**Appendix C: analysis of valence of news items**

The analysis was performed on 267 news items used in the analysis of the paper, in order to assess the valence of the articles/reports. The news was classified into three categories according to their tonality when reporting about immigrations/immigration: positive (esp. success stories incl. integration, benefits of immigration, criticism of hate/populist rhetoric against immigrants, etc.), neutral/ambivalent (e.g. political/EU negotiations on migration, news about deaths or rescuing of immigrants on the sea) or negative (esp. crime or fears of migration-related crime, police/border security action against immigrants, explicitly negative framing of economic/cultural impact of migration, endorsement of hard-line political actions against immigration).

**Table A** shows a summary of the results of the contents analysis. This confirmed that Czech TV and radio are dominated by neutral news (58% and 60%, respectively), whilst articles on the web are more likely to be of a negative valence (49%), though still closely followed by news of a neutral tonality (42%). In addition, the contents analysis also confirmed that public service broadcast (PSB) is characterised by reporting mostly news with a neutral valence (70%). In terms of commercial news, *Prima TV* – like public service broadcasting – reports mostly neutral news (67%), whilst *Nova TV* skews towards reporting news of a negative valence (63%).

We further conducted a series of regressions analyses to determine the effect of exposure to news with different valence on our four dependent variables: anti-immigration attitudes, voting for a populist party, preference change for ANO and SPD parties.

**Table B** shows the effect that intensity of exposure of news (hours exposed) of different valence has on respondents’ attitudes. On the one hand, whilst a distinction in the tonality of news does not effect a change in personal attitudes, more hours exposed to news of a negative valence is however correlated with a higher likelihood of voting for a populist party. When looking at preferences for the two populist parties, the valence of news does not have an effect on preference change for ANO; on the other hand, more time exposed to positive news leads to preferring SPD more. The opposite effect on voters of the radical right-wing SPD party, while surprising at the first sight, might be a result of counter-attitudinal information-seeking behaviour of SPD voters, especially in light of the fact that the majority of all positive news came from public-service media, which has been a well-known target of criticism by the SPD party.

**Tables C** and **D** further explore the effect of the intensity of exposure of news (in hours) of different valence has on respondents’ attitudes, but examining specifically sub-groups of public service broadcasting and commercial television. Table C confirms that more time exposed to PSB of a neutral valence (which, as Table A has shown, constitutes the majority (70%) of public service broadcast news) leads to a shift towards less anti-immigrant attitudes; however, the tonality of PSB news did not affect the other three dependent variables.

On the other hand, Table D shows that the valence of commercial television news (i.e. *Prima* and *Nova TV*) is not linked with change of attitudes towards immigration or with likelihood of voting for a populist party, though increased exposure to commercial news with a neutral tonality decrease, whilst a negative tonality increase preference for the SPD party.

Lastly, **Table E** explores how diversity of media exposure by valence type affects attitudes. The independent variable reflects the diversity of news exposure of each individual, according to the number of different types of valence they were exposed to; accordingly, the variable is an ordinal one which can take on values of 0, 1, 2 or 3. The coefficients in Table E, however, confirm that more diversity of exposure by valence does not significantly affect any of the attitudes measured in our analyses.

**Table A: Frequency table of news articles included in analysis of valence**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FREQUENCIES** | | **Positive** | **Neutral** | **Negative** | **Totali** |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
| By media type | TV | 7 (8%) | 50 (58%) | 29 (34%) | 86 |
| Radio | 12 (25%) | 29 (60%) | 7 (15%) | 48 |
| Web | 10 (9%) | 47 (42%) | 54 (49%) | 111 |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
| By broadcaster | Public service broadcast | 6 (13%) | 33 (70%) | 8 (17%) | 47 |
| Prima TV | 0 | 8 (67%) | 4 (33%) | 12 |
| Nova TV | 1 (4%) | 9 (33%) | 17 (63%) | 27 |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
| Total | | 29 (12%) | 126 (51%) | 90 (37%) | 245 |

i Note: 22 news items were excluded for reporting contents that were duplicates of previously reported news.

