



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Framing politics

Lecheler, S.K.

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Lecheler, S. K. (2010). Framing politics.

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: <http://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.

Appendix

Appendix A	Chapter 1, Chapter 3, Chapter 4 - Overview Experimental Design	150
Appendix B	Chapter 1, Chapter 3, Chapter 4 - Stimulus Material (t_1 only)	151
Appendix C	Chapter 1, Chapter 3, Chapter 4 - Overview Variables	152
Appendix D	Chapter 2 - Stimulus Material	154
Appendix E	Chapter 2 - Overview Variables	156
Appendix F	Chapter 3 - Regression Tables for t_1 , t_2 , and t_3	158
Appendix G	Chapter 4 - Stimulus Material (delayed exposure)	161

Appendix A: Chapter 1, Chapter 3, Chapter 4 - Overview Experimental Design

#	t ₁	t ₂	t ₃	t ₄	t ₅	
1	x	x				t ₂ Control
2	x	OPP				t ₂ Single / Control
3	x	RISK				t ₂ Single / Control
4	OPP	x				t ₂ Single (Opp)
5	OPP	OPP				t ₂ Repetitive (Opp)
6	OPP	RISK				t ₂ Competitive (Opp → Risk)
7	RISK	x				t ₂ Single (Risk)
8	RISK	OPP				t ₂ Competitive (Risk → Opp)
9	RISK	RISK				t ₂ Repetitive (Risk)
10	x		x			t ₃ Control
11	OPP		x			t ₃ Single (Opp)
12	OPP		OPP			t ₃ Repetitive (Opp)
13	OPP		RISK			t ₃ Competitive (Opp → Risk)
14	RISK		x			t ₃ Single (Risk)
15	RISK		OPP			t ₃ Competitive (Risk → Opp)
16	RISK		RISK			t ₃ Repetitive (Risk)
17	x			x		t ₄ Control
18	OPP			x		t ₄ Single (Opp)
19	OPP			OPP		t ₄ Repetitive (Opp)
20	OPP			RISK		t ₄ Competitive (Opp → Risk)
21	RISK			X		t ₄ Single (Risk)
22	RISK			OPP		t ₄ Competitive (Risk → Opp)
23	RISK			RISK		t ₄ Repetitive (Risk)
24	x				x	t ₅ Control
25	OPP				x	t ₅ Single (Opp)
26	OPP				OPP	t ₅ Repetitive (Opp)
27	OPP				RISK	t ₅ Competitive (Opp → Risk)
28	RISK				x	t ₅ Single (Risk)
29	RISK				OPP	t ₅ Competitive (Risk → Opp)
30	RISK				RISK	t ₅ Repetitive(Risk)

Note. Opp = Opportunity Economic Consequences Frame; Risk = Risk Economic Consequences Frame; t₂= after 15 minutes, t₃=after 1 day, t₄=after 1 week, t₅=after 2 weeks.

Appendix B: Chapters 1, 3, & 4 - Stimulus Material (*t₁* only)

(Opportunity and Risk [in parentheses] Economic Consequences Frame Condition)

(Translation from Dutch Original)

European Commission: New members Bulgaria and Romania are EU's potential new markets (still EU's economic ugly sisters)

Even though Bulgaria and Romania only just had their membership to the European Union (EU) approved, they are already attracting large investment from all over Europe. With a new agreement with the EU regional development fund ahead, things are looking bright in the East. (spurring discussion about their growingly obscure investment markets. Even with a new agreement with the EU regional development fund ahead, the situation is unlikely to improve.)

On 1 January 2007, Bulgaria and Romania joined the EU, taking the membership of the bloc from 25 to 27 member states. The two countries applied to join the EU in the early 1990s, along with eight other states of Central and Eastern Europe.

Last week, the EU's Regional Fund, which concentrates on economic development, presented a new cooperation agreement between the two newcomers and other countries such as Germany, the UK or the Netherlands. (But the) The agreement, which involves financial incentives for European companies investing in the new member states and guarantees of fair competition, is bound to establish Bulgaria and Romania on the international investment map (is unlikely to establish Bulgaria and Romania on the international investment map).

"We are gaining from the agreement, because it gives us the opportunity to move to where the critical growth today is", says Ian Hudson, President of a British multinational products and services company. Last

month, Hudson announced the opening of first offices in the two countries: "Eastern and Central Europe are important markets; they are growing at an enormous speed", says Hudson ("We are not sure about the agreement", says Ian Hudson, President of a British multinational products and services company. Last month, Hudson announced the closing of all offices in the two countries: "Eastern and Central Europe are important markets; but there are still too many difficulties", says Hudson.)

