britain to negotiate a new deal with the EU. But only on its terms, says Daniel Johnson. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Features, p. 21.
DT11	Mason, Rowena (January 26). Triple-dip slump fails to dent markets; Coalition policy is stifling economy, say experts. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , News; Front page, p.1.
DT12	Reece, Damian (2013, January 25). Business can see a path to EU resolution; Comment. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business, p. 2.
DT13	Aldrick, Philip (2013, January 25). EU has no alternative to the City, says Swedish minister. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business, p. 3.
DT14	Dennys, Harriet (2013, January 25). Blair takes up the EU reins on Politicians Day with PM attack; Davos Diary. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business, p. 3.
DT15	Ahmed, Kamal; Armitstead, Louise (2013, January 25). Soros warns EU vote would be a 'dangerous gambit'. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business, p. 3.
DT16	Nelson, Fraser (2013, January 25). Labour will do anything for the workers - except trust them; While Cameron puts his faith in the people, Miliband clings rigidly to belief in the state. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Editorial; opinion, columns, p. 20.
DT17	Winnett, Robert (2013, January 25). Fix EU or we vote 'out', senior Tories warn. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , News, p. 4.
DT18	N. n.(2013, January 25). Public backs exit; Poll. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , News, p. 4.
DT19	Winnett, Robert (2013, January 25). Fix Europe or we back exit, say Tories; Power struggle. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , News, p. 4.
DT20	Reece, Damian (2013, January 24). Business could cope with an EU exit, but could the politicians?; Comment. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business, p. 2.
DT21	Ahmed, Kamal; Armitstead, Louise (2013, January 24). EU uncertainty 'one of the five big threats to UK economy'; Sir Martin Sorrell says PM's referendum will hit investment, but business leaders divided on issue. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Business, p. 5.
DT22	N.n. (2013, January 24). At last, voters are trusted to choose Britain's future. <i>The Daily Telegraph (London)</i> , Editorial; opinion, columns, p. 21.

2013-07-15

*The Times*

T1	Taylor, David; Watson, Roland (2013, February 4). Global peace and wealth will suffer if Britain quits EU, says US vice-president. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T2	Watson, Roland (2013, January 31). Clarke sets out why quitting EU 'would be fatal for Britain'. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T3	Westerwelle, Guido (2013, January 30). Britain's narrow view of the EU is wrong. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T4	Rifkind, Hugo (2013, January 29). Politicians have lost their nerve: vote yes/no. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T5	Watson, Roland (2013, January 26). Hague ready to tackle EU for better deal. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T6	Sylvester, Rachel; Thomson, Alice (2013, January 26). 'The world is becoming more dangerous. The risk has risen'. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T7	Wighton, David (2013, January 26). It's all downhill from here for Osborne. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T8	Watson, Roland (2013, January 25). Most voters want Britain to quit EU, poll shows. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T9	N.n. (2013, January 25). Miliband's Mistake; Labour's referendum position is inconsistent, wrong and a political error. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T10	Finkelstein, Daniel (2013, January 25). Big moment with risks attached. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T11	Coates, Sam; Fleming, Sam (2013, January 25). Business-elite call for new blood to lead pro-European campaign. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T12	Watson, Roland (2013, January 23). Cameron pledges in-out referendum on Europe. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T13	Wighton, Davis (2013, January 23). Ring, ring ... 'It's all about the backbenchers'. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T14	Watson, Roland; Bremner, Charles (2013, January 24). Business backs PM's call for mandate on Europe. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T15	N.n. (2013, January 24). In or Out. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T16	Watson, Roland; Savage, Michael (2013, January 24). Tories sailing on clear blue water with in-out referendum pledge. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T17	Ollins, Philip (2013, January 24). A vision of Europe. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T18	Treneman, Ann (2013, January 24). Dave the Saviour has his finest 40 minutes. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T19	N.n. (2013, January 24). Merkel holds key to Cameron's prospects ... But her support will come at a price. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T20	King, Ian (2013, January 24). What business really wants is EU growth. <i>The Times (London)</i> .
T21	N.n. (2013, January 24). In or out, what's the PM's vision all about?. <i>The Times (London)</i> .



