

Where Is My Party Now?

New Data on Media Coverage of Parties' Ideological Positions Before Elections

Anna Adendorf, Christoffer Koch Florczak

University of Mannheim, Germany; Aalborg University, Denmark

Abstract. Political parties' statements on their policy positions and how their framing in the media stand at the centre of election campaigns. Some statements will be featured more prominently in the media, while less electorally beneficial ones will be downplayed. To assess media coverage of parties' ideological positions during election campaigns, we performed a media content analysis of election campaigns in ten European countries between 2014 and 2019. This results in three datasets on (i) parties talking about themselves, (ii) parties talking about other parties, and (iii) journalists talking about parties. Furthermore, all three datasets contain information about parties or journalists talking about individual issue areas, parties or journalists talking about the valence of these issue areas, and parties or journalists talking about general valence characteristics. These datasets may further add to comparative research on media coverage on election campaigns.

To cite:

Adendorf, Anna, Christoffer Koch Florczak. 2022. Where Is My Party Now? New Data on Media Coverage of Parties' Ideological Positions Before Elections. Mannheim: Mannheim Centre for European Social Research, University of Mannheim.



1 Media data

In order to analyse party competition before elections, we used media content analysis of relevant newspapers¹. For each country under study, the country teams chose two main daily newspapers, one that is more left-leaning, and one that is more right-leaning. For those countries that were studied in the first wave of this project, the respective country teams used the same daily newspapers that were used previously (cf. Baumann/Gross 2016, p. 8), apart from Hungary, where two additional newspapers were included. Country teams then collected all content related to the general elections under study from the daily newspapers. Table 1 shows all daily newspapers and election years in the countries included in the study.

Table 1. Newspapers and election years included in the study

Country	Daily newspapers		Election years		
Czech Republic	Pravo	Mlada Fronta Dnes	2017		
Denmark	Politiken	Jyllands- Posten	2015	2019	
Germany	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Sueddeutsche Zeitung	2017		
Hungary	Népszabadság	Magyar Nemzet	Népszava	Magyar Idők	2014 2018
The Netherlands	Volkskrant	Telegraaf	2017		
Poland	Gazeta Wyborcza	Rzeczpospolita	2015	2019	
Portugal	Público	Jornal de Notícias	2015	2019	
Spain	El Mundo	El País	2015	2016	2019
Sweden	Dagens Nyheter	Aftonbladet	2018		
United Kingdom	The Guardian	The Telegraph	2017		

For each country, we analysed all newspaper articles that covered the national election and that were published in the included daily newspapers in 30 days prior to the respective election to cover the most intense phase of each election campaign. After the relevant newspaper articles were collected by the country team, they were then analysed by the respective country's coders, typically undergraduate research assistants. We analysed a minimum of 60 articles for each newspaper/election and included all front-page articles relating to the elections as well as a 5% random sample of articles published in the remainder of the respective newspaper.

¹ For a detailed overview of the data collection, data cleaning and dataset creation processes in the first wave of this project cf. Baumann/Gross 2016. All of the procedures in this second wave of the project are based on the procedures outlined in Baumann/Gross 2016 in order to ensure continuity and comparability of the data.

2 Coder training and coding instrument

Our coding instructions are based on the instructions from the first wave of this project as outlined in Baumann/Gross (2016), which were developed following Clarke et al. (2004) and Schuck et al. (2010). All newspaper articles included in this study were coded by three coders per country to ensure inter-coder reliability. Undergraduate research assistants coded the newspaper articles by filling out an online survey provided by the Population Research Center of the University of Texas at Austin (Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap)).

Coder training was done in two steps. First, all country experts attended a workshop at the Mannheim Centre for European Social Research (MZES) in September 2019 where they were trained according to the coding instructions and coded several English training articles. Second, all country experts spent the following weeks training their respective undergraduate research assistants using the same training articles and an additional set of country-specific training articles.

2.1 General information

Coders began the survey by entering basic information, including their own name, election year, newspaper title, article number, title and date of the article, newspaper page number of the article, and length of the article in words. Coders then entered the party that they were going to code. For newspaper articles that mentioned more than one party, coders had to complete the questionnaire once for each subject that was mentioned.

