

Melenhorst, L., & Van Aelst, P. (2017). Why Do Politicians Use the Media When Making Laws? A Study On the Functional Use of Mass Media During Legislative Processes. In P. Van Aelst & S. Walgrave (Eds.), *How Political Actors Use the Media* (pp. 227-243). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

## **Chapter 12. Why do politicians use the media when making laws? A study on the functional use of mass media during legislative processes**

### **1. Introduction**

Why do politicians use the media in their legislative work? This question got surprisingly little attention in previous work on media and politics. The reason might be that the answer is considered too self-evident: the mass media are by far the most effective way to reach out to the public and build a reputation. Citizens almost entirely depend on the media to get to know politicians and to learn about their ideas and accomplishments (Shehata & Strömbäck, 2014). Therefore gaining media attention is a primary goal for politicians that have, or want to obtain, an electoral mandate, and there is no reason to expect this to be different when it comes to their legislative work. Studies namely indicate that the role of the media in modern politics goes beyond publicity: politicians use the media not merely for electoral reasons, but also to reach their policy goals (Davis, 2007; Elmelund-Præstekær & Wien, 2008; Kunelius & Reunanen, 2012).

This chapter deals with the functions the media have for parliamentarians during legislative processes that turn bills into laws. The focus is on the parliamentary legislative process, instead of the agenda-setting phase that proceeds this process. We look at the mass media from a functional perspective, asking for what purpose individual politicians use the media in their legislative work (Kunelius & Reunanen, 2012). The main question is whether the ideas about the dual function of the news media for political elites, as presented by Van Aelst & Walgrave in Chapter 1, are applicable in the context of legislation. According to them, the mass media have two essential functions for political elites (see also Van Aelst & Walgrave, 2016). On the one hand, they are a source of information for political elites. Politicians can use the media passively, to learn about the issue at hand or the opinions of other actors, or actively, as a window of opportunity to reach their goals. On the other hand, media are an arena for political communication. Politicians can enter this arena for self-promotion purposes, or for issue-promotion purposes.

So far, empirical work that investigates these two functions of the media for politicians in the context of lawmaking is largely missing. The few existing studies focus on the US (Sellers,

2010; Wolfe, 2012) instead of on proportional multi-party systems. Furthermore, it is unclear whether legislators' motivations for entering the media arena go beyond attracting public attention. We opt for an in-depth approach that allows us to understand what functions media can have for politicians in their work as legislators. We study the dual function of the media for Members of Parliament (MPs) in the context of lawmaking, a fundamental element of politics. The first research question is whether the media are a source of information for MPs when they are considering bills, and if so, whether they actively use this information during legislative processes. The second research question is whether the media are an arena for political communication during legislative processes, and if so, whether MPs employ it for self-promotion and/or issue-promotion purposes.

When dealing with these questions, we focus explicitly on two types of differences between MPs: members of opposition versus coalition parties, and Upper House versus Lower House members. With regard to the former, the literature suggests that the media have different functions for MPs of coalition parties versus MPs that are in opposition (Thesen, 2012; Vliegthart & Walgrave, 2011). With regard to the latter, the distinction has to do with the position of MPs towards the electorate. The 150 members of the Lower House in the Netherlands are full-time and directly elected politicians; the 75 members of the Upper House (Senate) are part-time politicians for only one day a week, and are elected indirectly via the members of the twelve States-Provincial. Whereas the Lower House is expected to deal with day-to-day politics, the Upper House is perceived as a so-called *chambre de réflexion* that usually operates in the background. Therefore we expect MPs in the Lower House to use and get more media-attention than their colleagues in the Senate.

## **2. Research design**

Since we are mainly interested in the motives of politicians, we conduct in-depth semi-structured interviews with politicians in the Netherlands. This allows us to understand why politicians think the media are (not) relevant for lawmaking. It means we are not so much interested in media coverage on legislative processes, but more in the underlying strategies and motives of MPs (for research about the media's influence on lawmaking, see for example Melenhorst, 2015). The interviews are conducted in three waves, in the context of case studies about specific legislative processes: a bill regulating top salaries in the (semi)public sector (*Wet normering bezoldiging functionarissen publieke en semi-publieke sector*), a bill regulating flexible work and unemployment, and governing dismissal (*Wet werk en zekerheid*) and a bill introducing a new student finance system (*Wet studievoorschot hoger onderwijs*). The topics of the bills received ample media coverage, and as a consequence media coverage could potentially be of importance for politicians during the process (for more information see Melenhorst, 2017).

