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DMa – The Daily Mail reporting on UKIP
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G – The Guardian reporting on UKIP
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LDMi – The Daily Mirror reporting on the Labour Party
CDT – The Daily Telegraph reporting on the Conservative Party

These abbreviations are followed by a number which refers to the order in which the articles appear in the corpus (order and bibliography in 5.1 Primary sources).
INTRODUCTION

This study examines the UK print press coverage of the political party UKIP and its leader Nigel Farage, and more specifically the extent to which such coverage can be regarded as objective. Nigel Farage and UKIP are interesting subjects for the study of the UK print press because of several reasons. Firstly, both UKIP and Nigel Farage tend to generate strongly worded reactions, from positive reactions about Nigel Farage’s often colourful utterances to negative reactions about the ‘racist’ image of the party. For example, one article from the Guardian calls Nigel Farage a ‘rock star’ (G11) whereas another talks about ‘a racist party’ (G7). That leads to a second reason, namely, the party and its leader often appear to be treated differently. Positive reactions usually tend to implicate Nigel Farage whereas negative reactions tend to refer to the party or its members. The Daily Mirror in our corpus, for example, describes Nigel Farage as follows: ‘UKIP’s figurehead’, ‘his combative public persona’, ‘an increasingly influential figure in British politics’ and ‘a bigger and bigger player on the British political stage’ (DMi1). The paper tends to be more negative about UKIP and its members: ‘UKIP candidates’ racist, sexist and anti-gay rants’, ‘the anti-Semitic postings of Joseph Quirk, UKIP candidate’ (DMi8), ‘the under-fire party’ (DMi10) and ‘the calamitous campaign’ (DMi11). A third reason is that some titles openly express their support for UKIP or are more likely to report positively on the party whilst others openly express their disdain for the party, such as in the following examples:

The truth about UKIP: Racist jibes, anti-gay rants, derogatory remarks about women and anti-foreign propaganda – Headline of The Daily Mirror on May, 17th 2014. (DMi8)

The deep sense of alienation and distrust revealed in the poll underlines the uphill struggle politicians from the main parties face in trying to convince Ukip supporters that Farage is making simplistic or untruthful claims. – The Guardian on May, 14th 2014. (G8)

A fourth and final reason is the tradition of the popular press to cover the news less objectively than the quality press does. Because the popular press is less formal and uses more colloquial English (Wieland, 2009) they tend to be more negative more quickly. The popular paper, the Daily Mirror, for example, as mentioned above, tends to be less formal when reporting on UKIP: ‘racist jibes, anti-gay rants, derogatory remarks about women and anti-foreign propaganda’ (DMi8).
In order to detect bias in newspaper articles, this study uses a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) based on the approaches of Ruth Wodak and Norman Fairclough. CDA is a theory used to expose bias, inequality, disempowerment or racism in texts. It often exposes unequal power relations towards minority groups. In this paper, however, it examines whether UKIP is treated unequally, a party whose discourse itself could be the subject of a CDA. The theory is quite often used to study the rhetoric or the language use of right-wing parties as those are gaining more and more support in present-day Europe (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). This research, however, will focus on the journalistic discourse (newspaper articles) and will compare the coverage of UKIP to that of the mainstream parties.

The most important research questions for this study can be listed as followed:

1. To what extent are general news articles biased in the coverage of UKIP and Nigel Farage, compared to the coverage of a mainstream party?
2. What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of right-leaning papers and that of left-leaning papers?
3. What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of the quality press and that of the popular press?
4. What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of UKIP and of Nigel Farage?

The hypotheses to the research questions above are the following and are based on the theories discussed in chapter 1 (1.3 Newspapers in the UK – the print press media system):

1. General news articles covering UKIP and Nigel Farage tend to be more biased compared to articles covering the supported mainstream parties.
2. Right-leaning titles tend to be more positive about UKIP and Nigel Farage and left-leaning titles tend to be more negative.
3. Popular press articles tend to exhibit more bias (positive or negative) towards UKIP and Nigel Farage compared to quality press articles.
4. The British press tends to react more positively towards Nigel Farage and more negatively towards UKIP.

The first chapter of this research is the theory chapter. First it will examine the theoretical framework of Critical Discourse Analysis focussing on three of the most well-known approaches to CDA, those of Norman Fairclough, Teun A. van Dijk and Ruth Wodak (section 1.1.1). The theories of Fairclough and Wodak will be discussed more extensively because this
study’s methodology focusses primarily on those two approaches. It will also discuss why CDA is a useful approach for the analysis of newspaper articles and why it is useful for the study in this paper. Section 1.2 will study the notions of journalism and objectivity by examining the journalistic discourse in newspaper articles according to the theory of Fowler (1991) and by examining the term ‘objectivity’ according to the ideas of Dean (n.d.). The third section of chapter 1 will analyse the print press media system in the UK, focussing on the two main distinctions: popular versus quality press and right-leaning versus left-leaning press. It will also give an overview of the four papers used for the corpus in this study as well as some information on their previous and current political affiliations. Section 1.4 will give a historical background on UKIP and the European Elections, but it will also discuss the main issues UKIP focusses on, the results for UKIP in the last and previous European Elections and the importance of such elections for the party. The second chapter is the Methodology and will cover how the corpus is organised, how it was composed and how it was coded. It will also describe the method or the approach to CDA that was chosen for the analysis in this study. The third chapter contains the results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis and will give an overview of those results. The quantitative analysis will be used to address the research questions while the qualitative analysis will provide additional insight into the research questions’ themes, shaped around the stated hypotheses. Finally, chapter 4 is the Conclusion.
1 THEORY

1.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

1.1.1 What is Critical Discourse Analysis?

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a relatively young research method which is used to study the relationship between a text and its social context. It primarily focusses on revealing relationships of disempowerment, inequality, dominance and bias. Furthermore, critical discourse analysts understand that language use might be influenced by a certain ideological point of view and therefore study the interpretation and reception of texts (Richardson, 2007). There are, however, various approaches with regard to CDA. In an interview from 2007, Ruth Wodak, researcher in the field of Discourse Studies and CDA, states these approaches have their own theory and their own methods and methodology. In the next paragraphs three of the most cited approaches to CDA will be discussed in order to extensively illustrate what CDA means, that is the approaches of Fairclough, Van Dijk and Wodak. Aspects of two out of those three approaches (that of Fairclough and Wodak) will be used for the analysis in this research.

The first approach is the ‘dialectical-relational approach’ of Norman Fairclough (1995). According to Fairclough CDA analyses the dialectical relationship between semiosis, which refers to all types of language including for example body language or sign language, and social practices or the social environment. Fairclough’s CDA is primarily focussed on the social change and which effect such change may have on semiosis (Fairclough, 2001). This approach to CDA believes language or semiosis can always be found in social practices. Semiosis is, for example, present in some jobs which require language to be used in a certain way. A shop assistant or a president for example will use a particular semiosis (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Nevertheless, this process also works the other way around as semiosis or language, or rather the people who read or view it, might influence the social environment as well (Richardson, 2007). The research in this paper will be analysing newspaper articles and will thus focus on written language rather than on other forms of semiosis. In Analysing Newspapers (2007: 37) Richardson describes Fairclough’s approach as ‘a more accessible method’ than others with regard to ‘doing CDA’ and examines the three stages of Fairclough’s analysis, that is a textual analysis followed by a section on discursive practices and one on social practices.

The first stage, the textual analysis, examines the choices the author of a text makes in terms of content by analysing not only linguistic aspects, such as vocabulary or grammar, but also by analysing how a text is organised, for example, how cohesive the text is (Richardson, 2007).
More importantly, however, is what such linguistic aspects or such text organisation means, that is, ‘in relation to their direct or indirect involvement in reproducing or resisting the systems of ideology and social power’ (Richardson, 2007: 39). This is exactly why CDA is so interesting for the research in this paper, that is, it will be examining whether, and if so, how language in British newspaper articles is used to obtain social power or how certain ideologies are hidden in news articles.

The second stage of Fairclough’s CDA is a discourse analysis as it includes discursive practices. The discourse analysis examines the production of a text, the rules a writer has to respect when writing a text in a particular genre, the reception of a text, how readers read and interpret a text, and the social environment in which both processes take place (Richardson, 2007). Both the process of production and that of reception are named ‘a two-way street’ (Richardson, 2007: 40). The producer or the author can influence a text by encoding a message in it, but the text is able to influence the producer as well as he has to comply with certain conventions of the text, that is, each text genre has its own conventions. With regard to the reading process, a reader at first receives and understands the message, ideological or not, but also decodes the text, meaning he can disagree with the message (Richardson, 2007). The research in this paper will study the production process in detail but will only look at the reception process in general and will be limited to for example studying the public’s image of the political party UKIP or to how the public might interpret headlines of news articles.

The third and final stage of Fairclough’s CDA includes the social practices or the social environment in which the text is written (Richardson, 2007). In this stage the aspects of the previous stages, textual and discourse analysis, will be critically analysed in terms of ethics and politics. This analysis will expose and question the power abuse or hidden ideologies and could give information about the kind of society it was written in and which effect such text might have on that society (Richardson, 2007). For the research in this paper that means studying how the language use in British newspaper articles on the political party UKIP may or may not influence readers’ opinions on that party and therefore also perhaps their voting behaviour.

The second often cited approach to Critical Discourse Analysis is that of Teun A. van Dijk, the so-called ‘social-cognitive approach’. In many books, essays or papers on CDA van Dijk himself, however, mentions he does not like to be associated with a certain ‘approach’, he rather describes his ideas of CDA as guidelines. Van Dijk advocates a diverse CDA, meaning researchers doing CDA should not just copy one’s approach or guidelines, but rather implement theories from different people and from different disciplines. This point of view causes his
‘approach’ to also be called multidisciplinary CDA (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). In contrast to the previous approach, Fairclough’s CDA, van Dijk does not analyse the relationship between discourse and its social environment, but the relationship of those two with a third component, that is, cognition (Angermüller, Maingueneau & Wodak, 2014). In the following paragraph these three components or dimensions, the so-called ‘discourse-cognition-society triangle’ (Wodak & Meyer, 2001: 98), will be explained in more detail and it will describe what their role is in van Dijk’s CDA.

