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Abstract

It is an open question why news media cover political campaigns the way they do. Framing elections in terms of conflict or strategy or focusing on horse-race and the role media and journalists themselves play in elections is commonplace, but this study investigates the factors that explain the variation in campaign news coverage. The context of our study is the 2009 European Parliamentary elections and we use a cross-national media content analysis (N=52,009) conducted in all 27 EU member states. Findings show that time-, country- and media-characteristics all matter in explaining the way news media frame elections, however, to different extents and with different emphasis. Especially the variation in conflict framing is contingent upon the medium, the electoral system, and public aversion against the EU. We conclude with a discussion of our findings in the light of the ongoing debate on the role and impact of media framing during election campaigns.

Keywords: election coverage, media framing, media content analysis, European Parliamentary elections, conflict framing, meta coverage, strategy framing, horse race framing
Introduction

Why do media frame elections the way they do? A news frame is ‘an emphasis in salience of certain aspects of a topic’ (de Vreese, 2002) and previous research has demonstrated how the news report elections with a special emphasis on conflict between political parties and actors (e.g., McManus, 1994), a focus on strategic considerations rather than actual substance (e.g., Cappella and Jamieson, 1997; Valentino et al., 2001), election polls (e.g., Semetko, 2000) or the role of the media themselves (Esser and D’Angelo, 2006). Research has amply demonstrated the effects news frames have on political attitudes (e.g., Iyengar, 1991; Schuck and de Vreese, 2006), issue interpretations (e.g., Rhee, 1997), policy proposals (e.g., Slothuus and de Vreese, 2010), or evaluations (e.g., Nelson et al., 1997).

Along with the findings of these studies, there is a debate on the normative implications of the consequences of such media framing or on the quality and function of election coverage more generally. A lot of this research has focused on the presumed negative consequences of the way journalists frame elections merely as tactical games and conflict-laden contests between actors, such as increasing levels of public cynicism thought to be detrimental for electoral participation (e.g., Cappella and Jamieson, 1997). However, surprisingly little attention has been devoted to the question how such coverage takes shape in the first place. Why do news media frame elections the way they do? And, is it possible to explain, at least partially, which factors drive media content during election campaigns?

These are central questions to the current study in which we focus on four distinct features of media coverage identified as characteristic for any election campaign: a) framing elections in terms of conflict, (b) framing elections in terms of strategy, (c) framing elections in terms of ‘horse-race’, and (d) metacoverage, i.e.
focusing on the role of the media during election campaigns. More specifically, the way news media frame election news will be explained by time-, country- and media-specific characteristics. We do so within the context of the 2009 European Parliamentary election campaign and based on an analysis of the media coverage within all 27 EU member states, as it gives us sufficient variety on both ends, i.e. with regard to the way different media in different countries have covered the election as well as with regard to the contextual factors that can help explain such differences.

Theoretical framework

Conflict framing

News about politics—both domestic and European—is in general framed in terms of conflict (McManus, 1994; Patterson, 1993). Previous research has pointed to the distinctively high news value of stories that focus on conflict between political actors (Price, 1989). Thus, the presence of conflict is an essential criterion for a story to make it into the news, not only because it ‘sells’, but also to meet professional standards of balanced journalistic reporting (e.g., Galtung and Ruge, 1965; Neuman et al., 1992; McManus, 1994). Conflict is also inherent to politics. It is embodied in political reasoning (Lupia et al., 2000) and in democratic theory conflict is seen as an essential part of democratic decision-making (e.g., Sartori, 1987). Schattschneider (1960, p. 135) defined democracy as ‘a competitive political system’ with elites defining policy options so that citizens can make a choice: ‘conflict, competition, organization, leadership and responsibility are the ingredients of a working definition of democracy’. Indeed, recent research suggests that party contestation over political
issues, such as EU integration, also contributes to higher visibility and thus the overall salience of the topic in news media coverage (Schuck et al., 2011).

