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Abstract.

According to Zaller political awareness means “the extent to which an individual pays attention to politics and understands what he or she has encountered” (Zaller 1992, 21). To elaborate, awareness reflects “intellectual or cognitive engagement with public affairs” (ibid.), as indicated by factual information about government and politics that has gotten into people’s minds. Political awareness operates in the political information exchange between the individual and various sources of political messages communicated in the public space. It is commonly understood as an important asset, which determines people’s engagement with politics and how political awareness might be a key asset, which determines participation and active citizenship. Although there is some degree of consensus, over how we should understand political awareness, there is a variety of conceptualizations of political awareness. Above all there are is an even greater variety in what cognitive information and other preconditions the political aware make use in analysis of information and participation decisions. There are questions of the role of political values; standards which makes people prefer certain policies, persons outcomes or ideologies, equality, freedom, respect, tolerance etc., the role of emotions; contempt, indignation, liking, pride, envy or admiration all influences rationality and other important issues operating as preconditions in the politically aware. This paper aim at developing a conceptual understanding and, how the concept might be measured in surveys. At the end we put some tasks to be considered for discussion.

Introduction.

Why study political awareness among young people? Because political awareness seems to be a key asset in citizens selection of information and orientation toward political issues and possibly toward political participation. With a point of departure in the Scandinavian context, it is of importance to gain deepened insights into how young people are attentive to, gain knowledge and understanding of the political world surrounding them. It is also important what skills they use, as well as what mechanisms that are actualised in the construction of political awareness of this world.

Out of this depiction, the study of political awareness among youth is one way to find linkages between context specific traits, the conditions and the very modes in which young people
perceive and explain what is going on in their political world. What is at stake, is to find points of convergence between young people’s political orientation and the political life and structures at hand in the institutional framework that is constituting representative democracy. Particularly revealing the role of political awareness is of special interest to education, as it constitutes the primary institution for political socialisation. Education plays a vital role in transmission and reproduction of political perception and explanation of politics necessary for a contextually sensitive formation of modes of localizing political rules and action taking in Scandinavian social liberal democracy.

With such a point of departure, studying political awareness of Scandinavian youth is one way of deconsolidating representative democracy. Such studies may feed reflectionss about the institutional implications of such deconsolidation, where questions about the role and function of education as a vibrant political socialisation agent can be pulled forth. It may also lead to recommendations for how this agency can be further qualified, in order to promote the development of political socialisation in a context sensitive way.

Out of an overview of existing research in the field, this study corresponds to a detected need for deepened knowledge about the very sources and mechanisms involved in young (Scandinavian) people’s development of political awareness. The articles aims at providing a conceptual framework of political awareness and suggest and discuss the measurement of and depicting the ‘reads’ of politics among young people in the Scandinavian context.

**What is political awareness (PA)?**

In order to provide a qualified conceptual framework of political awareness [PA], the concept itself calls for a definition. According to Zaller, PA is understood as “the extent to which an individual pays attention to politics and understands what he or she has encountered” (1992, 21). Here, political awareness denotes intellectual or cognitive engagement with public affairs as standing more or less against emotional or affective engagement, or no engagement at all.

Quite a few scholars builds on Zallers definition, but one of them is Paul Goren, who states that political awareness denoted intellectual or cognitive engagement with public affairs, as an
involvement that is indicated by factual information about government that has gotten into people’s minds” (Goren 2012, 509)

Political awareness, defined as knowledge about political events, campaigns, parties, elections, and salient issues, is the simplest measure of political sophistication (Berinsky 2006; Converse 2000). It also indicates the propensity to participate politically, because without political awareness, effective civic participation is unlikely to occur in the first place (Galston 2004; (Abdo-Katsipis 2017).

Lange (2005 and 2006) discusses ‘Politik Bevusstsein’, i.e. PA, as alertness, openness, having a vision, ability or being factual, critical, transparent and ‘Vernünftigkeit’, i.a. reasonable. Abilities to cognitively orient in politics and social affairs (society), but also ‘Partizipationsbereitschaft’, willingness to participate, is important. This approach to PA is normatively considered as being a ‘correct’ understanding of PA. Lange goes on to develop PA as a concept within subject didactics of politics.