All interviewees are members of the Lower and Upper Houses of Parliament, who were the spokespeople on behalf of their parliamentary party during the legislative process about one of the bills ( $N=52$ ). They represent a diverse range of political parties and have varying parliamentary experience. Because the starting point for the interviews was a specific legislative process, the interviewees had an incentive not to talk about 'the media' in general; they were asked specific questions about the rationale behind their own usage of media coverage and actual interactions with journalists. To avoid gathering only context-specific data, follow-up questions were asked to check for additional motivations during other legislative processes. We have not enforced a specific definition of 'the media' to the interviewees, because we are interested in all types of mass media they interact with during legislative processes.

All semi-structured interviews are conducted by the first author, and took on average between 50-70 minutes. The interview data are analyzed via a qualitative content analysis in MAXQDA, using a codebook based on the dual function of the media. We consider all statements about the content of media coverage and about reasons why a political actor uses media coverage relevant with regard to the media as a source of information. All statements concerning reasons why a political actor tries to get media coverage for him- or herself, or issues they are dealing with, are regarded as relevant with regards to the media as an arena for political communication.

This study is conducted in the Netherlands: a multiparty, bicameral political system that is considered a consensus democracy (Lijphart, 2012). Bills are typically introduced by members of government (Bovend'Eert & Kummeling, 2010) although the legislative power is constitutionally shared by government and parliament (Andeweg & Irwin, 2014). The dominant role of the government in drafting legislation is not unique, as the legislatures of most parliamentary democracies rarely introduce bills (Bergman, Müller, Strom, & Blomgren, 2003). During the legislative process members of the Lower House can amend bills, and members of both Houses can propose motions. Legislative processes start when a bill is introduced to the Lower House, and are completed when, after both Houses of Parliament have passed it, the law is published in the Government Gazette. In this chapter we focus on the role media coverage plays during these processes in Parliament. Given the exploratory nature of the study, we focus on *whether* MPs mention media as a source of information or as an arena (as opposed to *the extent* to which they serve these functions) in the context of lawmaking.

### **3. Results: 'information' & 'arena' during legislative processes**

#### *3.1 Media coverage as a source of information*

The first part of the first research question, to be answered in this section, is whether the media are a source of information for MPs when they are considering bills. Politicians argue that the mass media are a source of information in lawmaking, mainly about public opinion and about other politicians. However, they also indicate that the media are not their most important source on the topics of bills. We will first explain why politicians perceive the importance of the media as a source of information to be limited.

MPs have multiple other sources of information, that often contain information that is more tailored to the legislative process. Because MPs are often specialized, media attention hardly ever contains new information for them. Once they see or hear something in the media, they usually have already read about it in parliamentary documents, in research reports, or heard about it via interest groups or experts. In exceptional cases, such as via investigative journalism, media can present new information to politicians. An MP explains: "There are journalists who do research themselves. If that is quite thorough and there's more to it, than you can really use it as a Member of Parliament, just like any other source of information." It is however rare for investigative journalists to publish during legislative processes. Instead, their publications often have a more agenda setting effect prior to legislative processes. In the exceptional cases when media items do contain new information, MPs usually check the correctness of the information, for example by contacting somebody mentioned in it, or by looking up the original source of the news. According to some politicians, the expertise of journalists – for example, those writing for quality newspapers – can be useful. One MP argues: "Because I think that the people that write for these newspapers (...) know exactly what they are talking about, they have good networks themselves. (...) They follow a topic seriously, and by following closely what these people write, you get a reasonable idea of the breadth of the debate, of the various views in the debate."

Media attention is generally speaking considered as being rather superficial, or at least it does not go into the details of bills. Such coverage can nevertheless still be informative, for example because it provides an overview of the topics under consideration, or reminds politicians of the fundamental ideas behind the bill. MPs also argue that media coverage can direct their attention to potentially problematic elements of the bill they had not thought about previously. Although mass media coverage is not their most important source of information, politicians do monitor more or less closely what is in the media about the topic of the bill. As expected, members of the Lower House monitor more closely and intensely what is in the mass media than members of the Upper House.