Conflict results from the competition of different ideas, and if citizens realize that it is part of democratic decision-making, conflict may, in principle, have positive effects on citizens’ political participation (de Vreese and Tobiasen, 2007). Min (2004) adds an important nuance to this by spelling out the differential role of different types of conflict, whereby conflict about substantial issues has a positive impact on mobilization whereas conflict about persons can have the opposite effect. However, while conflict-driven news has the potential to engage and mobilize citizens, other studies have shown that conflict-driven news can negatively affect support for policies, including advances in European integration (Vliegenthart et al., 2008).

While a lot of research has focused on the question what impact conflict framing can have on political attitudes and political behavior, much less attention has been devoted to the question what factors explain variation in the degree to which news media apply this sort of framing. Considering European Parliamentary elections and with regard to country-characteristics with the potential to affect the degree to which news media cover such an election campaign in terms of conflict, we expect that closer ties between a country and the European Union result in less focus on conflict in media coverage. More specifically, we expect that (1) in countries in which public support for EU membership is high, this is also reflected in less focus on conflict framing compared to countries in which public support for EU membership is lower. Along the same lines, we expect that (2) in countries which are net contributors to the EU budget (i.e. which pay more than they receive) focus on conflict in news coverage is higher as compared to countries which are net receivers and thus profit by and large from the EU.
Another factor on the country-level with the potential to matter is the difference in electoral systems across countries. We expect that (3) countries with proportional representation of political parties are more conducive to conflict because here more parties contest over political issues, such as EU integration, and such higher degree of issue contestation should be reflected also in the way journalists cover current political events. Another factor on the country-level we consider relevant is the question if there are concurrent domestic (national/regional) elections taking place at the same time as European elections. We know from the literature on the second-order nature of European elections (e.g., Reif and Schmitt, 1980) that these elections are widely seen as less important and less relevant in the eyes of political actors as well as the general public. Thus, we expect that (4) when national elections are taking place at the same time this is detrimental not only with regard to the overall attention paid to them by the news media but also regarding their level of contestation by political actors and thus the level of focus on political conflict in media coverage is decreasing.

With regard to time aspects, and because of the inherent nature of a political campaign supposed to be increasingly contested over time, we expect that (5) the degree to which journalists cover an election in terms of conflict is increasing as election day approaches. Finally, with regard to media characteristics, little is known about differences between different types of media (TV vs. newspapers) or between different formats within the same type of medium (broadsheet vs. tabloid newspapers; public vs. private television). Given the absence of previous research focusing specifically on medium-specific differences with regard to conflict framing, we need to remain cautious and abstain from putting forward a clear expectation.
Strategy framing

A second feature of campaign news coverage that received ample attention relates to mediated information about strategic behaviours of political actors. Developments towards increasing professionalization of election campaigns (e.g., Norris, 2000) and the application of advanced political marketing strategies in political parties’ campaigning efforts (e.g., Kavanagh, 1995) have led to increasing attention by journalists for what is going on ‘behind the campaign’ (Cappella and Jamieson, 1997). News relying on such a strategy frame when covering election campaigns emphasizes considerations relating to how political actors present a certain issue or event and the style of such presentation. It furthermore relates to the description of specific actions of political actors to improve their position in the public eye. In sum, strategic news is described as stressing the strategies, performances, styles and tactics of campaigning necessary to for a candidate or party to obtain and remain in a favorable position (Esser and D’Angelo, 2006; Jamieson, 1992).

Such strategic news framing appears to be a standard ingredient of election coverage nowadays, to the disadvantage of substantial issue news coverage (Cappella and Jamieson, 1997; Iyengar et al., 2004). This observation applies to the US context, but has also been made – among others – for Germany (Esser and Hemmer, 2008), the UK (Scammell and Semetko, 2008), or the Netherlands (Elenbaas and de Vreese, 2008). For the 2004 EP election it was shown that the amount of strategy framing differed considerably between the member states, with Latvia, Estonia, Denmark or Luxembourg showing very little, and Greece, Poland, or Slovakia a substantial share of EP election news framed in terms of strategy. Exposure to this strategy framing in the media significantly affected public cynicism towards politics and, among the
higher educated, led to stronger intentions to turn out to vote (de Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2008).