2013-07-15

*The Guardian*

G1	Harris, John (2013, February 5). G2: Losing the plot: The same-sex marriage bill has opened up deep rifts between the different factions within the Tory party. So how do insiders view the crisis that threatens to engulf David Cameron, asks John Harris. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian features pages, p. 6.
G2	Watt, Nicholas; Travis, Alan (2013, February 1). National: Ex-chancellor who brought down Thatcher attacks PM on Europe: Howe comes out against plan for EU referendum: Coalition near breakdown over justice opt-outs. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 6.
G3	Watt, Nicholas (2013, January 31). Leaving EU would be 'fatal mistake', warns Clarke: UK 'can achieve more in Europe than on our own' Mandelson, Alexander also advise against no vote. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 7.
G4	Milmo, Dan (2013, January 29). EU referendum plan brings warning from defence and aerospace firms. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian financial pages, p. 19.
G5	Syal, Rajeev (2013, January 28). PM will grab your EU rights to destroy them, says TUC boss: O'Grady calls on unions in Europe to fight Cameron Focus on UK economy instead, warns Clegg. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 4.
G6	Bogdanor, Vernon (2013, January 28). Comment: Labour must back this vote: The party's history shows that a referendum can help it bring Europe's elite project back to the people. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian comment and debate pages, p. 24.
G7	Pratley, Nils (2013, January 26). Financial: Nils Pratley on Saturday: Apple has reached its peak - but is it the start of a rot?. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian financial pages, p. 27.
G8	Powell, Jonathan (2013, January 26). Comment: Cameron's fatal mistake: As a seasoned negotiator I have seldom seen a weaker opening hand than this Europe speech. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian Comment and debate pages, p. 34.
G9	Jenkins, Simon (2013, January, 25). Comment: A speech that told Europe's emperors to get dressed: The EU's elder statesmen tried to run before they could walk. We may not like it, but Cameron's call was brave and timely. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian comment and debate pages, p. 35.
G10	Jowit, Juliette (2013, January 25). National: Referendum pledge won't rule out new coalition, says Clegg: Lib Dems could join Tories in government after 2015: Party opposes Cameron's plan for vote on EU future. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 16.
G11	Treanor, Jill (2013, January 24). Sterling facing 'amber warning light' from the markets: Pound has fallen 3.45% against euro this year Economists say avoiding sudden slide is crucial. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian financial pages, p. 24.
G12	Kettle, Martin (2013, January 24). Comment: Cameron was not brave yesterday. He was reckless: This marks the moment when his pragmatic centre-right project finally bent the knee to ideological fantasy. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian comment and debate pages, p. 28.
G13	Garton Ash, Timothy (2013, January 24). Comment: From outside, it's clear why Britain has to stay in Europe: Cameron's speech could have been a lot worse, but five years of anxious uncertainty are bad news for Europe and the world. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian comment and debate pages, p. 29.
G14	Watt, Nicholas; Traynor, Ian; Wintour, Patrick (2013, January 24). Front: Let's talk, says Merkel, as Cameron gambles on EU: Berlin hints at compromise amid French disdain: Tory delight, but warning from business leaders. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 1.
G15	Pulver, Andrew (2013, January 24). Europe: Blazing Blair. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 6.
G16	Watt, Nicholas (2013, January 24). Europe: One speech, many audiences: Nicholas Watt analyses six key extracts that show how David Cameron shaped his speech to appeal to different constituencies. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 6.
G17	McAskill, Ewen; Kaiman, Jonathan; Burke, Jason (2013, January 24). Europe: World reaction: US and China unease over Britain's stance. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 6.
G18	Wintour, Patrick (2013, January 24). Europe: Labour refuses to be swayed by Cameron's rush to ref-

