

Alternative Media, Alternative Voices?

A Quantitative Analysis of Actor Diversity in Alternative and Mainstream News Outlets

Willem Buyens and Peter Van Aelst

Department of Political Science, University of Antwerp

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Digital Journalism on 25/06/2021, available at <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/21670811.2021.1929366>.

Author Note

Willem Buyens <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3565-6977>

Peter Van Aelst <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2548-0309>

This research was supported by Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) under Grant S008817N.

We have no known conflict of interest to disclose.

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Willem Buyens, University of Antwerp, Lange Nieuwstraat 55 (S.LN55.116), 2000 Antwerp. Email: willem.buyens@uantwerpen.be.

Abstract

Alternative news media are largely independent players in the news environment, which allows them to publish more alternative, and possibly more radical, news content. Do they utilize their independence to display actors that are underrepresented in the mainstream news? And does it affect the actor diversity in their news coverage and the journalistic environment as a whole? This study scrutinizes the differences in actor diversity and actor presentation in articles published by alternative and mainstream news media to gauge if alternative media are more one-sided and if they contribute to the external actor diversity of the news environment. We analyze a sample of news articles on migration and social affairs published by two mainstream media and four alternative outlets. Despite limited differences in article-level actor diversity between alternative and mainstream news media, our findings highlight that right-wing and left-wing alternative media exploit their editorial independence differently to highlight other actor categories. Left-wing alternative news media present more civil society actors, while right-wing alternative news outlets pay more attention to right-wing politicians and parties. Thus, alternative news media are not that different in terms of internal actor diversity, but they modestly advance the external actor diversity in the news environment.

Keywords: alternative news media, digital news media, content diversity, actor diversity, actors in the news, quantitative content analysis

Introduction

The internet has drastically changed the way we experience both interpersonal and mass communications over the last few decades. Digital platforms facilitate and amplify individual voices and viewpoints, but also provide new challenges and opportunities for news media. The challenges largely affect traditional news outlets who struggle to cater to their newly found online audiences (Blumler, 2010; Siles & Boczkowski, 2012). The opportunities mostly benefit digital media that are met with lower thresholds for organization and distribution in the online information environment. Not only do these changes possibly lead to more fragmented audiences in a more diverse media landscape, they could also result in new opportunities for alternative actors and voices to have their say.

In the current news environment, the diversity of actors and voices is likely to be affected by two diverging tendencies. On the one hand, mainstream news media seem to publish news coverage that is more homogeneous (Boczkowski & de Santos, 2007; Hendrickx, 2019; Hendrickx & Ranaivoson, 2019) due to declining readership numbers and diminishing advertising revenues and the subsequent mainstream media concentration (Almiron, 2010; Baker, 2006; van der Burg & Van den Bulck, 2017). On the other hand, the internet opens up possibilities for new forms of digital journalism that provide alternative and possibly more radical news coverage to growing audiences (Heft et al., 2020). Despite commonly voiced concerns about a lack of diversity and a more one-sided approach to news topics in these alternative news outlets, they could counter the homogeneity and possibly declining diversity in the traditional press.

Qualitative studies into the content of alternative news media show that their news coverage is different from the mainstream in terms of framing (Cissel, 2012), discourse (Pepermans & Maesele, 2018) and journalistic role perceptions (Nygaard, 2019). The current literature focuses largely on the ways in which alternative news coverage is given form, how news stories are constructed and the general tone that is used to present certain issues. With this contribution, however, we aim to add to the literature by quantitatively assessing which political actors and societal groups get access to the news coverage of alternative and mainstream news outlets. We will study what news gets covered,

which actors play a role within and what type of sources make it into the news. Two main questions guide our research to find out if alternative news media are more one-sided, and/or if they contribute to the diversity in the news and information environment. First, we analyze *whether alternative news media display different levels of actor diversity compared to mainstream news outlets*. Second, we will investigate *whether these alternative news media add to the multiperspectival news by highlighting actors that are often dismissed in mainstream news coverage*.

We address these research questions in the context of the Flemish media landscape, based on a quantitative content analysis of 1219 news articles published by both alternative and mainstream news media in 2017. Before discussing these analyses, we elaborate on the importance of actors in the news and further explore the central concept of actor diversity. Then, we discuss the characteristics of alternative news media and argue why they are equipped to challenge the actor diversity in mainstream news media. We end this paper by discussing the relevance of our findings and their implications for both the production and consumption of news in the digital information environment.

Actors in the news

Actors play a central role in the construction and consumption of news stories. To journalists and editors, they function as sources of information and serve as the main players in a news story. To the consumer, societal and political actors in the news are presented as important or relevant to the news issue, while voicing opinions that could occasionally affect the public debate or the perceptions of individual news consumers. Consequently, the actors presented and quoted in the news indirectly indicate their take on the structures of power and accountability in politics and society. Actors thus get a sense of exposure and visibility, which, for some societal and political groups, is crucial to their (perceived) position in society. Moreover, the actors quoted by the outlet get even more opportunities to directly express their unfiltered views in the news.

In this study, we are interested in two distinct groups of actors: political actors, that represent certain ideological values and beliefs, and actors that serve as a member of the societal category they belong to. By doing so, we follow Wolfsfeld and Sheafer's (2006) actor-oriented approach to the

construction of political news. Both their work and other studies on the presence (Hopmann et al., 2011; Tresch, 2009; Vos, 2014) and balance (Hopmann et al., 2012; Lewis & Cushion, 2019) of political actors in news coverage highlight the significance of news exposure, and the competition to gain it, to the construction of news stories (for a systematic overview of the dynamics between political actors and news media, see Van Aelst & Walgrave, 2016). We extend the actor-oriented approach to broader societal categories. In line with previous studies (see for example Beckers & Van Aelst, 2019; Korthagen, 2015; Masini et al., 2018; Tiffen et al., 2014) we argue that actors from different societal categories and groups, like civil society actors, business actors, or citizens, strive and compete for news media exposure on stories and issues they deem relevant, much like political actors do. News exposure provides them with a platform to share their opinions and voice concerns that are unique to their societal position. We will complement the actor-oriented approach to alternative news coverage by studying actor diversity more specifically.

Actor diversity

Despite conflicting normative assumptions about the societal duty of news media (see for example Strömbäck, 2005), most scholars agree that news consumers should have access to a multitude of different news outlets that, together, bring a diverse array of news coverage based on a plurality of sources and perspectives (e.g. McNair, 2009). In this paper, we will not only identify the types of societal and political actors displayed and quoted within the news coverage of alternative and mainstream news media, we will also calculate the diversity of these actor distributions. Actor diversity is one aspect to content diversity, a concept that van Cuilenburg defines as 'heterogeneity of media content in terms of one or more specified characteristics' (1999, p. 188). Content diversity is one of the many elements that make up news diversity (Hendrickx et al., 2020) and can be measured at the level of the outlet and its news articles (internal diversity) and on the level of the whole news environment (external diversity).

Internal actor diversity indicates the variety of actors that is allowed to play a role in the news coverage of a given outlet or news item. Internal actor diversity is affected by multiple factors, like the

media system, the medium, and article characteristics (Humprecht & Esser, 2018; Masini et al., 2018). Alternative news media have seldom been included in studies on news diversity. Scholars in the field of news diversity tend to include only one or a few alternative outlets at most, or study them with respect to their made-for-web characteristics (e.g. Humprecht & Büchel, 2013; Humprecht & Esser, 2018). These methodological choices are likely to veil the real differences in content diversity between alternative and traditional news outlets, as well as the differences within the group of alternative news media. Alternative outlets potentially present vastly different types of actors in their news coverage, but we have little idea what this means for the internal diversity of their news coverage.

