

Partisanship on subtopics of immigration

A closer look into a Dutch newspaper after 9/11



University of Amsterdam

– Master thesis–

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Student name: | Albert Koops |
| Student number: | 5953421 |
| Master: | Communication science |
| Specialisation: | Political communication |
| Supervisor: | Dr. Fadi Hirzalla |
| Date: | February 3, 2012 |

Preface

The master thesis that is lying in front of you is the result of half a year of research at the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Amsterdam.

The writing of the thesis has gone through ups and downs. Especially in the beginning I experienced some trouble finding the right topic and a suitable research question.

Unfortunately this period took more time than I wanted. Numerous e-mails were sent back and forth with my supervisor at the University of Amsterdam, Fadi Hirzalla. It was important for me to carry out research in an area that interests me and furthermore I wanted to specify a research question on which I was curious to find an answer. In my opinion I succeeded in both.

My first word of thanks goes to Fadi Hirzalla for helping me defining my research question. Additionally I would like to thank him for guiding me where needed and answering my questions via meetings and e-mail.

A second word of thanks goes to both Benjamin Klasmer and Judith Koops who I would like to thank for reading my report and for giving remarks on the structure, style and spelling.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for their financial and motivational support. During the whole process they were always there for me to support me and help me when I got stuck with my research.

Abstract

Support is surfacing in the popular media, specifically in newspapers in the United States of America, for allegations that news is tainted by partisanship. In a lesser extent this allegation is also being heard in the Netherlands and even sometimes confirmed in studies. All these studies together are characterized by its focus on a main topic like election campaigns and looking at the partisanship of newspapers during a particular period of time. However such a main topic can be divided into certain subtopics, where some show signs of partisanship and others maybe not. This could lead to studies where more accurate conclusions can be drawn. This is being tested in this study on subtopics of immigration in a Dutch newspaper, through using a content analysis. The subtopics multicultural society, residence permit and naturalization, derived from another Dutch study, do not show signs of partisanship, which is measured through difference in tone in reporting about right wing or left wing parties. Also the subtopics taken together as the main topic of immigration does not show signs of partisanship.

Introduction

The most important function of the media in Western democracies is to provide the nation with information that is sufficient for use in the evaluation of matters of policy and governance (McQuail, 2005). Therefore newspapers try, in their coverage of politics and policy issues, to conform to the professional “code of ethics.” One of the responsibilities according to these guidelines is that a journalist should report politically neutral and should provide different angles of an issue (Bennett, 1988). Recent research (Groseclose & Milyo, 2005) however suggests that partisanship in newspapers coverage does exist. This partisanship of newspapers can even have an influence on the way we think about political issues.

Existing research regarding partisanship in newspapers most of the time focuses on political campaigns (Druckman & Parkin, 2005; Kahn & Kenney, 2002) or looks at the coverage of public policy and the impact it has on public opinion (e.g., Gilens, 1999; Zaller, 1992). There is also a lot of research available that focuses on the factors in and outside a news organization that have an influence on the coverage in newspapers (Gentzkow & Shapiro, 2007; Milyo, 2007). Research on the overall political leaning of newspaper coverage is as well in any quantity available. However it mostly focuses on partisanship in coverage of one specific event and it is mostly researched within a small time frame. These studies are almost all carried out in the United States of America and therefore focusing on American media (e.g., Bagdikian, 1997; Larcinese, Puglisi & Snyder Jr., 2007).

Research on partisanship in Dutch national newspapers is (e.g., Brants & Van Praag, 2005; Van Aelst & Vliegenthart, 2010) scarce. Research that is available shows however that Dutch journalists describe themselves as rather left of the political middle (Deuze, 2002). So this leaves the suggestion that Dutch journalists and thus their coverage would be biased towards political parties left from the political middle. The aim of this research project is to

make an effort in identifying this possible bias within Dutch newspaper coverage on a specific political issue: immigration. Specifically, this research will investigate this possible partisanship over a long period, namely since the year 2001 of the terrorist attacks on 9/11. A long study on partisanship is not new, but they all focus on one certain topic or main topic like for example election campaigns (Brants, 2002; Ansolabehere, Lessem & Snyder Jr., 2006). In these studies they focus on if the coverage on election campaigns on the whole leads to partisanship of newspapers. They do not distinguish subtopics of election campaigns like access to voters, web interactivity, advertising (Gueorguieva, 2008) etcetera. The main topic can lead to partisanship to right or left wing parties, but it is possible that there is difference in partisanship on certain subtopics. Lott and Hassett (2004) namely show that different indicators of the economy in newspaper coverage, which could be seen as subtopics, all have their own partisanship. To test whether this assumption is true, partisanship on subtopics of immigration will be examined in the Dutch newspaper *The Telegraph (de Telegraaf)*.

Research was conducted on the newspaper coverage of immigration, because in the last decade this issue has become more common in public and political debates in Western European countries. After the 9/11 terrorist attacks the amount of attention on these issues changed, the tone was being influenced and the focus of these debates increased. Also other international events after 9/11 played influential roles in these debates, such as the war in Iraq and the terrorist attacks in London and Madrid (Vliegenthart & Roggebrand, 2007). At the same time the Netherlands' important societal and internal political developments played a potential role. The assassinations of popular Dutch politician Pim Fortuyn and Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh who had strong views on the Islam and the rise of Geert Wilders a Dutch politician who openly had critiqued the immigration policy of the Dutch government. Stories such as these make the Netherlands an interesting case to research the presence of partisanship in a Dutch national newspaper.

This all leads to the following research question: *To what extent is there evidence of partisanship in the coverage of de Telegraaf on the topic of immigration, and is there difference within subtopics, during the period September 11, 2001 until September 11, 2011?*

Theoretical Framework

In the upcoming section the theories and its shortcomings, who are related to the research question, are presented more in depth compared to the previous section. It starts by discussing the umbrella theory of the proposed study, namely media bias. After discussing this theory there will be focused on the specific theory that lies at the core of the proposed study, namely partisan bias or partisanship. This theory will first be explained by examples from the United States and subsequently the Netherlands. This leads to some shortcomings in this research field which is being discussed hereafter. The upcoming section ends with some background theory on the immigration issue.

Media bias

News media fulfills an important role in society. The public is informed about news around the world via the media and based on this information the public can individually and collectively form an opinion, criticize and take decisions in many areas (Baron, 2006). Therefore the media's national and international coverage of news are relevant discussion issues, especially the way they present the news. The centre of this discussion questions if the media are prejudiced or biased in their coverage. This phenomenon is better known in the literature as media bias (e.g., Chiang & Knight, 2011).

