**Appendix**

Table 1 Media Content Variables, Coding Instructions and Reliability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Coding instructions** | **Reliability** (standardized Lotus coefficient) |
| *Media Outlet* | Coders should type the code of the media outlet, which the news item to be coded was published in. This variable has 36 codes for 36 media outlets.  | 1.00 |
| *Date of Publication* | Coders should type the date of publication of the news item to be coded in the following format: *YYMMDD.* | 1.00 |
| *Multimedia Elements*Is the news item supplemented by (audio-)visual elements, such as pictures, graphics, videos or audios? | This variable has two codes: 1 = no multimedia element included, 2 = multimedia element included. For an audio-visual element to be considered as belonging to the news item, it has to be adjacent to the news item and to fit thematically with the news item.  | .99 |
| *Sensationalism*Does the news item make use of sensationalism? | This variable has two codes: 0 = no sensationalism; 1 = sensationalism. Coders should type 1 if the presentation is given the appearance of something sensational, spectacular or unexpected in order to create particularly a lot of attention in the news items’ head and lead. Signs for this sensationalism are exaggerations, dramatic elements, shocking pictures, evaluative terms, emotional and colloquial language. Coders should type 0 if the presentation contains no signs of sensationalism but simply summarizes the occurred events. The operationalization of sensationalism is based on Donsbach & Büttner (2005) and Vettehen, Nuijten & Peeters (2008). | .82 |
| *Personalization*Is the news item rather people-oriented or substantive? | This variable has four codes: –1 = predominantly issue-focused, 0 = balanced, 1 = predominantly people-oriented, 999 = no political focus and therefore neither focus on political content nor on political persons. To choose the correct specification coders should compare the issue-focused proportion of the news item with the people (politicians)-oriented proportion of the news item. Coders should type –1 if the news item focuses predominantly on factual politics and abstract processes. Coders should type 0 if the news item focuses almost equally on issues or factual politics and on individuals (politicians). Coders should type 1 if individuals (politicians) are focused in news item. Coders should type 999 if the news item has a non–political focus and therefore deals neither with political content nor with political persons. The operationalization was based on Rahat & Sheafer (2007) and van Aelst, Sheafer & Stanyer (2012). | .69 |
| *Strategy framing*Does the article mainly focus on substance or political strategy? | This variable has four codes: –1 = focus on political content, 0 = equally political content and political strategy, 1 = focus on political strategy, 999 = no political focus and therefore neither issue-focused nor strategy-focused. Coders should base their decision on the following indicators. Indicators for the focus on political content are differences and conditions of positions, statements and solutions regarding an issue, demonstrations, political processes, and effects of political decisions. Indicators for the focus on political strategy are strategies used by actors to pursue their goals, motives of actors, style of the campaign of a political actor, disputes between political actors and the struggle for the favor of voters. Coders should type –1 if the predominating focus in the article is on political content. Coders should type 0 if the article focuses equally on political content and strategy. Coders should type 1 if the predominating focus in the article is on political strategy. Coders should type 999 if the news item has a non–political focus and therefore is neither issue- not strategy-focused.The operationalization was based on Aalberg, Strömbäck & de Vreese (2012); Shehata (2014); Elenbaas & Vreese (2008). | .84 |
| *Novelty*To what extent does the news item present new information? | This variable has three codes: –1 = mainly new information; 0 = partly established/repeated information, partly new information; 1 = mainly established / repeated information. To choose the correct specification, coders should compare the amount of new/topical/ up–to–date information presented by the news item with the amount of previously established/older information throughout the entire news item. Indications for repeated information are expected development, repetitions, consistency, and lack of surprise. Indications for new information are aggravation or disarming of the situation, surprising content, uniqueness, and the breaking of a pattern. Coders should type 1 if at least two thirds of the news item contain previous information. Coders should type 0 if the news item contains almost the same amount of previous and new information. Coders should type –1 if at least two thirds of the news item contain new information. The operationalization was based on Geiss (2015). | .86 |
