

# Lawmaking and News Making: Different Worlds after all? A Study on News Coverage of Legislative Processes in the Netherlands

PETER VAN AELST, LOTTE MELENHORST\*,  
JOOP VAN HOLSTEYN and JOERI VEEN

*Over the last decades the importance of the media for understanding the functioning of democracy in the contemporary world has become evident. Yet despite the developing body of knowledge on political communication and newsworthiness there is little research about why and how the media cover legislative processes in a European context. Therefore this study analyses media coverage of lawmaking in the Netherlands and investigates which characteristics of legislation influence the amount of news coverage. It shows that only one out of five laws is covered at all and that no more than one out of 10 laws receives substantial media attention. This leads to the question why some laws get extensive news attention, whereas most laws are completely ignored. Press coverage for the legislative process turns out to be both selective and predictable. Traditional news values such as political conflict and significance are good predictors of media coverage for lawmaking. In addition, laws are largely ignored when they are part of the budgetary cycle.*

---

Keywords: lawmaking; media coverage; legislative processes; Dutch politics.

## Introduction

In advanced western democracies the mass media have become the most important sources for citizens and voters to get informed about what is going in politics. It is deemed crucial for the electorate to have accurate political knowledge in order to be able to hold its representatives accountable (Arnold, 2004). People of course can learn about politics in many ways, yet politics in fact has become highly mediated (Strömbäck, 2008). Despite there being ample coverage of political news, it is highly selective. Journalists focus on a narrow selection of specific actors and actions, while most of what politicians do and what they communicate on does not pass the media gates (see, for example, Berkowitz & Adams, 1990). It is an established fact, for example, that top political leaders have a high chance of appearing in the media while backbenchers and ordinary politicians get only occasional coverage (Bennett, 1990; Gans, 1979). Also some specific political events, such as election campaigns and processes of cabinet formation, receive ample attention, while routine inter-election periods are much less often reported on. In this respect Esser and Matthes (2013, p. 177) refer to the mediatisation of the 'power- and publicity-gaining' as

compared to the ‘policy- and decision-based’ aspects of politics. Attention to the daily work of parliamentarians is limited and even seems to decrease over time (Jones & Wolfe, 2010; Negrine, 1999).

Moreover, research on media and politics is predominantly directed at the symbolic political agenda, which has only limited substantive consequences for the daily life of citizens, and much less so at the more fundamental decision-making processes, the ‘substantial’ political agenda (Brants & Voltmer, 2011). The question to what extent these more important aspects of parliamentary work, such as the legislative process, are covered by the media is underexplored. Considering that one of the key functions of political journalism is to inform the general public about political decision-making, so that citizens can make informed choices (Eveland Jr, Hayes, Shah, & Kwak, 2005) and hold their representatives accountable (Carpini & Keeter, 1996), it is important to gain insight into the information that is provided to citizens by the media.

We address this shortcoming in the literature by studying media attention for lawmaking and laws. Legislative outcomes can have a strong impact on citizens’ everyday life and the functioning of society as a whole. If there is any truth in the definition by David Easton (1965) of the political process as ‘the authoritative allocation of values for society’ (p. 96) then it can easily be argued that lawmaking is at the heart of politics. We investigate press coverage of the legislative process of 603 laws<sup>1</sup> that were introduced in the Netherlands in the period 2006–11. Our analysis shows that only one out of five new laws received any media attention at all. Media attention for laws is the exception, not the rule. This leads to the follow-up question of why some laws get ample news attention, whereas most laws are (almost) completely ignored. There is, as yet, little scholarly knowledge of the aspects or characteristics that on occasion make the legislative process newsworthy. Using the concept of news values, we explore and identify several factors that increase a law’s chances of gaining media attention. In the conclusion we discuss the implications of our findings for both legislators and journalists as central players of contemporary democracy.

### Media Attention for Lawmaking

The relationship between media coverage and parliament is mainly studied at the actor level. For instance, scholars have tried to explain why certain members of parliament or congress get more attention than others. They showed consistently that (relatively small) status differences between parliamentarians are crucial to explain differences in exposure (Cook, 1986; Sellers, & Schaffner, 2007; Sheaffer, 2001; Tresch, 2009). The added value of legislative work on media visibility is, however, contested. Some studies suggest that working hard in parliament leads to more coverage of the politicians involved (Bowler, 2010; Midtbø, 2011), while others show no such positive effect (Fogarty, 2008; Tsfati, Markowitz Elfassi, & Waismel-Manor, 2010).

Previous studies on the newsworthiness of parliamentary activities mainly focus on what has been called the ‘symbolic’ political agenda. This concept refers to aspects of parliamentary work that have limited political or practical consequences, such as asking parliamentary questions (for example, Van Aelst & Vliegthart, 2014; Van Santen, Helfer, & Van Aelst, 2015). The influence of the media on legislative processes has been given scholarly attention in the US (Cook, 1989; Sellers, 2010; Wolfe, 2012), though studies that focus systematically and exclusively on news coverage of legislation are almost non-existent. An interesting exception is the study of Shoemaker, Eichholz, Kim, and Wrigley (2001) on the news attention for 50 major congressional bills. These authors studied the influence of individual characteristics of journalists on selecting and devoting attention to bills.

As a result of meagre scholarly attention we know little on the amount and dynamics that determine media attention for the legislative process, particularly in a European context. As a first step, then, it is relevant to know how many laws receive press coverage during the lawmaking process – if they receive any attention at all. We do not focus on the effects of media coverage, but if a law does not receive any coverage, it is extremely unlikely that the media influence this particular legislative process or that they fulfil their task of informing the public on this bill (see also Coglianesi & Howard, 1998, p. 40). Although there is debate about whether the media should cover politics more (Bennett, 2003) or less extensively (Schudson, 1998; Zaller, 2003), journalists must have to be selective, because they cannot report on everything that is happening in the political arena. This leads to the following general research question:

*RQ1: How much press coverage did recently developed laws in the Netherlands receive during the lawmaking process?*

Second, we analyse the variation in media attention for different laws. We build upon the literature on news values (sometimes called news factors) to guide this empirical exploration and analysis (O’Neill & Harcup, 2009). Since Walter Lippmann (1922) almost a century ago introduced the idea of news values, these have been seen as the key features that make a story worth reporting (Donsbach, 2004, p. 134). For instance, events that feature personalisation or negativism have a greater chance of being reported by the mass media than events that do not feature these aspects (Lengauer, Esser, & Berganza, 2012). More generally, news values refer to common views, particularly among journalists, about what is believed to be intrinsically relevant and interesting for the public (McQuail, 1993). As Shoemaker and Reese (1991) state: ‘news values provide yardsticks of newsworthiness and constitute an audience-oriented routine’ (p. 90). This means that news values concern collective routines and criteria grounded in an organisational context that determine news production (Galtung & Ruge, 1965; Tuchman, 2003).