Gaspar (2011) gives a description of the term media bias. The two researchers argue that the media can voice different impressions of a story by selectively omitting certain

information, the choice of words, and the degree of credibility that a medium imputes to a primary source. Baron (2006) states that media bias has different forms and it can lead to a one-sided news story. For example a bias can originate from being influenced by ideology or by the partiality of the owners. News stories can be manipulated to fit with the ideas and values of certain political parties or interest groups. Another definition for this bias is political bias or partisanship. Certain information can be withheld or distorted by a source and even the personal preferences of a journalist can have an impact. He examined how the public experiences the presence of bias in news. He states that there is hardly any consensus about the cause and direction of the experienced bias. Therefore it is not remarkable during the last couple of years that there has been a lot of research into this topic (e.g., Baron, 2006; Chiang & Knight, 2011; DellaVigna & Kaplan, 2006; Gasper, 2011; Gentzkow & Shapiro, 2007; Groseclose & Milyo, 2005). There is one area where the majority of critics and scientists agree upon, which is that the presence of a bias has an influence on the public (Lott & Hassett, 2004). Over the last decades the political balance of the news, better known as partisan bias or partisanship where a newspaper favors one political actor or party over the other, has been contested in western democracies.

Partisan bias/Partisanship in the United States of America

Ansola-behere, Lessem and Snyder Jr. (2006) used panel data to examine the political orientation of US newspaper endorsements over the period 1940-2002. They find that the advantage of Republican candidates receiving more endorsements, which was occurring in the 1940s and 1950s, has constantly declined in subsequent decades. In the 1990s the researchers even found a slight lead for the Democrats in the endorsement choice (10%). The researchers also found an upward trend in US newspapers providing more endorsement for candidates

who are already in office. Where as in the 1940s incumbent candidates received 60% of the total endorsements, in 2002 this figure has increased to almost 90%. Fridkin Kahn and Kenney (2002) analyzed how editorial endorsements influence campaign coverage and citizens' views of candidates. They looked into how large newspapers covered 67 senatorial campaigns as a function of their endorsements choices. Therefore the researchers used a human-based content analysis which coded the tone of the articles. They found that newspapers systematically give more favorable coverage to endorsements that are incumbent.

Lott and Hassett (2004) found out that the US press has an overall liberal, partisan bias. From 1991 to 2004 they analyzed 389 newspapers, focusing on economic news. They specifically looked at how they covered the release of official data on a set of economic indicators. According to the strategy of these two researchers, newspapers can provide a more positive or negative account of the same statistical figure. This depends on which party the incumbent president is affiliated with. Their main result, after controlling for the economic data, shows that when the incumbent president is a Republican that there are on average more than 10% fewer positive stories. Groseclose and Milyo (2005) also find that the US press has a liberal, partisan bias. They specifically look into which think tanks are quoted by the media outlets which are part of their sample. To find out what the political leaning of the think tanks is they look at the political position of US congress members who are quoted in a non-negative way. This helps to calculate the political leaning of the outlets in the study by looking at the frequency of quoted think tanks. Except *The Washington Times* and *Fox News' Special Report*, all outlets are located to the left of the average members of Congress. Almost all outlets display a high degree of centrism, which means that almost all outlets are located between the average Republican and Democrat Congressmen. In the same way, Gentzkow and Shapiro (2007) provide a different measure of partisan bias based on similarities between the language that is being used by members of Congress and media

outlets. By using the Congressional Record, they determine particular 'partisan' phrases and words. They focus on those words and phrases that show the largest difference in usage between Republican and Democratic representatives. They also measure how often these words and phrases appear in multiple newspapers. Their conclusion is that the partisan bias of newspapers does not necessarily depend on the identity of the owners, but mainly on the ideological leaning of the consumers.

Puglisi (2006) analyzes news about the presidential campaigns in *The New York Times* during the period 1946-1997. He specifically looks into the agenda-setting behavior of the newspaper. He concludes that the newspaper displays Democratic partisanship with certain watchdog aspects. During the presidential campaigns the newspaper gives systematically more coverage on Democratic topics (social welfare, health care), when the incumbent president is a Republican. After the 1960s the newspaper displays a more symmetric behavior. Since this period the newspaper gives more coverage to Republican issues (defense), when the president is a Democrat.

Most of the studies conclude that the US press have a overall liberal bias. However there are also studies that conclude that the US press employ a conservative bias. For example Franken (2003) concludes that the mainstream media in the US do not have a liberal bias. The big television channels like *ABC*, *CBS*, *NBC* and newspapers like *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post* and *Time* report in a fair way and even sometimes employ a conservative bias. Furthermore, Alterman (2003) argues that the media are maybe more liberal on social issues, but they employ a clear conservative bias when reporting about economic issues.

It can be concluded that the question whether the media have a bias towards the political left or right cannot be answered properly when looking at the US press.

Partisan bias/Partisanship in the Netherlands

Takens, Ruigrok, Van Hoof and Scholten (2008) look at if the Dutch media offer pluralistic viewpoints in their coverage of the 2006 Dutch election campaign. Therefore they use five national newspapers with a clear partisan history. Using a content-analysis they conclude that the national newspapers are still biased towards the parties which they are used to be aligned with. At the same time they conclude that opposition parties receive less attention than incumbent parties. However the tone that is being used towards incumbent parties is more negative than the tone that is being used towards opposition parties. Brants (2002) also focuses on election campaigns. However he analyzes multiple election campaigns, during the period 1998-2003 in the Netherlands. He uses a content-analysis of the five national newspapers that are also being used in another study (Takens et al., 2008). He focuses specifically on the news reports and the differences between the newspapers. He concludes that there is no bias towards one certain party. However in every election there are two main competitors and they receive significantly more attention than the other, smaller parties.

Scholten, Ruigrok, Schaper, Krijt, Welbers and Kiwitez (2010) do not focus on Dutch politics, but on American politics in Dutch newspapers. They specifically focus on the American elections of 2008. These researchers do not only focus on five national newspapers, but also on three free newspapers. They conclude, via content-analysis, that Dutch newspapers are extremely positive about Obama and his abilities and that there is a clear partisan bias towards the Democrats. Only *Trouw* has some skepticism in their reports about Obama. The majority of newspapers are negative about the Republicans. Some of the newspapers were quite positive about McCain, but Sarah Palin, his running mate, ensures that he is assessed worse. This was especially visible in *Trouw* and the free newspapers.

Scholten and Ruigrok (2006) state that Dutch media are often labeled as being leftish. Not only politicians accuse Dutch media of being leftish, but this also appears in reports of the advisory body of the government. They state that in the discussion about the partisan bias of the Dutch media, most of the times the critique lacks scientific substantiation. Therefore since 2005, the *National Nieuws Monitor* has started in the Netherlands. This is a scientific institution that constantly analyzes the Dutch news, to make the news process transparent. That Dutch newspapers are being accused of being leftish is endorsed by opinion editor Chris Rutenfrans (Geels, 2009). He says that *de Volkskrant*, *Trouw* and *NRC* are quite the same. Maybe one offers more news on religion and the other more news on opera, but when it comes to politics the three newspapers are all progressive and leftish. He even thinks that the Netherlands lacks a rightist newspaper that can be taken serious. According to Chris Rutenfrans *de Telegraaf* is not a newspaper for people who think. He therefore pleads for a good, rightist press just like in the US where you have *The Wall Street Journal*.