The first dimension is discourse. According to van Dijk a complete discourse analysis would be too extensive and researchers have to be selective as there are too many aspects or structures to be analysed within a text or discourse. Examples of such structures are lexical choices, stress and intonation, word order or propositions (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Researches therefore have to make a selection of structures that are relevant for their study. As van Dijk suggests:

if we want to study - as would be typical in CDA – the ways some speakers or writers exercise power in or by their discourse, it only makes sense to study those properties that can vary as a function of social power (Wodak & Meyer, 2001: 99).

So it is important to understand how structures are related to their social environment (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). For the research in this paper for example that means selecting those aspects or structures in newspaper articles which can be used to express the author’s opinions or ideologies in order to influence the reader and thus society.

The second component of van Dijk’s CDA theory is cognition, and specifically social cognition (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Social cognition or the cognition of groups or organizations refers to their ideology, attitude and knowledge. These three notions are able to influence discourse or language and consequently how such discourse or language is interpreted (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Nevertheless, discourse and language in turn, may influence the social cognition, as people or groups or organizations obtain their knowledge, ideologies and attitudes from ‘everyday discourse such as, conversations, news reports and textbooks’ (Wodak & Meyer, 2001: 114).

The third and final dimension of van Dijk’s CDA is society. When talking about society he pictures two kinds of society: one at a local or micro level and one at a more global level. The first one can refer to, for example, face-to-face interactions, while the latter refers to groups, institutions, organizations, political systems etcetera (Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. Ehernberger, 2003). According to van Dijk Critical Discourse Analysis is primarily used to study the relationships of power and dominance at a global level, but when doing so it actually
studies discourse at a micro level as it are individuals and their ideologies, attitudes and knowledge which form these groups or organizations (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

The final approach belongs to probably one of the most cited researchers of CDA, Ruth Wodak, and is called the ‘discourse-historical method’. Wodak’s approach is interdisciplinary, in other words, she strongly suggests not using just CDA, but combining it with other methods or theories. According to her, an interdisciplinary approach is important to clarify the complex relationship between discourse and society as well as the way in which those two influence each other (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Besides the interdisciplinary approach, Wodak also focusses on a historical analysis, meaning she studies the historical background of the social environment in which a certain discourse appears (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Briefly worded, according to Wodak the discourse-historical approach attempts “to work with different approaches […] and on the basis of a variety of empirical data as well as background information” (Wodak & Meyer, 2001: 65). This approach was initially used for a research on the anti-Semitic stereotyped image and later on it was used in a study on racist discrimination and in another one on nation and national identity. (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). The discourse-historical method of Wodak is rather a pragmatic approach to CDA, meaning it does not spend a lot of time on a complex theory but rather explains it through a specific social problem (in the case of CDA one of discrimination, bias, power abuse, etc. or like the ones in the studies mentioned above) and intends to find so-called conceptual tools to analyse such problems (Wodak & Meyer, 2001; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Wodak’s approach to CDA is three-dimensional, the analysis happens in three stages. These will be discussed in more detail in the next paragraph.

During the first stage of the analysis the content of the discourse is analysed and signs of power abuse or racist or biased language are marked (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Next, the discursive strategies are studied. These strategies refer to the ways in which language is used to introduce in a discourse what was marked in the previous stage, that is certain ideas or ideologies. Examples of such strategies are nomination, how people are referred to, or predication, what characteristics people are associated with (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). In the third and final stage, the meaning or the objective of such discursive strategies is analysed as well as the linguistic aspects that contribute to those strategies. For example, nomination, how people are referred to, is called the strategy, the objective is to create the notion of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ or the notion of in-groups and out-groups, the linguistic tools to create this strategy and objective are, for example, negatively connotated metaphors or generalizations (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).
Wodak’s approach can be summarized in certain steps. She emphasizes researchers should first gather information on the social environment as well as background information. Then, they should form research questions relevant for the social problem or phenomena being studied and think about other theories or methods that might be used besides CDA (interdisciplinary approach) to answer these questions (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Next is the analysis of the three stages mentioned in the previous paragraph, categorizing the discursive strategies and examining what they mean or what they are intended for. After this analysis Wodak suggests drawing up a diagram containing the topics of a specific text (what is being talked about in a text) so researchers can get a clear view of the, if present, personal opinion or ideologies of the author. The final step would be to interpret these results while linking them to the research questions and social problem (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

After having discussed three of the most cited approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis and having clarified the overall goal or objective of CDA, the research in this paper will be primarily leaning on the approach of Norman Fairclough and that of Ruth Wodak. These theories provide ways of analysing the corpus, British newspaper articles on the political party UKIP, efficiently and in-depth. The textual analysis described in the paragraph of Fairclough’s approach can be used to detect ideological or biased language in the articles. The discursive strategies Ruth Wodak uses in her theory, can be used then to examine the meaning of such ideological language. Just as Wodak’s approach suggests, this paper will be giving a historical background on the political party UKIP and on the period in which the newspaper articles were written (European Elections) as well as information on the social context in which the newspaper articles were written, meaning information on the role of journalism in today’s society and on the British print press media system.
1.1.2 Why is CDA a useful approach for the analysis of newspaper articles?

“Critical Discourse Analysis has become an established discipline, institutionalized across the globe in many departments and curricula” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009: 4). In an interview from 2007 Ruth Wodak talks about new research areas CDA is being used in, especially in the analysis of the new media genres, such as film, SMS but above all social media networks which seem to have a huge impact on today’s society (Kendall, 2007). Nevertheless, the research in this paper uses CDA to study one of the traditional media genres, that is printed press. The following paragraphs will discuss why CDA is a useful approach for the analysis of newspaper articles.

In order to demonstrate CDA is a more useful method for analysing texts or newspapers, Richardson (2007) compares CDA with quantitative content analysis, which used to be the generally adopted approach. Richardson (2007: 15) focusses on three shortcomings of quantitative content analysis compared to CDA, visualized in the following list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical discourse analysis</th>
<th>Quantitative content analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>offers interpretations of the meanings of texts</td>
<td>derives meaning from textual features after having quantified them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situates what is written or said in the context in which it occurs</td>
<td>summarizes patterns or regularities in texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argues that textual meaning is constructed through an interaction between producer, text and consumer</td>
<td>argues that textual meaning is ‘read off’ the page by all readers in exactly the same way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative content analysis focusses on coding and quantifying categories from which one then derives whether a newspaper article contains ideological or biased opinions (Richardson, 2007). In CDA this system is merely the basis of its analysis. It is used to label and organise data but once they have that data it focusses on examining what it means in relation to the social environment the article was written in (Richardson, 2007). Richardson (2007) intends to clarify this with an example from his own research on the representation of Islam in newspaper articles. According to quantitative content analysis, when a newspaper article on Islam contains more than the average number of negative references, such as ‘violence’, Islam must be negatively presented. CDA, however, might do a count of such negative references, but will also be examining who is being negatively referred to. Islam might just as easily be the victim of ‘violence’, depending on the context in which the article was written (Richardson, 2007). In other words, the biggest difference between both approaches is that quantitative content
analysis focusses on content while CDA asks further questions and thus focusses on context (Richardson, 2007).

The previous paragraph explained why Critical Discourse Analysis is a useful approach for analysing newspaper articles. Why it is interesting to apply CDA to journalistic discourses (or why journalistic discourses might be ideological) will be discussed further on in this paper.
1.1.3 Why is Critical Discourse Analysis useful for this study?

As mentioned before in this paper, Critical Discourse Analysis is used to examine discourses in order to reveal ideological, racist or discriminatory opinions of the author and examines the effect those discourses have on the social environment, or in other words, on a specific social problem. It is a theory that is used to be critical of those in power, and those who are thus able to abuse such power, and to defend those who are the victim of racism, discrimination, bias, etc., usually minority groups (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). The research in this paper does not, however, examine the effect of a biased discourse on a ‘minority group’ but the effect of it on the representation of a political party, and whether or not that representation is objective, for example, in comparison to that of another party.

This study will critically analyse the discourse used in newspaper articles of several British newspapers on the right-wing political party UKIP. Later on in this paper a historical background of this party will be presented to give a clear view of what it stands for and how it is perceived in British society. The discourse of this political party itself could be the subject of a CDA. According to Wodak and Meyer (2009) CDA is quite often used to study the rhetoric or the language use of right-wing parties as they are gaining more and more support in today’s Europe. This research, however, will focus on the journalistic discourse (newspaper articles) and whether or not it is able to report objectively on a right-wing party. To test each of the chosen newspapers’ objectivity in this research, the discourse used in the articles on UKIP will be compared to that of articles on another party. That other party will be the party that gains the support of the newspaper examined, as newspapers tend to affiliate with a certain left- or right-wing party (more details in 1.3). The comparison of both discourses could then indicate whether or not such affiliation effects, or rather causes bias towards, UKIP. Objectivity might not only depend on affiliation with a certain left- or right-wing party, but also on the difference between quality and popular press (examined more closely in section 1.3), as the popular press seems to “have the liberty” to express its affiliations more clearly. The next section in this paper will be devoted to the notion of journalism and objectivity.
1.2 Journalism and objectivity

“Particularly the language of the mass media is scrutinized as a site of power, of struggle and also as a site where language is apparently transparent. Media institutions often purport to be neutral in that they provide space for public discourse, that they reflect states of affairs disinterestedly, and that they give the perceptions and arguments of the newsmakers” (Wodak & Meyer, 2001: 6).

“According to Jäger “the self-descriptions of newspapers, for example, as `independent' or `non-partisan' should always be regarded with distrust” (Wodak & Meyer, 2001: 50).

“Newspaper coverage of world events is presented as the unbiased recording of ‘hard facts’. […] Roger Fowler challenges this perception, arguing that news is a practice, a product of the social and political world on which it reports.” (Fowler, 1991).

Previous quotes are just a few examples of findings or conclusions of CDA studies that have examined the objectivity of media or newspaper coverage. Because the research in this paper will be examining newspaper articles, the next section is devoted to the journalistic discourse of newspapers, what it intends (or pretends) to be and what it actually is, focussing on Roger Fowler’s Language in the News – Discourse and Ideology in the Press (1991), followed by some ideas of Walter Dean, director at the Committee of Concerned Journalists, on what objectivity actually means.