The subjects in this study are the most important parties and national governments at the time of the election campaign in the respective countries. Once coders identified the subject, they had to decide who is speaking on behalf of the subject, choosing from “party as a whole”, “party leader”, “a member of the national parliament”, “regional/local leader of the party”, “a member of the local/regional parliament”, “other member/affiliate of the party”, and “other”. Coders were able to name more than one person in cases where a newspaper article mentioned more than one person as speaking on behalf of a party.

2.2 Policy Issues

After capturing general information on the newspaper article and the subject, coders then coded which policy issues were mentioned in the article. They were able to include this information in one of three ways: (1) a subject mentioning its own position on a policy issue, (2) a subject mentioning other parties’ policies, or (3) the journalist writing the article mentioning the subject’s policy positions. Coders then captured which policy issue was referred to in the article. Most issues are identical for all, but country experts had the possibility of adding country-specific issues. Table 2 shows all country-specific policy issues that were included in the questionnaire.

Table 2. Additional country-specific policy issues

Country	Additional policy issues
Czech Republic	Traditional morality, family values, religion Corruption Constitutional change Roma
Denmark	Traditional morality, family values, religion Labour market policies (additional category of social policy)
Germany	Relationship with Turkey Gender equality
Hungary	Traditional morality, family values, religion Roma Hungarians outside the borders
Netherlands	Traditional morality, family values, religion
Poland	Traditional morality, family values, religion Gender equality Constitutional change Communist past Smolensk accident Corruption Judicial independence State-church relations
Portugal	Traditional morality, family values, religion Corruption Bailout and austerity measures
Spain	Traditional morality, family values, religion Gender equality Corruption Constitutional change Historical amnesia
Sweden	Traditional morality, family values, religion Gender equality
UK	Traditional morality, family values, religion

In addition to capturing which policy issues were mentioned in a newspaper article, coders added information on the positional direction that the subject took on the issue. They indicated whether the subject talked about the policy issue in a positive, neutral², negative, or contradictory way. When it comes to social policy and public service issues, coders instead coded whether the subject wants to increase or decrease spending, or whether the position was unclear or contradictory.

2.3 Valence

2.3.1 Issue-related valence

In the next section of the questionnaire, coders coded several aspects on the valence of subject or journalist statements on policy issues. First, they decided whether any valence characteristics of the subject were mentioned either by the subject itself or by the journalist,

² Taking a neutral position means describing the status quo, mentioning the issue without taking any position, or staying vague on the position.

and whether these valence characteristics were mentioned referring to a specific issue position. Second, coders were able to code whether the subject mentioned another relevant actor's valence characteristics while talking about an issue position. In both instances, coders could choose between the following options: "party/government honesty/integrity/character", "party/government (past, current, future) competence/performance", "party/government unity", "party/government other valence dimension", "leader honesty/integrity/character", "leader (past, current, future) competence/performance", "leader charisma", "leader other valence dimension", "other target actor". Coders also had to insert information on whether the valence category was mentioned in a positive, neutral, or negative way.

2.3.2 General valence

In addition to issue-related valence, coders also gathered information on whether parties talk about other parties' valence characteristics irrespective of specific policy issues. The coding instrument offers the same options for general valence that it also offers for issue-related valence, and coders also had to insert the (positive, neutral, or negative) direction of the valence statements.

2.3.3 Country-specific statement types

In addition to the general questionnaire, country experts had the opportunity to include country-specific statement types. Table 3 provides an overview of the country-specific statement types included in the study.

Table 3. Additional country-specific statement types

Country	Statement types
Denmark	Sports/games/war language (e.g., winner, loser, rank, odds, fight, etc.) References to the public or the voters
Germany	Potential coalition options for the federal government Journalist's attitude toward potential coalition options Journalist's statement on the numerical feasibility of coalition options after the election (e.g., by referencing poll results)
Hungary	Sports/games/war language (e.g., winner, loser, rank, odds, fight, etc.)
Portugal	Sports/games/war language (e.g., winner, loser, rank, odds, fight, etc.) Mentioning of past election results Mentioning of parties' placement in recent opinion polls Mentioning of subjects' or other parties' strategic choice or avoidance of issues
Spain	Potential coalition options for the federal government Journalist's attitude toward potential coalition options Journalist's statement on the numerical feasibility of coalition options after the election (e.g., by referencing poll results) Mentioning of parties' placement in recent opinion polls
Sweden	Potential coalition options for the federal government Journalist's attitude toward potential coalition options Journalist's statement on the numerical feasibility of coalition options after the election (e.g., by referencing poll results)

2.4 Journalist framing

Lastly, coders had to insert information on the general article tone towards the subject. They had to decide whether the tone was positive, neutral, or negative, and explain their judgment in their own words. Additionally, coders had to decide if the article mentions an alleged event involving the subject, and whether said event could be considered a scandal³. Coders then had to decide if there was a dominant issue in the newspaper article with regards to the subject. An issue could only be dominant if the article covered it as the only issue regarding the subject, otherwise coders were instructed to insert that there was no dominant issue.

