Karin A. Hasler

Accountability in the Metropolis

A Media Content Analysis across European City Regions

Nomos

Table of contents

Table of figures 17

List of tables 19

A Introduction or the communicational dimension of accountability across European metropolitan areas 23

1. A communicational perspective on legitimacy 25
   1.1 Accountability in and through political communication 27
   1.2 Why investigating the political communication of European metropolitan areas 30
2. State of the Art : Political communication and accountability 32
   2.1 Scientific contribution 38
3. Objectives and research questions 39
   3.1 Research question 1 40
   3.2 Research question 2 41
4. Outline 43

B Theory: Communicational Legitimacy 45

5. Interdisciplinary framework for comparative political communication 45
6. A communicative perspective on democratic legitimacy 46
   6.1 The problem of legitimacy in multilevel context 51
   6.2 Democratic legitimacy is public accountability 56
      6.2.1 Dimensions and types of accountability 58
      6.2.2 Public accountability 60
   6.3. Responsibility attribution as a measure for public accountability 63
7. A comparative perspective on political communication 72
   7.1 Review of comparative political communication literature 73

7.2 What creates variance in the public attribution of responsibility? 78
7.3 In a media context 81
7.3.1 Media systems and the national newspaper market 83
7.3.2 The role of regional newspapers: Strong and weak local media 87
7.4 In a political context 89
7.4.1 Political systems and the structural position of actors 89
7.5 In a metropolitan context 94
7.5.1 Metropolitan regions as types of governance 94
7.5.2 Many hands in metropolitan governance: Elected and non-elected actors 99
7.6 In a policy context 105
7.6.1 Public transport 106
7.6.2 Locational policy 108

8. Summary and conceptual overview 110

C Study design, methodology and case selection 112

9. Design: Embedded multi case study 112
9.1. Logic of case selection 113
9.1.1 National media systems 114
9.1.2 Local media systems: The strength of local newspapers 115
9.1.3 National political systems 116
9.1.4 Regional governance: Metropolitan areas 117

10. Overview of the comparative framework 118

11. Sample building: Newspaper selection and selection of articles 119
11.1 Framework for content analysis 119
11.2 Newspaper selection: Regional relevance 120
11.3 Keyword strings for the selection of sampling units (articles) 121
11.3.1 Sample building: Random stratified sample 122

12. Technique and data collection 124
12.1 Data collection: Identifying actors and the attribution of responsibility 124
12.1.1 Outline of the codebook 124
12.1.2 Formal Variables (V1-16) 126
12.1.3 Actors (variables 17a-c = Actor Institution / political party /real name) 126
12.1.4 The public attribution of responsibility and competence (V 18a-c, V19a-c, V20, V21) 128
12.2 Pre-test 132
12.3 Measuring of concepts: Visibility of accountability 134
12.4 Recruiting and training of coders 135
12.5 Computer assisted content analysis (ANGRIST) 137
12.6 Intercoder reliability 137
12.7 Validity 141
13. Summary and data outline 142

D Analysis 144
14. Outline of the analysis 144
14.1 The structure of responsibility attributions in the media 146
15. Case centred analysis 153
15.1 Switzerland (Bern & Zurich) 154
15.1.1 Swiss national media system 154
15.1.2 Local newspapers of Bern and Zurich 154
15.1.3 The national political system of Switzerland 156
15.1.4 Metropolitan governance in Bern 158
15.1.5 Metropolitan governance in Zurich 160
15.1.6 The structure of responsibility attributions in Bern and Zurich 162
15.2 Germany (Berlin & Stuttgart) 163
15.2.1 German national media system 163
15.2.2 Local newspapers of Berlin and Stuttgart 164
15.2.3 The national political system of Germany 165
15.2.4 Metropolitan governance in Berlin-Brandenburg 167
15.2.5 Metropolitan governance in Stuttgart 169

15.2.6 The structure of responsibility attributions in Berlin and Stuttgart 171
15.3 United Kingdom (London & Birmingham) 172
15.3.1 British national media system 172
15.3.2 Local newspapers of London and Birmingham 173
15.3.3 The national political system of the United Kingdom 175
15.3.4 Metropolitan governance in Greater London 177
15.3.5 Metropolitan governance in Birmingham 178
15.3.6 The structure of responsibility attributions in London and Birmingham 181
15.4 France (Paris & Lyon) 182
15.4.1 French national media system 182
15.4.2 Local newspapers of Paris and Lyon 182
15.4.3 The national political system of France 184
15.4.4 Metropolitan governance in Paris 185
15.4.5 Metropolitan governance in Lyon 187
15.4.6 The structure of responsibility attributions in Paris and Lyon 189
15.5 Overview of the complete comparative framework 190
16. Variable centred analysis 191
16.1 Media systems and the local press 192
Attribution patterns 194
The visibility of attribution actors 205
16.2 The national political system 215
16.3 In a metropolitan governance context 226
16.3.1 Elected and non-elected actors 234
Accountability: Attributions of responsibility to elected and non-elected actors 239
16.4 Public transport & locational policy 248
17. Summary 258
E Conclusions 264
18. Accountability in political communication: Empirically measurable? 264
18.1 Research question 1 264