The *external diversity* of a given news environment denotes the plurality of the news supply in that environment. It is linked to the normative concept of media pluralism, the way in which (a group of) media fulfill their societal duty by facilitating certain democratic processes (informing the public, providing a platform for debate and discussion, etc.) (for an overview, see: Raeijmaekers & Maesele, 2015). We have reason to believe that the external diversity of the news environment is in decline. Because of decreasing sales and diminishing advertising revenues, traditional news organizations are forced to revise their financial strategies, resulting in big media mergers and a concentration of most news titles within few leading organizations (Almiron, 2010; Baker, 2006; van der Burg & Van den Bulck, 2017). The tendency towards organizational concentration of media institutions seems to have led to editorial mergers too, resulting in a homogenization of mainstream news coverage (Boczkowski & de Santos, 2007; Hendrickx, 2019; Hendrickx & Ranaivoson, 2019). Alternative news media are organized differently than most mainstream news outlets which thus could affect or even counter the tendencies described above. In the next section we will elaborate on the specific characteristics of alternative news media and formulate hypotheses on their internal diversity and their possible influence on the external diversity of the news environment.

Alternative news media

Alternative news outlets are nothing new. Some scholars even argue that they have existed as long as their traditional and mainstream counterparts, fostering a counter-movement to what is considered

hegemonic and mainstream at the time (see for example Harcup, 2003). However, the internet and its digital applications have made the organization of alternative news outlets and the distribution of their news coverage increasingly more easy and effortless. The umbrella term 'alternative media' comprises a number of different types of media that are different from traditional and mainstream outlets in organizational and editorial structures, but also in their norms and values, content, and audience (Atton, 2001, 2004; Atton & Hamilton, 2008; Bailey et al., 2007; Forde, 2011; Heft et al., 2020). A growing number of scholars emphasize that the seemingly clear distinction between alternative and mainstream media is more likely to be a 'continuum of journalistic practice' (e.g. Harcup, 2005). This idea is reiterated in the relational approach to alternative news media introduced by Holt, Figenschou, and Frischlich (2019, p. 862), who define alternative news media as news outlets that proclaim or are perceived to be corrective, opposing the perceived dominant mainstream media in a given system. The perceived or proclaimed 'alternativeness' of these media is not clear-cut, and can be based on multiple different factors like the creators of their news coverage, their content, routines, organization, or media systems. Empirical research illustrates the ambivalence of the concept of alternative news media and further highlights the relational aspect to 'alternativeness' in news media. For example, Mayerhöffer (2021) found that Danish right-wing alternative news outlets present themselves as distinct from and in opposition to established mainstream news media on the structural level, while their news coverage is not nearly as radically different, serving as a supplement to mainstream news coverage. Also, Heft et al. (2020) show in their comparative study of right-wing alternative news websites that there is large variation in their 'alternativeness' with some sites opting for a radical niche approach, while others are 'normalizing' and difficult to distinguish from mainstream online news (see also Frischlich et al., 2020). The dominant mainstream news media, on the other hand, seem to protect the boundaries of professional journalism by exposing and condemning ideologically and journalistically deviant others (Nygaard, 2020). Atton and Couldry's (2003, p. 579), however, synthesize that alternative media are, for the most part, "media produced outside mainstream media institutions and networks". In this contribution, we will study a set of news media that are perceived as either

alternative or mainstream in terms of editorial organization, to determine if these organizational differences do in fact influence the content produced by these news outlets. We expect their independence of mainstream media institutions and organizations to have two main implications.

Firstly, it highlights their organizational and editorial alternativeness, and grants them the opportunity to diverge from mainstream standards in terms of content, journalistic practices and values. They are not bound by any of the public (e.g. governmental) or private (e.g. investors) stakeholders that generally inspire news media to publish news coverage that engages large ranges of the public, and thus do not have to generalize to sell their news coverage. Scholars have argued that the levels of content diversity in news coverage result from distinct editorial orientations to cater to the wishes and 'cultural capital' of the audiences they aim to reach (Benson, 2009; Masini et al., 2018). Alternative news media have different stakeholders compared to traditional outlets, and are thus expected to cater their news coverage to different, more specific and ideologically homogeneous audiences (see Bailey et al., 2007). Therefore we hypothesize that alternative news media have less incentives to produce news coverage that is diverse and multiperspectival, compared to their mainstream counterparts.

H1: Alternative news media (articles) display lower levels of actor diversity.

Secondly, the editorial makeup of alternative news media is likely to affect the types of societal and political actors that are presented and quoted in their news coverage. As stated in Hypothesis 1, we expect alternative news media to display lower levels of internal actor diversity. However, based on their independence of traditional media organizations and stakeholders, we hypothesize that they will contribute to the external content diversity of the news environment. Alternative (news) media are more imbedded in ideological communities and hold stronger ties with civil society, compared to their mainstream counterparts (Bailey et al., 2007). Alternative news outlets have been shown to attract and engage news consumers with pre-existing attitudes that are congruent with those of the medium (Leung & Lee, 2014) as well as people with stronger populist attitudes and a higher tendency to vote for populist parties (Müller & Schulz, 2019). In a way, they facilitate a counterpublic for people with

more radical viewpoints and a heightened sense of skepticism towards mainstream news media (see also Figenschou & Ihlebæk, 2019). The lower levels of internal actor diversity hypothesized in H1 will thus likely go hand-in-hand with a more specific focus on certain political and societal actor categories that cater to the audiences and stakeholders of the individual alternative news outlets.

H2: Alternative news media highlight actor categories often dismissed in mainstream news media.

H2a: Alternative news media pay more attention to civil society actors within their news coverage.

H2b: Alternative news media pay more attention to more radical politicians and political parties.

Methods

To study our hypotheses, we conducted a quantitative content analysis of news articles on two distinct issues published in Flemish alternative and mainstream news media over the course of one year (2017). Flanders, the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium that contains about 60% of the Belgian population, is considered to have a typical democratic corporatist media system (Hallin & Mancini, 2004). Historically characterized by strongly partisan news outlets and a highly pillarized media environment, the Flemish news media landscape has evolved to one based on objectivity, neutrality and quality journalism. It is centered around the public broadcaster (VRT) that reaches a large audience via television and radio news coverage, but also via their (free) news website. Most of the other traditional news media are concentrated in two big media organizations (Mediahuis and DPG Media) that combine popular and elite newspapers, magazines and in the case of DPG media also the commercial (news) broadcaster VTM. The Flemish media system also facilitates a number of alternative news outlets, most of which emerged around the turn of the century. For now, the audiences of these outlets remain fairly modest compared to the traditional media (Newman et al., 2018). Because of their relatively small audiences and organizational differences from the mainstream (e.g. less budget, fewer articles and mostly exclusively online platforms), the alternative news outlets in the Flemish news environment are still outsiders to the mainstream.

