



Cynulliad
Cenedlaethol
Cymru

National
Assembly for
Wales

Cofnod y Trafodion The Record of Proceedings

[Y Pwyllgor Diwylliant, y Gymraeg a Chyfathrebu](#)

[The Culture, Welsh Language and
Communications Committee](#)

14/07/2016

[Agenda'r Cyfarfod](#)
[Meeting Agenda](#)

Cynnwys
Contents

- 4 Cyflwyniad, Ymddiheuriadau a Dirprwyon
Introductions, Apologies and Substitutions
- 5 Memorandwm Cydsyniad Deddfwriaethol ar y Bil Eiddo Diwylliannol
(Gwrthdaro Arfog)
Legislative Consent Memorandum on the Cultural Property (Armed
Conflicts) Bill
- 8 Deiseb gan Gymdeithas yr Iaith ynghylch Safonau'r Gymraeg
Petition by Cymdeithas yr Iaith regarding the Welsh Language
Standards
- 8 Cyflwyniad gan Brifysgol Loughborough
Presentation by Loughborough University
- 27 Papurau i'w Nodi
Papers to Note

Cofnodir y trafodion yn yr iaith y llefarwyd hwy ynnddi yn y pwyllgor. Yn ogystal, cynhwysir trawsgrifiad o'r cyfieithu ar y pryd. Lle y mae cyfranwyr wedi darparu cywiriadau i'w tystiolaeth, nodir y rheini yn y trawsgrifiad.

The proceedings are reported in the language in which they were spoken in the committee. In addition, a transcription of the simultaneous interpretation is included. Where contributors have supplied corrections to their evidence, these are noted in the transcript.

Aelodau'r pwyllgor yn bresennol
Committee members in attendance

Hannah Blythyn Bywgraffiad Biography	Llafur Labour
Dawn Bowden Bywgraffiad Biography	Llafur Labour
Suzy Davies Bywgraffiad Biography	Ceidwadwyr Cymreig Welsh Conservatives
Neil Hamilton Bywgraffiad Biography	UKIP Cymru UKIP Wales
Bethan Jenkins Bywgraffiad Biography	Plaid Cymru (Cadeirydd y Pwyllgor) The Party of Wales (Committee Chair)
Dai Lloyd Bywgraffiad Biography	Plaid Cymru The Party of Wales
Jeremy Miles Bywgraffiad Biography	Llafur Labour
Lee Waters Bywgraffiad Biography	Llafur Labour

Eraill yn bresennol
Others in attendance

Dr Emily Harmer	Darlithydd mewn Cyfathrebu ac Astudiaethau'r Cyfryngau, Prifysgol Loughborough Lecturer in Communication and Media Studies, Loughborough University
Yr Athro/Professor James Stanyer	Athro mewn Cyfathrebu a Dadansoddi'r Cyfryngau, Prifysgol Loughborough Professor of Communications and Media Analysis, Loughborough University

Swyddogion Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru yn bresennol
National Assembly for Wales officials in attendance

Rachel Jones	Dirprwy Glerc Deputy Clerk
Gareth Price	Clerc Clerk
Robin Wilkinson	Y Gwasanaeth Ymchwil Research Service

Katie Wyatt

Cynghorydd Cyfreithiol
Legal Adviser*Dechreuodd y cyfarfod am 09:30.**The meeting began at 09:30.*

Cyflwyniad, Ymddiheuriadau a Dirprwyon Introductions, Apologies and Substitutions

[1] **Bethan Jenkins:** Croeso, bawb, i'r pwyllgor. Os bydd larwm tân, dylai pawb adael yr ystafell trwy'r allanfeydd tân penodol a dilyn cyfarwyddiadau'r tywyswyr a'r staff. Ni ddisgwylir prawf heddiw. Dylai pawb sicrhau bod y sain ar eu ffonau symudol wedi ei ddiffodd. Mae Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru yn gweithredu yn ddwyieithog. Mae clustffonau ar gael ar gyfer cyfieithu ar y pryd ac i addasu'r sain hefyd. Mae cyfieithu ar y pryd ar gael ar sianel 1. Gellir clywed y sain yn well ar sianel 0. Peidiwch â chyffwrdd y botymau ar y meicroffonau oherwydd gall hynny amharu ar y system, a gofawch fod y golau coch ymlaen cyn dechrau siarad. A oes unrhyw fuddiannau gan unrhyw un ar y pwyllgor i'w datgan o dan y Rheolau Sefydlog? Na? A oes yna ymddiheuriadau neu ddirprwyon? Rwy'n credu bod Suzy yn rhedeg yn hwyr, ond mae disgwyl iddi fod yma'n hwyrach.

Bethan Jenkins: Welcome, everybody, to the committee. If there's a fire alarm, everybody should leave the room through the specific fire exits and follows the instructions of the staff and ushers. We're not expecting a test today. Everybody should ensure that their phones are on silent. The National Assembly for Wales operates bilingually. Headphones are available for simultaneous translation and also to amplify the sound. The simultaneous translation is available on channel 1, and for sound amplification use channel 0. Please don't touch the buttons on the microphones because that can affect the system, and please ensure that the red light is on before you start speaking. Has anybody got any interests to declare under the Standing Orders? No? Are there any apologies or substitutes? I think Suzy is running late, but we expect her to be with us later.

[2] Jest cyn i ni gychwyn ar yr hyn sydd yn eitem 2, hoffwn i jest ddweud yn fras ein bod ni'n bwriadu, fel pwyllgor, ysgrifennu at bob darlledwr cyhoeddus i sicrhau bod eu

Just before we start on what is in item 2, I would just like to say broadly that we intend as a committee to write to every public broadcaster to ensure that their

hadroddiadau blynyddol yn dod atom ni fel pwyllgor, ac i sgrwtineiddio hynny. Mae'r BBC ac S4C yn barod wedi rhoi eu hadroddiadau i'r Cynulliad ac yn barod i ddod atom, ond byddwn yn ysgrifennu at bawb.

annual reports come to us as a committee, and to scrutinise those. The BBC and S4C have already submitted their reports to the Assembly and are willing to come before us, but we will be writing to everybody.

[3] Ac hefyd, jest i nodi ar y record i bobl sydd â diddordeb, byddwn yn ymgynghori dros yr haf ar syniadau gan y cyhoedd ynglŷn â'r hyn y byddwn ni eisiau ei wneud fel pwyllgor o ran ein gwaith yn y flwyddyn nesaf. Felly, unrhyw fath o syniadau, plŷs rhowch wybod i ni a byddwn yn rhoi'r wybodaeth ar y wefan, ar Trydar ac yn y blaen o ran sut rydych yn gallu ymwneud â ni. Byddwn hefyd yn mynd i'r Eisteddfod am un diwrnod i siarad â phobl ynglŷn â'u syniadau. Unrhyw gwestiwn ar hynny? Pawb yn iawn?

