Appendix: The Use of the Abuse Policy Narrative in Asylum Debates and its Effects on Citizens' Opinion Formation

David Kaufmann [a]* and Laurent Bernhard [b]

[a] ETH Zürich, Switzerland

kadavid@ethz.ch

ORCID: 0000-0002-4185-4550

[b] Research Observatory for Regional Politics (OVPR), Institute of Political Studies, University of Lausanne, Switzerland and Centre for Democracy Studies Aarau (ZDA), Department of Political Science, University of Zurich, Switzerland

laurent.bernhard@zda.uzh.ch

ORCID: 0000-0002-5910-2859

* Corresponding Author

Table A1: List of Organizations by Political Orientation

Political Orientation	Actor Type	2006	2013	2016
Radical left	Political party	Communists Greens Solidarity Young Socialists	Young Socialists	Basel Alternatives Solidarity Young Socialists
	State actor			
	Interest group/ Nongovernmental organizations	Solidarity without frontiers	Living together Swiss Workers' Aid Group for a Switzerland without an army	
	Committee	Comedia		
Moderate left	Political party	Social Democrats	Evangelicals Greens Social Democrats Young Greens	Evangelicals Greens Social Democrats
	State actor			Cantonal social directors
	Interest group/ Nongovernmental organizations	AGORA Charity of the Protestant Churches of Switzerland Christians and Jews for the freedom to aid Collective of irregulars Evangelical church of Zurich Forum for the integration of migrants Politakt Swiss Aid for Refugees Swiss Federation of Trade Unions Unia	Democratic Lawyers Evangelical Social Center Solidarity with frontiers Unia	Caritas Charity of the Protestant Churches of Switzerland Federation of Evangelical Churches Solidarity without frontiers Swiss Worker's Aid Swiss Aid for Refugees Unia
	Committee	Committee 2xNo Cultural workers against the asylum law Stop exclusion	Stop exclusion	Appeal for the maintenance of the right of asylum Stop exclusion
Center	Political party	Christian Democrats Christian Democrats of the anton of Geneva Christian Democrats of the canton of Vaud Evangelicals	Christian Democrats Green Liberals	Green Liberals
	State actor	Federal Office for Migration	Federal Office for Migration Federal Justice and Police Department	Federal Justice and Police Department State Secretariat for Migration
	Interest group/ Nongovernmental organizations	Amnesty International Charity of Swiss Jews Federation of Evangelical Churches Swiss Bishop's Conference	AGORA Amnesty international Caritas Charity of the Protestant Churches of Switzerland Justice and Peace Federation of Evangelical Churches	Amnesty International Justice and Peace Operation Libero Swiss Association of Cities
	Committee	Coalition for a Humanitarian Switzerland		

		Right-wing committee against the asylum law		
Moderate right	Political party	Free Democrats Free Democrats of the canton of Geneva Liberals Geneva Citizens' Movement	Conservative Democrats Free Democrats	Christian Democrats Conservative Democrats Free Democrats Swiss Democrats
	State actor	Federal Justice and Police Department	Cantonal Directors of Justice and Police	Cantonal Directors of Justice and Police
	Interest group/ Nongovernmental organizations	Young4fun.ch	Young4fun.ch	Swiss Homeowner Association
	Committee			
Radical right	Political party	Evangelical Fundamentalists Freedom Party Swiss People's Party	Swiss People's Party Young Swiss People's Party	Swiss People's Party
	State actor			
	Interest group/ Nongovernmental organizations	Campaign for an independent and neutral Switzerland Small Business Association	PIKOM Pro Libertate	Security for all
	Committee			

Table A2: List of Narratives and Messages by Referendums

Order	2006	2013	2016
#1	Abuses in the asylum system must be combated.	Abuses in the asylum system must be combated.	Asylum procedures must be accelerated.
#2	Switzerland's humanitarian tradition must be maintained.	Switzerland's humanitarian tradition must be maintained.	Asylum seekers should not have access to free lawyers.
#3	Asylum policy needs more efficient enforcement.	Asylum policy needs more efficient enforcement.	The test operation in Zurich has proven to be successful.
#4	The fundamental rights of asylum seekers must be protected.	The fundamental rights of asylum seekers must be protected.	Expropriate is not acceptable under any circumstances.
#5	There are already too many foreigners in Switzerland.	There are already too many foreigners in Switzerland.	The fundamental rights of asylum seekers must be protected.
#6	A tougher approach to tackling asylum problems is ineffective.	A tougher approach to tackling asylum problems is ineffective.	The number of asylum applications must be reduced.
#7	Foreigners contribute to the social and cultural quality of Switzerland.	Foreigners contribute to the social and cultural quality of Switzerland.	Federal authorities must be granted more room to maneuver.
#8	Social benefits for asylum seekers are too generous.	The number of asylum applications must be reduced.	Abuses in the asylum system must be combated.
#9	Switzerland is too attractive for asylum seekers.	Switzerland is too attractive for asylum seekers.	The integration of asylum seekers must begin earlier.
#10	International law and international agreements must be observed.	International law and international agreements must be observed.	Switzerland is too attractive for asylum seekers.
#11	The fatherland is in danger because of the asylum seekers.	The widespread distrust of asylum seekers must be put to an end.	Tougher action to tackle the problems of asylum is ineffective.
#12	The shifting of asylum costs to cities must be prevented.	Federal authorities must be granted more room to maneuver.	Costs in the field of asylum must be reduced.
#13	-	-	The 2012 urgent measures must be reversed.