Although news values always played a role in the news coverage of politics, scholars suggest that their importance has grown over time. The mediatisation of

politics literature states that news media nowadays work more autonomously according to their own logic and are less guided by a traditional political logic (see Strömbäck & Esser, 2014). This means that for the selection and production of news stories, journalists follow less what political actors consider important to report, but rather are guided by their own routines and standards of newsworthiness. This study acknowledges that there are some crucial steps in journalism between observing newsworthy events and actually reporting them (Strömbäck, Karlsson & Hopmann, 2012). However, we are particularly interested in the characteristics of laws and the legislative process and less in newsroom practices, so our analyses focus on the former. Therefore the second research question is:

*RQ2: Which characteristics of laws or the legislative process increase their chances of receiving media attention in newspapers?*

There is an extensive list of elements that may trigger the attention of journalists (O'Neill & Harcup, 2009). They consider stories containing some of the following elements worthy of pursuit: timeliness, proximity, drama, novelty, unpredictability, conflict, controversy, violence and significance (Barrett, 2007; Cook, 1996; Cook & Ragsdale, 1998; Davis, 2001; Fuller, 1996; Graber, 2002; Paletz, 2002). This long but also rather general list of news factors is applicable to all sorts of events which might become news. For the purposes of this study on lawmaking, we select and relate three key news values to specific characteristics of laws and the legislative process: political significance, proximity and political conflict.

### *Political Significance*

Besides gaining power by winning votes and office, influencing policy is one of the major aims of every political actor (for example, Müller & Strøm, 1999; Strom, 1990). Politics in the end has developing laws as one of its *raison d'être*, since the distribution of 'who gets what, when, and how' (cf. Lasswell, 1936) is largely decided upon within the lawmaking process. In that sense every law has political significance, even more so because of its general character: laws refer to the people or citizenry at large. There is little consensus in the literature, however, on how exactly to determine the degree of political significance of laws empirically. When is a law really consequential or very important or not, and when and how exactly do we come to know about its significance and relevance? In his study on American 'important laws' Mayhew (1993) used expert judgements of leading journalists to analyse the political significance of laws (see also Binder, 1999; Howell, Adler, Cameron, & Riemann, 2000). Since media attention for laws is our dependent variable, this particular operationalisation is highly problematic; for our study the Mayhew approach would probably introduce a strong tautological element. We therefore prefer to follow the approach suggested by Baumgartner and Jones (2002), who measured the attention in more objective terms of column lines devoted to each enactment. They argue that a law is politically more important and significant if legislators

spend more vocal attention and time and energy on it. Our first hypothesis springs from this line of reasoning.

*H1: Laws which get more attention in parliament receive more media attention than laws which get less attention.*

### *Political Conflict*

Conflicting ideas about the organisation of society and conflicting interests are at the heart of democratic politics (for example, Schattschneider, 1960). From this perspective, it is almost a truism that conflict is one of the most popular news frames used in political news coverage (Neuman, Just, & Crigler, 1992). Several scholars have argued that the news media in the US are biased towards conflict and negativity and frame political coverage largely in terms of rivalry and friction (Capella & Jamieson, 1997; Patterson, 1993). Moreover, Van Dalen (2012) shows in a comparative study that conflict is a prominent news value across countries, but that the exact amount of conflict coverage differs according to political system characteristics and journalistic cultures. The Dutch news media also pay extensive attention to political conflict (Heijting & De Haan, 2005; Kleinnijenhuis et al., 2007).

We can thus expect that political friction with regard to a specific bill enhances its newsworthiness, just as the absence of friction decreases a proposal's chances of receiving media coverage. We use parliamentary voting as our operationalisation of political conflict: laws which were carried unanimously or which were dealt with as a formality, meaning the law was not discussed in plenary, are considered to be absent of any real political conflict.<sup>2</sup>

*H2: Laws which were carried unanimously or which were dealt with as a formality receive less media attention than other laws.*

### *Proximity*

Proximity is a complicated concept. Laws can be considered more proximate regarding both their objective geographic distance and their subjective psychological distance. As a result of the ambiguity regarding the concept of proximity, this characteristic of laws can be operationalised as more or less distant in both ways.

First, studies on international events and news have found that overall geographic proximity affects news coverage (Chang, Shoemaker, & Brendlinger, 1987; Galtung & Ruge, 1965; Jones, Van Aelst, & Vliegenthart, 2013). The general argument is that most journalists are more likely to cover events that arise closer to home, because they are both easier to cover and easier for news audiences to understand and follow. Regarding geographic proximity, it can be argued that the 'political capital', The Hague, is no longer the exclusive centre of Dutch politics and lawmaking since binding decisions are increasingly made in Brussels, the centre of EU policy making (Steunenberg, 2011, p. 502; Thomassen & Andeweg, 2011, p. 499). As the prominence of EU politics

compared to domestic politics has increased over the years, we would expect the media to intensify coverage of the European political arena (Van der Eijk, 2000, p. 339). However, studies have found that this is not in fact the case, or only to a very limited extent: European issues still receive minimal media attention and if there is any attention, this is concentrated around exceptional and particular key events (Boomgaarden, Vliegthart, de Vreese, & Schuck, 2010; Norris, 2000). Similarly, we expect laws stemming from the European Union to receive less media attention. The so-called EU directives define specific ends and results that must be achieved within individual EU member states. National authorities have freedom to choose how they adapt the domestic laws in accordance with the directive, but there is always an ultimate implementation date specified (Mastenbroek, 2007). As the EU directives are decided upon outside the Netherlands, these Dutch laws that are based upon the directives themselves are considered geographically less proximate to citizens and therefore are expected to be less likely to be reported upon by the media.