We selected four Flemish alternative news media (SCEPTR, Doorbraak, DeWereldMorgen, and MO*) based on their reach and tendency to cover political news coverage¹. SCEPTR and Doorbraak identify as right-wing, conservative news outlets. Both websites find their origin in the Flemish-nationalist movement. Doorbraak mainly focuses on opinion pieces and prides itself on representing both “long-term visions behind the headlines” and “opposing opinions”, while also offering background stories, analyses and editorials. SCEPTR², unlike Doorbraak, focuses less on opinionated news content and more on news items that could be considered to have a more traditional format. Both conservative news outlets represent similar ideological stances while translating those into somewhat different types of alternative news coverage. Vastly different from Doorbraak and SCEPTR, DeWereldMorgen (DWM) and MO* share core values that are more towards the left-wing and progressive side of the spectrum. They have multiple partners in the fields of civil society and development cooperation. While MO* focuses on large, in-depth journalistic pieces on “mondial tendencies and local realities all over the world”, DeWereldMorgen calls itself a movement first and foremost because their news coverage is rooted in citizen journalism and readers’ contributions. All four alternative news media are independent of mainstream media organizations. Their journalism is funded by subsidies and gifts (all), subscribers (Doorbraak, MO*), partner organizations (DWM, MO*) and advertising revenues (Doorbraak, SCEPTR, MO*). Most research on alternative news media includes only a small selection of similar outlets, resulting in one-sided findings that are not, or only partly, generalizable to all alternative outlets in a given system. We choose for a systematic approach, including a diverse set of alternative news media with different political leanings, civil society stakeholders and means of funding. For comparison, we also included two mainstream news media, De Standaard (DS), the main elite newspaper owned by Mediahuis, and Het Laatste Nieuws (HLN), which qualifies as a ‘popular’ news outlet owned by DPG Media. Given the organizational consolidation

¹ Newsmonkey, another one of the most prominent alternative news outlets in Flanders in terms of general reach, was left out of the selection because of its focus on entertainment news and other news coverage that caters to teens and young adults.

² SCEPTR changed their name to PAL NWS early February 2021. Throughout this manuscript, we will only reference to ‘SCEPTR’, because they bore that name at the time of our data collection.

of news media in Flanders, we expect De Standaard and Het Laatste Nieuws to give us a general idea of the news coverage in Flemish mainstream news outlets. Furthermore, the relatively high homogeneity of Flemish mainstream news media justifies this selection (Masini et al., 2018).

The dataset was constructed by alternately selecting 50% of all news items published by the four alternative news media on the issues of migration and social affairs in the year 2017 from an exhaustive dataset. This technique of systematic random sampling resulted in the selection of 445 articles on migration and 361 items on social affairs. For reference, we also include two mainstream news outlets in our dataset. We selected a simple random sample of roughly 100 articles per news medium per issue from an exhaustive dataset for both De Standaard (N = 210) and Het Laatste Nieuws (N = 203). In total, we analyzed a sample of 1219 articles on the two prominent issues. The selection of issues allows us to analyze a relatively large portion of all articles published by the alternative news media on those two topics in one whole year and thus avoids unnecessary and possibly distorting methods of selection and sampling. Moreover, the two issues allow for a comparison of news coverage on a socio-economic and a socio-cultural issue. Issue codes were attributed by means of the same codebook consisting of an extensive range of issues for both mainstream and alternative news media for research conducted prior to the study presented in this manuscript.

All articles were coded manually by one of the authors and three student coders. Firstly, we determined the length, type, author, and geographic focus of the article to be able to distinguish between different types of articles. Next, coders identified all actors that were mentioned, paraphrased, or quoted in the articles. In the codebook, 'actors' were operationalized as all persons and official groups of people (organizations, businesses, institutions, parties, government agencies, civil society organizations, NGOs, ...) that were either mentioned by name, quoted or paraphrased at least once. Table 1 gives an overview of the number of articles and actors coded per issue and news outlet. To determine the social category they belong to we use the classification of Beckers and Van Aelst (2019) that consists of four societal actor categories: political and governmental actors, business actors and experts, civil society actors, and citizens. The four main categories consist of multiple sub-

categories (17) that provide additional insights on the distribution of specific groups in the news (see Appendix D). Secondly, we coded whether the actors were merely mentioned (passive actors) or if they were quoted or paraphrased (active actors) to study their possible influence on the content of the news item. Lastly, for political actors specifically, we coded the political function and party of the actor to study the exposure of different parties in the mainstream and alternative news outlets included in our study.

[Insert Table 1 around here]

To ensure the quality of the data and the reliability of the coding process, coders were trained extensively and supported during the coding process. Moreover, the reliability of the variables included in the analysis was tested at multiple moments in the course of the coding period. On a sample of 100 double-coded articles, Krippendorff's alpha was sufficient for both article-level variables and actor-level variables. The variables that measure article length and the total number of actors in an article both score around 0,90 and the variables that indicate the different characteristics of individual actors range from 0,75 to 0,99 ($\alpha_{\text{category17}} = 0,79$; $\alpha_{\text{category4}} = 0,81$; $\alpha_{\text{party}} = 0,99$; $\alpha_{\text{political function}} = 0,87$; $\alpha_{\text{activity}} = 0,75$).

To calculate the actor diversity on the article and medium level, we use Simpson's (1949) Diversity Index (D_z), a measure of dual-concept diversity (McDonald & Dimmick, 2003) that incorporates both the presence of different actor categories and the overall evenness of the distribution. To minimize a possibly distorting effect of the number of categories in the distribution, we only use the standardized diversity index. Moreover, the use of Simpson's standardized diversity index facilitates the comparison between distributions with a different number of categories. Simpson's D_z ranges from 0 (no diversity, very slanted distribution) to 1 (maximum diversity, fully even distribution) and is calculated following the formula below, where p_i is the proportion of actors in the i^{th} category, and k is the number of categories in the distribution:

$$\text{Simpson's } D_z = \frac{1 - \sum p_i^2}{1 - \frac{1}{k}}$$

Results

Societal actor diversity

Firstly, we determine the article-level actor diversity in alternative and mainstream news outlets. On average, the four alternative news media display more (active) actors per news article compared to the two mainstream outlets. Table 2 shows that the higher number of actors per news item, generally, goes hand-in-hand with a higher mean article-level actor diversity. The table shows that all individual alternative news outlets display higher levels of actor diversity compared to the two mainstream outlets. Of all alternative and mainstream news media, popular mainstream newspaper HLN generally displays the lowest article-level actor diversity, while left-wing alternative outlet MO* displays the highest. Overall, the alternative news media included in our sample display a higher mean number of (active) actors per news item and a higher level of article-level actor diversity.

[Insert Table 2 around here]

Table 2 gives a rough indication of the average actor diversity consumers of the different media are exposed to upon reading a random article of the medium, but it doesn't account for any additional factors that could affect the number and diversity of the actors presented in the articles. In the following section we take a closer look at the Simpson's D_z measure of actor diversity, which ranges from 0 (no diversity, highly slanted actor distribution) to 1 (all actor categories are presented and attention is distributed evenly). We perform two regressions on this measure of actor diversity to study the possible influence of other factors. Firstly, we run a binary logistic regression on the mere presence of actor diversity (Simpson's $D_z > 0$) versus the absence of it (Simpson's $D_z = 0$). Secondly, we perform a linear regression on the Simpson's D_z of articles with at least some actor diversity (Simpson's $D_z > 0$) to check if other explanatory variables prove to be significant.