And also, just to note on the record for those people who are interested, we will be consulting over the summer on ideas from the public with regard to what we'd like to do as a committee in terms of our work in the next year. So, any ideas, please let us know and we will place that information on the website, on Twitter and so forth regarding how you can engage with us. We will also be attending the Eisteddfod for a day to meet people to discuss their ideas. Any questions on that? Is everybody okay?

09:32

Memorandwm Cydsyniad Deddfwriaethol ar y Bil Eiddo Diwylliannol (Gwrthdaro Arfog)

Legislative Consent Memorandum on the Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill

[4] **Bethan Jenkins:** O ran eitem 2, mae gennym y memorandwm cydsyniad deddfwriaethol ar y Bil eiddo diwylliannol—*catchy* iawn. Bydd Katie o'r gwasanaethau cyfreithiol yn cyflwyno'r eitem. Os oes unrhyw gwestiynau gennych chi yr hoffech eu gofyn ar y diwedd, ac hefyd rwy'n siŵr eich bod i gyd wedi

Bethan Jenkins: In terms of item 2, we have a legislative consent memorandum on the cultural property Bill—very catchy. Katie from legal services will present the item. If you have any questions that you'd like to raise at the end, and also I'm sure that you've all read the legal note that's in your papers. There will

darllen y nodyn cyfreithiol sydd yn be a debate in Plenary at the start of
 eich pecynnau. Bydd yna ddadl yn y September. As Chair, I will then
 Cyfarfod Llawn ddechrau mis Medi. respond to that, and therefore if you
 Byddaf i wedyn fel Cadeirydd yn have any questions, we can discuss
 ymateb i hynny, ac felly os oes that as part of the debate in
 unrhyw gwestiynau gennyh chi, September. Thank you.
 byddwn yn gallu trafod hynny fel
 rhan o'r ddadl ym mis Medi. Diolch
 yn fawr.

[5] **Ms Wyatt:** Thank you. The Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill was introduced into the House of Lords on 19 May. It's currently progressing through the House of Lords. It's got a Report Stage on 6 September. Basically, the policy objective of the Bill is to incorporate the Hague convention on cultural property into UK legislation. So, because the areas that the Bill talks about—there's Part 2, Part 3 and Part 5—because they come within the legislative competence of the Assembly—they're touching on culture, which is a devolved area—then the Assembly is required to pass a legislative consent motion if it deems that the Bill is acceptable to it.

[6] Basically, in a nutshell, the Bill is aimed at protecting cultural property during the time of an armed conflict, so it's a very specific area of legislation. You know, it's not the sort of cultural Bill that's going to touch on daily life, really—you'd hope that it wouldn't come into play. A number of states have signed up to the Hague convention since 1954, and because those states sign up to it they've agreed that in the event of an armed conflict in their country or in our country, cultural artefacts—archaeological sites, museums, that sort of thing—will be protected. There's an emblem of a blue shield that's been introduced by the Hague convention that will be put in the Bill that would enable cultural artefacts and cultural resources to be labelled, so that in the event of an armed conflict these can be identified and protection afforded to them.

[7] It's not a controversial Bill, but it does come within the legislative competence of the Assembly, so it is for the Assembly to decide whether or not they would like to approve the motion for that legislation to go ahead. I don't know if any of you have any specific questions about the provisions of the Bill, or the Bill more generally; I'm happy to answer them.

[8] **Lee Waters:** Can I just ask: has anybody raised any objections?

[9] **Ms Wyatt:** Not that I'm aware of, no.

[10] **Lee Waters:** Okay, thank you.

[11] **Bethan Jenkins:** Unrhyw **Bethan Jenkins:** Any other questions?
gwestiynau eraill? Na? No?

[12] **Dawn Bowden:** Sorry; are we talking about the protection of cultural property just in Wales or is this a reciprocal thing?

[13] **Ms Wyatt:** Yes, exactly, it's a reciprocal thing. So, the UK signed up to this originally, and that's why the UK Government thinks that it would be useful to have it on UK-wide basis, and the other member states have signed up to it, and have reciprocal obligations. So, you know, they protect our artefacts and we protect theirs.

[14] **Bethan Jenkins:** Jeremy.

[15] **Jeremy Miles:** How does it relate to exhibits in museums and things like that, which may have been acquired under the circumstances?

[16] **Ms Wyatt:** So, the definition in the Bill of cultural property includes things such as museums, moveable property, archaeological sites and that sort of thing. So, if you're exhibit or site falls under the definition of 'cultural property', it can be designated as such and protected by the emblem and during an armed conflict.

[17] **Jeremy Miles:** I was thinking more about things that may be in museums, which may have been acquired as a consequence of conflict.

[18] **Ms Wyatt:** As a result of conflict itself?

[19] **Jeremy Miles:** I'm not sure, but it's certainly something I can look into and come back to you about.

[20] **Jeremy Miles:** Thanks.

[21] **Bethan Jenkins:** Grêt. Digon o **Bethan Jenkins:** Great. Plenty of
gwestiynau yn fanna, ac wedyn questions there, and then we can
gallwn gynnwys hynny yn rhan o'r include that as part of the debate in
ddadl ym mis Medi. September.

09:36

Deiseb gan Gymdeithas yr Iaith ynghylch Safonau'r Gymraeg
Petition by Cymdeithas yr Iaith regarding the Welsh Language
Standards

[22] **Bethan Jenkins:** O ran eitem 3 wedyn, sef deiseb ar yr iaith Gymraeg. Roedd y Pwyllgor Deisebau yn y Senedd ddiwethaf wedi cyfeirio deiseb at y pwyllgor yma. Rwy'n argymhell bod y pwyllgor yn ysgrifennu at y deisebwyr, gan ddweud y byddwn yn mynegi eu pryderon gyda'r comisiynydd yn yr hydref, pan fyddwn ni'n ystyried adroddiad blynyddol y comisiynydd. Rwy'n credu bod gan y clerc rywbeth i'w ychwanegu hefyd.

Bethan Jenkins: Item 3 then, which is the petition on the Welsh language. The Petitions Committee in the previous Assembly referred a petition to this committee. I recommend that this committee writes to the petitioners, saying that we will raise their concerns with the commissioner in the autumn, when we will be considering the commissioner's annual report. I think that the clerk has something to add as well.

[23] **Mr Price:** Jest i ddweud ein bod ni wedi rhoi llythyrau ychwanegol ar eich bwrdd chi, jest i esbonio tipyn mwy o'r cefndir. Byddwn yn ei ychwanegu i'r pecyn ar y we hefyd. Ydy pawb yn hapus gyda hynny?

Mr Price: Just to say that we have added additional letters in front of you, just to explain a little more of the background. We will add those to the package on the website as well. Is everyone content with that?

[24] **Bethan Jenkins:** Oes unrhyw gwestiynau? Na. Grêt.

Bethan Jenkins: Are there any questions? No. Great.