Building on Giesecke (1973) and Grammes (1998) they characterize PA as the totality of imaginations that humans have of the political world including the political processes, and as such includes the concept of political preparedness (Bereits Begrif) (see Lange 2006, 35). This should be understood as a mental model of subjective meanings, concepts and modes of reasoning (Denk-Figuren) like for example the use of hermeneutics and theories of politics. (ibid 35). Political awareness may find some commonality among individuals that are part of a group, and as such contribute to a political culture within a group. In this depiction of PA, it provides meaning and focuses matters of importance ‘back’ to the individual. Lange (2006) uses a ‘mental model’ as a concept for perception, selection and understanding of the political world. Such mental models, rooted in cognitive psychology, may serve as an inner map for a more fully fledged orientation and understanding of the political field, as well as a basis for young people’s political action like voting or other forms of participation (Lange 2006). Humans themselves may not be explicitly aware that they in fact develop a mental model. Here we build on the assumption that humans have a drive for understanding and relating to their social and political environment as part of their self-determination Deci & Ryan, (2000). In this process, they need to decompose and give meaning to social and political events and through this need.
Following Lange (2005 & 2006), PA (Politik Bewusstsein) has relevance beyond ‘public opinion’ research. It should be seen as a mental model constantly changing according to information. The model plays a role in any processing of political information whether it is about taking the decision to pay attention to information, to understand the information or decide to take some form of action. Such a mental model is to be seen as a personal combination of factual information, and criteria for attention, strategies for understanding and the processing of information. Being a personally held model, it may be different from realities (like any model), but we argue that the model might be an effective tool for an understanding of personal decision making on what to do in a certain context, at a particular time. The combines political facts, values, attitudes, heuristics and emotions and may therefore be used as a tool for thinking and taking action in political stances (Lange 2005).

Similarly, Lange points out that we may speak of awareness of other similar concepts like ‘democracy awareness’ or ‘Demokratibewusstsein’ and this is closely affiliated with political awareness (Lange, 2005). As regards political awareness, in relation to other forms of awareness, it may be understood as patterns of thought, which in turn are reductions of the political and systemic complexity, complexity that in the Scandinavian context stands out as democracy. Politics may be understood either in a narrow sense as institutionalized formal politics or more comprehensively in terms of everyday informal political discussions, action taking and events. Democratic awareness has its focus on politics which may affect a democratic, versus an authoritarian tradition and may be significant as current politics often touches upon democratic versus authoritarian aspects of procedures and decisions in our political system.

Democratic awareness denotes a community of citizens who are socially aware and have a certain trust in the political system. A democratic, competent citizen is thus someone who participates in democratic processes, in order to take part in the transformation of individual wishes into collective wills. May this process be related to either explicitly democratic systems or authoritarian ones; the democratic awareness addresses, in this perspective, an awareness that is particularly and typically preoccupied with procedures and decisions, rather than any substantial notion or labelling of the system itself.
RAS – receive accept and sample model.

The significance of PA become clearer when PA is relatet do the Receive-Accept-Sample (RAS) model, which stresses people’s opinion formation, and is one version of what might be called awareness-interaction models related to political judgment (Zaller, 1992). According to this model, higher scores of political awareness demarcates that the individual to increasing level is apt to link her or his personal predispositions as concerns certain policies, candidates, or political parties.

In the RAS model of awareness-interaction, people’s default option is to accept information that they receive unless it conflicts with their own political predispositions. Political predispositions, in turn, are defined as ‘stable, individual-level traits that regulate the acceptance or non-acceptance of political communications the person receives’ (Zaller 1992, 22). Political preconditions that inform political awareness are:

- Political cognitive information
- Political values such as equality, freedom, respect, tolerance etcetera.
- Standards which make people prefer certain policies, persons outcomes or ideologies such as liberalism, socialism etc.
- Emotions which inform rationality like; contempt, indignation, liking, pride, envy or admiration.

We see the aforementioned mental model a way of understanding how the elements in the preconditions are integrated and operates cognitively in people’s minds. Following this, we may say that according to the interactionist RAS model, people choose to select, observe and seek to match the political information to their previous experiences of politics in formal and informal scopes. People’s knowledge, opinions, values, emotions and ways of reasoning over politics plays a vital role for the selection and processing of information offered through media.