[Insert Table 3 around here]

Model I in Table 3 confirms the findings presented based on Table 2, both the left-wing and the right-wing alternative news media generally publish more diverse articles than the mainstream reference media. However, when we include the length of the article in model II, the significant effect

of the type of medium largely fades away. Right-wing alternative news media still seem to publish less non-diverse articles than the mainstream news media, but Appendix A shows that this is an individual effect for SCEPTR. Thus, when controlling for article length, alternative news media do not publish more diverse articles than mainstream news media. Alternative news media have few editorial limits regarding the length of the items on their digital platforms, compared to their mainstream counterparts. Generally, they publish longer news articles, which provide more space for a bigger and more diverse range of actors. The effect of type of medium shown in model I thus largely results from the difference in average article length between alternative and mainstream news media. A linear regression on non-zero Simpson's D_z -values (Appendix B) shows that within the group of at least slightly diverse articles (Simpson's $D_z > 0$), right-wing alternative news media SCEPTR and Doorbraak show somewhat lower levels of actor diversity, while left-wing outlets DeWereldMorgen and MO* seem to publish slightly more diverse articles. Thus, the mere presence of actor diversity within a single news article is mainly dependent on the length of the article, but the actual actor diversity presented within varies most between left-wing alternative news media (more diverse) and right-wing alternative outlets (less diverse). Even though the effect is significant, it is rather marginal.

The abovementioned analyses highlight that the differences in article-level actor diversity between alternative and mainstream news media are rather limited. Most of the apparent differences are to be attributed to the differing length of the articles in mainstream and alternative outlets. However, measures of actor diversity give no indication which actors and actor categories are presented and quoted within the news articles. Do alternative news media highlight other types of actors?

Table 4 shows the binary logistic regression on the presence of the four actor categories in articles published by the six news outlets, controlling for other factors like topic and article length. In general, alternative media are not that different from the mainstream in their focus on elite actors. What is more, right-wing alternative outlets SCEPTR and Doorbraak focus even more on political actors and business actors, and less on the institutionally less powerful categories of citizens and civil society actors. Left-wing news outlets MO* and DeWereldMorgen do not differ significantly from the

mainstream in their article-level presentation of political and business actors. However, they highlight civil society and citizen sources more than Het Laatste Nieuws and De Standaard in their articles. These results highlight that left-wing and right-wing alternative news media operate with a different focus. Left-wing alternative news media seem to work more bottom-up, focusing on the more vulnerable members of society, while right-wing alternative outlets work more top-down, reinforcing the elite-focus of mainstream news media.

[Insert Table 4 around here]

So far our analyses scrutinize differences in actor presentation and actor diversity on the article-level. Possibly, news media publish multiple articles on the same issue, highlighting different types of actors in each of them and thus presenting a more diverse set of actors on the aggregate level without publishing internally diverse articles. In the next section we take a step back and look at the aggregate-level actor presentation and diversity. Because previous research indicates that the distribution of actor categories is highly issue-dependent (Beckers & Van Aelst, 2019), we analyze the actor categories separately for migration and social affairs.

Table 5 and Table 6 synthesize the aggregated actor distribution and the Simpson's D_z diversity index calculated on the full set of actors presented in all articles coded for this study. Zooming in on migration news coverage, Het Laatste Nieuws displays the least diverse actor distribution of all news titles included in the analysis. De Standaard, Doorbraak, and SCEPTR all display a similar actor diversity on the aggregated level with a Simpson's D_z of around 0,70. MO* and DeWereldMorgen, on the other hand, distribute their attention most evenly over the four actor categories. Political actors, shown to be the most prominent elite group to be mentioned in migration news coverage, represent an absolute majority of all actors in the news coverage of four out of six news outlets. MO* and DeWereldMorgen do not pay as much attention to these political actors. Instead, they highlight more citizen and civil society sources, indicating their bottom-up approach to migration news coverage.

[Insert Table 5 around here]

In their news coverage on social affairs (Table 6), the two more conservative alternative news outlets (Doorbraak and SCEPTR), display noticeably lower levels of aggregated actor diversity compared to all other alternative and mainstream news outlets. This ‘lack’ of actor diversity is the result of their disproportionate attention to political and business (elite) actors. The other alternative news media pay more attention to civil society actors, whereas the two mainstream news outlets display citizen actors more often in social affairs news coverage.

[Insert Table 6 around here]

Even though the differences in article-level actor diversity between alternative and mainstream news media were limited, the aggregated actor presentation and diversity highlight more of a continuum, rather than a clear-cut distinction between alternative and mainstream news. On the one hand, right-wing alternative news media publish news coverage on migration and social affairs that is more one-sided in its presentation of societal actor categories. They mention and quote more elite, political actors and generally display lower levels of actor diversity on the article and aggregated level. On the other hand, MO* and DeWereldMorgen, who both have links to civil society and more left-wing organizations seemingly try to counter the elite-focus of mainstream news media. They publish news coverage that is more diverse in actor presentation, and they pay more attention to societal actor categories that are generally less prominent in mainstream news media. Consequently, H1 and H2a are only partly confirmed because left-wing alternative news media display higher levels of actor diversity (contrary to what we expected in H1) and they diverge their attention more towards civil society (in the case of social affairs) and citizen actors (in the case of migration) (H2a).

Political actor diversity

Because alternative news media are often associated with political and civil society organizations that are more outspoken on their ideological stances, we check if these organizational and editorial affiliations affect their display of political parties and politicians. Traditionally, mainstream media mainly focus on the political actors in government (Green-Pedersen et al., 2017; Hopmann et al., 2011; van Dalen, 2012), this is no different in our sample. On average, almost 85% of all 182 Flemish political

actors mentioned in the news coverage on social affairs and migration in the mainstream news media belonged to one of the three Flemish government parties (CD&V: 20%, Open Vld: 10%, N-VA: 54%). The government bonus seems to be slightly less prominent but still present in right-wing alternative news media (74% of 567 Flemish political actors belongs to a government party), and left-wing alternative outlets (83% of 155). On an aggregated level, these numbers indicate a significant government bonus in both mainstream and alternative news media. In the next section, we check if alternative news media balance these government political actors with other, possibly more radical, politicians.

Table 7 shows that on the article level, right-wing alternative news media Doorbraak and SCEPTR mention the governing parties N-VA, CD&V, and Open Vld to a similar rate compared to the mainstream reference media De Standaard and Het Laatste Nieuws. Conversely, left-wing alternative news media MO* and DeWereldMorgen seem somewhat less likely to display them in their news items on social affairs and migration. Next to their increased attention to the ‘elite’ governing parties, SCEPTR and Doorbraak present radical-right party Vlaams Belang more than the mainstream newspapers. Left-wing alternative news media MO* and DeWereldMorgen do not display the same tendency towards (radical-)left politicians and parties. Analyses that account for the display of actively mentioned (paraphrased or quoted) political actors (Appendix F) and the inclusion of individual media titles instead of media types (Appendix G) confirm our previous findings. H2b is thus confirmed only for the right-wing alternative news media in Flanders because they mention significantly more radical (right-wing) political actors.

[Insert Table 7 around here]

Conclusion and discussion

Changes in the digital news and information environment have brought along both threats to traditional news production and new opportunities for alternative journalism. Both of those trends are likely to affect the diversity in the news (see also Hendrickx, 2019; Hendrickx & Ranaivoson, 2019), raising questions about the ways in which both mainstream and alternative news media represent

society in their news coverage. We analyzed whether alternative news media provide a platform for new and different actor categories, and studied whether these outlets are more one-sided in their representation of society. Using a quantitative content analysis of news articles from right-wing alternative, left-wing alternative and mainstream Flemish news outlets, our aim was to investigate differences in actor diversity between alternative and mainstream media.