2.5 Identification of coder confidence

For each major topic (subject identification, policy issues, valence), coders had to insert how confident they felt about their coding decision. In cases where coders were “somewhat confident” or “not confident” (in contrast to being “fully confident”), they had to explain their coding choice using their own words.

3 Inter-coder agreement and data generation

Once the coders had completed the coding of all newspaper articles, we began the process of cleaning and organising the data in accordance with the process we followed in the previous wave of the project (cf. Baumann/Gross, 2016).

As described previously, all newspaper articles were coded by three coders selected by the respective country teams. To build a dataset based on these codings, we had to identify all statements that coders found and coded in agreement. As coders filled out one survey for each subject that was mentioned in a newspaper article, the raw data was in a wide format where one observation consisted of all statements made by one actor. Depending on how many subjects appeared in an article and how many statements they made, the number of coded variables varied. This design makes the comparison of codings between coders difficult, especially for newspaper articles with high complexity in subjects and statements. We therefore brought the data into a long format so that one observation consisted of one statement. This format then allowed us to identify the statements that coders agreed on and allowed us to remove codings with low reliability due to a low agreement rate.

Once the observations were disaggregated from an actor-article level to a statement level, we used coders’ confidence in their codings to determine a decision rule of which statements to keep. The decision rule was based on the number of identical codings for each statement and coders’ confidence in their codings as outlined in Table 4.

Table 4. Decision rule on which coded statements to keep

Coders’ confidence	Number of identical observations required to keep a statement
No requirement	3
Both coders at least “somewhat confident”	2
Coder is “fully confident”	1

³ A scandal is any event related to corruption, party/campaign finances, private financial misconduct, violation of laws, or violations of social norms (i.e., lying, stealing, sex, drunk driving).

4 The country datasets

4.1 Data overview

There are three datasets that cover different types of statements: Self, Other, and Journalist. The structure of the datasets is consistent with the datasets in the first wave of the project (cf. Baumann/Gross 2016). The Self dataset covers statements that parties made about themselves and their policies and that were covered as such in the media. The Other dataset covers statements that parties made about another party's policies or valence. Lastly, the Journalist dataset covers statements that journalists made about any party.

4.2 Structure of country datasets

The three datasets, Self, Other, and Journalist, are designed to have a similar structure within each country. In each dataset, an observation consists of one statement that was coded from a newspaper article, except for codings containing the journalist's tone towards a party. All datasets contain variables on the source of the coding, such as the newspaper article a statement was coded from. These variables are identical in all three datasets and are summarised in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Variables present in all three datasets

Variable	Description
<i>country</i>	Country
<i>coding_id</i>	ID of the RedCap survey containing the statement (primarily for internal use)
<i>article_number</i>	Number/ID assigned to the newspaper article containing the statement
<i>year_month</i>	Election campaign
<i>newspaper_title</i>	Number of newspaper (for newspaper names, see Appendix, Table A2)
<i>article_date</i>	Article's publication date
<i>section_name</i>	Newspaper's section
<i>page</i>	Newspaper's page
<i>length</i>	Article's length
<i>title</i>	Article's title

The further structure of the three datasets is very similar. The variable *statement_type* can take on several values depicting what the coded statement is about. While the values this variable can take on vary between the three datasets, they generally cover statements on issue positions, issue-related valence, and general valence. The values of *var_value* depend on the statement type coded in *statement_type*. If, for example, a general valence statement was coded, then *var_value* indicates the valence category of that statement. Similarly, *valen_issue* and all social policy variables depend on which statement type was coded. *Valen_issue* is only applicable when issue-related valence statements were coded, and the social policy variables can only refer to statements in the respective policy field. The *direction* variable indicates the direction of the statement that was made. Tables 6, 7, and 8 below give an overview about the variables and values in the Self, Other, and Journalist datasets, respectively.

