

1. Project title and abstract

Title: Popularization and Personalization in the Dutch Democracy

Abstract: The aim of the proposed research program is to map and explain the occurrence of popularization and personalization in the Dutch democracy since the beginning of Dutch television journalism in 1956 and to study whether and how these processes affect citizens' political trust and opinions.

2. Main applicant

Prof. dr. Liesbet van Zoonen
The Amsterdam School of Communication Research, ASCOR
Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences
University of Amsterdam
Kloveniersburgwal 48
1012 CX Amsterdam
Telephone: +31-20-5253906/5253907
Email: E.A.vanZoonen@uva.nl

3. Co-applicants

Dr. Dick Houtman
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Social Sciences
Erasmus University Rotterdam
P.O. Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands
Telephone: +31-10-4082118/2085
Email: houtman@fsw.eur.nl

Dr. Peter Achterberg
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Social Sciences
Erasmus University Rotterdam
P.O. Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands
Telephone: +31-10-4082068/2085
Email: p.achterberg@fsw.eur.nl

4. Previous and future submissions

This research proposal has not been submitted elsewhere.

5. Institutional setting

The proposed research program Popularization and Personalization in the Dutch Democracy consists of two projects, A Historical and Cultural Analysis of Dutch Political Television Journalism, 1956-2006 (project 1, UvA) and Assessing the Consequences for Citizens' Political Trust and Opinions (project 2, EUR). The first project will be embedded in the Amsterdam School of Communications Research (ASCOR) of the University of Amsterdam. The second project will be embedded in the Department of Sociology at Erasmus University, Rotterdam, and the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research (ASSR).

6. Period of funding

December 2007 – December 2012. The first (Postdoc) project runs from December 2007 – December 2010. The second (PhD) project is informed by the preliminary findings of project 1 and hence runs from December 2008 – December 2012.

7. Composition of the research team

Member	Institutional affiliation	Role	Discipline
Van Zoonen, Mw. prof.dr. E.A.	Department of Communication Science, University of Amsterdam	Main applicant, program leader, supervisor Postdoc project 1	Communication (50500)
Houtman, Dr. D.	Department of Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam	Co-applicant, supervisor Ph.D. student project 2	Sociology (54500)
Achterberg, Dr. P.H.J.	Department of Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam	Co-applicant, co- supervisor Ph.D. student project 2	Sociology (54500)
Engbersen, Prof.dr. G.B.M.	Department of Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam	Promotor Ph.D. student project 2	Sociology (54500)
N.N.	Department of Communication Science, University of Amsterdam	Postdoc project 1	Communication (50500)
N.N.	Department of Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam	Ph.D. student project 2	Sociology (54500)

8. Thematic classification

50500 Communication, 54500 Sociology

9. Description of the proposed research

In this project we focus on the popularization and personalization in the Dutch democracy in the Netherlands. We raise two related questions:

- What forms of popularization and personalization of politics can be identified since Dutch television journalism's inception in 1956 and to what features of political and media culture can they be attributed?
- How do specific forms of popularization and personalization affect citizens' perception of politicians and their opinions, and under which circumstances do specific negative or positive effects occur?

In the past decades, these questions have bothered political leaders in the Netherlands (e.g. ANP, 2002), government advice councils (e.g. RMO, 2003), political observers (e.g. De Vries, 2003), journalists (e.g. Breedveld, 2005), policy makers (Ministerie, 2007) and other actors in the political field. Their main concern can be phrased as '*video malaise*', a label that unites academic, political and journalistic discourse in their fear about the detrimental influence of the media, and in particular television, on the quality and viability of democracy and public debate (Robinson, 1975). A publication by the national Council for Social Development (RMO, 2003), for instance, concludes that public debate has become subject to media and television logic, which have driven other 'logics' – of political parties, stable constituencies and public broadcasting – to the margins. While the Council acknowledges the crucial role of media in democracies, its main position is that media logic has transformed public debate into a spectacle of short-term scandals, and produces an obsession with personalities, rather than issues and policies. In the end, the Council claims, cynicism and distrust among citizens will be the result. In his 2003 Thorbecke lecture¹, De Vries argues similarly that the Dutch media have reduced political debate to 'one liners' and favor personalities, drama and conflict over a substantial discussion of issues. Competition for audiences would have forced public broadcasters to imitate the approach of commercial broadcasters leading to pack-journalism and inflated hypes. The most extensive and best argued Dutch/Flemish version of the video malaise thesis can be found in Elchardus' (2003) book *De dramademocratie*. Elchardus argues that political journalism increasingly frames political conflict as a story of individual victims and perpetrators, heroes and villains whose battles need to be solved by legal and political institutions. When these institutions live up to their task, a happy end follows; when they fail, distrust and cynicism is the result. Lacking in these ritualized accounts, Elchardus writes, is an analysis of the structural forces underlying specific conflicts and a balanced examination of lasting policies and solutions.

