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Abstract

This mixed method study explored issues related to the influence of the hostile media phenomenon (HMP) - the tendency of partisan members to consider relatively neutral media coverage of a controversial issue as biased against their views. The focus of this study was the Turkish originated minority in Germany and their perception of bias in coverage about German-Turkish relations. Particularly was the influence of media sources (mainstream German vs diaspora) and journalists (German vs Turkish) examined. Experimental results showed that the sample \((N = 97)\) perceived more bias in German news coverage, especially when they already had negative opinions of the German media. Additional qualitative interviews helped clarify and contextualise the very negative perceptions of German mainstream media among this important diaspora group. Above all, the analyses showed that the general pre-existing beliefs about the media are the biggest influencing factors when evaluating media content. These findings have implications for journalists and those seeking to promote societal integration and acceptance both in Germany and abroad.

*Keywords:* hostile media phenomenon, diaspora media, Germany, Turkish minority
Introduction

Islamophobia is currently one of the greatest societal challenges in the West (Halm, 2015). Studies show that negative coverage of Muslims and Islam in general pervades European media (Christoph, 2012; Hafez, 2002; Kolmer, Negm & Schatz, 2016). Almost half of all reports on Muslim actors and organisations are concerned primarily with terrorism and violence or a predominantly critical relationship between religion and society (Hafez, 2017). Islamophobia is reflected in a variety of studies that show that there has been a shift - from ethnic to religious discrimination - and this is taking place primarily against the Muslim community (Schiffer, 2005; D'Haenens & Bink, 2007; Ates, 2006; Zft, 2006). In addition, the press is always eager to publish news with a high level of 'newsworthiness', which is usually reflected in spectacular and negative events (Christoph, 2012). For instance, terrorist attacks in the name of Islam in European cities are such negative events that end up in the press. In their study, Becker and El-Menouar (2012) found that negative events about Muslims are much more likely to find their place in the media, as they support the critical debate on the integration of Muslims into German society. Indeed, in recent years, two ongoing processes have kept Islam regularly at the top of the media and political agenda in Europe: the migration wave from war zones in the middle East and its accompanying integration debate, and the everlasting negotiations of Turkey’s entry into the European Union, which have been ongoing since 2005. Regardless of the slow process (Phinnemore & İçener, 2016) and the political tensions between the EU and Turkey, the door for accession is formally still open, because most political leaders in Brussels and in the capitals of Europe prefer to keep Ankara in their area of influence to pursue their economic and geopolitical agenda (Geinitz, 2017). Turkey’s entry would mean that they would be the second largest member state of the EU after Germany, with 70 million Muslims joining the almost exclusively Christian EU alliance (Arnold & Schneider, 2007; Negrine, Kejanlioglu, Aissaoui & Paphanassopoulos, 2008).
Public opinion is strikingly negative: the Religion Monitor 2015 (Halm, Sauer, Hafez, Schmidt & Traunmüller, 2015) shows that in some European regions Islamophobia rose from 70 percent in 2012 to 80 percent in 2014. The extent to which negative media coverage might exacerbate these attitudes is paramount.

Arnold and Schneider (2007) see the media as having a crucial duty to contribute to the integration of ethnic minority groups, as most people have few alternative sources of information. The perception of one's own ‘in-group’ and the ‘others’ (out-group) is based not only on personal interactions, but also on the message of the mass media (Bourdieu 1996; Friedland & McLeod 1999; Luhmann 1995). Representation in the mass media is important for the social integration of a minority, as the deficit of representation leads to a worsening or even hindering of social integration. Berger and Luckmann (1966) speak in this regard of a persistently constructed social reality of the collective. If individual groups are excluded in this process of communication because they are either not or are incorrectly represented, this means that they are also excluded from the construction of a social reality (Trebbe & Schönhagen, 2011). This bias results in underrepresentation, stereotyping and negative contextualisation of an ethnic minority.

Inadequate representation in the mainstream media is also felt today by the Turkish rooted minority in Germany (Hafez, 2002). People of Turkish origin immigrated to Germany in the 1960s after the two states signed an official recruitment agreement, and now three generations citizens with Turkish roots reside in Germany (Bilecen, Çatır, & Orhon, 2014). With about 2.15 million people, they make up the largest minority group in Germany (Simon & Neuwöhner, 2011). Deuze (2006) describes this perception of an inaccurate portrayal as one of the most important causes of the growing amount of media produced within and for a specific ethnic community (also called: diaspora media) in Europe and the US. Müller (2005) summarises the previous observations as follows: negative representation of migrants and
ethnic minorities create a hindered integration process. This in turn leads to minorities turning to the media of their diaspora and away from the mainstream media of their settlement country. Diasporic media furthermore favours the priorities and perspectives of the country of origin, which, according to Geißler and Pöttker (2005), leads to a further discouragement of integration and the formation of media ghettos or parallel societies.¹

In the case of the Turkish originated minority in Germany, while a few studies have dealt with the role of mass media and integration (Becker & El-Menouar, 2012; Brendler et al., 2013; Christoph, 2012; Duyvené de Wit & Koopmans, 2001; Hafez 2002; Sauer, 2007), the results are contradictory and no definite conclusions can be drawn about the use of German mainstream or diaspora media and the level of integration (Halm & Sauer, 2006; Lünenborg, Fritsche, & Bach, 2011). Therefore, this study seeks to examine this process in depth, using the Hostile Media Perception (Vallone et al., 1985) framework to understand how the Turkish diaspora in Germany respond to media coverage of German-Turkish relations, depending on the media source to which that coverage is attributed. Specifically, it asks: How does the type of media article (diasporic vs. German mainstream) influence the perception of biased media coverage, and does in-group identification and prior attitudes towards the media play a role in this relationship?

Theory

Over the past 20 years, migration to Europe has become more dynamic and complex and European countries are constantly facing the evolving challenges of integrating migrants. Although migratory flows have increased towards Europe in recent years (Trenz &

¹ Halm and Sauer (2006) represent a different opinion to Müller (2005). They can hardly detect an increase of parallel social structures in longitudinal analyses. Sauer (2007) furthermore criticises two misguided developments: first, the existing social adjustment of migrants is completely underestimated, and second, cases of failed integration are always attributed to the unwillingness to adapt to migrants or persons with a migrant background. Cultural plurality is thus declared a disintegrating factor of German society and only cultural assimilation defined as successful integration.
Triandafyllidou, 2017), it is equally important to consider integrating diaspora communities that have been in host societies for several generations. During the ‘long summer of migration’ (Kasparek & Speer, 2015), Germany was often associated with the term ‘Willkommenskultur’. However, before a society can claim to be truly open to new citizens, we should look at the integration of the largest ethnic minority and what role the media, as an integral part of the integration (Christoph, 2012), are playing.

**Diaspora Media**

Diasporic groups are increasingly becoming the focus of scientific debate (e.g. Bailey, Georgiou & Harindranath, 2007, Chan, 2011; Chatterji & Washbrook, 2011; Georgiou, 2006; Karim, 2003; Sutherland & Barabantseva, 2011). The term *diasporas*, which originated from Greek, meaning migration and colonization (Bailey, Georgiou & Harindranath, 2007), deals today with the “complexities of migration and the formation of cultural identities” (p. 133). Georgiou (2006) defines these groups of people as being in a new environment, outside their country of origin, and yet still feeling a strong connection to their homeland, for example through religion or language. Although they want to maintain their identity and interpersonal communication, according to Kim (2001), they also adapt well to their new environment. Discussing diasporic groups draws conclusions about how societies deal with the new ‘Others’ (Bailey, Georgiou & Harindranath, 2007, p. 1) and how diasporas encourage us to look at “nationalism, transnationalism, human mobility, urban communication, ethnicity, gender, identity, representation, multiculturalism, politics, and media” (p. 1) from a new perspective.

Above all, the media plays a major role for the diaspora as it represents a "digital bridge" to the homeland (Clifford, 1994). Especially new media technologies allow migrants to be involved in both contexts and to use transnational communication channels. Given the

---
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very different cultural backgrounds of the home and settlement countries, migrants can feel alienated; transnational networks can restore a certain autonomy which allows them to maintain some belonging, identity and their cultural heritage (Bozdağ, 2014; Caspi, Adoni, Cohen & Elias, 2002). McKenna and Bargh (1998) analysed minority communication and were able to demonstrate that online media, in particular, have revolutionised the opportunities for information and communication for minority groups in order to find “orientation, social acceptance and contact” (Arnold & Schneider, 2007, p. 121) among like-minded people.

Research on the issue of representation of ethnic minorities in the media shows that mass media can contribute positively to the integration process by portraying social groups (Arnold & Schneider, 2007). In this context, Esser (2000) even speaks of ‘images’ that the media create and which emerge in the minds of the audience, allowing the media to build, change, or reduce prejudices between and about ethnic groups. Ultimately this leads to building bridges within a society to form a unity that finds itself sharing values and structures mutually (Kamps, 1999). Milikowski (2000) argues that there are differences in the direction diaspora media and mainstream media can take in terms of integration. The diasporic media, unlike the mainstream media of the country of settlement, have a one-sided influence as it is only addressed to one ethnic group. Picking up this argument, Hargreaves and Mahdjoub (1997), as well as Bailey, Georgiou & Harindranath (2007) express concern that ethnic media will influence the diaspora negatively in promoting segregation.

A diaspora that already was subject to multiple studies (e.g. Arnold & Schneider, 2007; Bilecen, Çatır & Orhon, 2014; Bozdağ, 2014; Dorjee, Giles & Barker, 2011; Heft & Paasch-Colberg, 2013; Hafez, 2002) but still shows scientific gaps, is the Turkish diaspora in Germany, whose intercultural communication and media usage behaviour will be the subject of this paper. With over 2,500,000 people of Turkish origin, this group is the largest ethnic
minority in Germany (Bozdağ, 2014). Kaya (2007) calls the members a "recent phenomenon of transnational space" (p. 483), moving within political, social, as well as economic levels and experiencing constant cultural tensions in a space across borders.

A scientific debate deals with whether the intensified use of diasporic media could constitute an integration blockade for the ethnic minority (Arnold & Schneider, 2007). Hafez (2002) points out that exclusive use of Turkish media leads to a neglect of integration and co-determination in the German culture and society. In this context, Bilecen, Çatır and Orhon (2014) commented that past studies have failed to consider different levels of transnational involvement, a factor which influences migrants' activities. Bozdağ (2014) points to studies that have shown that most Turkish migrants use a mix of Turkish and German media and they certainly do not live in "media enclaves", as suggested by many nation-state theories about media and migration. Media from the country of origin as well as German media are used with varying intensity (Simon & Neuwöhner 2011). How intensively the members of the diaspora use the media of the respective countries and how the media channels are combined depends on a few factors, above all on the cultural identity and the feeling of belonging and identity of the user. Arnold and Schneider (2007) as well as Bozdağ (2014) conclude that the extent to which members of the Turkish diaspora in Germany use different kinds of media draws conclusions to their cultural identification patterns.

