

# NEWS FRAMING OF BREXIT IN LOCAL NEWSPAPERS ACROSS THE UK'S TWELVE REGIONS



LAURA SCHOTTE  
MA INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION THESIS  
UTRECHT, APRIL 2020

Thesis supervisor: Roselinde Supheert  
Second reader: Ashley Micklos  
10,004 words

## I. ABSTRACT

The UK is the first country to voluntarily exit the European Union, under the name of Brexit. The Brexit referendum took place in 2016 and has received vast amounts of news coverage on an international, national, regional, and local scale since. Local newspapers have proven to be a reliable source of information for the public and can influence the public's decision-making process by means of news framing. The present study aimed to discover how this news framing has shifted since the initial referendum in 2016 by taking the field of Intercultural Communication into the realm of language studies. As little research has been conducted on regional or local levels of news framing in the UK and the referendum results indicate that not all regions were in favour of the Brexit result, the present research aimed to fill this knowledge gap. A corpus analysis, critical discourse analysis, and collocate analysis of local newspaper articles from each of the UK's twelve regions facilitated the detection of a news framing shift. Local British newspapers shifted in news framing in terms of *economic consequences*, *responsibility*, *conflict*, and *human interest* when reporting on Brexit and are more inclined to discuss Brexit more frequently and frame the phenomenon more directly since 2016. Further research suggests discovering if these outcomes have indeed influenced the British public's decision-making process when voting for Brexit in 2016 and the General Election in 2019 by means of a survey.

**Keywords:** Brexit, political journalism, news framing, language studies, newspapers

**II. TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. ABSTRACT .....	2
1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK .....	7
2.1. POLITICAL JOURNALISM.....	7
2.2. MEDIATISATION OF POLITICS .....	8
2.3. NEWS FRAMING .....	9
2.3.1. DEDUCTIVE METHOD .....	10
2.3.2. BREXIT.....	11
3. RESEARCH FRAMEWORK .....	13
4. METHODOLOGY.....	14
4.1. MATERIALS.....	14
4.2. DATA ANALYSIS .....	16
4.3. PROCEDURE .....	17
5. RESULTS.....	19
5.1. TOPICS.....	19
5.2. TONE.....	23
5.2.1. CONTEXT.....	23
5.2.2. POSITIVE, NEUTRAL AND NEGATIVE.....	28
5.3. COLLOCATES.....	29
5.3.1. FREQUENCY.....	29
5.3.2. DISTANCE .....	32
5.3.3. EXCLUSIVITY.....	35
5.4. NEWS FRAMING SHIFT.....	37
6. DISCUSSION.....	39
6.1. TOPICS.....	39
6.2. TONE.....	40
6.3. COLLOCATES.....	41
6.4. NEWS FRAMING SHIFT.....	42
7. CONCLUSION.....	45
8. BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	48
9. APPENDICES.....	53
9.1. TOPICS.....	53
9.2. TONE.....	60
9.3. COLLOCATES.....	67





## **1. INTRODUCTION**

In 2020 it appears that we are living in a mediated reality, specifically a mediated reality of politics where “voters no longer experience politics first-hand but rather through the eyes and ears of the media systems.” (Bhatia, 2014, p. 3). Within this reality, news framing plays a crucial role. News framing selects specific aspects of (perceived) reality and connects them to a narrative that advocates a specific interpretation (Entman, 2010). Framing of political issues is often achieved by discussing one central idea that will give meaning to the issue, which in turn results in the audience basing its decision-making process on that one central idea (Borah, 2011). News framing has also been described as an intervention led by the media, an intervention which “is especially visible during election campaigns.” (Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995, p. 3) and referenda (de Vreese, 2004).

The most recent and vastly reported on referendum in Europe concerned the British exit from the European Union (EU), more commonly known as Brexit. On the 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2016 the British public voted to leave the EU with a 51.9% majority (BBC, 2016). The result shocked both the Brits and the remaining EU member countries, but also the rest of the world (Morris, et al., 2016). Inevitably, negotiations commenced between the United Kingdom (UK) and the EU in order to decide on a Withdrawal Agreement. Crucial matters such as trade, law enforcement, data sharing and security, aviation standards and safety, access to fishing waters, supplies of electricity and gas, and licensing and regulation of medicines were discussed by the then British Prime Minister (PM), Theresa May, and EU representatives (BBC, 2020). Other matters included Scotland’s wish to become independent from the UK and gain membership to the EU and how to manage the Northern Ireland – Ireland border. A gradual increase of Scottish support to leave the UK has been experienced since Brexit, with a 52% support as of the 4<sup>th</sup> February 2020 (Carrell, 2020). The main issue in regards to the aforementioned border was how to keep this border open to facilitate British trade with Ireland (Curtis, 2020).

May resigned as PM after failing to come to a deal with the EU on the 7<sup>th</sup> June 2019 (BBC, 2019). Fellow Tory Party member Boris Johnson became her successor and was re-elected on the

12<sup>th</sup> December 2019 when the Tories once again achieved a majority in the General Election (GE) (The Guardian, 2019). After three years of failing to come to a deal and numerous extensions, Johnson won the election by claiming that he would “get Brexit done” (Henley, 2019). During his election campaign, Johnson blamed his failure of not yet having gotten Brexit done on Labour Party opponent, Jeremy Corbyn (Connolly, 2019). Corbyn rejected both May’s and Johnson’s proposals on numerous occasions, however, his counter proposal was an undecided one (Shrimley, 2019). Johnson’s Withdrawal Agreement was approved by the House of Commons on the 20<sup>th</sup> December 2019 (Soussi, 2020). Aside from agreements with the EU, Johnson also made national pledges such as improving infrastructure, protecting the environment, and extending resources for the National Health Service (NHS) (BBC, 2019). The latter fell subject to extensive scrutiny as it was rumoured that Johnson would ‘sell’ the NHS to US President, Donald Trump (Enley, 2019).

Recent studies by Levy, Aslan & Bironze (2016), Sogelola (2018), and Gavin (2018) suggest that the 2016 Brexit result can be partially explained by news framing tactics employed by national newspapers. Such research has primarily focused on national newspapers, whereas the public places more trust in local newspapers (VIDEA, 2017). In addition, research on the framing of Brexit has centred around 2016, despite its negotiations being taken all the way to the end of 2019. It has also been made clear that Scotland, at the very least, did not agree with the referendum result. These matters suggest the need for further research on the news framing of Brexit by local newspapers since 2016. To that end, the present study aims to answer the following research-question: *How has written news framing of Brexit in local newspapers shifted since the referendum in 2016 across the twelve regions of the United Kingdom?* This research-question, along with three sub-questions, will be answered with a corpus and methodological triangulation. The corpus contains local newspaper articles from the UK’s twelve regions published during the Brexit campaign in 2016 and the GE in 2019. The method of triangulation consists of 1) a corpus analysis, 2) a critical discourse analysis, and 3) a collocate analysis. The study will begin with a critical discussion of the relevant theoretical framework, followed by the

demarcation of the present research with research-questions. The methodology will then be presented in detail leading to the results of each research-question. These results will then be discussed in relation to the theoretical framework and the current social and political context. The study will be concluded with a summary of the most important implications, their limitations, and suggestions for further research.

## **2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Newspaper circulation in the UK has decreased dramatically over the past decades, however newspapers remain a popular platform for accessing news, with 40% of British adults (16+) using this platform for news consumption (Jigsaw Research, 2017). Newspapers can be either of a national, regional or local nature. Both national and local news tend to emphasise the importance of the economy. However, national news aims to address the largest possible audience and local news has a more focused approach, often covering national news items from the perspective of the region or city (Jenkins & Nielsen, 2018). It has been suggested that local news is trusted more by the audience than national news (VIDEA, 2017). In addition, local newspapers outperform national television and radio in terms of originality, locality, and addressing critical information in their stories. Where local newspapers are of a smaller scale than national newspapers, television, and radio combined, they account for the majority of news stories meeting the aforementioned criteria of originality, locality, and addressing critical information (Mahone, McCollough, Napoli, Wang, & Weber, 2019).

### **2.1. POLITICAL JOURNALISM**

In newspapers of national, regional or local nature, such news stories are divided into various topics, one of them being government and politics (American Press Institute, 2014). News reporting on government and politics falls under the umbrella of political journalism, which is defined as “news journalism explicitly dealing with political institutions and actors, such as parliaments, governments, political representatives, or candidates for office” (Shehata & Strömbäck, 2018, p. 1). In an ideal world, political journalism functions as a provider of information, watchdog, and platform for political discussion with the main goal of helping citizens to understand political matters and to prevent the abuse of power (Shehata & Strömbäck, 2018). However, the role of the media in relation to politics is constantly changing “moving from the role of reporting on and about politics ... to that of being an active participant in, shaping influence upon ... an integral part of political process. This kind of intervention is especially visible during

election campaigns.” (Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995, p. 3). This shaping is not only apparent in election campaigns, but also around referenda. During the Danish 2000 Euro Referendum the public approval of the ‘Yes’ campaign declined when media reporting on the ‘No’ campaign increased (de Vreese, 2004). As with the topic of the 2000 referendum in Denmark, referenda topics in European countries often revolve around the EU and news reporting media are the main source of information in regards to EU matters with its citizens (Schuck, 2009).

## **2.2. MEDIATISATION OF POLITICS**

Shaping of public opinion can be related to the concept of mediatisation. Mediatisation of politics is the process of development towards an increasing media influence, consisting of four major phases: 1) mass media are the most important source of information and communication channel between citizens and political actors, 2) mass media are independent from governments and adhere more to a media logic than a political logic, with the former taking the requirements of the media as essential in how political communication is distributed and the latter taking the requirements of political institutions as essential in this distribution, 3) mass media are even more independent and important than in the previous phase, resulting in political actors having to adapt to the media and not vice versa, and 4) political actors realise that the mediated reality is more important than actual reality (Strömbäck, 2008). The four phases are not necessarily completed in their numeric order. It is possible for the mediatisation of politics to move back a phase, e.g. from the third to the second phase. However, it is unlikely that Western democracies will retreat from the second to the first phase. In addition, not all media institutions in a country will operate in the same phase at the same time, this is highly dependent on the institution’s power and purpose (Strömbäck, 2008). In a mediated reality of politics “voters no longer experience politics first-hand but rather through the eyes and ears of the media systems.” (Bhatia, 2014, p. 3). The reality is created by the repetition of specific ideas while ignoring other elements of the topic at hand (Bhatia, 2014). In addition to being repeated, ideas in a mediated reality are stable, pervasive, and inescapable, with pervasive implying a high noticeability and inescapable



suggesting unavoidable patterns (Nacos, 2000). Stable may also imply the aforementioned repetition as stability means not changing, thus the same idea in repetition. However, where repetition is considered as one of the most frequently employed news framing strategies, it is argued that even a short line at the end of an article could affect the interpretation of the message more so than the other ideas discussed (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). This is especially applicable if the short line resonates with the audience's already existing beliefs or references a cultural symbol relevant to that audience (Entman, 1993).

### 2.3. NEWS FRAMING

This mediated reality can take a turn for the worse, as previously suggested by the word *shaping*. Shaping is achieved with the help of framing. Here, the frame is the way in which something is presented to the audience with the help of words and images and employing such a frame leads to the verb, framing. Media employ framing by focussing on a specific event and placing this within a field of meaning (Arowolo, 2017). Frames select specific aspects of (perceived) reality and connect them to a narrative that advocates a specific interpretation. In other words, frames introduce or enhance the availability and importance of specific ideas in light of evaluating or perceiving a political matter (Entman, 2010). In addition, framing of political issues is often achieved by discussing one central idea that will give meaning to the issue, which in turn results in the audience basing its decision-making process on that one central idea. Research has found that when the idea of 'losses' involved in a news item is highlighted, the audience is more inclined to take risks. However, when the 'gains' around the same news item are focused on, the audience would rather avoid risk taking (Borah, 2011). Key in news framing is the audience's predispositions on the matter which are affected by demographics, social locations, and life experiences (Huang, 2009). This would imply that an audience can have different attitudes towards a frame and thus, the meaning given to the frame varies as well, despite the frame assuming it will achieve one specific reality. News framing is therefore particularly effective in

light of new or unusual matters as the audience misses prior knowledge, beliefs, values, and attitudes on the matter (Tewksbury & Scheefe, 2019).

### 2.3.1. DEDUCTIVE METHOD

In order to identify frames researchers employ either an inductive or a deductive method. The former is achieved by immersing oneself into the sample and analysing the news articles as a whole based on terms, metaphors, examples, images, and so on. The latter method is employed far more frequently due to its quantitative nature (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015) and often uses coding as its main tool (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). Within the deductive method, frames can be categorised into five categories based on their likelihood to appear in the news (*Table 1*) (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). The categories have been tested on news in the USA and Europe, confirming that all news predominantly falls within one of these framing categories (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000).

FRAME	USAGE
Responsibility	Who caused the matter or is responsible for solving the matter?
Conflict	Focuses on polarisation and confrontation between individuals or social groups.
Human interest	Brings the issue closer by evoking emotion.
Economic consequences	Focuses on the economic impact on individuals or social groups.
Morality	Focuses on the religious or moral implications or indicates how an individual or social group should behave.

*Table 1:* News frame categories (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015)

Despite the availability of news framing categories as listed in *Table 1*, it has proven a challenge to determine what form news frames can take. A general distinction can be made between written, spoken, graphical, and visual message modalities in print, broadcast, and online platforms (D'Angelo & Shaw, 2018). It has been argued that news framing could be greatly eliminated by ensuring that information and sources are presented in the same manner to the audience, however it remains impossible to cover a news item from every angle. In addition, framing can occur on such a specific level, such as the order in which facts are presented, selection of the headline or the use of specific adjectives and adverbs, that it cannot be eliminated (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). Such use of adjectives and adverbs can set the tone of the frame; either positive,

neutral or negative (Brunken, 2006). In addition to the use of adjectives and adverbs in the written modality, the use of nouns also aids news framing as numerous other topics than the primary issue can affect with which other matters the audience relates the framed issue (Levy, Aslan, & Bironze, 2016). Finally, the collocates used around a specific issue (target word) can also provide detailed information on how the issue has been framed. Collocates are all types of words (adjectives, adverbs, nouns) around the target word that are assessed on three criteria; 1) the distance of the collocate to the target word, such as five words to the left and to the right or the collocate directly prior to the target word, 2) the frequency of the collocate in the sample, and 3) the exclusivity the collocate has to the target word is much higher when it takes on the form of an adjective, adverb, noun or verb than with a preposition or pronoun for instance (Brezina, McEnergy, & Wattam, 2015).

