Robert Pinter, Annika Bergström, Fruzsina Gyenes, Leslie Haddon and Francesca Pasquali

Cross-cultural differences in press coverage of the internet

Book section

Cross-cultural differences in press framing of the internet

Robert Pinter, Annika Bergström, Fruzsina Gyenes, Leslie Haddon and Francesca Pasquali

In Haddon, L. (Ed.) (2011) *The Contemporary Internet: National and Cross-National European Studies*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt, pp.77-93

Introduction[1]

Although the internet is finding its way into more and more European households there are still considerable national differences in terms of take-up generally, in the adoption of newer developments like broadband, in overall amount of usage and, indeed, in consumer interest in particular services - as illustrated below in Table 1 for the four countries taking part in this media analysis project.

There will undoubtedly be many factors contributing to the variation shown below. Some influences on these figures come from the supply side - for example, to what extent access is actually available. Factors here include access to broadband, different national pricing structures and the online services offered (an aspect which has a bearing on how interesting and useful the internet is felt to be in the respective countries). Some of the factors affecting the extent of take-up are linked to potential demand, which in turn influence by income levels and ICT skills. In addition, without claiming that these are predominant factors, there will also be what might broadly be termed 'cultural' influences upon adoption and use. These have been initially charted in chapter one, but different facets are explored in chapters six and eight (see also Gilligan & Heinzmann 2005a, b).

One influence that may certainly have contributed to perceptions, attitudes and evaluations of the online world (which may in turn have had a bearing on adoption and use) is media coverage of the internet. To illustrate this, the *EU Kids Online* project was interested in perceptions of the risks facing children online and how parents act based on those perceptions, such as setting rules about what children can do on the internet– which in turn affects children's use (Hasebrink, et al., 2009). In principle, media representations could have a bearing on people's perceptions relating to other areas of the internet, such as

1 Although the authors collaborated the sections were predominately written as follows: the introduction by Bergström, the methodology by Pascali, the methodological limitations by Gyenes, the results of the content analysis by Pinter and the conclusions by Haddon.

eCommerce, eGovernment, online entertainment and leisure opportunities or, indeed, whether the internet is generally perceived as being a risky place to operate, not just for children. Media coverage may contribute to popular thinking about particular issues, such as debates about copyright in relation to downloadable material. Or sometimes the media may simply influence the symbolic impressions associated with a technology - its connotations, as explored in a previous COST project looking, cross-nationally, at social representations (Contarello, et al., 2008). In other words, there are a whole range of reasons for examining and levels upon which one can analyse such media coverage – asking how much is common across countries or whether there are national differences.

	UK	**Italy**	**Hungary**	**Sweden**
Internet access by households (Eurostat, 2008)	71%	42%	48%	84%
Broadband access by households (Eurostat, 2008)	62%	31%	42%	71%
Internet users (per 100 inhabitants, ITU 2007)	66%	54%	35%	77%
Reading online news, newspapers or magazines (all individuals, Eurostat, 2008)	37%	17%	33%	45%
Ordering goods or services for private purposes (all individuals, Eurostat, 2008)	49%	7%	8%	38%
Internet banking for private purposes (all individuals, Eurostat, 2008)	38%	13%	13%	65%
Reason for not having internet access at home: don't need internet ("Because not useful, not interesting etc.") (households without internet, Eurostat, Lööf, 2008)	30%	n.a.	49%	42%
Reason for not having internet access at home: lack of skills (households	13%	n.a.	28%	40%

without internet, Eurostat, Lööf, 2008)				

Table 1: National differences in experiences of the internet.

Media Studies research has developed a number of frameworks for examining such media processes. For example, one strand has focused on media moral panics, often specifically about children's relation to each new information and communication technology that appears – the internet included (Drotner, 1992; Boëthius, 1995; Critcher, 2008). Another strand of media analysis is that of 'agenda setting' whereby the media set the topics deemed to be of more public interest (McCombs & Shaw, 1972; Dearing & Rogers, 1996). Cultivation theory has looked at how media coverage can lead people to over-estimate the incidence of crime (Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Gerbner, et al., 1986). Here the emphasis is not on (the history of) particular media stories, as in the moral panic approach, but rather the routine processes of media coverage – in the example above, the routine coverage of crime that has a 'drip effect' of, over time, creating a (misleading) sense of the prevalence of the risk of crime.

