

possibility of influencing informal communication processes, e.g. between communication offices of the Government and media professionals – a strategy that works at the national level but is more difficult between nations. An example is a federal press conference in Berlin. The possibilities of influencing, at the informal level, the German media elite attending such a conference – e.g. by keeping certain issues out of the discussion – is certainly not quite as easy across national borders. The experience of the last few months has shown, however, that once good contact and trust are established between Government offices of a country and the media correspondents of the other countries on site, and also with the key editors-in-chief, such influence can no longer be ruled out. This is probably also a consequence of increasing globalization, the progressive growing together of the world.

Practice has shown that both the news agencies and the German national print media were interested in hearing the Liechtenstein viewpoint and even giving it space in their coverage. It was seen that – as in the case of national disputes – some media followed their own political-strategic line and reported on certain facts in an inaccurate, distorted or biased way, but that this does not represent a special feature of transnational communication. An analysis of the Anglo-Saxon media painted a different picture, but this is not an object of this paper's research.

Overall, it was shown that Eichhorn's model can in principle, with limitations, be applied with respect to the initial identification of the involved actors, the individual issues communicated via the German print media, the resulting framing of issues during the observed time period, and the influence process. This is possible, although the complexity is increased because of the "double allocation" of the political actors and interest groups (in both Germany and Liechtenstein) within the "elite audience" sphere. The political actors and interest groups must be considered separately and independently of each other in each country. The resulting complexity, which reflects nothing other than reality, cannot be described fully by the Eichhorn model, however. For this reason, the author developed her own model, namely the *transnational framing-of-issues* model.

One might at first glance assume that the "mass media" sphere exists in both Germany and Liechtenstein and that it has the significance accorded to the mass media by Eichhorn's model. But in the case examined, this was only true of Germany. As already shown in Chapter 4, the Liechtenstein newspapers are hardly read outside the country, except by the diplomats accredited to Liechtenstein and some EEA officials in Brussels, for whom they are required reading. Depending on the issue, the Liechtenstein media have a focused or unfocused influence on the Liechtenstein elite and passive audience. Conversely, the transregional German print media are indeed read by the Liechtenstein elite audience and thus influence it. The actors in Germany identified in Chapter 6.5.5 thus reach all actors that they target, both in Germany and in Liechtenstein. Moreover, via the German-speaking correspondents of all major international or at least European mass media resident in Berlin, they also reach the international actors. For these reasons, this paper only used the German print media as interpretation sources (not the Liechtenstein print media), so that the "mass media" sphere according to Eichhorn's model remained uniform.

The question of correspondents of important European media also indicates another problem for Liechtenstein's communication efforts: other than the NZZ, not a single foreign media