Taken together, the RAS model states that, compared to politically unaware individuals and groups, the ones who are deeply engaged with public affairs are more likely to encounter persuasive messages in political elite discourses. These people are also more likely to possess
the background knowledge necessary to accept or reject messages in light of their own already established predispositions; and, consequently, are more likely to deduce opinions that are consistent with their underlying predispositions. Put simply, politically aware individuals is able to make heavy use of their predispositions, while the unaware are not.

The role of political awareness in (young) people’s lives

First and foremost, PA is assumed to play a role in elections and in forming public opinion (Zaller 1992). Public opinion limited to election and party choice is for instance the framework for research on how PA mediates campaign effects (Claassen, 2011a),(Claassen, 2011b). However, public opinion is here not limited to election and campaigns but to any opinion on political issues that may be public. We argue that PA plays a role in more or less in any political issue or situation. To mention but a few, more or less remote political issues where PA is in question. , such as – as shown in the article by Ekpenyong (2013) - people’s preoccupation with the normative wish for increased political awareness in African politics. And further, in awareness of issues like how the court system works (Aydin Çakır & Şekercioğlu 2016), as well as the various ways in which PA is related with media feeds (Pasek, Kenski, Romer, & Jamieson, 2006). Furthermore PA is used strategically to promote group interest (Waddington, 2017).

The dimensionality of political awareness

In our model of political awareness, we assume that political awareness has three necessary components. The first component is political attentiveness, which refers to cognitive attention and recognition of political objects. Politically aware people will somehow pay attention to certain aspects of politics when encountering sources of information from their social or media environment, observe it and when it’s considered relevant, ‘update’ existing information or adjust the information to previous understanding or schemata. A-political people means that these people block out (as best as they can) political information as irrelevant to their life. The attentiveness is of utmost importance because the politically aware person will gather relevant new information regularly and gradually understand the perceived relevant fields of politics better, and are therefore depicted as more able to pursue their interest while less aware individuals and groups are not to the same extent. We therefore regard attentiveness as a key aspect of political awareness.
The second component in our model of PA is *political knowledge*. When individuals pay attention to politics, they receive information about political objects, which create knowledge about the objects. Some of the information is factually correct, whereas other information is factually incorrect. As a concept, political knowledge refers to the first cluster of information; in which extent individuals have factually correct information about political objects. The third component of PA is *political understanding*, which occurs when individuals cognitively identify how the different elements that they have knowledge about are related to each other.

Nonetheless, knowledge about the objects themselves is not sufficient in order to have a political understanding. The reason for this is that the knowledge might be fragmented; we may have knowledge about the parts, but lack at the same time cognition about how these objects, or parts, are related to each other or structured. Understanding about politics emerges, we argue, when individuals have the capability to relate different parts into cognitive configurations. For example, when we understand how different events create a process that results in a particular outcome. In sum, in order to be political aware, individuals need all three of the necessary components: attentiveness knowledge and understanding which is integrated in their mental model about politics.

To summarize, as all political orientations that people inhabit or create, political awareness have two dimensions. The first dimension is a psychological one, which in our model covers the three cognitive components of PA: political attentiveness, political knowledge, and political understanding. The second dimension concerns the objects or parts that individuals have orientations toward. Out of this, we may say that political awareness is psychological to its character, as it concerns *cognitive* notions of people’s awareness, and that it centres on the relationship between individuals and political objects.

The political objects may, in turn, be divided into subgroups of objects, see (Almond & Verba, 1963). Our model of political awareness may take as point of departure individuals’ cognitive orientations towards five groups of political objects: political structures, political processes, political actors, political cleavages/issues, and political roles. *Political structures* refers to basic relations within the political system. One of these structures is the political regime consisting of values, norms and institutions that constrain the actions and interactions of political actors.
Political processes are sequences of interactions that result in different political functions or political outputs. Government formation after elections in democracies, or decision-making that converts political demands into decision, are examples of political processes. Political actors are the actors that through their interactions create political processes. This group of objects includes hence actors like political parties, political leaders, organizations, media and citizens. Political cleavages refers to the different political conflicts that characterize and very structure of political life and the relations between actors. Awareness of these cleavages is indispensable, we argue, in order to understand the behavior of actors and to orient oneself toward political alternatives. Political roles denotes the different positions actors take within political structures and political processes. These roles are connected with different expectations of behavior, which the actors taking the roles are expected to perform. One significant set of roles are the roles of citizens and their norms in the political system. In the literature about civic culture, the studies assume that citizens can take passive or active roles in the political system (references).