Another factor undeniable in the media coverage of ethnic topics is the role and influence of ethnic journalists. Journalists of Turkish origin also want to represent the interests, opinions and attitudes of the Turkish originated minority in the German press (Arnold & Schneider, 2007). The orientation in everyday life and the provided bond with the homeland are the reasons that, according to Arnold and Schneider (2007), the people of Turkish origin mainly choose ethnic media, while the German mainstream media deal with more current issues and are also used for this purpose. Nonetheless, many studies point to the
importance of ethnic online media, which today has an almost stronger impact on the
diaspora than traditional media because it extends the possibilities of mediated interpersonal
communication (D'Haenens, Koeman & Saeys, 2007; Kaya, 2007; Madianou & Miller, 2012;
Shumow, 2012).

The presented theoretical discussion about the Turkish diaspora in Germany has
highlighted some aspects of conflicts. However, it still remains unresolved which
fragmentation problems they entail and how to reach an integration standard that is consistent
with secular modernization in Turkey.

Hostile Media Phenomenon

This theoretical discussion has shown the importance of the media for ethnic
minorities in their settlement countries and it is therefore of considerable scientific relevance
to close gaps that focus on the relationships between social identity, patterns of media usage,
media perception and media effects. Neumann (2015) holds the assumption that a strong
social and cultural identification with the homeland can lead to stronger media effects if the
own social group is portrayed in the media. This leads back to the Turkish diaspora in
Germany, who have a rather strong connection to their country of origin in their in-group and
who consider themselves to be inadequately and wrongly represented by the German
mainstream press (Karadas, Neumann & Reinemann, 2017).

Numerous studies have shown that people tend to perceive media reports about
controversial issues as biased against their own views. An in-depth part of the literature dealt
with the extent to which the group affiliation of the recipient and group membership of the
source influence the perception of bias (Ariyanto et al., 2007). The present work brings both
approaches together and additionally includes the component of the diasporic media, which is
of particular importance for ethnic minorities in their media usage behaviour (Bozdağ, 2014).
Especially with conflicting topics, people tend to perceive the reporting as unbalanced and directed against their own opinion. This phenomenon was first described by Vallone, Ross und Lepper (1985) in the context of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the U.S. media coverage about the 1983 Beirut massacre. For that research, American students who were either pro-Israeli or pro-Arab, were exposed to the same article with the outcome that both groups perceived the identical article as hostile to their own side. They titled this effect as the 'Hostile Media Phenomenon (HMP; also called Hostile Media Effect or Hostile Media Perception), stating that those who have a particular opinion on a controversial topic perceive identical news coverage as biased against their own views. Since Vallone et al. (1985), this effect has been confirmed in a variety of different topics. Hartman and Tanis (2013, p. 535) give a detailed list of past studies covering several of content-related issues which apply the HMP and lead to new insights. Particularly important for the present study are the insights that the effect applies specifically to mass communication and that the source of the media coverage plays a role (Ariyanto, Hornsey, & Gallois, 2007; Arpan & Raney, 2003; Gunther & Liebhart, 2006; Reid, 2012) as well as the extent of involvement of the media consumer (Chia, Yong, Wong, & Koh, 2007). Some individual findings will be discussed in more detail during the following theoretical discussion.

In this research field, different reasons were analysed and considered to explain why the HMP occurs and which other social scientific theories can be used for interpretation. In the following, insights from some of the main works on the HMP are presented and linked to the present research project in order to clarify the links between theory and study. Vallone et al. (1985) explain the effect by expressing unambiguous and divergent views on a controversial topic in a journalistic format, balancing them against each other, and thus competing. In the context of the study, this is an important argument to be considered, as national as well as German-Turkish issues are covered very differently and controversially by
the respective media. For instance, Ates (2000) found scientific evidence that the reporting of
the Turkish media does not meet objective criteria, as most of the news is controlled by the
ddictated opinion of the Turkish government. However, according to a representative study
conducted by Karakaş & Schulte (2017) which was repeatedly picked up by the media (e.g.
Reimann, 2017) an increasing proportion of the Turkish originated minority feel alienated
from Germany. The present study is therefore based on the intercultural conflict that the
Turkish diaspora is facing, which ultimately leads to an ever-increasing divide within the
German-Turkish population (Karadas, Neumann & Reinemann, 2017; Karakaş & Schulte,
2017).

This, in turn, leads to the next argument focused on by Dohle and Hartmann, namely
that the HMP is stronger if the media content is considered to be less credible and less
trustworthy in terms of quality. There are different relevant factors that explain the strength
of the effect. Gunther (1992) addresses group member identification and refers to a group
membership as being the most influential factor for the hostile media effect. This aspect
appears to be particularly relevant in dealing with Turkish originated recipients and media
effects, as the theoretical analysis of the Turkish diaspora has showed that their members are
often closely bonded to their country of origin.

Duck, Terry and Hock (1998) looked at subordinate group members in a society and
how they perceive the media to be rather biased against their own view, especially when it
means that the group’s positive status is threatened. This argumentation is in line with the
‘Social Identity Theory’ which explains how people need to believe that their in-group is
positively distinct from the out-group (Ariyanto, Hornsey & Gallois, 2007; Tajfel, 1978).
Research on members of the Turkish diaspora found that they often perceive the German
media coverage about Turkey and the Turkish government as being negative and biased
(Karadas, Neumann & Reinemann, 2017; Karakaş & Schulte, 2017).
On the basis of this theoretical discussion, it seems legitimate to transfer the model of the HMP to the group of Turkish diaspora members in Germany. This social group is particularly suitable for an analysis because it is comparatively heterogeneous. There are some significant differences in terms of socio-demographic characteristics, but above all the group vary a lot in identification and social involvement with the Turkish community (Hafez, 2002; Karakaş & Schulte, 2017; Sauer, 2016). These findings and the theoretical framework that has already been discussed, leads to the expectation that

_**Hypothesis 1:** Members of the Turkish diaspora in Germany perceive a diasporic news source less biased when discussing German-Turkish issues than when it comes from a German news source._

_**Prior beliefs.**_ Following the approach of Giner-Sorolla and Chaiken (1994) and using the HMP as a basic concept, they argue that an individual brings beliefs about media outlets from the past and use them as heuristics for an evaluation of issues in the present. This effect is even stronger for people who are highly involved or feel strongly aligned to a group. It can be assumed that previous beliefs act as an independent mechanism of the HMP. In this case, it can be argued that recipients unconsciously evaluate the media material with bias whereby an assessment of the media content would take place under the influence of heuristic shortcuts, which in turn will cause the HMP. These heuristics evolve if an individual has certain notions of media bias. Feldman (2014) also speaks in this context of a confirmation bias, whereby the HMP is influenced in its strength by the presumed agreeableness or disagreeableness of the source.

_**Hypothesis 2:** Members of the Turkish diaspora in Germany perceive more bias from a German mainstream outlet, when they have pre-existing beliefs that German media are in general not credible._
Cultural identity and in-group identification. The theory of ‘Social Identity’, as outlined by Tajfel & Turner (1979), shows that the HMP can be traced back to socio-psychological group processes. It is understood as the cognitive and emotional attachment to a group (Hartmann & Tanis, 2013; Tajfel, 1982). This means that the effect of a perceived media bias can be moderated by a high level of social involvement (Wirth, 2006). Previous research (e.g. Brendler et al., 2013) also showed that the use of mainstream media and diaspora media can be used as indicators of cultural identity. As mentioned earlier, the main distinction between mainstream media and diaspora media is that, whilst the mainstream media addresses and influences both the majority as well as minorities in the host society, the diaspora media is only aimed at the ethnic group. This one-way communication of which Hargreaves and Mahdjoub (1997) speak about in their paper raises the concern that diaspora media support a segregation of the minority group. Media content is interpreted with a sense of belonging to a group but as Ellemers, Spears and Doosje (2002) state, the reaction to in-group threats depend on the level of identification. In line with this assumption, Hartman and Tanis (2013) suggest that the HMP is positively related to the strength of identification with their in-group which in turn leads to the assumption that,

Hypothesis 3: The level of in-group identification moderates the evaluation of media bias, such that people who strongly identify with their ethnic in-group are more affected perceiving more bias than those who identify less.

Although there is already some research on the Turkish diaspora in Germany and their media usage (Arnold & Schneider, 2007; Bozdağ, 2014; Kaya, 2007;), there remains a scientific gap in the analysis of source cues on the perception of media bias, especially regarding the Turkish diaspora in Germany. Finding results to this would help to improve the handling of the tense Turkish-German relationship.
Methodology

To explore the hypotheses, an online experiment was conducted among a sample of people with a Turkish migration background living in Germany. The aim of the study was to find out how this community respond to different sources of media regarding German-Turkish relations. Due to the specific nature of the target population, recruitment was done through online media channels and personal recruitment, e.g. visiting mosques and local community clubs. Furthermore, the study was also distributed by the study coordinators and professors of Islamic Studies at the University of Munich and the track ‘Turkisitik’ at the University of Duisburg-Essen. These different recruiting methods were used to obtain as many heterogeneous respondents as possible. The participants did not receive any incentives for their participation. In total, 97 respondents agreed to participate in the study.

However, the recruitment process of the Turkish originated participants was unexpectedly problematic. Initial invitations to participate were, in several cases, met with highly critical responses. After discussing these experiences, and the survey, with an expert contact of mine, who herself has Turkish roots and works within the community, it became clear that the very divisions I sought to investigate in this paper were undermining my own ability to recruit participants. That is, due to the divided and isolated social environment in which the Turkish diaspora find themselves in Germany (Hafez, 2002; Karakaş & Schulte, 2017).

In response to these problems, the study was extended to an emergent mixed-method design, following the approach of Creswell and Plano Clark (2007). This designs generally occur when the restructuring to a mixed method happens during the course of the study due to

---

3 After these critical responses, and discussion with the expert, the survey was amended to incorporate the relevant critiques from the Turkish originated respondents. A mix method approach was used to correct for the inherent problem, which this paper itself is set to study: that German-Turks view out-group members as being biased. Thus, the survey was construed with bias. It must be noted that since the survey was created by me, a member of the out-group, it is possible that certain insensitivities were not detected upon first drafting, but that the survey was re-assessed with an in-group member to correct these and the survey re-sent with corrections made.
issues that developed during the process and one method would be inadequate to use (Morse & Niehaus, 2009). In particular, qualitative interviews were conducted with key members of the Turkish diaspora to help shed light on the quantitative results.

For the purpose of this research, an embedded mixed-method approach was chosen in which the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data are combined within a traditional quantitative or qualitative research design (Caracelli & Greene, 1997; Creswell & Clark, 2011; Greene, 2007). In this case, the quantitative data was collected first and had priority. Following Creswell and Clark (2011), the collection and analysis of the second data occurred during the implementation of the data collection to improve recruitment procedures (e.g., Donovan, Egger, Kapernick & Mendoza, 2002), to explain reactions to participation in the experiment (e.g., Evans & Hardy, 2002) and overall to address the primary research question. The results are summarised in the discussion section, which serves to interpret and explain the respective results.