Shortcoming of research on partisan bias/partisanship

Current research focuses on news on different kind of topics and if there is proof for partisan bias. Every research focuses on one certain topic like Dutch election campaigns (Brants, 2002) or US election campaigns (Ansolabehere, Lessem. & Snyder Jr., 2006). However Puglisi (2006) shows that a newspaper can show signs of Democratic as well as Republican partisanship and this depends on the topic. What these researchers have in common is that they collect all news stories on that certain topic during a certain period and draw general conclusions of partisan bias on this main topic for this period. However, for example US election campaigns consist of multiple subtopics that could be evaluated separately on partisan bias. Puglisi (2006) shows that certain main topics show signs of partisan bias

towards the Democrats or Republicans, so this could also be the case for certain subtopics within a main topic. This idea is confirmed by research (Lott & Hassett, 2004) that shows that different indicators, which can be seen as subtopics, of the economy in newspaper coverage all have their own partisanship towards either the Democrats or Republicans. This result leaves the option open that this could also be the case in the Netherlands on subtopics. This is what is being researched in this study on the main topic of immigration in the Netherlands.

Immigration issue in the Netherlands

The immigration issue is a hot item for research in the media within the Netherlands, because of the rise and fall of anti-immigrant parties over the last decade like *The List Pim Fortuyn (LPF)*, *Proud of the Netherlands (TON)* and *The Freedom Party (PVV)* (Boomgaarden & Vlieninghart, 2007; Van der Brug, Fennema & Tillie, 2005; Van Spanje, 2010). Three researchers (Van der Brug et al., 2005) focus on the explanation of differences in support for anti-immigration parties across Europe on the aggregate level. Therefore the researchers created their own model, instead of using the socio-structural models, because they think this model cannot explain the differences anymore because of a lot of developments across Europe. Their new model is tested among 13 anti-immigrant parties in Europe. The results indeed show that the new model introduced by the researchers is way more accurate than the socio-structural model. So it is better in predicting success for anti-immigration parties and it is therefore a useful addition to this particular research field. Van Spanje (2010) looks into the power that well performing anti-immigration parties have on other parties' immigration policy positions. He takes 75 parties from 11 Western-European countries into account in his study. The results show that the performance of anti-immigration parties has an effect on the policy positions about immigration of other parties. The results also show that not in particular right

wing parties are influenced, but rather all parties have to take in a clear policy position. However parties who are in government tend not to be affected. So the effect of the anti-immigration parties on other parties is large, which makes them quite influential even when they are most of the times not even governing. Finally, Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart (2007) examine whether news media content on immigration issues can explain the rise of anti-immigrant parties in the Netherlands. Attention for immigration issues between 1990 and 2002 have been examined in this study by using a content analysis. The researchers control for factors that are being accused of influencing the success of anti-immigrant parties such as level of immigration and unemployment rate. The results indicate that there is a positive, significant effect between immigrant-related issues in the media and voter intention for anti-immigrant parties. According to these researchers future research should focus more on the news media content, for instance the tone of immigration stories towards political parties. In this research they distinguish multiple subtopics; multicultural society (multiculturele samenleving), residence permit (verblijfsvergunning) and naturalization (inburgering). These subtopics are being used in the upcoming study to assess whether there is partisan bias or partisanship on the level of these subtopics. This has to lead to an answer to the following research question: *To what extent is there evidence of partisanship in the coverage of de Telegraaf on the topic of immigration, and is there difference within subtopics, during the period September 11, 2001 until September 11, 2011?*

Methodology

Sample

Given the research question for this study, it is necessary to find articles that possibly indicate partisanship on various subtopics. As indicators, as further explained below, the focus is on the distribution and the nature of attention to right wing and left wing parties.

To obtain articles on the subtopics of immigration, all articles on these subtopics during the period 2001-2011 in the most read Dutch national newspaper are selected. In total 1325 articles are picked, but not all of these articles are describing the role of right wing and left wing parties. 377 of these 1325 articles were describing the role of either right wing or left wing parties or both, so these articles are picked to analyze. Because all articles are picked to analyze, there is no special sampling technique being used to help pick the articles.

The partisan bias will be researched over a longer period which is normal in these kind of studies (e.g., Ansolabehere, Lessem & Snyder Jr., 2006; Puglisi, 2006). *De Telegraaf*, the newspaper that will be used for this study, can be seen as a newspaper right of the centre and is regarded a conservative, popular newspaper which is being read by an intermediately educated part of society who are mostly middle aged and non-religious (Bakker & Scholten, 2011). After the depillarization during the 1960s and 1970s, the Dutch media can be characterized as a press who acts autonomously. There are no formal or institutional alignments with political parties or politicians. They also show a high pluriformity when looking at the content of the newspaper (Van der Eijk, 2000; Hallin & Mancini, 2004). To only chose *de Telegraaf* and analyze 377 newspaper articles has several reasons. First of all, there has to be operated within a limited time-span, therefore it is better to focus on one single newspaper. Secondly, since my aim was to yield a thorough picture of partisan coverage, an

in-depth investigation of a single newspaper was favored over a broader but less in-depth exploration of news coverage of multiple newspapers.

The newspaper and its articles about the subtopics of immigration are electronically available through LexisNexis for the entire research period (2001-2011). A number of keywords will be used to select these articles: multicultural society (multiculturele samenleving), residence permit (verblijfsvergunning) and naturalization (inburgering). These subtopics are used for this study because they have been distinguished in earlier research (Vliegthart & Roggebrand, 2007).

Measurements

To examine the partisanship of *de Telegraaf* during the period September 2001 until September 2011 the following variables will be measured, which form the bases of the analysis. The codebook can be found in table 1 on the page after the next page.

The first variable will be the year of publication of the article. This can be the years 2001 to 2011, where every year starts at the 12th of September and ends at the 11th of September on the next year.

Secondly, there is determined whether the party that is being discussed in the article could be considered a right wing party or a left wing party. According to several studies (Andeweg & Thomassen, 2011; Boomgaarden & Vliegthart, 2007) the following right wing parties, during the period of 2001-2011, can be distinguished when looking at their stance on immigration: *The List Pim Fortuyn (LPF)*, *The Freedom Party (PVV)*, *Proud of the Netherlands (TON)* and *People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD)*. These parties will be labeled the right wing parties. All other parties are considered left wing parties on this issue and thus also in this dataset. It is possible that an article includes multiple right wing or

left wing parties. Then the tone either all right wing or all left wing parties will be taken together. The article will then be used a single time for either right wing or for left wing parties. It is also possible that an article will be used twice. That happens when in a article both right and left wing parties are discussed.

Thirdly, the subtopics of the articles will be determined which can be multicultural society, resident's permit and naturalization. It is also possible that an article consists of multiple subtopics, but to avoid further complications only articles that discuss one single subtopic will be added to the dataset.

Finally, partisanship can be measured through multiple variables like the amount of words given to either left wing or right wing parties, the placement of the articles or the tone of the articles. In this study there will be focused on the most prominent measurement of partisanship; tone (e.g., Niven, 2001; Schiffer, 2006). The tone will be based on the coder's estimation whether the article is negative, neutral or positive in its treatment of the party that is being discussed in the article on the three subtopics earlier discussed. Articles are coded negative by newspapers if right wing or left wing parties are blamed for a problem, because they have failed to respond in a problem or they were not involved in a success. Articles are coded positive if newspapers credited right wing parties for trying to correct a problem. Articles that fit neither category, or suggest that right wing as well as left wing parties are responsible for the situation are labeled neutral. Examples of an article with in turn a negative, neutral and positive tone can be found in the appendix.