Table 1: Summary of dimensions and aspects of political awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objects of political awareness</th>
<th>Components of political awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Attentiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political structures</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political cleavages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We propose that political awareness consists of two dimensions in our model above; one horizontal which have three aspects, and one vertical which have six aspects (and may have more). The horizontal dimension refers to three different cognitive components, i.e. qualities,
of individuals involved in our operationalized concept of PA. The three aspects represent three distinguished qualitative levels of political awareness.

All three aspects may vary from very high to very low consciousness/attentiveness. The other, vertical dimension of PA refers to the complexity involved in the three different aspects of political awareness. For example, some individuals may be highly aware of some specific political objects or groups of objects, while other individuals have a little awareness of several objects or different groups of objects. This two-dimensional structure of our model of PA implies, that becoming political aware is about developing cognitive abilities about political objects. Individuals develop political awareness through their varying opportunities for information and develop understanding of politics. Political issues, is an essential part in PA as most people are engaged in one or more of them. Political issues demarcates the ‘fact’ that new political objects emerge over time, which opens up for individuals’ possibility to develop political awareness through these emerging objects. A last but vibrant part in political awareness, is to develop an understanding about the varying relations between political objects in different subgroups. For example, to what extent individuals are attentive to, know about and understand how political parties (actors) act in government formation (process).

Measuring political awareness

Like many concepts, political awareness is rather broad and may cover a variety of relevant aspects. According to Zaller, ‘scholars have also used several different types of questions to operationalize what I am calling political awareness. These include media exposure, political participation, education, and self-described interest in politics. Zaller states that cognitive items political awareness is, for both theoretical and empirical reasons, best measured by simple tests of neutral factual information about politics’ (Zaller 1992, 21).

However, to be able to measure political awareness across nations, contexts and cultures do require extensive testing and construction of knowledge items of equal difficulty and comparability. Despite criticisms we suggest self-assessment items.

One of the criticisms about self-assessment of knowledge is that the items are often too general and thereby cover a too large field of knowledge in order to say something substantial
about anything (Bartle, 2000). However, in the context of cross-country comparison it is very difficult to avoid using self-assessment items in order to provide comparable measures. In response to this criticism, we therefore suggest an attempt to construct self-assessment items from relevant subfields like political system knowledge, knowledge of political cleavages and important political issues which are somewhat more context sensitive and in that sense more specific. These fields should be cross country comparable and also reflect some political information and awareness. Samples are ‘political parties’, what political parties stand for or party leaders, system knowledge like constitutional questions on election and or separation of power, local administration. A task is therefore to find relevant fields of self-assessment of system knowledge and possibly to develop comparable item ideas from a sample of these systems, or suggest subfields of knowledge. In the following we present some tentative items to measure the two dimensions and their aspects. In the process to develop a measurement of political awareness it is fruitful to try to cover measure all relevant aspects and pilot these to finalize a manageable measurement which also fulfil survey economy criteria.
Table 2: A suggestion of items by the two dimensions of political awareness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of political awareness</th>
<th>Political Attentiveness</th>
<th>Political knowledge</th>
<th>Political understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objects of political awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political structures</td>
<td>I pay attention to changes in political institutions</td>
<td>I know well how the political system operates</td>
<td>Generally I am informed about how the different parts of the political system operates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political processes</td>
<td>I usually pay attention to the political procedures</td>
<td>I have good knowledge of the political processes</td>
<td>I have good understanding of how the procedures in politics operates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political actors</td>
<td>I particularly observe who the political actors are?</td>
<td>I am well informed about the important politicians</td>
<td>I usually understand the messages politicians have when they speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political cleavages</td>
<td>I pay attention to information about particular conflicts in our society.</td>
<td>I have good knowledge about the major disagreements in politics in this country</td>
<td>I pay attention to how political issues reflect deeper conflicts in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political roles</td>
<td>I usually pay attention to how politicians behave in their roles.</td>
<td>I am well informed about the requirements different political roles have.</td>
<td>Usually I do understand the roles different politicians have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political issues?</td>
<td>I am particularly observe news of issues that I concerned of.</td>
<td>I have good knowledge of political issues I am concerned of.</td>
<td>Usually I understand what new political issues is about.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political awareness and its relation to other concepts

