



**UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)**

**Framing Turkey: Identities, public opinion and Turkey's potential accession into the EU**

Azroun, R.

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Azroun, R. (2013). *Framing Turkey: Identities, public opinion and Turkey's potential accession into the EU.*

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix 1A

Positive/negative development	In-group/out-group	Opportunities/threats	Other arguments
- Democracy – undetermined	- In-group/out-group – undetermined	- Opportunities/threats – undetermined	- Undetermined opportunities/threats for Turkey
- Human rights – undetermined	- Undetermined – culture	- Undetermined – economy	- Economic opportunities/threats for Turkey
- Undetermined – development	- Undetermined – religion	- Economic opportunities/threats for EU/NL	- Democratic opportunities/threats for Turkey
- Economic development	- Orientation of Turkey	- Costs for EU/NL	- Opportunities/threats for human rights in Turkey
- Democratic development	- Ties through migration	- Religious opportunities/threats	- Preventing Islamic state
- Role of the army	- Economic in-group/out-group	- Cultural opportunities/threats	- Multiple nationalities
- Corruption	- NATO member	- Immigration opportunities/threats	- Number of people in Turkey
- Position/equality of women	- Geographical in-group/out-group	- Crime opportunities/threats	- Because of Turks in the NL
- Development human rights	- Historical in-group/out-group	- Strategic opportunities/threats	- Environment
- Rule of law	- Cultural in-group/out-group	- Connection to Middle East opportunities/threats	- Holocaust denial
- Development Islam	- Religious in-group/out-group	- EU-arguments – undetermined	- Armenian genocide
- Separation of state and religion	- Cultural in-group/out-group	- Size of the EU	- Cooperation without membership
- Freedom of religion	- Religious in-group/out-group	- Ability to govern the EU	- Cyprus
- Respect for minorities	- In-group/out-group in ideas/mentality	- Readiness of the EU	- Greece
- Stability		- Strength of the EU	- Nice people
- Kurdish issue		- Trust in Turkey	- Vacation country
- Internal divisions		- Turkish/Islamic domination	- Hygiene
- Violence – terrorism			
- EU criteria			

Note: Some respondents only replied with one or two words. With 'human rights' or 'democracy' we can assume that this relates to the state of Turkish democracy and human rights. When respondents only mention 'economy', 'culture' or 'religion' there is much less certainty to which category this relates. Hence, these are only coded in the development, in-group/out-group or opportunity/threat category when the statement of the respondent was clear about this.

## Appendix 1B

Table 1.B1  
*Reliability of coding*

	Percentage agreement	Krippendorff's alpha
<b>Frames</b>		
Development	92.4%	.84
Identity	95.0%	.89
Utilitarian	99.1%	.83
First frame	88.7%	.85
<b>Arguments</b>		
Development - Positive	99.4%	.85
Development - Negative	93.3%	.86
Identity - In-group	97.6%	.81
Identity - Out-group	95.9%	.90
Consequences - Opportunity	98.4%	.90
Consequences - Threat	94.4%	.82
Other argument	96.9%	.85
No argument	98.9%	.96
First argument	89.1%	.87

*Note:* N = 700

### Appendix 3

#### Descriptives of coded items open-ended question

	Mean	SD	Krippendorff's alpha
Explicit out-group mentioning	.354	.479	.886
Explicit threat mentioning	..182	.387	.864
Explicit in-group mentioning (reversly coded)	.914	.280	.833
Explicit opportunity mentioning (reversly coded)	.892	.311	.824
Framing in terms of out-group	2.343	.873	.888