When it comes to explaining variation in European Parliament election campaign coverage, we expect media-related factors, aspects of the electoral system and time to affect the amount of strategy news. Tabloid newspapers, leaning towards a more sensationalist coverage of politics, have been shown to feature less substantial issue news coverage to the advantage of aspects of the political game (e.g., Norris, 2000). Although similar arguments can be made for the coverage of commercial television newscasts, the empirical evidence is less clear (e.g., Schulz and Zeh, 2007). Furthermore, newspapers are less confined in the amount of coverage of elections (Druckman, 2005), and therefore can devote space to strategic aspects of the campaign. Therefore, we expect that (1) tabloid newspapers and (2) commercial television newscasts devote more attention to strategy news than broadsheets and public broadcasting news, and that (3) newspapers show more strategy framing than television news. We furthermore expect (4) a stronger emphasis on strategy frames closer to Election Day in line with a generally increasing attention for the campaign in the final days and weeks (see, however, Vliegenthart et al., 2008). Finally, we expect (5) that co-occurring national elections also lead to an increase in strategically framed coverage, since there arguably is more at stake in these elections (Reif and Schmitt, 1980) and therefore parties’ campaign conduct is more relevant which spills over also to EP election news.

_Horse-race framing_
Related to strategic news is the notion of *horse-race framing*. Whereas such frames also put an emphasis on the political game, rather than on substantial news coverage, it particularly focuses on candidates’ and parties’ standing in public opinion. Although horse-race coverage is sometimes considered part of the strategy frame (Esser and Hemmer, 2008), we treat the mentioning of public opinion polls as a separate category, since it does not necessarily refer to the tactics of political actors. A horse-race frame therefore describes a reference to public opinion polls and parties’ standing in the polls, including whether they were winning or loosing. In line with the strategy frame, however, studies have demonstrated that election news coverage increasingly incorporates references to the horse-race (e.g., Darras, 2008; Sheafer et al., 2008). Such horse-race coverage also appears to be attractive to news audiences (Iyengar et al., 2004).

Again we formulate a number of expectations when it comes to factors influencing the degree of horse-race framing present in European Parliament election news coverage. In line with the above we not only expect more sensationalist news outlets to make more use of strategy frames, but also that they will show a stronger reliance on the horse-race aspect of the elections. Again, due to more space to cover the campaign, newspapers in general are also more likely to draw on horse-race frames. Furthermore, as Election Day approaches the relevance of opinion polls increases, since they might be a better indication of the actual election result than earlier on in the campaign (see also Domke et al., 1997). This leads to the expectation that news will increasingly be framed in terms of the horse-race when the election is approaching (Vliegenthart et al., 2008). Moreover, co-occurring national elections make the horse-race more relevant, which is expected to increase the amount of horse-race coverage. Finally, the horse-race is more clear-cut in majoritarian election
systems than in proportional systems, which leads us to expect that there will be more horse-race coverage in such first-past-the-pole systems.

**Metacoverage**

More recently, various scholars have noted that, in addition to favoring strategy-oriented coverage in political campaign coverage, journalists increasingly emphasize another part of the political process, which is the news media’s own role in the campaign. This type of coverage, referred to as *metacoverage*, exposes the interactions between political actors and the press, as well as the ways in which politicians approach the media and publicity, among other reasons, for image and news management purposes. The development towards metacoverage, as documented by election campaign studies in America and Europe (e.g., Esser and D’Angelo, 2006) affirms the widespread notion that the media are now an important, if not the most important, actor in politics and campaigns. As such, metacoverage can be considered an outcome of *media politics*: a modern and professionalized mode of (permanent) campaigning tailored to the logic of the media system (Esser and Spanier, 2005; Zaller, 1999).