Table A3: Robustness Tests for the Meso Level Analysis

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Tightening proposition (2006 referendum)	0.620[*] (2.16)	1.080[*] (2.18)	0.594[*] (2.10)	0.606[*] (2.14)	0.610[*] (2.13)
Streamlining proposition (2013 referendum)	-0.876[**] (-2.66)	-1.623[**] (-2.66)	-0.879[**] (-2.71)	-0.885[**] (-2.72)	-0.866[**] (-2.64)
Left-right scale (0-10)	0.256[***] (4.07)	0.412[***] (3.55)	0.252[***] (4.08)	0.250[***] (4.05)	0.258[***] (4.10)
Reformers	1.201[***] (3.53)	2.236[***] (3.48)	1.311[***] (4.21)	1.291[***] (4.11)	1.223[***] (3.63)
Party	0.398 (1.47)	0.628 (1.35)			0.378 (1.41)
Committee	-0.392 (-0.78)	-0.541 (-0.59)			-0.436 (-0.89)
State actor	-0.055 (-0.12)	-0.163 (-0.21)			-0.056 (-0.13)
French-speaking part	-0.199 (-0.55)	-0.324 (-0.53)		-0.175 (-0.50)	
Cut 1	0.611 (1.85)	0.985 (1.73)	0.582 (1.89)	0.543 (1.71)	0.645[*] (1.99)
Cut 2	2.681[***] (6.35)	4.529[***] (5.91)	2.568[***] (6.64)	2.531[***] (6.43)	2.713[***] (6.48)
Cut 3	3.679[***] (7.23)	6.251[***] (6.69)	3.559[***] (7.44)	3.520[***] (7.27)	3.712[***] (7.34)
N	104	104	104	104	104
Pseudo R^2	0.287	0.280	0.270	0.271	0.285

[*] p<0.05 [**] p<0.01 [***] p<0.001; z-values in brackets.
Reference categories: Balanced proposition (2013 referendum), status quo organization (for camp affiliation), and interest groups (for actor types).

Model 1 in Table A3 refers to the standard model (as published in Table 1), Model 2 to the standard model with order logit estimation, Model 3 to the standard model without the insignificant control variables, Model 4 to the standard model without actor types, and Model 5 to the standard model without language region affiliation.

Table A4: Descriptive Statistics of Elite Actors Surveys

Variable	Mean	S.d.	Min.	Max.	N
Abuse policy narrative	1.13	0.92	0	3	105
Tightening proposition	0.42	0.50	0	1	106
Balanced proposition	0.29	0.46	0	1	106
Streamlining proposition	0.29	0.46	0	1	106
Left-right scale	4.30	2.40	0	10	105
Interest group	0.46	0.50	0	1	106
Party	0.37	0.48	0	1	106
Committee	0.08	0.27	0	1	106
State actor	0.09	0.29	0	1	106
French-speaking part	0.15	0.36	0	1	106
Supporter	0.45	0.50	0	1	106

Table A5: Descriptive Statistics of Citizens' Opinion Formation (VOX Analyses)

Variable	Mean	S.d.	Min.	Max.	N
Abuse policy narrative	0.07	0.36	0	1	2369
Tightening proposition	0.23	0.42	0	1	2369
Balanced proposition	0.35	0.48	0	1	2369
Streamlining proposition	0.42	0.49	0	1	2369
Left-right scale	4.95	2.22	0	10	2214
Woman	0.51	0.50	0	1	2369
Age	55.0	16.6	18	94	2369
Education level	2.58	0.59	1	3	2369
German-speaking part	0.76	0.43	0	1	2369
French-speaking part	0.20	0.40	0	1	2369
Italian-speaking part	0.04	0.19	0	1	2369
Supporter	0.72	0.45	0	1	2369