#### Descriptives of indices and translations of closed-ended questions

		Mean	SD	alpha
<b>Support for Turkish membership (1-7)</b>	7 = very much in favour	2.741	1.782	
Een aantal landen zou op termijn kunnen toetreden tot de Europese Unie. Kunt u aangeven voor elk van de onderstaande landen in hoeverre u voor of tegen toetreding tot de EU bent? Turkije.				
<b>Immigration attitude index (1-7)</b>	7 = negative	4.662	1.178	.884
<i>Index of 8 items, answers on 7-point disagree-agree scale.</i>				
Op scholen met veel kinderen van immigranten is de kwaliteit van het onderwijs slecht.				
Immigranten maken misbruik van sociale voorzieningen.				
Immigranten zijn een bedreiging voor de veiligheid in Nederland.				
Immigranten krijgen een nadelige behandeling van de overheid.				
De aanwezigheid van immigranten doet de werkloosheid in Nederland groeien.				
Immigranten zijn een belangrijke oorzaak voor criminaliteit in Nederland.				
Immigranten zijn een verrijking voor de Nederlandse cultuur.				
De religieuze praktijken van immigranten vormen een bedreiging voor de Nederlandse levensstijl en tradities.				
<b>Economic evaluations index (1-7)</b>	7 = very much better	3.215	0.917	.818
<i>Index of 3 items, answers on 7-point worse-better scale.</i>				
Hoe denkt u dat de economische situatie in Nederland zich de komende twaalf maanden zal ontwikkelen?				
Hoe denkt u dat de economische situatie in Europese Unie zich de komende twaalf maanden zal ontwikkelen?				
Hoe denkt u dat uw persoonlijke financiële situatie zich de komende twaalf maanden zal ontwikkelen?				

		Mean	SD	alpha
<b>Government satisfaction index (1-7)</b>	7 = very satisfied	3.888	0.990	.823
<i>Index of 5 items, answers on 7-point dissatisfied-satisfied scale.</i>				
Kunt u aangeven hoe tevreden of ontevreden u in het algemeen bent met wat de huidige regering <bestaande uit CDA, PvdA en ChristenUnie> doet ?				
Kunt u aangeven hoe tevreden of ontevreden u bent met de manier waarop de regering handelt op het gebied van ...				
... Europese integratie?				
... de economie?				
... het milieu?				
... immigratie?				
<b>National identity index (1-7)</b>	7 = strong identity	5.182	1.172	.909
<i>Index of 5 items, answers on 7-point disagree-agree scale.</i>				
Ik ben er trots op een Nederlands burger te zijn.				
Nederlander zijn betekent veel voor me.				
De Nederlandse vlag betekent veel voor me.				
Nederlanders delen een gemeenschappelijke traditie, cultuur en geschiedenis.				
Ik voel mij verwant met andere Nederlanders.				
<b>European identity index (1-7)</b>	7 = strong identity	3.702	1.144	.868
<i>Index of 5 items, answers on 7-point disagree-agree scale.</i>				
Ik ben er trots op Europees burger te zijn.				
Europeaan zijn betekent veel voor me.				
De Europese vlag betekent veel voor me.				
Europeanen delen een gemeenschappelijke traditie, cultuur en geschiedenis.				
Ik voel mij verwant met andere Europeanen.				
<b>Exclusive national identity (1-7)</b>	7 = exclusive identity	2.594	1.251	
<i>Based on national identity index and on EU identity index, with:</i>				
<i>If natID &lt; euID → Exclusive national identity = 0;</i>				
<i>Else exclusive national identity =  natID - euID  + 1 .</i>				
<b>Gender (dich.)</b>	1 = female	.518	.500	
<b>Age (20-83)</b>		50.147	16.394	
<b>Education (1-6)</b>				
1 Primary school (LO-LBO)		.227	.419	
2 Lower general secondary education (MAVO)		.088	.283	
3 Intermediate vocational education (MBO)		.328	.470	
4 Higher general secondary education (HAVO-VWO)		.076	.266	
5 Higher vocational education (HBO-WO-kand)		.175	.380	
6 Univeristy degree (WO-DOCT)		.106	.308	