Fowler (1991) discusses four aspects that influence or are relevant for the construction of the news or the journalistic discourse: bias or representation, news values, stereotypes and social and economic factors in news selection. All four aspects will be discussed in further detail in the next paragraphs.

The first aspect is ‘bias or representation’. Fowler (1991) does not mean to say that all newspapers are biased but that they do represent the news from a certain point of view. Each newspaper has its own style, in terms of content as well as presentation because each newspaper also has a different readership and they represent the news according to that (Fowler, 1991). That difference in readership also causes the news in a specific newspaper to be ‘selected’, as some subjects mentioned in The Times might not be of any interest for the readership of The Mirror and vice versa (Fowler, 1991). A newspaper can be called biased when its ideologies become obvious due to, for example, word choice or just the general attitude of the article. For example, the political preference becomes clear when a newspaper refers to the political leader as ‘Mr. Gorbachev’ or as ‘Gorby’ (Fowler, 1991: 4). This is of interest for the research in this paper, as different British newspapers will be examined as well as their attitude towards the political party UKIP.
The previous paragraph talked about the fact that newspapers ‘select’ the news they report on. The next aspect has to do with the criteria according to which that selection happens, the so-called ‘news values’ (Fowler, 1991). These news values determine whether or not a certain event is worth reporting on, or in other words, whether or not it is “newsworthy”. Fowler (1991: 13-14) gives the list of Galtung and Ruge which contains criteria an event has to fit to be newsworthy, the more criteria it fits the more likely it is reported on in the newspaper. For example, one of the criteria is “relevance”, meaning, in case of British newspapers, relevant for British society. Another one is “proximity”, if an event is close to British territory, it is more likely to be mentioned in the paper.

The third aspect to have an influence on the way news is represented, are stereotypes. News events often confirm stereotypes and the stronger the stereotype, the more likely the event will be reported on in the paper (Fowler, 1991). According to Fowler (1991: 19) there is a “productive interaction between the news media, the public, and official agencies in the formation and application of stereotypes”. Possible news events might fit the criteria mentioned in the previous paragraph, but they are even more likely to be reported on when they affirm a certain stereotype (Fowler, 1991). Stereotypes are something this research will come across as well, for instance, when looking at the representation of Nigel Farage, stereotyped a ‘clown figure’ or a ‘beer drinker’. So whenever he does or says something that fits that stereotype, it is very likely to be reported on.

The fourth and last aspect relevant in the news selection process are the social and economic factors (Fowler, 1991). The economic factor refers to the fact that the newspaper industry is a business and that it thus has to make profits. This obviously has an influence on which news events they report on (sensational stories) and how they report on them (exaggeration). The social factor that has an influence on the representation of the news does not refer to the content but to the people who get to express their opinions in newspapers, that is usually the powerful or prominent ones (Members of Parliament, judges, politicians, CEO’s, etc.) (Fowler, 1991). Because the discourse or the type of language common for these people occurs so often in the papers, newspapers tend to copy or adopt this language as well as the ideological ideas or attitudes in it (Fowler, 1991).

It must be said that on several occasions Fowler (1991) mentions that the processes described in the previous paragraphs usually happen automatically. He does not mean to attack the newspaper industry and say that newspapers deliberately represent ideological
language or ideas but simply wants to study this type of language that people get in touch with on a daily basis (Fowler, 1991).

In the previous paragraphs an overview was given of the aspects Roger Fowler believes could influence the objectivity of the journalistic discourse, but the next paragraph will examine what such ‘objectivity’ really means, especially for a journalistic discourse, focusing on an article written by Walter Dean on bias and objectivity called *The lost meaning of ‘objectivity’* (n.d.).

It appears ‘objectivity’ was not one of the starting principles of journalism but it was only evoked at the beginning of the twentieth century when it was realised journalists were biased, intentionally or not. Objectivity was then created to make journalists aware of biased language and to make them avoid it in their journalistic discourse by looking for methods or tools that ensure objective language (Dean, n.d.).

In his article Dean especially refers to objectivity as discussed by Walter Lippmann, considered to be one of the founders of modern journalism in the twentieth century. Lippmann was one of the first journalists who went to look for those methods mentioned in the previous paragraph, which could ensure an objective representation of the news. He was in favour of one universal method of ‘doing’ journalism to ensure objective news representation (Dean, n.d.). According to Lippmann it was not enough to give room to columnists or other sections, such as opinion pieces, where journalists are allowed to express their biased opinions and to assume then that the rest of articles must be objective. But he also admitted that even if one objective method was to be found, it remains the method that is objective and not the journalist (Dean, n.d.). This means that a journalist might use objective language to report on a certain news item but that the content of the news article itself may still show signs of bias. For example, when journalists select the sources that represent their own point of view, or when they quote only the people who share their personal opinions. Some elements of objective language are presented in the following list:
### Tools for objective language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool Type</th>
<th>Specific Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word choice (Fowler, 1991)</td>
<td>A positive or negative nominalisation or reference can give away the author’s attitude towards someone (see example of Gorbachev in the discussion of Fowler’s theory on objectivity mentioned above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives (Rogers, 2015)</td>
<td>Subjective adjectives (positive or negative) give away the author’s feelings (e.g.: best or worst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different viewpoints (Rogers, 2015)</td>
<td>There are two sides to each story, give a voice to both supporters and opponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or sexual orientation (Sutherlin, 2012)</td>
<td>Do not mention one’s race or sexual orientations in an offensive context, it is allowed when it is relevant to the article’s subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Sutherlin, 2012)</td>
<td>Do not use the generic ‘he’ or ‘she’, avoid gender-specific terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though there are many specific tools such as the ones mentioned in the list above, Dean (n.d.) comes to the conclusion, as Lipmann suggests, that there still does not exist one method of ‘doing’ journalism. It even seems that no methods of reporting objectively are being taught to journalists in training. There are many strategies but they seem to have never been combined into one ‘method’, meaning there also does not exist one way to verify whether one reports objectively or not (Dean, n.d.).
1.3 Newspapers in the UK - the print press media system

The British print press system is very diverse and knows two main distinctions, that of popular versus quality press, and that of left- versus right-leaning press. In the following paragraphs these two distinctions will be examined briefly followed by an overview of the papers studied in this research and a description of where they belong in terms of those two distinctions.

The first distinction to be made between British papers is that of quality and popular papers. Wieland (2009) created a checklist with characteristics of both the popular press, or the tabloids, and the quality press, also called broadsheet. There are differences between, for example, the lay-out and composition of a quality or popular paper as well as between the language and word choice. Popular papers intend to be “eye-catching” whereas quality papers choose a more neutral lay-out, quality papers use formal language whilst popular papers might use colloquial English (Wieland, 2009). The main difference is probably the type of news items the papers aim to report on. Quality papers focus on national and international news with attention for politics whereas popular papers tend to focus on personal stories and gossip (Wieland, 2009). According to a study of Wring & Deacon (2010: 453) British newspapers can be divided into three categories in terms of quality:

‘Quality’ titles refers to the following: the Guardian, Observer, Telegraph, Sunday Telegraph, Times, Sunday Times, Financial Times, Independent, Independent on Sunday; ‘midmarket’ means the Mail, Mail on Sunday, Express, Sunday Express; and ‘populars’ is a synonym for the so-called ‘red tops’, which are the Sun, News of the World, Mirror, Sunday Mirror, People, Star and Star on Sunday.

The second distinction between British newspapers is that of left- and right-leaning papers. These terms refer to the affiliations of newspapers with a certain left- or right-wing political party. According to the study of Wring & Deacon of the 2010 General Elections, British newspapers have made no effort to hide those affiliations. Their study shows an overview of all the British papers, the political parties they affiliate with and to what extent (strong-moderate-weak). In the next paragraphs only the results of the papers of interest for this research will be discussed, that is, The Daily Mail, The Mirror, The Telegraph and The Guardian.

*The Daily Mail* is what Wring & Deacon (2010) refer to as a ‘midmarket’ paper, meaning nor a quality nor a popular paper, but somewhere in between. The study shows that out of the last five General Elections it supported the Conservative Party (right-wing) four times.
During the General Elections of 2010 their support of the Conservatives was labelled ‘strong’. The Daily Mail was founded in 1896 and belongs to the papers with large circulation in Britain (Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.).

According to the Wring & Deacon study The (Daily) Mirror is considered to be a popular or a ‘red top’ newspaper and a strong supporter of the Labour party. The paper’s own website says it focusses on (the latest breaking) news, sport and showbiz stories. The paper was founded in 1903 and is one of the papers with the largest circulation in the UK (Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.). Wring & Deacon’s study (2010) shows the paper has been in support of the Labour Party (left-wing) for the last five General Elections in Britain.

The third newspaper that will be examined in this research is The (Daily) Telegraph. The paper is described by Wring & Deacon (2010) as a quality newspaper giving moderate support to the Conservative Party (right-wing). During the previous General Elections their support to the Conservatives was labelled strong. The Daily Telegraph was founded in 1855 and even though it does not have the same large circulation as the papers mentioned above, it is considered to be one of the most well-known and read quality newspapers together with The Times and The Guardian (Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.).

Finally, the fourth newspaper is The Guardian. The Guardian, as already mentioned in the previous paragraph, belongs to the quality newspapers and gave its (moderate) support during the General Elections of 2010 to the Liberal Democrats (considered centre-right). The General Elections before, however, it had shown to be in support (ranging from weak to strong) of the Labour Party (left-wing) (Wring & Deacon, 2010).