Table 6. Variables and values in “Self” dataset

Variable	Identification
<i>subject</i>	Party making statements on its issue positions, issue-related valence, and general valence (country-specific party code, see Appendix, Table A1)
<i>statement_type</i>	Type of statement made <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>SelfIssue</i> (purely issue-related standpoint) - <i>SelfIssueVal</i> (issue-related valence) - <i>SelfVal</i> (general valence) - additional country-specific values (see Tables 9 and 10)
<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type</i> == <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Self-/Other)Issue: Policy area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 – Taxes 2 – Social Policy/Public Services 3 – Inflation 4 – Unemployment 5 – Other Economic Performance 6 – Centralization vs. Regional Autonomy 7 – Environment 8 – Immigration, Asylum 9 – Justice System 10 – Law and Order, Security, Terrorism 11 – National Way of Life, Patriotism 12 – Traditional Morality, Family Values, Religion 13 – Europe/European Union 14 – Internationalism (not EU) 15 – Foreign Intervention 16 – Agriculture/Rural Affairs 99 – Other Issue additional country-specific issue areas (see Table 11) - IssueVal: (issue-related) Valence category <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 – Party/Government honesty/integrity 2 – Party/Govt (past, current, future) <i>competence/performance</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 – Party/Government unity 4 – Leader honesty/integrity/character 5 – Leader (past, current, future) <i>competence/performance</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 – Leader charisma 7 – Other - SelfVal: Valence category <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 – Party/government honesty/integrity 2 – Party/govt (past, current, future) <i>competence/performance</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 – Party/government unity 4 – Leader honesty/integrity/character 5 – Leader (past, current, future) <i>competence/performance</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 – Leader charisma 9 – Leader other valence dimension 10 – Other target actor (e.g., an MP of the party, the deputy leader, a minister etc.) - additional country-specific values (see Tables 9 and 10)

Variable	Identification
<i>direction</i>	Direction of statement made -1 – <i>negative</i> 0 – <i>status quo; no clear position taken/vague; or just mentions the issue</i> 1 – <i>positive</i> 99 – <i>contradictory statement</i>
<i>valen_issue</i>	Issue/policy area related to issue valence statements: See codes for <i>var_value</i> if <i>statement_type</i> == <i>Issue</i> (only applicable for <i>statement_type</i> == <i>IssueVal</i>)
<i>socialPol</i>	Social policy issue/area sub-code (only applicable for statements on social policy, i.e., <i>issue area</i> ==2) - 1 – <i>Education</i> - 2 – <i>Health Care</i> - 3 – <i>Elderly care/pensioners</i> - 4 – <i>Public Housing</i> - 5 – <i>Public Transportation</i> - 6 – <i>Minimum Wage</i> - 7 – <i>Social Security</i> - 8 – <i>Childcare</i> - 9 – <i>Youth</i> - 10 – <i>Other family policies (e.g., maternity leave)</i> - 11 – <i>No specific issue, just a reference to social policy/public services</i> additional country-specific issue domains (see Table 10)
<i>socialPol_spend_dir</i>	Direction of social policy statement (only applicable for statements on social policy, i.e., <i>issue area</i> ==2) - -1 – <i>decrease spending</i> - 0 – <i>no clear direction/position</i> - 1 – <i>increase spending</i> - 99 – <i>contradictory statement</i>
<i>dominant_issue</i>	Dominant issue in the article, i.e., the issue an article focuses on. The issue categories are identical to those of the parties' statements; <i>see above</i>
<i>dominant_issue_social</i>	Dominant issue in the article, in the case of a social policy issue being the main issue (<i>dominant_issue</i> ==2); for issue categories, <i>see above</i>