Cyflwyniad gan Brifysgol Loughborough
Presentation by Loughborough University

[25] **Bethan Jenkins:** Eitem 4 wedyn—rydym yn symud at gyflwyniad gan Brifysgol Loughborough. Croeso i chi. Mae'r Athro James Stanyer—sori os rwy'n dweud hwnna'n anghywir—yn athro

Bethan Jenkins: Item 4 then—we move on to a presentation by Loughborough University. Welcome to you. Professor James Stanyer—sorry if I'm pronouncing that incorrectly—is a professor of

mewn cyfathrebu a dadansoddi'r cyfryngau, a Dr Emily Harmer, darlithydd mewn cyfathrebu ac astudiaethau'r cyfryngau ym Mhrifysgol Loughborough, yma i roi cyflwyniad. Cyd-destun hwn oedd fy mod wedi gweld y gwaith roeddech chi wedi'i wneud ar y refferendwm, yn asesu yr hyn oedd yn digwydd yn y byd newyddiaduriaeth ar lefel Brydeinig, ac roeddwn yn meddwl y byddai'n syniad i gael chi yma i roi cyd-destun i'r hyn rydych chi wedi'i wneud. Fel pwyllgor newydd, rydym am edrych atoch chi, at y prifysgolion sydd yn gwneud ymchwil yn y maes yma, ac rydym yn rhoi croeso mawr i chi am ddod heddiw. Felly, os medrdech chi wneud cyflwyniad, ac wedyn bydd Aelodau'r Cynulliad o gwmpas y bwrdd yn gofyn cwestiynau i chi yn y man. Diolch.

communications and media analysis, and Dr Emily Harmer, lecturer in communications and media studies at Loughborough University, are here to give us a presentation. The context of this is that I saw the work that you did on the referendum, in assessing what had happened in the world of journalism on a UK level, and I thought that it would be a good idea to invite you here to give a context to what you have done. As a new committee, we want to look to you, to the universities that are doing research in this field, and we warmly welcome you here today. So, if you could give us a presentation, and then Assembly Members around the table will ask you questions. Thank you.

[26] **Professor Stanyer:** Thank you very much for inviting us. We welcome this opportunity to talk a bit about the research that we've done. I suppose we can all agree that this is a major event in our political life, and perhaps to give you a bit of background behind the study, we thought it was a really important point to try and capture what's going on in the national media. In a sense, because, in a referendum, it's citizens forming opinions, and making decisions is a key part of that. Where do they get the information from? Well, the main source of information, of course, are the media institutions that produce news that citizens consume. So, I, Emily and colleagues at the Centre for Research in Communication Culture decided that this was something that was really important to capture—the media campaign.

[27] I should say from the start that we were looking at national media. In part, this is, in some sense, because of the size and the cost of doing a large-scale analysis like that. We can't cover all regional media, or even the national media of the different home nations. So, we were kind of trying to get the overview of the national media, although some of the findings, we

would say, have implications that, perhaps, you might want to take up in the context of Wales and Welsh citizens as well. So, in a way, I would imagine that many of the audience in Wales are exposed to much of the national media anyway, so I think, in some sense, the overlap is quite important to state at the start.

[28] I thought about this when I was thinking about designing the presentation, you know, that there was going to be lots of data and stats, so I'll kind of talk through it, and hopefully it won't be too much overkill, but I thought, in some senses, it would give you a good sense of it. So, if there are any questions you want to ask, then please feel free to ask as I go through. I'll start talking about some issues, and then I'll hand over to my colleague Emily, and then I'll wrap up with some broader—.

[29] **Dawn Bowden:** Just before you start, could we have a copy of your presentation, so that I'm not desperately scribbling notes?

[30] **Professor Stanyer:** Yes, I sent a link to one of your colleagues—Martha.

[31] **Mr Price:** We have it.

[32] **Professor Stanyer:** So, they can circulate it to everybody so you can all have a look at that.

[33] Okay. I should say that this was the second time we had done a running analysis; so, every week we'd come and finish that week's coverage and then report back. I think that's a good way of informing debate, and so people could then reflect on what was happening the previous week in the coverage. So, just in terms of, perhaps, just giving you some sense of the sample—. I'm assuming everyone knows what a content analysis is. If you don't, it's a systematic way of analysing media output. Many of us read the newspaper and we have a very impressionistic view of what's going on; content analysis is a more scientific way of having a determined sample, looking for set criteria and then systematically looking at those criteria in every story that appears. Now, that might chime with impressionistic opinions, it might not; it might confound that, but the idea is to move beyond just simply having, 'Oh, I feel that it was biased', or 'I feel that men were more represented than women', and so on and so forth.

[34] So, we looked at the weekday press and tv broadcasts between 6 May and 22 June. There was a team of about seven or eight coders, who we

trained, and we did a variety of reliability checks. So, in some senses, we had a fairly good level of reliability, a high level of reliability, so we feel quite confident with the results in the findings. It gives a good overview of what we've produced.

[35] Now, in terms of what we were looking at and the way I'd want to structure the talk today, there are four areas. The first, which I want to talk about first, is the issue balance. So, what were the topics that were covered. So, we might think, 'Oh, well, yes, of course, it's all about immigration', but there were other issues there that, perhaps, are really important now that weren't really covered at the time. So, you get a sense of what the preoccupation of the media was overall, but also we're going to divide between what the preoccupation of the press was and what the preoccupations of the tv broadcasters were. So, you get some sense of whether it's similar or different, whether agendas diverged, or not.

[36] The next is about the stopwatch balance. So, we're going to show you a bit about individuals: who was the most prominent. You might have your own ideas about who you saw when you switched on the tv news or Googled around, to get an idea of that, but it's to get an overall idea. So, were there, in particular, any Welsh politicians up there on the national picture, or not?

[37] Then, I'm going to talk about gender balance and the ratio of coverage of women to men. There was quite a big debate—I don't know if some of you remember—about that, and the invisibility of many leading women politicians in the debate.

[38] Then, finally, I want to do a bit about what I've called 'directional balance'. I don't call it 'bias', I call it the weight of opinion for and against, to get some sense of whether the campaign was dominated, if you like, by the outlets that were for remaining or for leaving, and you get some sense of that.

[39] What we don't do and what we haven't looked at at this stage is some sense of how this all plays out in terms of how individuals made decisions in various regions, or not. So, we haven't got those data. And we've got some interesting other colleagues in other institutions who are looking at public opinion and whether you can see shifts on that. But, at the moment, it's just the actual coverage of the media themselves. Are there any questions or queries?

[40] **Bethan Jenkins:** Rydych chi'n **Bethan Jenkins:** You said that people dweud bod pobl o sefydliadau from different institutions were gwahanol yn edrych ar sut y mae'r looking at how the public have cyhoedd wedi ymateb; pwy yw'r bobl responded; who are those people, hynny neu'r mudiadau hynny? and what institutions are they from?