None of the newspapers mentioned above are in full support of UKIP, but some are more supportive than others. According to Kellner (2014) readers of so-called right-leaning papers are more sympathetic towards UKIP, more specifically, 20 % of the Daily Mail readers support UKIP, as do 17 % of the readers of the Daily Telegraph. The readers of more centre or left-leaning papers are far less supportive of the party. According to the article only 7 % of the readers of the Daily Mirror are likely to vote for UKIP, and only 1 % of the Guardian’s readership would vote for the party (Kellner, 2014).
1.4 Historical Background

The first chapter of this paper examined three approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis, one of which is the approach of Ruth Wodak who explains the importance of a historical analysis of the social environments in which the discourse studied appears. This research focusses on the discourse used in news articles reporting on the political party UKIP during the European Elections of 2014. According to Wodak’s approach that means examining and understanding UKIP, for example, where it comes from, what it stands for, etc., to be able to study what characteristics of the party the authors of news articles focus on and to be able to conclude whether that choice is biased or not. The same will therefore also be done with the European Elections, in order to understand their purpose and importance.

1.4.1 UKIP, the UK Independence Party
The UK Independence Party or UKIP was founded in 1993 when it became the new name for the Anti-Federalist League established by Alan Sked in 1991. UKIP was created out of the opposition to the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 and thus opposed Britain’s membership of the European Union (Hunt, 2014). UKIP’s first success took place during the European Elections of 1999 when the party, led by Michael Holmes, won its first three seats in the European Parliament. In 2002 former member of the Conservative Party Roger Knapman became the party’s leader and in 2004 the party gained the support of show host Robert Kilroy-Silk during the European Elections of that year. UKIP’s support grew that year but after Knapman and Kilroy-Silk ended up in dispute over the party’s leadership, Kilroy-Silk left the party (Hunt, 2014). It was in 2006 that Nigel Farage became the party’s leader. He was successful at the European Elections 2009 but stood down later that year to focus on obtaining a seat in the House of Commons, as until then UKIP had still not been successful at General Elections. Nevertheless, he returned to the position of party leader in 2010. Nigel Farage began increasing the party’s membership figures and started focussing on other issues, besides leaving the European Union, such as immigration, which gained the party even more support (Hunt, 2014). In 2013 UKIP performed very well at by-elections and the local elections of that year would become the best local elections for the party so far by ending up the third biggest party. The success remained in 2014, especially when the party won the European Elections with a 27.5% of the total of votes cast (Hunt, 2014).

The UK Independence Party focusses on three main issues: immigration, the protection of the British national identity and Britain’s exit from the European Union, especially because of
Brussels’ control of the British economy and laws. These issues can also be found in the party’s so-called ‘Constitution’ (The Constitution, 2012). With regard to immigration the party clearly states that its policies will “ensure proper control over the United Kingdom’s borders”. In the party’s manifesto (UKIP Manifesto 2015, 2015) UKIP claims it is not against migration but it wishes to reform the system. Nevertheless, the party has been accused many of times of being racist and many of its members have had to be reprimanded or even removed from the party for unfortunate or controversial statements. Nigel Farage does intend, however, to avoid being linked to the far right (Hunt, 2014). The party’s constitution says it:

[...] does not discriminate against or in favour of any person on the grounds of their race, religion, ethnic origin, education, beliefs, sexual orientation, class, social status, sectarianism or any other basis prescribed by law (The Constitution, 2012).

The second main issue of UKIP is that of protecting the British identity. In the party’s manifesto (UKIP Manifesto 2015, 2015) UKIP promotes the British culture and it states to be against multiculturalism, instead it encourages patriotism and celebrates so-called ‘Britishness’. The party’s constitution states:

The Party further believes that the integrity of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (hereinafter “The United Kingdom”) should be maintained (The Constitution, 2012).

The third main issue of the party is a so-called ‘Brexit’, that is the withdrawal of Britain from the European Union. According to its manifesto (UKIP Manifesto 2015, 2015) UKIP is not against Europe but it does seek political and economic independence from the European Union. The party claims British legislation with regard to employment, businesses and immigration is in the hands of the EU as well as the country’s economy and several important industries such as the fishing, farming and energy industry. The party is very clear on this issue in their constitution:

[...] the only laws that should apply within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom are those wholly made by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. To that end it shall be the policy of the Party that the United Kingdom shall cease to be a member of the European Union and shall not thereafter make any Treaty or join any international organisation which involves in any way the surrender of any part of the United Kingdom’s sovereignty (The Constitution, 2012).
1.4.2 European Elections

European Elections are organised every five years in order to elect the members of the European Parliament (MEPs). They are organised in all countries part of the European Union and people can vote for members of their country’s national political parties. Every country is assigned a fixed number of MEPs primarily according to their population, for example, for the United Kingdom in 2014 that was 73 (European Elections, n.d.). The European Parliament consists of 751 MEPs chosen from the 28 member states of the European Union. Once the MEPs are elected they can become part of a European political party, one that affiliates with the national political party they belong to. In order to form such European party it has to consist, however, of 25 MEPs or more, who have to come from at least 7 different member states. If they fail or do not wish to become member of a European political party they will receive the label ‘non-attached’ (European Elections, n.d.). Being elected member of the European Parliament is important because the decisions made there affect the home country, especially in terms of legislation and budgetary matters. This is especially the case since the Lisbon Treaty, signed in 2007 but only implemented for the first time during the elections of 2014 (Adhami et al., 2014). Treaties over the years have increased the (legislative) power of the European Parliament in order to limit the power of the European Commission, the institution that originally held all the power, and to obtain a more democratic image. The Treaty of Lisbon extended the power of the European Parliament even further and granted it legislative power in areas such as immigration and public health services, but it also made sure that the European Union needs the European Parliament’s permission for every international agreement it makes (Adhami et al., 2014).

UKIP has been successful at every European Election it participated in since 1999, when it ended up fourth in the UK and won its first three seats with almost 7% of the votes. In 2004 it became the third party in the UK, receiving more votes than the Liberal Democrats with almost 16% of the votes, which accounted for 12 seats. In 2009 UKIP got close to 17% of the votes, it ended up second after the Conservatives and it won another seat (Norsk Senter For Forskningsdata, 2015). In 2014 UKIP achieved its best result when it won the elections with 27.5%, obtaining 24 seats in the European Parliament (UK European Election Results, n.d).

The European Parliamentary Elections of 2014 were especially interesting for UKIP because it was the first time the elections were held according to the Lisbon Treaty signed in 2007. This treaty, as mentioned before, extended the (legislative) powers of the European Parliament in several new areas. One of which of special interest to UKIP, that is immigration. Immigration, as mentioned in the previous section (background on UKIP), is one of the main issues the party
campaigns on. If the party succeeded in joining a European political party that would give it a bigger chance of truly influencing the legislative decisions in the area of immigration, as members of European parties are granted larger budgets, more speaking time in the parliament and also more status (Bearder, 2014). Nigel Farage refused to join the far-right political parties of Marine Le Pen, the French National Front, and of Geert Wilders, the Dutch Party for Freedom in a European political party (Bearder, 2014). Instead he intended to form a new Europe of Freedom and Democracy (EFD) party, a European party that was established for the European Elections of 2009. Farage renamed the party Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy (EFDD). He originally succeeded in finding members from six other member states to form such party (, as mentioned before a European party has to consist of at least 25 MEPs from at least 7 different member states). As it states on the party’s own website (http://www.ukip.org/index) the new EFDD party was to be formed by members of the following national political parties: UKIP, Italy’s Five Star Movement, Lithuania’s Order and Justice Party, the Sweden Democrats, the Free Citizen’s Party of the Czech Republic, the Latvian Farmers’ Union and an Independent MEP from France. The party existed for a few months until the only Latvian MEP, Iveta Grigule, decided to leave the party and the number of participating member states came back down to six (Bearder, 2014). It was in October of 2014 that the party announced in a press release it regained a seventh participating member state with Polish MEP Robert Iwaszkiewicz joining the EFDD party (http://wwwefdgroup.eu/).
2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Corpus

The corpus in this study consists of articles on UKIP or Nigel Farage and articles on the mainstream political party that the paper in question adheres to. This will make it possible to detect contrasts or similarities in terms of bias in the treatment of the parties.

For the composition of the corpora articles were taken from four different newspapers, all well-known in the UK: two quality newspapers (The Daily Telegraph and The Guardian), one mid-market newspaper (The Daily Mail) and one popular newspaper (The Daily Mirror). The diversity of these newspapers will allow us to analyse differences in the coverage of two political parties between popular and quality press, but also between so-called left- and right-leaning newspapers (the affiliations of the newspapers were discussed 1.3 on the British print press media system).

The articles used for the corpora date from the European Parliamentary Election period in 2014. According to an article from Wring & Deacon (2015), *Pints and pratfalls: for UKIP, all publicity is good publicity*, an article on the presence of UKIP in the British print press, British newspapers reported 4.25 times more on UKIP during the European Parliamentary Elections of 2014 than they did during the general elections of 2010. A survey was conducted in order to determine the number of articles on UKIP that appeared in online editions of newspapers during the run-up to the elections (the month of April), the election period itself (May) as well as the aftermath (June). Similarly, the total number of online articles about the mainstream political party supported by a given title was also counted (appendix 1). For both surveys opinion pieces were counted separately. The corpus consists of general news articles, opinion pieces were excluded because they are openly subjective.

After the survey a selection was made of 10 to 15 articles per newspaper covering UKIP or Nigel Farage. For the mainstream political party supported by the newspaper in question a selection of only 5 articles was made, because the focus of this study remains on UKIP and Nigel Farage and the articles on the mainstream party were just selected to make a comparison. The exact number of articles per newspaper can be found in appendix 3.