Table 1. Codebook

| <i>Variables</i> | <i>Value labels</i> |
|--|--|
| Year of publication | 0 = 12/09/01-11/09/02 1 = 12/09/02-11/09/03 2 = 12/09/03-11/09/04 3 = 12/09/04-11/09/05 4 = 12/09/05-11/09/06 5 = 12/09/06-11/09/07 6 = 12/09/07-11/09/08 7 = 12/09/08-11/09/09 8 = 12/09/09-11/09/10 9 = 12/09/10-11/09/11 |
| Is there a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 1 = no (left wing party) 2 = yes (right wing party) |
| The subtopic that is being discussed in the article | 0 = multicultural society 1 = resident's permit 2 = naturalization |
| Tone of the article regarding the party (parties) on the subtopic | 0 = negative 1 = neutral 2 = positive |

Analysis

The data will be analyzed quantitatively using a computer-assisted content analysis. In total 3 figures and 4 tests will be executed. First of all, the differences and/or similarities between right wing and left wing parties will be presented in 3 different figures, which can be found in the results section (Table 2-Table 4) . Then 4 tests will be ran with the collected data, 3 on the different subtopics and 1 on the main topic (Table 5). In all cases the independent variable is

whether there is a right wing party (right wing parties) being discussed in the article and the dependent variable is the tone of the article. This analysis, the *t*-test, will be executed for the articles per subtopic separately and for the main topic using all articles.

First of all, the number of articles per subtopic per year will be presented. This gives an overview of the distribution of the articles. Hereafter the differences and/or similarities in tone are analyzed on the three subtopics separately and between right wing and left wing parties will be presented in numbers which consist of percentages of articles, which can be found in the results section (Table 2-Table 4).

Secondly, the differences and/or similarities in tone on the three subtopics separately and the main topic will be analyzed, between right wing and left wing parties. This will be tested by using 4 independent two-sample *t*-tests (Howitt & Cramer, 2009). The *t*-test tests whether the means of the tone variable on the right wing and left wing parties are significantly different. The *t*-test on the main topic will use all articles (N=377), not selecting any subtopic. All this together has to answer the research question: *To what extent is there evidence of partisanship in the coverage of de Telegraaf on the topic of immigration, and is there difference within subtopics, during the period September 11, 2001 until September 11, 2011?*

Results

Comparisons of coverage on the subtopics of immigration and the main topic of immigration reveal little or no difference in the tone of coverage regarding right wing or left wing parties.

377 unique articles have been used to test whether there is partisanship, but not every subtopic got the same attention during the period of research. As shown in table 2 on the next page, more than half, 198 of the 377 articles, of the total number of articles used in this study are related to the subtopic residence permit. About a third of the articles, 112 of the 377

articles, is related to the subtopic of naturalization. Around a fifth of the articles, 67 of the 377 articles, is related to the subtopic of the multicultural society. When looking at the distribution of the articles the subtopic residence permit is spread evenly over the years. The subtopics of multicultural society and naturalization show in some years an enormous increase or decrease of articles in comparison with the other years.

Table 2. Year of publication and their articles per subtopic

| | | | What is the subtopic that is being discussed in the article? | | | Total |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------|--|------------------|----------------|-------|
| | | | Multicultural society | Residence permit | Naturalization | |
| Year of publication | 12/09/01-11/09/02 | Count | 17 | 24 | 8 | 49 |
| | 12/09/02-11/09/03 | Count | 4 | 31 | 16 | 51 |
| | 12/09/03-11/09/04 | Count | 7 | 16 | 20 | 43 |
| | 12/09/04-11/09/05 | Count | 4 | 20 | 6 | 30 |
| | 12/09/05-11/09/06 | Count | 2 | 18 | 5 | 25 |
| | 12/09/06-11/09/07 | Count | 8 | 15 | 5 | 28 |
| | 12/09/07-11/09/08 | Count | 3 | 17 | 10 | 30 |
| | 12/09/08-11/09/09 | Count | 8 | 18 | 14 | 40 |
| | 12/09/09-11/09/10 | Count | 5 | 22 | 14 | 41 |
| | 12/09/10-11/09/11 | Count | 9 | 17 | 14 | 40 |
| Total | | Count | 67 | 198 | 112 | 377 |

Left wing parties are mentioned more often in the articles on the subtopics of immigration and the main topic than right wing parties. The overall tone of the articles on immigration is

mostly neutral, namely 78% which is shown in table 3 below. This means that articles do not fit neither the negative nor positive category. When it comes to the differences and similarities in tone between right wing and left wing parties, the table shows that the tone of articles is more often negative towards left wing parties than to right wing parties. However this difference is only 3.7 percent. Either wing receives the same amount of articles employing a positive tone.

Table 3. Tone of the articles on immigration regarding political wing

| | | | Left wing parties | Right wing parties | Total |
|---|----------|---|-------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Tone of the article regarding the party (parties) on the main topic | Negative | Count | 57 | 34 | 91 |
| | | % within there is a right wing party (parties) being discussed in the article | 18.7 | 15.0 | 17.1 |
| | Neutral | Count | 235 | 180 | 415 |
| | | % within there is a right wing party (parties) being discussed in the article | 77.0 | 79.3 | 78.0 |
| | Positive | Count | 13 | 13 | 26 |
| | | % within there is a right wing party (parties) being discussed in the article | 4.3 | 5.7 | 4.9 |
| Total | | Count | 305 | 227 | 532 |
| | | % within there is a right wing party (parties) being discussed in the article | 57.3 | 42.7 | 100 |

When looking at the tone specifically per subtopic and the differences and similarities between right wing and left wing parties, the results in table 4 on the next pages show that the overall tone of the articles regarding either wing is neutral. The numbers regarding left wing

and right wing parties are almost equal for the subtopic of multicultural society. There is more difference in the numbers on the subtopics of residence permit and naturalization. For the subtopic of residence permit left wing parties receive more negative articles than right wing parties, namely 17.4% versus 13.8%. On the other hand right wing parties receive more positive articles than left wing parties, namely 6.9% versus 2.7%. For the subtopic of naturalization left wing parties receive more negative articles than right wing parties, namely 17% versus 12.3%. However left wing parties also receive more positive article than right wing parties, namely 3.2% versus 1.5%.