On the article level, all four alternative news media under study show higher levels of internal actor diversity than the mainstream reference media. However, taking into account the length of the article, a factor that has been proven to affect content diversity in news media (Masini et al., 2018), most differences do not hold. On average, Flemish alternative news outlets publish longer articles that provide more space for the display of different and diverse actor categories. We attribute the initial difference in internal article-level actor diversity between alternative and mainstream news media to this difference in average article length, and not their mainstream or alternative nature. On the aggregated level, more striking differences appear. On the one hand, left-wing alternative outlets MO* and DeWereldMorgen integrate a more diverse set of actors into their news coverage on migration and social affairs, spreading their attention more evenly across actor categories in favor of civil society actors and citizens. On the other hand, right-wing alternative news media SCEPTR and Doorbraak show lower levels of actor diversity, reinforcing the mainstream 'elite bias' towards political and business actors in news coverage on migration and social affairs. Thus, right-wing alternative news media do not seem to exploit their alternativeness in their presentation of alternative societal actor categories, while left-wing alternative news media partly counter the elite bias in mainstream news media by diverging their attention more to civil society and citizen sources.

While right-wing alternative news media do not exploit their alternativeness by providing a platform for other societal actors, they do pay more attention to radical political parties and politicians. For instance, the higher presence of radical right politicians (Vlaams Belang) can be seen as a 'correction' of the perceived 'liberal bias' in the mainstream press. Left-wing alternative news media do not do the same. Unlike their right-wing counterparts, they do not seem to serve as a platform for

(radical) left-wing politicians. Flemish right-wing alternative news media thus seem to operationalize their editorial independence and alternativeness on a political level, giving more exposure to right-wing and extreme-right politicians and parties, while left-wing alternative news media focus more on alternative civil society and citizen actors.

In sum, our findings have different implications in terms of internal and external news diversity. In terms of internal actor diversity, this study highlights that alternative news outlets are not that different from their mainstream counterparts. The seemingly clear distinction between alternative and mainstream news media is not translated into more or less actor diversity in their coverage. However, alternative news media are different in the type of actors they give attention in their coverage. Our results show quite clearly that right-wing and left-wing alternative news outlets operationalize their editorial independence differently. Right-wing alternative news media seem to exploit their organizational and editorial independence more for an ideological cause, highlighting more radical right-wing politicians and parties, while their left-wing counterparts seem to put their efforts into countering societal imbalances in mainstream news coverage. This indicates the possible influence of alternative outlets on the external actor diversity of the news environment. By positioning themselves so clearly on opposite sides of the ideological spectrum and broadcasting societal and political voices they deem too scarcely represented in the mainstream news media, they likely stimulate the range of perspectives presented in the media.

As with any study, there are some limitations we need to address. Firstly, we only studied news outlets in the Flemish media environment which could limit some results to this specific context. However, we studied an extensive and inclusive range of alternative news outlets that are likely to resemble those in other news environments. Across the globe, alternative news media flank the mainstream outlets on both sides of the political spectrum, serving more specific and homogeneous communities than their mainstream counterparts (Bailey et al., 2007; Heft et al., 2020). Mainstream news coverage is challenged both from the ideological right (e.g. Breitbart News in the US, ThePostOnline in The Netherlands) as well as the left (e.g. Democracy Now! in the US, The Canary in

the UK). In our research, we accounted for the broader types of alternative news media the outlets in our sample represent. This clear ideological division within the broader ecosystem of alternative outlets should be taken into account in further research on the content and effects of these new players in the digital news environment. Secondly, we only studied the diversity and presentation of actors without accounting for the way they are presented or the opinions they voice within the news. Previous quantitative research has indicated a link between levels of actor and viewpoint diversity (Masini et al., 2018), and qualitative studies have highlighted that alternative news outlets have a tendency to shed a different light on the news (Cissel, 2012; Pepermans & Maesele, 2018). We expect that our results complement these findings, but the link between actor and viewpoint diversity in alternative news media has to be validated in future research. Despite these limitations, we believe that our general findings transcend the specific context of our study and add to the general understanding of the content of alternative news media.

The results of this study paint a rather nuanced picture of alternative news media in the digital information environment. Despite the common perception of alternative news media as one-sided, ideologically and politically slanted forums for radical discourse on politicized issues, we find that Flemish alternative news platforms are largely similar to the mainstream news outlets with regard to the diversity of societal and political actors in their news coverage on migration and social affairs. However, we also find that they cover certain actors more elaborately than traditional mainstream media. Future research on diversity and alternative news media should consider these differences whilst figuring out how they interact with trends of selective exposure and selective perception. By doing so we will work towards a clear understanding of the new and possibly influential effects of online alternative news media on the production and consumption of news in today's high-choice digital information environment.

References

- Almiron, N. (2010). *Journalism in Crisis : Corporate Media and Financialization*. Hampton Press.
- Atton, C. (2001). *Alternative Media*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Atton, C. (2004). *An Alternative Internet*. Edinburgh University Press.

Atton, C., & Couldry, N. (2003). Introduction. *Media, Culture & Society*, 25(5), 579–586.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437030255001>

Atton, C., & Hamilton, J. F. (2008). *Alternative Journalism*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446216163>

Bailey, O. G., Cammaert, B., & Carpentier, N. (2007). *Understanding Alternative Media*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Baker, C. E. (2006). *Media concentration and democracy: Why ownership matters*. Cambridge University Press.

Beckers, K., & Van Aelst, P. (2019). Look who's talking: An analysis of actors in television news (2003–2016). *Journalism Studies*, 20(6), 872–890. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2018.1463169>

Benson, R. (2009). What makes news more multiperspectival? A field analysis. *Poetics*, 37(5–6), 402–418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2009.09.002>

Blumler, J. G. (2010). The two-legged crisis of journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 11(4), 439–441.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616701003802519>

Boczkowski, P. J., & de Santos, M. (2007). When More Media Equals Less News: Patterns of Content Homogenization in Argentina's Leading Print and Online Newspapers. *Political Communication*, 24(2), 167–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600701313025>

Cissel, M. (2012). Media Framing: a comparative content analysis on mainstream and alternative new coverage of Occupy Wall Street. *The Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Communications*, 3(1), 67–77.

Figenschou, T. U., & Ihlebæk, K. A. (2019). Challenging Journalistic Authority: Media criticism in far-right alternative media. *Journalism Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2018.1500868>

Forde, S. (2011). *Challenging the News: The Journalism of Alternative and Community Media*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Frischlich, L., Klapproth, J., & Brinkschulte, F. (2020). Between Mainstream and Alternative – Co-

- orientation in Right-Wing Populist Alternative News Media. In C. Grimme, M. Preuss, F. W. Takes, & A. Waldherr (Eds.), *Disinformation in Open Online Media. MISDOOM 2019. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 12021 (pp. 150–167). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39627-5_12
- Green-Pedersen, C., Mortensen, P. B., & Thesen, G. (2017). The Incumbency Bonus Revisited: Causes and Consequences of Media Dominance. *British Journal of Political Science*, 47(1), 131–148. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123415000022>
- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511790867>
- Harcup, T. (2003). “The unspoken - said”: The journalism of alternative media. *Journalism*, 4(3), 356–376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849030043006>
- Harcup, T. (2005). “I’m Doing this to Change the World”: Journalism in alternative and mainstream media. *Journalism Studies*, 6(3), 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700500132016>
- Heft, A., Mayerhöffer, E., Reinhardt, S., & Knüpfer, C. (2020). Beyond Breitbart: Comparing Right-Wing Digital News Infrastructures in Six Western Democracies. *Policy and Internet*, 12(1), 20–45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.219>
- Hendrickx, J. (2019). Trying to Survive While Eroding News Diversity: Legacy News Media’s Catch-22. *Journalism Studies*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2019.1694430>
- Hendrickx, J., Ballon, P., & Ranaivoson, H. (2020). Dissecting news diversity: An integrated conceptual framework. *Journalism*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884920966881>
- Hendrickx, J., & Ranaivoson, H. (2019). Why and how higher media concentration equals lower news diversity – The Mediahuis case. *Journalism*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884919894138>
- Holt, K., Ustad Figenschou, T., & Frischlich, L. (2019). Key Dimensions of Alternative News Media. *Digital Journalism*, 7(7), 860–869. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2019.1625715>
- Hopmann, D. N., de Vreese, C. H., & Albæk, E. (2011). Incumbency Bonus in Election News Coverage Explained: The Logics of Political Power and the Media Market. *Journal of Communication*, 61(2),