In the perception of legislators, journalists are often prone to report on incidents. Some argue that such incident coverage is not relevant information, because legislation is not suitable for solving such specific cases. However, if media pay attention to a particular case in which the

bill has presumably unforeseen consequences, other MPs do believe they should take note of that. The MPs agree that in any case, it is their task to analyze the meaning of the coverage. An MP explains: “There are very often items about incidents, they have a good signal function. Then you need to weigh: do I have to do something with this? Is this a sign of something structural or not?”. They seem not to trust media reports blindly, which is in line with previous research that shows political actors anticipate biases in the news (Herbst, 1998); they try to check whether the information is correct, and what the broader story is.

An important reason to monitor the media is that it provides clues about public opinion. MPs mention that it is part of their job to follow the media, because they are expected to know what is going on in society – in particular when it concerns a bill that is being considered in Parliament and that they are the spokesperson of their party on. “You have to know how the matter stands, and what people think about it. You are a representative of the people, you are not there for yourself”, one of them argues. “You have to translate notes from society to your appearance in the House.” MPs want to be aware of the information that is communicated to the wider public via the media, and want to check whether there is media coverage they feel they have to do something with. Since public opinion polls about topics of bills during legislative processes are rare, MPs look for alternative indications of what the public thinks. Some MPs mention pieces written by columnists, editors or opinion makers, while others believe that the readers’ opinions published on the correspondence pages of newspapers express what the public thinks. “In newspapers the readers’ letters are most important, and nowadays also the responses on websites. I think that is much more interesting than the opinion of the editor”, an MP explains. MPs also indicate that rely on specific newspapers one to know what the public thinks: “If you want to keep an eye on opinion in the Netherlands, than you always have to follow *De Telegraaf*, that is the type of newspaper that expresses the sentiments in the Netherlands.” Some devote special attention to particular media because they reflect the priorities and opinions of their voters or supporters. Although the media landscape in the Netherlands is not very polarized and not as partisan as it was in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, some newspapers and public broadcasting organizations have a more right-wing or left-wing leaning, or for example a religious character. About the latter, an MP from a Christian party says: “If these media write a lot about an issue, than you automatically look at it more critically.”

Via the media MPs also get information about political developments and the position or agenda of other politicians in the legislative process. Political actors explain that although most of the time they know what the position of others is, they still want to be aware of what other MPs say in the media. In particular when there is political tension, attention for the political process is relevant to MPs, and can inform them about the position of their colleagues. This may then be a reason to contact that colleague, to check their position in person, or to adjust one’s

own positioning. Regarding the latter, an MP explains: “The media are an important source of information about how other parties position themselves.” This is relevant because, if you aren’t committed to a particular position yet, “...you choose your position in relation to how others position themselves.” For members of the Upper House, media attention can be informative about the decision-making process in the Lower House. This is relevant because after a bill is passed by the Lower House, it is sent to the Upper House. Therefore several Upper House MPs indicated they already monitor the media prior to that moment, because they know that it is likely that at some point they will participate in the legislative process themselves.

Providing information is a first potential asset that the media offer to politicians. In a follow-up step this information can be used in their daily work. The second part of the first research question is whether MPs actively use information they acquired via the media during legislative processes. In general, Dutch parliamentarians emphasize that because they have multiple sources of information at their disposal, they do not use explicit media references very often. If they want to refer to a source when asking a question or making a claim, they prefer to mention sources like research reports, official documents or online publications, even when media coverage was the source via which a political actor first learnt about the issue. However, in addition to those sources, MPs do use media coverage in legislative processes. MPs argue they do refer to specific media items or to what is in the media more generally, for example when asking written questions to the minister, or during legislative debates. This concurs with what we know is quite common with regard to parliamentary questions in the Dutch Lower House (Van Aelst & Vliegthart, 2013). Media references seem to be more common in the Lower House than in the Upper House, which is in line with the expectations about the Senate as a *chambre de réflexion* that is less focused on topical issues.