[41] **Professor Stanyer:** Well, the research, I think, is done by the University of Manchester—someone called Jane Green. She is looking at public opinion. I think there's also some general public opinion from some of the public opinion poll companies, which have done some polling about different newspaper readers and whether they supported remain or leave, and tried to see how that then maps on to whether the papers had a similar kind of outlook as well.

[42] **Bethan Jenkins:** Okay. Thanks.

[43] **Professor Stanyer:** Okay, so if we move on to just looking at the issue balance first. I know there's a big table here, and maybe I can talk you through the table, if you can see it here. So, if you go down the left-hand column, these are all the subjects, the themes, if you like, or subjects we coded for. Okay, so lots of themes. I'm not going to go through every single one individually, but the ones I've highlighted are what I would say are the key themes. So, you've got the themes down the left-hand column and then, in the other columns, you've got all the media, the papers that supported remaining—that's 'IN papers'—the newspapers that supported 'out' and the television news. So, in the columns you've got television news, 'OUT papers', which are the papers that supported 'leave', the papers that supported 'remain', and all the media—an overall view; an aggregate of all the media.

09:45

[44] I've highlighted the first three because these were really the main—. So, if you just picked any day and you switched on the tv or you picked up a newspaper, the chances are you'd have had coverage about the campaign itself. So, this is this kind of campaign, who's doing what on the campaign trail. So, it's 'David Cameron's visiting this', or 'Boris Johnson's been going to something or doing something'. This is the kind of campaign stuff. But in terms of what I would call substantive issues—those are the kind of real issues, if you like, beyond the kind of campaign entertainment—they are the economy and business, and immigration. These are the two dominant issues of the campaign. So, if you switched on your tv or you picked up a

newspaper or you Googled around the web, these are pretty much what you imagine you'd pick up as the main issues of the campaign. In fact, when we look at these issues and how they played out over the period of the whole campaign—. So, this is about showing these two issues, immigration and economy and business, and how they played out over each week over the campaign period. You can see the kind of dominance of the economy at the start, and then immigration becoming a key issue, particularly around relationships with the EU, the whole discussion about Turkey and whether—. This peaked pretty much as a major political issue, and then the economy arrived. So, these just give you a sense of how these issues play out in the media agenda over the campaign period itself.

[45] Now, this is a kind of national picture, of course, and you might be thinking about specific issues to do with Wales. So, for example, we also—although we did look, as I said, at the Welsh media—looked at particular issues that might concern Wales about devolution. You can see, if you compare it to the economy and immigration, that devolution issues connected to the EU and the EU referendum received very little coverage at all. This is sort of very miniscule. It's the percentage of total overall coverage. So, if you think about overall issues in television, devolution-related matters were only 1.5 per cent of overall issues, and less than 1 per cent of issues in newspapers either supporting 'out' or 'remain'. If you take other issues like, for example, agriculture, which may have an appeal to many of your constituents—in certain areas, I should say—or maybe other more devolved issues that are connected to public services, for example, then, again, you can see very little overall coverage.

[46] So, in a way, the kind of striking feature for us, which perhaps confirmed some of your impressions anyway, was that the campaign was really about two issues: immigration and the economy. That's really what the main matters were. Lots of other issues, perhaps, were on the agenda but just didn't really get the kind of prominence to those two issues, other than, for example, referendum conduct. So, there are lots about what's going on, people talking about immigration, people talking about the economy and, maybe, lots of other issues, which have come to light now, particularly connected to Wales or other home nations that just really didn't feature on the agenda.

[47] Now, it could be interesting to compare this to the Welsh media or the media in Scotland or Northern Ireland to get some sense of whether there were alternative agendas going on, but, as far as giving you the national

picture, it probably very much confirms what you thought as well. So, in the sense of giving you an overview of the issues, that's what I would say was the agenda. Those were the main stories. I should say that, within the immigration and economy and business, there were a lot of sub-stories, but we kind of collapsed them into this big category to give you an overview.

[48] Now I want to move on to talking about the stopwatch balance, the prominence of individuals—my colleague Emily.

[49] **Dr Harmer:** Yes. So, I'm sure you'll be particularly interested to see how prominent, in particular, Welsh Assembly Members were in the national campaign, and I'll get onto that in a moment, but what I've got here is the top-20 individuals who appeared in the national coverage. As you can see, if you look at the number of appearances and the percentage, the campaign was very much dominated by a few key individuals. So, it was a very presidentialised campaign, which is perhaps slightly odd, considering it was not a traditional election. So, David Cameron appeared in one in four of all the stories that appeared. Perhaps that's not shocking given that he was the Prime Minister, but the other key actor, Boris Johnson, was one of the deemed leaders of the 'leave' campaign. So, if we go down the table to number 7—Jeremy Corbyn—below that, you will see that the number of appearances drops off quite considerably to be below 100. So, this gives you the extent to which this campaign has been dominated by certain individuals.

[50] For your specific purposes, I looked into—. In terms of the way in which we've configured the actors, we haven't included every single politician ever, but I have got statistics for you on the First Minister of Wales, Carwyn Jones, and each of the leaders of your parties. This is probably of particular interest because you might be disturbed to discover that Carwyn Jones appeared in exactly zero of the national media stories that we covered. It was the same across the board apart from Leanne Wood of Plaid Cymru, who appeared just once in our entire sample. So, here you're getting a sense that not only was this campaign dominated by a few key individuals, but that also, in terms of the national picture, Wales, in terms of its representatives, was completely marginalised. Obviously, that's not to say that they wouldn't have been covered in Welsh media and regional coverage, which we didn't have and weren't able to code. But in terms of the national picture, this is really important because it's important for you to be seen to be acting on behalf of your constituents and the fact that people have been absent from the coverage is potentially quite worrying for you as individuals.

[51] If we move on to the next graph, this just gives you a sense that this is pretty much the case over time. So, we can see that the top line there is the Conservative Party, which very much dominated the coverage throughout. I wanted to show you across time so that you could see that the in-the-round measure also shows that the Conservatives dominated. So, what's important here is that the smaller national and regional parties were significantly marginalised in the national coverage. Obviously, again, that will have implications for the sorts of issues that they were then seen to be talking about and so on.

[52] **Bethan Jenkins:** Do the Greens come under 'other' as well?

[53] **Dr Harmer:** Yes. So, on the next one, we've got—this is grouping actors together, so looking at politicians as well as other kinds of people who make interventions into the campaign. So, it's showing the same result, really; the Conservatives dominating this particular campaign. If we look across the media sector—the 'remain'-backing papers, the 'leave'-backing papers and the tv—that's also the case.

[54] I just wanted to also flag up the fact that other kinds of actors were also quite marginal. So, experts, for example, and trade union representatives were very much marginalised from the coverage, which perhaps again had some impact on what sorts of issues got spoken about in this really important campaign for the country. One thing that I think is quite encouraging from this graph is that, if you have a look at the citizen category, although they're very marginal in the press, they are much more prominent in broadcast media. Obviously, we haven't differentiated between citizens from the different nations, but that's perhaps quite encouraging for Welsh citizens to know that they are being somehow represented across the broadcast coverage in particular.