Video malaise perspectives also govern the international political communication literature, also blaming television primarily for the decline of political knowledge, decreasing voter turnout, the reduction of trust in government and other public institutions, the degeneration of public debate and the viability of democracy in general. Following authors like Benjamin Barber and Neil Postman, Meyer (2002, p. x), for instance, writes "that the citizens of television societies may be rapidly losing their faculties of political judgment as a result of stage-managed, entertainment oriented presentation of events." Video malaise authors identify two trends of political television journalism as problematic: popularization and personalization. They consider *popularization* to consist of sound bite interviews, 'horse race' coverage, the appearance of politicians in non-political and entertainment settings, and the authority of the vox populi (Capella and Jamieson, 1997). *Personalization* refers to a focus of tv journalists on the personalities and appearance of political candidates, human interest stories about

¹ A yearly prestigious event organised by the Thorbecke association, which is named after the 19th century founding father of the Dutch constitution and parliamentary democracy.

them, their private lives and affairs or scandals (Sparks, 1992). Video malaise authors contend that popularization and personalization have come to dominate political coverage at the costs of substantial treatment of issues and ideologies (e.g. Hart, 1994; Scheuer, 2001; Sennett, 1974). They contrast these trends to a more ideal era in which print journalism was the dominant form of political communication, and in which the codes and conventions of print journalism informed television journalism as a serious form of news reporting (Postman, 1985). Market forces in the media industries would have forced political television journalism into the entertainment arena and would have brought popularization and personalization to the fore. These developments are seen as most prominent in the United States, but other countries allegedly have come under the influence of popularization and personalization as well, as underscored by the usage of the term *Americanization* when these trends are identified outside of the US (e.g. Van der Doelen and Korsten, 1994; Plasser, 2005).

Video malaise perspectives have been criticized from various angles, but two sets of arguments are central. A first set of arguments concerns its proliferation as a worldwide phenomenon brought about by developments in the United States. Brants (1998) showed that the idea that popularization and personalization are inexorable and ubiquitous phenomena in television journalism is incorrect. He found European television journalism to be mostly serious and deliberative, and also observed that politicians in Europe have not overwhelmingly surrendered to television logic. His study was refuted by Blumler (1999) who argued that Americanization is an unmistakable trend in political television journalism, producing a crisis of civic communication, dumbing down citizens and politicians alike. Several authors have demonstrated, however, that the term Americanization wrongly puts the blame for these trends in the US ignoring particular national traditions of popularized and personalized politics. Te Velde (2002), for instance, has shown how political movements and parties in the Netherlands have flourished since the end of the 19th century partly because of the purposely-exploited appeal of charismatic leaders like Thorbecke, Kuyper, Colijn, Drees and Den Uyl. Whether popularization and personalization are recent and virtually omnipresent phenomena with American origins remains a highly contested issue, in short.

A second set of arguments says that, regardless of national particularities, there is no empirical support for the thesis that citizens become less informed and apathetic *because* of television. Newton (2003) argues that video malaise authors grossly overstate the influence of television, especially in comparison with other everyday influences on citizens, such as the family, peers, education and work. The most extensive and empirically substantiated refutation of the video malaise thesis comes from Norris (2000). She builds her case by comparing official statistics, survey data, newspaper and television coverage from the 29 OECD countries. Norris demonstrates not only that there is no empirical evidence that citizens become less informed and apathetic *because* of television, but that – on the contrary – “those most exposed to the news media and party campaigns consistently proved more knowledgeable, not less; more trusting towards government and the political system, not less; and more likely to participate in election campaigns, not less” (Norris, 2000).² Norris suggests, by way of conclusion, that current political communications produce a virtuous circle in which politically active citizens are likely to be much more intense consumers of political information, both from newspapers and television, than their less interested fellows. While their specific uses of political communications enhance their engagement in civic and political life, Norris claims, the data from the 29 OECD countries do not show a reverse process of the apathetic becoming more apathetic. Supporting Norris’ findings are other studies that have shown that well educated and highly interested voters show more interest in personal features of candidates than others (e.g. Miller et al., 1986). Another group of authors contends, however, that it is not (lack of) political interest or education that explains interest in personal features of candidates, but that these only come into play when they

² Quoted from the electronic version of Norris (2000).

<http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~pnorris/Acrobat/VIRTUOUS/Conclusions.pdf>, p.4. Last accessed March 9, 2007.

resemble those of their constituencies; women and blacks in particular would be prone to personal voting (e.g. Cutler, 2002).

Dutch empirical data have also questioned the different elements of the video malaise argument. Successive studies have shown that news coverage of Dutch election campaigns occasionally focuses on personalities, conflict and scandal, but by and large treats issues and policy debate (Brants and Van Praag, 1995, 2000, 2005; Kleinnijenhuis et al., 1998, 2003, 2007). Reviewing this body of work, and analyzing three Dutch elections (1956, 1986, 2003), Brants and Van Praag (2006) argue that there are relatively few signs of video malaise because of the strong tradition of public broadcasting values and because of the political consensus culture that “puts a break on cynical and negative reporting” (p. 39). The evidence for the video malaise claim that citizens would become more cynical and superficial because of the popularization and personalization is similarly mixed. Van Holsteyn and Irwin (1998) find that the appearance of politicians does make a difference for the way citizens judge them; yet, the effects disappear when these citizens have more information about the politicians. Kleinnijenhuis et al. (1998, 2003, 2007) consistently find that substantial coverage of campaign issues and of the party leader did affect voters and their party preference. However, the leader effect does not appear separately from the issue effects. Moreover, the authors do not find effects of non-substantial news.