*H3: Laws based on EU directives receive less media attention than truly domestic laws.*

Regarding the more subjective, psychological proximity, an analysis of the newspaper coverage of regulatory policy in the United States clearly shows that media coverage increases when policy has an effect on people's everyday lives (Coglianese & Howard, 1998). Because our data do not allow us to analyse how proximate the general public perceives specific laws in this respect, we employ in our first exploration of this topic a very rough dichotomy and we expect laws which deal with domestic issues to be more proximate to citizens. We therefore expect laws on domestic policy to receive more media attention. Laws which deal with foreign affairs are expected to be less newsworthy because they are assumed to be psychologically more distant from citizens' everyday lives.

*H4: Laws concerning foreign issues receive less media attention than laws concerning domestic issues.*

### **Lawmaking in the Netherlands**

In general, the Dutch legislative procedure does not differ substantially from the situation in other European parliamentary systems (Van Schagen, 1997). The procedures are in part set in the Constitution and other laws and in part based on customs and conventions that often are laid down in the standing orders of parliament. The Dutch parliament, officially called the States-General, has a bicameral structure: legislation is first discussed in the Lower House of Parliament (illogically and rather confusingly named the 'Second Chamber', *Tweede Kamer*), and once passed it is sent to the Upper House of Parliament (known as the 'First

Chamber', *Eerste Kamer*, or Senate). The formal legislative process starts at the Lower House, which in terms of political powers and democratic legitimacy is superior to the Upper House. A bill is introduced into parliament – after the Council of State has been consulted – by Royal Message. The parliamentary phase starts with the bill being consigned to a parliamentary committee. From that moment on members of the Lower House can introduce amendments and motions. Until the final vote the minister can send a government amendment to the Lower House as well. As soon as the Lower House passes a bill (by a majority vote), it is sent to the Upper House. In this phase parliament is less powerful, because formally senators can only propose motions, not full amendments. Also, bills cannot be sent back to the Lower House: the Senate either passes or rejects the proposed bill. The vote in the Upper House however is decisive because once a bill is passed it is signed and published in the *Government Gazette*.<sup>3</sup>

The Dutch case differs from most other western countries in two respects relevant for this paper. First, although both ministers and members of the Lower House can initiate legislation, compared with other countries only very few private members' bills are introduced in the Netherlands and almost all bills emanate from government (Andeweg & Irwin, 2009; Bovend'Eert & Kummeling, 2010, p. 198). Over the last four decades private members' bills never comprised more than 2 per cent of the total number of bills passed (Andeweg & Nijzink, 1995; van State, 2012). Compared with its neighbouring countries – Belgium, France, Germany and the United Kingdom – this is very low. MPs in these countries are much more active in introducing bills (Bräuninger & Debus, 2009, p. 819). Because the number of private member bills in the Netherlands is so very low, both in relative and in absolute figures, it is not possible to check in a robust way whether there is a significant difference between the amount of media attention government bills and private members' bills receive.

A second peculiar feature of Dutch lawmaking is that the process on a specific bill does not side and this process can take 'forever' (Andeweg & Irwin, 2009; Van Schagen, 1997; Voermans et al., 2012, p. 115). Nearly all other west European countries apply a legislative discontinuity principle, that is, pending legislation is dropped at the end of a parliamentary term and/or when there is a change of government. Since in the Netherlands the discontinuity principle was abolished in 1917, there is no such constraint to the length of the legislative process. The record for a single bill still pending stands at 26 years (Andeweg & Irwin, 2009, p. 153). As a consequence, only a very small number of bills never reach 'law-status', either because they have not been passed or because the initiator withdrew the bill. It is plausible to expect that laws that go through a lengthier process receive more media attention than short-lived processes, if only because there is more time to pay attention to the on-going process. Therefore, the duration of the legislative process is added as a control variable in our analysis.



## Method and Data

We explore our research questions and test our hypotheses using quantitative content analysis of laws and newspaper articles that deal specifically with those laws. Using the official database of the Upper House of Parliament,<sup>4</sup> we collected information on all bills initiated during the parliamentary years 2006–7, 2008–9 and 2010–11. A total of 603 laws were enacted in these three periods, with respectively 224, 214 and 165 laws during the three parliamentary years.

To assess its *significance*, we counted the number of parliamentarians (ranging from zero to a maximum of 14) who spoke in the Lower House on a specific bill. This information was mined from a dataset with all proceedings of the Lower House.<sup>5</sup> The dataset also contained information on the number of words that were devoted to each law. As this measure correlated positively and strongly with the number of speakers ( $r = 0.84$ ), for the analysis we selected the number of speakers as the single indicator of significance.

In order to measure *proximity* we coded the key issue of each law. We did so on the basis of the issue codebook of the authoritative Comparative Agenda-setting Project (see <http://www.policyagendas.org/page/datasets-codebooks>). For this analysis we dichotomised the established issue codes in foreign versus domestic issues. In addition, we coded whether reference was made to an EU directive or not. Neither measure was related; almost all EU directives (62 out of 71) in effect appear to deal with domestic policy.

Based on the information in the Upper House database on parliamentary voting behaviour, we constructed a dummy variable for political *conflict*, indicating whether the vote on a law was unanimous (or not voted on at all) or whether at least one party voted differently.

In addition to these key variables, we entered two control variables to the analyses. In order to control for the duration of the lawmaking process, the Upper House database was used to count the number of weeks between the introduction of the bill and the official publication of the law. Another dummy variable was constructed to distinguish between regular and so-called budget laws. Whereas the former can concern any kind of policy, the latter specifically concern budgetary policy. These latter laws are part of the standard, annual budgetary cycle and determine or change the status of budgets – which are overviews of the state of receipts, expenses and obligations – and the annual reports of the various budget chapters.