### **2.3.2. BREXIT**

As briefly discussed in the beginning of this chapter, referenda also fall subject to news framing (de Vreese, 2004). The most recent and vastly reported on referendum in Europe concerned the British exit from the EU, more commonly known as Brexit. In 2016, the year in which the British public voted 'leave' in the Brexit referendum, the Reuters Institute published a report on UK press coverage of the EU referendum. The report includes results on how Brexit was portrayed in nine national newspapers. 41% of UK newspapers favoured the leave campaign leading up to the referendum and only 27% supported the remain campaign. In addition, 76% of the messages in the leave newspapers had a negative tone leading up to the referendum in comparison to only 36% of negative messages in the remain newspapers, for example when discussing the 'post-referendum future' (Levy, Aslan, & Bironze, 2016). Initially, the British public deemed economy, sovereignty, and immigration as the three main arguments to vote for or against Brexit, in that order. As the Brexit campaign continued, immigration became the most important reason to vote (Sogelola, 2018). Research suggests that while news coverage on both topics of economy and immigration increased throughout the campaign, immigration increased at a more rapid pace in

the UK's most popular newspaper (in regards to largest readership), the *Daily Mail*. This shift may imply successful news framing by the *Daily Mail* (Sogelola, 2018). Moreover, regions experiencing the lowest immigration numbers had the strongest preference towards leave. Most likely not coincidentally, those were the regions where immigration was covered by the media as one of the most important factors for decision-making on Brexit (Gavin, 2018). Research on the framing of Brexit by newspapers has primarily been focused on the UK as a nation, despite there being discrepancies in public opinion across the UK in 2016. Britain's twelve regions had varying referendum results (Table 2), which according to the discussed literature, would imply a difference in news framing of Brexit between the regions as public opinion clearly varied.

REGION	LEAVE	REMAIN
Scotland	38.0%	62.0%
Northern Ireland	44.2%	55.8%
Wales	52.5%	47.5%
North East	58.0%	42.0%
North West	53.7%	46.3%
Yorkshire and the Humber	57.7%	42.3%
West Midlands	59.3%	40.7%
East Midlands	58.8%	41.2%
South West	52.6%	47.4%
South East	51.8%	48.2%
East of England	56.5%	43.5%
Greater London	40.1%	59.9%
National	51.9%	48.1%

Table 2: Referendum results (BBC, 2016) (BBC, sd)

### 3. RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

Based on the aforementioned academic discussion, the following main research-question has been formulated:

**RQ:** *How has written news framing of Brexit in local newspapers shifted since the referendum in 2016 across the twelve regions of the United Kingdom?*

In order to answer the main research question, the following sub-questions have been formulated:

**SQ1:** *Which topical nouns are addressed in local newspaper articles referencing Brexit?*

**SQ2:** *How do local newspapers set the tone in articles referencing Brexit by employing adverbs and adjectives?*

**SQ3:** *Which nouns, adverbs and adjectives are used in specific collocational relation to Brexit?*



## 4. METHODOLOGY

The aforementioned research questions were answered with a corpus and methodological triangulation. First, the corpus materials will be addressed, followed by the approach for analysis of Corpus Analysis (CA), Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), and collocates. The chapter will be concluded by presenting the procedure used for data analysis.

### 4.1. MATERIALS

The gathered materials were compiled from local online newspapers from the UK's twelve regions. As not all regions had an online regional newspaper, a selection of local newspapers from each region's largest city was made. As with the limitation of availability of regional newspapers, not all largest regional cities had an online local newspaper. Therefore, the largest city with a local online newspaper was taken per region (*Table 3*). In addition, the most popular national newspaper based on circulation, *The Sun*, (Statista, 2019) was included in the corpus as a control.

REGION	LARGEST AVAILABLE CITY	NEWSPAPER
Scotland	Glasgow	<a href="#">Daily Record</a>
Northern Ireland	Belfast	<a href="#">Belfast Telegraph</a>
Wales	Cardiff	<a href="#">Wales Online</a>
North East	Newcastle upon Tyne	<a href="#">Evening Chronicle</a>
North West	Manchester	<a href="#">Manchester Evening News</a>
Yorkshire and the Humber	Yorkshire	<a href="#">Yorkshire Post</a>
West Midlands	Birmingham	<a href="#">Birmingham Mail</a>
East Midlands	Nottingham	<a href="#">Nottingham Post</a>
South West	Somerset	<a href="#">Somerset County Gazette</a>
South East	Brighton & Hove	<a href="#">The Argus</a>
East of England	Norwich	<a href="#">Norwich Evening News</a>
Greater London	London	<a href="#">East London and West Essex Guardian</a>
National		<a href="#">The Sun</a>

*Table 3:* Corpus collection (Netherlands Worldwide, sd)

The corpus was collected with the help of Google's 'news' search engine tool from 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020 – 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020. The term *Brexit* was entered into the search bar, followed by the title of the newspaper. To discover if and how a shift in news framing of Brexit had occurred, data from two different periods were gathered. The earliest of the two was the period when the referendum took place: 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2016. In order to ensure a representative sample, the



time period selected was two months before and after the vote: 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2016 – 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2016. This custom range was added as a filter in the search and all articles were sorted by date. Initially, data from each calendar year since 2016 was to be collected, with the introduction of a hard Brexit in 2017, the publication of the draft Withdrawal Agreement in 2018, and the General Election in 2019 as the remaining corpora. However, due to constraints in time and resources and the vast amount of available data, additional data was only gathered from 2019. The General Election on the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2019 revolved largely around Brexit and was therefore taken as the basis for the time range of 12<sup>th</sup> October 2019 – 12<sup>th</sup> February 2020. The choice to select 2019 as opposed to 2017 or 2018 was made to ensure an up-to-date sample. All articles were taken into the corpus as presented in *Table 4*. For the hyperlinks to the articles please contact the researcher at [laurajane-93@hotmail.com](mailto:laurajane-93@hotmail.com) for the files. The articles were copied into a Word file and pictures, picture credits and “read more” / “related news” links were removed. The plain texts were then saved in a Rich Text document per article.

NEWSPAPER	NUMBER OF ARTICLES		
	23/04/2016 - 23/08/2016	12/10/2019 - 12/02/2020	TOTAL
Daily Record	33	55	88
Belfast Telegraph	44	83	127
Wales Online	67	46	113
Evening Chronicle	20	37	57
Manchester Evening News	32	27	59
Yorkshire Post	29	25	54
Birmingham Mail	12	31	43
Nottingham Post	1	40	41
Somerset County Gazette	31	39	70
The Argus	40	47	87
Norwich Evening News	37	38	75
East London and West Essex Guardian	40	44	84
The Sun	86	74	160
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>1,058</b>

Table 4: Corpus overview



#### 4.2. DATA ANALYSIS

The collected data were analysed with the help of a Corpus Analysis (CA) and a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The method of CA allowed the present research to take on its quantitative nature. CA enables the detection of language patterns in an objective manner (Bang, 2003) and quantifies patterns, often by frequency analysis (Chen, 2009). (Semi-)automatic retrieval of patterns with computer based programmes provided the option to analyse large amounts of texts. CA does have its limitations as the context of the text is no longer visible to the researcher. In the present research the grammatical relevance of a word being used as a noun, adverb or adjective is applicable as determined by the research-questions in *Chapter 3*. However, in some cases this could no longer be determined with 100% accuracy without the context. Examples of such words in the present study can be found in *Table 5*. Despite these grammatical ambiguities, the researcher opted to include all words that could be a noun, adverb or adjective in respect to the research-question to be answered as excluding these would result in a vast decrease of data and may even prohibit the aim of the research.

WORD	GRAMMAR
North	adjective, noun
Yorkshire	adjective, noun
Vote	noun, verb
Support	noun, verb
Direct	adjective, adverb, verb

*Table 5:* Grammatical ambiguities

In order to interpret the data as obtained through CA, CDA was employed. CDA allows for a social analysis to be taken into the realm of language studies. It seeks not only to describe discourse, but also to explain it. Research within the field of CDA is therefore based on two main parts; 1) close readings of texts are conducted followed by 2) placing the results into context (Fairclough, 2003). This implies that the results from the text analysis ought to be contextualised based on the social and political aspects as discussed in the *Introduction* and *Theoretical Framework*. In the present study, only the second part of CDA was employed as the first part was substituted by CA. This decision was primarily made as CDA is often limited to qualitative analyses (close readings) and has therefore frequently received critique for being time



consuming, not allowing for a large sample and being open to interpretation (Bang, 2003). Combining CDA with CA allowed for the present research to take on its quantitative nature. This combination of quantitative CA with the interpretation of the data with CDA allowed the researcher to analyse large amounts of data without missing contextual aspects.

In addition, the *Theoretical Framework* suggests the employment of a collocate analysis based on distance, frequency, and exclusivity (Brezina, McEnery, & Wattam, 2015). Inspired by research as conducted by the Migration Observatory (The Migration Observatory, 2013), the researcher has opted to conduct a frequency analysis of exclusive collocates that appear within five words to the right and to the left of the target word, *Brexit*. This procedure will be elaborated on further in *Chapter 4.3*. Including this type of analysis in the present research allowed for both CA and CDA to be employed on a specific and targeted level.

### 4.3. PROCEDURE

The procedure for data analysis was conducted with the help of the programme WordSmith Tools. All data were organised per region and per year and saved in a Rich Text format. Importing the Rich Text files allowed for the creation of Word Lists and Collocate Lists. Word Lists were generated in order to provide answers to sub-questions 1 and 2; these lists indicated which nouns, adverbs and adjectives were most frequently employed throughout the articles. Collocates were generated in order to answer sub-question 3; nouns, adverbs and adjectives most frequently employed in direct relation to the target word *Brexit*. Here, special attention was paid to the collocate used immediately before the target word (L1) as it is suggested that the L1 will say the most about the target word (The Migration Observatory, 2013), in addition to the remaining five words to the left and to the right (*Figure 1*). For both the Word Lists and the Collocate Lists, only the nouns, adverbs and adjectives that provided meaning without the context were selected. Nouns such as *percentage* and adverbs and adjectives such as *very* or *much* were removed as these would not provide information to answer the research-questions. Employing this selection procedure for the Collocate Lists also ensured that the criteria of exclusivity for collocate analysis

was met (Brezina, McEnery, & Wattam, 2015). In addition, the top 20 words in all instances were selected.

L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	TARGET	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
----	----	----	----	----	--------	----	----	----	----	----

Figure 1: Collocates

As previously discussed, limitations to this procedure include the missing of context as the articles are deconstructed into single words and collocates. Sentences and their structures are no longer visible to the researcher. Moreover, the use of negation is also not detected by the programme and can thus lead to mis-interpretations. Finally, neither lists allow for specific word types irrelevant to the present study (verbs, articles, prepositions, and pronouns) to be automatically filtered out of the sample. The researcher therefore had to remove these words manually.



## 5. RESULTS

The present chapter aims to present the most important findings of the study. All the findings can be found in *Appendices 9.1, 9.2. and 9.3.* The results are presented in relation to the research-question they answer. The main research-question encompasses the final segment of this chapter and provides a summary of the most important findings in relation to the shift in news framing. To simplify the data, all regions are referred to with the numbers 1 through 13 as indicated in their respective tables. Here, the national newspaper is referred to as 'region' 13.

### 5.1. TOPICS

The first section of this chapter will provide the results for SQ1: *Which topical nouns are addressed in local newspaper articles referencing Brexit?* First, the top three nouns addressed in the twelve regions and on a national basis in both 2016 and 2019 will be presented.

1. SCOTLAND						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Scotland	112	0,56	Brexit	259	0,80
2	EU	112	0,56	Scotland	149	0,46
3	Brexit	95	0,48	Election	133	0,41

Table 6: Top 3 topics Scotland

2. NORTHERN IRELAND						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Ireland	197	0,58	Brexit	580	1,19
2	EU	171	0,50	Ireland	286	0,58
3	UK	148	0,43	UK	271	0,55

Table 7: Top 3 topics Northern Ireland

3. WALES						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	440	0,82	Brexit	297	0,84
2	Wales	255	0,47	EU	192	0,54
3	UK	230	0,43	UK	171	0,48

Table 8: Top 3 topics Wales



	4. NORTH EAST					
	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	65	0,61	Brexit	246	1,05
2	Vote	45	0,42	EU	122	0,52
3	Referendum	44	0,41	Vote	104	0,44

Table 9: Top 3 topics North East

	5. NORTH WEST					
	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Manchester	152	0,79	Brexit	192	1,18
2	People	70	0,37	EU	111	0,68
3	Brexit	64	0,33	UK	73	0,45

Table 10: Top 3 topics North West

	6. YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER					
	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	79	0,34	Brexit	195	1,04
2	Brexit	62	0,27	Party	93	0,50
3	Yorkshire	58	0,25	Election	83	0,44

Table 11: Top 3 topics Yorkshire and the Humber

	7. WEST MIDLANDS					
	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Brexit	38	0,66	Brexit	198	1,05
2	EU	29	0,50	EU	107	0,57
3	Birmingham	27	0,47	UK	97	0,52

Table 12: Top 3 topics West Midlands

	8. EAST MIDLANDS					
	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	People	6	1,18	Brexit	199	0,92
2	Vote	5	0,98	Party	102	0,47
3	Side	4	0,79	Nottingham	81	0,37

Table 13: Top 3 topics East Midlands

	9. SOUTH WEST					
	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	71	0,52	Brexit	150	0,70
2	Brexit	69	0,50	Somerset	103	0,48
3	Vote	67	0,49	People	97	0,45

Table 14: Top 3 topics South West



10. SOUTH EAST						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	206	0,83	Brexit	248	1,26
2	Brexit	158	0,64	EU	149	0,76
3	Brighton	127	0,51	Brighton	96	0,49

Table 15: Top 3 topics South East

11. EAST OF ENGLAND						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	137	0,80	Brexit	185	0,87
2	Brexit	105	0,61	Norwich	124	0,58
3	Vote	89	0,52	Election	116	0,55

Table 16: Top 3 topics East of England

12. GREATER LONDON						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	135	1,09	Brexit	148	0,70
2	Brexit	85	0,69	Party	121	0,58
3	People	79	0,64	London	108	0,51

Table 17: Top 3 topics Greater London

13. NATIONAL						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	538	0,80	Brexit	602	1,20
2	Brexit	421	0,62	EU	360	0,71
3	Britain	292	0,43	Deal	320	0,64

Table 18: Top 3 topics National

As can be seen in the above tables, regions 1, 2, and 5 most frequently addressed news in light of their region or city in 2016 and regions 3, 6, 7, and 10 did also, but less frequently. This would imply that the majority of newspapers discussed the region or city as one of the most frequent nouns in 2016. This regional news declined in 2019 for the regions 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7, but remained the same in region 10. However, the regions 8, 9, 11, and 12 addressed regional news more frequently in 2019. Nationwide, this still implies a decrease in the importance of the region or city. In the regions 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 the *EU* was the most addressed noun in 2016 and regions 1, 2, and 7 did also, but on a smaller scale. This may imply that the *EU* was the most frequently addressed noun overall in 2016. This *EU* news declined in 2019 for the regions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, but remained the same or increased in the regions 5 and 7. Only region 8 did not address the *EU* in either years. This suggests an overwhelming decrease of news



in light of the *EU* from 2016 to 2019. In addition, *Brexit* became the most addressed noun in 2019 in the regions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. Region 7 addressed *Brexit* most frequently in both years. Despite the data collected in 2016 being from the time period of the referendum, *Brexit* only gained in frequency after the referendum had taken place.