[55] The next slide is moving into this discussion of gender and the prominence of men, compared to women, in the campaign. This was a hot topic during one of the weeks. As you can see here again, television is performing slightly better in this category as well, but still only 25 per cent of the actors involved were women as compared to 75 per cent—and the press is much more male dominated in comparison. This obviously has all sorts of implications for who is seen to be involved in politics, as well as what sorts of issues people are engaging with and what they find interesting.

[56] **Lee Waters:** Sorry, pardon me, that's showing there are more women

covered than men.

[57] **Professor Stanyer:** The colour coding is—

[58] **Dr Harmer:** Sorry, yes, the colour coding is wrong. It's the other way round. Those would have been quite shocking findings. [*Laughter.*] Sorry about that.

[59] **Dai Lloyd:** It was just a test for you, Lee.

[60] **Lee Waters:** Well, I'm awake.

[61] **Dr Harmer:** Just to reiterate, this is pretty much the picture across the campaign. Apart from a strange dip in the sixth week on television—television features more women than the press, who are much less, probably, interested in worrying about those sorts of issues.

[62] My last slide delves into this in a little bit more detail. Here we can see the different types of roles women were playing in the coverage compared to men. As you can see, only 16.5 per cent of the politicians featured were women, compared to 83.5 per cent of men on television. Then again, the press have a lower proportion of women. This is also the case for business and experts, broadly speaking—men are dominant there. One encouraging result is television for citizens. Women make up almost half of the citizens that are featured on television, which is what you would expect if you were to have equal proportions of how the citizenry is actually made up. So that's quite encouraging. Again, the press are performing much less well in that area with around 40 per cent. This is something that should be fairly easy—to find women to talk about as normal people, rather than as experts. It is often the excuse that there aren't enough women. Okay, I'm going to hand you back to my colleague.

[63] **Professor Stanyer:** Thank you, Emily. I want to move on finally to the last element of the analysis, which looked at the directional balance. This is whether the news coverage tended to favour arguments for 'remain' or whether it tended to favour arguments for leaving the EU. So, we're looking in some senses here across the picture, across newspapers, and this is kind of the volume of items favouring 'in' or favouring 'leave' in the newspapers. You can see here the kind of split of the press. So you get a good sense of the balance of the kinds of opinions. You've got a wide extreme—you've got *The Guardian* newspaper with the highest number of items in favour of 'in'

and then at the other end you've got the *Daily Express* with the highest number of items favouring 'out'. So you get some sense of the balance of debate. You get an interesting opinion. When you weight this with the circulation, which is the number of readers these particular opinions get, you get a slightly different picture. You get less of a balanced picture. You can see that if you weight it by circulation—the figures—you get a real sense of the dominance of the number of stories favouring 'out' in Eurosceptic newspapers. You get a sense of the weighted circulation in favour of 'out' rather than 'in' in the press.

[64] In terms of overall balance, in terms of broadcasting, I think the key figure here, to give some sense of the balance—. You might expect the press to be mainly solely 'in' or mainly solely to show some sense of partiality, but in terms of the bottom columns, if you look at the very bottom—balanced neutral treatment of positions—you can really clearly see that the broadcasters in our opinion gave a very balanced coverage, rather than favouring one particular side or the other. So, that gives you an overall picture of balance.

[65] In terms of the number of—again, moving back to favourability—the volume of 'in' and 'out' items in papers, we get some sense of the way in which arguments were favouring either 'remain' or 'leave'. So this shows the number of 'in' items minus the number of 'out' items, to get some sense of the overall balance in the papers.

10:00

[66] So, you can see, in the 'in' papers, the majority, perhaps not surprisingly, of items favoured 'remain', whereas with the 'out' papers, the majority of items favoured 'out'. But you can see that broadcasting gave a slight—. The broadcast outlets that we sampled gave a slight in favour of 'remain' rather than 'out'.

[67] Moving on to our penultimate slide, this is a sense of the presence of 'in' and 'out'—the percentage of appearances of actors. We have looked at all the actors where they were speaking for remaining or leaving the EU in the different outlets. So, perhaps not surprisingly, in papers that wanted to remain, most of the actors they cited favoured to remain. In 'out' papers, most of the actors cited wanted to leave the EU. In TV, there was a slight favouring of actors wanting to remain over actors wanting to leave. But in some senses, the disparity isn't perhaps as big as you might expect,

particularly in the 'out' and 'in' newspapers.

[68] This is quotation time. So, we looked at how much they might appear, but also—did they speak? How much did they talk, particularly putting the arguments across? Here we get a sense of a very similar pattern—'in' and 'out'. So, 'out' papers again gave more quotation time to people who wanted to talk about staying out, and 'in' papers gave more time to people wanting to remain. And tv again, in the news, it's slightly more—overall—giving a more balanced position.

[69] So, hopefully, that's given you an overview of the kind of issues that arose; the stopwatch; the amount of time for individuals; and with the individuals who did speak, the amount of time they spoke for; the gender balance, giving you some sense of the ratio of coverage of women to men; and the directional balance, giving you some sense of the balance between 'in' and 'out'; and perhaps if you're talking about newspapers supporting both 'remain' and 'leave'—.

[70] I know it's a lot of information for everyone to digest but, hopefully, that's kind of given you a broad sense that might chime with your own opinions and your own views. Maybe it's a sort of challenge to those. I don't know, but thank you very much for inviting us.

[71] **Bethan Jenkins:** Diolch. Rwy'n siŵr bod yna gwestiynau. Roeddwn jest eisiau gofyn yn gyflym yn gyntaf: a oedd yna rywbeth annisgwyl yn yr hyn yr oeddech wedi'i ffeindio yn yr ymchwil? Beth rwy'n ei deimlo yw bod lot o'r wybodaeth yn wybodaeth yr oeddwn yn disgwyl ei chlywed, o ran bod y papurau 'mewn' yn dangos yr hyn yr oedd pobl yn meddwl o ran aros yn Ewrop, ac wedyn roedd rhai papurau yn cefnogi eu hagendâu nhw. Felly, a oedd yna rywbeth nad oeddech yn ei ddisgwyl? Hefyd, a ydych yn ymwybodol o unrhyw un sy'n gwneud gwaith manwl ynglŷn ag agweddau datganoledig? Mae'n embaras clywed nad oedd Carwyn

Bethan Jenkins: Thank you. I'm sure there are questions. I just wanted to ask briefly to begin with: was there something unexpected in what you discovered in the research? What I feel is that a lot of the information is what we were expecting to hear in terms of the 'in' papers showing what people thought in relation to staying in Europe, and some of the papers were supporting their own agendas. So, was there something that you weren't expecting? Also, are you aware of anybody who is undertaking detailed work on the devolved issues? It's embarrassing to hear to that Carwyn Jones, for example, hasn't had any sort of UK

Jones, er enghraifft, wedi cael unrhyw fath o *coverage* Prydeinig o gwbl, o feddwl mai fe yw'r person etholedig mwyaf pwysig, o ran mai fe yw Prif Weinidog y wlad. Felly, dyna ddau gwestiwn, ond rwy'n siŵr y bydd mwy o gwestiynau nawr hefyd.