During the analysis newspapers will be referred to with the following abbreviations: DT (The Daily Telegraph), G (The Guardian), DMa (The Daily Mail) and DMi (The Daily Mirror). The articles retrieved from each newspaper will be given a number. When referring to articles on
UKIP, for example, DMa5, that means The Daily Mail, article 5. References to articles on the party supported by the paper will receive the first letter of the party supported before the abbreviation of the newspaper: LDMi (Labour for the Daily Mirror), CDMa (Conservatives for the Daily Mail), CDT (Conservatives for the Daily Telegraph) and LDG (Liberal Democrats for the Guardian), also followed by the number of the article in question.
2.2 Method

A Critical Discourse Analysis based on the approaches of Ruth Wodak and Norman Fairclough (discussed in 1.1.1) is used to analyse the newspaper articles from the corpus and to examine whether they are written objectively. The next section describes those aspects of Wodak’s and Fairclough’s approach that were introduced to the CDA used in this research. Those aspects will later on be divided in a quantitative and a qualitative analysis followed by an explanation of the coding system that will be used for the analysis.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the approach of Ruth Wodak includes the study of discursive strategies to detect biased language. Three of those discursive strategies will be examined in this research as well: nominalisation, framing and predication. Nominalisation, refers to every title or name given to the political party (either UKIP or the party supported by the paper), as well as the names given to its leaders, its members, or any other association that may reflect positively or negatively on the party or its leader. The second strategy, framing, refers to how a political party (or its leader or members) are reported on or described. As there is a wide range of linguistic tools to contribute to the process of framing, this research will only focus on quotations: quotations can represent the point of view of the party or that of the opposition. Quotations in this study do not necessarily have to be full sentences, quoted terms or words will also be considered as a quotation. The third and final strategy taken from Wodak’s approach, predication, is about the recurring themes surrounding a political party or its leader or members, and which are often turned into stereotypes by newspapers.

In addition to the discursive strategies of Wodak, the CDA in this research is also influenced by the approach of Fairclough. The first stage of Fairclough’s CDA, as seen in chapter one, focusses on a textual analysis and how a text, or in this case a newspaper article, is organised. Headlines, for example, are the first thing readers read and usually set the tone for the rest of the article. Therefore the headlines, and particularly the wording, of each article in the corpus will also be analysed. A second aspect of Fairclough’s approach and of interest for this research is his focus on all types of semiosis, that is, he does not intend to study just written language, but also other types of language, such as visual language. Many of the articles in the corpus are accompanied by pictures which can represent a positive or negative image of a political party or leader as well. Therefore the CDA in this research will also give a brief analysis of the images used in the news articles.
This research will analyse the aspects mentioned in the previous paragraphs both quantitatively and qualitatively. The first part of the analysis, the quantitative analysis, includes counting the different nominalisations that appear in an article and how many of those have a positive connotation, a negative or a neutral one. It also means counting how often one nominalisation appears in the same article and indicating whether that nominalisation reflects on UKIP or on Nigel Farage. Nominalisations, as mentioned above, not only include the terms or titles used to refer to the party or its leader, but also any other association. For example, in DMa1 (The Daily Mail article 1) 8 different nominalisations were found, 4 of them with a positive connotation, 4 of them with a negative one. The nominalisation ‘Mr Farage’ was used 6 times and can be labelled as positive because ‘Mister’ implicates a level of respect. When talking about Farage’s wife, the author preferred the term ‘his German wife’ 5 times. This is labelled as a negative reference since the author clearly chooses to emphasize the fact that Farage’s wife is German despite the anti-European character of his party.

The second aspect of the quantitative analysis is that of framing which, in this research, means counting the number of positive and negative (or neutral) quotations or utterances of the party’s leader or its members or from others about the party. In order to get a clear view of the balance between positive and negative quotations the words of each quotation will be counted. For example, DMa7 contains 11 quotations, 6 of which reflect positively on UKIP or Nigel Farage, 4 of which negatively and 1 of which was labelled as neutral. The positive quotations make up of 464 words, the negative quotations of 18 words, and the neutral one of 2 words. An example from a positive quotation from DMa7 is the following:

They called him a Right-wing extremist, a nutter, away with the fairies, he’ll never get anywhere and what happens? They won one by-election, a schoolmistress way out West, who resisted every bribe and temptation to rejoin the Conservative Party. (The Daily Mail, 26 May 2014)

This quotation can be labelled positive for UKIP because it speaks against the party’s critics and mentions the party’s success in a by-election. An example of a negative quotation from DMa7 is one cited from David Cameron who calls UKIP members “fruitcakes, loonies and closet racists” (The Daily Mail, 26 May 2014). The fact that they repeat a quote that speaks negatively of UKIP, its members or its leader is considered negative for the party and thus labelled as such.

The results of the quantitative analysis of the nominalisations and the quotations can be found in appendix 4,5,6 and 7 respectively and in the corresponding excel files. The articles in those
files are referred to with the codes as explained before in this section. The nominalisations and how many times they appear in the article, are listed per article. The total number of nominalisations can be found below each article in a different colour. They are also divided into three tables, indicating whether they reflect positively (+), negatively(-) or neutrally(?). The letter ‘U’ or ‘N’ appears after each nominalisation to indicate whether it reflects on UKIP or on Nigel Farage. The quotations were counted for each article as well. The list also shows how many of the quotations reflect positively (+), negatively (-) or neutrally (?) and how many words those three categories are each given in total per article.

The second part of the analysis, the qualitative analysis, consists of examining the discursive strategy ‘predication’ from Ruth Wodak’s approach to CDA, as well as studying articles’ headlines and images following the example of Norman Fairclough’s approach. The first aspect of the qualitative analysis examines the articles’ headlines. Headlines are the first to be read and tend to give an impression of the tone that is set for the rest of the article. Headlines can reflect positively or negatively, or both, on a party or its leader. The headline of G1, for example, is “Ukip is the party with most reasons to be cheerful ahead of European elections”. This headline is considered positive because it acknowledges the probable success of the UKIP in the upcoming elections. Headlines can also be both positive and negative. G5, for example, heads “Ukip likely to come out top in European elections, warn Hain and Tebbit”. This headline starts on a positive note but ends with a negative aspect, that is the term ‘warn’, which implies UKIP’s probable success is something to be warned of. An overview of all headlines can be found in appendix 8.

The second aspect is the analysis of images used in the articles. Both images on UKIP and Nigel Farage and images on the mainstream parties and its leaders will be examined. The analysis will discuss whether some images reflect positively or negatively on the party or the leader in question. Many of the articles studied adopt the same kind of images of the parties and its leader. Appendix 9 shows a list of which images can be found in which articles.

The third and final aspect of the qualitative analysis is predication, which refers to several recurring themes which often lead to the use of stereotypes by newspapers. When reading through to the articles a selection of three of those recurring themes or stereotypes was made (overview in appendix 10):

- UKIP and Nigel Farage are racist
- UKIP members are dubious
- Nigel Farage and UKIP tend to be popular with the working class voters
The first two stereotypes of this list are considered negative, the third stereotype can either reflect positively or negatively on the party and its leader. An example of the negative stereotype “UKIP and Nigel Farage are racist” is the party’s immigration campaign which newspapers tend to call racist. The Daily Mirror, for example, confirms this stereotype by mentioning the following in DMi6:

Critics say the posters, which cost UKIP £1.5million and were paid for by millionaire former Conservative party donor Paul Sykes, resemble those once produced by the British National Party. (The Daily Mirror, 21 April 2014)

The paper compares UKIP’s immigration campaign to that of the far right British National Party and thereby confirms the stereotype of their campaign being racist.

The results of the qualitative analysis will primarily be used in the next chapter to discuss some remarkable results that either confirm the answers to the research questions provided by the quantitative analysis or that contradict them.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Quantitative analysis

The following figure gives an overview of the results of the number of positive, negative or neutral nominalisations as well as of the number of words given to either positive, negative or neutral quotations in articles on UKIP as well as in articles on the supported mainstream parties. The last column indicates the share of all four newspapers together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DMa</th>
<th>DMi</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.35%</td>
<td>31.74%</td>
<td>29.13%</td>
<td>12.18%</td>
<td>25.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.74%</td>
<td>55.65%</td>
<td>66.97%</td>
<td>80.17%</td>
<td>66.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDHi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DMa</th>
<th>DMi</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.55%</td>
<td>39.02%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.53%</td>
<td>56.91%</td>
<td>75.76%</td>
<td>82.73%</td>
<td>71.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CDMa</th>
<th>LDHi</th>
<th>CDT</th>
<th>LDG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.12%</td>
<td>26.81%</td>
<td>40.09%</td>
<td>47.71%</td>
<td>42.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.26%</td>
<td>54.73%</td>
<td>29.06%</td>
<td>39.82%</td>
<td>37.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.62%</td>
<td>18.46%</td>
<td>30.85%</td>
<td>12.47%</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDHi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Overall results of the nominalisations and quotations analysis

The first research question is “To what extent are general news articles biased in the coverage of UKIP and Nigel Farage, compared to the coverage of a mainstream party?” Examining the last column of figure 1, the total share of all four papers together, the results of the nominalisations show that 66.88 % of the references in general news articles on UKIP or Nigel Farage are objective compared to 71.98 % of neutral references in articles on the supported mainstream parties. This means that general news articles on UKIP or Farage are slightly more biased in their nominalisations, either positively or negatively, than articles on the supported mainstream parties. The results of the quotations analysis, on the other hand, show that general news articles on the mainstream parties give more room to biased quotations (positively or...
negatively), with only 14.93% neutral quotations, compared to articles on UKIP or Farage, with 20.51% neutral quotations.

Examining some papers separately, the Daily Mirror especially proves to be more negative in its nominalisations in articles on UKIP or Farage (12.61%) than in articles on the Labour Party (4.07%). One of the negative nominalisations the Mirror uses, for example, is: “UKIP: Racist jibes, anti-gay rants, derogatory remarks about women and anti-foreign propaganda” (DMi8). The paper’s coverage is also in line with the hypothesis when looking at the quotation results, by giving largely more room to negative quotations in articles on UKIP or Farage (54.73%) than to negative quotations in articles on Labour (29.87%). In DMi7 a protester says the following about UKIP:

I think UKIP are disgraceful and blatantly racist. It's just breeding hatred. Unfortunately some people find these buffoon characters appealing. They need to see past this very clever mask and see Nigel Farage for what he is. (The Daily Mirror, 1 May 2014)

The Daily Telegraph coverage, on the other hand, refutes the hypothesis by referring even more positively to UKIP or Farage (29.13%) than to the Conservative Party (18.18%), the party it is said to be sympathetic towards. It refers to UKIP, for example, with “the biggest challenge to Britain’s main parties for decades” (DT10).