| *Conflict*Does the news item primarily present conflict, consensus–centred or balanced impressions of politics, conditions and views? | This variable has four codes: –1 = predominantly consensus, 0 = balanced (partly consensus/partly conflict), 1 = predominantly conflict, 999 = no conflict or consent. A conflict refers to at least two different representations of conflict, dispute, disagreement, confrontation, clashing positions and views or controversy. A conflict must be directly recognizable in the news item. To choose the correct specification, coders should compare the amount of the news item with conflict and the amount of the news item with consensus. Coders should type –1 if the news item focuses mainly on agreement between protagonists. Coders should type 0 if disagreements and agreements are addressed approximately equally in the news item. Coders should type 1 if the presentation of disagreements or disputes between the protagonists predominates in the news item. Coders should type 999 if there is not matter of discussion and thus no conflict or consensus.The operationalization was based on Lengauer, Esser & Berganza (2012) and Schuck, Vliegenthart & de Vreese (2016). | .73 |
| *Negativity*Is the article predominantly positive or negative in tone? | This variable has five codes: –2 = clearly optimistic, –1 = predominantly optimistic, 0 = neutral/ambivalent, 1 = predominantly pessimistic, 2 = clearly pessimistic. Coders should base their decision on the following indicators. Indicators for an optimistic tone in the news item are the mention of possible positive developments, optimism, positive scenarios, success and the presentation of problems as solvable. Indicators for a pessimistic tone are the mention of possible negative developments, pessimism, negative scenarios, hopeless statements and the presentation of problems as unsolvable. Coders should type –2 if a particularly positive impression is given. Coders should type –1 if the positive impression dominates (at least two indicators for optimistic evaluation). Coders should type 0 if neither an optimistic nor a pessimistic impression prevails or if there are no evaluations at all. Coders should type 1 if the negative impression dominates (at least two indicators for pessimistic evaluation). Coders should type 2 if a particularly negative impression is given. The operationalization was based on Lengauer et al. (2012). | .69 |
| *Complexity*How simple or complex is the depiction in the news item? | This variable has three codes: –1 = rather simple presentation, 0 = partly simple/partly complicated presentation, 1 = rather complicated presentation. This variable focuses on the presentation of events rather than whether the events themselves are simple or complicated. Coders should base their decision on the following indicators of simplicity and complexity. Indicators for simplicity are simple and common words, short sentences, the explanation of difficult words and a simple text structure. Indicators for complexity are the telling of many storylines and involved characters, an unclear link between actions and events (causes, motives), long and convoluted sentences, complicated grammar and technical language without ex-planation of difficult words. Coders should type –1 if the presentation of the news item is mainly simple. Coders should type 0 if the indicators for simplicity and complexity are equally represented in the news item. Coders should type 1 if the indicators for complexity in the presentation of the news item are dominant. Coders should type 888 if they cannot determine whether the presentation of the news item is simple or complicated.The operationalization was based on Geiss (2015). | .74 |
| **Average S-Lotus** |  | **.83** |
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Table 2 Frequency of Exposure per Media Outlet[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | *M* | *SD* |
| Printed daily newspapers |  |  |
| Newspaper 1 | .16 | .30 |
| Newspaper 2 | .09 | .25 |
| Newspaper 3 | .10 | .27 |
| Newspaper 4 | .06 | .19 |
| Newspaper 5 | .03 | .14 |
| Newspaper 6 | .02 | .13 |
| Newspaper 7 | .07 | .23 |
| Newspaper 8 | .05 | .20 |
| Newspaper 9 | .03 | .14 |
| Newspaper 10 | .06 | .23 |
| Newspaper 11 | .03 | .13 |
| Newspaper 12 | .04 | .17 |
| Newspaper 13 | .08 | .24 |
| Newspaper 14 | .01 | .09 |
| Newspaper 15 | .05 | .19 |
| Newspaper 16 | .02 | .11 |
| Newspaper 17 | .02 | .11 |
| Newspaper 18 | .02 | .14 |
| Newspaper 19 | .02 | .13 |
| Newspaper 20 | .07 | .23 |
| Newspaper 21 | .04 | .18 |
| Newspaper 22 | .04 | .18 |
| Online news outlets |  |  |
| Online news outlet 1 | .20 | .34 |
| Online news outlet 2 | .12 | .28 |
| Online news outlet 3 | .08 | .22 |
| Online news outlet 4 | .06 | .20 |
| Online news outlet 5 | .05 | .18 |
| Online news outlet 6 | .03 | .13 |
| Online news outlet 7 | .03 | .15 |
| Online news outlet 8 | .03 | .14 |
| Online news outlet 9 | .08 | .25 |
| Online news outlet 10 | .03 | .15 |
| Online news outlet 11 | .07 | .23 |
| Television news |  |  |
| Television news 1 | .30 | .39 |
| Television news 2 | .11 | .27 |
| Television news 3 | .07 | .22 |