In their various ways, all these approaches address the question of how the media frame reality (and potentially people's perceptions). In the research reported in this chapter the aim is certainly to address this issue of framing reality, and, in this chapter, this is achieved through a basic quantitative content analysis of media coverage, charting any convergences and variation across different national media.

As regards the specifically cross-cultural element, while there is an emerging literature on cross-cultural analysis, (Kohn, 1998; Livingstone, 2003) there is little on cross-national media differences. The work of Hallin and Mancini (2004) is probably the best known one for comparing whole media systems within Europe (e.g. the development of media markets, the degree of state interventionism, the extent of journalistic professionalism). But what is novel about the research project reported in this chapter is that it specifically examines variations in media content relating to a particular field: the internet.[2]

Methodology

The choice of countries studied – the UK, Italy, Hungary and Sweden – reflected the backgrounds of the participants in this study. Nonetheless, they represent not only geographical diversity in Europe but also the four media

2 Here there is a synergy with the *EU Kids Online* project, which has a strand focused on press coverage of children and the internet (Haddon & Stald, 2008).

systems analysed by Hallin & Mancini (2004), and by Jakubowicz (2007). This means that the chosen countries represent different media markets, political systems, media systems and journalistic professionalism (as stated by Hallin & Mancini), all of which can be important factors for the actual output in news media.

The decision was made to focus on newspapers, since there were relevant databases of these in some participating countries or else the articles were relatively easy to collect for a set period (e.g. compared to monitoring TV coverage). The pilot study suggested that if each team collected articles from two newspapers for three months this would generate enough material for analysis. More than two newspapers would generate more material than could be handled within the time available.[3]

The initial pilot study was conducted in the UK, which also served as a first pilot in the *EU Kids Online* project mentioned above. This allowed the team to test and add to the coding system that was being developed. It also provided a sense of what material existed, provided some indication of the time periods that would be required to obtain different sized samples of articles, showed differences in results between examining the original paper copy of newspapers versus electronic copy held on databases and indicated the results of using different search words in those databases. Importantly, the initial pilot also revealed how much research effort, mainly in terms of time, would be required when following different strategies. In the Italy, Hungary and Sweden group participants conducted further pilot analyses of the press in order to evaluate these choices and see what further issues emerged.

A sub-sample of material from the UK collection was then used to test intercoder reliability, since all participants spoke English (for intercoder reliability in general see Lombard, et al., 2002).[4] On the basis of these

---

3 To illustrate the trade-offs, in *EU Kids Online* the topic of children and the internet was much smaller, and hence more newspapers were examined in a fixed time period to generate a sufficient sample.

4 If we look at pairs of countries (e.g. UK vs. Italy), intercoder reliability ranged from 61%-85% for the centrality question (i.e. 'Is the internet the focus of the article?'). As regards the question of which section the article appeared in intercoder reliability ranged from 53% to 100%, but all the low scores turned out to be the same confusion of one particular pair of categories. In general there was considerable agreement. On the question of the area of life being examined intercoder reliability in the test ranged from 69%-85% - once again, in general there was a good deal of agreement. As regards the origin of the article, intercoder reliability in the test ranged from 38%-77%, but some of the low scores related to one

discussions about the pilot feedback and inter-code test the coding framework and search processes were finalised.

It was decided that one of the newspapers would be from the quality press (in the UK this is traditionally known as a 'broadsheet'): the *Independent* in the UK, *Népszabadság* in Hungary, *Corriere della Sera* in Italy, *Dagens Nyheter* in Sweden. One possibility was to then collect material from one of the popular press (or 'tabloids') in each country. But there was a question of what could be considered a tabloid in Italy – this is a first problem for comparative analysis, because in Italy this type of newspaper does not exist. However, since most countries seemed to have the free Metro newspaper, it was decided that this would be the second newspaper. Including the Metro added another dimension to the study, pointing to differences in content between the paid and the free press (Wadbring, 2007).

The time period chosen, based on the experience of the pilot study, was three months. The first collection was February, March and April, 2007.[5] A subsequent collection of articles took place in February, March and April 2008, both to explore whether there was much change on a year to year basis (or between different samples) and to have data that were nearer to the completion of the project. Only the first year's material is reported here.