Political actors mention a number of motivations for actively using media coverage during legislative processes. A first and rather self-evident reason is that political actors want to credit the source that initially brought the issue to their attention. One MP even makes a direct comparison with the way in which scientists refer to the sources they use. Mostly, however, the motivation to refer to media coverage is more strategic. Several politicians indicate that a media reference helps to underline the urgency or topicality of an issue. This is for example something MPs do to begin their contribution to legislative debates with: “Topical matters are always a good start of a debate, because people are watching it at home and should know what it is about”, an MP explains. According to him media references demonstrate that the issue the bill is about is “...topical, and relevant, and why people read about it in the newspapers on a daily basis.” Another explains that this is in particular helpful if you are dissatisfied with the bill: “The art of the debate is of course also to keep it topical, to make it lively – at least if your aim is to change something”.

Media coverage can also be employed to substantiate a party's point of view. In particular, media coverage is useful for opposition MPs because it is often negative, or at least critical towards those in power. For instance, an opposition MP remembers a legislative process in which "...journalists have (...) cooperated very well". In contrast, a coalition party MP says in the context of a particular bill: "The newspapers didn't really write things that helped me, so there was not much to quote, really." And an MP that was part of a temporary coalition to support a bill explains that "...once I have signed an agreement, I cannot go into the media anymore with all kinds of things that are completely different [to what is in the agreement]. So that limits the room I have".

Another motivation for MPs to refer to examples from the media is to make the topic of legislative debates clearer to the larger public: "The interesting thing about such examples is that they are recognizable for people", a Lower House MP explains regarding a reference he made to an issue that received ample media attention. Also when legislation is complex, it can be useful to refer to media coverage, an MP explains. "It can be very technical, (...) and then it is sometimes very useful to refer to an expert article (...), also during the plenary debate about a bill." Referring to a media source can also be a way for MPs to justify questions they ask. One of them explains that "...you can derive examples from it, and occasionally you think, this what I read, we can convert that into questions." Media coverage can also be used by MPs to confront or challenge their political opponents. For example, if a political actor said something in the media he or she has not said within parliament before, in particular if it goes contrary to prior statements, an MP can refer to this to force the other to respond to it and clarify their position.

In sum, media coverage can be informative in the sense that it contains opinions of other political actors, representatives of interest groups, experts or individual citizens. In the context of legislation, the media can thus function as a platform for people that have ideas about the content or consequences of bills. It is however not only a passive source of information: media coverage can also be used actively by MPs during legislative processes. Their motivations to use media references are diverse, including crediting the source, underlining the urgency of issues, substantiating their party's position, and clarifying the bill under deliberation to the larger public.

### *3.2 The media as an arena for political communication*

The second research question, to be answered in this section, is whether the media are an arena for political communication during legislative processes, and if so, whether MPs employ it for self-promotion and/or issue-promotion purposes. The information and arena model namely suggests that there are mainly two reasons why politicians want to enter the media arena. First,

because it is still the best way to develop name recognition and make themselves visible, and second, because it allows them to promote their issue agenda (Van Aelst & Walgrave, 2016).

During the interviews none of the interviewees mentioned that they aim at getting media attention for themselves personally in the context of lawmaking. Some do mention that they want to create visibility for the position and behavior of their parliamentary party during the legislative process. The 'self' they want to promote should be interpreted as the parliamentary party group the MP is representing as a spokesperson. In addition, in the context of legislative processes, political actors tend not to be concerned about the mere visibility of their party as such: they want attention for the *position* of their party. This is probably due to the substantial nature of legislative processes; if MPs are in contact with journalists, they are motivated by the debate about the bill and want to make apparent what their position is.

In the context of lawmaking the sub-function of 'self-promotion', in the sense of promoting oneself personally, is thus hardly applicable. Issue-promotion via the media seems to be a more common strategy, at least among Lower House MPs. Their main goal is to create visibility for the position of their parliamentary party group. By showing the issues their party cares about and demands attention for, they want to communicate what they are doing to the larger public. By doing so they want to give account to their voters, for example show that they are executing their election program, or show to interest groups that they take their concerns seriously. At the same time, with an eye to the future, they also want to show their legislative behavior to potential future voters. A member of the Lower House explains that it is about "...the communication between the representatives of the people and their supporters, whether that is a voter, or a member of the party, or people that have not voted for you but that do follow politics. That is an inextricable element [of your job]. So in that sense you are always a missionary that is trying to bring things into the limelight, and you need the media for that," also in order to "...increase the support for your ideas, and thus for your party".