Table 4. Tone of the articles per subtopic regarding political wing

| What is the subtopic that is being discussed in the article? | | | | Left wing party | Right wing party | Total |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------|------------------|-------|
| Multicultural society | Tone of the article regarding the party (parties) on the subtopic | Negative | Count | 15 | 8 | 23 |
| | | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | | 24,2% | 25,0% | 24,5% |
| | | Neutral | Count | 41 | 21 | 62 |
| | | | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | | 66,1% | 65,6% |
| | | Positive | Count | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| | | | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | | 9,7% | 9,4% |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|----------|---|--------|--------|--------|
| Total | | | Count | 62 | 32 | 94 |
| | | | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |
| Residence permit | Tone of the article regarding the party (parties) on the subtopic | Negative | Count | 26 | 18 | 44 |
| | | | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 17,4% | 13,8% | 15,8% |
| | | Neutral | Count | 119 | 103 | 222 |
| | | | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 79,9% | 79,2% | 79,6% |
| Positive | Count | 4 | 9 | 13 | | |
| | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 2,7% | 6,9% | 4,7% | | |
| Total | | | Count | 149 | 130 | 279 |
| | | | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |
| Naturalization | Tone of the article regarding the party (parties) on the subtopic | Negative | Count | 16 | 8 | 24 |
| | | | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 17,0% | 12,3% | 15,1% |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|--------|--------|--------|
| Neutral | Count | 75 | 56 | 131 |
| | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 79,8% | 86,2% | 82,4% |
| Positive | Count | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 3,2% | 1,5% | 2,5% |
| Total | Count | 94 | 65 | 159 |
| | % within there is a right wing party (are there right wing parties) being discussed in the article? | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

Now that the differences/similarities in the tone of the article are discussed in percentages, it is time to test whether these differences or similarities are significant or not to come to an answer on the research question. All results can be found in table 5 on the next page. Before the *t*-tests can be executed, the normality of the distribution of the tone variable has to be assessed for all test. In all cases the tone variable is normally distributed, so *t*-tests may be used.

Table 5. Results of the independent-samples *t*-tests

| | Is there a right wing party (parties) being discussed in the article? | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----|---------|
| Subtopic | <i>t</i> -statistic | df | p-value |
| Multicultural society | .09 | 92 | .93 |
| Residence permit | -1.49 | 277 | .14 |
| Naturalization | -.47 | 157 | .64 |
| | | | |
| Main topic | -1.30 | 530 | .19 |

First of all, an independent-samples *t*-test is conducted to compare the tone of the articles regarding the sub-topic of multicultural society on right wing and left wing parties. Levene's test for equality of variances was found not to be violated for the present analysis ($F(1,92) = .01, p = .93$). Owing to this non-violated assumption, a *t* statistic assuming homogeneity of variance was computed. The result shows that there is almost no difference in the scores for left wing parties ($M = 0.85; SD = 0.57$) and right wing parties ($M = 0.84; SD = 0.57$). This difference ($M_D = 0.01$) is not significant ($t(92) = .09, p = .93$). This result suggests that the tone of the article, when it comes to the subtopic of the multicultural society, does not differ significantly for right wing or left wing parties.

Secondly, an independent-samples *t*-test is conducted to compare the tone of the articles regarding a residence permit on right wing and left wing parties. Levene's test for equality of variances was found not to be violated for the present analysis ($F(1,277) = .97, p = .33$). Owing to this non-violated assumption, a *t* statistic assuming homogeneity of variance was computed. The result shows that there is almost no difference in the scores for left wing parties ($M = 0.85; SD = 0.43$) and right wing parties ($M = 0.93; SD = 0.45$). This difference ($M_D = -0.08$) is not significant ($t(277) = -1.49, p = .14$). This result suggests that the tone of

the article, when it comes to the subtopic of a residence permit, does not differ significantly for right wing or left wing parties.

Thirdly, an independent-samples *t*-test is conducted to compare the tone of the articles regarding naturalization on right wing and left wing parties. Levene's test for equality of variances was found not to be violated for the present analysis ($F(1,157) = 2.30, p = .13$). Owing to this non-violated assumption, a *t* statistic assuming homogeneity of variance was computed. The result shows that there is almost no difference in the scores for left wing parties ($M = 0.86; SD = 0.43$) and right wing parties ($M = 0.89; SD = 0.36$). This difference ($M_D = -0.03$) is not significant ($t(157) = -.47, p = .64$). This result suggests that the tone of the article, when it comes to the subtopic of naturalization, does not differ significantly for right wing or left wing parties.

Finally, an independent-samples *t*-test is conducted to compare the tone of all articles (main topic) on right wing and left wing parties. Levene's test for equality of variances was found not to be violated for the present analysis ($F(1,530) = 2.62, p = .11$). Owing to this non-violated assumption, a *t* statistic assuming homogeneity of variance was computed. The result shows that there is almost no difference in the scores for left wing parties ($M = 0.86; SD = 0.46$) and right wing parties ($M = 0.91; SD = 0.45$). This difference ($M_D = -0.05$) is not significant ($t(530) = -1.30, p = .19$). This result suggests that the tone of the article, when it comes to the main topic of immigration, does not differ for right wing or left wing parties.

All together none of the results is found significant, so the tone on both right wing and left wing parties, regarding subtopics or the main topic of immigration, is not different. Almost all newspaper articles have a neutral tone towards both political parties. Partisanship or partisan bias of *de Telegraaf* on subtopics and the main topic of immigration, during the research period, is therefore not proven.

Conclusion & Discussion

The pages of newspapers, in the United States and the Netherlands, have been tainted by numerous claims of partisan bias or partisanship (e.g., Ansolabehere, Lessem & Snyder Jr., 2006; Groseclose & Milyo, 2005; Takens, Ruigrok, Van Hoof & Scholten, 2008). Those claims derive from studies that focus on one main topic that is being researched during a certain period, for example studies into election campaigns or presidential campaigns. Nonetheless, these claims have not been subject to empirical evaluation based on testing the partisan bias or partisanship of subtopics who together form a main topic. Here, looking at the multicultural society, residence permit and naturalization as subtopics of the main topic of immigration, and then comparing the tone of the articles in *de Telegraaf* on right wing and left wing parties, allows us to see whether the newspaper show signs of partisanship.

Regarding the research question of partisanship, there is no evidence found to support claims of any meaningful partisan bias on the separate subtopics or on the main topic of immigration. The tone of the articles regarding right wing and left wing parties is not significantly different in all cases. The overall tone in the articles, regarding right wing and left wing parties, is mainly neutral. According to these results, the suggestion that Dutch journalists and thus their coverage would be biased towards political parties left from the political middle is not right (Deuze, 2002).

The implications of these results are two-fold. First of all, the results do not suggest difference in partisanship on subtopics of a particular main topic. Therefore existing research (e.g., Brants, 2002; Puglisi, 2006) did well in not distinguishing subtopics within studies looking at partisanship on a certain main topic. Secondly however, one single study cannot rule out the existence of partisanship on subtopics of a certain main topic. While the current study does not show signs of difference in partisanship on subtopics, earlier research does

prove some evidence for difference in partisanship on subtopics (Lott & Hassett, 2004). When partisanship on subtopics would differ this would have serious consequences for the results of existing literature. This would lead to more accurate and specific results and conclusions. For example Kahn and Kenney (2002) found that in 67 senatorial campaigns US newspapers give systematically more favorable coverage to endorsements who are incumbent. However a senatorial campaign, which can be seen as a main topic, can be divided into several subtopics. A US senatorial campaign consists of subtopics like television advertising, fundraising, online campaigning etcetera (Johnson, 2011). When looking at these subtopics separately it is possible to find out to what extent there is partisanship on these subtopics and if it differs. It could be possible that newspapers give systematically more favorable coverage to endorsements who are incumbent, but only on the subtopics television advertising and online campaigning. On the subtopic fundraising, newspapers could give systematically more favorable coverage to endorsements who are not incumbent. Now partisanship on the main topic could show either Republican or Democratic partisanship, but in new studies, focusing on the subtopics separately, this result could differ per subtopic. Likewise this also affects the study of Puglisi (2006) on the presidential campaigns in the United States of America and can even be applied to Dutch studies (Takens et al., 2008; Brants; 2002). The latter for example did not find bias towards one party, analyzing multiple Dutch election campaigns. However looking at subtopics of these election campaigns separately, using the new technique, the new results could give new insights. The current research only suggests partisanship of newspapers to Republicans or Democrats or right wing or left wing parties. However the new technique could point out that a newspaper is not as tainted as suggested, because on one subtopic it is biased towards the Republicans or right wing parties and on the other subtopic it is biased towards the Democrats or left wing parties. Overall the newspaper would then be less biased towards one single party or wing and therefore the population in that country could get less

skeptical of the tone of that particular newspaper. It even can have an influence on the way populations think about political issues (Groseclose & Milyo, 2005).