In order to be comprehensive, a broad range of questions was asked, including the size of the article and whether there were illustrations (See annex 1 for the full list of questions[6]).

Methodological limitations

In the first year, the participants analysed and created a database of a total of 1457 articles. The individual totals are not reported since for Hungary, Italy and Sweden an electronic searchable version of the Metro was available online but this was not the case for the UK, whereas the reverse was true for the quality papers – the UK could use the press-database Lexis-Nexis to search for these, but in the other countries the quality newspaper was read in the printed form.

---

particular process – while some classified an article as originating in one of the categories offered, others classified it as 'Other' if it had some extra nuance. Intercoder reliability for identifying the spokesperson ranged from 77%-85%. Some subsequent discussion to clarify coding was held.

5 Since this was decided at a meeting in early February, it was sometimes not practical to find paper copies for the earlier dates. In which case, some articles were collected in the first few days in May to compensate – e.g. in the UK.

6 A fuller analysis of all the variables considered can be found in Pinter, et al. (2009).

This difference in search procedure produced some non-comparable totals, and some analyses were not possible (e.g. the UK database did not reveal if there were an illustration or not). But it seemed not to affect the other figures – for example, it was usually not the case that the UK was consistently different from the other three countries.

After collecting the data the decision was made to collapse together some categories listed in annex 1. For example, in the 'origins' of the story, the options, academic research, market research and other institutional research were initially separate as indicated in annex 1 but the percentages for each were so small that they were combined as 'research'.

Despite the precautions of conducting a pilot study, intercoder reliability testing and much discussion, it became clear when examining the findings that some options had been analysed slightly differently – e.g. in the 'area of life', 'culture' and 'technological developments' had clearly been open to broader and narrower interpretations depending on the analysts. Under 'origins' some analyses were based on a press release being inferred whereas others coded it only when a press release was explicitly mentioned. When this led to different statistics, it became clear that this was product of the classification process rather than a difference between national newspapers.

Finally, one last caveat is that each country chose one quality newspaper, and it is possible that in some respect choosing different newspapers would have had some effect on the statistics. That said, and partly based on a general familiarity with the various national media, the team felt that the general trends revealed in the figures reflected real similarities and differences in national media coverage.

Results of the content analysis

It is possible to conduct several types of analysis related to form and content both from a paid/free newspaper perspective as well as from a country comparison perspective. This chapter focuses on findings comparing the internet and broadband focus, and then continues by highlighting specific country differences. This means that single items of the data are picked to illustrate these differences and the presentation of our findings will not give the whole picture of the internet and broadband coverage in newspapers in the four countries.

As regards areas of commonality across countries, some of the findings confirmed the original expectations. Technology developments are not the most newsworthy aspects reported as the internet has become integrated into everyday life. Nowadays the online world is discussed over a range of other newspaper categories, the two most popular being security and crime (18% of all articles) and entertainment (17% of all articles).

The figures in the first line of Table 2 underline the way in which the internet is increasingly taken for granted: a third of the articles collected (ranging from

32% in the UK to 42% in Italy) refer to but were not primarily about the internet. Hence many readers now encounter references to the internet in the background or in passing.

	UK	Italy	Hungary	Sweden	Average
The internet is not the main focus	32%	42%	33%	36%	36%
Broadband is explicitly discussed	11%	5%	6%	4%	6%

Table 2: Percentage of articles where the focus is not the internet and where broadband is explicitly discussed.

In the second line of Table 2 it is clear that despite the fact that technology companies and policy makers currently have a strong interest in 'broadband', in practice this term only occurred in 6% of all articles. It was also common across countries that references to broadband occurred mainly in discussions of the internet's technical infrastructure (56% of all articles) and the developing market for broadband (16%). In other words, broadband is framed as technological development and not as a social phenomenon - comment on the social consequences of the internet occurred in other sections of newspapers.

As regards commonalities, many of the options for the questions listed above attracted low percentages across the countries. Lastly, some media processes seem to be similar across countries. For example, academics/researchers appear as the spokespeople (experts) in articles ranging from 6% of articles in Hungary to 8% in the UK. It is interesting to note that the national and European institutions seem unable to get their own views about the internet onto the media's agenda. With the partial exception of the UK, shown in Table 3, they rarely become a news source for the media and they are not effective in using the media to communicate their own discourse concerning the internet, the broadband and innovation.