**Phase One: Quantitative Study**

This phase is designed as a population-based between-subjects post-test only experimental design to assess perceptions of media bias in response to source cues, and the extent to which those effects are moderated by in-group identification and prior beliefs among respondents. The source population was every person with a Turkish origin living in Germany. The participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions; for each condition a different source relevant to news consumers of Turkish origin was chosen. Differentiating between a German mainstream news source (ZEIT Online) and a diaspora media online outlet (Daily Sabah; see *Stimulus Material*). The post-test measured the dependent variable and moderator variables, using self-report items which will be merged to scales in the analysis.
**Participants.** Of the 184 subjects that started the questionnaire, the overall response rate was 54.3%. Only those were included who self-identify as having a Turkish migration background through their grandparents, parents or themselves. The survey was administered online between December 04th, 2018 and January 06th, 2019. The final sample thus included 97 individuals \((N)\), with more female \((n = 55)\) than male \((n = 41)\) participants, with ages ranging between 18 and over 65 years\(^4\) and most respondents placed themselves in the second age range of 25 - 34 years \((Mo = 2; M = 1.98, SD = 1.03)\). These figures show that most of the participants came from the second or third generation of Turkish origin which is also reflected in the fact that 81% of the participants were even born in Germany.

In the final sample, 1% reported having completed primary school, 48% secondary school, of which 26% have completed the highest German secondary school form. 10% of the respondents held a middle-level vocational/technical education (‘Berufsschule’), 40% a university degree (bachelor’s or master’s) and 1% a PhD. These figures show clear discrepancies to the distribution of the educational attainment of the total Turkish originated population in Germany. One third of this population had not finished any kind of school form and only 11.8% hold a university degree (Statista, 2016).

The randomization check showed that the four groups did not differ on age \(F(3, 96) = 1.94, p > .05\), gender \(\chi^2(6) = 6.89, p > .05\) and educational level \(\chi^2(27) = 13.70, p > .05\) and therefore a successful randomisation with no between-group differences for the sample can be assumed.\(^5\)

---

\(^4\) The participants have indicated their age in ranges.

\(^5\) *Recall/Manipulation.* The source recall questions (news outlet) were treated as a sort of manipulation check. Three participants failed every question and therefore their data were removed for the analyses of the experimental design. Furthermore, two other questions were asked (a) which newspaper and (b) which author wrote the article that was previously read by the participants. More than half of the participants (54.6%, \(n = 53\)) misjudged the source of the author as well as 45.4% \((n = 44)\) assigned the article an incorrect newspaper or they could not remember it. Jacoby and Whitehouse (1989) focus in their study on false recognition, which is influenced by subconscious perception. They state that although participants cannot consciously remember facts, there is still an effect of
**Procedures.** Participants were invited to take part in an online questionnaire on their opinion and perception of German and Turkish news and media outlets. After the participants’ consent to take part in the study, they were exposed randomly to a constructed newspaper article about the state visit from president Erdogan to Germany in September 2018 (see Appendix B), containing one of the four different source cues. Following the stimulus, participants received the post-test questionnaire.

**Stimulus material.** The manipulation consisted of one newspaper article per treatment condition. For this an article based on a current German-Turkish political event was created. The articles contained identical content, only the design and the author of the article differed between the conditions. The formats were a ZEIT Online article with a German author, a ZEIT Online article with a Turkish author, a Daily Sabah article and the control condition with no newspaper design or author. The state visit of president Erdogan was chosen as topic, since it concerned a current German-Turkish affair, which was much discussed in both Turkish and German media.

In order to ensure the highest possible authenticity, considerable efforts were made to adapt the news articles to the common layout and editorial style of the selected news outlets. The online outlet ZEIT Online was chosen for the German news format, since it has published many articles about the state visit of President Erdogan in Germany and with 12.25 million weekly users (Iq digital, 2018) it is one of the most widespread online news formats in Germany (Schröder, 2017). The Daily Sabah was chosen as the Turkish online news outlet, as it is currently largest English-speaking daily newspaper in Turkey (MedyaTava, 2017). It is considered to be closely associated with President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and his AKP party (Die WELT, 2016). In addition to the English language edition, some of the online

“unconscious perception on recognition memory judgments” (p. 132), when the events are processed by associating them with the effects of past experience. It shows that a subconscious recognition is indeed possible to influence the perception and processing of news. Given the fact that attitudes can still be influenced without being able to recall the source (Jacoby and Whitehouse, 1989), I kept this data in for the further analysis.
content also appears in German and Turkish. As the article was shown to the participants in German in every condition, this online outlet was also the most suitable for the purpose of the study. The stimuli have been carefully constructed to contain a balanced content and an identical number of critical events that occurred on both the German and Turkish sides during the state visit.

Due to the design of the study, I used a constructed article instead of an already published article because the description of the events had to be kept neutral and the use of true coverage would have led to a less controlled stimulus material. The possibility that this article could have been published in each of the two outlets had to be guaranteed. In order to ensure neutrality, a preliminary test was carried out in which 77.8% of the participants perceived the article was biased in favour of the German side. Therefore, the article was adjusted and made more neutral.

**Measures.**

*Media bias perception.* Following the theoretical approach, the dependent variable was operationalised according to existing literature on the HMP (e.g. Dohle & Hartmann, 2008; Vallone et al., 1986), consisting of four items. The items were measured on a nine-point scale ranging from “very negative/biased in favour of Germany” [-4] to “very positive/biased in favour of Turkey” [+4] with lower scores indicating a negative perception for the article and a bias towards the German side ($\alpha = .84$, $M = 4.22$, $SD = 1.36$), (e.g. “Would you say that the newspaper that printed this article is generally strictly neutral or too critical or too favourable of Turkey?”, “Would you say that the article was strictly neutral towards Germany and Turkey, or was it biased towards one or the other side?”).

---

6 Of which almost all were ethnic Germans.
7 For the further analysis the values were recoded to 1 (very negative/biased in favour of Germany) to 9 (very positive/biased in favour of Turkey).
Prior beliefs. Following the credibility scale by Gaziano & McGrath (1986), the participants were asked to indicate, on a scale ranging from “very unreliable” [-4] to “very reliable” [+4] their agreement regarding German mainstream and the Turkish media (“Please think about German [Turkish] media (TV, radio, newspapers, online media) and their political reporting on German-Turkish relations. How would you describe such reporting?”). These items were recoded (so that higher values represent greater credibility toward German media, and were averaged (α = .91, M = 2.94, SD = 1.9). Also a parallel scale assessed the prior beliefs towards the Turkish media (α = .93, M = 3.97, SD = 2.08), where a higher mean indicates higher credibility scores assigned to the Turkish media. Both scales are used in the moderation analysis (see Findings) to compare them separately with the Turkish versus the German scores.

In-group identification. Ten items measured how much participants identified with their in-group. This measure included five items from the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Roberts et al., 1999) and five items from Benet-Martinez and Haritatos’ (2005) Bicultural Identity Integration (BII) scale. The participants indicated their level of agreement on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from “fully agree” [1] to “fully disagree” [5]. Sample items include for example, “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me” and “I feel like someone moving between two cultures” (α = .77, M = 2.07, SD = .62). The values were summarised into an index that reflects the degree of the respondent’s in-group identification.

Phase Two: Qualitative Study

As noted, qualitative interviews were conducted with several respondents, who were asked to reflect on main concepts that were crucial for the experimental design. Due to the

---

8 The single items asked were: unfair/fair; biased/unbiased; does not tell the whole story/does tell the whole story
9 For the further analysis the values were recoded to 1 (very unreliable) to 9 (very reliable).
sensitivity of the topic and the scepticism of the target population to be misrepresented by someone from outside their community, a particular importance was laid on sensitive, transparent and common language during the interviews. Through a particularly tactful phrasing, I tried to prevent a barrier between interviewer and respondents (Gläser & Laudel, 2009). Furthermore, a semi-structured interview was chosen because open-ended questions encourage interviewees to respond in detail. According to Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) as well as Patton (2002), this kind of interview is particularly useful for sensitive topics and serves as a strong stimulus for an engaged conversation.

Experts are a special target group for interviews (Mayer, 2008), since they can use their detailed knowledge about a phenomenon of interest purposefully for the aim of a study. Expert knowledge in this case was either active engagement or scientific experience with Turkish and German media. The experts in this research are subjects to the design, as their thoughts, attitudes and feelings are relevant to the study and to support the interpretation of the quantitative data (Finkenbeiner, 2017).

Participants. Interviewees were either those who refused to participate in the experimental study or because they were particularly interested in the topic. Some refuted the participation because they feared misrepresentation of their opinion, or because they saw themselves as belonging to another ethnic subgroup of Turkish origin (for example, Kurds) and did not feel sufficiently addressed in the experiment. Others were recruited as being experts in the field of Turkish news media and provided a deeper insight into the attitudes and perceptions of the German and Turkish media landscape. A total of five people were interviewed (see Appendix D), using a semi-structured interview guideline, which was built
from the three main concepts of the quantitative study. The interviewees comprised two women and three men, with two of the interviewees having a Kurdish background.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{Procedure.} After thanking the interviewees for their participation and providing some introductory information on the content, aim and purpose of the study, the interviewee was shown the stimulus of the control group from the online experiment and was given time to read it. After the interviewee read the provided article, the first part of the interview included a brief warm-up phase, asking for demographics as well as questions about the family’s immigration history from Turkey. These warm-up questions were designed to ensure a smooth start and to create confidence and interest in the interview situation (Finkbeiner, 2017). The further course of the interviews was based on the semi-structured protocol (see Appendix \textit{C}), whereby neither the wording nor the order of the questions had to be strictly adhered to. Furthermore, they were adapted to the course of the interview (Finkbeiner, 2017, p. 145). The recorded interviews lasted between 20-35 minutes and were later transcribed.

\textbf{Analysis.} The analysis of the qualitative data was based on the study by Baheiraei et al. (2011), who also work with a mixed method. To analyse the data, the interviews were carefully reviewed and codes and categories extracted from the main concepts of the quantitative analysis (Tolley, Ulin, Mack, Robinson & Succop, 2005). The variables of the quantitative design that were used to create coding categories, these are: bias perception, prior beliefs and in-group identification.

According to the study by Baheiraei et al. (2011), subordinate topics and categories are analysed in order to examine the media perception of various media formats and other factors influencing this relationship. The performed part of the analysis included the coding of the transcripts, to help and enlighten more detailed explanation of the topics given by the

\textsuperscript{10} Following the criticism of a German-Kurdish community, which according to their opinion were not sufficiently taken into account as an independent ethnic group in the construction of the experiment, German Kurds were explicitly recruited for expert interviews to ensure a balanced and varied opinion in the study.
experiment. Therefore, coding categories were derived directly from the raw data without first prescribing certain categories or previous theoretical perspectives. Subsequently, tables were created which amalgamated the transcribed segments of the interviews into each code (see Appendix D). This allowed patterns to be identified among interviewees.

