

ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

**MOTIVATED REASONING AND DECISION MAKING: THE EXAMPLE
OF DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME**

MEHMET CAN ONEY

117605003

Prof. Dr. EMRE ERDOGAN

ISTANBUL

2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1.....	3
DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME.....	3
1.1 DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME DISCUSSIONS IN TURKEY.....	3
CHAPTER 2.....	5
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
2.1 MOTIVATED REASONING.....	5
2.2 MOTIVATED SKEPTICISM AND PARTY BIAS.....	6
2.3 DECISION MAKING.....	7
2.4 BACKFIRE EFFECT.....	10
2.5 VOTERS BEHAVIORS AND SYMMETRIC ASYMMETRY.....	10
2.6 COGNITIVE DISSONANCE AND CONFORMATION BIAS.....	14
2.7 EFFECTS OF THE MEDIA AND INFORMATION SOURCING...22	
CHAPTER 3	24
FIELD RESEARCH.....	24
3.1 ELECTION AND POPULATIN INBEYOĞLU.....	24
3.2 METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION.....	25
3.3 HYPOTHESES.....	27
3.4 ANALYSIS TOOL.....	28
3.5 RESULTS.....	28
CONCLUSION.....	41
REFERENCES.....	45
ATTACHMENTS.....	49
1.1 Questionnaire.....	49
1.2 Demographics and Political Preferences.....	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The Effect of Partisan Identification	28
Table 2. The Effect of the Source of Information	29
Table 3. The Effect of Confirming Sources of Information	31
Table 4. The Effect of Contradicting Sources of Information.....	32
Table 5. The Effect of A Priori Opinion on the Degree Of Change.....	33
Table 6.1. Demographic factors that affect people's opinions	34
Table 6.2. Demographic factors that affect people's opinions.....	36
Table 6.3. Demographic factors that affect people's opinions.....	38
Table 7. Albayrak's Effect on the Supporters of the Nation Alliance.....	40
Table 8. Albayrak's Effect on the Supporters of the Nation Alliance.....	40
Table 9. Albayrak's Effect on the Supporters of the Nation Alliance.....	40
Table 10. Gender of Participants.....	53
Table 11. Satisfaction with Life.....	53
Table 12. Political Party Preferences.....	53
Table 13. Preferences in the 2019 Istanbul Municipal Elections.....	54
Table 14. Importance of Supporting Their Political Party.....	54
Table 15.1. Opinions for the Sources of Information.....	55
Table 15.2. Opinions for the Sources of Information.....	55
Table 15.3. Opinions for the Sources of Information.....	56
Table 16. Effects of the Permanent Daylight Saving Time in Daily Life.....	56
Table 17. Work Status.....	57
Table 18. Education.....	58
Table 19. Number of People in the Household.....	58
Table 20. Marital Status.....	59
Table 21.1. Having Children.....	59
Table 21.2 Number of Children.....	59
Table 21.3 Child at the Age of School.....	60
Table 22. Household Income.....	60

ABSTRACT

Daylight saving time has been used in Turkey for decades and has been the subject of many arguments whether it is useful or not, whether Turkey needs to implement a fixed time for the whole year or continue with the traditional way. Turkey's ruling party (AKP) has tried to implement a fixed time for the whole year in 2013 but until 2016 Turkey kept its former daylight saving time practice.

In 2016, with the efforts of the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Turkey has shifted to a fixed summer time zone, abolishing the dual time for year. This implementation has come under many criticisms both from political parties and from the public and divided the public opinion on this daily issue.

I have tried to analyze motivated reasoning theory on the daylight saving time arguments in Turkey and we have surveyed 400 people in the district of Beyoğlu/İstanbul. We have found that people tend to conserve their primary opinion even when faced with an opposite information. We also found that less politicized sources and party aligned sources have different effects on people's decision making process.