Table A6: Robustness Tests for the First Model of the Micro Level Analysis

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Tightening proposition	0.910***	1.641***	0.906***	0.892***	0.909***
(2006 referendum)	(8.72)	(8.40)	(8.71)	(8.74)	(8.70)
Streamlining proposition	-0.812***	-1.874***	-0.806***	-0.822***	-0.810***
(2016 referendum)	(-5.33)	(-5.09)	(-5.28)	(-5.33)	(-5.34)
Left-right scale (0-10)	0.043$^{(*)}$	0.064	0.042	0.052*	0.043$^{(*)}$
	(1.67)	(1.30)	(1.64)	(2.01)	(1.66)
Reformers	0.990***	2.029***	0.977***	0.979***	0.985***
	(6.11)	(6.44)	(6.02)	(5.92)	(6.14)
Woman	0.0527	0.063			0.053
	(0.56)	(0.35)			(0.57)
Age	0.006*	0.008	0.006*		0.006*
	(2.12)	(1.57)	(2.12)		(2.12)
Education level	-0.187*	-0.311*	-0.196*		-0.188*
	(-2.34)	(-2.08)	(-2.52)		(-2.37)
French-speaking part	0.080	0.146		0.088	
	(0.73)	(0.70)		(0.80)	
Italian-speaking part	-0.180	-0.375		-0.192	
	(-0.87)	(-0.84)		(-0.99)	
Constant	-2.428***	-4.352***	-2.350***	-2.583***	-2.409***
	(-7.39)	(-6.92)	(-7.78)	(-15.28)	(-7.44)
N	2214	2214	2214	2214	2214
Pseudo R^2	0.242	0.242	0.241	0.232	0.241

$^{(*)}$ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001; z-values in brackets.
Reference categories: Balanced proposition (2013 referendum) and inhabitants of German-speaking part (for language regions).

Model 1 in Table A6 refers to the standard model (first model of Table 2), Model 2 to the standard model with logit estimation, Model 3 to the standard model without the insignificant control variables, Model 4 to the standard model without socio-economic control variables (gender, age, and education), and Model 5 to the standard model without language region affiliation.

Table A7: Robustness Tests for the Second Model of the Micro Level Analysis

	Model 1 (Standard)	Model 2 (Logit)	Model 3 (w/o INS)	Model 4 (w/o SES)	Model 5 (w/o F&I)
Tightening proposition (2006 referendum)	0.900*** (8.61)	1.621*** (8.29)	0.896*** (8.60)	0.886*** (8.65)	0.900*** (8.59)
Streamlining proposition (2016 referendum)	-0.799*** (-5.23)	-1.840*** (-4.99)	-0.792*** (-5.18)	-0.807*** (-5.23)	-0.796*** (-5.24)
Center	0.362** (2.73)	0.661* (2.49)	0.353** (2.65)	0.442*** (3.41)	0.352** (2.65)
Right	0.341* (2.57)	0.604* (2.28)	0.333* (2.54)	0.388** (2.91)	0.339* (2.55)
Reformers	0.928*** (5.74)	1.888*** (5.99)	0.916*** (5.66)	0.911*** (5.54)	0.924*** (5.77)
Woman	0.050 (0.54)	0.066 (0.37)			0.051 (0.55)
Age	0.005$^{(*)}$ (1.79)	0.006 (1.23)	0.005$^{(*)}$ (1.80)		0.005$^{(*)}$ (1.81)
Education level	-0.173* (-2.12)	-0.280$^{(*)}$ (-1.85)	-0.182* (-2.28)		-0.175* (-2.15)
French-speaking part	0.087 (0.79)	0.162 (0.77)		0.096 (0.87)	
Italian-speaking part	-0.209 (-1.00)	-0.427 (-0.96)		-0.231 (-1.16)	
Constant	-2.398*** (-7.23)	-4.364*** (-6.99)	-2.324*** (-7.55)	-2.564*** (-15.97)	-2.378*** (-7.30)
N	2214	2214	2214	2214	2214
Pseudo R^2	0.247	0.246	0.246	0.238	0.246

$^{(*)}$ $p<0.10$ * $p<0.05$ ** $p<0.01$ *** $p<0.001$; z-values in brackets.
Reference categories: Balanced proposition (2013 referendum), inhabitants of German-speaking part (for language regions), and leftist voters.

Model 1 in Table A7 refers to the standard model (second model of Table 2), Model 2 to the standard model with logit estimation, Model 3 to the standard model without the insignificant control variables, Model 4 to the standard model without socio-economic control variables (gender, age, and education), and Model 5 to the standard model without language region affiliation.