264–282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01540.x>

Hopmann, D. N., Van Aelst, P., & Legnante, G. (2012). Political balance in the news: A review of concepts, operationalizations and key findings. *Journalism*, 13(2), 240–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884911427804>

Humprecht, E., & Büchel, F. (2013). More of the Same or Marketplace of Opinions? A Cross-National Comparison of Diversity in Online News Reporting. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 18(4), 436–461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161213497595>

Humprecht, E., & Esser, F. (2018). Diversity in Online News: On the importance of ownership types and media system types. *Journalism Studies*, 19(12), 1825–1847. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2017.1308229>

Korthagen, I. (2015). Who Gets on the News? The relation between media biases and different actors in news reporting on complex policy processes. *Public Management Review*, 17(5), 617–642. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.822529>

Leung, D. K. K., & Lee, F. L. F. (2014). Cultivating an Active Online Counterpublic: Examining Usage and Political Impact of Internet Alternative Media. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 19(3), 340–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161214530787>

Lewis, J., & Cushion, S. (2019). Think Tanks, Television News and Impartiality: The ideological balance of sources in BBC programming. *Journalism Studies*, 20(4), 480–499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2017.1389295>

Masini, A., Van Aelst, P., Zerback, T., Reinemann, C., Mancini, P., Mazzoni, M., Damiani, M., & Coen, S. (2018). Measuring and Explaining the Diversity of Voices and Viewpoints in the News: A comparative study on the determinants of content diversity of immigration news. *Journalism Studies*, 19(15), 2324–2343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2017.1343650>

Mayerhöffer, E. (2021). How do Danish Right-wing Alternative Media Position Themselves Against the Mainstream? Advancing the Study of Alternative Media Structure and Content. *Journalism Studies*, 22(2), 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2020.1814846>

- McDonald, D. G., & Dimmick, J. (2003). The Conceptualization and Measurement of Diversity. *Communication Research*, 30(1), 60–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650202239026>
- McNair, B. (2009). Journalism and democracy. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* (pp. 237–249). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203877685-27>
- Müller, P., & Schulz, A. (2019). Alternative media for a populist audience? Exploring political and media use predictors of exposure to Breitbart, Sputnik, and Co. *Information, Communication & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2019.1646778>
- Newman, N., Fletcher, R., Kalogeropoulos, A., Levy, D. A. L., & Nielsen, R. K. (2018). *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2018*.
- Nygaard, S. (2019). The Appearance of Objectivity: How Immigration-Critical Alternative Media Report the News. *Journalism Practice*, 13(10), 1147–1163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2019.1577697>
- Nygaard, S. (2020). Boundary Work: Intermedia Agenda-Setting Between Right-Wing Alternative Media and Professional Journalism. *Journalism Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2020.1722731>
- Pepermans, Y., & Maesele, P. (2018). Manufacturing Consent: Rereading News on Four Climate Summits (2000-2012). *Science Communication*, 40(5), 621–649. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547018798119>
- Raeijmaekers, D., & Maesele, P. (2015). Media, pluralism and democracy: what's in a name? *Media, Culture and Society*, 37(7), 1042–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443715591670>
- Siles, I., & Boczkowski, P. J. (2012). Making sense of the newspaper crisis: A critical assessment of existing research and an agenda for future work. *New Media and Society*, 14(8), 1375–1394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812455148>
- Simpson, E. H. (1949). Measurement of diversity. *Nature*, 163(4148), 688.
- Strömbäck, J. (2005). In search of a standard: Four models of democracy and their normative

- implications for journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 6(3), 331–345.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700500131950>
- Tiffen, R., Jones, P. K., Rowe, D., Aalberg, T., Coen, S., Curran, J., Hayashi, K., Iyengar, S., Mazzoleni, G., Papathanassopoulos, S., Rojas, H., & Soroka, S. (2014). Sources in the News. *Journalism Studies*, 15(4), 374–391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2013.831239>
- Tresch, A. (2009). Politicians in The Media: Determinants of Legislators' Presence and Prominence in Swiss Newspapers. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 14(1), 67–90.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161208323266>
- Van Aelst, P., & Walgrave, S. (2016). Information and Arena: The Dual Function of the News Media for Political Elites. *Journal of Communication*, 66(3), 496–518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12229>
- van Cuilenburg, J. (1999). On competition, access and diversity in media, old and new: Some remarks for communications policy in the information age. *New Media and Society*, 1(2), 183–207.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444992222555>
- van Dalen, A. (2012). Structural Bias in Cross-National Perspective: How Political Systems and Journalism Cultures Influence Government Dominance in the News. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 17(1), 32–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161211411087>
- van der Burg, M., & Van den Bulck, H. (2017). Why are traditional newspaper publishers still surviving in the digital era? The impact of long-term trends on the Flemish newspaper industry's financing, 1990–2014. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 14(2), 82–115.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/16522354.2017.1290024>
- Vos, D. (2014). Which Politicians Pass the News Gates and Why? Explaining Inconsistencies in Research on News Coverage of Individual Politicians. *International Journal of Communication*, 8(1), 2438–2461.
- Wolfsfeld, G., & Sheaffer, T. (2006). Competing Actors and the Construction of Political News: The Contest Over Waves in Israel. *Political Communication*, 23(3), 333–354.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600600808927>

Tables

Table 1*Number of articles and actors per issue and outlet*

Medium	Migration		Social Affairs	
	Articles	Actors	Articles	Actors
De Standaard	106	553	104	454
Het Laatste Nieuws	102	448	101	393
SCEPTR	240	1495	115	868
Doorbraak	22	170	37	287
DeWereldMorgen	78	532	102	605
MO*	105	741	107	671
Total	653	3939	566	3278

Table 2*Means of article-level number of (active) actors and actor diversity*

Medium	Actors	Active actors	Simpson's D_z (4 cat.)
DS	4,79 ^a	1,65 ^{ab}	0,42 ^{acd}
HLN	4,13 ^a	1,44 ^a	0,33 ^c
Doorbraak	7,75 ^b	1,63 ^{ab}	0,47 ^{abd}
SCEPTR	6,65 ^b	2,45 ^c	0,48 ^{de}
MO*	6,61 ^b	2,04 ^b	0,59 ^b
DWM	6,30 ^b	1,67 ^{ab}	0,54 ^{be}

Note. ^{a,b,c,d}: means with differing superscripts within columns are significantly different ($p < 0,05$)

Table 3*Binary logistic regression with presence of actor diversity as dependent variable (N=1199)*