The main dependent variable in our analyses is the amount of press attention for each law. The Netherlands belong to the cluster of northern and central European countries with high levels of newspaper readership and newspapers are still considered very important as a source of (political) news (Bakker & Scholten, 2009) Dutch '[d]ailies reach about 70 percent of the population, a large majority of which spends more than half an hour a day reading a daily paper' (Van der Burg, Lauf, & Negenborn, 2011, p. 56). A search for articles was made in all



15 Dutch national newspapers, including typical broadsheet papers, popular newspapers, free dailies, and two religious papers with a lower circulation.<sup>6</sup> These two newspapers owe their existence to the original Dutch media system that was characterised by a high degree of political parallelism (Hallin & Mancini, 2004). Newspapers openly supported a certain party or religious group. Since the period of so-called depillarisation and deconfessionalisation in the second half of the twentieth century, there are no longer institutionalised linkages between the main newspapers and political parties or religious groups (see, for example, Brants & Van Praag, 2006). Although ‘the Dutch media market has no tabloids’ (Deuze, 2005, p. 864), the newspapers vary slightly in content, focus, terms of readership and circulation figures.

Based on the title of the law and its short database description, search strings were created. These strings were used in the LexisNexis database to collect all newspaper articles that dealt *specifically* with the bill or an issue central or directly related to the bill. These articles thus deal with the key issue of the bill and mention either (a) (parts of) the bill, (b) direct consequences of the bill when accepted, (c) the positions of both political or non-political actors regarding the bill, or (d) references to (parts of) the lawmaking procedure, such as parliamentary debates or voting rounds. We searched for newspaper articles within a period ranging from two years before the introduction of the proposed law until one year after its publication in the *Government Gazette*. This procedure resulted in a total of 3539 articles being collected and coded.

To test the reliability of search string construction by coders, almost one third of the laws (183 laws) were checked using the same instructions, with specific attention given to cases in which no media attention was found at all. This showed that in those cases where no media attention was found, it was not due to a too narrowly formulated search string but a valid reflection of coverage absence. In only 18 cases (3 per cent) did the reliability check find a slightly different number of relevant articles than the initial coder had found.<sup>7</sup>

In order to answer the first research question, some important characteristics of the laws under consideration are described. Since only one out of five laws receive media attention (see below), the dependent variable does not adhere to a normal distribution. Instead it behaves as discrete data over an unbounded positive range, similar to a Poisson distribution. The dependent variable is a count of success: the amount of media attention as measured by the number of newspaper articles. Because the sample variance exceeds the sample mean, the negative binomial distribution is more appropriate to construct an explanatory model of media attention. Therefore the hypotheses are subsequently tested using negative binomial regression.

## Results

How much press coverage have recently developed bills and accepted laws in the Netherlands received during their full legislative process? The findings

(presented in the first row of [Table 1](#)) show that only about one in five lawmaking processes (22 per cent) received attention in the national press.<sup>8</sup> This means that the very large majority of laws never receive any attention at all directly prior to, during, or in the direct aftermath of the legislative process. Moreover, if we exclude laws that received attention in fewer than five newspaper articles, the amount of media attention drops to 11 per cent. This indicates that there is very little attention given to a very large majority of new laws in Dutch national newspapers. There are some differences between the different years under study,<sup>9</sup> but no major differences in the amount of coverage of the legislative processes in the newspapers with the highest circulation.<sup>10</sup>

The uneven distribution of media attention is also shown by focusing on those cases that got ample media attention. For instance, the law that liberalised the Dutch postal market received a staggering 793 newspaper articles, which is about one fourth of all press attention ( $N = 3060$  articles). Also, the law that abolished the 'no-claim return' for health insurance and replaced it with an excess clause received impressive media attention: 392 newspaper articles on this bill were found (13 per cent of all media attention).

What characteristics of bills and the legislative process increase the odds of gaining attention in the written press? We hypothesised that political significance, political conflict and proximity would all impact the newsworthiness of bills and the lawmaking process positively. [Table 1](#) presents a first indication of a relationship between the independent and dependent variables. First of all, the political

**Table 1: Characteristics of Laws and Media Attention for Lawmaking (%)**

	Media Attention: Number of Articles			Total (Laws)
	0	1–4	5 >	
All laws	78	11	11	100 ( $N = 603$ )
<i>Significance: number of speakers</i>				
0	86	10	4	100 ( $N = 406$ )
1–5	80	10	10	100 ( $N = 60$ )
+5	53	16	31	100 ( $N = 137$ )
<i>Proximity: origin of law</i>				
EU-initiated	66	20	14	100 ( $N = 71$ )
National-initiated	80	10	10	100 ( $N = 532$ )
<i>Proximity: focus of law</i>				
Foreign policy	78	15	7	100 ( $N = 46$ )
Domestic policy	78	11	11	100 ( $N = 557$ )
<i>Conflict: final decision</i>				
No/unanimous vote	82	11	7	100 ( $N = 483$ )
Divided vote	61	13	26	100 ( $N = 119$ )
<i>Duration</i>				
0–25 weeks	84	10	6	100 ( $N = 372$ )
+ 25 weeks	69	13	18	100 ( $N = 231$ )
<i>Type of law</i>				
Regular law	67	16	17	100 ( $N = 372$ )
Budget law	96	4	0	100 ( $N = 231$ )

significance of a law does indeed seem to matter. Almost half of the laws (47 per cent), for which more than five MPs joined the parliamentary debate, received press coverage.<sup>11</sup>

A second aspect taken into account is political conflict, as indicated by whether a bill was dealt with as a formality/carried unanimously or had a divided vote. Table 1 shows that 80 per cent of all bills considered became laws without a vote taken or by unanimous voting. Of these laws 18 per cent received media attention, whereas of the laws that were voted upon in the Lower House 39 per cent received newspaper attention. Of the laws that were decided upon by a divided vote, 26 per cent received substantive newspaper coverage. Third, the descriptive results regarding the proximity of a law are less straightforward. Laws that deal with domestic policy are more newsworthy compared with laws relating to foreign policy, but only because fewer foreign laws get real substantive media attention. Laws initiated by the EU receive more attention than home-grown laws. However, this surprising finding should be treated with caution, since both the number of EU-initiated bills and laws that deal with foreign policy are relatively modest.

Finally, we see substantial differences with regard to the control variables. The difference between the amount of media attention given to budget laws compared with that given to 'regular' laws is highly relevant. The analysis shows that of all budget laws in the database, 96 per cent did not receive any attention in Dutch national newspapers. By contrast, one third of regular laws did get at least some media coverage. The duration of the lawmaking process also matters in terms of media attention, as was expected. If the process lasts less than half a year (25 weeks), the chance of these laws getting substantial attention in the press (6 per cent) is extremely low.