Table 7. Variables and values in “Other” dataset

Variable	Identification
<i>subject</i>	Party making statements on other parties' issue positions, issue-related valence, and general valence (country-specific party code; see Appendix, Table A1)
<i>other_code</i>	Party to which the statement refers (country-specific party code; see Appendix, Table A1)
<i>statement_type</i>	Type of statement made <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>OtherIssue</i> (purely issue-related statement on other parties) - <i>OtherIssueVal</i> (issue-related valence statement on other parties) - <i>OtherVal</i> (general valence statement about other parties) - optional country-specific values (see Table 9)
<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type</i> == <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>OtherIssue</i>: Policy area; see Table 6 - <i>OtherIssueVal</i>: (issue-related) Valence category; see Table 6 - <i>OtherSelfVal</i>: Valence category; see Table 6 - optional country-specific values (see Table 9)
<i>direction</i>	Direction of statement made; see Table 6
<i>valen_issue</i>	Issue/policy area related to issue valence statements; see codes for <i>var_value</i> if <i>statement_type</i> = <i>OtherIssue</i> (only applicable for <i>statement_type</i> = <i>OtherIssueVal</i>)
<i>socialPol</i>	Social policy issue/area sub-code (only applicable for statements on social policy, i.e., <i>issue area</i> ==2); see Table 6
<i>socialPol_spend_dir</i>	Direction of social policy statement (only applicable for statements on social policy, i.e., <i>issue area</i> ==2); see Table 6
<i>dominant_issue</i>	Dominant issue in the article, i.e., the issue an article focuses on. The issue categories are identical to those of the parties' statements; see Table 6
<i>dominant_issue_social</i>	Dominant issue in the article, in the case of a social policy issue being the main issue (<i>dominant_issue</i> ==2); for issue categories see Table 6

Table 8. Variables and values in “Journalist” dataset

Variable	Identification
<i>subject</i>	Party to which journalist statements refer to (applicable only for <i>statement_type</i> == <i>Journ_articletone</i>)
<i>statement_type</i>	Type of statement made <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>JournIssue</i> (purely issue-related statement) - <i>JournIssueVal</i> (issue-related valence) - <i>JournVal</i> (general valence statement) - <i>JournTone</i> (journalist’s tone towards the party (mean across coders)) - optional country-specific values (see Table 9)
<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type</i> == <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>JournIssue</i>: Policy area; see Table 6 - <i>JournIssueVal</i>: (issue-related) Valence category; see 6.2.2 - <i>JournVal</i>: Valence category; see Table 6 - optional country-specific values (see Table 9)
<i>direction</i>	Direction of statement made; see Table 6
<i>valen_issue</i>	Issue/policy area related to issue valence statements; see codes for <i>var_value</i> if <i>statement_type</i> == <i>JournIssue</i> (only applicable for <i>statement_type</i> == <i>JournIssueVal</i>)
<i>socialPol</i>	Social policy issue/area sub-code (only applicable for statements on social policy, i.e., <i>issue_area</i> ==2); see Table 6
<i>socialPol_spend_dir</i>	Direction of social policy statement (only applicable for statements on social policy, i.e., <i>issue_area</i> ==2); see Table 6
<i>dominant_issue</i>	Dominant issue in the article, i.e., the issue an article focuses on. The issue categories are identical to those of the parties’ statements; see Table 6
<i>dominant_issue_social</i>	Dominant issue in the article, in the case of a social policy issue being the main issue (<i>dominant_issue</i> ==2); for issue categories, see Table 6

4.3 Country-specific variables and values

Since the involved country experts have been encouraged to introduce country-specific modifications to the coding scheme, the three datasets can vary slightly between countries. The country-specific changes that were made consist of the inclusion of new statement types, such as parties making coalition statements, or the addition of further policy fields into the coding scheme. Both kinds of changes alter the values of the existing variables. The country-specific changes are summarised in Tables 9 and 10 below.

Table 9. Country-specific variables and values

Dataset	Variable	Additional Values
Germany		
Self	<i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i>	<i>SelfCoal</i> (Coalition formation statements of parties) Coalition constellation statement refers to 1 – CDU/CSU and FDP 2 – SPD and Buendnis 90/Die Gruenen 3 – CDU/CSU and SPD 4 – CDU/CSU and Buendnis 90/Die Gruenen 5 – SPD, FDP, and Buendnis 90/Die Gruenen 6 – SPD, Buendnis 90/Die Gruenen, and Die Linke 7 – Other coalition option
Journalist	<i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i>	<i>JournCoal</i> (Statements on coalition options by journalist) Coalition constellation statement refers to (see Self)
Denmark		
Self	<i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i>	<i>SLang</i> (Usage of war/sports etc. language referring to the party) Contents of war/sports language -1 – negative 0 – neutral 1 – positive
	<i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i>	<i>SPubl</i> (References to the public or the voters) Context in which references to public or voters are made 1 – Policy issue without valence 2 – Policy issue with valence 3 – Non-issue-specific valence 4 – Other
Other	<i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i> <i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i>	<i>OLang</i> (Usage of war/sports etc. language referring to other party) Content of war/sports language (see Self) <i>OPubl</i> (References to the public or the voters) Context in which references to public or voters are made (see Self)
Journalist	<i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i> <i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i>	<i>JournLanguage</i> (Usage of war/sports etc. language by journalist) Content of war/sports language (see Self) <i>JournPublic</i> (References to the public or the voters) Context in which references to public or voters are made (see Self)