As the empirical evidence for the negative effects of personalization and popularization is ambiguous, both in the national and the international context, some researchers have begun to explore possible positive effects of these processes. For instance, Street (1997), argues that politics should be seen as a form of popular culture, Coleman (2003) claims that politics has fundamental democratic lessons to learn from the success of *Big Brother*, and Jones (2005) contends that popular political comedy and talk shows provide important alternatives to elite political news sources. Van Zoonen (2005) similarly starts from the assumption that personalization and popularization are socially inclusive styles of communication that “allow for more people to perform as citizens” (p.151) and make citizenship more pleasurable and engaging. She has examined this in more detail through studies of popular forms of political communication and audience responses to them. An analysis of the appearance of Dutch political leaders in popular TV talk shows has demonstrated, for instance, that the relaxed conversational atmosphere of these programs enables politicians to talk about personal concerns and issues, with the successful political communicator capable of combining political messages with personal conversation (Van Zoonen, 2000). Subsequent analyses of audience reactions to popular and personal shows about politicians demonstrate that these evoke different kinds of political discussions that vary from reasonable and deliberative to aggressive and populist (Van Zoonen, forthcoming; Van Zoonen et al., forthcoming).

The picture emerging from this literature, is that neither the occurrence of personalization and popularization themselves, nor their negative or positive effects on citizens’ political trust and opinions have been demonstrated convincingly yet. The proposed research program therefore has a dual aim. In the first project, it aims to describe and analyze historical and current forms of popularization and personalization in Dutch television journalism in order to verify whether the term ‘video malaise’ is appropriate for the Dutch context. The second project builds on and tests the findings of project 1. It is a media-effect study that examines how the identified processes of popularization and personalization in project 1 affect citizens’ political trust and opinions. The result of this effect-analysis will (un)settle the taken for granted assumptions of the political elites interviewed in project 1 about the effects of popularization and personalization. The two projects together constitute a truly multidisciplinary study, articulating approaches from media history and media studies using (project 1) with political science and sociology (project 2).

Project 1.

A Historical and Cultural Analysis of Dutch Political Television Journalism, 1956-2006

Research problem

This project aims to provide a historical and cultural analysis of changes in political television journalism in the Netherlands. With the latter we mean all news and current affairs programs, talk shows and other genres of infotainment that deal with politics and politicians. We attempt to trace processes of popularization and personalization in particular, and describe their forms and formats, as well as explain their emergence at particular moments in time, and in particular broadcasting organizations and channels.

Elaboration of the research problem

Dutch television journalism started with the first broadcast of a daily news program, the *Journal*, on January 5, 1956. It took its inspiration from the national *Polygoon* movie news and presented a sequence of filmed events with a voice over. Only in 1961 the *Journal* started working with different news presenters (Van Liempt, 2005). Due to its organizational status as a collective product of the Dutch broadcasting organizations, the *Journal* could only bring the main news stories, but had to refrain from providing background information, interpretation and commentary. The separate broadcasting organizations made their own current affairs programs, beginning with *Brandpunt* (KRO) in 1959. In these programs critical, investigative and innovative forms of television journalism were developed, especially in the late sixties and seventies (Wijffjes, 2005). Both the *Journal* and the current affairs programs were considered 'heavy information' in the classification schemes of the broadcasters, while the talk shows of the time, such as the one of Willem (O') Duys were classified as 'light information' (Manschot, 1993). In addition, the late sixties and seventies witnessed a number of experimental and controversial programs, especially from VPRO and VARA that could not easily be considered 'journalism' but which nevertheless presented political and social commentary, for instance through satire or parody (Bank, 1989). While the late seventies and eighties were a relatively quiet period in Dutch broadcasting, the arrival of commercial television in the Netherlands in 1989, produced an upsurge of forms of television journalism that were until then relatively unknown in the Netherlands: daytime and late night talk shows like *Koffietijd* and *Barend en Van Dorp* and popularized news formats such as *Hart van Nederland* or *Editie NL*. Recently, political satire has re-emerged on Dutch television in programs such as *Kopspijkers* or *Koefnoen*.

While there is some historical work on particular aspects of these developments (e.g. Bardeel et al., 2002; Vettehen et al., 2005; Wijffjes, 2004), a systematic analysis of changes in content, form and generic conventions is lacking. From the perspective of political communication it is even more unclear how this arena of news and infotainment has enabled and disabled political actors to engage in public debate and communicate with citizens, and more generally which aspects of this arena have been and will be beneficial or detrimental to a viable democracy (although here too there have been some isolated case studies, e.g. Bank, 1991 and Prenger, 1993). In project 1 we aim to identify and articulate changes in political television journalism with these issues, by examining the processes of popularization and personalization and their impact on the communicative strategies and styles of political actors. We ask three questions in particular:

- Which processes of popularization and personalization can be identified in Dutch political television journalism from its inception in 1956?
- How are these processes related to developments in the media and political landscape?
- How have political actors adapted to these processes of personalization and popularization and how has their adjustment altered their modes of address to audiences in their role as political citizens?