The second research question is “What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of right-leaning papers and that of left-leaning papers?”.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N UKIP</th>
<th>RIGHT</th>
<th>LEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>29.74%</td>
<td>21.96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
<td>10.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>65.86%</td>
<td>67.91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Party x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>21.87%</td>
<td>23.11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>74.15%</td>
<td>69.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q UKIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>47.11%</td>
<td>37.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.16%</td>
<td>47.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25.74%</td>
<td>15.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Party x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>62.15%</td>
<td>57.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.99%</td>
<td>29.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16.87%</td>
<td>12.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Results of nominalisations and quotations of left- and right-leaning titles on UKIP and on the supported mainstream parties

The nominalisations show that, although both the right- and left-leaning press refer more positively than negatively to UKIP or Nigel Farage, the right-leaning press does use even more positive and less negative nominalisations than the left-leaning press does. Looking at the references to the supported mainstream parties, left-leaning titles are indeed slightly more positive about their mainstream party (23.11\%) than about UKIP (21.96\%), and less negative about the mainstream party (7.07\%) than about UKIP (10.13\%). The results of the right-leaning titles are surprising as they use even more positive nominalisations for UKIP or Farage (29.74\%) than for the mainstream parties they are sympathetic towards (21.87\%). The right-leaning press uses about as many negative references for their mainstream parties as they do for UKIP. The most significant result between right- and left-leaning titles examining the quotations is that of the words given to negative quotations in articles on UKIP or Nigel Farage. Right-leaning press gives 27.16\% of the total words of quotations to negative ones, compared to 47.28\% in articles on UKIP of the left-leaning press, confirming the hypothesis that left-leaning titles are more negative towards UKIP or Farage than right-leaning titles.
Comparing, for example, the Daily Mail (right-leaning title) to the Guardian (left-leaning title), there is indeed a difference in bias. The Daily Mail refers largely more positively to UKIP or Farage (30.35%) than the Guardian does (12.18%). Looking at the quotations, the hypothesis is confirmed as well, with the Daily Mail giving less room to negative quotations about UKIP or Farage (25.26%) than the Guardian (39.82%). In G4, for example, the Guardian quotes a student commenting on UKIP:

Ukip have come along today and are giving easy answers to the fears that people have, whipping up racism against migrants and people who come to this country. They're using that to gain political advantage out of a horrendous situation. I don't think Farage believes a word he says. (The Guardian, 22 April 2014)

The third research question is “What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of the quality press and that of the popular press?”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N UKIP</th>
<th>Popular</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>31.05%</td>
<td>20.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.76%</td>
<td>5.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>60.20%</td>
<td>73.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Party x</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>32.29%</td>
<td>12.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>64.72%</td>
<td>79.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q UKIP</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>40.47%</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.99%</td>
<td>34.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19.54%</td>
<td>21.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Party x</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>56.73%</td>
<td>63.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.91%</td>
<td>28.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21.36%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Results of nominalisations and quotations of popular and quality titles on UKIP and on the supported mainstream parties

The hypothesis says popular press is expected to be more biased than quality press. The results of the nominalisations confirm that, with the quality titles referring more objectively to UKIP or Nigel Farage (73.57%) than the popular titles (60.20%). Quality titles also use more neutral terms when referring to the supported mainstream parties (79.25%) compared to the popular
titles (64.72%). Looking at the quotations about UKIP or Farage, however, there is little difference between popular and quality press. They both seem to be giving a similar amount of room to positive, negative and neutral quotations, meaning the popular press is not particularly more biased than the quality press in its quotations about UKIP or Farage. And when looking at the quotations about the supported mainstream parties, the hypothesis is even contradicted with the quality titles giving less room to neutral quotations (8.50%) than the popular titles (21.36%).

Comparing, for example, the Daily Mirror (popular) and the Daily Telegraph (quality), the nominalisation results (figure 1) show that the Daily Mirror refers indeed less objectively to UKIP or Nigel Farage (55.65%) than the Daily Telegraph does (66.97%). The quotations also confirm the hypothesis, with the Daily Telegraph giving more room to objective quotations about UKIP or Farage (30.85%) than the Daily Mirror (18.46%).

The fourth and final research question is “What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of UKIP and of Nigel Farage?”. Due to the extent of the research results, the difference in coverage of UKIP and that of Nigel Farage will only be based on nominalisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DMa</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>84.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMi</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>39.39%</td>
<td>25.76%</td>
<td>34.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>24.07%</td>
<td>20.37%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>54.72%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>41.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>36.73%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>54.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>39.06%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>51.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
<td>18.95%</td>
<td>71.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>44.96%</td>
<td>12.23%</td>
<td>42.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>19.27%</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
<td>66.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Results of nominalisations used for UKIP and for Nigel Farage for each newspaper
Examining the average result (of the four papers together), general news articles do refer more positively to Nigel Farage (44.96%) than to UKIP (19.27), confirming the hypothesis. Especially the Daily Mail reports more positively on Farage (46.67%) than on UKIP (6.82%). When referring to UKIP, the Daily Mail appears to be preferring neutral nominalisations (84.09%). Also the Guardian adopts 39.06% of positive nominalisations for Farage, compared to only 9.47% positive references to UKIP. Remarkably, the Daily Mirror, left-leaning and popular, refers quite positively Nigel Farage (39.39%) but also to UKIP (24.7%).

The following figure will give an overview of how the research questions can be answered after the quantitative results:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Quantitative results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To what extent are general news articles biased in the coverage of UKIP and Nigel Farage, compared to the coverage of a mainstream party? | Nominalisations: general news articles on UKIP or Nigel Farage are more biased than articles on the supported mainstream parties  
Quotations: general news articles on UKIP or Nigel Farage are not more biased, on the contrary, they are even less biased than articles on the mainstream parties |
| What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of right-leaning papers and that of left-leaning papers? | Nominalisations: both right- and left-leaning press report more positively than negatively on UKIP or Nigel Farage, the right-leaning press does so even more  
Quotations: right-leaning press reports more positively on UKIP or Nigel Farage and left-leaning press more negatively |
| What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of the quality press and that of the popular press? | Nominalisations: general news articles on UKIP or Nigel Farage of the popular press are more biased, positively or negatively, than those of the quality press  
Quotations: general news articles on UKIP or Nigel Farage of the popular press are not particularly more biased, positively or negatively, than those of the quality press |
| What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of UKIP and of Nigel Farage? | Nominalisations: all four newspapers studied report more positively on Nigel Farage than on UKIP |
3.2 Qualitative analysis

The first aspect of the qualitative analysis are the general news articles’ headlines on UKIP or Nigel Farage and on the supported mainstream parties. An overview of all articles’ headlines can be found in appendix 8. The first research question seems to be hard to answer with qualitative results, firstly, because it asks to what extent articles on UKIP or Farage are more biased compared to articles on the supported mainstream party. Without numbers it is rather hard to say which articles are ‘more biased (positively or negatively)’. Secondly, very few of the headlines can be labelled ‘neutral’, they all seem to reflect either positively or negatively on the party in question. The results seem to differ for each paper. The Daily Mail results cannot confirm the hypothesis as its headlines are positively biased in both the articles on UKIP or Farage and the articles on the Conservative Party. The Daily Mirror is also rather biased in both cases, negatively in articles on UKIP and positively in articles on the Labour Party. The headline of DMi11, for example, “Nearly 38% of voters UNAWARE European elections take place on Thursday”, can be considered negative because the term ‘unaware’ in capitals implies that if UKIP won the European Parliamentary Elections it would not be representative because a large part of the population is not informed of the elections. The Daily Telegraph adopts both positive and negative headlines on UKIP or Farage, and mostly positive headlines on the Conservative Party. The Guardian, finally, is mostly negative in its headlines on UKIP, and both positive and negative in its headlines on the Liberal Democrats. The headline of LDG3, for example, says “Nick Clegg rejects call to quit if Lib Dems wiped out in European elections”. This headline is considered negative because ‘Nick Clegg rejects call to quit’ does not imply some form of determination, but it rather depicts Nick Clegg as a stubborn politician still willing to lead the party despite calls from his own party to quit.

Comparing the headlines of the left- and right-leaning press, the results are similar to those of the quantitative analysis. Left-leaning papers do indeed start off their articles with more negative headlines. The headlines of the Daily Mirror and the Guardian are indeed mostly negative, those of the right-leaning press are both negative and positive (Daily Telegraph) or mostly positive (Daily Mail).

Comparing headlines of the popular press to those of the quality press, the results correspond to those of the nominalisations, that is, the popular press is more biased, positively or negatively, than the quality press. The Daily Mail and the Daily Mirror have either positive or negative headlines, while the quality titles, the Daily Telegraph and the Guardian are fifty-fifty in some cases. For example, the Telegraph is neither overly positive nor overly negative in its
headlines on UKIP or Farage. DT1, for example, heads “European elections: Conservatives face poll humiliation as one in three Tory voters defects to Ukip”, considered positive for UKIP. The headline of DT11, on the other hand, says “British Asian Ukip youth leader quits 'racist' and 'terrifying' Ukip”, considered negative for the party. The same goes for the Guardian with its headlines on the Liberal Democrats.

The analysis of the headlines did not allow to provide results for the fourth research question (UKIP versus Nigel Farage). No division between headlines on UKIP and headlines on Farage was made due to the extent of the results already acquired.

The second qualitative aspect are the images used in the general news articles. Appendix 9 shows a list of which images can be found in which articles. The images seem to confirm the hypothesis to the first research question. All four papers show more bias in their images of Farage compared to images of other party leaders, using several less serious images of Farage compared to the neutral ones of the mainstream party leaders. The articles on UKIP or Nigel Farage often include images of Farage laughing heartily or with a pint of beer, while pictures of other leaders are mostly neutral or depict them giving interviews or speeches or smiling modestly. The two images below taken from articles of the Daily Mail illustrate the difference.

![Left image: 27 May 2014 (DMa9), right image: 27 May 2014 (CDMa3)](image)

Nevertheless, the frequent use of images of Farage smiling or with a pint of beer can be interpreted as an attempt to depict Farage as a more ‘affable’ politician, a politician that stands more closely to the people, in which case it reflects positively on Farage.
There is little difference in the use of images between left-and right-leaning press. It is possible right-leaning titles introduce the images to depict Farage as an ‘affable’ politician, as mentioned above, and left-leaning titles do so to depict him as a less serious politician, but this research has no evidence to support such a statement. There also seems to be no difference in the images of the popular and quality press. The quality titles do seem to use fewer images than the popular ones, but no quantitative analysis of this aspect was made due to the extensive results this research already provided.