	UK	Italy	Hungary	Sweden	Average
National / transnational law, regulation, statements	6%	5%	2%	2%	3%
Campaigns (lobbying, awareness raising)	7%	2%	0%	0%	2%

Table 3: Percentages of articles originating in laws, etc and campaigns.

The same is true – again with the partial exception of the UK, in Table 3 – for NGO and civil society associations (which usually are the promoters of events connected with campaign, lobbying, awareness raising, etc.). Even if they have an agenda concerning internet and innovation and use the internet as a place for their initiatives they are rarely effective in creating news events and communicating actions that break the mainstream news-making routines.

Looking now at national differences, background factors such as the different level of internet adoption in each country seemed to make less difference to media coverage than variations in the media styles in the different national newspapers. This in turn, however, can be a consequence of the different media system models mentioned initially, which themselves include technological developments.

One notable exception is perhaps stories relating to e-commerce as an area of life: it is only covered in 4% of articles in Italy, which is 2-3 times less than in other countries in Table 4. Here media coverage probably reflects the fact that eCommerce has not been adopted so much in Italy, in large part because it is not trusted as a secure medium.

	UK	**Italy**	**Hungary**	**Sweden**	**Average**
eCommerce	12%	4%	8%	7%	7%

Table 4: Percentage of articles were 'eCommerce' was the area of life covered.

One observation concerns the organisation of newspapers: the same type of story can appear in one country's business news, in another's international news or in yet another country's technology sections. This potentially frames the subject matter slightly differently by virtue of where it is located (and thinking about the process of reading, some readers might not come across certain articles if they do not tend to read those sections).

For example, in the Swedish Metro, the proportion of entertainment items relative to the other countries is boosted by the regular 'website of the day' tip – but this is found in the financial section, even though it is not really 'financial' news! This single fact meant that the 'economy' section was relatively high in Sweden compared to the other countries. Meanwhile, in the Hungarian quality paper every fourth article was to be found in the technology section, which suggests that internet is still perceived as being a technological innovation rather than as an economic or socio-cultural phenomenon. In fact, in some of the other countries' press there was no dedicated section for technology. Conversely, in UK, 25% of all articles appeared in the section for company news - whereas the Hungarian Metro, for example, has no such section, so events like company

takeovers tend to be reported in technology section in this newspaper, probably because it has limited impact economically on the everyday life of Hungarians.

In Italy, Sweden and the UK, the percentage of articles originating in the legal field is fairly similar (see Table 5), probably reflecting media routines where the police and the courts among the most traditional and common media sources.[7] But we see a noticeable difference in the case of Hungary, perhaps reflecting a lower incidence of crime reporting in general (and what coverage there is tends to be in terms of foreign news about crime and the internet).[8]

	UK	Italy	Hungary	Sweden	Average
Court case, police action or crimes	12%	11%	3%	10%	8%

Table 5: Percentage of articles where the origin was court cases, police actions of crimes.

Even where the percentage of articles originating from court cases, police action and crime reporting is similar, the framing varies in different countries. The clearest example is Italy, where the internet is more often framed as a "social problem" (Italy has the highest rate of articles characterised in this way with 11%, and Sweden the lowest with 1%), and where the newspapers tend to report the online world using highly emotive terms. In Table 6 it is shown that in Italy a much higher percentage of members of the public and victims find a voice in the media than in other countries, but conversely there are also more institutional voices talking about the internet (even when it is related to crime, police action, etc.). This of course is relevant to the construction of a more widespread apprehension about the online world in the Italian press.

	UK	Italy	Hungary	Sweden	Average
Member of the public, victim	13%	25%	20%	14%	18%
Non-commercial Institutions	8%	12%	7%	7%	9%

Table 6: Percentage of spokespeople quoted in new stories.

7 In the *EU Kids Online* study relating to press coverage of children, this source was even higher and dominated coverage (Haddon & Stald, 2008).

8 Generally, not only in the case of legal/ crime related internet news, there is much more foreign internet news reported in Hungary than national internet news.

What is perhaps striking about the UK newspapers is, in various guises, the presence of business in articles about the internet. There is more business internet news than in the other countries and we more frequently hear the voices of company spokespeople. Nearly half of the articles mention at least one brand in the UK, and many different companies mentioned one. In other countries only approximately 15% of the articles contain brands. Finally, a much higher proportion of the stories originate from companies reports in the UK. Most probably it can be explained by the fact that London has a strong stock exchange and vivid business life; hence the presence of companies in the media has had a long tradition.