Data and method

The main data for the project will arise from a longitudinal analysis of television programs and from expert-interviews with key actors in broadcasting and politics. The research takes place in four consecutive steps.

- First, we will produce an inventory of political television journalism. Using archive material from *Beeld en Geluid* and print television guides we will map and categorize political television journalism on public and commercial channels in the three months preceding national election dates, from 1956 until the last elections of 2006. To balance the campaign bias in this material, we will also select the two midterm months between elections.
- Secondly, we build on this inventory in two ways:
 - We will identify so-called ‘critical events’ and broadcasts in the history of political television journalism, based on the inventory and on secondary material about Dutch political and media history. These critical events will be subjected to a qualitative content analysis in which a number of preset dimensions of popularization (sound bite interviews, ‘horse race’ coverage, non-political settings, human interest items, vox populi) and personalization (personality, appearance, private lives and experience, affairs and scandals) constitute the coding scheme. In addition, the coding scheme will allow for other dimensions to come up from the material.
 - We will select long running tv-programs and subject them to a similar procedure of coding preset dimensions of popularization and personalization and identifying new ones.
- Thirdly, we will examine how political actors have engaged in processes of popularization and personalization by analyzing different genres of tv-interviews with political candidates and office holders. Using Van Zoonen’s (2000) model of personalized and popularized communicative strategies of politicians appearing in talk shows, and Ekström’s (2001) conversational analytic approach to TV-news interviews with politicians, we will identify the historical changes in political talk on television, examining in particular how these changes have altered their modes of address to audiences in their role as political citizens, trying to inform themselves and engage in public debate.
- Finally, we will complement the results of the inventory, the longitudinal analyses and the study of the political interview, with expert-interviews asking for the memories, perspectives and assessments of politicians and tv-journalists to contextualize the findings within broader developments in political and media history.

Project 2.

Assessing the Consequences for Citizens' Political Trust and Opinions

Research problem

This project aims to study under which circumstances popularization and personalization affect individuals' sympathy for particular politicians and their opinions about particular issues. We will examine whether the occurrence and direction of effects depend on level of education, level of political interest, personal features of political candidates in relation to personal features of citizens, all of these being the main issues of contention in the video malaise literature.

Elaboration of research problem

Research about video malaise has claimed effects on a range of factors, such as political knowledge, and decreasing voter turnout, but the dependent variable that is most relevant in the context of contested democracy is political trust, especially in the representatives of the democratic system, i.e. politicians. We therefore use sympathy for politicians as our first dependent variable, with 'sympathy' according to the Dutch electoral studies being a valid indicator for perceived competence and reliability of political candidates (Anker, 1994). Our second dependent variable concerns (dis)agreement with particular political issues, since this possible effect has been mostly ignored in the literature, although Scheuer (2001) does elaborate the theory that political television journalism "helps the right and hurts the left."

Much evidence demonstrates that in contemporary western democracies political trust is much stronger among the well educated as compared to the poorly educated (e.g. Van Aelst et al., 1999). Many studies also point out that western politics has become increasingly polarized between well and poorly educated, with the former supporting left-libertarian political agendas and parties and the latter right-authoritarian ones (e.g. Lipset, 1981; Achterberg, 2006; Houtman et al., 2007). The segment of the electorate with rightist-authoritarian attitudes thus by and large coincides with that characterized by political distrust and (hence) non-voting (Elchardus, 1996). Indeed, rightist-authoritarian attitudes and political distrust are sometimes held to be rooted in a more general populism that relies on an antagonism between 'the common people' and a 'parasitic class', with the latter including politicians who fail to take the voice of the former seriously (e.g., Taggart, 2002; Betz, 1994). Scheuer (2001) claims that this rightist-authoritarian segment of the electorate is most susceptible to popularization and personalization, because like authoritarianism, these processes simplify politics and transform it into a matter of personal likes and dislikes, common sense and easy solutions.

However, other authors claim that while the appeal of personalization and popularization indeed lies in their populist tendencies, that does not necessarily mean that they are closely tied to rightist-authoritarian issues. Populism has a long left wing history (Canovan, 2002) and current practice as well (as for instance visible in the Dutch Socialist Party). One would expect effects of personalization and popularization therefore to occur among different ideological segments of the electorate, depending much more on level of education, level of political interest, and personal features of political candidates in relation to personal features of citizens.

Data and method

To study the effects of popularization and personalization on different segments of the electorate, we combine the strengths of an experimental and a survey design, by using a so-called 'factorial survey': a survey with inbuilt experimental conditions (e.g., Rossi and Nock, 1982; Houtman, 1994). In this design, respondents are asked to rate a number of multidimensional items that constitute a small sample from a larger population, the latter designed in such a way as to include all possible combinations of relevant categories and dimensions. With several items nested in each of the

respondents, multilevel analysis can be used to estimate the effects of item characteristics, respondent characteristics, and interactions between the two on item ratings (Hox et al., 1991).