### Appendix 4

#### Individual level variables

<b>Support for Turkey's EU membership</b>	M = 3.07	SD = 1.93
For each of the following countries, to what extent are you in favour of or against it becoming a member of the EU? -> Turkey		
	[1. Strongly against ..... 7.Strongly in favour]	
<b>Anti-immigrant attitudes</b>	M = 3.08	SD = 1.52    alpha = .84
<i>Index of 5 items, answers on 7-point disagree-agree scale.</i>		
Immigrants abuse [COUNTRY]'s social welfare system, because they take more out than they put in.		
Immigrants are a threat to the security of [NATIONALITY] people.		
The religious practices of immigrants are a threat to the [NATIONALITY] way of life and its traditions.		
Immigrants are an important cause of crime in [COUNTRY].		
Immigration is good for the [NATIONALITY] labour market. <Reversely coded>		
	[0. Strongly disagree ..... 6.Strongly agree]	
<b>National identity</b>	M = 4.21	SD = 1.53    alpha = .89
<i>Index of 4 items, answers on 7-point disagree-agree scale.</i>		
I am proud to be a [NATIONALITY] citizen.		
Being [NATIONALITY] means a lot to me.		
I feel close to fellow [NATIONALS].		
I feel more [NATIONALITY] than European.		
	[0. Strongly disagree ..... 6.Strongly agree]	
<b>European identity</b>	M = 2.68	SD = 1.45    alpha = .87
<i>Index of 4 items, answers on 7-point disagree-agree scale.</i>		
I am proud to be a European citizen.		
Being a citizen of the European Union means a lot to me.		
I feel close to fellow Europeans.		
The European flag means a lot to me.		
	[0. Strongly disagree ..... 6.Strongly agree]	
<b>Exclusive national identity</b>	M = 1.82	SD = 1.65
<i>Similar as in chapter 3, exclusive national identity is based on national identity index and on index of European identity, with:</i>		
<i>If natID &lt; euID à Exclusive national identity = 0;</i>		
<i>Else exclusive national identity =  natID - euID .</i>		
	[0. No exclusive national identity 6.Strong exclusive nation:	

<b>Government satisfaction</b>	M = 2.26	SD = 1.38	alpha = .90
<i>Index of 5 items, answers on 7-point disagree-agree scale.</i>			
In general, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? ->			
The current national government is doing a good job.			
[0. Strongly disagree ..... 6.Strongly agree]			
And how well do you think the government is handling the issue of ...			
-> ... European integration?			
-> ... the economy?			
-> ... the environment?			
-> ... immigration?			
[0. Very poorly ..... 6.Very well]			
<b>Economic evaluations</b>	M = 2.85	SD = 1.28	alpha = .81
<i>Index of 3 items, answers on 7-point disagree-agree scale.</i>			
Looking at the economic situation in [COUNTRY], do you think the situation will be better or worse twelve months from now?			
How about if you think of the European Union, do you think that twelve months from now the economic situation in the EU will be better or worse?			
How about your personal situation: Do you think that twelve months from now your personal economic situation will be better or worse?			
[0. Much worse ..... 6.Much better]			
<b>Political ideology</b>	M = 5.22	SD = 2.70	
In political matters, people talk about "the left" and "the right". What is your position? Please indicate your views using any number on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means "left" and 10 means "right". Which number best describes your position?			
[0. Left ..... 10.Right]			
<b>Political interest</b>	M = 3.85	SD = 1.15	alpha = .79
<i>Index of 5 items, answers on 7-point disagree-agree scale.</i>			
How interested are you in politics?			
[0. Not at all interested ..... 6.Very interested]			
And how interested are you in ...			
-> ... economic issues?			
-> ... immigration issues?			
-> ... European Union issues?			
-> ... environmental issues?			
[0. Not at all interested ..... 6.Very interested]			
<b>Age</b>	M = 39.52	SD = 13.40	
<i>From TNS database.</i>			
<b>Gender</b>			
<i>From TNS database.</i>			
<i>Dummy with male as reference category.</i>			
Gender male	M = .48	SD = .50	
Gender female	M = .52	SD = .50	

---

**Education**

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

*Country specific educational levels recoded into low, medium and high education.*

*Dummies with medium level education as reference category.*

Education low	M = .25	SD = .43
Education medium	M = .34	SD = .47
Education high	M = .41	SD = .49

---

**Ethnicity**

Do you consider yourself to be a member of an ethnic minority group?