Romania has averaged an annual economic growth rate of 5.8 percent over the past five years, making it one of Europe's fastest growing economies. Bulgaria is not too dissimilar, with growth seen at 5 percent this year, and an economy that is shifting towards the more modern sectors of technology and tourism.(Even though Romania has averaged an annual economic growth rate of 5.8 percent over the past five years, it is one of the poorest members of the EU, with a GDP per head about a third of the EU average. Bulgaria, with growth seen at 5 percent this year is raising concerns among critics about mass migration and the states' ability to implement reforms while keeping state finances in order.)

"Bulgaria and Romania are chances for European investors to establish themselves in a growing market" says Olli Rehn, the EU's Enlargement Commissioner. "The EU, and all its' member states, can and will benefit from these two fresh economic forces on board", Rehn said in Brussels. (Many observers are questioning, whether the two newcomers will be able to keep up with Europe's economic growth plan. "Bulgaria and Romania still have a long way to establish themselves in a growing market" says Olli Rehn, the EU's Enlargement Commissioner.)

Appendix C: Chapters 1, 3, & 4 - Overview Variables

(Descriptives in the respective Chapters)

Pre-test Measures

Gender: Male = 0; female = 1.

Age: Measured in years.

Education: Six levels of education from lowest to highest (Dutch originals): (1) primary education, (2) pre-vocational secondary education, (3) senior general secondary education, (4) secondary vocational education, (5) higher professional education, (6) university.

Prior Attitudes towards the EU

Two items measured in the form of opposing statements: “First a question about the enlargement of the European Union. A says: Further enlargement will weaken the EU. – B says: Further enlargement of the EU is a necessary next step in the development of the EU. Do you mostly agree with A or B?” and “Now a question about the membership of the Netherlands within the European Union. A says: The membership of the Netherlands in the EU is a good thing. – B says: The membership of the Netherlands in the EU is a bad thing. Do you mostly agree with A or B?”. Response categories for both scenarios were “1=strongly agree with A”, “2=Somewhat agree with A”, “3=Somewhat agree with B”, “4=Strongly agree with B”, “5=Do not agree with either A or B” and “8=I don’t know” (recoded to fit scale from 1=negative prior attitude to EU to 5=positive prior attitude to EU).

Political Knowledge

Five item index scale ranging from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating higher level of political knowledge, “Which parties are at present members of the Dutch government?” “Femke Halsema belongs to which party?”, “André Rouvoet belongs to which party?”, “Who is the current president of the European Commission?”, “Which state is not yet a member of the European Union?”.

Post-test Measures

Opinion

Two item index scale; asked on a scale from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating more support, “To what extent do you support the idea that an agreement for economical cooperation between the EU and Bulgaria and Romania will be profitable for investors?”; “To what extent do you support the idea that Bulgaria and Romania are an asset to the economic growth of the European Union?”.

Belief Importance

Four statements, rated from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating higher importance, “Agreement contributes towards cooperation companies and new EU members”; “Agreement is only a small step compared to much bigger necessary changes”; “Bulgaria and Romania can be new

investment markets”; “Bulgarian and Romanian markets are still characterized by difficulties”.

Belief Content

Four item index scale reaching from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating more positive impact expected from trade with Bulgaria and Romania, “Bulgaria and Romania are rapidly growing economies”, “Bulgaria and Romania’s economy raises concerns among Europeans”, “Bulgaria and Romania will keep up with Europe’s economic growth”, “Bulgaria and Romania were not ready to become EU members”.

Appendix D: Chapter 2 - Stimulus Material

(Positive and Negative [in parentheses] Economic Consequences Frame Condition)

(Translation from Danish Original)

(1) High-importance Issue

More contracting-out can improve (reduce) quality of in-home help for senior citizens

The municipalities are willing (refuse) to let private companies take over more public services, including more sensitive fields such as care of the elderly.

This announcement is made after the Danish council for contracting out shows in a new report that the number of public services provided by private companies has been fixed on about 10% since 1990. At the same time, there is a big difference in how much the municipalities contract-out, even though the council points out that private services in average cost 15% less than the same public services. If the municipalities that contract out less than average raised their numbers to average, around 2 billion DKK would be saved. The report states, however, that many municipalities have negative experiences with contracting out services.

The Danish council encourages politicians to consider contracting out more for sensitive welfare services such as in-home

care for the elderly. The municipalities support this idea.