Metacoverage, however, is a broad concept comprising an array of media-related themes and latent meanings (Esser and D’Angelo, 2003). In the present study, we are specifically interested in *press* metacoverage, which focuses on the presence, behaviors and influences of media in relation to politics, which stands out from the more strategy-based *publicity* coverage that bears considerable conceptual resemblance to the strategic news frame described above (de Vreese and Elenbaas, 2008).
In terms of the factors that shape metacoverage in the context of elections, we expect to find a significant influence of some of the structural variables also considered above, though on slightly different theoretical grounds. Specifically, we first expect more of such coverage in majoritarian election systems, since such systems spur the professionalization and mediatization of political campaigns more strongly than other systems (e.g., Esser and D’Angelo, 2006; Mancini and Swanson, 1996; Mazzoleni and Schulz, 1999). Further, we expect metacoverage most likely to arise in more sophisticated “quality” news outlets including public television and highbrow newspapers. This expectation is based on the assertion that metacoverage appeals to politically interested and sophisticated news audiences in particular, also in the light of the “insider” type of information typically conveyed through this coverage (de Vreese and Elenbaas, 2008; Esser and Spanier, 2005).

Methods

To empirically test our expectations and collect information about our dependent variables, we rely on a large-scale media content analysis. This content analysis was carried out within the framework of PIREDEU (www.piredeu.eu), Providing an Infrastructure for Research on Electoral Democracy in the European Union. PIREDEU is funded by the European Union’s FP 7 program (for more details see data documentation report in Schuck et al., 2010).

Sample

The content analysis was carried out on a sample of national news media coverage in all 27 EU member states. In each country we include the main national
evening news broadcasts of the most widely watched public and commercial television stations. We also include two ‘quality’ (i.e. broadsheet) and one tabloid newspaper from each country. Our overall television sample consists of 58 TV networks and our overall newspaper sample consists of 84 different newspapers. The content analysis was conducted for news items published or broadcast within the three weeks running up to the election. The date of the election varied across countries. Depending on the date of the elections in a given country, the coding period ran from May 14 to June 4 or from May 17 to June 7.

Data Collection

All relevant news outlets were collected either digitally (TV and newspapers) or as hardcopies (newspapers). With regard to story selection, for television, all news items have been coded; for newspapers, all news items on the title page and on one randomly selected page as well as all stories pertaining particularly to the EU or the EP elections on any other page of the newspaper have been coded (within the political news, opinion-editorial, and business-economy sections). In total, 52,009 news stories were coded (32,041 newspaper stories and 19,968 TV stories) in all 27 EU member countries combined. 19,996 of these news stories dealt specifically with the EU (16,749 newspaper stories and 3,247 TV stories), of which 10,978 news stories dealt specifically with the EP election (8,718 newspaper stories and 2,260 TV stories). The unit of analysis and coding unit was the distinct news story.

Coding procedure

Coding was conducted by 58 coders at two locations, the University of Amsterdam (The Netherlands) and the University of Exeter (UK). Coders were
trained and supervised and the coder training included repeated tests of intercoder-reliability which yielded satisfactory results (reported below). The study coordinators not only attended but also performed as trainers in all training sessions at both locations.

**Dependent Variables**

**Conflict framing.** A conflict frame was considered to be present in a given news story when the story mentioned either (1) two or more sides of a problem or issue; (2) any conflict or disagreement; (3) a personal attack between two or more actors; or (4) an actor’s reproaching or blaming another. These four items together formed a reliable scale (Cronbach’s alpha = .63), while Krippendorff’s alpha’s for intercoder reliability ranged from .45 to .57.