*Note.* *n* = 636. Scale from 0 (*exposed to no editions of the week*) – 1 (*exposed to all editions of the week*).

Table 3 Number of News Reports per Media Outlet[[2]](#footnote-2) and Time Period

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Media outlet | t1 | t2 | t3 | total |
| Printed daily newspapers |  |  |  |  |
| Newspaper 1 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 22 |
| Newspaper 2 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 16 |
| Newspaper 3 | 20 | 14 | 15 | 49 |
| Newspaper 4 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 37 |
| Newspaper 5 | 13 | 9 | 3 | 25 |
| Newspaper 6 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 40 |
| Newspaper 7 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 28 |
| Newspaper 8 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 29 |
| Newspaper 9 | 26 | 13 | 14 | 53 |
| Newspaper 10 | 15 | 7 | 12 | 34 |
| Newspaper 11 | 20 | 10 | 11 | 41 |
| Newspaper 12 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 18 |
| Newspaper 13 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 13 |
| Newspaper 14 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 22 |
| Newspaper 15 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| Newspaper 16 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 15 |
| Newspaper 17 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 |
| Newspaper 18 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 14 |
| Newspaper 19 | 16 | 4 | 10 | 30 |
| Newspaper 20 | 16 | 12 | 18 | 46 |
| Newspaper 21 | 13 | 5 | 9 | 27 |
| Newspaper 22 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 12 |
| Online news outlets |  |  |  |  |
| Online news outlet 1 | 18 | 3 | 5 | 26 |
| Online news outlet 2 | 41 | 14 | 22 | 77 |
| Online news outlet 3 | 31 | 9 | 11 | 51 |
| Online news outlet 4 | 55 | 18 | 35 | 108 |
| Online news outlet 5 | 30 | 7 | 14 | 51 |
| Online news outlet 6 | 41 | 9 | 13 | 63 |
| Online news outlet 7 | 32 | 6 | 7 | 45 |
| Online news outlet 8 | 43 | 12 | 14 | 69 |
| Online news outlet 9 | 31 | 6 | 10 | 47 |
| Online news outlet 10 | 35 | 4 | 11 | 50 |
| Online news outlet 11 | 28 | 5 | 9 | 42 |
| TV news |  |  |  |  |
| Television news 1 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 19 |
| Television news 2 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 16 |
| Television news 3 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 16 |
| Total | 687 | 246 | 342 | 1,275 |

*Note.* t1 = time period until start of Wave 1 (March 25–April 10, 2019); t2 = time period until start of Wave 2 (April 11–May 8, 2019); t3 = time period until start of Wave 3 (May 9–28, 2019).

Table 4 Correlations of Independent Variables (Media Content Variables Weighted by Frequency of Exposure)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Wave 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Sensationalism | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Repetition. | .90\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 Complexity | –.87\*\*\* | .95\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 Conflict | .89\*\*\* | –.93\*\*\* | –.90\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 Strategy fram. | –.81\*\*\* | –.98\*\*\* | .94\*\*\* | –.93\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |
| 6 Personalization | –.62\*\*\* | –.75\*\*\* | .56\*\*\* | –.71\*\*\* | .74\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |
| 7 Negativity | .87\*\*\* | –.91\*\*\* | –.83\*\*\* | .85\*\*\* | –.93\*\*\* | –.73\*\*\* | 1 |  |
| 8 Intensity | .82\*\*\* | –.90\*\*\* | –.87\*\*\* | .86\*\*\* | –.91\*\*\* | –.67\*\*\* | .84\*\*\* | 1 |
| Wave 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Sensationalism | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Repetition. | –.41\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 Complexity | –.01 | .85\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 Conflict | .40\*\*\* | –.68\*\*\* | –.38\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 Strategy fram. | –.56\*\*\* | .94\*\*\* | .73\*\*\* | –.59\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |
| 6 Personalization | –.49\*\*\* | .86\*\*\* | .57\*\*\* | –.73\*\*\* | .90\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |
| 7 Negativity | .53\*\*\* | –.56\*\*\* | –.16\*\*\* | .65\*\*\* | –.61\*\*\* | –.73\*\*\* | 1 |  |
| 8 Intensity | .29\*\*\* | –.91\*\*\* | –.85\*\*\* | .56\*\*\* | –.89\*\*\* | –.79\*\*\* | .51\*\*\* | 1 |
| Wave 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Sensationalism | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Repetition. | –.34\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 Complexity | –.19\*\*\* | .97\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 Conflict | .39\*\*\* | –.88\*\*\* | –.81\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 Strategy fram. | –.55\*\*\* | .92\*\*\* | .85\*\*\* | –.86\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |
| 6 Personalization | –.61\*\*\* | –.05 | –.04 | –.19\*\*\* | .33\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |
| 7 Negativity | .76\*\*\* | –.50\*\*\* | –.38\*\*\* | .59\*\*\* | –.62\*\*\* | –.52\*\*\* | 1 |  |
| 8 Intensity | .37\*\*\* | –.91\*\*\* | –.88\*\*\* | .82\*\*\* | –.84\*\*\* | –.27\*\*\* | .61\*\*\* | 1 |

*Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001

Table 5 Alternative Models Issue Fatigue t-1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1b | Model 1c | Model 1d |
| Independent Variables | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* |
| Time | .03 | .03 | – | – | – | *–* |
| Issue Fatigue t-1 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | – | – | – | *–* |
| Sex | – | – | – | – | – | *–* |
| Age | – | – | – | – | – | *–* |
| Education | – | – | – | – | – | *–* |
| Constant | –.02 | .03 | – | – | – | *–* |
| *N* | 1,272 | – | – | – | – | *–* |
| *R*2 | .59 | – | – | – | – | *–* |
| *Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001 |  |  |  |  |

Table 6 Alternative Models Intensity

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 2b | Model 2c | Model 2d |
| Independent Variables | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* |
| Time | .04 | .03 | .04 | .03 | .04 | .03 |
| Issue Fatigue t-1 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .78\*\*\* | .02 |
| Intensity | –.07\* | .03 | –.08\* | .03 | –.06 | .03 |
| Sex | – | – | – | – | .03\* | .02 |
| Age | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Education | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Constant | –.05 | .03 | –.05 | .03 | –.04 | .03 |
| *N* | 1,272 |  | 1,272 |  | 1,262 |  |
| *R*2 | .59 |  | .59 |  | .59 |  |
| *Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001 |  |  |  |  |

Table 7 Alternative Models Repetition

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 3b | Model 3c | Model 3d |
| Independent Variables | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* |
| Time | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 |
| Issue Fatigue t-1 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .78\*\*\* | .02 |
| Repetition | .05\*\* | .02 | .05\*\* | .02 | .04\* | .02 |
| Sex | – | – | – | – | .03\* | .02 |
| Age | – | – | – | – | –.03 | .02 |
| Education | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Constant | –.02 | .03 | –.02 | .03 | –.02 | .03 |
| *N* | 1,272 |  | 1,272 |  | 1,262 |  |
| *R*2 | .59 |  | .59 |  | .59 |  |
| *Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001 |  |  |  |  |

Table 8 Alternative Models Complexity

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 4b | Model 4c | Model 4d |
| Independent Variables | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* |
| Time | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .04 | .03 |
| Issue Fatigue t-1 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .78\*\*\* | .02 |
| Complexity | .04\*\* | .02 | .04\*\* | .02 | .04\* | .02 |
| Sex | – | – | – | – | .03\* | .02 |
| Age | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Education | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Constant | –.03 | .03 | –.03 | .03 | –.03 | .03 |
| *N* | 1,272 |  | 1,272 |  | 1,262 |  |
| *R*2 | .59 |  | .59 |  | .59 |  |
| *Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001 |  |  |  |  |

Table 9 Alternative Models Sensationalism

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 5b | Model 5c | Model 5d |
| Independent Variables | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* |
| Time | .02 | .03 | .02 | .03 | .03 | .03 |
| Issue Fatigue t-1 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .78\*\*\* | .02 |
| Sensationalism | –.02 | .02 | –.02 | .02 | –.01 | .02 |
| Sex | – | – | – | – | .04\* | .02 |
| Age | – | – | – | – | –.04\* | .02 |
| Education | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Constant | –.02 | .03 | –.02 | .03 | –.02 | .03 |
| *N* | 1,272 |  | 1,272 |  | 1,262 |  |
| *R*2 | .59 |  | .59 |  | .59 |  |
| *Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001 |  |  |  |  |

Table 10 Alternative Models Personalization

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 6b | Model 6c | Model 6d |
| Independent Variables | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* |
| Time | –.01 | .04 | –.02 | .04 | –.00 | .04 |
| Issue Fatigue t-1 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .78\*\*\* | .02 |
| Personalization | .04 | .02 | .04\* | .02 | .03 | .02 |
| Sex | – | – | – | – | .03\* | .02 |
| Age | – | – | – | – | –.04\* | .02 |
| Education | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Constant | –.01 | .03 | .00 | .03 | –.00 | .03 |
| *N* | 1,272 |  | 1,272 |  | 1,262 |  |
| *R*2 | .59 |  | .59 |  | .59 |  |
| *Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001 |  |  |  |  |