19. Accountability in political communication across Europe 268
19.1 Research question 2 268

G Bibliography 277

F Appendix 291

Table of figures

Figure 1:	Expected influences on public accountability	42
Figure 2:	Accountability (Bovens 2007:13)	57
Figure 3:	Attribution triad adapted from Gerhards et al. 2007	69
Figure 4:	Causal direction of independent and dependent variables	111
Figure 5:	Structural correlate of one case	113
Figure 6:	Attribution triad adapted	129
Figure 7:	Attributions densities per newspaper* across countries	198
Figure 8:	Attribution types per newspaper types* by country	201
Figure 9:	Attribution types per newspaper type* by country	203
Figure 10:	Attribution types by media systems (N=1812)	204
Figure 11:	Actor types* (addressees) per media systems (N= 1330)	208
Figure 12:	Voice (senders) and accountability (addressees) of actor types* by media systems (N 1812)	211
Figure 13:	Actor types (addressees)* by local media system	213
Figure 14:	Actor types (sender)* by country and political system	218
Figure 15:	Actor types (addressees)* by country and political system (N=1330)	218
Figure 16:	Actor types (sender)* by case and political system	220
Figure 17:	Actor types (addressee)* by case and political system	221

Figure 18: Attribution types of actor types* by political system 224

Figure 19: Actor types* by governance types 228

Figure 20: Actor types (senders)* by governance types split by case and political system (N=1330) 230

Figure 21: Actor types (addressees)* by governance types split by case and political system (N=1330) 230

Figure 22: Frequency of attribution actors (senders = 1812, addressees = 1812) most involved in public accountability: 235

Figure 23: Actor types by media visibility (N = 9062) and accountability of actor types (N =1812) in % 240

Figure 24: Media visibility (N = 9062) and accountability (N =1812) of actor types by governance type in % 242

Figure 25: Media visibility (N = 9062) and accountability (N =1812) of actor types 244

Figure 26: Accountability of actor types by attribution types in % 246

Figure 27: Actor types (addressees) by policy fields (N=1812) 252

Figure 28: Actor types (addressees) by policy* and country 253

Figure 29: Actor types (addressees) by policy field* and governance type 255

Figure 30: Actor types (addressees, N=1812) by policy and country 257

List of tables

Table 1:	Indicators for the three different types of media systems (Hallin and Mancini 2004: 67)	86
Table 2:	Summary of comparative framework	119
Table 3:	Overview of selected newspapers and final stratified random sample for coding units	123
Table 4:	Reliability of article variables during the pre-test	139
Table 5:	Reliability of actors coding during the pre-test	139
Table 6:	Reliability of attributions coding during the pre-test	140
Table 7:	Average attribution density of complete dataset	141
Table 8:	Data overview (actors and attributions) by cases, policy fields and governance types	145
Table 9:	Distribution of attribution types in percent and absolute numbers	147
Table 10:	Senders and addressees of causal attributions by social sectors	150
Table 11:	Self-other-attributions (only causal): N= 1224	151
Table 12:	Addressees of success and blame by governance types (N=884)	152
Table 13:	Strength of regional media system: Switzerland	156
Table 14:	Types of multilevel governance: Switzerland	162
Table 15:	Attribution types in Bern	162

Table 16:	Attribution types in Zurich	163
Table 17:	Strength of regional media system: Germany	165
Table 18:	Types of multilevel governance: Germany	171
Table 19:	Attribution types in Berlin	171
Table 20:	Attribution types in Stuttgart	172
Table 21:	Strength of regional media system: United Kingdom	174
Table 22:	Types of multilevel governance: United Kingdom	180
Table 23:	Attribution types in London	181
Table 24:	Attribution types in Birmingham	181
Table 25:	Strength of regional media system: France	184
Table 26:	Types of multilevel governance: France	189
Table 27:	Attribution types in Paris	189
Table 28:	Attribution types in Lyon	190
Table 29:	Complete comparative framework	191
Table 30:	Number of attributions across countries and attribution density	195
Table 31:	Responsibility attributions by journalists (senders) across countries:	197
Table 32:	Attribution density across newspaper types	199
Table 33a, b:	National actors as senders (a) and addressees (b) in unitary systems	226
Table 34:	Party involvement and governance types (N=651)	231

Table 35a, b: The attribution behaviour of Metropolitan Regions as a sender (a) and addressee (b) 233

Table 36: Attribution types of the three most frequent attribution addressees across countries 237

Table 37: Attribution types across policy fields: 249

Table 38: Ranking of topics (as attribution subjects) in public transport policy 250

Table 39: Ranking of topics (as attribution subjects) in locational policy 250