Key Words: Motivated Reasoning, Voting Behaviour, Beyoğlu, Daylight Saving Time

ÖZET

Yaz saati uygulaması Türkiye'de onlarca yıldır kullanımda olan bir uygulamaydı ve Türkiye'nin tüm yıl boyunca sabit bir saat uygulamasına geçmesi ve geleneksel yöntemi geride bırakmasının gerekliliği, bu uygulamanın faydalı olup olmadığı pek çok tartışmanın konusu olmuştur. Türkiye'de iktidar partisi (AKP) 2013 yılında tüm yıl boyunca sabit bir saat uygulamasına geçmeye çalışmış, ancak 2016 yılına kadar Türkiye eski ve geleneksel olan uygulamasını sürdürmüştür.

2016 yılında Enerji ve Tabii Kaynaklar Bakanlığı'nın çabalarıyla Türkiye sabit yaz saat dilimine geçerek yıllık ikili saat uygulamasını kaldırmıştır. Bu uygulama hem siyasi partilerden hem de kamuoyundan pek çok eleştiriye maruz kalmış ve bu günlük mesele de kamuoyunu tartışmalarla bölmüştür.

Biz de bu çalışmada, Türkiye'deki gün ışığından yararlanma saati argümanları üzerinden motive edilmiş akıl yürütme teorisini analiz etmeye çalıştık ve bu ölçüm için İstanbul'un Beyoğlu ilçesinde 400 kişiyle anket yaptık. Çalışma sonucunda insanların aksi bir bilgiyle karşı karşıya kaldıklarında bile birincil görüşlerini koruma eğiliminde olduklarını gördük. Buna ek olarak, daha az siyasallaşmış bilgi kaynaklarının ya da siyasi partilerle birebir ilişkili olan bilgi kaynaklarının insanların karar verme süreçlerinde farklı etkileri olduğunu gözlemledik.

Anahtar Kelimeler; Motive Edilmiş Akıl Yürütme, Oy Verme Davranışı, Beyoğlu, Gün Işığında Yararlanma Saati

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, I wanted to analyze the process behind people's decision making, especially when it comes to a political change that affects their life directly. One of the reason why I selected the daylight saving time discussion in Turkey as my research subject is that, it is both a political and a social issue. The discussion has created an atmosphere in which I could observe the different political camps, their opinions and motivations. This also provided me with political and non political statements from different actors of Turkey's environment such as politicians, universities and non governmental organizations.

Even years after the new implementation on the daylight saving time, the discussions did not rest. Every year the same discussion comes back to take its place in political arena and finds its supporters and opposers.

Turkey's ruling party (AKP) has been in power since 2002 elections. Since then AKP's election percentages were always between 35% to 49% and they have always been the first party in the elections, including the local(municipal) elections. AKP always had the necessary share of votes in order to found a cabinet and have the majority in the parliament thus never needed a coalition government. There is only one exception to that as even though the outcome of the election was favoring the AKP, in June 7, 2015, AKP lost the majority in the parliament but was the first party nonetheless. But this results were not to form a government thus a re-election held in November 2015, giving AKP enough vote share to win the parliament again.

The election results were almost always split as 50% AKP and %50 others. AKP's biggest rival in terms of vote share has been the CHP, the founder party of Turkey. Parties tried to tackle the government but never succeeded in the process. In 2017, a referendum was held in order to change the governing system of Turkey's from parliamentary to presidential system. Erdoğan and his party have long been advocating for this change and it only became possible with the support from the MHP, the far right nationalist party which has been against the AKP's

and Erdoğan's policies longer than a decade. MHP's political turn was one of the outcomes of the failed coup attempt in July 2016, and the long state of emergency era of Turkey's which lasted around two years.

MHP's political turn was not an easy transition though it created an internal rivalry in the party which caused eventually a division in which İYİ Party (Good Party) was founded as an outcome. In this process of transition of government system, Turkey's two biggest political sides were being formed which will be called as the People's Alliance including AKP and MHP, and Nation Alliance including CHP and İYİ Party as the biggest members. This two political alliances were officially formed before the 2018 elections. Nation Alliance's primary goal is to win the elections and change the presidential system to strengthen parliamentary system. Nation Alliance's biggest member CHP also has a de facto political alliance with the Kurdish Movement's HDP in which HDP voters backed Nation Alliance candidates in the local elections in 2019 especially in İstanbul which resulted the victory for the Nation Alliance.