	UK	Italy	Hungary	Sweden	Average
Brand mentioned	30%	13%	12%	12%	15%
Spokesperson: Company[9]	48%	18%	24%	42%	33%
Origins: Company reports, company statements, profit warnings	32%	1%	1%	1%	6%

Table 7: Percentage of stories mentioning brands, having company spokespeople and originating in company reports.

Another difference is related to the higher level of 'political' presence in the news in Italy and Hungary. In the Italian case this is mainly connected to the habit by journalists of reporting politicians' points of view on almost every kind of issue, which in turn relates to the high degree of mediatisation of Italian politics. In the case of Hungary the reason is the ongoing debate on the role of Hungarian Government in building the information society and propagating internet use because of the current relatively low penetration rate.

	UK	Italy	Hungary	Sweden	Average
Politicians, government	6%	17%	19%	8%	13%

Table 8: Percentage of politicians and government spokespeople in articles.

9 Internet industry, media industry and other companies

In contrast, in Sweden there were no 'hot' political issues about broadband and the internet by the time of the data collection. Five to ten years ago there probably would have been, with focus on how to overcome the digital divide, how to organise broadband infrastructural development, but nowadays the country no longer faces these kinds of challenges.

Conclusion

This study has focused on the meaning of the internet, since what it symbolises (at various levels) has a bearing upon perceptions of how much the internet is leading to changes in the way we live our lives, to changes in the economy, the political system and cultural life more generally – and whether this is for better or worse. What we understand by the internet and what is happening on it, or what we can do with it, can have a bearing upon people's decisions to use it, their awareness and choice of what to do online, what they let their children do, etc. In other words, the symbolism of technology is important, important for understanding usage, but important for reasons beyond that.

People derive their understanding of the internet from various sources, but one key source of representations of life online comes from the media, increasingly so according to some of the theorists discussed. Hence, this chapter has examined the levels on which the media may provide audiences with messages and whether and how these vary cross-nationally. One of the key interests of this book is the cultural factors at work, especially affecting adoption and use. Here, media representations can be viewed as being one such cultural influence.

Although, in principle, the interest is in media more generally, the focus has been on the press both for practical reasons and because reading figures generally indicate that this medium retains an important role in the life of many Europeans. One limitation is the decision to cover just two newspapers per country. However, the parallel *EU Kids Online* study drew on a sample from more newspapers per country and also found find data showing cross-national differences. Hence, even with this limited sample size of the project report here, when coupled with our background knowledge of the national media of these four countries we believe that the findings do reveal something about country differences and certainly about different media logics in the press.

To start with the commonalities across the different national newspapers the evolving internet still remains somewhat special in the sense that stories are often reported because they involve the internet. Of course, that can be true of other media, such as stories about developments in television, but at this point at least the majority of coverage still places it in the foreground. That said, there is also a process of routinisation since the internet is now only in the background

in many stories as it has become more taken for granted. Meanwhile, it is the internet in general that is still special, as indicated by the number of stories about internet firms, websites and emails, although its continuing evolution through developments such as web 2.0 applications may help to keep it newsworthy. In comparison, broadband is only explicitly discussed in a small proportion of cases, and mainly in relation to technological and market developments rather than social ones.

Aside from these commonalities, this chapter has demonstrated the numerous ways in which, and levels of which, some country variation exists. In that sense has contributed to cross-cultural analysis of the media more generally, complementing the comparative analysis of media systems, as well as more substantively adding to our understanding of representations of the internet.

Turning to the detail, the variation examined included the coverage of particular topics (e.g. eCommerce), the area of life from which stories are drawn (e.g. crime), the origins of articles, and the spokespeople whose voice is heard in the different media.[10]

Of course, some of the variation in coverage may reflect aspects of the society more generally, for instance certain values, in which case there is an argument that the media are reflecting the wider social context.[11] However, we saw how national internet diffusion rates did not seem to shape the level of coverage overall and we strongly suspect that the different media logics discussed earlier count for much of the variation. Thus point is made all the more clearly when formatting differences between national newspaper are such that certain sections do not even exist in some of the press covered. Of course, a quantitative content analysis alone cannot explain all the reasons for the cross-national variation identified, but we have tried to provide some plausible suggestions from wider background knowledge of the national media covered. In other words, the chapter has attempted to contextualise, indeed account for, some of this variation through observations about the, especially cultural, processes at work in the respective countries.