**Findings**

**Quantitative Findings**

**Main effect: perception of media bias.** It was predicted that members of the Turkish diaspora in Germany perceive a diasporic media article as less biased than a German mainstream media article (H1). A one-way ANOVA examined whether exposure to the experimental stimuli affected the respondents’ perception of bias. The subjects who read the article from a Turkish news outlet perceived it as most neutral \(^\text{11}\) (\(n = 18; M = 5.08, SD = 1.15\)) while those who have read the article from a German news outlet, written by a German author perceived it as most biased and negative against Turkey (\(n = 23; M = 3.45, SD = 1.64\); \(F(3, 93) = 5.63, p = .001, \eta^2 = .15\)). A Bonferroni post-hoc test indicated this difference was significant (\(M_{\text{difference}} = 1.64, p = .001\)). By contrast, those who read the article from a German news outlet but written by a Turkish journalist scored in between these values, (\(n = 27; M = 4.23, SD = 1.25\)), similarly to the participants in the control group with no news outlet and author shown (\(n = 29; M = 4.29, SD = 1.00\)). Post-hoc tests showed that these groups did not significantly differ from the others.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{11}\) Values are ranging from “very negative/biased in favour of Germany” (1) to “very positive/biased in favour of Turkey” (9); a score of 5 meaning a fairly neutral perception of the article

\(^{12}\) The assumption of equal variances in the population had been violated, Levene's \(F(3, 93) = 3.88, p = .012\). This is due to the small sample sizes and it means that the results should be interpreted with caution.
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Figure 1. Mean scores of conditions on DV (bias perception)

Moderation: prior beliefs. Next, it was predicted that a greater perceived bias towards newspaper articles would be visible among people who generally find the press less credible (H2). The within-samples t-test ($t(96) = 3.51, p = .001$) showed a significant effect that on average the German media ($M= 2.94, SD= 1.90$) were considered less credible than the Turkish media ($M= 3.97, SD= 2.08$).

In order to examine the moderation effect, I first focused on prior beliefs about German media as a moderator of the media source. The influence of prior beliefs towards German media was tested. I used the PROCESS macro by Hayes (Model 1; 2013), testing for moderation on the main effect. Estimates were based on 5,000 bootstrap samples. The control group was treated as a reference group in this model — all three other conditions were entered as dummy variables; and each condition was interacted with the prior beliefs variable — scored such that higher scores indicate more positive prior beliefs about German media. The main interaction effect showed that the overall model had a significant effect ($F(7, 89) = 6.52, p < .001$). The regression model could therefore be used to predict perception of media bias and the strength of the prediction was moderately high: 34 percent of the variance in perceptions of media bias in the article was be predicted by the model ($R^2 = .34$).
Table 1

Summary of PROCESS Hayes Moderation Regression: Prior Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1: Prior beliefs German media interaction</th>
<th>Model 2: Prior beliefs Turkish media interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$se$ $b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish outlet</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German outlet with German author</td>
<td>-0.72**</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German outlet with Turkish author</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs (German/Turkish)</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish outlet x Prior beliefs</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German outlet with German author x Prior beliefs</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German outlet with Turkish author x Prior beliefs</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for change in $R^2$</td>
<td>6.52***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p < .10$. **$p < .05$. ***$p < .01$.

Table 1 shows that two message conditions—as reflected in the initial analyses above—predicted significant differences in perceived bias. Further, prior beliefs about German media significantly moderated the impact of the German source with German author message condition ($b = 0.30$, $t = 1.70$, $p < .10$, 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval [CI]: [-0.05; 0.64]). This interaction is displayed in Figure 2, where it can be seen that at the lowest end of prior beliefs—so, those most sceptical of German media—the German outlet with a German author (‘GER_ger’) led to the greatest perceptions of pro-German (and
anti-Turkey) bias. This same group perceived the article from the Turkish outlet as the least biased against Turkey. The differences in article perceptions, then, were greatest among those with the most prior scepticism toward German media. Those at the mean and more positive prior belief levels did not display significant differences in article perceptions—the source did not significantly influence their perceptions of bias toward or against Turkey.

![Figure 2](image)

**Figure 2.** Bias perception per condition with moderation effect of prior beliefs

*Note.* The value 0 in this diagram represents the mean of the variable ‘prior beliefs German media’ \((M = 2.94; SD = 1.90)\), the values left and right of the mean show -1 SD and +1 SD of the mean.

This moderation shows clearly that among those who already distrust German media, a German article will be perceived as most biased against their position. Thus, a sort of confirmatory effect was found: those who believe there will be bias are also the most likely to perceive it—but only when it comes to German media.

A similar model (Model 1; Hayes, 2013) was run to examine whether a similar moderation emerged for prior beliefs about Turkish media, but as can be seen in Table 1, no such interaction emerged. The overall model was significant \((F(7, 89) = 2.90, p = .009, R^2=\)
.19) but no interactions showed a significant effect. Overall, these results lead to the assumption that we find only partially support for H2.

**Moderation: In-group identification.** To test whether the perception of media bias is stronger for participants with a higher identification with their in-group, a moderation analysis was conducted with PROCESS (Model 1; Hayes, 2013). The results showed that both the main effect ($F(7, 89) = 2.84, p = 0.010, R^2 = 0.182$) as well as the interaction effect (see Table 2) were not significant. This shows that irrespective of the stimuli, the in-group identification of the participants did not have an effect on their perceived bias about a media article. As a result, Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Table 2

**Summary of PROCESS Hayes Moderation Regression: In-Group Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>se b</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish outlet</td>
<td>0.84*</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German outlet with German author</td>
<td>-0.83*</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German outlet with Turkish author</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group identification</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish outlet x In-group identification</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German outlet with German author x In-group identification</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German outlet with Turkish author x In-group identification</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for change in $R^2$</td>
<td>2.84*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05.

**Qualitative Findings**

In order to better understand the statistical findings and get a more detailed insight into the findings, experts on diaspora media use were interviewed about the main concepts of
the study. During the course of the interviews, four themes emerged: ways of perceived bias on media outlets; the influence of prior beliefs about the media; the identification with the in-group; and the general value of diasporic media to the members of the community. In particular, a more detailed look was taken at the interaction results, because they could only receive limited statistical support. Continuity occurred in that the participants were very critical about the media and did not believe in any kind of objectivity.

Ways of perceived bias on media outlets. After reading the experimental design control article, the interviewees talked about the possible publication source. The German mainstream media was almost exclusively mentioned. In addition, all participants rated the article as more or less neutral. Only one interviewee thought that the article could have been published in either the Turkish or German media. Bias was perceived in particular that neither German, nor by any means Turkish media portrayed a political relationship without the influence of the media’s or the journalist's agenda. Two of the interviewees mentioned some sentences in the article where they found the wording was too ‘diplomatic’ and should have been more critical. A respondent pointed out an exact phrasing in the article, which in his opinion should have been commented on by the author to ensure objectivity: “[T]he journalist could have commented on this and should have explained the definition of ‘terrorism’ in Turkey - where all those who oppose the government can somehow be defined as terrorist” (Interview 5, l. 9-11). Personal experience gained importance when it came to evaluating the media and perceiving bias. This was also discussed by an interviewee who talked about the Gezi Park protests in 2013, which she had participated in.

I have to admit that I also believed the Turkish media and Erdogan in everything he said until I was on vacation in Istanbul and witnessed the Gezi Park protests. [...] Even the [Turkish] news channels showed nothing of what happened there. [...] This was my awakening that it [what the media was showing] can’t be true because I was there. I saw what happened. (II, l. 116-127)
So, although the journalist's article and intentions were presumed biased, most participants believed only the German media could have published the article.

**The influence of prior beliefs about the media.** The interviews could be looked at from three different aspects under which prior beliefs about the media were apparent. The interviewees showed that their trust towards the credibility of the media in general was very low. Looking again at the data of the experiment, the values support this opinion. Every second respondent \((n = 49)\) said that journalists never were objective when it came to reporting on German-Turkish affairs. However, both national mainstream media landscapes are used very regularly by the participants. Nevertheless, the interviewees made a difference in their perception of the media between the two countries.

**German media.** The opinions about German media vary. It was clear that the participants attributed the media landscape with bias and one-sidedness. One interviewee described the case of the Kurdish PKK. She said it was not necessarily wrong how the German media portray the PKK, but certain aspects were softened. Thus, the PKK was not 'just' a political party, but responsible for many deaths of civilians, which in her opinion is not reflected in the German media. In this regard another interviewee explained: “It is also a political tool for Germany, how they report about Turkey” (Interview 3, l. 88-89). Overall, gradations were made in the credibility of the sources. Thus, established and well-known newspapers were named by the participants as the most objective news source.

**Turkish media.** The opinions on the Turkish media were even more divergent. The majority of respondents saw the Turkish media as being heavily influenced and controlled by the government. Two of the interviewees mentioned that publishers and media houses are aligned with the government and therefore critical voices in the Turkish media landscape are not heard. One respondent said:
“There is indeed a very polarised media landscape, although polarisation would require two poles which are about equally strong. Actually, it is a very centralised media system. It’s centred around Erdogan, the AKP and the government [...]” (Interview 5, l. 23-25).

With regard to the article that the participants read, most could not imagine that it was published by a Turkish newspaper because it was not positive enough in terms of the success Erdogan achieved during his state visit.

On the other hand, nearly 25%\textsuperscript{13} of the respondents in the quantitative analysis found a Turkish journalist more credible to objectively report on German-Turkish affairs. This was in line with the statement of an interviewee who said that she preferred the Turkish media formats, as they would sound more logical to her and report more diversely in contrast to German media.

\textit{The influence of news sources.} The previous paragraph is consistent with the participant’s assessment of the degree of influence a journalist has. With regards to the news source and its credibility, everyone agreed that this would have a major impact on readers of Turkish origin. An interviewee summarised the topic: “[T]he people of Turkish origin are always very emotional and if that was written by a compatriot, they always consider it very different. If a German would write that, then it's more like: he wants to harm and downgrade us”. (Interview 4, l. 30-34)

\textit{The identification with the in-group.} First, it is relevant to note that it is hard to make generalised assumptions for people with Turkish roots because they do not all see themselves as ‘Turks’, or German-Turks. One respondent, who had a Kurdish ethnic background, said: “You can interview ten people and if you are unlucky, you interview ten people from ten different ethnic groups” (Interview 3, l. 108-110). This has to be kept in mind when analysing and interpreting the findings. But the overarching feeling of belonging to a Turkish originated group could be found in two aspects of identification:

\textsuperscript{13} Versus 18% who find German authors more objectively to report on German-Turkish relations
**Misrepresentation in the German media.** All interviewees confirmed that they felt misrepresented by the German mainstream media. It was emphasised that the predominant problem was the lack of background and contextual knowledge by German journalists, which lead to generalisation and stereotyping of Turkish originated people. An example came from an interviewee who explained:

> Of course, there are still relatively one-sided reports and racist articles [...] when they wrote about the “Dönermorde”\(^{14}\) and clans and mafia structures [...] This structural racism was present in the media and was never critically questioned except maybe by the TAZ\(^{15}\) [...] however, the entry of Turkish-speaking voices [into the German media] has become better. (I5, l. 78-86)

One participant again drew attention to the differences in ethnic groupings. He said that the collective and its subgroups were definitely not sufficiently represented and, most of all, any representation was very one-sided. For him, and for example the Kurdish Germans, criticism of the Turkish government is missed and Germany’s own political agenda was always reflected in the coverage of Turkey.

**The personal meaning of identification.** As clear as the opinion was about a false representation in the media, the assessment of the personal importance of identification with the in-group was ambivalent. Many participants agreed that they did not identify solely on the basis of their ethnic roots and therefore did not take criticism of Turkey as an attack on themselves and their in-group. The concept of multiple identities came up in one interview and another participant said: “I can’t really place myself anywhere, I'm just a human” (Interview 1, l. 96-97).