	erendum: Ed Miliband has taken a risk - and disappointed members of the shadow cabinet -by not capitalising on the new Eurosceptic mood. But he may reap benefits in the future, writes Patrick Wintour. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 6.
G19	Elliott, Larry (2013, January 24). Europe: Business reaction: 'We never like uncertainty,' company leaders warn PM. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 7.
G20	Meikle, James; Haider, Hansa (2013, January 24). Europe: Travellers' views: 'It would be a shame if Britain left the EU'. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 8.
G21	Watt, Nicholas (2013, January 24). Europe: Tories back PM's move - but there may be trouble ahead: Conservative MPs rally behind pledge on EU Issue could split party and dominate 2015 elections. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 8.
G22	Hoggart, Simon (2013, January 24). Europe: Simon Hoggart's sketch: In, out, in, out? That's not really what it's all about. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 8.
G23	Editorial (2013, January 24). Leading Article: Cameron's hokey-cokey: In-out EU referendum. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian leader pages, p. 30.
G24	Watt, Nicholas (2013, January 23). Front: Cameron to pledge in-out vote on EU: Revise terms of our membership or trigger British exit, PM tells Europe. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 1.
G25	Wintour, Patrick (2013, January 23). Front: Analysis: Moment of truth for a man opposed to risk. <i>The Guardian (London)</i> , Guardian home pages, p. 2.

### *The Independent*

I 1	Dejevsky, Mary (2013, February 1). The EU has changed Britain - and mostly for the better; EU referendum. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , comment, p. 14.
I 2	Grice, Andrew (2013, January 31). Clarke warns Cameron of 'fatal mistake' of EU opt-out; Leading pro-European MPs unite to launch cross-party campaign group. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 11.
I 3	Grice, Andrew (2013, January 29). Most Labour and Tory voters say EU vote would be bad for the economy; Survey reveals fear that long build-up to poll creates uncertainty. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 2.
I 4	N.n. (2013, January 26). Mr Miliband can afford to be bolder on Europe. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , comment, p. 38.
I 5	Grice, Andrew (2013, January 26). Europe's no longer the PM's problem. The economy is; What will voters be worrying about when they go to the polls in 2015, asks Andrew Grice. A clue: it won't be Brussels. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 6.
I 6	Kinnock, Neil (2013, January 26). How should we convince Britain to stay in the EU? Has the Labour Party improved its image?; The big questions. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , comment, p. 44.
I 7	Hamilton, Adrian (2013, January 25). We risk sliding out of Europe without even wanting to; WORLD VIEW. . <i>The Independent (London)</i> , comment, p. 18.
I 8	Leftly, Mark (2013, January 25). No point reversing to the 1990s on rail franchising if the model is so flawed; OUTLOOK. . <i>The Independent (London)</i> , business, p. 52.
I 9	Grice, Andrew (2013, January 25). Tory ministers who back EU exit must quit Cabinet; Cameron rules out allowing Conservatives to campaign freely against his position. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 4.
I 10	N.n. (2013, January 24). A desperate gamble with Britain's interests; LEADING ARTICLE. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , comment, p. 14.
I 11	Richards, Steve (2013, January 24). He can retreat to a Thatcherite comfort zone, but he won't be safe; Cameron's speech. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , comment, p. 14.
I 12	Farage, Nigel (2013, January 24). Let the war of independence begin here; Referendum. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , comment, p. 14.