The items are brief video fragments of politicians communicating political messages. To keep the effects of all third variables under control, we do not use ‘real’ footage, but will construct video fragments ourselves, using professional actors rather than ‘real’ politicians. We will present him or her as a ‘member of parliament’, without giving a clue about his or her party affiliation. The video fragments will be identical, except for six characteristics: 1) Personalization (yes / no); 2) Popularization (yes / no); 3) Type of issue addressed (cultural / economic), 4) Ideological message (leftist / rightist), 5) Politician’s gender (male /female), and 6) Politician’s ethnicity (Dutch / Moroccan).

Personalization is operationalized as a politician using human interest and personal experience to communicate his or her political message (e.g., ‘an elderly lady I met last week told me...’) and popularization as a politician presented in an informal and unexpected setting (a bar, race circuit or stadium). The second two characteristics express the type of message that is being communicated, more specifically, whether it concerns an economic (e.g., poverty) or a cultural issue (e.g., crime or immigration) and whether the political message is leftist or rightist on these issues (Houtman, 2003; Achterberg, 2006). The two final video characteristics have been added to study whether gender and ethnicity make a difference. Women and allochtonous citizens are expected to make more favorable judgments on politicians of their own gender and/or ethnicity.

Because these six variables with two categories each produce $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 = 64$ unique combinations, we will hire four professional actors (a Dutch man, a Dutch woman, a Moroccan man, and a Moroccan woman) to record 16 brief videos each (no longer than 30 seconds). All videos will be identical except for the characteristics mentioned above. Each respondent will be presented six different videos that are randomly selected from the population of 64, and will be asked two questions with seven-point rating scales about each of these videos:

- 1) How sympathetic or unsympathetic did you find this politician?
- 2) To what extent did you agree or disagree with what this politician said?

Respondents will also be asked about their political ideas and preferences (authoritarianism / libertarianism, level of political interest, voting behavior etc.) and other individual characteristics (education, age, gender, etc.). We use the nationally representative panel of Centerdata, containing about 2,000 respondents, with which Houtman (1994, 2003) and Achterberg (2006) have already collaborated several times in the past.