To test more thoroughly the relative impact of these different characteristics of laws and the legislative process on media attention we use a negative binomial regression analysis. Since our dataset contains a handful of deviant cases that had a disproportionately large amount of coverage, we established a cut-off point and as a result 11 cases that were obvious outliers were left out of the general analysis.<sup>12</sup> As a result values of media attention varied between zero and 50 in our count model. Table 2 shows the relevant coefficients and the exponential parameter estimates ( $\text{Exp}(B)$ ) that the model yields.<sup>13</sup>

Our first hypothesis is based on the news value of 'significance' and states that laws which get more parliamentary attention are more likely to receive more media attention. We find empirical support for this expectation. For every additional parliamentarian who spoke on the bill in the parliamentary debate, levels of media coverage increased by 12 per cent ( $|\text{Exp}(B)| = 1.12$ ). Political journalists are more willing to cover a bill when it is discussed by multiple politicians in parliament.<sup>14</sup>

Our second hypothesis predicts the impact of political conflict, operationalised as divided voting in parliament. Our model clearly shows that bills which ultimately did not get a unanimous vote are much more likely to receive

**Table 2: Negative Binomial Model Predicting Amount of Media Attention**

Independent Variable	<i>B</i>	Standard Error	Exp( <i>B</i> )
(Intercept)	-0.057	0.1375	0.945
<i>Political significance</i>			
Number of speakers (0–14)	0.115	0.0169	1.122***
<i>Proximity</i>			
Origin (1 = EU directive)	-0.168	0.1774	0.845
Policy area (1 = foreign policy)	-1.061	0.2704	0.346***
<i>Conflict</i>			
Voting (1 = unanimous/no vote)	0.629	0.1475	1.876***
<i>Control variables</i>			
Duration	0.007	0.0018	1.007***
Type of law (1 = budget)	-1.834	0.2127	0.160***
Pseudo $R^2$ ( $N = 591$ )			0.32

Note: Reported figures are unstandardised regression coefficients, standard errors, and exponential parameter estimates.

\*\*\* $p < 0.000$ .

higher levels of media attention than laws which were accepted unanimously or dealt with as a formality (Exp( $B$ ) = 1.87). Indeed, disagreement between parties and parliamentarians appears to be an important factor in explaining journalistic attention and coverage.

Our third and fourth hypotheses refer to the news value proximity, in particular foreign and EU-initiated legislation. In the case of laws that deal with foreign affairs, the model confirms our expectations. Such law proposals are 65 per cent *less* likely to receive the same level of media coverage as laws which deal with national issues. Our model does not, however, show any significant difference between the levels of coverage for EU-based laws and laws that originate from national politics.

The two control variables also prove to be significant. The analysis shows that the length of the lawmaking process does matter: the increase per week in the duration of the legislative process results in 0.7 per cent more media attention (Exp( $B$ ) = 1.007). This small effect should not be underestimated since duration has a median value of 20 weeks and a maximum value of 255 weeks. As a result, the overall effect may be quite strong. As expected, the difference between budget laws and ordinary laws improves the explanatory value of our model. We have already noted that budget laws are seldom discussed in the national press. This concurs with the finding that a law's chances of receiving newspaper attention strongly decrease when it is part of the yearly budgetary cycle (Exp( $B$ ) = 0.16).<sup>15</sup>

## Conclusion and Discussion

We have already referred to the classical definition of politics by Easton (1965, p. 96) as 'the authoritative allocation of values for society' and to Lasswell's (1936) *Politics: Who Gets What, When, and How*. These of course are broad

definitions of politics and the political process, but there can be no doubt that lawmaking is at the core of both. The media are assumed to play an important role by informing citizens about political decision-making, so that the latter can make informed decisions and hold their representatives accountable. This study has examined the attention of the national press to the legislative process and its outcomes. Our study of media attention to lawmaking in the Netherlands during several parliamentary years shows that a large majority of laws is *not covered at all* in the work of national newspaper journalists. At a time when scholars and laymen alike worry about the growing or even dominant role of the media in the political process (for example, Mazzoleni & Schulz, 1999), this finding comes as a surprise. Almost four out of every five Dutch laws never receive any coverage in national newspapers; only one out of 10 gets more than just a few articles. Approximately 25 years ago, Timothy Cook (1989) suggested that in the US Congress the processes of making news and making laws were getting highly intertwined. For the majority of laws in the Dutch case, this seems not to be the case: lawmaking and news making are often different worlds.

There is a diverse range of bills that do not get any coverage. Not only budget bills and technical bills, but also bills that have consequences for the daily life of citizens are passed without any media attention. For instance, a bill about the reintegration of people who are on sickness benefit, as well as a bill that introduced the individual pupil funding scheme in intermediate vocational education never received any journalistic attention. How should this lack of media attention for the core business of the political process be explained? Our study suggests that traditional news values matter. To a large extent the characteristics of laws and the lawmaking process explain whether journalists will devote attention to it or not. In particular, political significance and political conflict are important factors to explain the newsworthiness of the legislative process. This means that more general ideas about news values are applicable to understanding the media coverage of lawmaking processes as well. Laws that get ample attention in parliament and about which there is no consensus have a higher chance of making it into the news. This seems to indicate that journalists are not ignoring legislative processes, but rather that journalistic attention is triggered only when there is political debate and friction.

These findings can be interpreted in two distinct ways. On the one hand, this finding is reassuring from a democratic perspective. If the stakes are high and political actors debate intensively about their conflicting views in parliament, the media will notice and report on it. This suggests that newspaper journalists monitor politics closely and report on important or discordant laws. In this way the media logic that guides journalists in their reporting partly overlaps with a political logic of party competition. When parties have different views about the content of a law, they might then look for public attention or strategically use the media by leaking information (Van Aelst, Thesen, Walgrave, & Vliegenthart, 2014). This finding is also in line with the ideas of, for instance, Zaller (2003) and Schudson (1998) that the media should mainly inform the

public selectively on the issues that matter, and not on everything that is happening in politics. Although this view is somewhat controversial (see, for example, Bennett, 2003), nobody expects a newspaper to be a copy of the *Government Gazette*, which means that journalists have to be selective when it comes to reporting on the political process in general and on legislation and the lawmaking process in particular.