MPs may also try to get media coverage for particular issues to influence the direction of parliamentary debates. They may for example try to enter the media arena directly prior to legislative debates or votes. "The news cycle 24 hours before the debate starts is very useful to direct the debate towards your position. That isn't any different with legislation", a Lower House MP explains. "If you say [in a newspaper]: we are going to introduce an amendment (...), all your colleagues read it. And they will start to develop an opinion on it. (...) And thereby you achieve that at least part of the debate is about your ideas." Another MP explains that "...you want to make clear what the position of your party is, and show that you are serious about it. (...) And if you really disagree with something, it is important to become issue owner, by approaching the media a lot. And at the same time, you always have the hope that you can find a hole in the coalition".



Generally speaking, coalition MPs do not have a strong incentive to get into the media while the legislative process is still in progress. For them, the main priority is to make sure that the bill under consideration passes both Houses of Parliament. They tend to perceive being in the media as a risk, in the sense that if they say something one of their coalition partners is unhappy with, that may put pressure on the often delicate balance between the parties. Nevertheless, complying with a journalistic request is sometimes perceived as beneficial, particularly if they think the media coverage will allow them to defend their support for the bill. A Lower House MP explains that he for example participated in a radio interview because "...it was a good opportunity to tell our own story". Members of the Upper House, whether they represent coalition or opposition parties, are usually not in favor of entering the media arena prior to legislative debates. One of the senators states rather clearly: "We debate with the government, and not with the newspaper".

Lower House MPs enter the media arena more than Upper House MPs, but they also stress that it is not something they do frequently in the context of lawmaking. Because legislative processes are often lengthy, rather technical and complex, MPs have ample room to bring up issues within the parliamentary arena and deliberate about them with their colleagues and with members of the cabinet. It is according to the politicians not very common for them to try and get media coverage for topics they are concerned about with regard to legislation, because most of what happens in parliament remains out of the media's spotlights. This perception concurs with research that shows most legislative processes receive no, or only little, media coverage (Melenhorst, 2013; Van Aelst, Melenhorst, Van Holsteyn, & Veen, 2015). Some legislators even mention 'not using the media' as a strategy. This means that political actors sometimes deliberately *not* inform journalists about their position on a bill, because media coverage for their position might obstruct what is considered by them to be the desirable legislative outcome. If a party for example received precarious support for a proposal, they might wait until the actual vote took place before telling the media about it. An MP explains: "In some situations you (...) do not want to involve the media. For example, (...) if you say out loud in the media that you are going to manage something, then it may become very difficult for another spokesperson to get his parliamentary party to go along."

In sum, many of the actions and behaviors of MPs during legislative processes are not particularly aimed at receiving media attention. In this regard various MPs contrast legislative processes with the parliamentary question hour, to indicate that whereas one of the goals of asking oral parliamentary questions is to try and gain media attention (Van Aelst, Santen, Melenhorst, & Helfer, 2016; Van Santen, Helfer, & Van Aelst, 2015), this is not the case when MPs ask questions or do proposals during lawmaking processes. The reason seems to be that, in the eyes of the politicians, journalists are not always equally interested in the actual, legislative,

deliberative and decision-making processes in parliament – even when the topic the bill is about is often covered by the media. In the words of an MP: “Legislation is a bit of a backwater, a desert, a legitimization, that is the least interesting for journalists. They want to be at the front of the news, not when it is being finished off.”

#### **4. Conclusion and discussion**

Previous studies show that politicians consume a lot of news and also react to media coverage. This literature has however only seldom looked into the motives of politicians to use the media during legislative processes. Van Aelst and Walgrave (2016; see also Chapter 1 of this book) argue that the media have a dual function in politics: that they are both a source of information and an arena for political communication. Does this conceptualization apply to the legislative context in a parliamentary system such as the Netherlands?

<TABLE 12.1 ABOUT HERE>

The results of the empirical test of the dual function of the media in legislative processes is summarized in Table 12.1. On the one hand, the media can be a source of information for politicians. They use it primarily to learn about public opinion, the position of interest groups and expert, and to stay informed about the position of competitors and allies. In some cases MPs actively use coverage in parliament, to illustrate their position or confront political opponents. Using media references gives an intervention in the parliamentary debate a more topical and up-to-date character. For MPs from opposition parties, the often critical nature of media coverage is useful to underline their position or confront the legislative initiatives of the government.