*Dummy with not member of an ethnic minority as reference category.*

Not member ethnic minority	M = .94	SD = .24
Member ethnic minority	M = .06	SD = .24

---

## Country level variables

<b>Number of Turkish migrants (%)</b>			
<i>Data retrieved from Eurostat.</i>			
Country level (N = 20)		M = 0.28	SD = 0.55
<b>Number of Muslims (%)</b>			
<i>Data retrieved from Pew Forum on Religion &amp; Public Life (2009).</i>			
Country level (N = 20)		M = 1.75	SD = 1.99
<b>Importance of immigration issue: general public</b>			
<i>Data from own own survey.</i>			
In your opinion, how important are the following problems in [COUNTRY]?			
-> Immigration problems			
		[0. Not at all important ..... 6. Very important]	
Individual level (N = 26,344)		M = 3.85	SD = 1.75
Country level (N = 20)		M = 3.88	SD = 0.54
<b>Importance of immigration issue: political parties</b>			
<i>Data retrieved from 2006 Chapel Hill Expert Survey.</i>			
On each dimension, we ask you to assess the position of the party leadership, and then to assess the importance/salience of this dimension for a party's public stance.			
-> Importance/salience of immigration policy for each of the following parties.			
-> Importance/salience of integration of immigrants and asylum seekers for each of the following parties.			
-> Importance/salience of ethnic minorities for each of the following parties.			
		[0. Not important at all ..... 10. Extremely important]	
Party level (N = 156)	alpha = .88	M = 5.72	SD = 1.73
Country level (N = 20)		M = 5.28	SD = 1.35
<b>Importance of immigration issue: media salience (%)</b>			
<i>Data retrieved from media dataset of 2009 European Election Study.</i>			
<u>Primary topic of the story</u> (i.e. major subject of the story = taking the most space or time – often mentioned in the headline). Topics have to be referred to/mentioned at least twice in the article or newscast and not just mentioned in passing.			
<u>Secondary topic of the story</u> (i.e. second most important subject of the story)			
<u>Tertiary topic of the story</u> (i.e. third most important subject of the story)			
Note: If there is more than one appropriate category, <b>always choose the most specific one.</b>			
Note: <u>Up to 3</u> topics can be coded. However, a story does not necessarily address more than 1 topic. Thus, do not search for additional topics if there really are no more than 1 or 2 topics discernable!			
-> Immigration		-> Multiculturalism (cultural diversity, cultural plurality)	
-> Ethnic minorities		-> National immigration policy	
<i>Article scored 1 if at least one of four topics mentioned above is primary, secondary or tertiary topic of the story, else 0.</i>			
Article level (N = 36979)		M = 1.56	SD = 12.39
Country level (N = 20)		M = 1.18	SD = 0.94