The strongly identifying pro-Turkish community must not be disregarded since over 25\(^{16}\) of the respondents in the quantitative study showed a high identification with their in-group. This is also in-line with one interviewee who mentioned that Turkey and its politics is

---

\(^{14}\) [engl.] ‘kebab murders’

\(^{15}\) German newspaper

\(^{16}\) \((M= 2.38, Mo= 2.10, SD= .49)\); The scale is ranging from “High involvement” (1) to “Low involvement” (5)
a very difficult topic and there is a large Turkish rooted community in Germany that feels offended when Turkey and its government is criticised by the German media.

**The general value of diasporic media to the members of the community.** Despite the lack of moderating effects of prior beliefs with respect to the Turkish media, we see that some respondents criticise and doubt the relevance of diaspora media today. They report on different relationships and meanings that diasporic media have for them. Almost all respondents know such formats, but use them in different intensities and for different purposes.

**Relevance.** Diasporic media was used as an opportunity to demand other opinions, better representation and to get additional information that German mainstream media do not provide for people of Turkish origin. Therefore, this form of media is an enrichment in the sense of gaining information. Respondents experienced the use of diaspora media as positive when they want a more differentiated view on an event, in contrast to the mainstream media. For instance, one interviewee (Interview 3, l. 71-73) explained that when he wants to know something about what is happening in Turkey he always consults diaspora media. He said:

“Mostly it’s [diaspora media] more critical of the [Turkish] government and more objective. It has extraordinary value for the Turkish community.”

In addition, diaspora media provides a platform for media that cannot be published in Turkey. Several interviewees have emphasised that 95% of media outlets in Turkey are now controlled by the Turkish government, which is why, for example, Kurdish newspapers only find in Germany a platform to publish their content. On the other hand, diasporic media does not seem to be as relevant to the broader masses as it was before online media:

I believe that these media are no longer important, because the Turkish people who live here in Germany consume a media mix and these purely diasporic media actually don’t matter in my Turkish-speaking environment. [...] That may have been different in the 70s and 80s, but not anymore. (Interview 5, l. 68-75)
Diaspora media did not seem to be the most important source but an addition that picked up both migrants’ and Turkish perspectives. One respondent was speaking about it as a “positive complement” to his media selection. To support these statements, we looked at the media use of the quantitative sample. Over half of the respondents of the experimental design said that they used German media regularly (52.6%, \( n = 51 \)). Turkish state-owned media is used nearly as much (42.3%, \( n = 41 \)) but only 12.5% (\( n = 12 \)) of the respondents used diaspora media on a regular basis. These quantitative results reflect the interviewees’ sentiments that diaspora media is perhaps becoming a more obsolete form of media.

**Encouragement of separation.** A negative aspect of diasporic media was mentioned by two interviewees who reported on diaspora newspapers that are used for purposes of extremist propaganda in Germany. As an example, they referred to the nationalist group "Gray Wolves", whose welcome salute is to be banned in Germany. Another negative aspect mentioned was that diasporic media use could lead to enhancing parallel societies. One of the respondents said: “Not that they [parallel societies] arise because of diaspora media but they are promoted by it” (Interview 3, l. 100-102). This quotation picks up on the previously discussed concerns about emerging "media enclaves" and media ghettoization, which can be promoted by diaspora media and ultimately lead to obstacles of integration. These aforementioned aspects critically questioned the possibility of a successful integration into the German society by the respondents.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to examine perceived bias of German versus diasporic news sources by Turkish rooted people in Germany. This contributes to the understanding of the influence and perception of different media formats that are important for the Turkish diaspora in Germany (Halm, 2006). Since the Turkish-originated minority is the largest in Germany, I focused on the media effects upon this group. Although this community has been
installed in the country since the 1960s, integration (Christoph, 2012) and identity (Sauer, 2007) are still difficult and controversial, in part because the majority of the community are Muslims and Western societies still find it very challenging to successfully integrate Muslim communities. Given this sensitivity—which affected the research process, as described in the methods section, both quantitative and qualitative data was needed to fully meet the research objectives. Using a mixed-method study highlights the quantitative results with a complementary in-depth insight by the expert interviews (Baheiraei et al., 2011).

Following research on the HMP (e.g. Giner-Sorolla & Chaiken, 1994; Matheson and Dursun, 2001; Vallone et. al, 1986), as well as on the importance and influence of media formats, in particular diasporic media (e.g. Arnold & Schneider, 2007; Becker & El-Menouar, 2012; Brendler et al., 2013), this study offers both consensus and some new insights. The statistical findings indicate that the source indeed explains perceptions of hostile media content (Ariyanto, Hornsey & Cindy Gallois, 2007). The participants perceived a news story about German-Turkish relations as particularly biased among members of the Turkish diaspora when it was attributed to a German outlet, whereas a Turkish source was believed to be more or less neutral. However, this effect could not be confirmed by the qualitative data — interviewees indicated little-to-no perceived bias towards the article source. As Reid (2012) explains, partisans find the media more hostile than non-partisans, both for themselves and their in-groups’ position. Although most interviewees showed little identification with their ethnic in-group, in fact they all criticised the way in which people with Turkish roots are portrayed in the German media. This issue was reflected by both German-Turkish and German-Kurdish interviewees. This was generally very widespread amongst the participants in the qualitative interviews, as well as among Turkish media users in Germany.

17 It has to be noted that this could be explained by the fact that they are not aware of their own bias perception.
18 The Kurdish-versus-Turkish issue developed during the course of the study and had to be treated with a lot of sensitivity since both ethnic subgroups do not want to be treated as the same ethnic group.
in general (Hafez, 2002). These perceptions among respondents reflect Müller’s (2005) evidence that ethnic minorities in German media are rare, negatively and wrongfully presented. The number of critical arguments in relation to the image of the Turkish diaspora in the German media also helps to explain the findings about prior attitudes of the German media.

Both statistically, as well as through the expert interviews, an effect could be found on the relationship amongst those who have strong prior beliefs about the media in general. Giner-Sorolla and Chaiken (1994) already noted in their study that the assessment of a biased media presentation is influenced by pre-existing attitudes towards the media. Furthermore, the researchers have argued in their study that it is not necessarily about the affiliation to a group but rather prior attitudes about a media format that actually affects the strength of the HMP effect. Evidence for this assumption can be found in this study as the judgment of a news article was triggered by source heuristics as soon as the subject was engaged in the topic. These earlier beliefs continue to evolve as an individual attains certain perceptions of media bias (Giner-Sorolla and Chaiken, 1994). Bias was especially strong for prior attitudes of the German media and the condition group that read the article published by the German outlet. This is also consistent with the assessments of the qualitative results, which confirmed that pre-existing beliefs of the media, have crucial influence on members of the Turkish diaspora in Germany.

This study addresses a disagreement in the literature over the key moderators of perceived media bias: whereas Giner-Sorolla and Chaiken (1994) find that prior beliefs about media play an important role, others (Matheson & Dursun, 2001; Karadas, Neumann & Reinemann, 2017) find that in-group attachment is dominant. In this study, both quantitative

---

19 The evidence whether previous beliefs about media really have an impact on the HMP was found to be very contradictory in the literature for the HMP. For instance, Matheson and Dursun (2001) as well as Arpan and Raney (2003) did not find evidence for prior beliefs being influential whereas this study and Giner-Sorolla and Chaiken (1994) did find evidence.
and qualitative findings showed clearly that prior attitudes was the predominant moderator of perceived bias and not a strong identification with the ethnic community. There are two alternative explanations why this moderator did not cause a hostile perception of the media. First, almost all participants (97%) are second or third generation of Turkish migrants, which means, they came to Germany at an early age or even were born in Germany. Second, as already mentioned at the beginning of this paper, the sample here shows a higher than average level of education for people of Turkish origin in Germany. Sauer (2007) finds evidence that educational attainment and economic satisfaction are key factors to the sense of belonging and cultural integration of the diaspora. This assumption has also been confirmed by some qualitative interviews - where they see themselves as "hybrid" identities rather than being strictly bound to one or the other identity. Studies show that second and third generation migrants are less likely to identify with their Turkish roots as the first generation (e.g. Sauer, 2007; Trebbe & Schoenhagen, 2011). Therefore, for future studies, care must be taken to ensure that the diversity of the total population is respected, both in the case of the migration generation and in terms of representativeness of the educational level.

This study has several important limitations which merit discussion. As already mentioned, the sample is not representative and therefore lacks in population validity - below average age, completed a higher level of institutional education and mostly from second and third generation families. Thus, the results must be interpreted with caution, noting that they should not be generalised to the totality of the Turkish-originated population in Germany. Both the quantitative and the qualitative results did not show completely irrefutable results. This emerged from the expert interviews, mainly because there are so many different ethnic groups that Turkish people can belong to. Therefore, opinions and concerns can be very different. Future studies should make finer distinctions between those groupings and identification scales used to create more reliable measures. Testing such measures would also
help explain the potentially complex mechanisms of the HMP among various ethnic subgroups. However, it can be argued that the relationships found here may be even stronger for a more representative sample of the Turkish diaspora which is not so well integrated and therefore uses more Turkish state media.

In addition, it would have been beneficial to test the impact with more media outlets, including a Turkish state newspaper, to make clearer assertions about the perception of the article. Since the statistical findings showed that diaspora media was not regularly consulted for news gathering, it should be examined whether the chosen diaspora online outlet was recognised as such. Additionally, respondents performed quite poorly on the source and article recall measures, which suggests that these cues either influenced them beyond their awareness, or that perhaps the cues were actually not strong enough. Future research should conduct a pre-test to examine how consciously the author of an article is recognised. Of course, assumptions about the source can certainly be based post-hoc on the impression of the article, therefore recall measures are also vulnerable here. However, it is an interesting empirical question for future researchers to pursue.

These limitations aside, this research contributes to understanding the influence and perception of various media formats among the Turkish originated community in Germany. No previous research, to my knowledge, has attempted to look at the perception of a hostile majority media by ethnic minorities and which contributions diaspora media to the minority. For the first time, the assumptions were quantitatively examined, and then linked to qualitative data. The qualitative data provided insights into other subgroups of people of Turkish descent who could show a more diverse picture of media perception. These findings highlight the importance that in HMP research, different subgroups of an ethnic minority can be affected differently by news content. Instead of applying two competing sides of an issue or conflict, as the original HMP research did (Vallone et al., 1985), these findings show that
such patterns also emerge within disadvantaged, diasporic communities vis-à-vis the settlement country’s mainstream media. This highlights the bleak implications for the integration of the Turkish originated ethnic minority in Germany. Since the Turkish media is heavily state-controlled and strictly regulated, the way of portraying news in both mainstream media landscapes differs considerably and I expected to find a much bigger influence of Turkish media prior attitudes rather than German media. Therefore, it is even more surprising that such a low relevance and weak effect of diaspora media sources could be recognised within the sample.