On the other hand, and to a lesser extent, the media can serve as an arena for political communication. Whereas in the context of lawmaking political actors do not aim at self-promotion via the media, some do try to get media attention to make visible what their party is doing, and draw attention to their position with regard to a bill. In sum, the news media do serve both functions, but overall our interviewees conceive their importance as relatively limited. The media can be a source of information for politicians, mostly in addition to the broad range of other sources of information they dispose of. To a much lesser extent the media also serve as an arena for political communication.

These findings suggest that the conceptualization of the ‘dual function of the media’ should be nuanced in the context of legislation. Could this be explained by a form of social desirability of the politicians we interviewed? For instance, they might not like to admit that gaining personal media attention during legislative processes is one of their goals. It is unlikely that this is the case, because this finding is in line with previous research. Studies have shown

that many ordinary politicians receive little attention media attention, as political journalists mainly follow the trail of power (Vos, 2014). For this reason, Hess (1986) even suggested that for the bulk of US Senators it is irrational to pursue media coverage, as most journalists are simply not interested. Our previous work shows that indeed, legislative processes in the Netherlands are not very newsworthy (Van Aelst et al., 2015). As a consequence, it is rather logical that Dutch MPs seldom try to enter the media arena in the context of legislative processes in parliament.

However, various other reasons might also partly explain the limited media use of MPs when making laws. Firstly, whereas journalists are sometimes eager to bring issues up, they mostly do so long before a legislative process is started, or only when the law is being implemented. During the actual legislative process they mainly report on decisions that have been made. This concurs with studies that suggest the media's influence is stronger in the agenda setting phase of the policy cycle, due to its ability to focus attention on certain issues (Baumgartner & Jones, 1993; Esser & Pfetsch, 2004, p. 388).

Secondly, MPs monitor media coverage for relevant information, but it only rarely contains information that is new to them. If it does, they may use it during the legislative process, but MPs are often already well-informed and have a strong network to consult regarding a bill. For this study the parliamentarians that were spokespeople for their party on a bill were deliberately interviewed; the media may play a more important role for MPs that are not experts on an issue. MPs that are most occupied with a bill however have more and better sources to rely on.

Thirdly, the modest functional role of the media might be related to the low journalistic interest in the actual lawmaking process. In a previous study we already showed that most bills in the Netherlands do not get very much media attention (Van Aelst et al., 2015). But even if the topic of the law is mediatized, this does not necessarily mean that journalists devote attention to the fine tuning of a bill. For instance, MPs know that it is definitely not self-evident for their motions and amendments to be covered in the news. That confirms earlier findings about the limited journalistic interest into the 'details' of legislative processes (Melenhorst, 2015, 2017).

Fourthly, because lawmaking is complex and has substantial policy consequences, using the media as an arena to influence parliament is generally speaking not perceived as a very effective or appropriate way to get things done. In a fragmented multiparty system such as the Netherlands, parties always have to form coalitions to pass legislation. Such coalitions are either established in coalition agreements or in temporary agreements. Coalition parties in particular do not have much to gain by being in the media in terms of affecting legislative outcomes. Being in the media is primarily a way for them to publicly defend the decisions made. Politicians that do deliberately enter the media arena are often critical opposition MPs that hope to influence

public opinion, or even legislative debates. This is in line with Sellers' (2000) findings that in the United States, it is the minority party that has most to benefit by entering the media arena. However, if the agreement between the ruling parties on the particular bill is solid, entering the media arena will not change much. For legislators that are part of the coalition it can even be a reason to stay out of the news, as this can only hurt the often delicate compromise the parties have chosen. Put differently: with regard to legislation, the partitocracy trumps the mediocracy.

In a sense, it might be reassuring that media mainly play a passive role during legislative processes. In terms of the quality of lawmaking, one might hope that political actors' main aim is to try and make laws that are in accordance with their political viewpoints as much as possible. That they are thereby not very often responding to the media, or acting in the media themselves, might be more a good than a bad thing. At least during legislative processes MPs do not seem to be swayed by the controversies of the day. In that respect we are inclined to follow an MP that states media-attention is "...definitely not leading".