## Appendix 5A

Country	Wave 1					Wave 2				
	Emails sent	Did not take part	Contact rate (AAPOR CON1)	Completed int.	Response rate (AAPOR RR1)	Emails sent	Did not take part	Contact rate (AAPOR CON1)	Completed int.	Response rate (AAPOR RR1)
UK	7636	5913	23%	1421	19%	1421	272	81%	1007	71%
France	6379	4602	28%	1418	22%	1418	250	82%	1015	72%
Italy	5335	3323	38%	1420	27%	1420	260	82%	1002	71%
Germany	6886	4885	29%	1408	20%	1408	248	82%	1004	71%
Spain	6692	4816	28%	1457	22%	1457	263	82%	1020	70%
Sweden	6562	4628	29%	1428	22%	1428	299	79%	1008	71%
Denmark	10643	8591	19%	1421	13%	1421	270	81%	1017	72%
Greece	5351	3639	32%	1419	27%	1419	196	86%	1018	72%
Hungary	4089	2430	41%	1414	35%	1414	161	89%	1019	72%
Czech Republic	4298	2318	46%	1488	35%	1488	278	81%	1013	68%
Poland	4370	2447	44%	1409	32%	1409	205	85%	1011	72%
Ireland	7736	5450	30%	1417	18%	1417	264	81%	1004	71%
Austria	6369	4254	33%	1427	22%	1427	241	83%	1001	70%
Portugal	5957	4110	31%	1422	24%	1422	167	88%	1012	71%
Belgium	18632	14655	21%	2805	15%	2805	721	74%	2000	71%
Netherlands	5239	3405	35%	1408	27%	1408	214	85%	1025	73%
Finland	5012	3354	33%	1440	29%	1440	240	83%	1018	71%
Lithuania	3006	1124	63%	1393	46%	1393	193	86%	1093	78%
Latvia	10600	7385	30%	2260	21%	2260	748	67%	1314	58%
Slovakia	5622	3181	43%	1628	29%	1628	430	74%	1189	73%
Bulgaria	3988	1922	52%	1509	38%	1509	410	73%	1016	67%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>140402</b>	<b>96432</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>32412</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>32412</b>	<b>6330</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>22806</b>	<b>70%</b>

Note: Differences between contact rates and response rates are due to incomplete interviews and respondents who wanted to participate but were excluded because they were from a demographic group that was already overrepresented in the sample.

## Appendix 5B: Question and item wording

### Survey

**Support Turkish membership wave 2.** To what extent are you in favour of or against Turkey becoming a member of the EU?

[1. Strongly against ..... 7. Strongly in favour]

**Support Turkish membership wave 1.** For each of the following countries, to what extent are you in favour of or against it becoming a member of the EU?

-> Turkey

[1. Strongly against ..... 7. Strongly in favour]

In the same question, support or opposition towards membership of Croatia and Switzerland was asked, with the order of the countries being rotated.

**Anti-immigrant attitudes.** Next we would like to ask for your opinion about immigrants in [COUNTRY]. Could you please indicate for every statement below to what extent you agree or disagree with it?

-> Immigrants abuse [COUNTRY]'s social welfare system, because they take more out than they put in.

-> Immigrants are a threat to the security of [NATIONALITY] people.

-> The religious practices of immigrants are a threat to the [NATIONALITY] way of life and its traditions.

-> Immigrants are an important cause of crime in [COUNTRY].

-> Immigration is good for the [NATIONALITY] labour market. (reversely coded)

[1. Strongly disagree ..... 7. Strongly agree]

**Exclusive national identity.** Similar as in chapter 3, we constructed our measure of exclusive national identity as follows: When EU identity was stronger than national identity, national identity was presumed non-exclusive (0). When national identity was stronger than EU identity, the exclusiveness of national identity was the difference of national and EU identity.

National identity: Please consider the following statements about [COUNTRY] and tell us for each of them to what extent you agree or disagree.

- > I am proud to be a [NATIONALITY] citizen.
- > Being [NATIONALITY] means a lot to me.
- > I feel close to fellow [NATIONALS].
- > I feel more [NATIONALITY] than European

[1. Strongly disagree ..... 7. Strongly agree]

EU identity: In the following we present you several statements about the European Union. Please tell us to what extent you agree or disagree with each one of them.

- > I am proud to be a European citizen.
- > Being a citizen of the European Union means a lot to me.
- > I feel close to fellow Europeans.

[1. Strongly disagree ..... 7. Strongly agree]

Please also tell us to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

- > The European flag means a lot to me.

[1. Strongly disagree ..... 7. Strongly agree]

**Government satisfaction.** In general, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

- > The current national government is doing a good job.

[1. Strongly disagree ..... 7. Strongly agree]

And how well do you think the government is handling the issue of...