Very few articles use images of UKIP, the party itself. Most images in articles on UKIP or Farage depict the party leader. The images that do reflect on the party, mostly reflect negatively. The following image is an example taken from DMa3.

![Image: 21 May 2014 (DMa3)](image)

The third and final aspect of the qualitative analysis is predication, referring to recurring themes, often turned into stereotypes, on UKIP and Nigel Farage. In section 2.2 Method, we discussed the three recurring themes selected. This research did not study stereotypes on the supported mainstream parties because they would have been taken from only 5 articles, which could have led to a distorted conclusion. Only 5 articles on the mainstream parties were introduced into the corpus because the prime focus of this research is on UKIP and Nigel Farage. This section will therefore not contribute to the answer to the first research question.

The hypothesis to the second research question says right-leaning titles are expected to be more positive about UKIP and Nigel Farage and left-leaning titles more negative. The quantitative results showed they are either both mostly positive (nominalisations) or the right-leaning press is indeed more positive than the left-leaning press (quotations). The results of the analysis of the recurring themes correspond to those of the quotations analysis. Although the right-leaning
titles also introduce negative ‘stereotypes’, the left-leaning titles do so more intensely. The Daily Mirror seems to focus particularly strongly on the racist image of UKIP and Nigel Farage, and the Guardian appears to focus on the dubious character of the party’s members:

(…) the decision of a prominent Asian woman to quit the party saying it had “descended into a form of racist populism” (…) Sanya-Jeet Thandi, who was chairwoman of UKIP’s London youth wing, said: “The direction the party is going is terrifying.” (The Daily Mirror, 17 May 2014)

At the weekend, Ukip became embroiled in a fresh racism row following revelations that William Henwood, a local election candidate for the party in Enfield, north London, had said Lenny Henry should emigrate to a "black country" after the comedian and actor suggested ethnic minorities were poorly represented on British television. (The Guardian, 27 April 2014)

One remarkable example of a negative recurring theme by a right-leaning title is that of the Daily Telegraph in DT3:

He thinks he can do it on the back of working class voters, many of whom have never voted Tory, angered by immigration and disaffected with politicians who speak a language they don't recognise. Academics have dubbed Ukip’s base the “left behind” voters – typically older, typically male, typically northern, less likely to be university educated, who feel they no longer recognise or have a role in modern Britain. (The Daily Telegraph, 23 April 2014)

The results of the quantitative section for the third research question (popular versus quality press) say popular titles are more biased, positively or negatively (nominalisations) or popular titles are not particularly more biased (quotations). The examination of the three recurring themes shows that all papers make use of biased themes (positive or negative), and that the popular titles, similar to the results of the quotation analysis, are not particularly more biased. The Daily Mirror does focus on the ‘racist image of UKIP and Nigel Farage’ in several articles, but the Guardian also frequently mentions ‘UKIP’s dubious candidates’. A qualitative analysis of the recurring themes does not seem to prove popular titles are more biased, positively or negatively, than quality ones.

Looking at the fourth and final research question (UKIP versus Nigel Farage), the recurring themes do mostly seem to reflect on the party or its members rather than on Nigel Farage. A fourth possible recurring theme could have been Nigel Farage’s presentation as an ‘affable’ man, but, as mentioned in the section on the images, it would be hard to tell if the intention is truly to depict him as affable rather than to depict him as a less serious politician (since the theme mostly would have contained statements on Farage’s drinking or his appearances in bars). Nevertheless, the analysis of the three themes selected does confirm the hypothesis that
the British press seems to be more negative about UKIP and more positive about Nigel Farage considering the negative stereotypes surrounding UKIP are emphasized more strongly.
4 CONCLUSION

Both the results of the quantitative analysis and the qualitative analysis show that not all research questions can be answered unambiguously. The hypothesis to the first research question, “general news articles on UKIP or Nigel Farage are more biased than articles on the supported mainstream parties”, is supported by some of the aspects examined, but not by others. The analysis of the nominalisations and of the images shows general news articles on UKIP or Farage are indeed more biased than articles on the mainstream parties. The quotations analysis, on the other hand, indicates the opposite, meaning articles on the mainstream parties are more biased.

The second research question is “What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of right-leaning papers and of left-leaning papers?”. The hypothesis was that right-leaning titles tend to be more positive about UKIP and left-leaning titles more negative. This hypothesis seems to be confirmed. The analysis of nominalisations shows both right- and left-leaning titles are rather positive, but the right-leaning titles are even more positive. The analysis of quotations and headlines confirms right-leaning titles are more positive and left-leaning titles more negative. The analysis of the recurring themes or ‘stereotypes’ shows right-leaning titles also introduce negative stereotypes, but emphasize them less than left-leaning titles do.

The hypothesis to the third research question is general news articles on UKIP or Farage from the popular press tend to be more biased, positively or negatively, than articles from the quality press. The aspects examined do seem to confirm that hypothesis, although some do so more strongly than others. The analysis of the nominalisations and the headlines concludes popular press is indeed more biased, positively or negatively, than the quality press. The analysis of the quotations shows popular press is more biased, but compared to the quality press the difference is rather small. The results of the recurring themes or ‘stereotypes’ are not conclusive, as both popular and quality press introduce negative stereotypes, the one not particularly emphasizing them more than the other.

The fourth and final research question is “What are, in terms of bias, the similarities and/or contrasts in the coverage of UKIP and of Nigel Farage?”. The hypothesis says the British press tends to report more positively on Nigel Farage and more negatively on UKIP. The results of the nominalisations analysis suggest that hypothesis is correct. With regard to the images and recurring themes or ‘stereotypes’, the results should be handled more carefully. The Results chapter mentions if the images try to depict Farage as an ‘affable’ man, rather than a less serious
politician, the hypothesis can indeed be confirmed. This research has, however, not found a way to determine the papers’ intentions with certainty with regard to this aspect. The analysis of ‘stereotypes’ is confronted with the same uncertainty regarding the intentions of depicting Farage. Nevertheless, the negative stereotypes surrounding UKIP are more numerous and emphasized more strongly, confirming the hypothesis the British press is more negative about UKIP than about Nigel Farage.

This research seems to confirm some of the assumptions about journalism and objectivity, such as the different treatment of topics by left- and right-leaning press or by popular and quality press. At the same time this research has shown those differences are not always as strong as expected and critical nuancing is necessary. This research has chosen to focus on the UK Independence Party, a controversial party, meaning biased opinions, either positive or negative, are to be expected perhaps. Further research on this subject could be interesting. It would be interesting to see if there is also a difference between the coverage of two of the mainstream parties. This research also made a selection of aspects to study bias in newspapers, but there are many more aspects that can be studied and which could also provide interesting results.
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6 APPENDIX

6.1 Appendix 1: Survey of articles on UKIP and the supported mainstream party during the European Parliamentary Elections of 2014 (April-June) per paper

The Daily Mail's general news articles during the European Election period of 2014

The Daily Mirror's general news articles during the European Election period of 2014
The Daily Telegraph's general news articles during the European Election period of 2014

April
May
June

UKIP
The Conservative Party

The Guardian's general news articles during the European Election period of 2014

April
May
June

UKIP
The Liberal Democrats
6.2  **Appendix 2:** Survey of the total number of online articles on UKIP during the European Elections of 2014 of all four papers studied.

![Bar Chart: General news articles on UKIP during the European Election period of 2014](chart.png)
6.3 **Appendix 3: Number of articles selected from the total for each newspaper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Number of articles on UKIP</th>
<th>Number of articles on party supported by paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Mirror</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Mail</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Appendix 4: Quantitative analysis: number of nominalisations in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DMa</th>
<th>DMI</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>30.35%</td>
<td>31.74%</td>
<td>29.13%</td>
<td>12.18%</td>
<td>25.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>64.74%</td>
<td>55.65%</td>
<td>66.97%</td>
<td>80.17%</td>
<td>66.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CDMA</th>
<th>LDMA</th>
<th>CDT</th>
<th>LDG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>25.55%</td>
<td>39.02%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>72.53%</td>
<td>56.91%</td>
<td>75.76%</td>
<td>82.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Appendix 5: Quantitative analysis: number of nominalisations on Nigel Farage and on UKIP in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DMa (+)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>84.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DMi (+)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>39.39%</td>
<td>25.76%</td>
<td>34.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>24.07%</td>
<td>20.37%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DT (+)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>54.72%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>41.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>36.73%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>54.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G (+)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>39.06%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>51.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
<td>18.95%</td>
<td>71.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (+)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Farage</td>
<td>44.96%</td>
<td>12.23%</td>
<td>42.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP</td>
<td>19.27%</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
<td>66.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.6 Appendix 6: Quantitative analysis: framing: number of quotations in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKIP</th>
<th>DMa</th>
<th>DMi</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>37,81%</td>
<td>18,67%</td>
<td>31,36%</td>
<td>39,17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,51%</td>
<td>64,00%</td>
<td>36,44%</td>
<td>44,17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>17,68%</td>
<td>17,33%</td>
<td>32,20%</td>
<td>16,67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party x</th>
<th>CDMa</th>
<th>LDMi</th>
<th>CDT</th>
<th>LDG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>50,00%</td>
<td>40,74%</td>
<td>48,49%</td>
<td>52,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,18%</td>
<td>37,04%</td>
<td>33,33%</td>
<td>36,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>31,82%</td>
<td>22,22%</td>
<td>18,18%</td>
<td>12,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.7 Appendix 7: Quantitative analysis: framing: number of words given to quotations in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKIP</th>
<th>DMa</th>
<th>DMi</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>54,12%</td>
<td>26,81%</td>
<td>40,09%</td>
<td>47,71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,26%</td>
<td>54,73%</td>
<td>29,06%</td>
<td>39,82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>20,62%</td>
<td>18,46%</td>
<td>30,85%</td>
<td>12,47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party x</th>
<th>CDMa</th>
<th>LDMi</th>
<th>CDT</th>
<th>LDG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>60,53%</td>
<td>52,93%</td>
<td>63,77%</td>
<td>62,78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,95%</td>
<td>29,87%</td>
<td>28,02%</td>
<td>28,45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>25,52%</td>
<td>17,20%</td>
<td>8,21%</td>
<td>8,78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8: Qualitative analysis: headlines from each newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Headlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMa</td>
<td>So, Nigel Farage, whose job is your German wife taking? Ukip leader is confronted over controversial posters by a question that hits close to home (DMa1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukip surges into lead in European election contest: Poll gives Nigel Farage's party 31% support after bruising week of controversies (DMa2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukip on course to win more than HALF of votes in some areas despite 1 in 3 voters saying Farage's party is racist (DMa3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Euroskeptics say: We're not racist (DMa4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would do a deal with the devil to get an EU vote, Farage says as he reveals plan to paper over 'cracks' in Ukip's one-man band (DMa5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukip closing in on victory: Poll puts Farage seven points ahead on day of crucial EU vote (DMa6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Now I will destroy the Tory party': In a crowing interview, Nigel Farage reveals he will quit politics... once he's got the UK out of the EU (DMa7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'It looks like we've won a great victory,' said Farage. 'Right then, where's the bar?' (DMa8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Now I'll stop Scotland splitting from the UK,' vows Farage as he says he will take on Alex Salmond over independence after Euro election triumph (DMa9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of Ukip's four million plus supporters intend to vote for them again in general election, poll reveals (DMa10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farage's plan for Britain: Tax free minimum wage, a grammar school in every town and help for the rich (DMa11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Britain isn't Britain without Farage with a pint in one hand and a mystery woman in the other': Gordon Brown mocks UKIP leader (DMa12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigel Farage facing £20,000 fine as election watchdog probes failure to declare £200,000 worth of donations to party since 2001 (DMa13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukip's voters will still back the party at the general election, casting doubt on Tory claims that supporters were 'lending' their votes to Nigel Farage (DMa14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We could have joint Tory-Ukip candidates in 2015, says Farage: Leader says some eurosceptics would be open to the idea (DMa15)