---

10 Although it is not covered here, there was also variation in how the articles visually appear, as reflected in their number, size and whether they are illustrated (see Pinter, et al., 2009). This can - even if only at an unconscious level - affect our impressions of the significance of the online. It can involve variation in the framing of articles by virtue of the sections in which they are located within newspapers.

11 An example of this from *EU kids Online* was the question of whether the lower concern about pornography in Norway reflected a particular view of the child and sexuality more prevalent in the Nordic countries.

To acknowledge another limitation, a study that looks at coverage alone cannot in itself prove that this affects readers' understandings of the online world. But media theories suggest that the way in which the press frames coverage of phenomena does have important implications for how it is perceived in the wider society.

Bibliography

Boëthius, U., 1995. Youth, the media and moral panics. In: J. Fornäs & G. Bolin, eds. *Youth culture in late modernity*. London: Sage, pp. 39–57.

Contarello, A., et al., 2008. ICTs and the human body: an empirical study in five countries. In: E. Loos L. Haddon & E. Mante-Meijer, eds. *The social dynamics of information and communication technology*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 25-38.

Critcher, C., 2008. Making waves: historical aspects of public debates about children and mass media. In: K. Drotner & S. Livingstone, eds. *The international handbook of children, media and culture*. London: Sage, pp. 91-104.

Dearing, J. W. & Rogers, E., 1996. *Agenda-setting*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Drotner, K., 1992. Modernity and media panics. In: M. Skovmand & K. Schrøder, eds. *Media cultures: reappraising transnational media*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 42-62.

Eurostat, 2008. *Internet access and use in the EU27 in 2008*. [Online] STAT/08/169. Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=STAT/08/169 [Accessed 18 December 2009].

Gerbner, G. Gross L. Morgan, M. & Signorielli, N., 1986. Living with television: The dynamics of the cultivation process. In: J. Bryant & D. Zillman, eds. *Perspectives of media effects*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 17-40.

Gerbner, G. & Gross, L., 1976. Living with television: the violence profile. *Journal of Communication*, 26 (2), pp. 173-99.

Gilligan, R. & Heinzmann, P., 2005a. Exploring how cultural factors could potentially influence ICT use: an analysis of Swiss TV and radio use. In: L. Haddon, ed. *International collaborative research: cross-cultural differences and cultures of research*. Brussels: COST, pp. 87-96.

Gilligan, R., & Heinzmann, P., 2005b. Exploring how cultural factors could potentially influence ICT use: an analysis of European SMS and MMS use. In: L. Haddon, ed. *International collaborative research: cross-cultural differences and cultures of research.* Brussels: COST, pp. 97-116.

Haddon, L. & Stald, G., 2009. *A cross-national European analysis of press coverage of children and the internet*. [Online] Available at:

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EUKidsOnline/Reports/MediaReport.pdf [Accessed 18 December 2009].

Hallin, C., & Mancini, P., 2004. *Comparing media systems: three models of media and politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hasebrink, U. Livingstone, S. & Haddon, L., 2008. *Comparing children's online opportunities and risks across Europe: cross-national comparisons for EU Kids Online*. London: London School of Economics, EU Kids Online.

ITU, 2007. *ITU Statistics from 2007*. [Online] (Updated 18 December 2009) Available at: http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/icteye/Indicators/Indicators.aspx# [Accessed 18 December 2009].

Jakubowicz, K., 2007. The Eastern European/post-communist media model countries. In: G. Terzis, ed. *European media governance: national and regional dimensions*. Bristol: Intellect Books.

Kohn, M., ed., 1998. *Cross-national research in sociology*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Livingstone, S., 2003. On the challenges of cross-national comparative media research. *European Journal of Communication*, 18 (4), pp. 477-500.

Lombard, M. Snyder-Duch, J. & Campanella Bracken, C., 2002. Content analysis in mass communication. Assessment and reporting on intercoder reliability. *Human Communications Research*, 28 (4), pp. 587-604.