However this study has limitations and these could be hopefully resolved in future research. First of all, this research is based on a case study of one newspaper only, therefore obviously precluding the possibility to ‘generalize’ the findings presented here. In other words, it is not possible to compare results with other newspapers on these subtopics and main topic. If multiple newspapers were used, than this would make it more easy to compare and makes it help to identify evidence of partisanship more accurately. Therefore future research should always analyze two or more newspapers when it comes to partisanship on subtopics.

Secondly, this study only uses the most commonly used measure of partisanship in the form of the tone of the article. Partisanship can be measured through more variables such as the placement of the article and the length of the article (e.g., Niven, 2001; Schiffer; 2006). However the placement and the length of the article do not explicitly point out partisanship. A long article on the front page of a newspaper can show the same partisanship than a short article in the middle of the newspaper. Therefore future studies have to come up with other measures of partisanship, to see if these measures have an effect on the partisanship of newspapers.

Thirdly, this study has not find any significant differences in tone of the articles regarding right wing and left wing parties. This could partly be an effect of the sampling technique. In this study is chosen to collect all articles that were available during the years, without distinguishing columns, opinion articles and ANP articles. Columns and opinion articles for example have shown to employ mostly a negative or positive tone towards right wing or left wing parties. ANP articles, from the biggest Dutch press agency, tend to employ mostly a neutral tone towards right wing or left wing parties. Therefore, in future research,

researchers should make distinctions between these kind of articles, otherwise the results could be influenced too much. They could also collect more articles which are written by journalists of the newspaper(s) itself.

Fourthly, the categories of the tone variable could have been more extensive. For example articles that fit the negative tone label are articles in where parties not responded in a problem or are not involved in a success. But parties can also be portrayed otherwise negatively, but are not counted as so because they do not fit this label. This also applies for the positive label. Here only articles were coded positive if parties were credited for trying to correct a problem, but for example parties could also be involved in a success without correcting a problem. Therefore, in future research, the labels of a negative and positive tone have to be extended.

Finally, future research should extend research into subtopics, because the assumption that partisanship is only present in main topics and not in subtopics is too simple (Lott & Hassett, 2004). For example the current study could be extended by testing it on other Dutch newspapers and to test whether there are differences or similarities between these newspapers. This could lead to a more concrete picture of supposed partisanship in Dutch newspapers on subtopics of immigration. Still, when this would lead to no clear patterns of partisanship, this does not has to mean that partisanship on subtopics is necessarily absent. Therefore this research also has to spread on other main topics like election campaigns or economic news. It is even possible to repeat earlier studies and distinguish subtopics in the collected articles to test whether there is partisanship on subtopics of a certain main topic. Therefore the earlier mentioned limitations and the possible solutions should be used in this future research.

Bibliography

- Alterman, E. (2003). *What liberal media? The truth about bias and the news*. New York: Basic Books.
- Andeweg, R. & Thomassen, J. (2011). *Democratie doorgelicht. Het functioneren van de Nederlandse democratie*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Ansolabehere, S., Lessem, R. & Snyder Jr., J. M. (2006). The orientation of newspaper endorsements in U.S. elections, 1940-2002. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 1(4), 393-404.
- Bagdikian, B. H. (1997). *The media monopoly*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bakker, P. & Scholten, O. (2011). *Communicatiekaart van Nederland*. (8th ed.). Alphen aan de Rijn: Kluwer.
- Baron, D. P. (2006). Persistent media bias. *Journal of Public Economics*, 90(1), 1-36.
- Bennett, W. L. (1988). *News: The politics of illusion*. New York: Longman.
- Boomgaarden, H. G. & Vliegenthart, R. (2007). Explaining the rise of anti-immigrant parties: The role of news media content in the Netherlands. *Electoral Studies*, 26(2), 404-417.
- Brants, K. (2002). *Politiek & media in verwarring*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Brants, K. & van Praag, P. (2005). Op weg naar de toeschouwersdemocratie. In K. Brants & P. van Praag (Eds.), *Politiek en media in verwarring; de verkiezingscampagnes in het lange jaar 2002* (pp. 268-279). Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Chiang, C. F. & Knight, B. (2011). Media bias and influence: Evidence from newspaper endorsements. *Review of Economic Studies*, 78(3), 795-820.
- DellaVigna, S. & Kaplan, E. (2006). The Fox news effect: Media bias and voting. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3), 1187-1234.
- Deuze, M. (2002). *Journalists in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers.

- Druckman, J. N. & Parkin, M. (2005). The impact of media bias: How editorial slant affects voters. *Journal of Politics*, 67(4), 1030-1049.
- Franken, A. (2003). *Lies and the lying liars who tell them: A fair and balanced look at the right*. New York: Dutton.
- Gaspar, J. T. (2011). Shifting ideologies? Re-examining media bias. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 6(1), 85-102.
- Geels, B. (2009, July 20). Chris Rutenfrans wil een rechtse kwaliteitskrant. *HP/De Tijd*. Retrieved November 24, 2011, from <http://www.hpdetijd.nl/2009-07-20/chris-rutenfrans-wil-een-rechtse-kwaliteitskrant>
- Gentzkow, M. A. & Shapiro, J. M. (2007). Media bias and reputation. *Journal of Political Economy*, 114(2), 280–316.
- Gilens, M. (1999). *Why Americans hate welfare: Race, media, and the politics of antipoverty policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Groseclose, T. & Milyo, J. (2005). A measure of media bias. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(4), 1191–1237.
- Gueorguieva, V. (2008). Voters, MySpace, and Youtube: The impact of alternative communication channels on the 2006 election cycle and beyond. *Social Science Computer Review*, 26(3), 288-300.
- Hallin, D. C. & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howitt, D. & Cramer, D. (2009). *Statistiek in de sociale wetenschappen*. (3rd ed.). Amsterdam: Pearson Education.
- Johnson, D. W. (2011). *Campaigning in the twenty-first century: A whole new ballgame?* New York: Routledge.