References

- Aelst, P. et al. 1999. Politiek wantrouwen en protest: Over het democratisch kapitaal van Belgische betogers, *Tijdschrift voor Sociologie* 20:441-69.
- Anker, H. 1994. *Normal vote analysis*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- ANP 2002. Balkenende waarschuwt voor 'versoaping' van de politiek. Planet Nieuws, p. 25 uit L. van Zoonen 2003, *Identiteit en burgerschap in populaire cultuur*. Amsterdam: Vossius Pers.
- Bank, J. 1989. Televisie in de politieke cultuur van de jaren zestig. In: J.Th. van den Berg (ed.) *Tussen nieuwspoort en Binnenhof. De jaren zestig als breuklijn in de na-oorlogse ontwikkelingen in politiek en journalistiek*. Den Haag: SDU.
- 1991. De dramatisering van de nacht van Schmelzer. Televisie en politiek rondom 1966. *Jaarboek Mediageschiedenis* 3:265-86.
- Betz, H. 1994. *Radical right-wing populism in Western Europe*. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Blumler, J. 1999. Political communication systems all change. A response to Kees Brants. *European Journal of Communication* 14:241-9.
- Brants, K. 1998. Who's afraid of infotainment? *European Journal of Communication* 13:315-35.
- Brants, K. and Ph. van Praag (eds) 2005. *Politiek en media in verwarring. De verkiezingscampagnes in het lange jaar 2002*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- 2000. *Tussen beeld en inhoud. Politiek en media in de verkiezingen van 1998*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- 1995. *Verkoop van de politiek. De verkiezingscampagne van 1994*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Breedveld, W. 2005. *De stamtafel regeert. Hoe politici en journalisten het publieke debat maken en breken*. Utrecht: Het Spectrum.
- Cappella, J. and K. Jamieson 1997. *Spiral of cynicism. The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cutler, F. 2002. The simplest short cut of all. Sociodemographic characteristics and electoral choice. *The Journal of Politics* 64:466-90.
- Doelen, F. van and Korsten, A. 1994. Amerikanisering. Tussen verzet en aanvaarding. *Themnummer Blad Bestuurskunde*.
- Ekström, M. 2001. Politicians interviewed on television news. *Discourse and Society* 12: 563-584.
- Elchardus, M. 2002. *De dramademocratie*. Antwerpen: Lannoo.
- Hart, R. 1994. *Seducing America. How television charms the modern voter*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holsteyn, J. van and G., Irwin (eds) 1998. *De wilde frisheid van limoenen. Studiën over politici in de ogen van kiezers*. Leiden: DSWO.
- Houtman, D. 1994. *Werkloosheid en sociale rechtvaardigheid. Oordelen over de rechten en plichten van werklozen*, Amsterdam: Boom.
- Hox, J. et al. 1991. The Analysis of Factorial Surveys, *Sociological Methods & Research* 19: 493-510.
- Kleinmijnhuis, J. et al. 1998. *Paarse polarisatie. De slag om de kiezer in de media*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.
- 2003. *De puinhopen in het nieuws. De rol van de media bij de Tweede-Kamerverkiezingen van 2002*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.
- 2007. *Politiek vijfstromenland. e rol van media en stemwijzers bij de verkiezingen in 2006*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Liempt, A. van 2005. *Het journaal. Vijftig jaar achter de schermen*. Amsterdam: Balans.
- Lipset, Seymour M., 1981. *Political man. Expanded and updated edition*, Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Manschot, B. 1993. *'t Zijn de programma's die 't 'm doen. Normen en feiten over de televisieprogrammering in Nederland, 1972-1992*. Amsterdam: Otto Cramwinkel.
- Miller, A. et al. 1986. Schematic assessments of presidential candidates. *American Political Science Review* 80: 521-40.
- Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken 2007. *Festival der bestuurskunde. Wie is de ideale politicus*. Internal Workshop, The Hague.
- Newton, K. 2003. May the weak force be with you. The role of mass media in modern politics. *Keynote lecture ECPR meeting*, Marburg.
- Plasser, F. 2005. From hard to soft news standards? How political journalists in different media systems evaluate the shifting quality of news. *The Harvard Interbational Journal of Press/Politics* 10: 47-68.
- Postman, N. 1985. Amusing ourselves to death. Public discourse in the age of show business. New York: Viking.
- Prenger, M. 1993. Uitglijden over de beeldbuis. Nederlandse politici op de televisie in de jaren vijftig en zestig. *Jaarboek Mediageschiedenis* 5: 199-226.
- RMO 2003. *Advies 26. Medialogica. Over het krachtenveld tussen burgers, media en politiek*. Den Haag: RMO.
- Robinson, M. 1975. American political legitimacy in an era of electronic journalism. Reflections on the evening news. In: D. Cater and R. Adler (eds), *Television as a social force. New approaches to tv criticism*. New York: Praeger.
- Rossi, P. and S. Nock 1982. (eds) *Measuring social judgments. The factorial survey approach*, Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage.
- Sennet, R. 1974. *The fall of public man*. New York: W.W.Norton.
- Sparks, C. 1992. Popular journalism: theories and practice. In: P. Dahlgren and C. Sparks (eds). *Journalism and Popular Culture*. London: Sage, p. 22 – 44.
- Taggart, P. 2002. Populism and the pathology of representative politics. In: Y. Mény and Y. Surel (eds), *Democracies and the populist challenge*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Velde, H. te 2002. *Stijlen van leiderschap. Persoon en politiek van Thorbecke tot Den Uyl*. Den Haag: Wereldbibliotheek.
- Vettheden, P. et al. 2005. News in an age of competition. The case of sensationalism in Dutch television news. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 49: 282-295.
- Vries, J. de 2003. Verdwijnt het debat uit de wetenschap en de politiek? Thorbeckelezing, <http://ver-thorbecke.nl>, last accessed 9-3-2007.
- Wijffjes, H. 2005. De journalistiek van het Journaal. Vijftig jaar televisienieuws in Nederland. *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 2: 7-29
- 2004. *Journalistiek in Nederland, 1850 – 2000. Beroep, cultuur en organisatie*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Zoonen, L. van 2000. De talkshow. Personalisering als politieke strategie. In K. Brants and Ph. Van Praag (red.). *Tussen beeld en inhoud: politiek en media in de verkiezingen van 1998*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Zoonen, L. van et al. (forthcoming). Dr. Phil meets the candidates. How family life produces political discussion. Accepted by *Critical Studies in Media Communication*.

10. Word count

General introduction: 1,846 words
Project 1: 963 words
Project 2: 998 words

11. International perspective

The program ties into the most recent international developments in political communication. The main applicant has written one of the first systematic monographs in this field (*Entertaining the Citizen*, 2005), which has acquired a leading status since its publication (according to positive reviews in *European Journal of Communication*, *Acta Politica*, *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *Political Communication*, *Journal of Popular Culture*, *International Journal of Media and Communication*). In addition, the main applicant is involved in two structural international collaborations that cover the theme of the proposed program. First with the Institute of Communication Studies of the University of Leeds, led by Prof. Stephen Coleman. The collaboration involves joint and comparative studies of popularized political communication. Secondly with the Advanced Cultural Studies Institute of the University of Lnköpin, directed by Prof. Johan Fornäs. This collaboration involves the development of joint projects and staff exchange in the area of television culture. Both these collaborations will be used to embed the proposed program and its research staff in international surroundings, which will concretely provide feedback, comparative data, presentation and publication platforms.