The bottom line is clear: the results suggest that the German mainstream media needs to significantly improve its image and credibility status especially among this minority group, before it can (re)build any sort of trust. If Germany hopes to live up to its own self-image as an integrative state and immigration friendly nation, the news media must facilitate that “minority and majority identities interact and attune. Creating one shared identity that has nevertheless distinct ethnic features on all sides of the integration process” (Arnold und Schneider, 2007, p. 117). However, I hope that this kind of research will be extended to relevant socio-political contexts and real-world communication campaigns, thereby promoting a greater tolerance for the integration of Muslim groups into West-European countries.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire experimental design (engl. translation)

Opinions about the news

Dear Sir or Madam,

You are invited to participate in a study carried out for a Master’s Thesis at the University of Amsterdam. The lead researcher is a German citizen who is studying in Amsterdam, but wants to conduct research about her home country of Germany. Germany is made up of people of various ethnic backgrounds and the latest numbers show that every 8th person in Germany has a migration background. These include people who feel that they belong to more than one ethnic group. However, relations between the different communities in Germany could certainly be improved. In academic studies of Germany, there is not enough research into the opinions and feelings of minority communities in Germany. A special focus will be on people of Turkish origin, as they are the largest ethnic community in Germany and thus have an important impact on the entire German society.

Please note that the goal of this research is to help understand the German Turkish community and their opinions about news media—nothing else. The researcher sincerely cares about all parts of German society and is motivated to try to increase the chance for all parts of society to be heard.

This study does not aim to depict Turkish citizens as clichés and to generalise them as a homogenous group. The investigation aims to objectively reflect the views of people of Turkish descent.

If you agree to participate in this short study, you’ll be asked to read a short newspaper article and answer some questions about it, and about yourself. Reading the article and filling out the questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes.

As this research is being carried out under the responsibility of the University of Amsterdam, there are some formal declarations necessary. In particular, we can guarantee that:

1. Your anonymity will be protected—your name or other identifying information will NOT be tied to your answers, and that your answers will not be passed on to any 3rd parties;
2. You can refuse to participate in the research or cut short your participation without having to give a reason for doing so. You also have up to 24 hours after participating to withdraw your permission to allow your answers or data to be used in the research;
3. Participating in the research will not entail any risks or serious discomfort and you will
not be exposed to any offensive material;
4. No later than two months after the conclusion of the research, we will be able to provide you with a research report that explains the general results of the research;
5. The research project was examined in advance by an ethics committee and was found to conform to ethical research practices in the social sciences;
6. All questions that are asked here are based on existing, published academic literature on the subject and will help us understand your views and opinions.

For more information about the research, you can contact the project leader at any time: Alice Claridge, ASCoR, University of Amsterdam; alice.claridge@student.uva.nl. Should you have any complaints or comments about the study, you can contact Ms. Claridge’s supervisor, Penny Sheets Thibaut, PhD, Department of Communication Science, University of Amsterdam, Kloveniersburgwal 48, 1012 CX Amsterdam; 020-525 3680; ascor-secr-fmg@uva.nl . Any complaints or comments will be treated in the strictest confidence.

We hope that we have provided you with sufficient information. Thank you very much in advance for your valuable participation.

With kind regards,

Alice Claridge

Informed Consent

I agree, fully and voluntarily, to participate in this research study. With this, I retain the right to withdraw my consent, without having to give a reason for doing so. I am aware that I may halt my participation in the experiment at any time.
If my research results are used in scientific publications or are made public in another way, this will be done such a way that my anonymity is completely safeguarded. My personal data will not be passed on to third parties without my express permission.
If I wish to receive more information about the research, either now or in future, I can contact Alice Claridge (alice.claridge@student.uva.nl).
√ I understand the text presented above, and I agree to participate in the research study.

Demographics

Dear participant,
Firstly, we would like to ask you some questions about yourself. Please answer them as honestly as possible.

NB: You will not be able to go back within the questionnaire to the previous question once you have moved to the next question.
Q1. What is your gender?
   1. Male
   2. Female
   3. Genderfluid

Q2. How old are you?
   [provided age ranges: 18-24 years, 25-34 years, etc.]

Q3. What is your highest completed level of education?
   1. Elementary school/primary school
   2. Hauptschule
   3. Realschule
   4. Fachoberschule (FOS)
   5. Berufsschule
   6. Gymnasium
   7. Bachelor degree
   8. Master degree
   9. PhD/Doktor
   10. Other, ________

Q4. Did you do most of your higher education in Germany?
   1. Yes
   2. No

Q5. Which languages are spoken at your home? [Multiple answers possible]
   1. German
   2. Turkish
   3. Arabic
   4. English
   5. Other, namely: ________

Q6. Where were you born?
   1. Germany
   2. Turkey
   3. Other: ________

Q7. Where was your father born?
   1. Germany
   2. Turkey
   3. I don’t know
   4. Other: ________

Q8. Where was your mother born?
   1. Germany
2. Turkey  
3. I don’t know  
4. Other:_________

Q9. Who in your family immigrated from Turkey to Germany?  
1. Myself  
2. One or both of my parents  
3. One or both of my grandparents  
4. I don’t know

Stimulus

On the next page you will see a news article. Please read it carefully as you will not be able to return to it later. The article will remain on the screen for a minimum of 30 seconds. When you have finished reading, click the arrow on the bottom of the page.

--------- Page break ---------

[Participants are randomly assigned to one of the four articles]

Dependent variable/HMP measurement

[9-point scale with -4, strong against and +4, strong in favor, 0 as (neutral) center]

Q10. Would you say that the author seems generally positive or negative about the future of German-Turkish relations?  
-4: strongly negative  
0: neutral  
-4: strongly positive

Q11. Would you say that the article was strictly neutral towards Germany as well as Turkey, or was it biased towards one or the other side?  
-4: The journalist's arguments were only in favour of the German side  
0: Strictly neutral  
+4: The journalist's arguments were only in favour of the Turkish side

Q12. Would you say that someone without much prior knowledge on the subject would perceive the article as positive or negative about German-Turkish relations?  
-4: strongly negative about the German-Turkish relations  
0: neutral  
+4: strongly positive about the German-Turkish relations

Q13. Would you say that the newspaper that printed this article is generally strictly neutral
or too critical or too favourable about Turkey?
-4: too critical
0: neutral
+4: too favourable

General media use

Now I would like to know a bit more about your general media use.
Q14. How often do you currently use German mainstream media (e.g. Das Erste (ARD), Süddeutsche Zeitung, Der SPIEGEL, ANTENNE BAYERN) to inform yourself on politics, business and social affairs?
[several times a day - daily - several times a week - several times per month - rarely - never]
Q15. How often do you currently use Turkish media (e.g. Hürriyat, Sabah, Radyo 1, TRT 1, Kanal D) to find out about politics, business and social affairs?
[several times a day - daily - several times a week - several times per month - rarely - never]
Q16. How often do you currently use media made by German-Turks for the Turkish German community; e.g. Radyo Metropol)
[several times a day - daily - several times a week - several times per month - rarely - never]

Prior beliefs

Next, I would like to know a bit more about your opinion to German and Turkish media outlets. I please ask you to rate the following questions by the media outlet that you are most familiar with.

First, please think about German media (TV, radio, newspapers, online media) and their political reporting on German-Turkish relations. How would you describe such reporting?

Q17. fair or unfair
[9-point scale with −4, very unfair, and +4, very fair, 0 as the (neutral) midpoint]
Q18. biased or unbiased
[9-point scale with −4, very biased, and +4, very unbiased, 0 as the (neutral) midpoint]
Q19. tell the whole story or doesn’t tell the whole story
[9-point scale with −4, not at all telling the whole story, and +4, telling very much the whole story, 0 as the (neutral) midpoint]

Now, please think about Turkish mainstream media (TV, radio, newspapers, online media) and their political reporting on German-Turkish relations. How would you describe such reporting?
Q20. fair or unfair
[9-point scale with −4, very unfair, and +4, very fair, 0 as the (neutral) midpoint]
Q21. biased or unbiased
[9-point scale with −4, very biased, and +4, very unbiased, 0 as the (neutral) midpoint]
Q22. tell the whole story or doesn’t tell the whole story
[9-point scale with −4, not at all telling the whole story, and +4, telling very much the whole story, 0 as the (neutral) midpoint]

Q23. Who do you think reports more objectively on German-Turkish relations?
[German journalists – Turkish journalists - equally – neither side reports objectively - don’t know]

Recall/Manipulation Check

Now, please think back to the article you read earlier:

Q24. In which city did the opening ceremony of the new Ditib mosque happen?
   a) Paris
   b) Cologne
   c) Hamburg
   d) I can’t remember

Q25. And who was the author of the article?
   (a) A Turkish journalist
   (b) A German journalist
   (c) There was no journalist displayed
   (d) I can’t remember

Q26. And which news source did the article came from?
   a. It was a German news outlet
   b. It was a Turkish news outlet
   c. There was no news outlet visible
   d. I can’t remember

In-group identification

In today’s increasingly diverse and mobile society, more and more people feel they belong to more than one culture. We would like to ask you to include your cultural background in answering the following questions. In addition, we would like to point out again that there is no right or wrong in the answers and that all answers are completely anonymous.

Q27.
   1. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I keep German and Turkish cultures separate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I feel part of a combined culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I am conflicted between the German and Turkish ways of doing things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel like someone moving between two cultures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal/integration questions**

Thank you very much for staying with me so far. In the following are some last questions I would like to ask you:

**Q28.** How often do you normally welcome ethnic German friends or neighbours in your home?  
[never - rarely - occasionally - frequently - every day]

**Q29.** How often do you usually welcome Turkish originated friends or neighbours in your home?  
[never - rarely - occasionally - frequently - every day]

**Q30.** Some people regularly vote and participate in elections, and others do not because they don’t have the time or they weren’t allowed to vote. Did you have a chance to vote at the federal election in November 2017?  
1. Yes  
2. No  
3. I don’t know/don’t remember  
4. I am not allowed to vote

**Q31.** And did you vote for the Turkish Constitutional Referendum in 2017?  
1. Yes, I voted in favour of the referendum.  
2. No, I voted against the referendum.  
3. I didn’t vote.  
4. I am not allowed to vote.  
5. I don’t want to say.

**Q32.** Are you a member of a religious community? - And if so, to which of the world’s religions does this community count in the broadest sense?  
[Christianity - Islam - Buddhism - Judaism - Hinduism - Others - Not a member of a religious community]
Q33. What role does this religion play in your own life?

[7-point-Likert; not at all important (1) – very important (7) - Not a member of a religious community (8)]

De-briefing

Many thanks for your participation in this study. With your help, we can better understand what is affecting German-Turkish people in Germany today and what role media plays in their everyday life.

Please read the following paragraph carefully:
As communication scientists, we are interested in the effect of news sources on the perceived bias and credibility of a news article. The questionnaire you completed was part of an experiment where we tested how people would perceive a news article dependent on the source/author of the article. Every participant in this study has seen the same newspaper article but they were randomly assigned to be exposed to one of four different news outlet designs and journalists either a German mainstream media outlet with a German journalist, a German mainstream media outlet with a Turkish journalist, a Turkish media outlet or no author. All articles were constructed by the researchers for the purpose of this experiment, and were never published by a newspaper. Some of the facts and figures in the text are made up and the opinions expressed in it did not belong to the authors named. All the information we collected in this study is confidential, and there will be no way of identifying your responses in the data archive later. We are not focusing on individual responses; we want to look at the general patterns that emerge among larger groups of people. The data will only be used for scientific purposes and not be passed on to others. If you have any questions or concerns, you are welcome to contact me at the Department of Communication Science, University of Amsterdam: alice.claridge@student.uva.nl

Thank you very much!
Appendix B

Stimulus Material

STATE VISIT
Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and Federal President Steinmeier talk about German-Turkish relations

BERLIN - Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has been decorated with military honors at the official opening of his visit to Germany. After a seven-year break, Erdoğan was in Germany from 27th to 29th September to rebuild diplomatic relations.

