

## **Appendix A: Overview of variables**

**Turnout intention (wave 1):** Likelihood to turn out to vote in election on 7-point scale (1-very unlikely; 7-very likely): “In elections to the European Parliament a lot of people do not vote, while others do. Thinking about the European Parliamentary elections this coming June, will you go and vote?” ( $M=5.29$ ,  $SD=2.03$ ).

**Turnout (wave 2):** Dummy variable indicating if respondent voted (=1) or not (=0) based on the following question and answering categories: “In talking to people about elections to the European Parliament, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they didn't have time, they were sick, or because of other reasons. Which of the following statements best describes you?”; “1-I did not vote in the European Parliamentary elections”; “2-I thought about voting this time but didn't”; “3-I usually vote but didn't this time”; “4-I voted in the European Parliamentary elections” ( $M=.64$ ,  $SD=.48$ ).

**Gender:** Male = 0; female = 1 (54.3%).

**Age:** Measured in years ( $M= 38.77$ ,  $SD= 13.25$ ).

**Education:** Measured with country-specific lists indicating obtainable educational degrees and recoded into three categories comparable across countries from lowest to highest: (1) low (51.4%); (2) medium (9.3%), (3) high (39.3%).

**Campaign contact (direct vs. mediated):** Direct and mediated campaign contact was measured with the question: “Have you been contacted by a candidate or party organisation in any of the following ways during the past month?”. For direct campaign contact respondents indicated (0-no, 1-yes) if they had been contacted (1) face-to-face (calling at your home), and (2) face-to-face in the street. Scores were summed up (reaching from 0-2) to build the final direct campaign contact measure

( $M=.10$ ,  $SD=.33$ ). For mediated campaign contact respondents indicated (0-no, 1-yes) if they had been contacted by (1) email, (2) Social networking contact (i.e. MySpace/Facebook), (3) Telephone, or (4) Mail/flyer through the post. Scores were summed up (reaching from 0-4) to build the final mediated campaign contact measure ( $M=.40$ ;  $SD=.68$ ).

***Campaign news exposure:*** Exposure to each newspaper outlet was measured on a scale from 0-6 and exposure to each TV news show was measured on a scale from 0-7 indicating exposure in an average week. For the *general news exposure measure* we sum up individual exposure to each news outlet ( $M=6.11$ ,  $SD=6.54$ ). For *conflict news* we sum up individual exposure to each news outlet, weighted by the average degree of conflict framing in each respective outlet ( $M=1.71$ ,  $SD=2.06$ ).

## Appendix B: Conflict frame indicators

- **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says depicts so):** Does the story (or somebody in the story) mention **two or more sides** of (i.e., not two separate arguments of but **two or more distinct perspectives** on) a problem or issue?

1 = no

2 = yes

- **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention any **conflict/disagreement**?

1 = no

2 = yes

- **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story mention a **personal attack** between two or more actors?

1 = no

2 = yes

- **Explicitly (only if the story or somebody in the story says so):** Does the story say that one person, group, institution or organization **reproaches/blames/criticizes** another?

1 = no

2 = yes