- Kahn, K. F. & Kenney, P. J. (2002). The slant of the news: How editorial endorsements influence campaign coverage and citizens' views of candidates. *American Political Science Review*, 96(2), 381-394.
- Larcinese, V., Puglisi, R. & Snyder Jr, J. M. (2007). Partisan bias in economic news: Evidence on the agenda-setting behavior of U.S. newspapers. *Social Science Research Network*. Retrieved December 1, 2011, from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/25185/>
- Lott, J. R. & Hassett, K. A. (2004). Is newspaper coverage of economic events politically biased? *Social Science Research Network*. Retrieved December 1, 2011, from <http://www.aei.org/404/>
- McQuail, D. (2005). *Mass communication theory: An introduction* (5th ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Milyo, J. (2007). *The effects of cross-ownership on the local content and political slant of local television news*. Retrieved December 1, 2011, from <http://web.missouri.edu/~milyoj/files/Publications/Milyo%20FCC%20Cross-Ownership%20Study%20REVISED.pdf>
- Niven, D. (2001). Bias in the news: Partisanship and negativity in media coverage of presidents George Bush and Bill Clinton. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 6(3), 31-46.
- Puglisi, R. (2006). Being the New York Times: The political behaviour of a newspaper. *Social Science Research Network*. Retrieved December 1, 2011, from http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/19292/1/Being_the_new_york_times.pdf
- Schiffer, A. J. (2006). Assessing partisan bias in political news: The case(s) of local senate election coverage. *Political Communication*, 23(1), 23-39.

- Scholten, O. & Ruigrok, N. (2006). Politiek en politici in het nieuws in vijf landelijke dagbladen. *Stichting het persinstituut: De Nederlandse nieuwsmonitor*. Retrieved December 1, 2011, from <http://www.nieuwsmonitor.net/publications/list>
- Scholten, O., Ruigrok, N., Schaper, J., Krijt, M., Welbers, K. & Kiwitz, K. (2010). De Amerikaanse verkiezingen in de Nederlandse dagbladen. *Stichting het Persinstituut: De Nederlandse nieuwsmonitor*. Retrieved December 1, 2011, from <http://www.nieuwsmonitor.net/publications/list>
- Takens, J. H., Ruigrok, N., Van Hoof, A. M. & Scholten, O. (2008). Leaning to the right or leaning to the left? Dutch media and politics. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, Quebec*. Retrieved December 1, 2011, from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p233853_index.html
- Van Aelst, P. & Vliegenthart, R. (2010, November 22). Rechtse media ontzien rechtse politici niet. *Trouw*. Retrieved December 1, 2011, from <http://www.trouw.nl/tr/nl/4324/Nieuws/article/detail/1807553/2010/11/22/Rechtse-media-ontzien-rechtse-politici-niet.html>
- Van der Brug, W., Fennema, M. & Tillie, J. (2005). Why some anti-immigrant parties fail and others succeed. A two-step model of aggregate electoral support. *Comparative Political Studies*, 38(5), 537-573.
- Van der Eijk, C. (2000). The Netherlands: Media and politics between segmented pluralism and market forces. In R. Gunter & A. Mughan (Eds.), *Democracy and the media: A comparative perspective* (pp. 303-342). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Spanje, J. (2010). Contagious parties: Anti-immigration parties and their impact on other parties' immigration stances in contemporary Western Europe. *Party Politics*, 16(5), 563-586.

- Vliegenthart, R. & Roggeband, C. M. (2007). Framing immigration and integration: Relationships between press and parliament in the Netherlands. *International Communication Gazette*, 69(3), 295-319.
- Zaller, J. R. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Example of an article with a negative tone towards both wing parties:

February 12, 2002

Iedereen aast op Fortuyn-stemmers

LUNSHOF, KEES

LENGTH: 811 words

De oude aanhang van Leefbaar Nederland is ruwweg in vier categorieën in te delen. Om te beginnen is er een vaste groep boze proteststemmers die al jaren van de ene partij naar de andere zweeft zolang het maar geen regeringspartij is. Die is goed voor circa zeven zetels.

Daarnaast is er een nog iets grotere groep VVD-stemmers die de eigen partij heeft verlaten omdat die zich te veel vereenzelvigde met Paars. Deze groep 'Wiegel-liberalen' is goed voor zo'n acht zetels. Een derde groep zijn de jongeren die anders waarschijnlijk niet zouden stemmen. Verder komt een klein deel rechtstreeks van de linkse partijen. Bij deze stemmers speelt het migratievraagstuk een niet onbelangrijke rol. Proteststemmers stemden in 1994 massaal op D66, die hen eenmaal in het kabinet weer snel kwijt raakte. In 1998 profiteerden vooral GroenLinks en SP van de proteststemmers. Met een ruk naar links had dat weinig van doen. Er miste nu eenmaal ter rechterzijde zo'n partij. Tot in ieder geval vorige week parkeerden die proteststemmers hun stem bij LN. Dat de links-radicalen per saldo toch gelijk blijven, komt omdat ze op hun beurt kiezers weghalen bij D66 en PvdA. Ook de VVD van Dijkstal richtte zich, met weinig succes, op die laatstgenoemde kiezers, de traditionele VVD-stemmers vergetend. Deze laatsten vonden hun weg naar LN. De VVD zal zeker proberen hen terug te winnen. Maar daar liggen ook kansen voor het CDA van Balkenende. Dat die in een enquête de VVD heeft ingehaald en de tweede partij is, moet de liberalen te denken geven. De verschillende motieven van de kiezers maken dat de 22 zetels niet voor iedereen voor het oprapen liggen. Zo behoeven de paarse partijen niet te rekenen op de pure proteststemmers op LN. Die stemmen nooit op een regeringspartij. Zij zullen het verlies van PvdA en D66 aan de linkse partijen dan ook niet goed maken.

D66 staat al tijden op meer dan halvering van de partij. Lijsttrekker Thom de Graaf hoopt op ten minste acht zetels om te kunnen meeregeren, mits zijn partij in een meerderheidskabinet de doorslag kan geven en niet, zoals nu, overbodig is. Haar inbreng in het kabinetsbeleid was beperkt, terwijl ze veel last heeft van de gebrekkige populariteit van minister Borst en haar wachtlijsten. Ook bij de PvdA zit er de klad in nu kiezers er achterkomen dat Kok echt verdwijnt. Melkert is niet

de charismatische leider die massaal kiezers trekt. De partij maakt zich overigens over het zetelverlies nauwelijks druk. Ze blijft, zoals het zich nu laat aanzien, de grootste waardoor ze de premier kan leveren. Bovendien kan er zonder haar waarschijnlijk niet geregeerd worden. Den Uyl en Kok begonnen ook met een kleinere PvdA. VervelingDe VVD zal de groep traditionele proteststemmers en de recalcitrante jongeren binnen LN evenmin kunnen winnen. De VVD heeft wel meer kans op het terugwinnen van de pas onlangs weggelopen eigen kiezers. Dan is het verstandig, maar niet genoeg, om Wiegel of Bolkestein in te zetten om die dan na de verkiezingen weer weg te schuiven. Dijkstal zal dat zelf moeten doen. Voor het CDA liggen onder die ex-VVD'ers ook kansen. Over het migratievraagstuk en de **multiculturele samenleving** is de partij altijd duidelijk geweest. Financiële soliditeit staat naast solidariteit, hoog in haar vaandel. Ze is net als de VVD hard wat betreft de aanpak van de criminaliteit, wil ook meer verantwoordelijkheid aan de burgers geven, is al tijden voor kleinschaligheid en vernieuwing van de volksgezondheid. Ze kan met nieuwe mensen en nieuwe ideeën wellicht iets nieuws tegenover de verveling met Paars stellen. Moeilijker wordt het voor het CDA om de immer zwevende groep boze kiezers uit Leefbaar Nederland aan zich te trekken. Die associëren die partij met de gevestigde macht. Ook voor de swingende jongeren is het CDA niet erg aantrekkelijk.