	Model I		Model II	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Constant	0,53***	1,69	-0,63**	0,53
Issue (ref. = social affairs)	-0,27	0,76	-0,26	0,77
Type of medium (ref. = Mainstream)				
Right-wing alternative (SCEPTR & Doorbraak)	1,22***	3,39	0,59**	1,79
Left-wing alternative (MO* & DWM)	1,23***	3,43	0,31	1,36
Length (ref. = short)				
Medium			1,49***	4,44
Long			2,01***	7,44
Extra long			2,57***	13,07
Nagelkerke R ² (NR ²)	0,096		0,240	

*** $p < 0,001$; ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$

Table 4*Binary logistic regression on article-level presence of actor categories (N=1219)*

	Political actors		Professionals and experts		Civil society		Citizens	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Constant	0,21	1,23	-0,28	0,76	-1,69***	0,19	-2,20***	0,11
Issue (ref. = social affairs)	1,10***	3,01	-1,04***	0,35	-0,36**	0,70	0,68***	1,98
Type of medium (ref. = Mainstream)								
Right-wing alternative	1,57***	4,81	1,12***	3,06	-0,50**	0,61	-1,01***	0,36
Left-wing alternative	0,02	1,02	-0,02	0,98	0,90***	2,45	-0,50**	0,61
Length (ref. = short)								
Medium	0,43	1,53	0,73**	2,07	0,98***	2,65	1,19***	3,30
Long	0,85**	2,33	0,91***	2,49	1,50***	4,49	1,36***	3,88
Extra long	0,79**	2,20	1,70***	5,48	1,49***	4,41	1,94***	6,97
NR ²	0,177		0,201		0,192		0,121	

*** $p < 0,001$; ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$

Table 5*Actor distribution and diversity in migration coverage per medium*

	Mainstream		Right-wing alternative		Left-wing alternative	
	DS	HLN	Doorbraak	SCEPTR	MO*	DWM
Politics & security (%)	64,0	73,7	63,9	69,2	41,3	42,9
Professionals & experts (%)	12,8	5,8	23,7	17,0	21,3	15,6
Civil Society (%)	12,8	4,0	3,0	5,7	17,5	26,5
Citizens (%)	10,3	16,5	9,5	8,1	19,8	15,0
Simpson's D_z	0,73	0,57	0,70	0,64	0,95	0,93
N	553	448	170	1495	741	532

Table 6*Actor distribution and diversity in social affairs coverage per medium*

	Mainstream		Right-wing alternative		Left-wing alternative	
	DS	HLN	Doorbraak	SCEPTR	MO*	DWM
Politics & security (%)	36,6	23,7	59,6	57,5	36,7	43,0
Professionals & experts (%)	33,9	37,2	26,8	30,0	34,7	24,0
Civil Society (%)	18,1	9,2	9,4	9,7	19,1	25,8
Citizens (%)	11,5	30,0	4,2	2,9	9,5	7,3
Simpson's D_z	0,94	0,94	0,75	0,76	0,93	0,91
N	454	393	287	868	671	605

Table 7*Binary logistic analysis on article-level presence of Flemish political actors (N=1219)*

	Extreme-right		Centre-right/government						Left				Extreme-left	
	Vlaams Belang		N-VA		Open Vld		CD&V		Sp.a		Groen		PVDA	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Constant	-4,33***	0,01	-1,66***	0,19	-3,23***	0,04	-2,36***	0,10	-3,75***	0,02	-4,45***	0,01	-34,16	0,00
Issue (ref. = social affairs)	0,47	1,59	1,22***	3,38	-0,92***	0,40	-0,42*	0,66	-1,02**	0,36	-0,05	0,95	-1,59*	0,21
Type of medium (ref. = Mainstream)														
Right-wing alternative	2,14***	8,46	0,16	1,18	0,71*	2,03	0,43	1,54	1,05*	2,86	0,36	1,43	16,54	1,5E7
Left-wing alternative	-0,60	0,55	-1,28***	0,28	-0,22	0,80	-1,00**	0,37	-0,18	0,84	-1,35*	0,26	15,80	7,3E6
Length (ref. = short)														
Medium	-0,88	0,42	0,06	1,06	0,70	2,02	-0,22	0,81	0,29	1,34	0,71	2,04	-2,20	0,11
Long	0,10	1,10	0,36	1,44	1,10*	3,01	0,87*	2,39	0,70	2,02	1,49	4,43	14,26	1,6E6
Extra long	-0,15	0,86	0,44	1,55	1,47**	4,36	0,98**	2,67	0,89	2,44	1,33	3,76	14,86	2,8E6
NR ²	0,167		0,170		0,087		0,090		0,079		0,063		0,207	

*** $p < 0,001$; ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$

Appendices

Appendix A

Binary logistic regression with presence of actor diversity as dependent variable (N=1199)

	Model I		Model II	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Constant	0,73***	2,08	-0,72**	0,49
Issue (ref. = social affairs)	-0,30*	0,74	-0,32*	0,73
Medium (ref. = DS)				
HLN	-0,38	0,69	0,18	1,20
Doorbraak	0,73*	2,07	-0,32	0,73
SCEPTR	1,09***	2,97	0,82***	2,28
MO*	1,18***	3,26	0,35	1,42
DWM	0,89***	2,44	0,32	1,38
Length (ref. = short)				
Medium			1,49***	4,42
Long			2,03***	7,58
Extra long			2,74***	15,52
Nagelkerke R ²	0,102		0,248	

*** $p < 0,001$; ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$

Appendix B*Linear regression on non-zero Simpson's D_z (N=904)*

	Model I			Model II		
	B	S.E.	β	B	S.E.	β
Constant	0,63***	0,01		0,63***	0,02	
Issue (ref. = social affairs)	-0,01	0,01	-0,04	-0,01	0,01	-0,03
Type of medium (ref. = Mainstream)						
Right-wing	-0,05**	0,02	-0,13	-0,05**	0,02	-0,12
alternative						
Left-wing	0,05**	0,02	0,14	0,04**	0,02	0,12
alternative						
Length (ref. = short)						
Medium				-0,01	0,03	-0,03
Long				-0,01	0,03	-0,02
Extra long				0,02	0,03	0,06
Adj. R^2		0,058			0,060	

*** $p < 0,001$; ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$

Appendix C*Binary logistic regression on article-level presence of actor categories (N=1219)*

	Political actors		Professionals and experts		Civil society		Citizens	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Constant	0,36	1,43	-0,11	0,90	-1,29***	0,27	-2,98***	0,05
Issue (ref. = social affairs)	1,08***	2,93	-1,16***	0,31	-0,35**	0,71	0,69***	2,00
Medium (ref. DS)								
HLN	-0,23	0,80	-0,17	0,84	-0,77**	0,46	1,11***	3,03
Doorbraak	0,58	1,79	-0,30	0,74	-0,74*	0,48	-0,64	0,53
SCEPTR	1,75***	5,77	1,32***	3,75	-0,80***	0,45	-0,53*	0,59
MO*	-0,21	0,81	0,29	1,34	0,39	1,48	0,04	1,04
DWM	-0,01	1,00	-0,61**	0,54	0,86***	2,35	-0,17	0,84
Length (ref. Short)								
Medium	0,35	1,42	0,60**	1,83	0,87**	2,40	1,49***	4,44
Long	0,78*	2,18	0,83***	2,30	1,40***	4,05	1,67***	5,32
Extra long	0,82**	2,27	1,79***	6,00	1,38***	3,98	2,29***	9,87
NR ²	0,185		0,236		0,206		0,145	