I 13	Grice, Andrew (2013, January 24). The ins and outs of a vote on Britain's future; What happens if there's another Coalition - and what about Scottish independence? Andrew Grice on the potential pitfalls of an EU exit. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 4.
I 14	Grice, Andrew (2013, January 24). Handbagged!. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 1.
I 15	Morris, Nigel (2013, January 24). MILIBAND CAUGHT OUT OVER PLANS FOR EU VOTE. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 2.
I 16	Macintyre, Donald (2013, January 24). He's no Galileo, but he managed to make his heresy seem sensible; DONALD MACINTYRE'S SKETCH. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 2.
I 17	Spanier, Gideon (2013, January 24). City raises PM's chances in election following his EU referendum speech. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , business, p. 50.
I 18	Verhofstadt, Guy (2013, January 24). RABBIT FROM A HAT... OR IS IT JUST A DEAD DUCK?; The Prime Minister's aggressive European gambit has prompted a furious debate about the prospect of a 'Brexit'. Here, influential figures tell <i>The Independent</i> whether he's done the right thing... <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 4.
I 19	Grice, Andrew (2013, January 23). In or out? PM pledges EU exit vote by 2017; Landmark speech to set out choice between 'new settlement' and leaving. Cameron: there will be no EU vote before the next election. <i>The Independent (London)</i> , news, p. 1.

## Appendix B: Coding forms

Coding Form: The Sun

Coder ID: MH

Frame Article	Conflict	Strategy	Economic Con- sequences	Attribution of Responsibility	Pro/contra
S1	0	0	0	1	9
S2	1	0	1	1	9
S3	1	0	0	0	9
S4	0	0	0	1	-1
S5	1	1	0	1	-1
S6	0	1	0	1	-1
S7	0	0	0	1	9
S9	0	1	0	1	9
S9	1	0	0	1	9
S10	1	0	0	1	9
S11	1	0	0	0	1
S12	1	0	0	1	9
S13	1	0	0	0	1
S14	1	1	0	1	1
S15	1	0	0	0	9
S16	1	1	1	1	0
S17	0	1	0	1	-1
S19	1	0	0	1	-1
S19	1	0	1	0	1
S20	1	0	0	0	1
S21	0	0	0	1	9

Coding Form: The Daily Telegraph

Coder ID: MH

2013-07-15

Frame Article	Conflict	Strategy	Economic Consequences	Attribution of Responsibility	Pro/contra
DT1	1	0	1	1	1
DT2	1	0	0	0	1
DT3	1	1	0	0	1
DT4	0	0	1	1	1
DT5	1	1	0	0	9
DT6	1	0	0	0	1
DT7	1	1	0	0	1
DT9	0	1	0	1	-1
DT9	1	1	0	0	0
DT10	1	1	0	0	0
DT11	0	0	1	1	9
DT12	0	1	1	0	0
DT13	0	0	1	0	1
DT14	1	0	0	0	9
DT15	1	0	1	0	1
DT16	1	1	0	1	9
DT17	1	0	0	0	0
DT19	0	1	0	0	-1
DT19	1	0	0	0	-1
DT20	0	0	1	1	0
DT21	1	0	1	0	0
DT22	1	1	0	1	0

Coding Form: The Times

Coder ID: MH

Frame Article	Conflict	Strategy	Economic Con- sequences	Attribution of Responsibility	Pro/contra
T1	1	1	0	0	1
T2	1	0	0	0	1
T3	1	0	0	0	1
T4	0	1	0	0	9
T5	1	1	0	0	9
T6	1	1	0	1	0
T7	1	0	1	0	0
T8	1	0	1	0	0
T9	1	0	0	1	9
T10	0	0	0	1	1
T11	1	0	1	0	1
T12	1	1	0	0	1
T13	1	0	1	1	1
T14	1	1	0	1	0
T15	0	1	0	0	9
T16	1	0	1	1	0
T17	0	1	0	0	9
T18	0	1	0	1	9
T19	1	0	0	1	1
T20	0	0	1	1	1
T21	1	1	1	1	0