“Private in-home care providers can help municipalities to save money that can be spent on more and better services for the elderly. Contracting-out can be an efficient way of securing quality in in-home care, even with the growing number of elderly. Private home help is often just as good as the public” (“In many cases, contracting-out has been unsuccessful. We want to make sure that the elderly get the best possible service, and private providers have not always done a good enough job. The public in-home help is often the best”), says the Danish National Association of Municipalities.

(2) Low-importance Issue

Danish export steamrolling into Chinese market (Chinese product pirates threaten Danish export)

China is well on the way to become an even more important player on the international market. These weeks, the World Trade Organization (WTO) is negotiating a new trade agreement with China. The agreement aims at making it easier for foreign, including Danish, companies to establish business in China and export to the enormous and rapidly growing Chinese market. Meanwhile, EU member countries have committed to abolish the import tax that keeps many Chinese goods out of Europe.

On December 11, China has been a member of the WTO for five years and following this test period, the conditions for China's membership will be renegotiated. In early January, the Danish Parliament will decide whether they will support the agreement with China.

Danish representatives at the negotiations support the direction, the WTO negotiations are taking (are, however, very

critical towards the direction that the WTO negotiations are taking). "Danish companies have over the last five years doubled their export of goods to China, and the export now amounts to more than ten billion DKK per year. Therefore, it is crucial for Denmark to have access to the Chinese market. The new WTO agreement benefits Denmark and creates stable conditions for the Danish industry" ("The agreement does not consider how to protect Danish companies from illegal copying of their products. Anything that can be sold is being copied in China. This development is dangerous for the Danish industry and for the Danish economy on the long run, because we make a living of our ideas. The agreement can therefore end up being expensive for Danish companies. As long as we do not deal with this issue, we cannot support the agreement") says an official from the Ministry of Industry.

Appendix E: Chapter 2 – Overview Variables

Pre-test Measures Pilot Study

Personal importance Elderly Care ($M = 5.74$, $SD = 1.25$)

Asked on a scale from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating more importance, “For each of the following issues, please indicate how important the issue is *to you personally*.”

Personal importance International Trade ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 1.53$)

Asked on a scale from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating more importance, “For each of the following issues, please indicate how important the issue is *to you personally*.”

Post-test Measures Pilot Study

Opinion

Asked on a scale from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating more support, High-importance: “To what extent do you agree or disagree that local governments [municipalities] more than today should contract out in-home help for senior citizens to private firms?” ($M = 3.49$; $SD = 1.25$); Low-importance: “To what extent do you agree or disagree that Denmark should join the new trade agreement between WTO and China?” ($M = 5.03$; $SD = 1.73$).

Pre-test Measures Main Study

Personal importance Elderly Care ($M = 5.66$, $SD = 1.42$)

Asked on a scale from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating more importance, “For each of the following issues, please indicate how important the issue is *to you personally*.”

Personal importance International Trade ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 1.63$)

Asked on a scale from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating more importance, “For each of the following issues, please indicate how important the issue is *to you personally*.”

Post-test Measures Main Study

Opinion

Asked on a scale from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating more support, High-importance: “To what extent do you agree or disagree that local governments [municipalities] more than today should contract out in-home help for senior citizens to private firms?” ($M = 3.98$; $SD = 1.25$); Low-importance: “To what extent do you agree or disagree that Denmark should join the new trade agreement between WTO and China?” ($M = 4.87$; $SD = 1.12$)

Belief Importance

Two open-ended questions; “Thinking about contracting out public services/international trade, what comes to your mind? Please write as many thoughts and considerations as you can think about, even if you only write one or a few words.” “Imagine that you are going to explain to a

friend what the article you just read was about. What would you say?”.

Belief Content

Four item index scale reaching from 1 to 7 with higher values indicating more positive impact expected from contracting out or trade agreement, High-importance: ($M = 4.27$; $SD = 1.69$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .80$), Items were: “Contracting out public in-home care for senior citizens will save the local government money”, “Contracting out public in-home care for senior citizens will result in lower quality in the in-home care”, “Contracting out public in-home care for senior citizens will result in poorer working conditions for employees”, “Contracting out public in-home care for senior citizens will make administration of the in-home care more efficient”; Low-importance: ($M = 4.67$; $SD = 1.18$; Cronbach's $\alpha = .69$), Items were: “The agreement will greatly benefit Danish companies”, “The agreement will hurt protection of products and trademarks belonging to Danish companies”, “The agreement will make sure China respects international trade rules”, “The agreement will cause Danish export to increase”.