*** $p < 0,001$; ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$

Appendix D*Actor distribution in migration coverage per medium (%)*

	Mainstream		Right-wing alternative		Left-wing alternative	
	DS	HLN	Doorbraak	SCEPTR	MO*	DWM
Politics and security	64,0	73,7	63,9	69,2	41,3	42,9
Politician	25,3	34,8	34,3	31,1	11,6	11,7
Political party	0,7	5,4	10,7	9,3	2,3	2,6
Government organization	31,6	28,3	15,4	22,6	24,7	23,3
Law enforcement and emergency services	4,3	3,6	3,0	4,9	1,5	4,5
Terrorist organizations	2,0	1,6	0,6	1,3	1,2	0,8
Professionals and experts	12,8	5,8	23,7	17,0	21,3	15,6
Media and journalists	4,9	2,0	7,7	11,9	5,4	5,3
Business professionals	0,2	0,0	0,6	0,7	2,0	3,2
Private sector company	1,4	0,7	1,2	1,1	3,4	1,1
Experts and academics	3,8	1,8	8,9	2,2	8,4	3,8
Celebrities	1,1	0,2	3,0	0,1	1,2	0,6
Religious organizations	0,5	0,0	1,8	0,5	0,1	0,9
Lawyers and legal representatives	0,9	1,1	0,6	0,3	0,8	0,8
Civil society	12,8	4,0	3,0	5,7	17,5	26,5
Civil society organization	11,9	3,3	3,0	4,3	12,7	21,4
Civil society representative	0,9	0,7	0,0	1,4	4,9	5,1
Citizens	10,3	16,5	9,5	8,1	19,8	15,0
Involved citizens	6,1	9,2	3,6	4,5	7,2	9,0
Uninvolved citizens	0,0	2,9	2,4	0,9	2,2	1,7
Migrants and refugees	4,2	4,5	3,6	2,6	10,5	4,3
N	553	448	169	1495	741	532

Appendix E*Actor distribution in social affairs coverage per medium (%)*

	Mainstream		Right-wing alternative		Left-wing alternative	
	DS	HLN	Doorbraak	SCEPTR	MO*	DWM
Politics and security	36,6	23,7	59,6	57,5	36,7	43,0
Politician	13,0	9,9	26,1	27,9	12,8	14,5
Political party	4,2	1,3	8,7	11,2	1,8	5,3
Government organization	18,9	12,0	24,7	17,3	20,3	22,8
Law enforcement and emergency services	0,4	0,5	0,0	0,9	0,9	0,3
Terrorist organizations	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2	0,9	0,0
Professionals and experts	33,9	37,2	26,8	30,0	34,7	24,0
Media and journalists	7,9	6,1	11,1	16,9	8,3	3,6
Business professionals	4,0	4,6	4,2	1,8	5,5	4,1
Private sector company	9,0	14,2	4,2	4,3	8,5	8,8
Experts and academics	9,7	7,6	5,2	4,4	11,2	6,8
Celebrities	3,1	3,8	1,7	0,3	0,6	0,3
Religious organizations	0,0	0,8	0,3	1,7	0,1	0,2
Lawyers and legal representatives	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,5	0,4	0,2
Civil society	18,1	9,2	9,4	9,7	19,1	25,8
Civil society organization	15,0	6,1	8,7	6,1	14,8	19,5
Civil society representative	3,1	3,1	0,7	3,6	4,3	6,3
Citizens	11,5	30,0	4,2	2,9	9,5	7,3
Involved citizens	9,7	25,2	1,4	2,1	6,9	7,3
Uninvolved citizens	1,5	4,8	2,1	0,8	0,7	0,0
Migrants and refugees	0,2	0,0	0,7	0,0	1,9	0,0
N	454	393	287	868	671	605

Appendix F*Binary logistic analysis on article-level presence of Flemish political actors mentioned actively (N=1219)*

	Extreme-right		Centre-right/government						Left				Extreme-left	
	Vlaams Belang		N-VA		Open Vld		CD&V		Sp.a		Groen		PVDA + PTB	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Constant	-5,76***	0,00	-2,66***	0,07	-4,24***	0,01	-3,03***	0,05	-4,85***	0,01	-5,06***	0,01	-33,34	0,00
Issue (ref. = social affairs)	0,30	1,34	1,12***	3,06	-0,70*	0,50	-0,03	0,97	-0,97	0,38	-0,14	0,87	-1,64	0,19
Type of medium (ref. = Mainstream)														
Right-wing alternative	2,57**	13,05	0,44*	1,56	0,64	1,89	0,33	1,39	0,91	2,48	-0,25	0,78	16,39	1,3E7
Left-wing alternative	-15,84	0,00	-1,76***	0,17	-0,16	0,86	-1,95**	0,14	-0,44	0,65	-17,46	0,00	14,03	1,2E6
Length (ref. = short)														
Medium	0,09	1,10	0,50	1,64	1,17	2,48	0,99*	0,91	0,17	1,18	1,12	3,07	-2,61	0,07
Long	0,94	2,56	0,74*	2,09	1,34	3,24	0,32	2,69	1,45	4,25	2,21*	9,08	12,71	3,3E5
Extra long	0,02	1,02	0,51	1,67	-4,24***	3,81	-3,03***	1,38	0,64	1,89	1,13	3,08	14,29	1,6E6
NR ²	0,224		0,196		0,046		0,103		0,088		0,126		0,274	

*** $p < 0,001$; ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$

Appendix G*Binary logistic analysis on article-level presence of Flemish political actors (N=1219)*

	Extreme-right		Centre-right/government						Left		Extreme-left			
	Vlaams Belang		N-VA		Open Vld		CD&V		sp.a		Groen		PVDA + PTB	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Constant	-4,37***	0,01	-2,20***	0,11	-3,45***	0,03	-2,77***	0,06	-4,60***	0,01	-4,55***	0,01	-34,78	0,00
Issue (ref. = social affairs)	0,48	1,62	1,27***	3,57	-0,90***	0,41	-0,39*	0,68	-0,98**	0,38	-0,05	0,95	-1,72*	1,80
Medium (ref. = DS)														
HLN	0,00	1,00	0,74**	2,10	0,32	1,38	0,58	1,78	1,13	3,08	0,13	1,14	0,54	1,71
Doorbraak	2,11**	8,25	0,65	1,91	0,91*	2,48	0,91*	2,48	1,82*	6,15	0,28	1,32	-1,22	0,30
SCEPTR	2,12**	8,30	0,44*	1,56	0,82*	2,27	0,61*	1,85	1,57*	4,82	0,43	1,54	17,36	3,4E7
MO*	-16,96	0,00	-1,62***	0,20	-0,37	0,68	-1,02*	0,36	-0,28	0,76	-2,11	0,12	14,91	3,0E6
DWM	0,18	1,19	-0,43	0,65	0,20	1,22	-0,45	0,64	0,90	2,45	-0,79	0,46	16,53	1,5E7
Length (ref. = short)														
Medium	-0,84	0,43	0,26	1,29	0,79	2,21	-0,05	0,95	0,56	1,75	0,74	2,09	-2,15	1,12
Long	0,14	1,15	0,57*	1,76	1,19*	3,29	1,04**	2,83	0,98	2,65	1,52	4,55	14,25	1,5E6
Extra long	-0,09	0,91	0,65*	1,91	1,56**	4,75	1,10**	3,01	1,12	3,07	1,40	4,06	15,44	5,1E6
NR ²	0,180		0,195		0,092		0,099		0,096		0,068		0,278	

*** $p < 0,001$; ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$