A concept like PA is defined by itself but also in relation to other concepts. We briefly introduce some of them here. In the literature about political cognition, scholars use ‘political awareness’ as a synonym to other concepts. However, our model of political awareness distinguishes the concept of PA from concepts such as political knowledge, political sophistication, and internal efficacy. According to our model, political knowledge is a necessary, but insufficient component of political awareness. We need attentiveness toward objects, factual knowledge about politics and understanding to really become politically aware. As Zaller emphasizes in his definition, political awareness also requires that we understand the information we encounter. Among the individuals with political knowledge, some have political understanding, while others lack such understanding. Internal efficacy refers to individuals’ beliefs about their competence to understand and to participate effectively in political (Bandura, 1997). However, the subjective
feeling that one understand politics is different from the actual ability to understand politics. A low political awareness may foster internal efficacy through repeated successful attempts to grasp the meaning.

A third concept that scholars sometimes confuse with political awareness is political sophistication, which concerns the complexity and the internal consistency of political attitudes. The concept of political sophistication trace back to the seminal work of Philip Converse (1964), which identifies three dimensions of political sophistication: structure, constraint, and stability. A basic ideology framework provides a structure between core values (beliefs) and specific issues, which constrain the issue positions and creates correlations between issues. Furthermore, these positions should be stable over time, which guide the behaviors and decisions in different situations. Hence, individuals with high political sophistication have attitudes on a range of issues, which creates a complexity of different opinions. They have an opinion on different issues but also hold political attitudes that are not in conflict with each, which creates a structured complexity with internal consistency between the political attitudes. For example, if they express a liberal opinion on one issue, they tend to hold liberal positions in other issues as well, and over time in different settings.

Although political awareness is a necessary, but insufficient condition, for political sophistication (individuals that are politically sophisticated are politically aware, but all individuals with political awareness are not politically sophisticated), there are three main differences between political awareness and political sophistication. The first difference is that political awareness focuses on the cognitive dimension, while the concept of political sophistication also includes other attitudinal dimensions (e.g., emotional, evaluated, and behavioral dimensions) apart from the cognitive dimension. However, Luskin (1990) emphasizes the cognitive dimension of political sophistication and claims the significance of the ability to organize received information. According to his definition, political sophistication is about the structure of cognitive complexity among individuals. Individuals need an extended body of knowledge, which is well organized to be recalled and utilized, to be politically sophisticated. The second difference between PA and political sophistication concerns the political objects. Political awareness is about political objects within the formal or informal
political system, which includes processes, structures, and actors that create politics. Political sophistication also refers to attitudes toward substantial political issues (political opinions), more than to objects within the political system. Thirdly, political sophistication refers to the internal structure of political orientation; complexity and internal consistency are essential qualities of political sophistication. Political awareness lacks a similar focus on the internal structure of cognition. The crucial quality for political understanding here is not the internal consistency of complexity but the degrees and extents of individuals’ understanding of politics.

Tasks to be considered

Knowledge of political ideologies has been mentioned by more than one researcher, and is important for PA (Classen, 2011) (Bartle, 2000). The question is whether it is possible to identify ideologies operating in the three national contexts and thereby measurable with the same reliability? The third task is therefore to identify ideologies and suggest knowledge items which address knowledge of ideologies.