[72] **Professor Stanyer:** Thank you very much. I think that, for me, anyway, speaking personally, you are absolutely right. A lot of the coverage—. We kind of expected the Eurosceptic press to champion a particular cause. But I think the gender issue surprised me. Emily, I don't know if you got the same—? Maybe not. Maybe the extent to which women were kind of invisible in the debate was a kind of—.

[73] **Dr Harmer:** Well, what I thought was particularly interesting about the gender issue was the fact that it almost became a story in itself at one point after Harriet Harman MP made an intervention, where she wrote to Ofcom to suggest that there should be more women being covered in broadcast news anyway. So, that kind of surprised me a little bit because, quite often, people don't always notice, or it's something that gets spoken about afterwards. You know, 'Women have been marginalised in terms of their concerns as well as in terms of their being able to speak'. But I was sort of quite heartened—after that intervention—that there was a slight increase as we went over time. So, particularly with the televised debates, which, obviously, we haven't covered in the sample, there was obviously a response from each of the campaign sides, that they thought, 'Right, well, we need to foreground women.' Therefore, quite a lot of the debates featured women after that. So, that was kind of quite pleasing—that there was a response—from my point of view. But, I wasn't surprised that women were marginalised because, based on previous research, politics tends to be dominated by male voices in the campaign.

[74] **Professor Stanyer:** As for your second point about studies being done on the devolved media, I'm not aware of anything although maybe something's being conducted at Cardiff University. I'm not sure, at the moment, whether that's the case or not.

[75] **Bethan Jenkins:** Diolch. A oes **Bethan Jenkins:** Any other questions? yna gwestiynau gan Aelodau? Jeremy. Jeremy.

[76] **Jeremy Miles:** Did you say that you had looked at the online presences of the various newspapers as well?

[77] **Professor Stanyer:** No, this was just the offline presence, but it's kind of indicative, I think, of the—

[78] **Jeremy Miles:** You'd expect the same—

[79] **Professor Stanyer:** Yes, I would expect online—.

[80] **Bethan Jenkins:** Unrhyw gwestiynau eraill? Dai.

[81] **Dai Lloyd:** A allaf ddiolch yn fawr i chi am y cyflwyniad a hefyd am wneud gwaith astudiaeth reit fanwl yn y fan yna? Roeddwn i jest eisiau holi, pan rŷch chi'n cymharu y penawdau yn y papurau a oedd o blaid aros i mewn, ac yn cyfri'r niferoedd o benawdau yn y papurau hynny a oedd yn cefnogi'r ddadl i aros mewn, a'u cymharu nhw efo'r niferoedd o benawdau yn y papurau oedd o blaid gadael, a oedd yna unrhyw ymgais i gymharu pa mor drawiadol oedd yr eitemau yna? Hynny yw, a oedd yna unrhyw agweddau mwy eithafol neu fwy mentrus yn yr ochr i adael—nid fy mod i eisiau rhoi geiriau o'ch blaenau chi—ac efallai jest mater o sôn am eitemau oedd yr ochr i mewn, neu efallai yr oedd yr ochr oedd eisiau gadael jest yn sôn yn ddiymdrech ac yn anymfflamychol o gwbl ynglŷn â'r ddadl—. A oeddech chi'n gallu gwneud mwy na dim ond cymharu y niferoedd o benawdau? Rwy'n deall y pwyslais, wrth gwrs, ac mae o yn drawiadol pan rŷch chi'n ffactorio i mewn niferoedd gwerthiant y

Dai Lloyd: Yes, may I thank you very much for the presentation and for your detailed studies? I just wanted to ask, when you compare the headlines in the papers who were in favour of remaining, and counting the number of headlines in those papers—the campaign to remain—and the number of headlines in the papers that were in favour of leaving, was there any attempt made to compare how striking those items were? Were there more extreme or sensational headlines in the 'leave' campaign papers—I don't want to put words in your mouth—or were the 'remain' papers talking about substantive issues, or were they just talking about the issues without it being inflammatory in any way? Could you do more than just compare the number of headlines? I understand the emphasis, and it is striking when you factor in the sales of those papers. It means that there was a much greater emphasis, of course, as you've said, to the 'leave' side. But I just wanted to see if there was any comparison made of how

papurau newydd yna. Mae'n rhoi inflammatory the headlines were on
 pwyslais llawer mwy cryf wedyn yn both sides?
 naturiol, fel rŷch wedi'i ddadlennu, i'r
 ochr sydd eisiau gadael. Ond meddwl
 oeddwn i a oedd yna unrhyw
 gymhariaeth wedi'i wneud ynglŷn â
 pha mor ymfflamychol oedd y
 penawdau ar y ddwy ochr.

[82] **Professor Stanyer:** Thank you. You raise a very good point, an interesting point. We didn't actually code for the precise tone. I think where you could see a distinct difference, of course, is between what I would call, perhaps, a broadsheet or quality newspapers, on the one hand, with TV news, and then on the other side the tabloid press. So, there was a real, clear distinction, particularly, amongst the *Daily Mail*, *Daily Express* and *The Sun*, a very, very extreme, you could argue, there's a sense of—though I haven't got any data to prove that. We didn't particularly code for the—we could have, I suppose, devised a scale or something to sort of measure, but it's a difficult one to try and capture.

[83] **Dr Harmer:** I would just add that the method that we used, in an attempt to be much more scientific—those sorts of issues about language and stuff probably warrant a more qualitative approach that we haven't ourselves done as yet. But that might be worth looking at in the future. Thank you.

[84] **Bethan Jenkins:** Diolch yn fawr, Dai. Dawn Bowden.

[85] **Dawn Bowden:** Thank you. It's on a similar theme to Dai's, and perhaps it's a little bit unfair because this is a specific piece of research that you've done within the campaign period for the EU referendum. My question is, are you aware of any similar studies that were done on the media before the campaign? I'm thinking, actually, in the last 10–20 years—because I certainly had a sense of our media was generally Eurosceptic, in terms of the headlines that we saw, over a long period of time, particularly the tabloid media. I would be interested to see whether there is any research that's been done around that and would confirm or not that that was the case. What I'm saying, I think, is the tone of the campaign had been set long before we actually got into it and I wondered whether any kind of research had been done on that previously, maybe not you, but if you were aware of it.

[86] **Professor Stanyer:** I haven't read anything that's been a systematic analysis going from the referendum all the way back, but I think anecdotally there's been some research that I've read that have looked at particular periods around, for example, whether we were going to move to adopt the euro and debates around that, or leaving the exchange rate mechanism. So, there are those moments where there's been some research, but nothing that's done time—you know, month on month or year by year. I think you could trace, perhaps, back to I suppose that kind of immortalised coverage, you know, 'Up Yours Delors'. That was kind of, you know—. So, I think *The Sun* newspaper has had a long track record of Euroscepticism, so you could say, 'Well, it's not surprising that the coverage they gave was probably the coverage we could all have predicted'. You would needn't to be super wise to do that.