The remaining 17 most frequently addressed nouns as presented in *Appendix 9.1* also offer some interesting insights. In 2016 all regions except for region 8 addressed either the matter of *time* or *years* which may suggest an emphasis on the duration of Brexit. The only shift in 2019 is that region 1 no longer referenced this matter, whereas region 8 started to do so. The British government was also frequently addressed in all regions with nouns such as *government*, *parliament*, *minister*, *campaign*, *party*, *MP*, and so on. The amount and frequency of these nouns increased in nearly all regions from 2016 to 2019, implying a stronger focus of Brexit in light of the government. There is sparse remaining data in regards to addressed nouns that provide meaning without the presence of context as presented in *Table 19*. A shift from a focus on *business*, the *market*, *company*, and *jobs* in 2016 to the still related, but more specific *trade* in 2019 is the most noticeable. Only regions 1 and 2 have consistent nouns of *independence* and *border* respectively across both years. As region 13 forms a control in the present study, it is interesting to note that this region's focus on *immigration* in 2016 is only shared by region 8. Finally, the *NHS* became a more frequent topic of discussion in 2019.

REGION	2016	2019
1. Scotland	Independence	Independence
		NHS
2. Northern Ireland	Border	Border
	Business	Trade
4. North East		Trade
5. North West	Business	NHS
	Market	
6. Yorkshire and the Humber	Business	
	Company	
7. West Midlands	Bank	Travel
	Passport	
8. East Midlands	Immigration	Business
	School	Trade
9. South West		Education
10. South East	Business	
11. East of England	Jobs	



REGION	2016	2019
12. Greater London	Work	Police
	Women	
13. National	Immigration	Trade

Table 19: Informative topics

Data as presented in *Chapter 5.1.* allows for SQ1: *Which topical nouns are addressed in local newspaper articles referencing Brexit?* to be answered as the following: the region, the EU, and Brexit were addressed most frequently, with the former two nouns having a higher frequency in 2016 and the latter a higher frequency in 2019. In addition, the duration of Brexit, the government and the economy were addressed in the local newspapers. The NHS was also a topical noun, however only in 2019. Finally, Scotland and Northern Ireland also addressed the topic of independence and the border, respectively.

## 5.2. TONE

The second section of this chapter will provide the results for SQ2: *How do local newspapers set the tone in articles referencing Brexit by employing adverbs and adjectives?* From the results it became clear that tone ought to be divided by the context in which the tone is set and the positive, neutral or negative tone the adverbs and adjectives evoke.

### 5.2.1. CONTEXT

First, the top three adverbs and adjectives used in the twelve regions and on a national basis in both 2016 and 2019 will be presented.

	1. SCOTLAND					
	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Scottish	69	0,35	Labour	178	0,55
2	European	50	0,25	Scottish	136	0,42
3	Labour	46	0,23	Tory	56	0,17

Table 20: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives Scotland





2. NORTHERN IRELAND						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Northern	149	0,44	Northern	230	0,47
2	Irish	67	0,20	Labour	126	0,26
3	European	66	0,19	European	93	0,19

Table 21: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives Northern Ireland

3. WALES						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	151	0,28	Labour	115	0,33
2	Welsh	140	0,26	Welsh	73	0,21
3	Labour	80	0,15	General	65	0,18

Table 22: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives Wales

4. NORTH EAST						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	23	0,22	Labour	143	0,61
2	Irish	22	0,21	European	41	0,17
3	Polish	17	0,16	General	38	0,16

Table 23: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives North East

5. NORTH WEST						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Labour	39	0,20	Labour	84	0,52
2	European	26	0,14	European	44	0,27
3	Public	25	0,13	Conservative	28	0,17

Table 24: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives North West

6. YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Yorkshire	58	0,25	Labour	132	0,71
2	Labour	37	0,16	Yorkshire	48	0,26
3	European	34	0,15	European	31	0,17

Table 25: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives Yorkshire and the Humber

7. WEST MIDLANDS						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	British	17	0,29	European	35	0,19
2	European	12	0,21	Labour	30	0,16
3	Political	8	0,14	General	29	0,15

Table 26: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives West Midlands

8. EAST MIDLANDS						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	National	2	0,39	Labour	73	0,34
2	European	2	0,39	Conservative	38	0,18
3	Xenophobic	1	0,20	General	31	0,14

Table 27: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives East Midlands

9. SOUTH WEST						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	21	0,15	Liberal	64	0,30
2	Uncertain	20	0,15	Labour	48	0,22
3	Nuclear	20	0,15	Local	42	0,20

Table 28: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives South West

10. SOUTH EAST						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	34	0,14	Labour	47	0,24
2	Conservative	22	0,09	European	42	0,21
3	Labour	21	0,08	Green	22	0,11

Table 29: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives South East

11. EAST OF ENGLAND						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	80	0,47	Labour	71	0,33
2	British	27	0,16	General	59	0,28
3	Conservative	19	0,11	Conservative	48	0,23

Table 30: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives East of England

12. GREATER LONDON						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	26	0,21	Labour	110	0,52
2	Conservative	18	0,15	Green	49	0,23
3	Legal	14	0,11	Liberal	42	0,20

Table 31: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives Greater London

13. NATIONAL						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	141	0,21	Labour	189	0,38
2	British	119	0,18	Tory	97	0,19
3	Tory	85	0,13	European	59	0,12

Table 32: Top 3 adverbs and adjectives National

As can be seen in the above tables, regions 1, 2, and 6 most frequently used the context of their region to set the one in 2016 and region 3 did also, but less frequently. This regional context declined in 2019 for the regions 1, 2 and 6, but remained the same in region 3. This implies a



decrease in the importance of the region from 2016 to 2019. In the regions 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 *European* was used most frequently as the context to set the tone in 2016 and all other regions did also, but on a smaller scale. This *European* context declined in 2019 for the regions 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, but remained the same or increased in the regions 2, 5, 6, and 7. This suggests an overall decrease of tone with a *European* context from 2016 to 2019. In addition, setting the tone in light of political parties was very apparent in 2019. The regions 1, 3, 5, 6, and 10 employed the adjective *Labour* in 2016 and regions 11, 12, and 13 employed either *conservative* or *Tory*. In 2019 all regions set the tone in light of the *Labour* Party and regions 1, 5, 8, 11, and 13 also did so for the *Tory* Party or *conservative*. This would imply that setting the tone through political parties increased from 2016 to 2019 with the *Labour* Party being the most predominant in both years.

The remaining 17 most frequently employed adverbs and adjectives as presented in *Appendix 9.2.* also offer some interesting insights. All regions used macro-environmental factors most frequently as adverbs and adjectives. These have been categorised into economy, environment, legislation, locality, people, politics, and ethnicity (*Table 33*). In 2016 the categories employed were locality (12 newspapers), politics (11), economy (10), people (9), ethnicity (7), legislation (1), and environment (0). In 2019 this sequence shifted to people and politics (12 newspapers each), locality (11), economy (6), ethnicity (3), environment (2), and legislation (1). Both economy and ethnicity had the largest decrease in news coverage of four newspapers less each. The category of economy encompasses *economic*, *financial* and *domestic*, whereas the category of ethnicity covers more factors and with a broader variation. In 2016 ethnicity included the adverbs and adjectives *foreign* in regions 3, 10, and 13, *Polish* in region 4, *Syrian* in region 4, *racial* in region 7, *ethnic* in region 8, *French* in regions 9 and 13, and *German* in regions 11 and 13. This shows that the North East is the region where nationalities of immigrants in the UK were used as the context to set the tone, whereas the South and the national newspaper did this with Western-European nationalities in 2016. In addition, region 8 also set the tone in light of *xenophobic* and *racist* (*Appendix 9.2.8.*). In 2019 ethnicity included the adverbs and adjectives *Polish* in regions 8 and 11 and *foreign* in region 10. The usage is consistent with that of 2016,

except for the use of *Polish* in region 11 which may suggest a shift in focus from Western-European to Eastern-European nationalities in this region.

REGION	FACTOR	2016	2019
<b>1. SCOTLAND</b>	ECONOMY		economic
	LEGISLATION		legal, constitutional
	PEOPLE	public, social	public
	POLITICS		political
<b>2. NORTHERN IRELAND</b>	ECONOMY	economic	economic
	LOCALITY	global, local	
	PEOPLE	social, public	public
	POLITICS	political	political
<b>3. WALES</b>	ECONOMY	economic, financial	
	LOCALITY	rural	national
	PEOPLE	public, social	public
	POLITICS	political	political
	ETHNICITY	foreign	
<b>4. NORTH EAST</b>	LOCALITY	national	local, national
	PEOPLE	public	social
	POLITICS	political	political
	ETHNICITY	Polish, Syrian	
<b>5. NORTH WEST</b>	ECONOMY	financial, economic	
	LOCALITY	urban	local, abroad
	PEOPLE	public, social	public
	POLITICS	political	political
<b>6. YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER</b>	ECONOMY	financial	financial
	LOCALITY	national, local	local
	PEOPLE	public, social	public, social
	POLITICS		political, parliamentary
<b>7. WEST MIDLANDS</b>	ECONOMY	economic	economic
	ENVIRONMENT		sustainable
	LOCALITY	national	international, global
	POLITICS	political, parliamentary	
	ETHNICITY	racial	
<b>8. EAST MIDLANDS</b>	LOCALITY	national	local
	PEOPLE		public, social
	POLITICS	political	political
	ETHNICITY	ethnic	Polish
<b>9. SOUTH WEST</b>	ECONOMY	financial, economic	financial
	ENVIRONMENT		environmental
	LOCALITY	local	local, rural, national
	PEOPLE		public, social
	POLITICS	political	political
	ETHNICITY	French	
<b>10. SOUTH EAST</b>	ECONOMY	economic	
	LOCALITY	local, global, national, international	local, national, international
	PEOPLE	public	public, social
	POLITICS	political	political, parliamentary
	ETHNICITY	foreign	foreign
	ECONOMY	economic, domestic	



REGION	FACTOR	2016	2019
11. EAST OF ENGLAND	LOCALITY	national, local	national
	PEOPLE	public, social	public, social
	POLITICS	political	political
	ETHNICITY	German	Polish
12. GREATER LONDON	ECONOMY	economic, financial	
	LEGISLATION	Legal	
	LOCALITY	local	local, national
	PEOPLE	social, public	public, social
	POLITICS	political	political, parliamentary
13. NATIONAL	ECONOMY	economic	economic
	LOCALITY	national	national, local
	PEOPLE		public, social
	POLITICS	political	political
	ETHNICITY	foreign, German, French	

Table 33: Categories of adverbs and adjectives

### 5.2.2. POSITIVE, NEUTRAL AND NEGATIVE

Those remaining adverbs and adjectives that can be determined as evoking either a positive (+), neutral (/) or negative (–) tone are presented in *Table 34*. In 2016 newspapers set the tone more frequently than in 2019. However, in both years the tone was more often set as negative. The negative adverb or adjective most frequently employed was *uncertain*. In general, the negative tone was evoked by more subjective terminology such as *stupid* and *wicked*. The lack of data for 2019 in *Table 34* implies a decrease in setting the tone which in hand may also imply an increase of objectivity as less adverbs and adjectives were used.

REGION	2016			2019		
	+	/	–	+	/	–
1. Scotland	Strong		Stupid			
2. Northern Ireland	Strong					
3. Wales	Positive					Serious
	Strong					
4. North East			Firm		Special	Serious
5. North West		Important	Expensive			
6. Yorkshire and the Humber	Strong		Wicked			
			Hate			
7. West Midlands	Proud		Violent			
			Racist			
			Scared			
8. East Midlands	Staunchly		Xenophobic			
	Happy		Racist			
9. South West			Uncertain			
			Nuclear			
			Shock			
10. South East			Uncertain	Proud	Encouraging	





REGION	2016			2019		
	+	/	-	+	/	-
11. East of England	Stronger		Uncertain Negative			Racist
12. Greater London	Optimistic					

Table 34: Tone

Data as presented in *Chapter 5.2.* allows for SQ2: *How do local newspapers set the tone in articles referencing Brexit by employing adverbs and adjectives?* to be answered as the following: the context of the tone was most frequently set in light of the region, European, and the Labour (Party). In addition, the context of the tone was often set in light of macro-environmental factors with locality, politics, economy, and people taking centre stage. Overall, the tone of the articles was a negative one. However, articles from 2019 refrain from setting the tone as either positive, neutral or negative as much as they did in 2016.