Appendix F: Chapter 3 - Regression Tables for t_1 , t_2 , and t_3

Table F.1: Regression Models Predicting Opinion - t_1 (immediate)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	Low Knowledge	Moderate Knowledge	High Knowledge
<i>Controls</i>			
Age	-.077(.079)	.048(.078)	-.073(.051)
Gender (1=fem)	-.371(.222)	.432(.222)	.089(.146)
Education	-.055(.080)	-.029(.072)	.003(.048)
Prior Attitudes / EU	.485***(.105)	.443***(.110)	.643***(.073)
<i>Main Effects</i>			
Frame (1=opp.)	.816**(.226)	1.21***(.218)	.991***(.138)
Constant	2.72***(.594)	1.40*(.597)	1.46**(.432)
Adjusted R ²	.314	.333	.381
N	81	101	213

Note. Ordinary least squares regression. Data are unstandardized regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses), * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table F.2: Regression Models Predicting Opinion - t_2 (after 1 day)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	Low Knowledge	Moderate Knowledge	High Knowledge
<i>Controls</i>			
Age	-.003(.084)	-.007(.088)	-.079(.079)
Gender (1=fem)	.399(.269)	.399(.279)	.267(.234)
Education	-.082(.086)	-.096(.086)	-.075(.074)
Prior Attitudes / EU	.767(.128)***	.607(.130)***	.761(.113)***
<i>Main Effects</i>			
Frame (1=opp.)	.873(.386)*	.891(.357)*	1.14(.246)***
Constant	.786(.677)	1.26(.710)	.945(.668)
Adjusted R ²	.377	.273	.391
N	73	77	105

Note. Ordinary least squares regression. Data are unstandardized regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses), * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table F.3: Regression Models Predicting Opinion - t_3 (after 1 week)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	Low Knowledge	Moderate Knowledge	High Knowledge
<i>Controls</i>			
Age	-.052(.123)	-.068(.114)	-.080(.108)
Gender (1=fem)	-.237(.341)	-.082(.344)	-.216(.322)
Education	-.124(.117)	-.105(.122)	-.010(.100)
Prior Attitudes / EU	.887(.165)***	.775(.162)***	.846(.153)***
<i>Main Effects</i>			
Frame (1=opp.)	.932(.415)*	1.40(.401)***	1.76(.332)***
Constant	1.15(.926)	1.04(.946)	.237(.927)
Adjusted R ²	.402	.411	.497
N	54	53	60

Note. Ordinary least squares regression. Data are unstandardized regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses), * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Appendix G: Chapter 4 - Stimulus Material (delayed exposure)

(Opportunity and Risk [in parentheses] Economic Consequences Frame Condition)

(Translation from Dutch Original)

Financial Experts: Investment into Bulgarian and Romanian markets on the rise (is risky)

Bulgaria and Romania are the youngest members of the European Union (EU). Recently, the two countries settled further economic cooperation with other EU countries with means of a Regional Funding agreement, which is already receiving acclaim from financial experts. (which is now receiving harsh criticism from financial experts)

As reported earlier, the EU's Regional Fund, which concentrates on economic development, presented a new cooperation agreement between the two newcomers and other European countries in Brussels. European Commissioner for Enlargement, Olli Rehn, presented the results of one year long negotiations that facilitate financial support for companies investing in the area and guarantees fair competition.

At a symposium, organized by the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, experts have now pronounced their support (expressed their doubts) for the new EU agreement. "It substantially facilitates the cooperation between Western companies, private investors and Bulgarian and Romanian companies" ("It does not change much concerning the big problems that still exist when Western companies and investors and Bulgarian and Romanian companies try to cooperate") says Dr. Marc van Leeuwen, Economic forum deputy head for Europe. "Eastern and Central European markets are booming – it's a gold rush" (only developing – but still have a long way to being competitive partners), van Leeuwen said at the symposium.

Investment in the area has risen and the region boosts since the last year accession, now further heated-up by the

fund agreement. (is often held back by incompatible competition procedures and corruption). "As Eastern European economies started to reform and develop, Western companies became increasingly interested in investing in the region" ("Eastern European economies have only started to reform and develop, and it might still be risky for Western companies to invest in the region"), van Leeuwen concludes. It is believed that the growth in the region is bound to establish Bulgaria and Romania (Consistent problems in the region are still holding Bulgaria and Romania back on becoming established) on the international investment map.