[87] In some senses, one of the arguments has been—and one of the areas I'd mentioned briefly when I responded to Bethan was—about what impact has this had. The thinking is that it's very difficult to measure long-term exposure. So, the campaign is a short period of time, but a lot of the papers—you know, it could be argued that it's the long-term reinforcing of a particular perspective over years and it's not surprising, perhaps, then that people interpret—. You know, when asked the question, then they make a decision based on the kind of information they've had.

[88] **Lee Waters:** First of all, thank you very much for coming to present to us; we do appreciate it. I was struck by the table showing the coverage of the issues by media, broadcast and print. Do you have any sense of which was taking the lead in setting the agenda, because it's often said that the television follows the agenda set by the newspapers? Do you have any ability to analyse that?

[89] **Dr Harmer:** I think it's quite difficult to tell. I think the broadcasters would heavily resist that interpretation, but sometimes it is difficult to come to any other conclusion, in particular, with the dominance of these two—

[90] **Lee Waters:** There was very little difference, wasn't there?

[91] **Dr Harmer:** Yes. So, I think it's difficult to see who's responding to whom, but the press still have very much an agenda-setting role in British politics, generally, let alone for the broadcasters. So, I mean, we don't have specific—. What do you think, James?

[92] **Professor Stanyer:** It's very difficult. Often, you know, in a way—. I would see it perhaps in other ways. You've got kind of elements of political parties: the 'out' campaign, you know, 'leave' and 'remain'. So, 'leave' had a particular political agenda, which was supported by the press and I think, in some senses, it may be a combination of the 'leave' campaign setting the press agenda and then that agenda setting the broadcasters' agenda. So, I think it's very difficult to disentangle that and say, 'Well, you can clearly see—you know, there was a press conference and then the papers had this story'. Most of the time, the stories tended to go across both press and broadcasting. They covered it perhaps in a slightly different way: maybe the balance of actors might've been different within the stories, in the sense of who they asked or who they quoted, but, generally, it's very difficult to say who was leading whom.

[93] **Lee Waters:** Okay.

[94] **Bethan Jenkins:** Jeremy, did you want to come in again?

[95] **Jeremy Miles:** Yes. You didn't include an analysis of radio news and so on. Was there a particular reason for that and would you expect a particular pattern to emerge if you had done an exercise?

[96] **Professor Stanyer:** I think, like all these things, there are kind of budget issues, you know; it kind of constrains what we can do, so we thought—. One of the glaring omissions might be the *Today* programme or something like that on Radio 4, a national outlet, or regional radio stations or even the kind of key stations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. So, yes, it would've been great, but my opinion, I think, in some senses, is that it would've reflected more of what we see here; I don't think it's going to be a complete divergence from what we've found here.

[97] **Bethan Jenkins:** Neil.

[98] **Neil Hamilton:** Have you drawn any conclusions as to whether the media actually influenced the outcome of the referendum, in as much as, if you look at the editorial line of newspapers, most of them are actually publishing propaganda rather than news on both sides of the argument, particularly at the tabloid levels? And I suppose most of us actually read newspapers or search for things online more to bolster our prejudices than to inform our opinions. I imagine that that's true of normal people as well.

[99] **Bethan Jenkins:** Are we abnormal now? [*Laughter.*]

[100] **Neil Hamilton:** I remember when I was an undergraduate 100 years ago, there was some research done about the influence of television upon people's political opinions in the 1950s, which broadly came to the conclusion that, actually, what people said had no impact whatsoever, but the images that they retained of events or individuals was something that mattered more. So, it's rather more what you look like than what you say.

10.15

[101] **Professor Stanyer:** You make a good point, and I think it ties into the one earlier about the length of exposure. So, you could be, in some senses—you know, where do you get—? For example, if you are a citizen, over time you're fed particular stories about the European Union, and those come to form your opinion. So, it could be about the length of exposure, and I think perhaps often a campaign might be too short a time period to really understand, and I think one of the challenges of doing this kind of research is developing the panel surveys where you can look at people's exposure to messages over periods of time, and then see how they respond, particularly around issues they may not be familiar with. So, they may be familiar with their local political issues, but with Europe in the context—. So, there's a been a whole bit of interesting research about these Euro myths that perpetuate and seem to emerge over time, so in the press, about straight bananas, metric sausages, whatever you want to call it. These are the kind of stories that you find that, often, when you talk to members of the public, get regurgitated: 'Oh, but this is the overbearing EU'. So, there's a sense of—. That doesn't come out in a campaign; these are—.

[102] I think that you're probably right in the sense that there's probably a good proportion of the public who had already made their mind up before the campaign started, and this was just about reinforcing their positions. But I think that certain sectors of the electorate—in this case, young people, I would say—probably hadn't. They were perhaps more open. There's been some interesting research to see in some sense how they responded to information—whether they were more open to potential information and informing. But I think what struck us was that, if they were relying on the national media for their main source of information, they would probably have been disappointed, because it was very narrow and very focused on certain political parties, and, if you like, it was the Boris and Dave show talking about immigration and the economy, and maybe George popping in

to talk a bit about how it's all going to be damned and whatever. So, in a way, there's a sense of: what media do the citizens deserve, and what do we get? There's that kind of trying to join those two bits up.

[103] **Bethan Jenkins:** Grêt. Mae gennyf ddau gwestiwn ychwanegol, os mae hynny'n iawn. Y cwestiwn cyntaf oedd jest wedi dod i fy meddwl wrth i chi siarad. Yn yr Alban, maen nhw'n cael papurau sydd â thudalen gyntaf wahanol i'r hyn sy'n cael eu rhoi allan yng Nghymru ac yn Lloegr. Roeddwn i'n 'wonder-an' os oeddech chi wedi edrych ar hynny yng nghyd-destun sut, felly, oedd pobl yn pleidleisio. Rwy'n credu roedd un yn cefnogi'r hyn a oedd Nicola Sturgeon yn ei wneud, ac wedyn roedd un arall nad oedd yng ngweddill Prydain. So, rwy jest eisiau gofyn i chi ynglŷn ag a oeddech chi wedi asesu hynny.

Bethan Jenkins: Great. I have two additional questions, if that's okay. The first question just came to mind as you were speaking there. In Scotland, they have papers with a first page different to what is being distributed in Wales and England. I was wondering whether you'd looked at that in terms of how people were voting. I think there was one that supported what Nicola Sturgeon was doing, and then there was another that didn't in the rest of Britain. So, I just wanted to ask whether you'd assessed that.