Adendorf/Florczak. Where Is My Party Now?

Dataset	Variable	Additional Values
Hungary		
Self	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>SLang</i> (Usage of war/sports etc. language referring to the party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Contents of war/sports language -1 – negative 0 – neutral 1 – positive
Other	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>OLang</i> (Usage of war/sports etc. language referring to other party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Content of war/sports etc. language (see Self)
Journalist	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>JournLanguage</i> (Usage of war/sports etc. language by journalist)
	<i>var_value</i>	Content of war/sports etc. language (see Self)
Portugal		
Self	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>SLang</i> (Usage of war/sports etc. language referring to the party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Contents of war/sports language -1 – negative 0 – neutral 1 – positive
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>SPelec</i> (Statements on past election results referring to the party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to past election results -1 – negative 0 – neutral 1 – positive
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>SPolls</i> (Statements on placement in recent opinion polls referring to the party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to recent opinion polls -1 – negative 0 – neutral 1 – positive
Other	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>OLang</i> (Usage of war/sports etc. language referring to other party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Content of war/sports etc. language (see Self)
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>OPelec</i> (Statements on past election results referring to other party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to past election results (see Self)
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>OPolls</i> (Statements on placement in recent opinion polls referring to other party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to recent opinion polls (see Self)
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>OStratIss</i> (Statements on strategic choice or avoidance of issue referring to other party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to strategic choice or issue avoidance: -1 – negative 0 – neutral 1 – positive
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>OStratCamp</i> (Statements on strategic choice or avoidance of campaign means or events (e.g., interviews, debates, visits to specific regions of the country) referring to other party)

Adendorf/Florczak. Where Is My Party Now?

Dataset	Variable	Additional Values
Portugal (ctd)		
Other (ctd)	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to strategic choice or avoidance of campaign means or events: -1 – negative 0 – neutral 1 – positive
Journalist	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>JournLanguage</i> (Usage of war/sports etc. language by journalist)
	<i>var_value</i>	Content of war/sports language (see Self)
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>JPelec</i> (Statements on past election results by journalist)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to past election results (see Self)
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>JPolls</i> (Statements on placement in recent opinion polls by journalists)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to recent opinion polls (see Self)
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>JStratlss</i> (Statements on strategic choice or avoidance of issue by journalist)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to strategic choice or issue avoidance (see Other)
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>JStratCamp</i> (Statements on strategic choice or avoidance of campaign means or events (e.g., interviews, debates, visits to specific regions of the country) by journalist)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to strategic choice or avoidance means or events (see Other)
Spain		
Self	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>SPolls</i> (Statements on placement in recent opinion polls referring to the party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to recent opinion polls -1 – negative 0 – neutral 1 – positive
	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>SelfCoal</i> (Coalition formation statements of parties)
	<i>var_value</i>	Coalition constellation statement refers to: 1 – PSOE 2 – PP 3 – PSOE and Podemos (2015: and IU) 4 – PSOE, Podemos, and peripheric nationalists (2015: and IU) 5 – PSOE and Ciudadanos 6 – PSOE, Ciudadanos, and PP 7 – PSOE and PP 8 – PP and Ciudadanos 9 – PP, Ciudadanos, and VOX (only in 2019) 10 – Other coalition option
Other	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>OPolls</i> (Statements on placement in recent opinion polls referring to other party)
	<i>var_value</i>	Reference to recent opinion polls (see Self)
Journalist	<i>statement_type</i>	<i>JournCoal</i> (Statements on coalition options by journalist)
	<i>var_value</i>	Coalition constellation statement refers to (see Self)

Adendorf/FlorczaK. Where Is My Party Now?