Political conflicts or cleavages are central to democratic politics in western societies. To measure awareness of cleavages I assume would be of good conceptual validity and of particular relevance to the overall political awareness. Cleavages are first of all the left right heuristic particularly represented in the working class – ownership cleavage. Second, the centre—periphery is a major cleavage in Norway and assumedly also in Sweden and Denmark. Third the religious secular cleavage is there but is less salient? A fourth task is to try to formulate knowledge or attentiveness or understanding of cleavage items, which are applicable to the different Scandinavian countries and cultures?

Political issues are often closely affiliated with political cleavages but equally salient. It may be argued that political issues or conflicts are particularly important as a focus for political awareness because awareness of issues might reflect attentiveness to news in politics. The question is whether there are issues that can be identified and measured across these three nations. My suggestion would be immigration as one of them, environmental issues, transport and communication?, salaries and pensions? Foreign policies? Cultural politics? Foreign aid?
The fifth task is therefore to identify salient political issues, which may work as sample issues across the three nations.

**Political interest**

Politics is often understood as institutionalized politics while, politics in the widest sense comprise of a variety of political activities. A simple measure of the standard single item ‘Are you interested in politics’ therefore lacks both concept validity and reliability. In response to this I suggest a multi item scale which selects relevant domains of interest for young people across three nations. I assume that these fields of interest might correspond to issues of political salience above. *The sixth task is therefore to suggest the fields of interest in politics like elections, environmental issues, foreign policy, local politics, NGOs or ‘very particular domains not mentioned’?? A preliminary suggestion for such fields would be, elections, party politics, environmental politics, youth, immigration, economics/employment fields not mentioned of personal interest. A sample item would be. ‘Below we present some fields of interest in politics’ To what extent are you interested in these fields of politics?’ Seven point scale Very little interest – very interested’

**Attentiveness to information/media**

The political awareness seems to be critical in attention, analysis, selection and the use of political information. We believe that the active role of attentiveness towards political information reflects the importance of political awareness. The use of media is often a measurement of attentiveness. A question is which media is used, and how are items directed to relevant political issues in their wording? On the other hand media may not be the sole source of political information. Friends, parents and even school might be additional sources. Also the active seeking of information of political sources versus being a passive observer of ‘what comes by’ is an important aspect of attentiveness. Therefore there seem to be several alternatives in constructing the scales here which need to be considered. To list them; sources of information, actively seeking versus passive observation, frequency of seeking (daily, weekly, seldom), degree of attentiveness to particular fields or general interest. *The seventh task is therefore to consider these alternatives in measuring attentiveness and to suggest an item format.*
Table 3 A summary of tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The first task is therefore to try to single out comparable and equally difficult questions of political knowledge, which can be developed in the multiple-choice format dichotomous or with more distractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>item</strong> Name of one or more ministers with distractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The second task is therefore to find relevant fields of self-assessment of system knowledge and possibly to develop comparable item ideas from a sample of these systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>item</strong> I have good knowledge (alt. I am well informed...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The third task is therefore to identify ideologies and suggest knowledge items which address knowledge of ideologies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | **Item** I am particularly attentive to political issues which may limit my personal freedom  
|   | Alt; I am particularly attentive to policies which may undermine (worsen?) the situation of the poor.  
|   | Alt; I am particularly attentive to policies which support poor countries.     |
| 4 | A fourth task is to try to formulate knowledge or attentiveness of cleavage items, which are applicable to the different countries. |
|   | **item** I am particularly preoccupied with the concentration of power and wealth in the central areas in this country.  
|   | Alt. I am particularly preoccupied with a better distribution of wealth particularly to the poor ones.  
|   | Alt. I am particularly attentive to policies which favour one particular religion |
| 5 | The fifth task is therefore to identify salient political issues, which may work as sample issues across the three nations. |
|   | **item** Alt. I am particularly attentive to policies of immigration.  
|   | Alt. I am particularly attentive to policies directed at young people.         |
| 6 | The sixth task is therefore to suggest the fields of interest in politics like elections, environmental issues, foreign policy, local politics, NGOs or ‘very particular domains not mentioned?? |
|   | **item** I am particularly interested in local political affairs.              |
| 7 | The seventh task is therefore to consider these alternatives in measuring attentiveness and to suggest an item format. |
|   | **Item** I watch news daily, weekly, ...  
|   | I find political information in the social media...                         |