[104] Yr ail gwestiwn oedd: ar y wefan, roeddwn i wedi gweld eich bod chi wedi cael sleid yn dweud beth oedd y materion a oedd wedi dod i'r golwg ar ôl y refferendwm—pethau fel erthygl 50, nad oedd wedi cael ei drafod yn ystod yr etholiad—y refferendwm, sori—cymaint. A allech chi jest esbonio hynny ychydig bach? Achos roeddwn i'n gweld hynny yn ddiddorol iawn o ran sut wedyn roedd y drafodaeth wedi newid efallai o allfudwyr i bethau fel arian cydgyssylltiol gan Ewrop ac yn y blaen, ac yn y blaen.

The second question was: on the website, I saw that you had a slide saying what the issues were that had arisen after the referendum—for example, article 50, which hadn't been discussed during the referendum so much. Could you just explain that a little bit further, because I found that very interesting in terms of how the discussion changed, perhaps, from immigrants to issues such as funding from Europe and so forth?

[105] **Dr Harmer:** So, in terms of your first question, again, due to budgetary reasons, we weren't able to look at the Scottish press, but we did a similar

analysis of the 2015 election last year where we did include the Scottish press, and a bit more media generally, and so this perhaps might be borne out in the referendum as well, but, without looking, I couldn't say for sure.

[106] **Bethan Jenkins:** I was thinking of the UK press that was Scotland-skewed as opposed to the Scottish press in and of itself.

[107] **Dr Harmer:** Yes. So, *The Scottish Sun*, for example, which is obviously the sister paper of the national *The Sun* that is distributed in England and Wales, obviously backed two different horses in the election, so I think quite a lot of that has to do with the whims of ownership in a lot of the tabloid press, for example. But, yes, you do occasionally get that sort of phenomenon, and we did track that last year, but we weren't able to do that this year. Sorry, what was your second question?

[108] **Professor Stanyer:** Was it about Lisbon? Or article 50?

[109] **Bethan Jenkins:** Well, it was about—sorry. Perhaps it wasn't translated. It was to do with after the referendum. I think, on your website, part of the research showed how the difference of topics had changed from during to after. For example, things like article 50, which hadn't really been mentioned much during the campaign, were mentioned quite a lot. So, I just personally found that interesting, and wondered whether you could just explain to the others on the committee what that meant.

[110] **Dr Harmer:** We did have that slide in the presentation at one point, but I think I must have taken it out. Basically, it showed that article 50 was very much not really being discussed. So the actual process of Brexit wasn't really being discussed during the campaign but, then, in the few days after the result, article 50 suddenly became—everybody was talking about it, because it suddenly became real. In terms of the issues, I've got anecdotal feelings about that. We are actually completing a week's worth of post-coverage in order to try and compare which issues have been raised, which we're hoping to complete this week. We'd be happy to share that with you later on, but, yes, I think this where devolved issues, for example, has raised its head, particularly in terms of the Scottish question about independence versus staying in and all those sorts of issues. So, yes, I can distribute that to you once we have the findings, if you would find that interesting.

[111] **Bethan Jenkins:** Diolch yn fawr. **Bethan Jenkins:** Thank you. Are there A oes unrhyw gwestiynau eraill, neu any other questions, or shall I draw

fe wnaif ddod â'r sesiwn i ben os nad oes? Na. Diolch yn fawr iawn am roi tystiolaeth. Rwy'n credu ei bod yn ddiddorol iawn i glywed yr hyn sy'n digwydd yn y wasg. Gobeithio y gallwn edrych ar hyn yng nghydestun y gwaith efallai y byddwn yn gwneud yn y dyfodol fel pwyllgor newydd. Felly, diolch yn fawr iawn, a siwrnai saff gartref.

the session to a conclusion? No. Thank you very much for giving evidence. I thought it was very interesting to hear what's happening in the press. Hopefully we can look at this in the context of the work that we'll be doing in future as a new committee. So, thank you very much to you, and a safe journey home.

[112] **Professor Stanyer:** Thank you very much to you all.

[113] **Dr Harmer:** Thank you.

10:21

Papurau i'w Nodi Papers to Note

[114] **Bethan Jenkins:** Rydym yn mynd ymlaen i eitem 5—papurau i'w nodi. Mae yna lythyr gan y Llywydd at Gadeirydd y pwyllgor yn dweud wrthyf beth yw'r hyn y dylem ei wneud, a thelerau fy nghyfnod fel Cadeirydd. Felly, plis peidiwch â'i ddarllen—jôc. [*Chwerthin.*] Wedyn, mae llythyr at yr Arglwydd Hall, cyfarwyddwr cyffredinol y BBC, gennyf i fel Cadeirydd. Gwnaethom gytuno i ysgrifennu yn y sesiwn breifat. Gobeithio eich bod i gyd yn hapus gyda hynny. Wedyn, byddwn yn disgwyl ymateb gan yr Arglwydd Hall.

Bethan Jenkins: We move on to item 5—papers to note. There is a letter from the Llywydd to the Chair of the committee, to inform me of what we should be doing and the conditions of my term as Chair. Please don't read that—joke. [*Laughter.*] Then, we have a letter to Lord Hall, director general of the BBC, from me as Chair. We agreed to write that letter in the private session last week. I hope that you're all content with the contents of that letter. Then, we'll await a response from Lord Hall.

[115] Fel y dywedais ar y dechrau, bydd y pwyllgor yn cymryd rhan mewn digwyddiad yn yr Eisteddfod gyda nifer ohonoch chi yn yr ystafell

As I said, the committee will take part in an event at the National Eisteddfod with a number of you in this room present. Then, we'll be meeting again

yma. Wedyn, byddwn yn cwrdd dydd on Wednesday, 14 September, when Mercher, 14 Medi, pan fydd y Senedd the Senedd will have reconvened. nôl yn gweithio. Rydym yn mynd i We're going to visit Media Wales ymweld â Media Wales yn syth nawr immediately after this meeting comes ar ôl i'r pwyllgor yma orffen. Jest i to an end. Just to note on the record, nodi ar y record, nid dim ond Media we're not just visiting Media Wales, Wales y byddwn ni fel pwyllgor yn but we will be visiting a number of ymweld ag ef, ond byddwn yn people who work in the media as part ymweld â nifer o bobl sy'n gweithio of the committee's work. But we're yn y cyfryngau fel rhan o'r pwyllgor. starting with Media Wales to see what Ond byddwn yn dechrau gyda Media they're doing and to ask questions to Wales i weld yr hyn maen nhw'n them about their work in Wales. gwneud a gofyn cwestiynau iddyn nhw am eu gwaith yng Nghymru.

[116] A oes unrhyw sylwadau eraill? Are there any further comments? If Os nad oes, bydd y cyfarfod not, the public meeting will come to cyhoeddus yn dod i ben. Mwynhewch an end. Enjoy the summer. We'll meet yr haf. Byddwn yn cwrdd ar ôl yr haf. in the autumn. Thank you very much. Diolch yn fawr.

Daeth y cyfarfod i ben am 10:22.

The meeting ended at 10:22.

Drafft - Drafft