| DMi  | Nigel Farage: Nine things you DIDN'T know about the much-talked about UKIP leader (DMi1)  
|      | Nigel Farage fails to turn TV debate victory over Nick Clegg into votes (DMi2)  
|      | Watch Nigel Farage squirm under questioning about his £2m expenses on Have I Got News For You? (DMi3)  
|      | UKIP's Nigel Farage could face expenses probe after receiving EU cash to pay for office he uses RENT-FREE (DMi4)  
|      | Nigel Farage defends EU handouts: UKIP leader says he'll spend how he likes (DMi5)  
|      | Nigel Farage slammed over new UKIP anti-immigration poster campaign branded 'racist' by critics (DMi6)  
|      | EU chicken! Nigel Farage chickens out when the Mirror ruffles his feathers (DMi7)  
|      | The truth about UKIP: Racist jibes, anti-gay rants, derogatory remarks about women and anti-foreign propaganda (DMi8)  
|      | Nigel Farage news round up: Today's top stories on the controversial politician (DMi9)  
|      | UKIP European election news round up: 4 top stories from today's campaign trail (DMi10)  
|      | Nearly 38% of voters UNAWARE European elections take place on Thursday (DMi11)  
|      | UKIP is still on course to win European elections despite disastrous week for Nigel Farage (DMi12)  
|      | Nick Clegg 'clinging on' to Liberal Democrat leadership following UKIP European election triumph (DMi13)  

| DT   | European elections: Conservatives face poll humiliation as one in three Tory voters defects to Ukip (DT1)  
|      | Nigel Farage launches Ukip European election campaign in Sheffield (DT2)  
|      | Nigel Farage takes his message to the country (DT3)  

62
EU elections: German Eurosceptics snub 'ridiculous' Ukip (DT4)
Ukip might lose Euro elections because of mistaken identity, says Nigel Farage (DT5)
Ukip has torn up the map (DT6)
Nigel Farage: David Cameron will 'fall at first hurdle' in bid to reform EU (DT7)
Ukip vote in European elections no flash in pan according to new poll (DT8)
Nigel Farage: People will not vote for 'one man band' Ukip in a general election (DT9)
Ukip storms European elections (DT10)
British Asian Ukip youth leader quits 'racist' and 'terrifying' Ukip (DT11)
UKIP demands more seats in House of Lords (DT12)
Ukip is on its way to Westminster, claims Farage (DT13)

G
Ukip is the party with most reasons to be cheerful ahead of European elections (G1)
Nigel Farage rejects 'outrageous' EU expenses allegations (G2)
Nigel Farage defends Ukip's election campaign after critics call ads racist (G3)
Nigel Farage launches Ukip campaign amid criticism of 'racist' rhetoric (G4)
Ukip likely to come out top in European elections, warn Hain and Tebbit (G5)
Ukip condemned by cross-party group for running 'racist' campaign (G6)
Ukip soars to top of polls despite Farage ducking byelection battle (G7)
Ukip poll finds fans of Farage more likely to feel alienated and angry (G8)
Nigel Farage says Ukip will 'win' in European elections (G9)
Nigel Farage keeps low profile before European election results (G10)
Nigel Farage all smiles as he revels in Ukip's European election success (G11)
Nigel Farage lays out Ukip plans for schools and taxes (G12)
| **CDMa** | Cameron will call for Britain to LEAVE the European Union if he fails in bid to claw powers back from Brussels (CDMa1)  
Liars, turncoats and cowards! Top Tories blast European allies but PM gets a boost in the polls (CDMa2)  
Brussels is too big and too bossy, Cameron tells EU leaders (including Kinnock's daughter-in-law) (CDMa3)  
Newark win is blueprint for beating Ukip, boast Tories: David Cameron told to stick to 'optimistic' message after by-election win (CDMa4)  
Cameron under pressure to strike deal with Ukip as jubilant Farage boasts he's heading for Euro triumph (CDMa5) |
| **LDMi** | Ed Miliband 'on course to be Prime Minister' after big gains in marginal seats, says poll (LDMi1)  
Labour will raise minimum wage: Ed Miliband's pledge to 'significantly' boost pay (LDMi2)  
Mirror Election Poll: Ed Miliband is just a single point ahead of the Tories (LDMi3)  
Labour to toughen up on UKIP after surpassing expectations in local elections (LDMi4)  
Top Ed Miliband adviser defects to Lib Dems after describing Labour leader as "really weak" (LDMi5) |
| **CDT** | David Cameron tells Eurosceptics: trust me I get it (CDT1)  
Tories gain their first opinion poll lead for two years (CDT2)  
David Cameron: Nigel Farage wants to 'destroy' the Conservatives (CDT3)  
Trust me, no need to vote Ukip, says David Cameron (CDT4)  
Tories face coming third behind Ukip in Euro poll (CDT5) |
| **LDG** | Nick Clegg aims to stay on as Lib Dem leader through next parliament (LDG1) |
| Clegg launches Lib Dems as pro-EU anti-Ukip party for European elections (LDG2) |
| Nick Clegg rejects call to quit if Lib Dems wiped out in European elections (LDG3) |
| Nigel Farage's mask is slipping, revealing his nasty views, says Clegg (LDG4) |
| Nick Clegg: now is not the time for me to resign (LDG5) |
### Appendix 9: Qualitative analysis: frequently recurring images

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Article image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DMa       | picture of protesters calling Nigel Farage ‘racist scum’ (DMa5)  

picture of Farage smiling ‘stupidly(??)’ (DMa6, DMa8, DMa9, DMa15)  

picture of Farage with a large pint of beer (DMa7, DMa8, DMa10, DMa12, DMa13, DMa14) |
| DMi       | picture of Nigel Farage with a funny face (DMi1, DMi5, DMi6)  

picture of Farage with a pint of beer (DMi1)  

picture of Farage smiling ‘stupidly(??)’ (DMi10, DMi11, DMi13) |
| DT        | picture of Farage smiling ‘stupidly(??)’ (DT1)  

picture of Farage with a pint of beer (DT3, DT13) |
| G         | picture of Farage smiling ‘stupidly(??)’ (G1)  

picture of Nigel Farage with a funny face (G2, G5, G7, G13) |
| CDMa      | picture of David Cameron smiling in the Commons (CDMa2)  

picture of David Cameron giving an interview (CDMa1, CDMa3)  

picture of David Cameron looking seriously (CDMa3, CDMa5)  

picture of David Cameron smiling (CDMa4) |
| LDMi      | picture of Ed Miliband smiling (LDMi1)  

picture of Ed Miliband making a funny face? (LDMi2)  

picture of Ed Miliband giving an interview (LDMi4)  

picture of Ed Miliband with a copy of The Sun (LDMi5) |
| CDT       | picture of David Cameron smiling (CDT1)  

picture of David Cameron giving a speech (CDT4) |
| LDG       | picture of Nick Clegg giving a speech (LDG1, LDG3)  

picture of Nick Clegg smiling (LDG4)  

picture of Nick Clegg giving an interview (LDG5) |
### 6.10 Appendix 10: Qualitative analysis: predication; recurring positive or negative themes or ‘stereotypes’ for each newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Stereotypes/ recurring themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DMa       | UKIP and Nigel Farage are racist (DMa1, DMa2, DMa4, DMa5, DMa6)  
            UKIP members are dubious (DMa2, DMa4)  
            UKIP and Nigel Farage are popular with the working class (DMa12) |
| DMi       | UKIP and Nigel Farage are racist (DMi6, DMi7, DMi8, DMi9, DMi10, DMi11, DMi12)  
            UKIP members are dubious (DMi8) |
| DT        | UKIP and Nigel Farage are racist  (DT2, DT3, DT4, DT9, DT11)  
            UKIP members are dubious (DT11)  
            UKIP and Nigel Farage are popular with the working class (DT3, DT6) |
| G         | UKIP and Nigel Farage are racist (G3, G4, G5, G6, G7, G8, G9)  
            UKIP members are dubious (G5, G6, G7, G8)  
            UKIP and Nigel Farage are popular with the working class (G1) |