On the other hand, it means that the impression that citizens get of politics in general, and more specifically of lawmaking, is that of heated debate and frequent conflict. Politicians disagree with each other and debate their views in parliament, which in turn is reflected in the press. However, in reality daily politics is not only about disagreement and political fights, although this is often suggested by the biased image created by the media. Only 7 per cent of all laws that are passed unanimously or dealt with as a formality are covered extensively in the press, as opposed to 26 per cent of the laws about which there is no consensus. As a result, the public might indeed get a biased impression of the legislative process and of politics in general. In addition, debates about budgetary legislation are almost completely ignored by the media, which means that the public is not informed about this crucial aspect of politics and lawmaking.

In sum, this study shows that media attention on legislative processes is both highly selective and at the same time to some extent predictable. When looking at the characteristics of laws and how they come about, we are in a good position to predict which laws will make it into the news. Still, two important questions are left unanswered. First, we cannot determine whether the media focus most on the laws that really matter for the public. Our results show that the (small number of) laws on foreign, less 'proximate', issues receive less attention, but this is only a rough distinction that tells us little about the large majority of laws that deal with domestic issues. Is something like public importance measurable at all? Coglianesse and Howard (1998) note that in the US the quality press devoted most attention to those parts of regulatory policy that matter most for peoples' everyday lives, but their operationalisation of importance remains somewhat unclear because they do not define explicitly a criterion that says when policy directly affects features of everyday life. More in-depth (qualitative) research may be necessary to explore and determine how and to what extent the media are fulfilling their democratic role of informing the public on the most important news (by some sort of general and 'objective' standard).

Second, this study raises questions on the role of the media in the legislative process when there is ample media attention. The fact that laws are often left unreported does not tell us much about what happens when the press does get involved. Some laws were covered so extensively that it raises questions on whether this media attention has an effect on the lawmaking process. It is hard to imagine that legislators are not influenced, one way or another, by such extensive media attention. Again, this requires additional, more in-depth research that focuses on an aspect of the lawmaking process that is limited in scope, but potentially important in terms of explaining legislative outcomes.

## Note on Authors

**Peter Van Aelst** is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Antwerp, Belgium and at the University of Leiden, The Netherlands, email: [peter.vanaelst@uantwerpen.be](mailto:peter.vanaelst@uantwerpen.be); **Lotte Melenhorst**\* is a PhD candidate in the Institute of Political Science at Leiden University, The Netherlands, email: [l.d.melenhorst@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:l.d.melenhorst@fsw.leidenuniv.nl); **Joop van Holsteyn** is a Senior Lecturer in Political Science as well as Supernumerary Professor in Electoral Research at the Institute of Political Science of Leiden University, The Netherlands, email: [holsteyn@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:holsteyn@fsw.leidenuniv.nl); **Joeri Veen** was a PhD candidate in Media and Politics at Leiden University, The Netherlands, in 2011–12, email: [joeriveen@gmail.com](mailto:joeriveen@gmail.com)

\*Corresponding author

## Funding

This work was supported by the Dutch Scientific Organization [452-10-016].

## Notes

1. This means we only take into account the lawmaking processes of bills that ultimately have become laws, that is, that have passed both the Lower House (Second Chamber) and subsequently the Upper House (Senate) of parliament and are then signed by the King with the countersignature of the relevant minister(s) and published in the official law gazette (*Staatsblad*).
2. This means that we do not take into account conflicts that have occurred in an earlier stage of the process, and probably underestimate the level of conflict. Parties may initially disagree on a bill, leading to friction and conflict at an earlier stage, although they eventually all vote in favour of the law. It might also be the case that voting is unanimous because of party discipline. However, in the absence of information on standpoints of parties and parliamentarians during the various early phases of the entire lawmaking process, we adhere to using the ultimate voting information.
3. Although the King or the minister formally may refuse to sign the law, this almost never happens in practice (Bovend'Eert & Kummeling, 2010, p. 203).
4. Accessible via [www.eerstekamer.nl](http://www.eerstekamer.nl), *Kamerstukken*.
5. We extend our gratitude to Tom Louwse for putting this dataset at our disposal and to Harmen van der Veer for his assistance on the automatic data subtraction.
6. The 15 national newspapers included in the study are (ordered alphabetically) *Algemeen Dagblad*, *Boerderij Vandaag*, *DAG*, *Dagblad De Pers*, *De Telegraaf*, *De Volkskrant*, *Het Financieele Dagblad*, *Het Parool*, *Metro*, *Nederlands Dagblad*, *NRC.NEXT*, *NRC Handelsblad*, *Reformatiisch Dagblad*, *Spits* and *Trouw*.
7. With one exception, the difference in number of articles found was between one and five articles. The sole exception featured a difference of 18 newspaper articles, a result of an additional keyword added to the search string.
8. Since newspaper journalists have more opportunity to report on a much broader spectrum of issues and topics compared to television journalists, who have to deal with more restraints in time and space, it is very likely that an analysis of television news would show even less coverage of the legislative process.
9. Comparing the three parliamentary years under study, the high amount of coverage for laws that were initiated during the parliamentary year 2006–7 stands out. This turns out to be mainly law-specific: 11 out of the total of 224 laws received 80 per cent of all media coverage in this period.
10. The small (in terms of subscription) and specialised financial paper (*Het Financieele Dagblad*) devotes most attention to lawmaking, while the attention is lowest in the free dailies. The differences between other broadsheets and major national newspapers are extremely limited. For



instance, the more right-wing newspaper *De Telegraaf* and the more left-wing *De Volkskrant* have an equal number of articles on legislative processes.