### 5.3. COLLOCATES

The third section of this chapter will provide the results for SQ3: *Which nouns, adverbs and adjectives are used in specific collocational relation to Brexit?* The results will be divided based on the criteria of frequency, distance, and exclusivity (Brezina, McEnery, & Wattam, 2015). As both nouns and adverbs and adjectives are included in this sub-question, topics, context, and tone will be discussed throughout each section.

#### 5.3.1. FREQUENCY

As with the previous sub-questions in this chapter, the top 3 most frequently used nouns, adverbs and adjectives will first be presented.

	1. SCOTLAND					
	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	20		Deal	36	9
2	Wake	7		Party	29	
3	Scotland	6		Referendum	12	

Table 35: Top 3 collocates Scotland



2. NORTHERN IRELAND						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	23		Deal	84	7
2	Ireland	11	1	Party	56	
3	Northern	8		Ireland	31	1

Table 36: Top 3 collocates Northern Ireland

3. WALES						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Post	16	15	Party	35	
2	UK	12		Deal	32	8
3	Campaign	7		Price	11	

Table 37: Top 3 collocates Wales

4. NORTH EAST						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	7		Party	43	
2	People	3		Deal	28	8
3	Experts	2		Vote	11	

Table 38: Top 3 collocates North East

5. NORTH WEST						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	16		Deal	27	6
2	Post	7	6	Party	23	
3	Manchester	6		Plans	7	

Table 39: Top 3 collocates North West

6. YORSHIRE AND THE HUMBER						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	12		Party	27	
2	Party	3	1	Deal	17	3
3	Uncertainty	3		Vote	12	

Table 40: Top 3 collocates Yorkshire and the Humber

7. WEST MIDLANDS						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	10		Deal	25	6
2	Birmingham	5		UK	11	
3	Constituency	4		Party	9	

Table 41: Top 3 collocates West Midlands



8. EAST MIDLANDS						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Residents	1		Party	34	
2	Vote	1		Deal	18	6
3	Camp	1		Agreement	12	

Table 42: Top 3 collocates East Midlands

9. SOUTH WEST						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	18	1	Party	16	
2	UK	7	1	Deal	10	4
3	Shock	7		People	7	

Table 43: Top 3 collocates South West

10. SOUTH EAST						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	21		Party	34	
2	Post	14	14	Brighton	10	1
3	Impact	9		Deal	10	3

Table 44: Top 3 collocates South East

11. EAST OF ENGLAND						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	27		Party	23	
2	Post	8	7	Deal	15	5
3	UK	8	3	Poster	11	

Table 45: Top 3 collocates East of England

12. GREATER LONDON						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Post	15	13	Party	34	
2	Leader	7		London	8	1
3	Council	7		Referendum	7	

Table 46: Top 3 collocates Greater London

13. NATIONAL						
2016			2019			
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	37	3	Deal	92	8
2	EU	20		Party	64	1
3	Britain	19		Vote	35	

Table 47: Top 3 collocates National

As can be seen in the above tables, regions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 13 most frequently framed Brexit in light of the referendum *vote* taking place in 2016. This framing declined in all mentioned regions in 2019. In the regions 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 *party* was the most frequent



topic used to frame Brexit and all other regions applied this framing as well, but less frequently. There is reason to believe that considering the close distance of a maximum of 5 words from the target word, *party* would here suggest the political party, Brexit Party. Finally, the regions 1, 2, 5, 7, and 13 addressed *deal* the most frequently in 2019 and all other regions framed Brexit in this manner as well, but less frequently. This implies the framing of Brexit in light of coming to a deal with the EU.

### 5.3.2. DISTANCE

In order to assess the collocates on distance, only the collocates employed directly before *Brexit* (L1) will now be presented as this position has the smallest distance to the target word and is most likely to refer directly to Brexit.

1. SCOTLAND					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Post	4	4	Deal	36	9
UK	3	1	Election	9	1
Fears	2	1	Shadow	8	8
			Post	8	8
			Tory	7	1
			Minister	6	1
			Scottish	6	1
			Hard	5	4

Table 48: L1 collocates Scotland

2. NORTHERN IRELAND					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Ireland	11	1	Deal	84	7
Impact	6	2	Ireland	31	1
Post	5	5	Post	13	13
			Election	13	1
			Time	9	1

Table 47: L1 collocates Northern Ireland

3. WALES					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Post	16	15	Deal	32	8
Impact	5	1	Post	6	6
			Debate	6	2
			Election	5	1

Table 48: L1 collocates Wales



4. NORTH EAST					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Post	1	1	Deal	28	8
			Referendum	8	1
			Election	7	1
			News	6	1
			Clear	4	1

Table 49: L1 collocates North East

5. NORTH WEST					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Post	7	6	Deal	27	6
Warning	2	1	Post	5	5
			Delay	4	1

Table 50: L1 collocates North West

6. YORSHIRE AND THE HUMBER					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Party	3	1	Deal	17	3
			Parliament	5	1
			Voters	4	1

Table 51: L1 collocates Yorkshire and the Humber

7. WEST MIDLANDS					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Post	2	2	Deal	25	6
			Government	5	1

Table 52: L1 collocates West Midlands

8. EAST MIDLANDS					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
			Deal	18	6
			Post	4	4

Table 53: L1 collocates East Midlands

9. SOUTH WEST					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Vote	18	1	Deal	10	4
UK	7	1	Impact	5	2
Business	5	1	Hard	4	2
Post	4	3	Post	4	3

Table 54: L1 collocates South West

10. SOUTH EAST					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Post	14	14	Brighton	10	1
			Deal	10	3
			Post	4	4
			Vote	4	1
			Artists	4	2

Table 55: L1 collocates South East

11. EAST OF ENGLAND					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Post	8	7	Deal	15	5
UK	8	3	Happy	6	6
EU	4	1	Tory	4	1
			Post	2	2

Table 56: L1 collocates East of England

12. GREATER LONDON					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Post	15	13	London	8	1
			Deal	6	1
			Hard	5	4
			EU	4	1
			Fight	2	1

Table 57: L1 collocates Greater London

13. NATIONAL					
2016			2019		
WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
Vote	37	3	Deal	92	8
Post	14	14	Party	64	1
			EU	26	3
			Labour	22	2
			Referendum	19	1
			Post	10	9
			Brussels	6	1

Table 58: L1 collocates National

As can be seen in the above tables, in 2019 far more nouns, adverbs and adjectives were used in direct relation to Brexit than in 2016. *Post* was used most frequently as an L1 in 2016 in nearly all regions and this word was also employed in 2019, but less frequently. This may suggest a focus on the future; post-Brexit. In 2016 only region 2 mentioned their local region or city as an L1, but in 2019 regions 1, 2, 10, and 12 did so which suggests a higher focus on the impact of Brexit on the region or city. Brexit was framed as *hard* in 2019 by the regions 1, 9, and 12 which



is assumed to imply the distinction between the well-known soft and hard Brexit. There was no mention of this in 2016 which is most likely due to the fact that a distinction between a soft or hard Brexit was yet to take shape. Finally, in 2016 regions 1 and 5 set a negative tone of Brexit by employing *fears* and *warning* as an L1, respectively. In 2019 regions 1 and 12 set such a tone by employing *shadow* and *fight* as an L1, respectively. As region 1 is the only region setting a consistent negative tone, it may suggest that in general Brexit is framed in a negative manner by this newspaper. Region 11 is the only region to set a positive tone by employing *happy* as an L1 in 2019. Overall, however, the tone is more frequently set as negative than as positive.

### 5.3.3. EXCLUSIVITY

In this final section the exclusivity of the collocates will be presented; nouns, adverbs and adjectives that suggest a direct relation to the target word without the presence of context (Brezina, McEnery, & Wattam, 2015). As in *Chapter 5.2.*, these will be assessed on the tone being positive (+), neutral (/) or negative (–), however not limited to adverbs and adjectives (*Table 59*). In 2016 newspapers set the tone more frequently than in 2019. However, in both years the tone was more often set as negative. In 2016 the most frequent word to set a negative tone was *uncertainty* in the regions 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 12, followed by *turmoil* in the regions 1, 2, and 4. Only region 2 employs both these words, however the most negative words *fears*, *disaster*, *panic*, *warning*, *pain*, *battle*, and *hate* are employed in the regions 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, and 12. In 2019, the most negative words were *defeat*, *battle*, *frustration*, *fears*, *fight*, *mistake*, and *fury* in the regions 6, 7, 11, 12, and 13. Only regions 6, 7, 11, and 12 had a consistent use of very negative terminology in regards to Brexit across both years.



REGION	2016			2019		
	+	/	-	+	/	-
1. Scotland			Fears			Shadow
			Shock			
			Turmoil			
2. Northern Ireland			Turmoil			
			Uncertainty			
3. Wales		Consequences	Disaster			Protester
4. North East			Turmoil			
5. North West	Victory		Uncertainty			Bollocks
			Panic			Risk
			Warning			
6. Yorkshire and the Humber			Uncertainty			Deadlock
			Pain			Defeat
			Warning			
7. West Midlands			Shock			Battle
			Battle			Deadlock
			Victim			
9. South West	Victory		Shock	Breakthrough		Uncertainty
			Uncertainty	Saga		Backstop
			Impediment			
			Casualty			
10. South East			Uncertainty			Risks
			Concerns			Battle
			Instability			
11. East of England			Fallout	Happy	Opportunities	Frustration
			Risk			Fears
12. Greater London			Crime			Fight
			Uncertainty			
			Hate			
			Tensions			
13. National			Divorce			Mistake
						Fury

Table 59: Tone collocates

Data as presented in *Chapter 5.3.* allows for SQ3: *Which nouns, adverbs and adjectives are used in specific collocational relation to Brexit?* to be answered as the following: the Brexit-deal was the most frequently addressed noun in 2019 and post-Brexit was the most frequently employed adjective in direct relation to Brexit overall. Adverbs and adjectives in direct relation to Brexit most often set a negative tone, but less frequently in 2019. Finally, the exclusive nouns uncertainty and turmoil were used most frequently when addressing Brexit.

#### 5.4. NEWS FRAMING SHIFT

The final section of this chapter will provide the results for the main RQ: *How has written news framing of Brexit in local newspapers shifted since the referendum in 2016 across the twelve regions of the United Kingdom?* As the research-question suggests, this chapter will provide a summary of the most important findings focusing on the shift within regions from 2016 to 2019 and thus, provide an answer to the RQ.

In 2016 local newspapers framed news about Brexit most frequently in light of the region or city, however, this decreased in 2019 in the use of both nouns and adverbs and adjectives. Such a decrease was even more apparent for the framing of news in light of the EU in the use of both nouns and adverbs and adjectives. An increase, however, occurred in framing news in light of Brexit. Additional data indicates an increase in the framing of news in terms of the government from 2016 to 2019. In 2016, news framing focused on businesses, but in 2019 this focus had shifted to trade which implies an internationally oriented shift. Finally, the NHS became a topic of discussion in 2019.

In 2019, setting the tone through political parties increased. The Labour Party was employed most frequently in both 2016 and 2019, but the Tory Party experienced a higher relative increase. From 2016 to 2019, the economy and ethnicity experienced the most drastic decrease in news framing across the regions. In regards to ethnicity, a shift from Western to Eastern-European news framing occurred, especially in the East of England. This could imply a higher degree of news framing in light of immigration. In general, setting the tone as either positive, neutral or negative declined drastically from 2016 to 2019, however the tone was most often negative in both years.

Overall direct news framing of Brexit increased significantly in 2019. A slight increased shift in the direct framing of Brexit in light of the region or city occurred in 2019, however this is in contrast with the decline of regional news framing in regards to the overall news articles. As with the degree of tone setting as previously mentioned for the articles overall, the same decrease from 2016 to 2019 was experienced in direct relation to Brexit. The same prevalence of negative

over positive occurred as well. In 2016, a direct negative tone of Brexit was most frequently set as *uncertain* or as a *turmoil*. This high frequency declined in 2019 but was replaced with more subjective words such as *defeat*, *battle*, *frustration*, *fears*, *fight*, *mistake*, and *fury*.

## 6. DISCUSSION

Based on the presented results, the data will now be contextualised by means of the relevant theoretical framework and the current social and political climate. As with *Chapter 5*, the discussion will be approached per sub- (topics, tone, collocates) and research-question. The news framing shifts will only be addressed when discussing the main research-question.

### 6.1. TOPICS

It was expected that the local newspapers would most often cover national news items from the perspective of the region or city (Jenkins & Nielsen, 2018), which was indeed the case in both 2016 and 2019. The British government was frequently addressed as a topic across both years. This result may therefore fall under the framing category of *responsibility* as the government created, but is also responsible for solving the matter of Brexit (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). Another framing category that can be detected is that of *economic consequences*. In both 2016 and 2019, the local newspapers framed news in light of varying economic matters, from individual matters such as jobs and businesses to group matters such as the market and trade (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). This economical framing is in-line with the economy being the most important reason to vote for or against Brexit during the initial campaign (Sogelola, 2018).

Despite there being five framing categories that newspapers can employ (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015), local UK newspapers only opted for the categories of *responsibility* and *economic consequences* across both years with the topics they addressed. This fact, however, is based on the theory of repetition (Bhatia, 2014). Should repetition not have been taken as the main criteria for analysis and been substituted by the first stage of CDA (close-readings) (Fairclough, 2003), the remaining three framing categories may have been discovered in the corpus due to the presence of context. High degrees of framing in the articles could have been discovered just by headlines, pictures, a short line at the end of the article, and so on (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015).

The national newspaper, taken as a control in the present study, framed news in light of immigration in 2016. This result is in-line with immigration becoming the most important reason

to vote for or against Brexit as the campaign progressed (Sogelola, 2018) which may imply a national framing in the category of *conflict* as it suggests a polarisation between groups; British citizens and immigrants (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). This framing was only shared by the East Midlands, which would suggest a large discrepancy between national and local newspapers. The fact that it was only the East Midlands who shared this framing could be related to the region's relative high percentage (58,8%) of the vote leave in the referendum (BBC, sd). Previous research indeed confirms that a high degree of immigration framing resulted in a higher percentage of voting leave (Gavin, 2018). Finally, the newspapers from Scotland and Northern Ireland consistently framed news in light of their independence and their border, respectively. This can be related to Scotland's desire to remain in the EU, even if this were to cost them their membership to the UK (Carrell, 2020) and Northern Ireland's ongoing concerns in regards to trade with Ireland (Curtis, 2020).