Coding Form: The Guardian

Coder ID: MH

Frame Article	Conflict	Strategy	Economic Con- sequences	Attribution of Responsibility	Pro/contra
G1	1	1	0	0	9
G2	1	1	0	1	1
G3	1	0	0	1	1
G4	0	0	1	0	1
G5	1	0	1	1	0
G6	0	0	1	1	0
G7	1	1	0	0	9
G9	1	1	0	1	1
G9	0	1	1	1	-1
G10	1	1	1	0	1
G11	0	0	1	0	9
G12	1	1	0	0	1
G13	0	1	1	1	1
G14	1	1	0	0	1
G15	1	0	0	0	9
G16	1	1	0	0	9
G17	0	0	1	0	1
G19	1	1	0	1	1
G19	1	0	1	1	0
G20	1	0	0	0	1
G21	1	1	0	1	0
G22	1	1	0	0	9
G23	1	0	0	1	9
G24	1	1	0	0	0
G25	1	0	0	1	9

2013-07-15

Coding Form: The Independent

Coder ID: MH

Frame Article	Conflict	Strategy	Economic Consequences	Attribution of Responsibility	Pro/contra
I 1	0	1	0	0	1
I 2	1	1	0	0	1
I 3	1	0	1	1	-1
I 4	1	1	1	1	1
I 5	1	1	0	1	1
I 6	0	0	1	1	1
I 7	1	0	0	1	1
I 9	1	1	0	0	9
I 9	1	0	1	0	0
I 10	0	1	0	1	1
I 11	1	1	0	1	9
I 12	0	1	0	1	-1
I 13	1	1	0	0	9
I 14	1	0	1	0	1
I 15	1	1	0	0	9
I 16	1	1	0	0	9
I 17	0	1	0	0	9
I 19	0	1	1	0	1
I 19	1	0	1	1	1

Coding Form: Pretest

Coder ID: MH

Frame Article	Conflict	Strategy	Economic Consequences	Attribution of Responsibility	Pro/contra
S1	0	0	0	1	9
S12	1	0	0	1	9
S19	1	0	1	0	1
DT15	1	0	1	0	1
T20	1	1	1	1	0
G2	1	1	0	1	1
G24	1	1	0	0	9
I 5	1	1	0	1	9
I 15	1	1	0	0	9
I 17	0	1	0	0	9

Coding Form: Pretest

Coder ID: LB

Frame Article	Conflict	Strategy	Economic Consequences	Attribution of Responsibility	Pro/contra
S1	0	1	0	1	1
S12	1	0	0	1	9
S19	0	0	1	0	9
DT15	0	0	1	0	1
T20	1	1	1	0	0

G2	1	1	0	0	1
G24	1	0	0	0	1
I5	1	1	1	0	9
I15	1	0	0	0	9
I17	0	0	0	0	9

**Appendix C: Krippendorff's alpha and 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals**

**Table 4: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Conflict Frame)**

Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Conflict Frame)

	Alpha	LL95%CI	UL95%CI	Units	Observrs	Pairs
Nominal	.5476	-.1310	1.0000	10.0000	2.0000	10.0000

Probability (q) of failure to achieve an alpha of at least alphamin:

alphamin	q
.9000	.9000
.8000	.9000
.7000	.6150
.6700	.6150
.6000	.6150
.5000	.3160

Number of bootstrap samples:

1000

Judges used in these computations:

MH LB

**Table 5: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Strategy Frame)**

Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Strategy Frame)

	Alpha	LL95%CI	UL95%CI	Units	Observrs	Pairs
Nominal	.2400	-.3300	.8100	10.0000	2.0000	10.0000

Probability (q) of failure to achieve an alpha of at least alphamin:

alphamin	q
.9000	.9980
.8000	.9650
.7000	.9650
.6700	.9650

2013-07-15

.6000 .8410  
.5000 .8410

Number of bootstrap samples:  
1000

Judges used in these computations:  
MH LB

**Table 6: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Economic Consequences Frame)**

Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Economic Consequences Frame)

	Alpha	LL95%CI	UL95%CI	Units	Observrs	Pairs
Nominal	.7912	.3736	1.0000	10.0000	2.0000	10.0000

Probability (q) of failure to achieve an alpha of at least alphamin:

alphamin	q
.9000	.6410
.8000	.6410
.7000	.2550
.6700	.2550
.6000	.2550
.5000	.0710