11. In most cases there was no plenary debate at all ( $N = 406$ ), which means that the number of speakers is zero.
12. To establish a cut-off point we use the evaluations of model fit of negative binomial modelling. We estimated five models using the same factors and covariates, but using a different cut-off point for case exclusion. Setting the cut-off point at 50 drops out 11 cases out of 602 (1.8 per cent) and yields a decrease in deviance of almost 500 points. In addition, the Bayesian Information Criterion decreases by almost 600 points: a substantial improvement of the model fit. Dropping more cases does not improve the model enough to warrant setting the cut-off point at a lower level.
13. For numeric variables, every decimal increase or decrease from 1.0 indicates that for every additional unit of the variable, the dependent variable increases or decreases by 10 per cent. For dichotomised variables this corresponds roughly with the percentage increase in, or decrease in, the dependent variable in comparison with the reference category.
14. We cannot, however, completely rule out the possibility that the influence runs (at least partly) in the opposite direction: because the media devote more attention to a law, more MPs and more parties feel the need to participate in the debate.
15. Since the effect of budget versus regular laws is so strong we also ran the model for regular laws only, but this did not change our main findings.

## References

- Andeweg, R. B., & Irwin, G. A. (2009). *Governance and politics of the Netherlands* (3rd ed.). Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Andeweg, R. B., & Nijzink, L. (1995). Beyond the two-body image: Relations between ministers and MPs. In H. Döring (Ed.), *Parliaments and majority rule in Western Europe* (pp. 152–178). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Arnold, R. D. (2004). *Congress, the press, and political accountability*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bakker, P., & Scholten, O. (2009). *Communicatiekaart van Nederland. Overzicht van media en communicatie*. Amsterdam: Kluwer.
- Barrett, A. W. (2007). Press coverage of legislative appeals by the president. *Political Research Quarterly*, 60(4), 655–668.
- Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (2002). *Policy dynamics*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bennett, L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–127.
- Bennett, W. L. (2003). The burglar alarm that just keeps ringing: A response to Zaller. *Political Communication*, 20(2), 131–138.
- Berkowitz, D., & Adams, D. (1990). Information subsidy and agenda-building in local television news. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 67(4), 723–731.
- Binder, S. A. (1999). The dynamics of legislative gridlock, 1947–96. *The American Political Science Review*, 93(3), 519–533.
- Boomgaarden, H. G., Vliedenthart, R., de Vreese, C. H., & Schuck, A. R. T. (2010). News on the move: exogenous events and news coverage of the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 17(4), 506–526.
- Bovend'Eert, P. P. T., & Kummeling, H. R. B. M. (2010). *Het Nederlandse parlement* (11th ed.). Deventer: Kluwer.
- Bowler, S. (2010). Private members' bills in the UK parliament: Is there an 'electoral connection'? *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 16(4), 476–494.
- Brants, K., & Van Praag, P. (2006). Signs of media logic. Half a century of political communication in the Netherlands. *Javnost/The Public*, 13(1), 27–41.
- Brants, K., & Voltmer, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Political communication in postmodern democracy. Challenging the primacy of politics*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bräuninger, T., & Debus, M. (2009). Legislative agenda-setting in parliamentary democracies. *European Journal of Political Research*, 48(6), 804–839.