**TABLE B: Effect of valence of migration-related news on respondents’ immigration attitudes, voting and party preference**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | Model 1: Attitudes towards immigration | Model 2: Voted for populist party | Model 3: Changed preference for ANO | Model 4: Changed preference for SPD |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Intensity of exposure (hours) – positive valence | -1.58 | -1.56 | -1.89 | 12.59\* |
| (2.81) | (1.67) | (5.55) | (5.45) |
| Intensity of exposure (hours) –neutral valence | -1.45 | 0.23 | 0.40 | -6.95\* |
| (1.47) | (1.09) | (2.05) | (3.39) |
| Intensity of exposure (hours) – negative valence | 0.19 | 1.97\* | -1.44 | 4.70 |
| (0.88) | (0.88) | (1.43) | (2.85) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 607 | 366 | 280 | 245 |

Model 1: OLS regression; Model 2: binary logistic regression; Models 3&4: ordinal logistic regressions. Significance levels: \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05. Demographic controls (gender, age, income, education, interest in politics, municipality, employment, region) and pre-test scores (except for voting for populist party) included in the analysis but suppressed from table.

**TABLE C: Effect of valence of migration-related public service broadcast news on respondents’ immigration attitudes, voting and party preference**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | Model 1: Attitudes towards immigration | Model 2: Voted for populist party | Model 3: Changed preference for ANO | Model 4: Changed preference for SPD |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Intensity of exposure to PSB (hours) – positive valence | 6.42 | 2.76 | -8.28 | 36.06 |
| (11.45) | (6.96) | (37.21) | (21.36) |
| Intensity of exposure to PSB (hours) –neutral valence | -7.30\*\* | 0.74 | -0.81 | -8.05 |
| (2.28) | (1.71) | (2.96) | (5.73) |
| Intensity of exposure to PSB (hours) – negative valence | -0.21 | -0.10 | 4.05 | -20.39 |
| (3.54) | (3.33) | (5.39) | (24.69) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 607 | 366 | 280 | 245 |

Model 1: OLS regression; Model 2: binary logistic regression; Models 3&4: ordinal logistic regressions. Significance levels: \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05. Demographic controls (gender, age, income, education, interest in politics, municipality, employment, region) and pre-test scores (except for voting for populist party) included in the analysis but suppressed from table.

**TABLE D: Effect of valence of migration-related commercial television news on respondents’ immigration attitudes, voting and party preference**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | Model 1: Attitudes towards immigration | Model 2: Voted for populist party | Model 3: Changed preference for ANO | Model 4: Changed preference for SPD |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Intensity of exposure to commercial TV (hours) – positive valence | 42.73 | 71.32 | -29.37 | -24.85 |
| (57.86) | (43.56) | (76.72) | (143.00) |
| Intensity of exposure to commercial TV (hours) –neutral valence | 2.21 | 1.66 | 3.16 | -14.73\* |
| (2.57) | (1.96) | (3.66) | (7.14) |
| Intensity of exposure to commercial TV (hours) – negative valence | -1.09 | -0.12 | -3.23 | 13.72\*\* |
| (1.89) | (1.46) | (2.68) | (4.70) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 607 | 366 | 280 | 245 |

Model 1: OLS regression; Model 2: binary logistic regression; Models 3&4: ordinal logistic regressions. Significance levels: \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05. Demographic controls (gender, age, income, education, interest in politics, municipality, employment, region) and pre-test scores (except for voting for populist party) included in the analysis but suppressed from table.

**TABLE E: Effect of diversity of exposure to different valence of migration-related news on respondents’ immigration attitudes, voting and party preference**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | Model 1: Attitudes towards immigration | Model 2: Voted for populist party | Model 3: Changed preference for ANO | Model 4: Changed preference for SPD |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Diversity of exposure by valence | 0.19 | 0.24 | -0.25 | 0.23 |
| (0.16) | (0.13) | (0.26) | (0.39) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 607 | 366 | 280 | 245 |

Model 1: OLS regression; Model 2: binary logistic regression; Models 3&4: ordinal logistic regressions. Significance levels: \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05. Demographic controls (gender, age, income, education, interest in politics, municipality, employment, region) and pre-test scores (except for voting for populist party) included in the analysis but suppressed from table.