Dataset	Variable	Additional Values
Sweden		
Self	<i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i>	<i>SelfCoal</i> (Coalition formation statements of parties) Coalition constellation statement refers to: 1 – Alliansen (M, KD, L, and C) 2 – S and MP 3 – S, MP, and V 4 – S, MP, C, and L 5 – M, KD, and SD 6 – Alliansen and SD 7 – Other coalition option
Journalist	<i>statement_type</i> <i>var_value</i>	<i>JournCoal</i> (Statements on coalition options by journalist) Coalition constellation statement refers to (see Self)

Table 10. Additional country-specific issue (sub-)domains

Country	Variable	Identification
Czech Republic	<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type==</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue: Policy area 17 – <i>Corruption</i> 18 – <i>Constitutional change</i> 19 – <i>Roma</i>
Denmark	<i>socialPol</i>	Social policy issue/area sub-code (only applicable for statements on social policy, i.e. <i>issue_area==2</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 11 – <i>Labour market policies</i>
Germany	<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type==</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue: Policy area 18 – <i>Relationship with Turkey</i> 19 – <i>Gender Equality</i>
Hungary	<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type==</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue: Policy area 17 – <i>Roma</i> 18 – <i>Hungarians outside the borders</i>
Poland	<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type==</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue: Policy area 17 – <i>Communist past</i> 18 – <i>Smolensk accident</i> 19 – <i>Corruption</i> 20 – <i>Gender Equality</i> 21 – <i>Constitutional Change</i> 22 – <i>Judicial Independence</i> 23 – <i>State-Church Relations</i>
Portugal	<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type==</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue: Policy area 17 – <i>Corruption</i> 18 – <i>Bailout and austerity measures</i>
Spain	<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type==</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue: Policy area 17 – <i>Gender Equality</i> 18 – <i>Corruption</i> 19 – <i>Constitutional Change</i> 20 – <i>Historical Amnesia</i>
Sweden	<i>var_value</i>	Content of statement, dependent on <i>statement_type</i> . For <i>statement_type==</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue: Policy area 17 – <i>Gender equality</i>

5 References

Baumann, Markus, and Martin Gross. 2016. *Where Is My Party? Introducing New Data Sets on Ideological Cohesion and Ambiguity of Party Positions in Media Coverage*. Arbeitspapiere – Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung; 167.

Clarke, Harold D., David Sanders, Marianne C. Stewart, and Paul F. Whiteley. 2004. *Political Choice in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schuck, Andreas R., Georgios Xezonakis, Susan A. Banducci, and Claes H. de Vreese. 2010. *EES (2009) Media Study Data Advance Release Documentation*. University of Amsterdam and University of Exeter.

6 Appendix

Table A1. Identification of subjects

Country	Identification of subject making statements (<i>subject</i>)
Czech Republic	1 – Czech Social Democratic Party – CSSD 2 – Civic Democratic Party – ODS 3 – Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia – KSCM 4 – Christian Democratic Party – Czechoslovak People's Party – KDU–CSL 5 – TOP 09 7 – ANO 2011 10 – Freedom and Direct Democracy (SPD) 11 – Mayors and Independents (STAN) 12 – Pirates (PP) 9 – The government (CSSD, ANO, and KDU-CSL as a whole)
Denmark	1 – Venstre [Liberals] 2 – Socialdemokraterne [Social Democrats] 3 – Dansk Folkeparti [Danish People's Party] 4 – Socialistik Folkeparti [Socialist People's Party] 5 – Det Konservative Folkeparti [Conservatives] 6 – Det Radikale Venstre [Social Liberals] 7 – Enhedslisten [Red/Green Alliance] 9 – Liberal Alliance [Liberal Alliance] 11 – Kristendemokraterne [Christian Democrats] 12 – Alternativet [Alternative] 13 – Nye Borgerlige [New Right] 14 – Stram Kurs [Hard Line] 15 – Klaus Riskær Pedersen 10 – The government (Social Democrats + Social Liberals as a whole in 2015, Conservatives + Liberals + Liberal Alliance as a whole in 2019)
Germany	1 – CDU 2 – CSU 3 – CDU/CSU (as a unitary actor) 4 – SPD 5 – FDP 6 – Bündnis 90/Die Grünen 7 – Die Linke 8 – AfD 10 – The government (CDU + CSU + SPD as a whole)
Hungary	3 – Fidesz–KDNP alliance as a whole 4 – MSZP (Hungarian Socialist Party) 10 – MSZP–Párbeszéd (Hungarian Socialist Party – Dialogue) (only 2018) 5 – Jobbik 8 – LMP (Politics Can Be Different) 13 – DK (Democratic Coalition) 14 – Momentum (only 2018)