- Capella, J., & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spyral of cynism. The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carpini, M. X. D., & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Chang, T.-K., Shoemaker, P. J., & Brendlinger, N. (1987). Determinants of international news coverage in the U.S. media. *Communication Research*, 14(4), 396–414.
- Coglianesi, C., & Howard, M. (1998). Getting the message out: Regulatory policy and the press. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 3(3), 39–55.
- Cook, T. E. (1986). House members as newsmakers: The effects of televising Congress. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 11(2), 203–226.
- Cook, T. E. (1989). *Making laws & making news. Media strategies in the US House of Representatives*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Cook, T. E. (1996). The negotiation of newsworthiness. In A. N. Crigler (Ed.), *The psychology of political communication* (pp. 11–36). Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Cook, T. E., & Ragsdale, L. (1998). The president and the press: Negotiating newsworthiness at the White House. In M. Nelson (Ed.), *The presidency & the political system* (5th ed., pp. 323–357). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Davis, R. (2001). *The press and American politics: The new mediator* (3rd. ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Deuze, M. (2005). Popular journalism and professional ideology: Tabloid reporters and editors speak out. *Media, Culture & Society*, 27(6), 861–882.
- Donsbach, W. (2004). Psychology of news decisions: Factors behind journalists' professional behavior. *Journalism*, 5(2), 131–157.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A framework for political analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Esser, F., & Matthes, J. (2013). Mediatization effects on political news, political actors, political decisions, and political audiences. In H. Kriesi, D. Bochsler, J. Matthes, S. Lavenex, M. Bühlmann & F. Esser (Eds.), *Democracy in the age of globalization and mediatization* (pp. 177–201). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Eveland, W. P. Jr, Hayes, A. F., Shah, D. V., & Kwak, N. (2005). Understanding the relationship between Communication and political knowledge: A model comparison approach using panel data. *Political Communication*, 22(4), 423–446.
- Fogarty, B. J. (2008). The strategy of the story: Media monitoring legislative activity. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 33(3), 445–469.
- Fuller, J. (1996). *News values: Ideas for an information age*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Galtung, J., & Ruge, M. (1965). The structure of foreign news: The presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus crises in four Norwegian newspapers. *Journal of Peace Research*, 2(1), 64–90.
- Gans, H. J. (1979). *Deciding what's news: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news*. New York: Pantheon.
- Graber, D. A. (2002). *Mass Media & American politics* (6th. ed.). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems. Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heijting, K., & De Haan, R. (2005). De gestage teloorgang van politieke inhoud. Campagnes in vijf landelijke dagbladen. In K. Brants & P. Van Praag (Eds.), *Politiek en Media in Verwarring. De verkiezingscampagnes in het lange jaar 2002* (pp. 44–65). Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Howell, W., Adler, S., Cameron, C., & Riemann, C. (2000). Divided government and the legislative productivity of Congress, 1945–94. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 25(2), 285–312.
- Jones, T. M., Van Aelst, P., & Vliegenthart, R. (2013). Foreign nation visibility in U.S. news coverage: A longitudinal analysis (1950–2006). *Communication Research*, 40(3), 417–436.
- Jones, B. D., & Wolfe, M. (2010). Public policy and the mass media: An information processing approach. In K. Voltmer & S. Koch-Baumgarten (Eds.), *Public policy and mass media : The interplay of mass communication and political decision making* (pp. 17–43). London: Routledge.
- Kleinijnshuis, J., Scholten, O., van Atteveldt, W., van Hoof, H., Krouwel, A. M. J., Oegema, A. P., den Ridder, J. A., Ruigrok, N., & Takens, J. (2007). *Nederland vijfstromenland: De rol van de media en stemwijzers bij de verkiezingen in 2006*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1936). *Politics: Who gets what, when, how*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Lengauer, G., Esser, F., & Berganza, R. (2012). Negativity in political news: A review of concepts, operationalizations and key findings. *Journalism*, 13(2), 179–202.
- Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion*. New York: Free Press.
- Mastenbroek, E. (2007). *The politics of compliance: Explaining the transposition of EC directives in the Netherlands*. Leiden: Leiden University.
- Mayhew, D. R. (1993). Reply: Let's stick with the longer list. *Polity*, 25(3), 485–488.
- Mazzoleni, G., & Schulz, W. (1999). 'Mediatization' of politics: A challenge for democracy? *Political Communication*, 16(3), 247–261.
- McQuail, D. (1993). *Mass communication theory: An introduction*. London: Sage.
- Midtbø, T. (2011). Explaining media attention for Norwegian MPs: A new modelling approach. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 34(3), 226–249.
- Müller, W. C., & Strøm, K. (1999). *Policy, office, or votes? How political parties in Western Europe make hard decisions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Negrine, R. (1999). Parliaments and the media: A changing relationship? *European Journal of Communication*, 14(3), 325–352.
- Neuman, W. R., Just, M. R., & Crigler, A. N. (1992). *Common knowledge*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Norris, P. (2000). *A virtuous circle. Political communications in postindustrial societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Neill, D., & Harcup, T. (2009). News values and selectivity. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *Handbook of journalism studies* (pp. 161–174). New York: Routledge.
- Paletz, D. L. (2002). *The media in American politics: Contents and consequences* (2nd. ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers.
- Patterson, T. (1993). *Out of order*. New York: Knopf.
- Schattschneider, E. E. (1960). *The semi-sovereign people*. New York: Holt.
- Schudson, M. (1998). *The good citizen: A history of American civic life*. New York: Martin Kessler Books.
- Sellers, P. (2010). *Cycles of Spin. Strategic communication in the US Congress*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sellers, P. J., & Schaffner, B. N. (2007). Winning coverage in the U.S. Senate. *Political Communication*, 24(4), 377–391.
- Sheafer, T. (2001). Charismatic skill and media legitimacy: An actor-centered approach to understanding the political communication competition. *Communication Research*, 28(6), 711–736.
- Shoemaker, P. J., Eichholz, M., Kim, E., & Wrigley, B. (2001). Individual and routine forces in gate-keeping. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(2), 233–246.
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (1991). *Mediating the message. Theories of influences on mass media content*. New York: Longman.
- van State, Raad. (2012). *Jaarverslag 2011*. The Hague: Den Haag. Retrieved from [http://jaarverslag.raadvanstate.nl/bedrijfsvoering-cijfers/advisering-in-cijfers/initiatiefwetsvoorstellen/cDU145\\_Initiatiefwetsvoorstellen.aspx](http://jaarverslag.raadvanstate.nl/bedrijfsvoering-cijfers/advisering-in-cijfers/initiatiefwetsvoorstellen/cDU145_Initiatiefwetsvoorstellen.aspx)
- Steunenberg, B. (2011). Onder nationale beleidsambtenaren: Europese beleidsvoorbereiding en de rol van het Nederlandse parlement. In J. Thomassen & R. Andeweg (Eds.), *Democratie doorgelicht: het functioneren van de Nederlandse democratie* (pp. 501–520). Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Strom, K. (1990). A behavioral theory of competitive political parties. *American Journal of Political Science*, 34(2), 565–598.
- Strömbäck, J. (2008). Four phases of mediatization: An analysis of the mediatization of politics. *International Journal of Press Politics*, 13(3), 228–246.
- Strömbäck, J., & Esser, F. (2014). Mediatization of politics: Towards a theoretical framework. In J. Strömbäck & F. Esser (Eds.), *Mediatization of politics: Understanding the transformation of Western democracies* (pp. 3–28). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Strömbäck, J., Karlsson, M., & Hopmann, D. N. (2012). Determinants of news content. *Journalism Studies*, 13(5–6), 718–728.
- Thomassen, J., & Andeweg, R. (Eds.). (2011). *Democratie doorgelicht: het functioneren van de Nederlandse democratie*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- 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.

- Tsfati, Y., Markowitz Elfassi, D., & Waismel-Manor, I. (2010). Exploring the association between Israeli legislators' physical attractiveness and their television news coverage. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 15(2), 175–192.
- Tuchman, G. (2003). The production of news. In K. B. Jensen (Ed.), *A handbook of media and communication research* (pp. 78–90). London: Routledge.
- Van Aelst, P., & Vliegthart, R. (2014). Studying the tango: An analysis of parliamentary questions and press coverage in the Netherlands. *Journalism Studies*, 15(4), 392–410.
- Van Aelst, P., Thesen, G., Walgrave, S., & Vliegthart, R. (2014). Mediatization and political agenda setting: Changing issue priorities? In J. Strömbäck & F. Esser (Eds.), *Mediatization of Politics: Understanding the transformation of Western democracies* (pp. 200–222). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Dalen, A. (2012). Structural bias in cross-national perspective. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 17(1), 32–55.
- Van der Burg, M., Lauf, E., & Negenborn, R. (2011). *Mediamonitor: The Dutch media in 2010*. Hilversum: Dutch Media Authority.
- Van der Eijk, C. (2000). The Netherlands: Media and politics between segmented pluralism and market forces. In R. Gunther & A. Mughan (Eds.), *Democracy and the media. A comparative perspective* (pp. 303–342). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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, 45–63.
- Van Schagen, J. (1997). The principle of discontinuity and the efficiency of the legislative process. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 3(4), 115–125.
- Voermans, W., Ten Napel, H-M., Diamant, M., Groothuis, M., Steunenberg, B., Passchier, R., & Pack, S. (2012). *Legislative processes in transition*. Leiden/The Hague: Leiden University/WODC.
- 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.
- Zaller, J. (2003). A new standard of news quality: Burglar alarms for the monitorial citizen. *Political Communication*, 20(2), 109–130.