Number of bootstrap samples:  
1000

Judges used in these computations:  
MH LB

**Table 7: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Attribution of Responsibility Frame)**

Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Attribution of Responsibility Frame)

	Alpha	LL95%CI	UL95%CI	Units	Observrs	Pairs
Nominal	.3736	-.2527	1.0000	10.0000	2.0000	10.0000

Probability (q) of failure to achieve an alpha of at least alphamin:

alphamin	q
.9000	.9710
.8000	.9710
.7000	.8410



2013-07-15

.6700	.8410
.6000	.8410
.5000	.6140

Number of bootstrap samples:

1000

Judges used in these computations:

MH          LB

**Table 8: Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Attitude towards British EU membership)**

Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability Estimate (Attitude towards British EU membership)

	Alpha	LL95%CI	UL95%CI	Units	Observers	Pairs
Nominal	.4956	-.0088	1,000	10.0000	2.0000	10.0000

Probability (q) of failure to achieve an alpha of at least alphamin:

alphamin	q
.9000	.9710
.8000	.8470
.7000	.8470
.6700	.8470
.6000	.6240
.5000	.6240

Number of bootstrap samples:

1000

Judges used in these computations:

MH          LB

**Appendix D: Cross Tabulations**

*Cross tabulations chapter 5.1.*

**The Sun**

**Table 9: Conflict Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict Frame	absent	0	7	7
	present	6	8	14
Total		6	15	21

**Table 10: Strategy Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Strategy Frame	absent	6	9	15
	present	0	6	6
Total		6	15	21

**Table 11: Conflict Frame \* Strategy Frame**

		Strategy Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict Frame	absent	4	3	7
	present	11	3	14
Total		15	6	21

**Table 12: Conflict Frame \* Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict Frame	absent	7	0	7
	present	11	3	14
Total		18	3	21

**The Daily Telegraph****Table 13: Strategy Frame \* Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Strategy Frame	absent	5	7	12
	present	9	1	10
Total		14	8	22

**Table 14: Conflict Frame \* Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict Frame	absent	2	5	7
	present	12	3	15
Total		14	8	22

**Table 15: Conflict Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict Frame	absent	3	4	7
	present	12	3	15
Total		15	7	22

**Table 16: Economic Consequences Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Economic Consequences Frame	absent	11	3	14
	present	4	4	8
Total		15	7	22

**The Times****Table 17: Strategy Frame \* Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Strategy Frame	absent	5	6	11
	present	9	1	10
Total		14	7	21

**Table 18: Conflict Frame \* Strategy Frame**

		Strategy Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict Frame	absent	2	4	6
	present	9	6	15
Total		11	10	21

**Table 19: Conflict Frame \* Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict Frame	absent	5	1	6
	present	9	6	15
Total		14	7	21

**Table 20: Strategy Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Strategy Frame	absent	5	6	11
	present	6	4	10
Total		11	10	21

**Table 21: Economic Consequences Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Economic Consequences Frame	absent	8	6	14
	present	3	4	7
Total		11	10	21

**The Guardian**

**Table 22: Conflict Frame \* Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict Frame	absent	0	6	6
	present	16	3	19
Total		16	9	25

**Table 23: Strategy Frame \* Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Strategy Frame	absent	5	6	11
	present	11	3	14
Total		16	9	25

**Table 24: Conflict Frame \* Strategy Frame**

		Strategy Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict Frame	absent	4	2	6
	present	7	12	19
Total		11	14	25

**Table 25: Strategy Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Strategy Frame	absent	5	6	11
	present	8	6	14
Total		13	12	25

**Table 26: Economic consequences Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Economic Consequences Frame	absent	9	7	16
	present	4	5	9
Total		13	12	25

**The Independent**

**Table 27: Conflict Frame \* Strategy Frame**

		Strategy frame		Total
		absent	present	
Conflict frame	absent	1	5	6
	present	5	8	13
Total		6	13	19