The co-applicants have published widely internationally about (the consequences of) the emergence of a new political culture in which cultural rather than class-related economic issues are central. Dick Houtman published his book *Class and Politics in Contemporary Social Science* with Aldine de Gruyter in the United States in 2003 and their joint book *Farewell to the Leftist Working Class* (with Anton Derks) is forthcoming with Transaction Publishers. After the completion of his Ph.D. thesis *Considering Cultural Conflict* (2006), Achterberg now collaborates with Clemente Jesus Navarro (University of Sevilla) and Terry Nichols Clark (University of Chicago) on a comparative project about the new political culture. With Jorgen Goul Andersen, Christian Albrekt Larsen (Aalborg University), Axel West Pedersen (NOVA, Norwegian institute for social research), and Wim van Oorschot (Aalborg University, Tilburg University), he has composed the International Comparative Module on Welfare Opinions. This is a joint questionnaire module that has as yet been included in national surveys in the Netherlands (2006), Denmark (2007), Norway (2007), and Sweden (2007), while parties from other countries have expressed serious interest.

12. Work program

Period	<i>Project 1</i> (Postdoc UvA)	<i>Project 2</i> (Ph.D. student EUR)
Dec. 07 – Dec. 08	Data collection and data analysis	---
Jan. – Dec. 09	Data analysis and writing of two international articles	Research training, literature study, preparation of data collection
Jan. – Dec. 10	Data analysis, writing of third international article, writing of Dutch language book*	Data collection, preparation of data for analysis, data analysis
Jan. – Dec. 11	---	Data analysis, writing of two international articles
Jan. – Dec. 12	---	Writing of dissertation (in English)

* A Dutch book is envisioned because of the considerable interest of Dutch political actors, journalists and interested citizens in this topic. We feel that an English book would provide a barrier for much of this readership, moreover the international dissemination of the results is assured through the publication of articles.

13. Planned deliverables and knowledge dissemination

Apart from the usual academic deliverables (five international articles, one national book, one dissertation, and an international conference in 2010, when project 1 has been completed and project 2 is well underway), the results of the program will be delivered to the field in four ways:

- Yearly workshops for the fields to present and validate results, and to inform subsequent phases of the program;
- Publications and interviews in internal media of ministries, regional and local governments, political parties and other actors in the field;
- Contributions to public debate in the form of articles for the op-ed pages of national newspapers, and lectures/speeches for the field;
- A website (maintained by co-applicant Peter Achterberg) containing all the reports and publications of the program, and video fragments of critical moments in political television journalism.

14. Short curriculum vitae principal applicant

Liesbet van Zoonen (1959) studied political science at the University of Amsterdam, where she obtained her MA in 1984 and her Ph.D. (cum laude) in 1991. She is a professor of Media and Popular Culture at the University of Amsterdam since 2002 (chair of the Department of Communication Studies since 2005) as well as a professor at the Department of Media and Communication, University of Oslo (since 2004). During the period 2000-2002 she was a professor of Gender and Multimedia at the Center for Gender and Diversity, University of Maastricht, and she served as a visiting professor at the Caribbean Institute for Mass Communication, University of the West Indies, Kingston, Jamaica (1993), the Hochschule für Film und Fernsehen Karl Wolff, Potsdam, Germany (1992), and the Institute of Social Studies, The Hague (1988-1991).

Liesbet van Zoonen currently supervises six Ph.D. students, she acted as a (co)promotor of five successfully defended Ph.D. theses since 2002, and she has been a member of twenty Ph.D. juries since 2000. She has acquired research funding from the 6th Framework Program of the EU, the European Science Foundation, NWO, the Dutch Ministry of the Interior, and several partners from the Dutch media industry. She is a member of the editorial boards of a number of international journals (Popular Communication, Social Semiotics, Javnost/The Public, Critical Studies in Media Communication, New Media and Society, European Journal of Communication, Journalism Studies, Feminist Media Studies, and European Journal of Cultural Studies) and of the book series Critical Media Studies (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Boulder, CO). A small selection of Liesbet van Zoonen's publications can be found below. For a complete overview of her publications, the reviewer is referred to her homepage at <http://users.fmg.uva.nl/lvanzoonen/>.

15. Literature

Ten key publications by the applicants

- Achterberg, Peter (2006). Class Voting in the New Political Culture: Economic, Cultural and Environmental Voting in 20 Western Countries, *International Sociology* 21(2), 237-261.
- Achterberg, Peter (2006). *Considering Cultural Conflict: Class Politics and Cultural Politics in Western Societies*, Maastricht: Shaker.
- Achterberg, Peter, and Dick Houtman (2006), Why Do So Many People Vote 'Unnaturally'? A Cultural Explanation for Voting Behavior, *European Journal of Political Research*, 45(1), 75-92.
- Houtman, Dick (2003). *Class and Politics in Contemporary Social Science: 'Marxism Lite' and Its Blind Spot for Culture*, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Houtman, Dick, Peter Achterberg, and Anton Derks (2007). *Farewell to the Leftist Working Class*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction (forthcoming).
- Zoonen, Liesbet van (2007). Audience Reactions to Hollywood Politics, *Media, Culture and Society* (forthcoming).
- Zoonen, Liesbet van (2006). The Personal, the Political and the Popular: A Woman's Guide to Celebrity Politics, *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3), 287-301.
- Zoonen, Liesbet van (2005). *Entertaining the Citizen: When Politics and Popular Culture Converge*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Zoonen, Liesbet van (2004). Imagining the Fan Democracy, *European Journal of Communication*, 19(1), 39-52.
- Zoonen, Liesbet van (ed.) (2004). *Popular Qualities in Public Broadcasting*, special issue *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 7(3).