Country	Identification of subject making statements (<i>subject</i>)
The Netherlands	1 – PvdA 2 – CDA 3 – VVD 4 – D66 5 – SP 6 – PVV 7 – ChristenUnie 12 – SGP (Political Reformed Party) 8 – GroenLinks 9 – PvdD (Party for the Animals) 10 – 50PLUS 13 – FvD (Forum for Democracy) 14 – DENK (Think) 11 – The government (VVD + PvdA as a whole)
Poland	1 – Law and Justice (PiS) 19 – United Right as a whole 2 – Civic Platform (PO) 4 – Polish Peasant's Party (PSL) 9 – The government (PO + PSL, only in 2015) 11 – Modern (.N) 18 – The Greens (Zieloni) 20 – Civic Coalition (KO) as a whole (only 2019) 10 – Kukiz'15 (K'15) 22 – Polish Coalition (PSL + K'15) as a whole (only 2019) 12 – United Left (ZN) (only 2015) 14 – Together (Razem) 15 – Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) (only 2019) 16 – Spring (Wiosna) (only 2019) 21 – The Left (Lewica: Razem + SLD + Wiosna) as a whole (only 2019) 13 – KORWiN (on its own, only 2015) 17 – Confederation (Konfederacja) (only 2019)
Portugal	1 – Partido Socialista (PS) 2 – Partido Social Democrata (on its own) (PSD) 3 – Coligacao Democratica Unitaria (CDU) 4 – Bloco de Esquerda 5 – CDS – Partido Popular (on its own) (CDS-PP) 6 – Pessoas-Animais-Natureza (PAN) 7 – Portugal à Frente (as joint party) (PàF) (only 2015) 8 – Iniciativa Liberal (IL) (only 2019) 9 – Livre (L) (only 2019) 10 – Chega (CH) (only 2019)

Country	Identification of subject making statements (<i>subject</i>)
Spain	1 – PP (Popular Party) 2 – PSOE (Socialist Party) 3 – Ciudadanos (Citizens) 4 – Podemos (We can) (only 2015) 5 – Izquierda Unida (United Left) (only 2015) 6 – Unid@s Podemos (United We can) (2016 and 2019) 7 – VOX (only 2019) 8 – ERC (Republican Left of Catalonia) 9 – ONV (Nationalist Basque Party) 10 – DiL (Democracy and Freedom) (only 2015) 11 – PDECat (Catalan Democratic Party of Europe) (only 2016) 12 – JxCat (Together for Catalonia) (only 2019)
Sweden	1 – Left party (V) 2 – Green party (MP) 3 – Social democratic party (S) 4 – Center party (C) 5 – Liberals (L) 6 – Moderate party (M) 7 – Christian democratic party (KD) 8 – The Sweden democrats (SD) 9 – Feminist initiative (FI) 11 – The government (S + MP as a whole) 12 – The Alliance (M + KD + L + C as a whole)
United Kingdom	1 – Labour Party 2 – Liberal Democratic Party 3 – Conservative Party 4 – UKIP 5 – Scottish National Party 6 – Brexit Party

Table A2: Identification of newspapers

Country	Identification of newspapers (<i>newspaper_title</i>)
Czech Republic	1 – Právo 2 – Mláda Fronta Dnes
Denmark	1 – Politiken 2 – Jyllands-Posten
Germany	1 – Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung 2 – Süddeutsche Zeitung
Hungary	1 – Népszabadság 2 – Magyar Nemzet 3 – Népszava 4 – Magyar Idők
The Netherlands	1 – Volkskrant 2 – Telegraaf
Poland	1 – Gazeta Wyborcza 2 – Rzeczpospolita
Portugal	1 – Público 2 – Jornal de Notícias
Spain	1 – El Mundo 2 – El País
Sweden	1 – Dagens Nyheter 2 – Aftonbladet
United Kingdom	1 – The Guardian 2 – The Telegraph