**Table 28: Strategy Frame \* Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic consequences frame		Total
		absent	present	
Strategy frame	absent	1	5	6
	present	11	2	13
Total		12	7	19

**Table 29: Strategy Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of responsibility frame		Total
		absent	present	
Strategy frame	absent	2	4	6
	present	8	5	13
Total		10	9	19

**Table 30: Economic Consequences Frame \* Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of responsibility frame		Total
		absent	present	
Economic consequences frame	absent	7	5	12
	present	3	4	7
Total		10	9	19

*Cross tabulations chapter 5.2.*

## The Sun

**Table 31: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude towards British EU Membership	opposing	5	0	5
	balanced	0	1	1
	supporting	4	1	5
Total		9	2	11

**Table 32: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude towards British EU Membership	opposing	5	0	5
	balanced	0	1	1
	supporting	4	1	5
Total		9	2	11

**Table 33: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame**

		Conflict Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	opposing	3	2	5
towards	balanced	0	1	1
British EU	supporting	0	5	5
Membership				
Total		3	8	11

**Table 34: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame**

		Strategy Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	opposing	2	3	5
towards	balanced	0	1	1
British EU	supporting	4	1	5
Membership				
Total		6	5	11

## The Daily Telegraph

**Table 35: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	opposing	3	0	3
towards	balanced	4	3	7
British EU	supporting	4	4	8
Membership				
Total		11	7	18

**Table 36: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame**

		Strategy Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	opposing	1	2	3
towards	balanced	3	4	7
British EU	supporting	6	2	8
Membership				
Total		10	8	18

**Table 37: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame**

		Conflict Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	opposing	2	1	3
towards	balanced	2	5	7
British EU	supporting	2	6	8
Membership				
Total		6	12	18

**The Times****Table 38: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	balanced	2	4	6
towards	supporting	6	3	9
British EU				
Membership				
Total		8	7	15

**Table 39: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame**

		Conflict Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	balanced	0	6	6
towards	supporting	2	7	9
British EU				
Membership				
Total		2	13	15

**Table 40: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame**

		Strategy Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	balanced	3	3	6
towards	supporting	7	2	9
British EU				
Membership				
Total		10	5	15

**Table 41: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	balanced	2	4	6
towards	supporting	5	4	9
British EU				
Membership				
Total		7	8	15



**The Guardian****Table 42: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame**

		Conflict Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	opposing	1	0	1
towards	balanced	1	4	5
British EU	supporting	3	8	11
Membership				
Total		5	12	17

**Table 43: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of Responsibility Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	opposing	0	1	1
towards	balanced	1	4	5
British EU	supporting	6	5	11
Membership				
Total		7	10	17

**Table 44: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic Consequences Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	opposing	0	1	1
towards	balanced	2	3	5
British EU	supporting	7	4	11
Membership				
Total		9	8	17

**Table 45: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame**

		Strategy Frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude	opposing	0	1	1
towards	balanced	3	2	5
British EU	supporting	4	7	11
Membership				
Total		7	10	17

## The Independent

**Table 46: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Attribution of Responsibility Frame**

		Attribution of responsibility frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude towards British EU membership	opposing	0	2	2
	balanced	1	0	1
	supporting	4	6	10
Total		5	8	13

**Table 47: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Strategy Frame**

		Strategy frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude towards British EU membership	opposing	1	1	2
	balanced	1	0	1
	supporting	4	6	10
Total		6	7	13

**Table 48: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Economic Consequences Frame**

		Economic consequences frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude towards British EU membership	opposing	1	1	2
	balanced	0	1	1
	supporting	5	5	10
Total		6	7	13

**Table 49: Attitude towards British EU membership\*Conflict Frame**

		Conflict frame		Total
		absent	present	
Attitude towards British EU membership	opposing	1	1	2
	balanced	0	1	1
	supporting	4	6	10
Total		5	8	13