Federal President Frank-Walter Steinmeier welcomed the Turkish president on Friday in front of the Bellevue Palace in Berlin and invited Erdoğan to a state banquet in the evening. Steinmeier announced in advance that he would also discuss issues with Erdoğan that have been disputed in the past, such as the promotion of the rule of law and freedom of the press: "During the Second World War, Germans found refuge in Turkey - today a worrying number of Turks are looking to take refuge here in Germany from the growing pressure on society in their homeland."

Erdoğan responded to Steinmeier's statement and demanded respect for the Turkish judiciary and in particular for the controversial extradition request for the journalist Can Dündar. According to Erdoğan, the former editor-in-chief of the government-critical newspaper “Cumhuriyet” is being passed around "On a silver platter" in Germany, even though a prison sentence awaited him in Turkey. He also said that "Hundreds or thousands of terrorists walk around free in Germany - shouldn’t we talk about that? Shouldn’t we say something about that?"

After the first meeting of the two statesmen on Saturday, the opening of the new central mosque took place in Cologne’s district Ehrenfeld. Erdoğan opened the facility, which serves as a church for the Turkish Islamic Union of the Institute of Religion (DİTİB). According to the city of Cologne, before Erdoğan's state visit, the DİTİB headquarters had presented an inadequate security concept for the opening of the central mosque. As a result, the authorities imposed strict conditions that severely restricted the number of invited guests and also prohibited an event taking place outside the mosque, which was to be attended by many thousands of Erdoğan supporters. Erdoğan's delegation criticised the decision stating, the president was “very disappointed” about the "lack of support" by the city.

Nevertheless, Erdoğan described his state visit to Germany as positive. "It was a successful visit," he said in his speech at the DİTİB Mosque in Cologne on Saturday afternoon. The next few months will show the impact of the talks on both the economic and diplomatic relations between Turkey and Germany.
Figure 3. German outlet with German journalist (Condition 1)

Figure 4. German outlet with Turkish journalist (Condition 2)

Figure 5. Turkish diaspora outlet (Condition 3)
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Topics List/ Interview Protocol Experts

Introduction:

- First of all thank you for taking part in this interview for my master’s thesis on opinions toward German and Turkish media by German-Turks. Since Turkey and Germany are politically closely interconnected and the German-Turkish community is the largest ethnic minority in Germany, this connection is very important and interesting to study.

- In order to make my investigation even more diverse and to allow opinions to be discussed in depth and not just to draw conclusions from statistical analysis, I conduct qualitative expert interviews next to my quantitative research. In this way, topics are addressed that can’t be asked in the questionnaire, and furthermore an even more diverse light can be shed on the topic.

- The interview will be anonymously incorporated into my work.

- One of the central concepts I will ask you about is the perception of media bias.

- Could you please make sure you have signed the consent form I sent you per email, where you formally agree to take part in this research project [sign form] If you have any questions about this, please don’t hesitate to ask them now.

- After a few very introductory questions, I’d like to show you a news article and see how you respond to it

Introductory Questions relevant to the topic:

1. Could you please state your name, age and gender?

2. Could you please tell me who in your family immigrated from Turkey to Germany—that is, how long your family has been living in Germany?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 1: Stimulus discussion</th>
<th>[showing the control group stimulus]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I were to show you this news article, would you please read it and tell me some reactions to it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction:</strong></td>
<td>I would now like to ask you a few questions about the article you’ve just read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Question:</strong></td>
<td>1. What are your reactions to this article? Does it seem to you that its portrayal of Turkey is fair? How about German-Turkish relations? Do you think they’d perceive it as biased, or relatively neutral?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Following Questions:</strong></td>
<td>2. If you had to guess, who or what sort of media outlet do you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: News article as a trigger of the perception of bias</td>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong>: The second topic concerns these kind of media articles in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Question</strong>:</td>
<td>1. What sort of news/media sources are the fairest, in your opinion, in terms of how they present German-Turkish relations/issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Following Questions</strong>:</td>
<td>2. Would you say that German mainstream media portrayals Turkey and German-Turkish matters in a biased way? If so, in what way – biased in favor of Turkey or against it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How about Turkish media, produced in Turkey—are they neutral toward German-Turkish relations, and Germany, or biased? And if biased, in what way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What about Turkish media produced for Turkish people who live outside Turkey? In my studies, we call this “diasporic” media. This media is supposed to deal with issues that are of specific interest for the members of diasporic communities. Do you use diasporic media? - How important do you think this sort of media is for your community? And what does it offer beyond what is available in other media sources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. How important do you see the role of the individual journalist in this matter, versus the news outlet/organization?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 3: Media choice as an indicator of trust</th>
<th><strong>Initial Question</strong>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. How much in general do you think the German-Turkish community can trust the media to cover German-Turkish relations fairly? Does that depend on the medium/source?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Following Questions</strong>:</td>
<td>2. For which matters do you find German mainstream media to be most trustworthy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. For which matters do you consider media that are aimed at a German-Turkish audience to be most trustworthy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Topic 4: In-group identification as an indicator of perception of bias | Initial Question:  
1. Do you feel that the German-Turkish community is represented correctly in the media?  
Following Questions:  
2. When you read news on German-Turkish matters, do you have a feeling of ‘us’ vs. ‘them’? |
| --- | --- |
| Topic 5: Integration as an indicator of perception of bias | Initial Question:  
1. Media plays an important role in our everyday's life and has a lot of influence on us. Earlier we already talked about diasporic media and what it contributes to the Turkish community. Do you see any objection to consume diasporic media?  
Following Question:  
2. Do you think diasporic media helps the German-Turkish community feel more tied together?  
3. Do you think it keeps German-Turks from feeling more integrated in German society, or does it help?  
4. How does German media play a role in that—does it prevent German-Turks from feeling at home here? |

Rounding Up Interview:  
Thank you for taking part in the interview and answering my questions  
1. Do you think we have covered everything regarding this topic?  
2. Is there anything you would like to add?  
3. Any last remarks?  

End of Interview (keep recording on for another few minutes for unplanned remarks from the interviewee)  

Probes for the Interview:  
1. Could you please repeat that?  
2. If possible could you elaborate on your answer?  
3. What do you mean by [insert answer]?  
4. Could you please expand on the point you just made?  
5. If the interviewee does not understand a term used by the interviewer, provide definition of the term.
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Qualitative Data

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of Interview Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Who immigrated to Germany? When?</th>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3rd generation</td>
<td>Grandparents, during the 60s</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18.12.2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3rd generation</td>
<td>Grandparents (parents were born in Turkey), during the 60s</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.12.2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>Parents, 20 years ago</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.12.2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3rd generation</td>
<td>Grandparents, during the 60s</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27.12.2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>Father, during the 70s (mother is German)</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30.12.2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Coding Scheme Interview 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretative Code</th>
<th>Descriptive Code</th>
<th>Transcribed Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Assessment of the article</td>
<td>I think rather fair. It is very neutral in my opinion. (II, l. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Assessment of the neutrality or bias of Turkish media towards the article</td>
<td>I would not say Turkish, because, no matter what, they would show which direction they support. (II, l. 17-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Opinion on Turkish media publications</td>
<td>I would be very surprised if a Turkish newspaper published it [the article]. (II, l. 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Influence of the source</td>
<td><em>I: How much do you think a news source affects a Turkish-originated reader?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>R: Quite, very strong. (II, l. 23-25)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Biased news processing of Turkish media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish media, which we also have at home, Turkish news usually come up with only half the truth. All that is hidden behind the other truth are the negative things and they are not addressed. ( (\text{II, l. } 25\text{-}28) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Distrust in media outlets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I generally don’t believe news. [...] Therefore I would not distinguish [between the German and Turkish media landscape]. ( (\text{II, l. } 31\text{-}34) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Distrust in neutrality of German media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think that even the German media... if they have an opinion they stick to this opinion in their reporting and they don’t question it. They also report very one-sided. ( (\text{II, l. } 38\text{-}40) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Turkish media landscape controlled by government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The entire publishers were all bought by Erdogan. Well, not all but most of them and those which haven’t been bought have no chance to survive because they get threatened by other fellow citizens and they have no financial means to survive. That's why they are very influenceable. ( (\text{II, l. } 44\text{-}47) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Media are driven by political agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In general, the press is always biased because it always has a political agenda. ( (\text{II, l. } 78\text{-}79) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Example of misrepresentation in German news</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: You have mentioned that all media are biased, what do you think is concealed or misrepresented by the German media? ( \text{R:} ) Maybe not concealed, but presented differently. As I said, the best example is this PKK. The Germans present them very neutral and they’re simply portrayed as a political party, but they are responsible for many deaths, including children's lives in Turkey. This is not shown in the German news. ( (\text{II, l. } 87\text{-}90) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Adaption to German society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can’t really place myself anywhere, I'm just human. ( (\text{II, l. } 95\text{-}97) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora Media</td>
<td>Diaspora media as alternative news source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t see any problems [using diasporic media], because if there are any elections, for example, you will be informed by the diasporic media and if you read German newspapers you won’t get any news [about that topic]. ( (\text{II, l. } 102\text{-}104) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Group identification</td>
<td>Personal attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When the Germans criticise Turkey, I don’t feel attacked. ( (\text{II, l. } 113) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception, Media Trust</td>
<td>Personal experience change opinion of Turkish media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have to admit that I also believed the Turkish media and Erdogan in everything he said until I was on vacation in Istanbul and witnessed the Gezi Park protests. [...] Even the news channels showed nothing of what happened there. [...] This was my awakening that it can’t be all right because I was there. I saw what happened. Sometimes you need such an experience to say: that's not true. [...] It actually sounds always very logical what he [Erdogan] says on television and that's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
why so many believe him. It sounds so logical. *(I2, l. 116-129)*

*Note. I = Interviewer; R = Respondent*

### Table 5

**Coding Scheme Interview 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretative Code</th>
<th>Descriptive Code</th>
<th>Transcribed Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Personal media usage</td>
<td>German and Turkish media say their own opinions and have their own views. When I come home I first look at the Turkish news and then the German. <em>(I2, l. 9-11)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Assessment of the article</td>
<td>So, partially, I think it's neutral. <em>(I2, l. 14)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Opinion on article source</td>
<td>*I: If you had to guess who or what media format published this article, what would you say? R: Rather a German newspaper. <em>(I2, l. 15-17)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Plausibility of Turkish source</td>
<td>*I: How do you think your opinion would change if I told you that the article came from a Turkish source? Would that influence your opinion? R: Not really, no. <em>(I2, l. 18-20)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>More trust in Turkish than in German media</td>
<td>I find the Turkish media formats better than listening to German media. If I listen to the German and then the Turkish versions of certain events, I think the Turkish already sounds different and then, of course, the question arises to what I believe. I think Turkish media report more diverse. <em>(I2, l. 23-26)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs, Media Trust</td>
<td>Conflicting view on the different media landscapes</td>
<td>*I: Do you feel that the Turkish community is well represented in the media? R: I don’t think so, because when you look at the Turkish media, they show something completely different. <em>(I2, l. 33-36)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. I = Interviewer; R = Respondent*
Table 6