Lööf, A., 2008. *Internet usage in 2008 – households and individuals*. Eurostat Data in Focus 46, 2008. [Online] Available at: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-QA-08-046/EN/KS-QA-08-046-EN.PDF) [Accessed 18 December 2009].

McCombs, M. & Shaw, D., 1972. The agenda setting functions of the mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36 (1), pp. 176-87.

Pinter, R. Bergström, A. Gyenes, F. Haddon, L. & Pasquali, F., 2009. *Give us our daily broadband – a comparative press discourses project in 4 countries*. A report for COST298.

Wadbring, I., 2007. The role of free dailies in a segregated society. *Nordicom Review*, 28, pp. 135-48.

Annex 1: Selection from the content analysis coding system

Question area	Rationale
Which part of the internet is discussed? 1. Internet in general 2. Websites and world wide web, domain names 3. Internet and computer infrastructure: standards, software, hardware, wires, types of connection 4. Internet activities, services and economy: e-banking, e-commerce, online shopping, internet advertising, marketing, searching and search engines, e-work 5. Internet business: company takeovers, profitability, price of internet, size of markets etc. 6. Education and research: e-learning, blended learning, statistics, online survey, etc. 7. Politics, democracy and administration: e-voting, e-petition, e-government (downloading forms), e-democracy, regulation, censorship, etc. 8. Entertainment and media: online gaming, downloading, gambling, virtual worlds, sexuality, digital TV, new media, online newspapers, radio etc. 9. Communication: e-mailing, IM, chat, VoIP, forum, videoconference, etc. 10. Web 2.0: blogging, citizen journalism, podcasting, Wikipedia, file-sharing, video-sharing, photo-sharing, social networking sites, etc. 11. Security and crime: security, privacy, virus, spam, adwares, cyberbullying, phishing, hacking-cracking, sexual predators, paedophilia, etc.	The aim was to see if any aspect of the internet currently had more visibility in the media.
Is Broadband explicitly discussed?	It was important to check this

1. Yes 2. No	given that policy makers often use this term.
Is the internet the focus of the article? 1. Yes, internet is the centre of the article 2. No, the internet is only discussed in passing, it is not the focus	To what extent do people encounter the internet as a background feature when reading about other things?
Which section contains the article? 1. Local news section 2. National news section 3. International news section 4. Politics section 5. Lifestyle section 6. Humour section, anecdotes 7. Job section 8. Economy section 9. Technology section 10. Money/saving section, Product comparison section 11. Travel section 12. Personal advice section ("Agony aunt") 13. Frontpage 14. Letters 15. Competitions (reported on or run by the paper) 16. Interpersonal, dating section 17. Entertainment section 18. Education 19. Sport 20. Radio/TV 21. Editorial/debates/opinion	The section in which an article is located can frame the internet story - e.g. whether it is within a product comparison section or humorous one.
What area of life does it relate to? 1. Technology developments 2. Legal, crime/ police/courts 3. Hacking 4. Citizen's rights 5. Work 6. Education 7. Entertainment 8. Sport 9. Politics	For example, do we mainly encounter internet stories relating to education or to business?

10. Medical 11. Interpersonal/sexual relations 12. Banking 13. e-commerce, online shopping 14. Security industry 15. Media 16. Travel 17. Product comparisons, shopping 18. 'Human Interest' story 19. Social problems 20. Environment 21. Personal reflection 22. Betting, gaming, gambling 23. Culture	
Is there any special origin of the article (a source that generated it), such as: 1. Academic research 2. Market research 3. Institutional (official) research 4. New national or transnational law, regulation, statements 5. Academic events (e.g. conference) 6. Market events (fair, trade show) 7. Company reports, company statements, profit warnings, etc. 8. Press conference, press release 9. Campaign (lobbying, awareness raising) 10. Court case, police action and crime reporting 11. Other	What type of events generate articles – for example, how important is research in generating media coverage?
The views of what agency/ spokesperson, if any, is reported: 1. Internet industry 2. Politicians, government 3. Media industry (apart from internet) 4. Legal representatives, police 5. NGOs, charities 6. Researchers, academics 7. Medical representatives 8. Trade associations	Traditional media analysis has often been interested in the question of whose voice is heard in the media, who is quoted, who is sought out as a spokesperson.

9. Celebrities 10. Member of the public, victim 11. Consumer groups 12. Other companies (not media, internet) 13. Institutions (non-commercial) 14. Education	