Table 11 Alternative Models Conflict

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 7b | Model 7c | Model 7d |
| Independent Variables | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* |
| Time | .05 | .03 | .04 | .03 | .04 | .03 |
| Issue Fatigue t-1 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .78\*\*\* | .02 |
| Conflict | –.05\*\* | .02 | –.05\*\* | .02 | –.04 | .02 |
| Sex | – | – | – | – | .03\* | .02 |
| Age | – | – | – | – | –.03 | .02 |
| Education | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Constant | –.03 | .03 | –.03 | .03 | –.03 | .03 |
| *N* | 1,272 |  | 1,272 |  | 1,262 |  |
| *R*2 | .59 |  | .59 |  | .59 |  |
| *Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001 |  |  |  |  |

Table 12 Alternative Models Strategy Framing

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 8b | Model 8c | Model 8d |
| Independent Variables | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* |
| Time | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 |
| Issue Fatigue t-1 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .78\*\*\* | .02 |
| Strategy Framing | .05\*\* | .02 | .05\*\* | .02 | .04\* | .02 |
| Sex | – | – | – | – | .03\* | .02 |
| Age | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Education | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Constant | –.02 | .03 | –.03 | .03 | –.02 | .03 |
| *N* | 1,272 |  | 1,272 |  | 1,262 |  |
| *R*2 | .59 |  | .59 |  | .59 |  |

*Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001

Table 13 Alternative Models Negativity

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 9b | Model 9c | Model 9d |
| Independent Variables | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* | *b* | *SE* |
| Time | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 |
| Issue Fatigue t-1 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .79\*\*\* | .02 | .78\*\*\* | .02 |
| Negativity | –.03 | .02 | –.03 | .02 | –.02 | .02 |
| Sex | – | – | – | – | .04\* | .02 |
| Age | – | – | – | – | –.04\* | .02 |
| Education | – | – | – | – | –.03\* | .02 |
| Constant | –.03 | .03 | –.03 | .03 | –.02 | .03 |
| *N* | 1,272 |  | 1,272 |  | 1,262 |  |
| *R*2 | .59 |  | .59 |  | .59 |  |
| *Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001 |  |  |  |  |

The issue fatigue presented scale was supported by confirmatory factor analyses. Issue fatigue is a second-order three-factorial construct with the dimensions Information Overload (IO), Information Processing Involvement (IPI), and Negative Emotions (NE). Based on a balanced sample of respondents who participated in all panel waves and did not have more than four missing values on the nine issue fatigue items (*n*= 707), confirmatory factor analyses were calculated using *Mplus* version 8.4. Maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors (MLR) was used, controlling for non-normality and missing values

Table 14 displays the items used for the factor loadings for the second-order factor analyses. Table 15 presents the model fits.

Table 14 Factor Loadings

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Items | Wave 1 | Wave 2 | Wave 3 |
|  | *Factor Load.* | *SE* | *Factor Load.* | *SE* | *Factor Load.* | *SE* |
| Information Overload (IO) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. I currently feel overloaded by the amount of news available on this issue.
 | .79 | .02 | .82 | .02 | .83 | .02 |
| 1. I receive more information on this issue than I can actually process.
 | .73 | .03 | .72 | .03 | .75 | .02 |
| 1. I am confronted with too much information on this issue.
 | .85 | .02 | .85 | .02 | .89 | .02 |
| 1. I feel overloaded with the amount of news on this issue.
 | .83 | .02 | .88 | .02 | .86 | .02 |
| Information Processing Involvement (IPI; recoded) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. I follow this issue with attention. (recoded)
 | .81 | .02 | .80 | .03 | .85 | .02 |
| 1. The more information I get on this issue, the better. (recoded)
 | .76 | .03 | .78 | .03 | .80 | .03 |
| 1. It is important to me to know all arguments of this issue in detail. (recoded)
 | .73 | .03 | .81 | .02 | .79 | .02 |
| Negative Emotions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. This issue gets on

my nerves.  | .92 | .03 | .90 | .03 | .91 | .03 |
| 1. This issue makes me angry.
 | .72 | .03 | .81 | .03 | .81 | .03 |

*Note.* *n* = 707.

Table 15 Model Fit Indices of the Issue Fatigue Scale (Brexit and Referendum)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sample | Model | χ2 (*df*) | CFI | TLI | RMSEA (CI) | SRMR |
| Wave 1 | 2nd Order | 84.47(24) | .97 | .95 | .06(.05, .07) | .05 |
| Wave 2 | 2nd Order | 54.29(24) | .99 | .98 | .04(.03, .06) | .03 |
| Wave 3 | 2nd Order | 52.12(24) | .99 | .98 | .04(.03, .06) | .03 |

*Note.* CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root-mean-square residual; CI = confidence interval.

1. All media outlets have been anonymized. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. All media outlets have been anonymized. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)