Coding Scheme Interview 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretative Code</th>
<th>Descriptive Code</th>
<th>Transcribed Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Assessment of the article</td>
<td>So I think if you are rather uninformed on the subject, then it is an objective and informative text. If you look at it in more detail, then some of the phrasing in this text are indeed softened. <em>(I3, l. 10-12)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Media neutrality as questionable construct</td>
<td>But this is also a popular way of trying to appear unbiased through apparent objectivity, but this ‘neutrality’ is often not true. <em>(I3, l. 18-20)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Source influences opinion to article</td>
<td>Yes, definitely. Simply from the point that someone who is involved with Turkish relations or comes from Turkey would notice that it is written too mildly coming from a Turkish newspaper. The events would not have been expressed that way. <em>(I3, l. 26-29)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Perceived difference between well established and online media formats</td>
<td>In well-established German newspapers the information is presented most informatively. In social media networks, for example, news only cut certain aspects. <em>(I3, l. 40-41)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Media as a government-controlled entity</td>
<td>In Turkey, the media is even more in-line with the government than in Germany, I would say. Here [In Germany] you get the information from an objective pool of news agencies. But in Turkey, these possibilities don’t exist. For this reason, the newspaper industry is very limited. <em>(I3, l. 42-45)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group identification</td>
<td>Turks form diverse ethnic groups</td>
<td>The Turkish people must be divided into different ethnic groups, you can’t generalise Turkish originated people. <em>(I3, l. 51-53)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>The way Turkey presents news</td>
<td>That's interesting, Turkey has always had two press conferences. One is for the Turkish people. It is always very charged and stokes the concept of the enemy and then there is a second press conference, which is made for the international press. <em>(I3, l. 57-59)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Turkish government controls media outlets</td>
<td>By and large, the Turkish media are biased. 95% of the Turkish media are controlled by the government. <em>(I3, l. 62-64)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora media</td>
<td>Value of diasporic media for Turkish diaspora</td>
<td>Mostly it’s [diaspora media] more critical of the government and more objective. It has extraordinary value for the Turkish community. In recent years, this [diaspora media] has faded away a bit by Facebook and social media. (I3, \ l. \ 71-74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group identification</td>
<td>High in-group identification leads to a defensive attitude towards German criticism of Turkey.</td>
<td>Turkey's policy is definitely a very ambiguous topic in Germany. There is a large Pro-Turkey community who feel offended when Turkey is criticised by the media. (I3, \ l. \ 82-84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media trust</td>
<td>Duty of journalists to cover any news-worthy aspect</td>
<td>Serious human rights violations by a NATO partner are happening there, which someone who takes the journalism profession seriously should not conceal. (I3, \ l. \ 86-88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior belief</td>
<td>Germany’s agenda to report on Turkey</td>
<td>It is also a political tool for Germany, how they report about Turkey. (I3, \ l. \ 88-89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group identification</td>
<td>Representation of Turkish community in German media</td>
<td>If you refer to the collective, then no. It has to be pointed out that when someone speaks of people of Turkish origin, you speak of different ethnic groups. For example, the Kurds want to hear a critical tone about Erdoğan. (I3, \ l. \ 92-94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora media</td>
<td>Diaspora as promotion of parallel societies</td>
<td>Diaspora newspapers lead indeed a bit to enhancing parallel societies. Not that they arise because of diaspora media but that they are promoted by them. (I3, \ l. \ 99-102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Diaspora as obstacle of integration</td>
<td>Actually in a country where you want to integrate it’s not ideal. For example, the Turkish right-wing extremist group, the Gray Wolves, run very bad diaspora newspaper policies, calling for racism. (I3, \ l. \ 108-110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group identification</td>
<td>Turks form diverse ethnic groups</td>
<td>You try to find general statements in statistics but this is not possible with the Turkish policy. You can interview ten people and if you are unlucky, you interview ten people from ten different ethnic groups. (I3, \ l. \ 108-110)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. \(I = \) Interviewer; \(R = \) Respondent*
Table 7

Coding Scheme Interview 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretative Code</th>
<th>Descriptive Code</th>
<th>Transcribed Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Assessment of the article</td>
<td>[...] it’s not negative or exaggerated. It has a very slight negative touch, but not particularly. [...] It's not that I have the feeling that the author wants to portray the events in a particularly negative way. (I4, l. 15-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Differentiated between German and Turkish reporting style</td>
<td>I would say that this is a German author because, in my opinion, the Turkish coverage would look a bit different. It would be very glorious. It's all he [Erdogan] does and says everything is super and great. (I4, l. 21-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Influence of the news source</td>
<td>It affects them [the Turkish people] very much. I can tell you that if it actually came from a Turkish source ... the people of Turkish origin are always very emotional and if that was written by a compatriot, they always consider it very different. If a German writes that, then it's more like, he wants to harm and downgrade us. (I4, l. 30-34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Media bias in general</td>
<td>[...] as for the news, they are totally manipulated and influenced. There is hardly a neutral opinion. [...] What is still the most neutral source in my opinion are the newspapers. (I4, l. 38-43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Ways of propaganda in Germany</td>
<td>There are also several radio stations [Turkish] which are also very propagandistic and I won’t even start with the mosques. That’s why I don’t go to the mosque. Unfortunately, there is a lot of politics going on there. (I4, l. 39-42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs, In-group identification</td>
<td>Presentation of Turkey in German media</td>
<td>So I would say the country is sometimes presented very cliché-like and thus gets a negative touch. I think it doesn’t do justice to either side and you generalise very fast. Usually rather unfavourable than unfavourable. (I4, l. 47-50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Turkey’s handling with German affairs</td>
<td>That’s thoroughly subjective. It’s always polarised. When things are going well everything is great and when things are going badly, Germany is ‘boo’. (I4, l. 54-55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora media</td>
<td>Parallel media landscapes</td>
<td>At home we watch Turkish channels and the European versions [of the channel]. The news come</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at the same time and it’s the same person who speaks the news, but it’s a different reporting, sometime it has nothing to do with each other. You see two different perspectives. Which is propagated in the country [in Turkey] and which is propagated in Europe. (*I4, l. 61-66*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior beliefs</th>
<th>Factors of media coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So in the first place, the medium is only the instrument. Of course, it depends on several factors. Primarily it depends on the people and how they want to perceive and represent the matter itself. And whether they want to achieve a goal, whether they want to influence a mass. (<em>I4, l. 74-77</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-group identification</th>
<th>Assessment of correct representation in German media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t because a lot of knowledge is missing. You need a lot of background knowledge to report correctly and because they [journalists] don’t want to get involved which often leads to clichés. (<em>I4, l. 82-84</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diaspora Media, In-group identification</th>
<th>Diasporic media as supporter for a stronger community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a negative sense, it certainly helps, in a positive sense less momentarily. Rather, that people live here but say - Ah, we have someone [Erdogan] over there who represents us. I have relatives in Cologne, who were at the opening of the mosque in Cologne and apparently it has been absurd the things he said. (<em>I4, l. 87-90</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Coding Scheme Interview 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretative Code</th>
<th>Descriptive Code</th>
<th>Transcribed Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Assessment of the article</td>
<td>I think the article was relatively neutral and factual. (<em>I5, l. 4</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>Criticism of the author</td>
<td>[...] I noticed that there is a passage in which Erdogan is upset about the treatment of Can Dündal and that this statement is unchallenged by the journalist. [...] say that Dündal is a terrorist and that thousands of terrorists still live in Germany. This is of course a correct quote from Erdogan but the journalist could have commented on this and should have gone into the definition of terrorism in Turkey, where all those who oppose the government can somehow be defined as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Opinion on Turkish media publications</td>
<td>I would not believe if you said the article came from an AKP-related newspaper. [...] 95% of all newspapers are in the hands of the AKP and AKP media holdings. <em>(I5, l. 17-21)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception</td>
<td>News source influences the perception of the article</td>
<td>My opinion would change depending on which source the article comes from. <em>(I5, l. 21-22)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior beliefs</td>
<td>Turkey’s centralised media system</td>
<td>There is indeed a very polarised media landscape, although polarised would require that two poles are about equally strong. Actually, there is a very centralised media system. It’s centered around Erdogan, the AKP and the government - there are only a few niche news channels that are trying to report critically, oppositional or even just a bit more neutral than the pro-government media. <em>(I5, l. 23-28)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias perception, Media trust</td>
<td>The point when German media changed their way of reporting about Turkey</td>
<td>I’ve always talked about a so-called turn. Until 2013/2014, the German mainstream media reported very positively. Turkey as a glimmer of hope in the Middle East, as a liberal or gentle Islam, which on the one hand satisfies the Islamic demand of the local population, but on the other hand satisfies the Western and imperialist interests [...]. From this point of view, the reporting was always very positive about the ‘reformer’ Erdogan. The whole thing then, although there have been critics before, not only me, but much more important voices, that said that what happened there is the building of a dictatorship, but these voices got lost in the media. It was not until the Gezi protests and the brutal reaction of the state that some saw that what was celebrated as a liberal project was only a mask [...]. <em>(I5, l. 45-57)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora media, In-group identification</td>
<td>German-Turkish journalists giving a new perspective to Turkish events</td>
<td>Meanwhile, there is a very differentiated reporting, which is also related to the fact that for 4-6 years now more and more Turkish journalists have managed to work in German mainstream media. Denniz Yüzel, Özlem Topçu and so on ... And of course, they have a more differentiated picture and can better categorise events happening in Turkey. <em>(I5, l. 45-57)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Diaspora media | Assessment of the | I believe that these media are no longer important,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Importance of Diaspora Media</th>
<th>Because the Turkish people who live here in Germany consume a media mix and these purely diasporic media actually don’t matter in my Turkish-speaking environment. [...] That may have been different in the 70s and 80s, but not anymore. (I5, l. 68-75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora Media</td>
<td>Germany as a platform for media banned in Turkey</td>
<td>Kurdish-speaking media, which can’t be published in Turkey due to the ban policy are published in Germany. They play a role. (I5, l. 71-73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group Identification</td>
<td>The representation of Turkish originated people in the German media</td>
<td>Of course, there are still relatively one-sided reports and racist articles [...] then they wrote about the “Dönermorde” and clans and mafia structures [...] This structural racism was given in the media and was never critically questioned except maybe in the TAZ [...] however, the entry of Turkish-speaking voices [into the German media] has become better. (I5, l. 78-86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group Identification</td>
<td>No strong in-group attachment</td>
<td>No, I don’t feel like us versus them, but also because I do not define myself as being Turkish, but have multiple identities [...]. (I5, l. 89-91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora Media</td>
<td>Diaspora media as enrichment instead of delimitation</td>
<td>No, I don’t think so, because, keyword media mix, diaspora media are no longer used exclusively, but they are an addition which pick up migrant and Turkish-based perspectives, but for me this is not delimiting, but something positive complementary. (I5, l. 96-99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. I = Interviewer; R = Respondent*