- > ... European integration?
- > ... the economy?
- > ... the environment?
- > ... immigration?

[1. Very poorly ..... 7. Very well]

**Economic evaluations.** Looking at the economic situation in [COUNTRY], do you think the situation will be better or worse twelve months from now?

[1. Much worse ..... 7. Much better]

How about if you think of the European Union, do you think that twelve months from now the economic situation in the EU will be better or worse?

[1. Much worse .....7.Much better]

How about your personal situation: Do you think that twelve months from now your personal economic situation will be better or worse?

[1. Much worse .....7.Much better]

### **Media analysis**

**Evaluation of Turkey's membership in the media. Explicitly: Does the story evaluate the potential membership of TURKEY in the EU?**

1. not mentioned
2. mentioned but not evaluated
3. negative
4. rather negative
5. balanced/mixed
6. rather positive
7. positive

### Appendix 5C: List of media outlets

Country	Newspaper	Television news
<b>Austria:</b>	Der Standard	Aktuell 19h20 (ATV)
	Die Presse	ZiB 19h30 (ORF1)
	Neue Kronen Zeitung	
<b>Belgium:</b>	De Morgen	Het Journaal 19h00 (VRT)
	De Standaard	VTM-Nieuws 19h00 (VTM)
	Het Laatste Nieuws	
	La Dernière Heure	JT Meteo 19h30 (La Une)
	La Libre Belgique	Le Journal (19h00 (RTL-TV)
	Le Soir	
<b>Bulgaria:</b>	24 Chasa	bTV Новините 19h00 (bTV)
	Dnevnik	По света и у нас 20h00 (BNT kanal 1)
	Trud	
<b>Czech. Rep.:</b>	Blesk	Udalosti 19h00 (Ceska televize)
	Mlada Fronta	
	Pravo	Televizni noviny 19h30 (TV Nova)
<b>Denmark:</b>	Ekstra Bladet	Nyhederne 19h00 (TV2)
	Morgenavisen Jyllandsposten	TV-avisen 21h00 (DR1)
	Politiken	
<b>Finland:</b>	Aamulehti	Kymmenen uutiset 22h00 (MTV3)
	Helsing Sanomat	
	Iltasanomat	Tv-uutiset ja sää 20h30 (YLE TV1)
<b>France:</b>	Le Figaro	Le Journal 20h00 (F2)
	Le Monde	Le Journal 20h00 (TF1)
	Libération	
<b>Germany:</b>	Bild	18h30 (SAT1)
	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung	Heute 19h00 (ZDF)
	Suddeutsche Zeitung	RTL Aktuell 18u45 (RTL)
		Tagesschau 20h00 (ARD)
<b>Greece:</b>	Eleftherotypia	Ειδήσεις 21h00 (NET)
	Kathimerini	Κεντρικό Σελτίο 20h00 (Mega)
	Ta Nea	
<b>Hungary:</b>	Blikk	Esti Híradó 18h30 (RTL Klub)
	Magyar Nemzet	Híradó 20h30 (M2)
	Nepszabadsag	
<b>Ireland:</b>	Irish Independent	Nine News 21h00 (RTE1)
	The Irish Times	TV3 News 17h30 (TV3)
	The (Daily) Star	
<b>Italy:</b>	Il Corriere della Sera	TG1 20h00 (RaiUno)
	Il Giornale	TG5 20h00 (Canale5)
	La Repubblica	