Buiten kijf staat dat de gevestigde partijen de zorgen van de kiezers meer in acht moeten nemen, ook al is Leefbaar Nederland nu veel van haar aantrekkingskracht kwijt en nog moet blijken of Fortuyn op eigen kracht veel verder komt. Maar gezien de verschillende achtergronden van de LN-kiezers ligt een uitwaaiering daarvan over verschillende partijen voor de hand.

Een ding is zeker. Wat meer speelsheid, wat meer elkaar uitdagen en minder fletsheid maakt, net als nieuwe gezichten, de politiek spannender. Dat voorkomt ook verveling zoals met Paars. Ook het meer uitstralen gevoelig te zijn voor de noden van de mensen is nodig als het gaat om handhaving van regels, bestrijding van criminaliteit, de volksgezondheid, het onderwijs, kleinschaligheid en het migratieprobleem. Om onderlinge ruzies te voorkomen was Paars II te zakelijk. Ook werden te veel zaken vooruitgeschoven. Het wordt tijd dat de bestaande partijen hun politieke agenda's meer op die van de kiezers en van de maatschappij afstemmen en wat minder op wat hen zint en uitkomt.

LOAD-DATE: Rubriek Politiek
February 15, 2002

Example of an article with a neutral tone towards a left wing party:

December 15, 2001

PvdA wil vrij op Suikerfeest

BOS, ALEXANDRA VANDEN

LENGTH: 119 words

Van onze parlementaire
redactie

AMSTERDAM, zaterdag

De PvdA wil dat Nederland Hemelvaartsdag of tweede pinksterdag als vrije dag afschaft en inruilt voor een extra vrije dag tijdens de jaarlijkse viering van het islamitische Suikerfeest. Het congres van de PvdA nam gisteren een voorstel daartoe van de afdeling-Rotterdam over. Tegelijkertijd werd vastgelegd dat 1 mei, de Dag van de Arbeid, voortaan een vrije dag moet worden.

Volgens de PvdA'ers past een vrije dag op een islamitische feestdag goed in de huidige **'multiculturele samenleving'**. Het PvdA-bestuur noemde het voorstel aanvankelijk niet realistisch, maar het merendeel van de congresgangers steunde uiteindelijk wel het voorstel.

LOAD-DATE: De PvdA wil dat Nederland Hemelvaartsdag of tweede pinksterdag als vrije dag afschaft en inruilt voor een extra vrije dag tijdens de jaarlijkse viering van het islamitische Suikerfeest. Het congres van de PvdA nam gisteren een voorstel daartoe van de afdeling-Rotterdam over. Tegelijkertijd werd vastgelegd dat 1 mei, de Dag van de Arbeid, voortaan een vrije dag moet worden.

February 4, 2002

LANGUAGE: Dutch / Nederlands

PUB-TYPE: Paper

Example of an article with a positive tone towards a right wing party:

May 1, 2002

Politieke Gastenboek Pim Fortuyn : Kies voor verandering

VEERMAN, RONALD

LENGTH: 518 words

De waarheid over de **multiculturele samenleving** mocht jarenlang niet worden gezegd, met als gevolg dat geen passende maatregelen werden genomen. Wij eisen dat nieuwkomers zich inspinnen om zich de Nederlandse taal en cultuur eigen te maken. De ongecontroleerde toestroom van nieuwkomers zorgt voor tweedeling en maakt de grote steden onleefbaar. Wij nemen het niemand kwalijk dat hij hier zijn heil komt zoeken, we nemen het wel de paarse overheid kwalijk dat zij in het buitenland de illusie heeft gewekt dat in het dichtbevolkte Nederland plaats is voor iedereen. Daardoor ontkracht zij de nieuwe Vreemdelingenwet.

Valse hoop

Vorig jaar zijn 33.000 asielzoekers naar Nederland gekomen, van wie minder dan tien procent echt zal worden toegelaten. De meesten belanden dus in de illegaliteit. Dit betekent dat 30.000 mensen een vergeefse reis hebben gemaakt en valse hoop is gegeven. Dat is pas asociaal! Helderheid is geboden, de Nederlandse ambassades en plaatselijke media zullen worden ingeschakeld om het nieuwe aangescherpte beleid in het buitenland uit te dragen. Vluchtelingen moeten volgens de richtlijnen van de Verenigde Naties in de regio worden opgevangen. Het is onze plicht daar ruimhartig financieel aan bij te dragen.

Er moet meer blauw op straat en minder achter het bureau. Elk gedoogbeleid ten aanzien van onveiligheid op straat dient te verdwijnen. Tegen minachting van de politie wordt krachtig opgetreden. Er moeten prioriteiten worden gesteld. Het is onbegrijpelijk dat justitie wel de burger aanpakt die het recht op zelfverdediging uitoefent, maar de boeven laat lopen. Het is onbegrijpelijk dat justitie wel een brave Turkse kleermaker en hardwerkende Poolse aspergestekers oppakt, maar geen tijd zegt te hebben om misdrijven op te lossen. Wanneer gaan we eens normaal doen? De korpsleiding moet op resultaat worden afgerekend.

Het doek is nu voor Paars gevallen en u krijgt op 15 mei een unieke kans te kiezen voor echte verandering. Dat kunnen we u garanderen als de Lijst Pim Fortuyn de grootste partij wordt. Als u naar de Soundmixshow heeft gekeken, dan zag u dat de paarse politici u gouden bergen beloofden. Zelfs GroenLinks beloofde zowaar de bureaucratie te gaan aanpakken. Over populisme gesproken!

Vindt u niet vreemd dat inmiddels nagenoeg al onze standpunten zijn overgenomen door partijen die ons eerst zwart maakten? Hoe geloofwaardig zijn VVD en PvdA die jaren de kans kregen en hoe betrouwbaar is het CDA dat blijft lonken naar links? Om maar te zwijgen van de combinatie PvdA en GroenLinks die dodelijk is voor de automobilist. De LPF maakt een einde aan het autootje pesten en gaat de doorstroming van het verkeer verbeteren.

Ik wil terug naar de menselijke maat, terug naar kleinere scholen en ziekenhuizen, waar mensen met plezier aan het werk gaan en het ziekteverzuim daalt. Geen Haagse dictaten, maar de zeggenschap terug bij de mensen die het moeten doen: de onderwijzers, artsen, verpleegkundigen en politieagenten.

U kunt daarvoor zorgen. Het is zij of ik. Kies voor verandering. Stem Lijst 15.

Reacties: info@pimfortuyn.nl

LOAD-DATE: Column Pim Fortuyn 01 mei 2002
May 3, 2002

LANGUAGE: Dutch / Nederlands

PUB-TYPE: Paper