**Strategy framing.** A strategy frame was considered to be present in a given news story when the story mentioned either (1) an actor’s presentation and style of how it handled an issue; (2) an action by an actor that was taken in order to stabilize his position or in order to make him look better in public opinion or in the political arena; or (3) one or more metaphors from the language of games, sport and or war. Together, these items formed a reliable scale (Cronbach’s alpha = .59). Krippendorff’s alpha’s for intercoder reliability ranged from .52 to .61.

**Horse race framing.** A horse race frame was considered to be present when a given news story mentioned any opinion poll results predicting the outcome of the EP elections. (Krippendorff’s alpha = .66).

**Metacoverage.** A meta-frame was considered to be present when a given news story mentioned any aspect relating to the role of the media in – or media coverage of – the election campaign or political affairs in general (Krippendorff’s alpha = .85).
For each outlet, data are aggregated to a weekly level. For each dependent variable, we take the share of total news items per outlet per week that contains the frame under consideration. We ended up with a total of 427 observations for the conflict framing and 417 observations for the other frames (due to some missing values).

**Independent Variables**

*Proximity to Elections* captures the temporal aspect of the campaign coverage. This variable indicates the week number, starting with the value ‘1’ for the first week of the research period and increasing by one point for each following week approaching the election.

Four variables capture key country characteristics as predictors of coverage. *EU Membership evaluation* is measured as the aggregated country scores of the percentage of the population who answered affirmatively to the question: “Generally speaking, do you think that (YOUR COUNTRY’S) membership of the European Union is a good thing?” We rely on Eurobarometer data of Spring 2009 (EB 71) for this variable. *Net benefit* measures the yearly percentage of the Gross National Income (GNI) that is being paid to the European Union (negative score) or is being received from the European Union (positive score). Data are collected from the 2008 annual budget report from the European Commission. We consider a country’s *Electoral System* by means of a dummy variable indicating whether the country in regular elections adhere to a system of closed-list proportional representation, or to another electoral system. Data are retrieved from Carter and Farrell (2010). Our fourth and final country variable is *Simultaneous Elections*, a dummy variable
indicating whether national or local elections were held at the same day as the EP elections.

Finally, we account for three key characteristics of the media. *Television* is a dummy variable indicating, for each case, whether the outlet was a television broadcast or not. *Private Television* is a dummy variable indicating whether or not the outlet was a commercial television broadcast. *Tabloid* is a dummy variable indicating whether or not the outlet was a newspaper tabloid.

We conduct four separate ordinary least squared regressions with each of the framing items as dependent variables, and the variables listed above as independent variables, as far as relationships with the framing variables have been hypothesized.

**Results**

In the following, we will present the results of our analyses attempting to explain conflict, strategy, horse-race and meta-framing. First, however, we take a look at the absolute prominence of these different kinds of framing in actual campaign news coverage across countries. Therefore we build index scales for each frame reaching from a minimum value of 0 (frame not present) to a maximum value of 1 (frame present) (see e.g., Semetko and Valkenburg, 2000). Our results show that the *strategy frame* was most prominent (*M*=.29, *SD*=.33), closely followed by the *conflict frame* (*M*=.28, *SD*=.29). Both these frames show to be of considerable importance in election news coverage. The *horse-race frame* was much less prominent (*M*=.11, *SD*=.31) in campaign news coverage but still slightly more prominent than the *meta-frame* (*M*=.09, *SD*=.29). Figures 1 to 4 show the cross-national variation in the use of the different frames.
Turning to our explanatory models, we first take a closer look at the factors that account for the degree of conflict framing in the news. As shown in Table 1 below, higher levels of support for EU membership in a country and being a net receiver from the EU budget both are associated with lower levels of conflict framing in media coverage of the election. Also the occurrence of simultaneous other national/regional elections are linked to less conflict framing in EP campaign coverage. Furthermore, countries that have a closed-list electoral system of proportional representation show higher degrees of conflict framing. It could be that such electoral systems, in which more parties contest with one another, are more conducive to conflict and this is also reflected in media coverage. Finally, there is a negative effect for tabloid newspapers, meaning that conflict framing is more present in more serious broadsheet outlets. Overall, the above results confirm our expectations. Perceived profit from EU membership (either in the public eye or financially) is linked to lower levels of conflict framing. Concurrent other elections seem to draw attention away from EP elections and lead to lower levels of conflict framing in EP campaign news. Interestingly, and in line with recent research (Vliegenthart et al., 2010), we find higher degrees of conflict framing in more serious quality outlets as compared to tabloid newspapers. Finally, we find no difference with regard to the type of medium (newspaper or TV) and also do not see that the proximity of the election matters for the degree of conflict framing in the news.
Next in our analysis, we turn to strategy framing. As Table 2 shows, none of the factors that could be expected to account for the degree to which news frame EP elections in terms of strategy has a significant impact. Strategy framing does not increase during the campaign and neither country nor media characteristics matter in explaining degrees of strategy framing in the news. For now, we have to conclude that none of the factors tested in the present study seems to account for any variance in the degree of strategy framing in the news.

- TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE -

We now turn to horse-race framing and see that as for strategy framing, media characteristics do not seem to have an influence. However, as the election comes closer, horse-race framing increases and also the occurrence of other simultaneous elections is connected to higher degrees of horse-race framing. Electoral systems with proportional representation show lower degrees of horse-race framing in election news, possibly because in other systems the question who is in the lead and will ultimately win the election becomes more important.

- TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE -

As Table 4 shows below, media characteristics do have an impact on the prominence of metacoverage. We find that more serious broadsheet newspapers and public television programs are more reflective of the role of the media with regard to the election campaign. The only other factor that has an impact on the degree of metacoverage is the electoral system. In countries with proportional representation
news coverage is more reflective of the role of the media during the election campaign.

Discussion

This paper set out to investigate the impact of medium, time, and context factors on variation in the way in which the media use some of the most frequently identified frames in election news coverage. The frames include the conflict frame, the strategy frame, the horse race frame and the meta coverage frame. The analysis was conducted in the context of the European Parliamentary elections in 2009 which ensures 27 countries in which to study the variation of the framing of a single event. The article draws upon a comprehensive study of the election news coverage in the most prominent television news and newspapers in the 27 EU countries, totaling more than 50,000 stories.

A first conclusion concerns the use of the different news frames. The strategy and conflict frames were the most prominently used and they were about three times more present than the horse race and meta frames. The use of these frames by the media varied significantly between the different countries, but this article took a step further to explicate the structural factors underlying this cross-national variation.

In terms of conflict framing, benefits from the EU were related to lower levels of conflict framing. Concurrent elections depressed the emphasis on conflict framing, and quality news outlets tended to use the conflict frame more often than tabloid outlets. These findings are robust, support our a priori expectations, and are in line
with other research on the news media framing of the elections (Vliegenthart et al., 2010). For the remaining frames the results are less clear cut. The variation in the use of the strategy frame was unrelated to the factors included in this study. For the horse race frame, we see that as the actual election approaches, the use of the horse race frame increased. Additionally, the co-occurrence of other elections is connected to higher degrees of horse-race framing. Looking at the meta coverage, we find that more serious broadsheet newspapers and public television programs are more reflective of the role of the media with regard to the election campaign.