## References

- Andeweg, R. B., & Irwin, G. A. (2014). *Governance and politics of the Netherlands* (4th ed.). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (1993). *Agendas and instability in American politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bergman, T., Müller, W. C., Strom, K., & Blomgren, M. (2003). Democratic delegation and accountability: Cross-national patterns. In K. Strom, W. C. Müller & T. Bergman (Eds.), *Delegation and accountability in parliamentary democracies* (pp. 109-220). Oxford: University Press.
- Bovend'Eert, P. P. T., & Kummeling, H. R. B. M. (2010). *Het Nederlandse parlement* (11th ed.). Deventer: Kluwer.
- Davis, A. (2007). Investigating journalist influences on political issue agendas at Westminster. *Political Communication*, 24(2), 181-199.
- Elmelund-Præstekær, C., & Wien, C. (2008). What's the fuss about? The interplay of media hypes and politics. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13(3), 247-266.
- Esser, F., & Pfetsch, B. (2004). *Comparing political communication: Theories, cases and challenges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herbst, S. (1998). *Reading public opinion: How political actors view the democratic process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Kunelius, R., & Reunanen, E. (2012). Media in political power: A parsonian view on the differentiated mediatization of Finnish decision makers. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 17(1), 56-75.
- Lijphart, A. (2012). *Patterns of democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six countries* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Melenhorst, L. (2013). De wetgevende macht van de media? Een kwantitatieve analyse van media-effecten op de behandeling van wetsvoorstellen. *Res Publica*, 55(4), 481-503.
- Melenhorst, L. (2015). The media's role in lawmaking: A case study analysis. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 20(3), 297-316.
- Melenhorst, L. (2017). *Media and lawmaking: Exploring the media's role in legislative processes*. Leiden University, Doctoral dissertation.
- Sellers, P. (2000). Manipulating the message in the U.S. Congress. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 5(1), 22-31.
- Sellers, P. (2010). *Cycles of spin: Strategic communication in the US Congress*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shehata, A., & Strömbäck, J. (2014). Mediation of political realities: Media as crucial sources of information. In A. Shehata & J. Strömbäck (Eds.), *Mediatization of politics: Understanding the transformation of Western democracies* (pp. 93-113). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Thesen, G. (2012). *Political agenda setting and the mediatization of politics: How the media affect political issue attention & party competition*. Paper presented at the Comparative Policy Agendas Conference, Reims, France.
- Van Aelst, P., Melenhorst, L., Van Holsteyn, J., & Veen, J. (2015). Lawmaking and news making: Different worlds after all? A study on news coverage of legislative processes in the Netherlands. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 22(1), 534-552.
- Van Aelst, P., Santen, R. v., Melenhorst, L., & Helfer, L. (2016). From newspaper to parliament and back? A study of media attention as source for and result of the Dutch question hour. *World Political Science*, 12(2), 261-282.
- Van Aelst, P., & Vliegthart, R. (2013). Studying the tango: An analysis of parliamentary questions and press coverage in the Netherlands. *Journalism Studies*, 15(4), 392-410.
- 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.
- Van Santen, R., Helfer, L., & Van Aelst, P. (2015). When politics becomes news: An analysis of parliamentary questions and press coverage in three West European countries. *Acta Politica*, 50(1), 45-63.
- Vliegthart, R., & Walgrave, S. (2011). Content matters: The dynamic of parliamentary questioning in Belgium and Denmark. *Comparative Political Studies*, 44(8), 1031-1059.

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: 2438-2461.

Wolfe, M. (2012). Putting on the brakes or pressing on the gas? Media attention and the speed of policymaking. *Policy Studies Journal*, 40(1), 109-126.

### Tables and figures

Table 12.1: *Applicability of the media's dual role in the context of lawmaking*

	<b>Source of information</b>	<b>Arena for political communication</b>
<b>Sub-function</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Passive</i>: seldom new information about the topic of bills, but monitor the media to learn about opinions of political actors, interest groups, experts or individual citizens.</li> <li>• <i>Active</i>: illustrate and justify one's position or confront political opponents; shows topicality and underlines urgency of issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Self-promotion</i>: hardly applicable to the context of lawmaking, focus on parliamentary party position instead of mere visibility of individual political actors</li> <li>• <i>Issue-promotion</i>: create visibility for the position of one's parliamentary party group and use media coverage to support position in parliament</li> </ul>