Ten key publications in the international literature

- Ankersmit, Frank 1997. *Aesthetic Politics: Political Philosophy between fact and value*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Brants, Kees and Philip van Praag 2006. Signs of Media Logic: Half a Century of Political Communication in the Netherlands. *Javnost/The Public*, 13(1), 25-40.
- Canovan, Margaret 2002. Taking Politics to the People: Populism as the Ideology of Democracy. In: Yves Mény and Yves Surel (eds) *Democracies and the Populist Challenge*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Corner, John and Dick Pels (eds) 2003. *Media and the Restyling of Politics*. London: Sage.
- Coleman, Stephen 2003. *A Tale of Two Houses: The House of Commons, the Big Brother House and the People at Home*. London: Hansard Society.
- Elchardus, Mark 1996. Class, Cultural Re-Alignment and the Rise of the Populist Right. In: Angus Erskine (ed.), *Changing Europe: Some Aspects of Identity, Conflict and Social Justice*.
- Graber, Doris (2003). The media and democracy: beyond myths and stereotypes. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6, 139 – 60.
- Norris, Pippa 2000. *A Virtuous Circle: Political Communication in Post-Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schudson, Michael 1998. *The good citizen: a history of American civic life*. New York: Free Press.
- Street, John 1997. *Politics and Popular Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

16. Summary for non-specialists

Popularisering en personalisering in de Nederlandse democratie

Dat politieke televisiejournalistiek een negatieve invloed heeft op de kwaliteit van het publieke debat en het politieke vertrouwen, is een vertrouwd geluid binnen de journalistiek, de wetenschap en de politiek zelf. De bezorgdheid hieromtrent concentreert zich rond processen van popularisering en personalisering. Van popularisering is sprake wanneer politieke interviews zijn gericht op het ontlokken van sound bytes, wanneer verkiezingen worden voorgesteld als ‘wedstrijden’, wanneer politici in een niet-politieke setting worden geïnterviewd, en wanneer de stem van het volk wordt voorgesteld als zaligmakend. Van personalisering is sprake wanneer de persoonlijkheid, het uiterlijk en het privé-leven van politici worden benadrukt, evenals de kwesties en schandalen waarin zij verwickeld zijn.

De feitelijke rol van popularisering en personalisering in Nederlandse politieke tv-journalistiek is echter omstreden, net als hun culturele en historische wortels en hun gevolgen voor het politieke vertrouwen en de politieke opvattingen van burgers. Daarom heeft het multidisciplinaire onderzoeksprogramma *Popularisering en personalisering in de Nederlandse democratie* een tweeledige doelstelling. Het eerste deelproject, *Een historische en culturele analyse van de Nederlandse politieke televisiejournalistiek, 1956-2006*, is geworteld in de mediageschiedenis en mediastudies en is kwalitatief van aard. Het biedt een historische en culturele analyse van de verschijningsvormen van popularisering en personalisering in politieke tv-programma's sinds het begin van de Nederlandse televisiejournalistiek in 1956.

Het tweede deelproject, *De bepaling van de gevolgen voor het politiek vertrouwen en de opvattingen van burgers*, is sociologisch en politicologisch van aard en bouwt voort op de resultaten van het eerste deelproject via de combinatie van een experimenteel onderzoeksontwerp met een survey. Het onderzoekt de gevolgen van de uit project 1 blijkende vormen van popularisering en personalisering voor het politiek vertrouwen en de politieke opvattingen van burgers. Hierbij wordt mede nagegaan in hoeverre de volgens project 1 onder politici bestaande veronderstellingen over deze gevolgen houdbaar zijn.

17. Research budget

Type of costs	<i>Program supervision</i>	<i>Project 1</i> (Postdoc UvA. 1.0 fte, 3 years)	<i>Project 2</i> (Ph.D. student EUR. 1.0 fte, 4 years)	General	Total
Personnel costs	k€ 24	k€ 176	k€ 177	-	k€ 377
Data collection		k€ 10 ¹	k€ 57 ²	-	k€ 67
Building website		-	-	k€ 10	k€ 10
Organization conference (Dec. 2010)				k€ 20	k€ 20
Total		k€ 186	k€ 234	k€ 30	k€ 474

1. The k€ 10 for the data collection of project 1 is based on the costs of hiring research assistance (a half-time position for six months = 6 x k€ 1 = 6 k€) and additional costs estimated at k€ 4 for travel, making copies, etcetera. The research assistant will uncover sources such as television guides, will track their contents for all periods of three months preceding all national elections and for the two midterm months between elections since 1956, and will subsequently retrieve the relevant footage from the *Beeld en Geluid* archive.

2. The k€ 57 for the data collection of project 2 is based on a rough estimation of the costs of the production of 64 brief videos with the help of a professional director and actors on the one hand (estimated at € 500 per video = 64 x € 500 = k€ 32) and the costs of a survey in which these videos are rated (by means of the panel of Centerdata, University of Tilburg, also estimated at k€ 25).