Our paper focused on some of the most prominent frames in the literature on election news (Strömbäck and Kaid, 2008). Some of these frames occur frequently in the news, also in relation to European Parliament Elections. Our analyses covered some initial ground in understanding variation, but while the models perform well for understanding e.g., conflict news framing the models of variation in e.g. the strategy news frame is underdeveloped. This can mean one of two things: either strategy framing has become such an unequivocal part of news coverage of elections that variation hardly exists, but in fact both this study and reviews of extant election news research (Strömbäck and Kaid, 2008) suggest that there is plenty of variation in the use of the strategy frame, at least across countries. The alternative is to raise the question about which factors – not included in this study – can explain this variation. We focus on medium, time and EU related contextual factors but these obviously fall short of explaining the differences. Our bet would be to establish comparable information about the nature of the political contest in a country or the political journalistic culture. Such research is emerging (e.g., Van Dalen et al., 2010; Pfetsch et al., 2001), but more of such research, collected in a systematic and comparable fashion is needed. The mediocre performance of our models in explaining some of the
frames also points towards a general problem in research explaining variation in media content. Such studies are often challenged by theoretically well-specified models, which, empirically, however, suffer from low explained variance (e.g., Vliegenthart et al., 2010). This problem extends beyond the current research but asks for better explication of features explaining news content pertaining both to the political system and the media system as well as journalistic practices.

In terms of research on the media and European integration, our study raises a number of important points. Conflict news comes out of the study as the most utilized news frame together with the strategy frame. Pointing to political differences and disagreement as inherent to a political campaign and it is beneficial to the EU that conflict is a dominant feature of the election coverage, pointing the electorate to the political choice on offer. Such information is mobilizing for an electorate, especially when the conflicts covered are substantive in nature (van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996; de Vreese and Tobiasen, 2007). The strategy news frame, however, is often seen as a ‘de-mobilizer’, by increasing political cynicism and mistrust (Cappella and Jamieson, 1997; Valentino et al., 2001). However, other research has shown that strategic news framing does not demobilize per se (Adriaansen et al., 2010; de Vreese, 2005) and in the context of EP elections a certain level of cynicism can even be conducive to turnout intention (de Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2008). At this stage, the EU should be happy with news reporting, also in a strategic fashion, as this contributes to the impression that the EP elections are ‘real’ elections, unlike what the second-order literature suggests (Franklin, 2002) with a political battle taking place and alternative options to choose from.
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Figure 1: Conflict framing in campaign news coverage in all 27 EU member states

Figure 2: Strategy framing in campaign news coverage in all 27 EU member states
Figure 3: Horse-race framing in campaign news coverage in all 27 EU member states

Figure 4: Metacoverage in campaign news coverage in all 27 EU member states
Table 1: OLS regression explaining conflict framing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU membership 'good thing'</td>
<td>-.004***</td>
<td>(.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net benefit</td>
<td>-.038**</td>
<td>(.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral system</td>
<td>.123***</td>
<td>(.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous elections</td>
<td>-.047(*)</td>
<td>(.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to elections</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>(.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV (private)</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>(.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper (tabloid)</td>
<td>-.107***</td>
<td>(.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (TV)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>(.027)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square: .14

N: 427

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized coefficients (standard errors in parentheses).

(*)p ≤ .10; *p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001 (two-tailed)
Table 2: OLS regression explaining strategy framing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral system</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous elections</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to elections</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV (private)</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper (tabloid)</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (TV)</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square: .00

N: 417

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized coefficients (standard errors in parentheses).

(*) p ≤ .10; *p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001 (two-tailed)
Table 3: OLS regression explaining horse-race framing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral system</td>
<td>-.050***</td>
<td>(.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous elections</td>
<td>.029(*)</td>
<td>(.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to elections</td>
<td>.015(*)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV (private)</td>
<td>.026 (.021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper (tabloid)</td>
<td>.024 (.019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (TV)</td>
<td>-.002 (.018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square: .02
N: 417

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized coefficients (standard errors in parentheses).

(*) p ≤ .10; *p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001 (two-tailed)
Table 4: OLS regression explaining metacoverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral system</td>
<td>.042* (.018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous elections</td>
<td>.009 (.017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to elections</td>
<td>-.006 (.009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV (private)</td>
<td>-.046* (.024)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper (tabloid)</td>
<td>-.039(*) (.022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (TV)</td>
<td>.008 (.021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square .04
N 417

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized coefficients (standard errors in parentheses).

(*)p ≤ .10; *(p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001 (two-tailed)
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