## 6.2. TONE

As with the results previously discussed, the context in which the tone was set was most often the region or city (Jenkins & Nielsen, 2018). The Labour (Party) was also repeated throughout both years as the context to set the tone. It was expected that the Tory Party would be subject to more repetition than the Labour Party as the Tories have been in power throughout the Brexit campaign and still are. As the Tory Party was re-elected as the majority government in the 2019 General Election (The Guardian, 2019), a repetition of their party may have fallen under the framing of who is responsible for solving Brexit within the *responsibility* category (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). However, as it was the Labour Party that fell subject to the most repetition, there is reason to believe this still falls under the framing category of *responsibility*, but in light of who is to blame for a Brexit-deal not yet being achieved with the EU (Connolly, 2019). This may also link this framing to the category of *conflict* as it entails a confrontation between right- and left-winged political parties (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). In addition, this frequent repetition of the Labour Party may imply the framing of news with Corbyn's undecided Brexit-deal proposal (Shrimpsley,

2019) as the central idea. This in turn gives meaning to the issue (Borah, 2011). Here, the issue is not coming to a deal with the EU if the Labour Party were to be elected which therefore sheds a more positive light on the deal as proposed by Corbyn's opponent, Johnson. The fact that the British public re-elected the Tory Party in 2019 may imply that this framing influenced the public's decision-making process successfully (Borah, 2011). However, as the approach of CA was taken in the present study, one can only speculate that the context surrounding the repetition of the Labour Party was as described above, despite the results of the General Election supporting this discussion.

In-line with the results on immigration for the East Midlands in *Chapter 6.1.*, this region set the tone in the context of Polish immigrants in 2019, which is again in-line with previous research (Gavin, 2018) and in relation to the region's leave vote (58.8%) in the referendum (BBC, sd). The North East also employed this context of immigration in 2016 which again coincides with previous research (Gavin, 2018) and the region's relatively high (58.0%) vote to leave in the referendum (BBC, sd). The East Midlands and the North East had the second and third highest percentage of leave votes, respectively. The West Midlands had the highest percentage (59.3%) of leave votes (BBC, sd), however immigration was not used to set the context in this region which may mean not being able to draw conclusions on the relation of news framing in light of immigration and the vote to leave in the present study. Finally, the frequent setting of a negative tone in 2016 is in-line with previous research suggesting that leave newspapers employed a more negative tone than remain newspapers during the Brexit campaigns (Levy, Aslan, & Bironze, 2016) as overall, the UK indeed decided to leave the EU (BBC, 2016).

### 6.3. COLLOCATES

In the collocate analysis it became apparent that the Brexit Party was one of the most frequently employed topics with *party* being the collocate. However, it is believed that this frequency cannot be compared to that of the Labour Party in *Chapter 6.2.* as the present result was taken from a much smaller corpus (only collocates as opposed to the entire articles). In addition, the Brexit

Party is the only political party in the UK to use the referendum in its name, which may result in its frequency as a collocate being misinterpreted as a predominance of the Brexit Party addressed in relation to Brexit. Therefore, it is highly plausible that this result is a coincidence that would be apparent for any political party whose name included Brexit. In contrast to the results as discussed in *Chapter 6.1.* and *6.2.*, the direct framing of Brexit in light of the region or city (Jenkins & Nielsen, 2018) was not highly visible. This may imply that it was not Brexit being framed on a regional or local basis, but its related topics and context as presented in *Chapter 5.1.* and *5.2.* were. This would make sense as Brexit was a national and not a regional or local referendum.

As in *Chapter 6.2.*, the overall tone expressed in regards to Brexit was a negative one, in-line with the effects of this tone (Levy, Aslan, & Bironze, 2016) on the referendum results (BBC, 2016). The most exclusive nouns used to set this tone were *uncertainty* and *turmoil*, which could be related to the chaotic debate around and long duration of coming to a deal with the EU (Henley, 2019). Scotland was the only region to consistently frame Brexit in a negative tone with the L1 across both years. This could be linked to the region's consistent topic of their independence from the rest of the UK as discussed in *Chapter 6.1.* as Scotland maintains the negative framing of Brexit which would have their consistent want for independence as a result. This in turn, goes hand in hand with the region's unwavering desire to maintain membership in the EU.

#### 6.4. NEWS FRAMING SHIFT

In the final section of this chapter, the results for the main research-question will be discussed. Overall, the framing of news in light of the region or city decreased from 2016 to 2019, despite local newspapers being expected to do so (Jenkins & Nielsen, 2018). This may be due to the fact that after four years, local newspapers decided that Brexit was no longer a matter which they could address from their local perspective, but was one that needed to be addressed on a national level. Moreover, within the framing category of *economic consequences* (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015), a national to an international shift was experienced. This may be due to the realisation of Brexit being a matter that effects much more than just the national way of life, specifically future trade





with the rest of the world. On the other hand, the overall decrease of news framed in light of the EU may eliminate this argument. However, it could also be argued that this decrease was not one from an international to a national scale, but an acceptance that the UK will no longer be a part of the union and thus have no need to address the EU to such an extent anymore. Framing news in light of Brexit increased from 2016 to 2019 which may seem unexpected as the Brexit referendum took place in 2016 and not in 2019. However, it may be that the local newspapers now had a better understanding of what Brexit entails, thus feeling more confident in addressing the matter more frequently. This is also in-line with the previously discussed understanding of the large-scale impact Brexit may have (from local to national to international news framing).

Another increase was experienced in framing news around the government. This would suggest a larger use of the framing category *responsibility* or even *conflict* (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015) in 2019 as previously discussed in *Chapter 6.2.* Framing news in light of conflict may also suggest a higher degree of newspapers not just reporting on politics but being an active participant in the political process (Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995). This is supported by the fact that such media participation is especially apparent during election campaigns (Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995) and the present 2019 corpus was focused around the General Election. Finally, the NHS became a noun for news framing in 2019. This can be linked to negotiations PM Johnson held with US President, Donald Trump, which resulted in concerns that Johnson would 'sell' the NHS (Enley, 2019).

The frequency with which local newspapers set the tone as positive, neutral or negative (Brunken, 2006) decreased drastically from 2016 to 2019. What tone was set, however, did remain predominantly negative. Such a decrease in tone setting may imply a shift from subjective to objective news framing. However, where the collocate analysis also indicated this decrease in frequency, those nouns, adverbs and adjectives that were employed were far more subjective than those in 2016. This subjectivity, however, could also be placed in the framing category of *human interest* (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). Newspapers may have decreased their subjectivity overall, but in turn focused more on bringing Brexit closer to the public by evoking emotions

(Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015) such as fear, frustration, and fury. This implies a decrease in the *frequency* of subjective news framing, but an increase in *emotional* subjectivity.

Finally, an increase in framing Brexit directly from 2016 to 2019 was experienced by employing more nouns, adverbs adjectives from L5 – R5. This may suggest a better understanding of Brexit as journalists felt more confident and comfortable to do so in 2019. Overall, these results suggest a stronger focus on framing Brexit specifically, as opposed to news in general. This is also in-line with the increase of framing overall news in light of Brexit as discussed in the first paragraph of this chapter.

## 7. CONCLUSION

The final chapter of this study entails relevant concluding remarks and hopes to shed light on possibilities for further research. The current political climate in the UK due to Brexit was the initial trigger for research, especially how this climate has been portrayed by local newspapers since 2016. Taking the field of Intercultural Communication into the realm of language studies allowed for the present research to take shape with the help of four research-questions. These research-questions were formulated after a detailed review and critical analysis of the existing theoretical framework in regards to political journalism, mediatisation of politics, and news framing. The method of triangulation aided the outcome of this study on different levels. The corpus analysis was applied in order to retrieve large amounts of data and remove any possible bias from the researcher. The critical discourse analysis allowed for this data to be contextualised in light of existing theories and the current social and political climate. Finally, the collocate analysis allowed for both previous mentioned methods to be applied on a very specific level. The analyses presented vast amounts of data which were presented in tables, supported by descriptions on how to interpret the data. Contextualising these results indicated that local British newspapers are most frequently reliant on the framing categories of *economic consequences*, *responsibility*, *conflict*, and *human interest*, in that order when reporting on Brexit. In addition, newspapers have grown in confidence and knowledge in regards to Brexit since the referendum, being inclined to discuss Brexit more frequently and frame the phenomenon more directly. The conclusions that have here been drawn allow for the research-question *How has written news framing of Brexit in local newspapers shifted since the referendum in 2016 across the twelve regions of the United Kingdom?* to be answered as the following: *Written news framing of Brexit in local newspapers has shifted in terms of economic consequences, responsibility, conflict, and human interest all the while becoming a more active participant in the political process since the referendum in 2016 across the twelve regions of the United Kingdom.*

Limitations to this research and thus, to these conclusions can first and foremost be found in the methodology. While combining CA and CDA allowed for a much larger corpus to be

analysed, it eliminated the meaning that the context of the news articles could have provided. CA did not allow for any context to be taken into consideration and therefore data could have been interpreted differently from what was actually implied. As a consequence, the present research also partially relied on the researcher's interpretation and knowledge of the English language and social and political climate to select the nouns, adverbs and adjectives that did provide meaning without the context. The researcher, however, is a native speaker and British citizen which would minimise this limitation.

Where it has just been argued that the combination of CA and CDA allowed for a larger corpus, this was not the case in all instances. The corpus for the East Midlands in 2016 contained only one article. As the corpus had to meet the criteria of a specific date and newspaper, this limitation could not be eliminated. However, this does imply that all conclusions for this region in 2016 ought to be taken with a grain of salt. Where the overall corpus could nevertheless be considered large with 1,058 articles, the distribution of these articles was not evenly divided between regions or years. This uneven distribution results in an unequal portrayal of the regions and the years which may have affected the frequency analysis within CA. The final limitation to the present methodology was the selection of the newspapers. Conclusions have been drawn for the regions in the UK, but based on data from cities within those regions. The results may therefore not all be applicable to the region, but to the city. Unfortunately, not all regions had a regional newspaper, hence the researcher's decision to continue the research with this approach.

Another limitation to the present researcher is that the intermediate shift in news framing has not been portrayed. However, due to constraints in time and resources and the vast amount of available data, the researcher opted to select 2019 as opposed to 2017 or 2018 to ensure an up-to-date sample. A final limitation is related to the topic of this research. An exit from the European Union is a recent phenomenon and therefore theories and studies on this matter were limited. However, the researcher felt researching a recent and relevant topic would provide more useful insights to the field of Intercultural Communication.

Suggestions for further research include conducting the same research but with a larger corpus. Where other researchers would also face the problem of regional newspapers not being available, multiple cities from each region could be selected, as opposed to one per region. Another suggestion would be to apply an analysis programme other than WordSmith Tools that would allow for verbs, articles, prepositions, and pronouns to be filtered out automatically in order to reduce the efforts of the researcher. Where the present study merely sketched an image of how local British newspapers have attempted to frame Brexit, the effects on the British public's decision-making process and their opinions and feelings in regards to the matters addressed has not been researched. It would be interesting to take the results from the present study as the basis for a survey among the British public to test if the news framing as presented in the present study was effective. Does the British public indeed place blame on the Labour Party for the long duration of Brexit? Have Polish immigrants really affected the British public's referendum and General Election votes? These are questions the researcher would like answered with such a survey. Finally, the present methodology could be applied to the news framing of Brexit throughout the rest of the EU. One could take the most popular newspaper from each country in the EU and subject them to the same analysis.

## 8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Press Institute. (2014). *The rational and attentive news consumer*. American Press Institute.
- Ardèvol-Abreu, A. (2015). Framing theory in communication research. Origins, development and current situation in Spain. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, 70, 423-450.
- Arowolo, O. (2017). *Understanding Framing Theory*. Lagos: Lagos State University.
- Bang, M. (2003). *A corpus based study of representation of foreign countries in the South Korean press*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- BBC. (2016, June 24). *UK Politics*. Retrieved January 12, 2020, from BBC: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-36616028>
- BBC. (2019, May 24). *UK politics*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from BBC: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-48379730>
- BBC. (2019, December 31). *UK politics*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from BBC: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-50956221>
- BBC. (2020, February 17). *UK politics*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from BBC: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887>
- BBC. (n.d.). *EU Referendum Results*. Retrieved January 12, 2020, from BBC: [https://www.bbc.com/news/politics/eu\\_referendum/results](https://www.bbc.com/news/politics/eu_referendum/results)
- Bhatia, K. (2014). *Construction of Reality: Politics in a Mediated World*. Ahmedabad: MICA.
- Blumler, J., & Gurevitch, M. (1995). *The Crisis of Public Communication*. Psychology Press.
- Borah, P. (2011). Conceptual Issues in Framing Theory: A Systematic Examination of a Decade's Literature. *Journal of Communication*, 61(2), 246-263.
- Brezina, V., McEnery, T., & Wattam, S. (2015). Collocations in context. A new perspective on collocation networks. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 20(2), 139-173.
- Brunken, B. L. (2006). *Hurricane Katrina: A content analysis of media framing, attribute agenda setting, and tone of government response*. Louisiana: Louisiana State University.

- Carrell, S. (2020, February 4). *Scottish Independence survey shows Brexit has put union at risk*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2020/feb/04/scottish-independence-survey-shows-brexit-has-put-union-at-risk>
- Chen, C.-H. (2009). Corpus, Lexicon, and Construction: A Quantitative Corpus Approach to Mandarin Possessive Construction. *Computational Linguistics and Chinese Language Processing*, 14(3), 305-340.
- Connolly, S. (2019, October 31). *Johnson blames Corby for delay in Brexit as poll campaigns crank up*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from Independent: <https://www.independent.ie/world-news/europe/britain/johnson-blames-corbyn-for-delay-in-brexit-as-poll-campaigns-crank-up-38647821.html>
- Curtis, J. (2020, January 14). *Brexit and the Northern Ireland border*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from Commons Library: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/brexit/policy/brexit-and-the-northern-ireland-border/>
- D'Angelo, P., & Shaw, D. (2018). Journalism as Framing. In T. P. Vos, *Handbooks of Communication Science: Journalism* (pp. 205-233). Columbia: De Gruyter Mouton.
- de Vreese, C. H. (2004). Primed by the Euro: The Impact of a Referendum Campaign on Public Opinion and Evaluations of Government and Political Leaders. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 27(1), 45-64.
- Enley, J. (2019, December 13). *Trump welcomes Boris Johnson Tory election win with promise of massive trade deal*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2019/dec/13/trump-welcomes-boris-johnson-tory-election-win-with-promise-of-massive-trade-deal>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Entman, R. M. (2010). Media framing biases and political power: Explaining slant in news of Campaign 2008. *Journalism*, 11(4), 389-408.



- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Gavin, N. T. (2018). Media definitely do matter: Brexit, immigration, climate change and beyond. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 20(4), 827-845.
- Henley, J. (2019, February 13). *Bombastic Boris Johnson wins huge majority on promise to get Brexit done*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2019/dec/13/bombastic-boris-johnson-wins-huge-majority-on-promise-to-get-brexit-done>
- Huang, H. (2009). Frame-Rich, Frame-Poor: An Investigation of the Contingent Effects of Media Frame Diversity and Individual Differences on Audience Frame Diversity. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 22(1), 47-73.
- Jenkins, J., & Nielsen, R. K. (2018). *The Digital Transition of Local News*. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Jigsaw Research. (2017). *News Consumption in the UK: 2018*. Ofcom.
- Levy, D. A., Aslan, B., & Bironze, D. (2016). *UK Press Coverage of the UK Referendum*. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Mahone, J., McCollough, K., Napoli, P., Wang, Q., & Weber, M. (2019). *Who's Producing Local Journalism? Assessing Journalistic Output Across Different Outlet Types*. Sanford: DeWitt Wallace Center for Media & Democracy.
- Morris, C., Williamson, L., Hill, J., Harrison, S., Galpin, R., Rainsford, S., . . . Rosenberg, S. (2016, June 24). *UK politics EU referendum*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from BBC: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36616018>
- Nacos, B. (2000). Television and its Viewers: Cultivation Theory and Research. *Political Science Quarterly*, 115(2), 317-319.
- Netherlands Worldwide. (n.d.). *Doing Business UK Regions*. Retrieved January 11, 2020, from Netherlands Worldwide: <https://www.netherlandsworldwide.nl/countries/united-kingdom/doing-business/uk-regions>



- Schuck, A. R. (2009). Referendum campaign dynamics: news media, campaign effects and direct democracy. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 14(1), 40-66.
- Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European Politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News. *Journal of Communication*, 93-109.
- Shehata, A., & Strömbäck, J. (2018). Political Journalism. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. 1-27). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shrimley, R. (2019, January 21). *Content*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from Financial Times: <https://www.ft.com/content/a88bcee2-1d5d-11e9-b2f7-97e4dbd3580d>
- Sogelola, D. (2018). Brexit, Agenda Setting and Framing of Immigration in the Media: The Case of the Daily Mail. *LSE Research Online*, 1, 128-142.
- Soussi, A. (2020, January 9). *UK parliament approves Boris Johnson Brexit deal*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from Aljazeera: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2020/01/uk-parliament-approves-boris-johnson-brexit-deal-200109144917032.html>
- Statista. (2019, April). *UK Newspaper Market by Circulation*. Retrieved January 26, 2020, from Statista: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/529060/uk-newspaper-market-by-circulation/>
- Strömbäck, J. (2008). Four Phases of Mediatization: An Analysis of the Mediatization of Politics. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13(3), 228-246.
- Tewksbury, D. H., & Scheffle, D. A. (2019). News Framing Theory and Research. In M. B. Oliver, A. A. Raney, & B. J. *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research* (pp. 17-33). Illinois: Routledge.
- The Guardian. (2019, December 13). *UK General Election 2019 full results live labour conservative Tories*. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/ng-interactive/2019/dec/12/uk-general-election-2019-full-results-live-labour-conservatives-tories>
- The Migration Observatory. (2013). *Migration in the News: Portrayals of Immigrants, Migrants, Asylum Seekers and Refugees in National British Newspapers, 2010-2012*. Oxford: COMPAS.



VIDEA. (2017). *Local TV is Trusted TV*. VIDEA.

## 9. APPENDICES

In this chapter all raw data as discussed in *Chapter 5* is presented, divided by topics, tone, and collocates.

### 9.1. TOPICS

The data in this section was employed to answer SQ1: *Which topical nouns are addressed in local newspaper articles referencing Brexit?*

#### 9.1.1. SCOTLAND

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Scotland	112	0,56	Brexit	259	0,80
2	EU	112	0,56	Scotland	149	0,46
3	Brexit	95	0,48	Election	133	0,41
4	People	82	0,41	UK	120	0,37
5	Vote	81	0,41	SNP	117	0,36
6	Referendum	67	0,34	Party	117	0,36
7	Time	58	0,29	Referendum	111	0,34
8	UK	47	0,24	EU	106	0,33
9	Minister	46	0,23	Government	105	0,32
10	Europe	41	0,21	Deal	98	0,30
11	Union	39	0,20	People	95	0,29
12	Country	39	0,20	Minister	91	0,28
13	Party	38	0,19	Independence	84	0,26
14	Leader	36	0,18	Leader	75	0,23
15	Campaign	36	0,18	Vote	66	0,20
16	Independence	31	0,16	Parliament	50	0,15
17	Britain	29	0,15	NHS	49	0,15
18	War	27	0,14	Year	47	0,14
19	Parliament	24	0,12	Union	46	0,14
20	Secretary	23	0,12	Support	45	0,14

#### 9.1.2. NORTHERN IRELAND

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Ireland	197	0,58	Brexit	580	1,19
2	EU	171	0,50	Ireland	286	0,58
3	UK	148	0,43	UK	271	0,55
4	Brexit	148	0,43	EU	253	0,52
5	People	135	0,40	Deal	247	0,50
6	Vote	119	0,35	Party	214	0,44
7	Referendum	104	0,30	People	167	0,34
8	Border	63	0,18	Minister	140	0,29



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
9	Work	59	0,17	Leader	135	0,28
10	Business	58	0,17	Government	126	0,26
11	Minister	56	0,16	Election	125	0,26
12	Union	49	0,14	Agreement	116	0,24
13	Years	48	0,14	Vote	112	0,23
14	Belfast	45	0,13	DUP	109	0,22
15	Year	40	0,12	Border	101	0,21
16	Result	40	0,12	Union	98	0,20
17	Time	37	0,11	Trade	90	0,18
18	Europe	37	0,11	Time	82	0,17
19	Secretary	36	0,11	Britain	78	0,16
20	London	36	0,11	Withdrawal	67	0,14

### 9.1.3. WALES

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	440	0,82	Brexit	297	0,84
2	Wales	255	0,47	EU	192	0,54
3	UK	230	0,43	UK	171	0,48
4	People	225	0,42	Deal	125	0,35
5	Brexit	197	0,37	Party	117	0,33
6	Vote	154	0,29	Election	117	0,33
7	Referendum	102	0,19	Government	93	0,26
8	Europe	101	0,19	People	92	0,26
9	Britain	99	0,18	Wales	88	0,25
10	Country	92	0,17	Bill	86	0,24
11	Union	80	0,15	Coin	70	0,20
12	Cardiff	79	0,15	Vote	65	0,18
13	Year	76	0,14	Minister	62	0,18
14	Market	73	0,14	Time	61	0,17
15	Government	73	0,14	January	57	0,16
16	World	72	0,13	Year	55	0,16
17	Years	61	0,11	Union	50	0,14
18	Work	59	0,11	Parliament	46	0,13
19	England	58	0,11	Support	45	0,13
20	Future	57	0,11	Conservatives	43	0,12

### 9.1.4. NORTH EAST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	65	0,61	Brexit	246	1,05
2	Vote	45	0,42	EU	122	0,52
3	Referendum	44	0,41	Vote	104	0,44
4	Newcastle	38	0,36	Party	103	0,44
5	North	37	0,35	People	98	0,42
6	Brexit	37	0,35	North	92	0,39



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
7	People	36	0,34	Deal	82	0,35
8	UK	32	0,30	UK	71	0,30
9	Britain	27	0,25	East	64	0,27
10	Years	24	0,23	MP	63	0,27
11	Country	24	0,23	Election	61	0,26
12	East	22	0,21	Government	58	0,25
13	Time	21	0,20	Minister	47	0,20
14	Scotland	21	0,20	Referendum	39	0,17
15	Minister	19	0,18	Sunderland	37	0,16
16	Gala	19	0,18	Country	34	0,14
17	MP	17	0,16	Union	33	0,14
18	Campaign	17	0,16	Trade	32	0,14
19	Part	16	0,15	Support	31	0,13
20	Council	16	0,15	Time	30	0,13

#### 9.1.5. NORTH WEST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Manchester	152	0,79	Brexit	192	1,18
2	People	70	0,37	EU	111	0,68
3	Brexit	64	0,33	UK	73	0,45
4	Vote	56	0,29	Deal	70	0,43
5	EU	55	0,29	Party	59	0,36
6	City	54	0,28	Election	51	0,31
7	UK	43	0,22	Vote	50	0,31
8	London	41	0,21	People	49	0,30
9	Year	37	0,19	Minister	41	0,25
10	Party	36	0,19	Time	34	0,21
11	Market	32	0,17	January	33	0,20
12	Street	28	0,15	Parliament	32	0,20
13	Result	28	0,15	Union	31	0,19
14	Referendum	28	0,15	Country	31	0,19
15	North	28	0,15	Government	26	0,16
16	Business	28	0,15	Period	24	0,15
17	Years	26	0,14	NHS	24	0,15
18	Work	26	0,14	Britain	24	0,15
19	Time	26	0,14	Majority	22	0,14
20	House	26	0,14	Years	21	0,13

#### 9.1.6. YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	79	0,34	Brexit	195	1,04
2	Brexit	62	0,27	Party	93	0,50
3	Yorkshire	58	0,25	Election	83	0,44
4	Year	58	0,25	Deal	61	0,33



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
5	People	56	0,24	EU	60	0,32
6	Vote	45	0,19	Government	50	0,27
7	UK	44	0,19	Yorkshire	48	0,26
8	Referendum	38	0,16	Vote	45	0,24
9	Business	35	0,15	Time	44	0,24
10	Britain	34	0,15	Leader	43	0,23
11	Company	33	0,14	Minister	41	0,22
12	London	32	0,14	People	40	0,21
13	Show	31	0,13	Parliament	40	0,21
14	Years	30	0,13	Seats	35	0,19
15	Group	30	0,13	North	35	0,19
16	Country	30	0,13	Voters	33	0,18
17	Cotton	30	0,13	Britain	31	0,17
18	Time	28	0,12	UK	30	0,16
19	Leeds	28	0,12	Majority	29	0,16
20	Campaign	28	0,12	Country	29	0,16

#### 9.1.7. WEST MIDLANDS

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Brexit	38	0,66	Brexit	198	1,05
2	EU	29	0,50	EU	107	0,57
3	Birmingham	27	0,47	UK	97	0,52
4	UK	23	0,40	Election	50	0,27
5	Vote	21	0,36	Deal	50	0,27
6	Referendum	20	0,35	Play	40	0,21
7	People	18	0,31	Birmingham	38	0,20
8	Right	15	0,26	Party	34	0,18
9	Time	11	0,19	Parliament	34	0,18
10	MP	11	0,19	Vote	33	0,18
11	Combat	11	0,19	Union	33	0,18
12	England	10	0,17	People	33	0,18
13	Britain	10	0,17	Minister	32	0,17
14	Union	9	0,16	January	31	0,17
15	Market	9	0,16	Government	31	0,17
16	County	9	0,16	Time	30	0,16
17	City	9	0,16	Blues	30	0,16
18	Bank	9	0,16	Travel	27	0,14
19	Play	8	0,14	Country	27	0,14
20	Passport	8	0,14	End	25	0,13





## 9.1.8. EAST MIDLANDS

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	People	6	1,18	Brexit	199	0,92
2	Vote	5	0,98	Party	102	0,47
3	Side	4	0,79	Nottingham	81	0,37
4	Referendum	4	0,79	Election	73	0,34
5	EU	4	0,79	EU	71	0,33
6	City	4	0,79	UK	67	0,31
7	Areas	4	0,79	People	66	0,30
8	Union	3	0,59	Year	58	0,27
9	Nottingham	3	0,59	Time	49	0,23
10	Immigration	3	0,59	MP	49	0,23
11	Class	3	0,59	Deal	47	0,22
12	Brexit	3	0,59	Vote	45	0,21
13	Wards	2	0,39	Years	38	0,18
14	UKIP	2	0,39	Trade	34	0,16
15	Supporters	2	0,39	East	34	0,16
16	Situation	2	0,39	Change	34	0,16
17	School	2	0,39	Business	34	0,16
18	Percentage	2	0,39	Agreement	33	0,15
19	Night	2	0,39	House	30	0,14
20	Issue	2	0,39	Leader	27	0,12

## 9.1.9. SOUTH WEST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	71	0,52	Brexit	150	0,70
2	Brexit	69	0,50	Somerset	103	0,48
3	Vote	67	0,49	People	97	0,45
4	People	65	0,48	EU	66	0,31
5	Somerset	59	0,43	Party	65	0,30
6	UK	44	0,32	Election	59	0,28
7	Referendum	42	0,31	Years	52	0,24
8	Energy	38	0,28	West	45	0,21
9	Country	33	0,24	Government	45	0,21
10	Decision	32	0,23	Vote	43	0,20
11	Government	31	0,23	Country	40	0,19
12	Point	29	0,21	Deal	39	0,18
13	West	25	0,18	Year	37	0,17
14	Result	25	0,18	Candidate	35	0,16
15	Project	25	0,18	Parliament	32	0,15
16	MP	25	0,18	County	32	0,15
17	Business	25	0,18	Education	30	0,14
18	Years	24	0,18	Democrats	30	0,14
19	Minister	24	0,18	Support	28	0,13
20	Cent	24	0,18	Minister	27	0,13