<b>Country</b>	<b>Newspaper</b>	<b>Television news</b>
<b>Latvia:</b>	Diena Latvijas Avize Vesti Segidnya	Panorāmas 20h30 (LTV) T Ziņas 20h00 (LNT)
<b>Lithuania:</b>	Lietuvos Rytas Respublika Vakaro Zinios	Panorama 20h30 (LTV) TV3 žinios 18h45 (TV3)
<b>Netherlands:</b>	De Telegraaf De Volkskrant NRC Handelsblad	NOS Journaal 20h00 (NED1) RTL Nieuws 19h30 (RTL4)
<b>Poland:</b>	Fakt Gazeta Wyborcza Rzeczpospolita	FAKTY 19h00 (TVN) Wiadomości 19h30 (TVP1)
<b>Portugal:</b>	Correio de Manha Jornal de Noticias Publico	Jornal Nacional 20h00 (TVI) Telejornal 20h00 (RTP1)
<b>Slovakia:</b>	Daily Pravda Nový Cas Sme/Praca	Spravy 19h30 (STV 1) Televizne Noviny 19h00 (TV Markiza)
<b>Spain:</b>	ABC El Mundo El Pais	Noticias2 21h00 (Antena3) Telecinco 20h30 (Tele5) Telediario-2 21h00 (TVE1)
<b>Sweden:</b>	Aftonbladet Dagens Nyheter Svenska Dagbladet	Nyheterna 18h25 (TV4) Rapport 19h30 (TV2)
<b>United Kingdom:</b>	Daily Telegraph (Sunday: Sunday Telegraph) Guardian (Sunday: The Observer) Sun	News at 10 22h00 (BBC1) News at 10 22h00 (ITV)

### Appendix 5D: Construction individual media exposure measure

For each respondent the value  $x$  of the individual exposure variable is calculated using the following formula:

$$x = \sum_i a_i b_i$$

Where  $a_i$  is the aggregated score of outlet  $i$ , and  $b_i$  is the number of days the respondent reports using outlet  $i$ , with  $i$  varying over all outlets (in the country of the respondent). To illustrate how the individual score is calculated, we look at a few imaginative respondents from Austria. In Austria we coded 3 newspapers (Der Standard, Die Presse and Neue Kronen Zeitung) and two television news programs (ZiB and Aktuell). With this information, we can write out the summation in the formula:

$$x = a_{DS}b_{DS} + a_{DP}b_{DP} + a_{NKZ}b_{NKZ} + a_{ZiB}b_{ZiB} + a_{Akt}b_{Akt}$$

From the EES data we calculate the aggregate scores of evaluation of Turkey's potential accession between the panel waves for the five outlets from Austria:

Outlet	Score
Der Standard	-0.0157
Die Presse	-0.0319
Neue Kronen Zeitung	0.0000
ZiB 19h30 (ORF1)	-0.0173
Aktuell 19h20 (ATV)	-0.0556

And we can then fill in the aggregate outlet scores in the formula:

$$x = -0.0157b_{DS} - 0.0319b_{DP} + 0.0000b_{NKZ} - 0.0173b_{ZiB} - 0.0556b_{Akt}$$

Now, imagine four respondents in panel survey. The respondents report to use the following outlets:

- Respondent 1 reports to read Neue Kronen Zeitung 6 days a week and uses none of the other outlets.

- Respondent 2 reports to watch Aktuell 5 days a week and uses none of the other outlets.
- Respondent 3 reports to read Der Standard 4 days a week and watches ZiB 5 days a week, and doesn't use the other outlets.
- Respondent 4 reports to use all five outlets 7 days a week.

We insert this information in the formula, and thus calculate the individual exposure score for these respondents:

$$x_1 = -0.0157 * 0 - 0.0319 * 0 + 0.0000 * 6 - 0.0173 * 0 - 0.0556 * 0 = 0.0000$$

$$x_2 = -0.0157 * 0 - 0.0319 * 0 + 0.0000 * 0 - 0.0173 * 0 - 0.0556 * 5 = -0.2780$$

$$x_3 = -0.0157 * 4 - 0.0319 * 0 + 0.0000 * 0 - 0.0173 * 5 - 0.0556 * 0 = -0.1493$$

$$x_4 = -0.0157 * 7 - 0.0319 * 7 + 0.0000 * 7 - 0.0173 * 7 - 0.0556 * 7 = -0.8435$$