## 9.1.10. SOUTH EAST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	206	0,83	Brexit	248	1,26
2	Brexit	158	0,64	EU	149	0,76
3	Brighton	127	0,51	Brighton	96	0,49
4	Vote	117	0,47	UK	84	0,43
5	People	93	0,37	Party	82	0,42
6	UK	77	0,31	People	79	0,40
7	Referendum	76	0,31	City	51	0,26
8	Country	59	0,24	Council	41	0,21
9	Sussex	53	0,21	Election	40	0,20
10	MP	52	0,21	Year	36	0,18
11	City	52	0,21	Candidate	35	0,18
12	Campaign	46	0,19	MP	34	0,17
13	Year	45	0,18	Vote	31	0,16
14	Europe	37	0,15	Deal	29	0,15
15	Council	33	0,13	Time	28	0,14
16	Years	32	0,13	Country	28	0,14
17	Time	32	0,13	Sussex	27	0,14
18	Britain	32	0,13	Government	27	0,14
19	Business	31	0,12	Future	27	0,14
20	Result	29	0,12	Britain	26	0,13

## 9.1.11. EAST OF ENGLAND

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	137	0,80	Brexit	185	0,87
2	Brexit	105	0,61	Norwich	124	0,58
3	Vote	89	0,52	Election	116	0,55
4	UK	89	0,52	Norfolk	115	0,54
5	People	82	0,48	People	104	0,49
6	Union	49	0,29	Party	75	0,35
7	Referendum	48	0,28	North	62	0,29
8	Norfolk	47	0,27	Deal	60	0,28
9	Campaign	40	0,23	EU	59	0,28
10	Britain	40	0,23	South	55	0,26
11	Party	35	0,20	Candidate	53	0,25
12	Leader	34	0,20	Parliament	39	0,18
13	Norwich	33	0,19	MP	39	0,18
14	Council	33	0,19	Country	38	0,18
15	Country	30	0,18	Time	37	0,17
16	Minister	29	0,17	Tower	36	0,17
17	Support	24	0,14	Majority	36	0,17
18	Year	23	0,13	Vote	35	0,16
19	Jobs	22	0,13	UK	35	0,16
20	Europe	22	0,13	Years	34	0,16



## 9.1.12. GREATER LONDON

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	135	1,09	Brexit	148	0,70
2	Brexit	85	0,69	Party	121	0,58
3	People	79	0,64	London	108	0,51
4	Referendum	55	0,44	People	102	0,49
5	MP	51	0,41	Vote	70	0,33
6	Britain	48	0,39	Election	67	0,32
7	Council	37	0,30	Candidate	49	0,23
8	Country	36	0,29	EU	48	0,23
9	UK	33	0,27	Government	43	0,20
10	Vote	32	0,26	Years	41	0,20
11	Leader	30	0,24	Year	40	0,19
12	June	28	0,23	Parliament	39	0,19
13	Minister	26	0,21	Country	35	0,17
14	Party	24	0,19	Referendum	34	0,16
15	Work	22	0,18	MP	33	0,16
16	Community	22	0,18	Police	31	0,15
17	Union	20	0,16	Mayor	30	0,14
18	Women	19	0,15	Issues	29	0,14
19	Government	19	0,15	Public	27	0,13
20	Time	18	0,15	Time	26	0,12

## 9.1.13. NATIONAL

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	EU	538	0,80	Brexit	602	1,20
2	Brexit	421	0,62	EU	360	0,71
3	Britain	292	0,43	Deal	320	0,64
4	Vote	246	0,36	Vote	179	0,36
5	People	241	0,36	UK	162	0,32
6	Referendum	186	0,28	Party	162	0,32
7	UK	170	0,25	Britain	128	0,25
8	Minister	121	0,18	Election	124	0,25
9	Europe	120	0,18	Trade	111	0,22
10	Campaign	115	0,17	People	109	0,22
11	Country	102	0,15	Time	100	0,20
12	Immigration	94	0,14	Parliament	94	0,19
13	Party	90	0,13	Referendum	82	0,16
14	Government	90	0,13	Union	72	0,14
15	Union	87	0,13	Tories	68	0,14
16	Time	81	0,12	Government	67	0,13
17	Year	80	0,12	Country	67	0,13
18	Years	79	0,12	Bill	65	0,13
19	Leader	78	0,12	Week	62	0,12
20	World	77	0,11	December	61	0,12

## 9.2. TONE

The data in this section was employed to answer SQ2: *How do local newspapers set the tone in articles referencing Brexit by employing adverbs and adjectives?*

### 9.2.1. SCOTLAND

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Scottish	69	0,35	Labour	178	0,55
2	European	50	0,25	Scottish	136	0,42
3	Labour	46	0,23	Tory	56	0,17
4	Tory	28	0,14	General	54	0,17
5	British	23	0,12	European	42	0,13
6	English	20	0,10	Political	24	0,07
7	Former	17	0,09	Clear	24	0,07
8	Public	14	0,07	Long	23	0,07
9	General	13	0,07	Former	23	0,07
10	United	12	0,06	Royal	22	0,07
11	Strong	11	0,06	Public	22	0,07
12	Conservative	11	0,06	Anti	21	0,06
13	Clear	11	0,06	Economic	19	0,06
14	Northern	9	0,05	Pro	17	0,05
15	Stupid	7	0,04	Hard	17	0,05
16	Social	7	0,04	Conservative	16	0,05
17	Long	7	0,04	Legal	14	0,04
18	Irish	7	0,04	North	12	0,04
19	Independent	7	0,04	Independent	11	0,03
20	Early	7	0,04	Constitutional	11	0,03

### 9.2.2. NORTHERN IRELAND

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Northern	149	0,44	Northern	230	0,47
2	Irish	67	0,20	Labour	126	0,26
3	European	66	0,19	European	93	0,19
4	United	41	0,12	Irish	90	0,18
5	British	38	0,11	General	56	0,11
6	Political	29	0,08	United	50	0,10
7	Long	22	0,06	Political	42	0,09
8	Unionist	21	0,06	British	38	0,08
9	State	20	0,06	Unionist	37	0,08
10	Former	20	0,06	Tory	37	0,08
11	Social	18	0,05	Former	35	0,07
12	Economic	18	0,05	Hard	33	0,07
13	Global	16	0,05	Long	30	0,06
14	Early	16	0,05	Important	30	0,06
15	Strong	15	0,04	Conservative	30	0,06
16	Local	15	0,04	Good	29	0,06



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
17	Executive	15	0,04	Free	29	0,06
18	Clear	15	0,04	Economic	25	0,05
19	Public	14	0,04	Public	24	0,05
20	Scottish	13	0,04	Clear	23	0,05

### 9.2.3. WALES

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	151	0,28	Labour	115	0,33
2	Welsh	140	0,26	Welsh	73	0,21
3	Labour	80	0,15	General	65	0,18
4	British	59	0,11	Conservative	54	0,15
5	Economic	45	0,08	European	50	0,14
6	Single	42	0,08	Public	32	0,09
7	Free	39	0,07	National	32	0,09
8	National	36	0,07	Northern	29	0,08
9	Public	32	0,06	British	29	0,08
10	Social	29	0,05	Political	26	0,07
11	Rural	27	0,05	Liberal	25	0,07
12	Long	26	0,05	Royal	24	0,07
13	Political	24	0,04	Long	21	0,06
14	Positive	22	0,04	Current	17	0,05
15	Foreign	22	0,04	State	16	0,05
16	Financial	21	0,04	Former	16	0,05
17	Together	20	0,04	United	15	0,04
18	Strong	20	0,04	Serious	15	0,04
19	Former	20	0,04	Longer	15	0,04
20	Expected	20	0,04	Green	15	0,04

### 9.2.4. NORTH EAST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	23	0,22	Labour	143	0,61
2	Irish	22	0,21	European	41	0,17
3	Polish	17	0,16	General	38	0,16
4	Labour	16	0,15	Conservative	33	0,14
5	Great	12	0,11	Clear	32	0,14
6	Northern	11	0,10	Liberal	29	0,12
7	Public	10	0,09	Former	25	0,11
8	British	10	0,09	Tory	19	0,08
9	Scottish	9	0,08	Political	17	0,07
10	National	8	0,08	Long	15	0,06
11	Former	8	0,08	Special	14	0,06
12	United	7	0,07	Free	14	0,06
13	Firm	7	0,07	Local	13	0,06
14	Potential	6	0,06	United	10	0,04



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
15	Open	6	0,06	National	10	0,04
16	Free	6	0,06	Good	10	0,04
17	Clear	6	0,06	British	10	0,04
18	Syrian	5	0,05	Social	9	0,04
19	Political	5	0,05	Serious	9	0,04
20	Geordie	5	0,05	Longer	9	0,04

### 9.2.5. NORTH WEST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Labour	39	0,20	Labour	84	0,52
2	European	26	0,14	European	44	0,27
3	Public	25	0,13	Conservative	28	0,17
4	Northern	16	0,08	General	18	0,11
5	Political	14	0,07	Passed	14	0,09
6	Long	14	0,07	Former	14	0,09
7	Important	14	0,07	Tory	11	0,07
8	Former	14	0,07	Political	11	0,07
9	Urban	13	0,07	Irish	11	0,07
10	Good	11	0,06	Longer	10	0,06
11	Financial	11	0,06	Liberal	10	0,06
12	Direct	11	0,06	Long	9	0,06
13	Detached	11	0,06	Good	9	0,06
14	Open	10	0,05	British	9	0,06
15	Local	10	0,05	Anti	9	0,06
16	Expensive	10	0,05	Public	8	0,05
17	Economic	10	0,05	Abroad	7	0,04
18	Social	9	0,05	Royal	6	0,04
19	Central	9	0,05	Local	6	0,04
20	British	9	0,05	Immediately	6	0,04

### 9.2.6. YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	Yorkshire	58	0,25	Labour	132	0,71
2	Labour	37	0,16	Yorkshire	48	0,26
3	European	34	0,15	European	31	0,17
4	Wicked	22	0,10	General	27	0,14
5	British	20	0,09	Conservative	25	0,13
6	Long	19	0,08	Political	22	0,12
7	Former	18	0,08	Public	18	0,10
8	National	17	0,07	Tory	16	0,09
9	Good	16	0,07	Long	16	0,09
10	Public	15	0,06	Northern	15	0,08
11	Hate	15	0,06	Former	14	0,07
12	Executive	15	0,06	Financial	14	0,07



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
13	Local	14	0,06	Clear	14	0,07
14	Conservative	13	0,06	British	14	0,07
15	Financial	11	0,05	Central	13	0,07
16	Clear	11	0,05	Parliamentary	12	0,06
17	Northern	10	0,04	Hard	10	0,05
18	Liberal	10	0,04	Social	9	0,05
19	Strong	9	0,04	Local	9	0,05
20	Social	9	0,04	Vital	7	0,04

### 9.2.7. WEST MIDLANDS

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	British	17	0,29	European	35	0,19
2	European	12	0,21	Labour	30	0,16
3	Political	8	0,14	General	29	0,15
4	English	8	0,14	Conservative	16	0,09
5	National	7	0,12	British	16	0,09
6	Former	6	0,10	Good	15	0,08
7	Economic	6	0,10	Long	13	0,07
8	Blue	5	0,09	Royal	11	0,06
9	Violent	4	0,07	Economic	10	0,05
10	Traditional	4	0,07	Planned	9	0,05
11	Racist	4	0,07	Permanent	9	0,05
12	Long	4	0,07	Official	9	0,05
13	Labour	4	0,07	Former	9	0,05
14	Green	4	0,07	International	8	0,04
15	Foreign	4	0,07	Current	8	0,04
16	White	3	0,05	Central	8	0,04
17	Scared	3	0,05	Valid	7	0,04
18	Racial	3	0,05	United	7	0,04
19	Proud	3	0,05	Global	7	0,04
20	Parliamentary	3	0,05	Sustainable	6	0,03

### 9.2.8. EAST MIDLANDS

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	National	2	0,39	Labour	73	0,34
2	European	2	0,39	Conservative	38	0,18
3	Xenophobic	1	0,20	General	31	0,14
4	White	1	0,20	Local	29	0,13
5	Staunchly	1	0,20	Green	28	0,13
6	Single	1	0,20	European	22	0,10
7	Racist	1	0,20	Northern	20	0,09
8	Political	1	0,20	British	18	0,08
9	Labour	1	0,20	Liberal	17	0,08
10	Hard	1	0,20	Independent	16	0,07



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
11	Happy	1	0,20	Public	15	0,07
12	Former	1	0,20	Good	15	0,07
13	Favoured	1	0,20	Political	14	0,06
14	Ethnic	1	0,20	Former	14	0,06
15	Controlled	1	0,20	Polish	11	0,05
16	Comfortable	1	0,20	Little	11	0,05
17				Long	10	0,05
18				Tory	9	0,04
19				Social	9	0,04
20				Small	9	0,04

## 9.2.9. SOUTH WEST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	21	0,15	Liberal	64	0,30
2	Uncertain	20	0,15	Labour	48	0,22
3	Nuclear	20	0,15	Local	42	0,20
4	Good	19	0,14	Conservative	34	0,16
5	French	16	0,12	European	29	0,14
6	Conservative	15	0,11	Green	26	0,12
7	British	13	0,10	Hard	21	0,10
8	Political	11	0,08	Good	21	0,10
9	Long	11	0,08	General	20	0,09
10	Former	11	0,08	Independent	16	0,07
11	Financial	10	0,07	Public	15	0,07
12	Clear	10	0,07	Clear	14	0,07
13	Shock	9	0,07	Long	13	0,06
14	Labour	9	0,07	British	12	0,06
15	Economic	8	0,06	Rural	12	0,06
16	Local	7	0,05	Social	11	0,05
17	Secure	6	0,04	Political	10	0,05
18	General	6	0,04	National	8	0,04
19	Executive	6	0,04	Financial	8	0,04
20	Delayed	6	0,04	Environmental	8	0,04

## 9.2.10. SOUTH EAST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	34	0,14	Labour	47	0,24
2	Conservative	22	0,09	European	42	0,21
3	Labour	21	0,08	Green	22	0,11
4	British	21	0,08	General	22	0,11
5	Uncertain	19	0,08	Conservative	21	0,11
6	Tory	19	0,08	Public	19	0,10
7	Public	18	0,07	Political	16	0,08
8	Political	18	0,07	Former	14	0,07





	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
9	Foreign	18	0,07	Tory	13	0,07
10	Local	16	0,06	British	13	0,07
11	Green	15	0,06	Local	10	0,05
12	Good	15	0,06	Foreign	10	0,05
13	General	15	0,06	National	9	0,05
14	Former	15	0,06	Social	8	0,04
15	Economic	13	0,05	Pro	8	0,04
16	Long	12	0,05	Parliamentary	8	0,04
17	Global	12	0,05	International	8	0,04
18	National	11	0,04	Encouraging	8	0,04
19	English	11	0,04	Proud	8	0,04
20	International	10	0,04	Good	7	0,04

### 9.2.11. EAST OF ENGLAND

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	80	0,47	Labour	71	0,33
2	British	27	0,16	General	59	0,28
3	Conservative	19	0,11	Conservative	48	0,23
4	National	15	0,09	Liberal	33	0,16
5	Political	13	0,08	European	30	0,14
6	Economic	13	0,08	English	23	0,11
7	Long	12	0,07	Public	20	0,09
8	Executive	12	0,07	Green	20	0,09
9	United	11	0,06	Former	20	0,09
10	Uncertain	11	0,06	Political	19	0,09
11	Public	11	0,06	National	15	0,07
12	Local	11	0,06	British	15	0,07
13	Labour	11	0,06	Polish	14	0,07
14	Tory	9	0,05	Young	12	0,06
15	Negative	7	0,04	Tory	12	0,06
16	Former	7	0,04	Royal	12	0,06
17	Stronger	6	0,04	Long	12	0,06
18	Social	6	0,04	Racist	11	0,05
19	German	6	0,04	Clear	11	0,05
20	Domestic	6	0,04	Social	9	0,04

### 9.2.12. GREATER LONDON

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	26	0,21	Labour	110	0,52
2	Conservative	18	0,15	Green	49	0,23
3	Legal	14	0,11	Liberal	42	0,20
4	Labour	14	0,11	Conservative	34	0,16
5	Local	13	0,11	Public	27	0,13
6	Political	12	0,10	Local	25	0,12



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
7	Green	12	0,10	General	25	0,12
8	British	11	0,09	Political	21	0,10
9	Economic	9	0,07	European	20	0,10
10	Pro	8	0,06	Independent	19	0,09
11	Tory	7	0,06	Democratic	16	0,08
12	General	6	0,05	Anti	16	0,08
13	Former	6	0,05	Social	15	0,07
14	Social	5	0,04	National	13	0,06
15	Optimistic	5	0,04	Former	12	0,06
16	Hard	5	0,04	British	12	0,06
17	Financial	5	0,04	Clear	11	0,05
18	Clear	5	0,04	Young	10	0,05
19	Anti	5	0,04	Pro	9	0,04
20	Public	4	0,03	Parliamentary	9	0,04

### 9.2.13. NATIONAL

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	%	WORD	FREQUENCY	%
1	European	141	0,21	Labour	189	0,38
2	British	119	0,18	Tory	97	0,19
3	Tory	85	0,13	European	59	0,12
4	Former	69	0,10	Northern	41	0,08
5	Labour	59	0,09	British	40	0,08
6	Foreign	55	0,08	Former	31	0,06
7	Political	48	0,07	National	30	0,06
8	Pro	37	0,05	Long	30	0,06
9	Long	34	0,05	General	29	0,06
10	Blue	34	0,05	Conservative	28	0,06
11	German	33	0,05	Public	27	0,05
12	Economic	33	0,05	Political	25	0,05
13	Northern	32	0,05	Good	23	0,05
14	Hard	28	0,04	Senior	21	0,04
15	French	27	0,04	Clear	20	0,04
16	English	27	0,04	Hard	18	0,04
17	General	25	0,04	Anti	17	0,03
18	Irish	24	0,04	Economic	15	0,03
19	Conservative	22	0,03	Social	14	0,03
20	National	21	0,03	Local	14	0,03



### 9.3. COLLOCATES

The data in this section was employed to answer SQ3: *Which nouns, adverbs and adjectives are used in specific collocational relation to Brexit?*

#### 9.3.1. SCOTLAND

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	20		Deal	36	9
2	Wake	7		Party	29	
3	Scotland	6		Referendum	12	
4	Campaign	5		Bill	9	
5	Post	4	4	Election	9	1
6	Result	4		Scotland	8	
7	Country	4		Shadow	8	8
8	Referendum	4		Post	8	8
9	Event	3		Tory	7	1
10	UK	3	1	EU	7	
11	Decision	3		Secretary	7	
12	Labour	3		Britain	6	
13	Remain	3		Minister	6	1
14	Independence	2		Trade	6	
15	Fears	2	1	Scottish	6	1
16	Impact	2		Government	6	
17	Party	2		Hard	5	4
18	Shock	2		UK	4	
19	Tory	2		Candidate	4	
20	Turmoil	2		Decision	4	

#### 9.3.2. NORTHERN IRELAND

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	23		Deal	84	7
2	Ireland	11	1	Party	56	
3	Northern	8		Ireland	31	1
4	EU	7		Leader	25	
5	Result	7		Northern	23	
6	Referendum	6		Minister	20	
7	Impact	6	2	EU	16	
8	Border	5		Negotiations	15	
9	Event	5		Extension	15	
10	Post	5	5	Labour	14	
11	Negotiations	5		Post	13	13
12	Wake	5		Election	13	1
13	UK	5		People	13	
14	Campaign	4		UK	13	



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
15	Debate	4		Referendum	11	
16	Turmoil	4		Government	10	
17	Business	3		Time	9	1
18	Deal	3		Position	9	
19	Interests	3		Message	9	
20	Uncertainty	3		Trade	8	

### 9.3.3. WALES

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Post	16	15	Party	35	
2	UK	12		Deal	32	8
3	Campaign	7		Price	11	
4	Result	7		Worth	7	
5	Britain	7		Minister	6	
6	EU	6		Post	6	6
7	Welsh	5		Debate	6	2
8	Disaster	5		EU	6	
9	Absolute	5		Time	5	
10	Impact	5	1	Election	5	1
11	Time	4		Event	5	
12	Campaigners	4		Royal	5	
13	Government	4		Welsh	5	
14	Votes	3		Labour	5	
15	Voters	3		Parliament	5	
16	Leader	3		UK	4	
17	Consequences	3		Trade	4	
18	Country	3		Protester	4	
19	Immigration	3		Leader	4	
20	Scotland	3		Conservative	4	

### 9.3.4. NORTH EAST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	7		Party	43	
2	People	3		Deal	28	8
3	Experts	2		Vote	11	
4	EU	2		Referendum	8	1
5	Campaigners	2		Candidate	7	
6	Referendum	1		Election	7	1
7	Operatively	1		EU	7	
8	Projected	1		UK	7	
9	Region	1		Parliament	6	
10	Party	1		News	6	1
11	Overwhelming	1		Labour	5	
12	Permission	1		Future	5	



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
13	Post	1	1	Special	5	
14	Portrayed	1		Businesses	4	
15	Result	1		Clear	4	1
16	Vision	1		Result	4	
17	Votes	1		Secretary	4	
18	Turmoil	1		Withdrawal	4	
19	UK	1		Alignment	4	
20	Whopping	1		Bill	4	

### 9.3.5. NORTH WEST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	16		Deal	27	6
2	Post	7	6	Party	23	
3	Manchester	6		Plans	7	
4	Market	5		EU	7	
5	Debate	5		UK	7	
6	Event	4		Bill	7	
7	Wake	3		Debate	5	
8	Voters	3		Post	5	5
9	Britain	3		Election	4	
10	UK	3		Final	4	
11	Uncertainty	2		Time	4	
12	Decision	2		Voters	4	
13	Fans	2		Bollocks	4	
14	Jobs	2		Vote	4	
15	Result	2		Delay	4	1
16	Property	2		Focus	3	
17	Panic	2		Operation	3	
18	Warning	2	1	Message	3	
19	Victory	2		Legislation	3	
20	National	2		Risk	3	

### 9.3.6. YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	12		Party	27	
2	Party	3	1	Deal	17	3
3	Uncertainty	3		Vote	12	
4	Labour	3		Leader	9	
5	Plans	3		Labour	9	
6	Expansion	2		Election	7	
7	European	2		Candidate	5	
8	Ireland	2		Parliament	5	1
9	Result	2		Debate	4	
10	Final	2		Prominence	4	



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
11	City	2		Tactically	4	
12	Britain	2		Extension	4	
13	Voters	2		Britain	4	
14	Wake	2		Parliamentary	4	
15	People	1		Yorkshire	4	
16	Pain	1		Voters	4	1
17	Parking	1		Major	3	
18	Warning	1		Prospective	3	
19	Predictions	1		Deadlock	3	
20	Negotiations	1		Defeat	3	

### 9.3.7. WEST MIDLANDS

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	10		Deal	25	6
2	Birmingham	5		UK	11	
3	Constituency	4		Party	9	
4	EU	3		Government	5	1
5	Results	3		Britain	5	
6	People	2		Europe	5	
7	Post	2	2	Deadline	5	
8	Shock	2		Vote	4	
9	European	2		Impact	4	
10	Economic	2		Chancellor	4	
11	City	2		Campaign	4	
12	Battle	2		Queen	4	
13	UK	2		Time	4	
14	Racial	1		Minister	4	
15	Resignation	1		Battle	4	
16	Referendum	1		Travel	4	
17	Passports	1		Deadlock	3	
18	Prospect	1		Parliament	3	
19	Result	1		Legislation	3	
20	Victim	1		EU	3	

### 9.3.8. EAST MIDLANDS

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Residents	1		Party	34	
2	Vote	1		Deal	18	6
3	Camp	1		Agreement	12	
4				Bill	11	
5				Withdrawal	11	
6				Election	10	
7				Conservative	9	
8				Labour	7	



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
9				Vote	5	
10				Leader	5	
11				Campaign	5	
12				Post	4	4
13				Referendum	4	
14				Ireland	4	
15				Democrats	4	
16				People	4	
17				Northern	4	
18				Travel	4	
19				Customers	4	
20				Clear	3	

## 9.3.9. SOUTH WEST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	18	1	Party	16	
2	UK	7	1	Deal	10	4
3	Shock	7		People	7	
4	Energy	6		Candidate	6	
5	Business	5	1	Vote	5	
6	Impact	5		Impact	5	2
7	Post	4	3	Election	4	
8	Minister	4		General	4	
9	Uncertainty	3		Hard	4	2
10	Issues	3		Debate	4	
11	Victory	3		Post	4	3
12	Investment	2		Uncertainty	3	
13	Impediment	2		Conservative	3	
14	Citizens	2		Deals	3	
15	Citizenship	2		Political	3	
16	Clarity	2		Backstop	3	
17	Campaigner	2		Breakthrough	2	
18	Casualty	2		Saga	2	
19	Accountants	2		Government	2	
20	Agricultural	2		Referendum	2	

## 9.3.10. SOUTH EAST

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	21		Party	34	
2	Post	14	14	Brighton	10	1
3	Impact	9		Deal	10	3
4	Campaign	6		EU	8	
5	Campaigner	5		Robots	7	



	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
6	Brighton	5		Communications	7	
7	Uncertainty	5		People	6	
8	EU	5		Council	6	
9	Result	4		Family	5	
10	Country	4		Officer	5	
11	Budget	4		UK	5	
12	UK	4		Referendum	5	
13	People	4		Impact	4	
14	Concerns	4		Risks	4	
15	Expected	3		Election	4	
16	Immigration	3		City	4	
17	Mandate	3		Post	4	4
18	Instability	3		Battle	4	
19	Future	3		Vote	4	1
20	Property	3		Artists	4	2

### 9.3.11. EAST OF ENGLAND

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	27		Party	23	
2	Post	8	7	Deal	15	5
3	UK	8	3	Poster	11	
4	People	5		People	11	
5	Deal	5		Election	10	
6	EU	4	1	Happy	6	6
7	Campaign	4		Voters	5	
8	Impact	4		Debate	4	
9	Britain	4		Candidate	4	
10	European	3		Vote	4	
11	Fallout	3		Labour	4	
12	Campaigners	3		Tory	4	1
13	Risk	2		Minister	3	
14	Politicians	2		Frustration	3	
15	Result	2		Impact	3	
16	Questions	2		Fears	3	
17	Property	2		Parliament	3	
18	Price	2		Opportunities	3	
19	Prophecy	2		Candidates	3	
20	School	2		Post	2	2



## 9.3.12. GREATER LONDON

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Post	15	13	Party	34	
2	Leader	7		London	8	1
3	Council	7		Referendum	7	
4	People	6		People	7	
5	Country	5		Vote	6	
6	Crime	4		Deal	6	1
7	Referendum	3		Candidate	5	
8	Community	3		Hard	5	4
9	EU	3		Green	5	
10	Uncertainty	3		EU	4	1
11	Housing	3		Labour	4	
12	Delayed	3		Climate	3	
13	Businesses	3		Environment	3	
14	Hate	3		Democrats	3	
15	Government	3		Alliance	3	
16	Birmingham	3		Economy	2	
17	Lawyer	2		Election	2	
18	Tensions	2		Liberal	2	
19	Forest	2		Opponent	2	
20	Society	2		Fight	2	1

## 9.3.13. NATIONAL

	2016			2019		
	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1	WORD	FREQUENCY	L1
1	Vote	37	3	Deal	92	8
2	EU	20		Party	64	1
3	Britain	19		Vote	35	
4	Post	14	14	EU	26	3
5	Campaign	14		Labour	22	2
6	Voters	11		Parliament	21	
7	Referendum	11		Referendum	19	1
8	UK	9		Election	16	
9	Campaigners	8		Britain	15	
10	People	8		Trade	11	
11	Deal	7		Post	10	9
12	Negotiations	7		UK	9	
13	Party	6		Mistake	9	
14	Border	6		Country	8	
15	London	5		Fury	7	
16	Campaigner	5		Extension	7	
17	Tory	5		Transition	7	
18	Europe	5		Tory	7	
19	Immigration	5		Brussels	6	1
20	Divorce	5		Campaign	6	