This brief information on Turkey's current political situation is to give a general understanding of our research since the political sides were mostly represented by the voters of People's and Nation Alliance.

I have analyzed the literature around the Motivated Reasoning and tried to apply this into my research in order to understand the basic dynamics behind the people who participated in our study as survey respondents and I tried to make an inference on general Turkish public.

The study follows with an explanatory section on the daylight saving time debate, its past and current situation. And the general literature review has been presented in the following section. In the results I presented my main hypotheses and presented the findings of my research. This study gives an example of people's decision making process and how they handle new information.

CHAPTER 1

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

1.1 DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME DISCUSSIONS IN TURKEY

Daylight saving time is a practice that is applied in approximately 70 countries (CNN, 2020), which is implemented for countries or certain regions to benefit from sunlight more, and that the hours are taken 1 hour ahead and back in the spring months. Abolition of daylight saving time in Turkey and the discussion of the stabilization of the time zones has been brought to the agenda by Berat Albayrak, former Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and as of 2016, this proposal has been enacted (Cabinet decree dated October 7, 2016 and numbered 2016/9154). The public also has many claims about the benefits and harms of this change, which has long been a topic of debate even after its implementation. Berat Albayrak argued that this change will increase the time it takes to benefit from sunlight during working hours, and will also save energy (Yenişafak, 2016). The current Minister of Energy and Natural Resources Fatih Dönmez participated in a television program in November 2019, and stated the positivity of the implementation; “In 2016, we decided to switch to a fixed time zone application and it had been a matter of criticism. We had technical work done at that time, too. Turkey had saved 1 billion Turkish Lira annually with this implementation. The EU has also made a decision in the past months and recommended that the member states would enact the fixed time zone implementation. Thus, we also saw that how accurately we made the decision” (Milliyet, 2019).

On the other hand, opposition parties and some non-governmental organizations such as the Chamber of Electrical Engineers (EMO) have opposed this change from the very beginning. EMO stated in December 2016 and argued that the change did not save energy, but on the contrary increased energy waste and expenditure and proposed an immediate replacement of the application (EMO, 2016). Republican People's Party deputy Murat Bakan also said in a speech in the

parliament that the practice forced students to go to school in the dark in the mornings and the companies doing business with the West experienced difficulties due to the time difference (140journos, 2016).

The Minister of Turkey's Energy and Natural Resources alongside with the Istanbul Technical University shows that the implementation proved to be saving energy. Unlike them, several deputies from the opposition party CHP, alongside with the Chamber of Electrical Engineers of Turkey claims the opposite that this implementation did not save energy but also increased the energy consumption in the mornings.

Turkey has been one of those countries who could easily be divided into two in any political or social issue. As polarization rises amongst the voters and the parties, it effects the social life and the way we think about political events. The referendum in 2017, presidential election in 2018 and the local elections of 2019 showed that the ruling party and the opposition has come to a point that they both represent a different 50% of the population.

While I was trying to select the subject that I would base my research on, I found that the daylight saving time discussion in Turkey would make a good example because it is both a political and a social issue. Also, the way that the public and politicians argued about it reminded me how easily Turkish society can fall into two political camps in any issue.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 MOTIVATED REASONING

To understand the basis of the debate and politicization of daylight saving time in Turkey, it is important to understand how people across the political spectrum – in other words, people with different political motivations - approach and process information on the subject when presented from different sources. The argument that motivation affects reasoning has been the thesis of much research and scholarly work. That is, that people's beliefs and biases – their motives - affect the way that they come to a conclusion that they desire. People seek to bring about their desired outcome but are also limited by the existing information and knowledge. Accordingly, they tend to make their decisions as reasonably as possible and justify them to others (Kunda, 1990).

Rational Choice Theory argued that people were rational actors and, that individuals acting with rational self-interest made decisions logically and based on what outcomes they wanted to see (Scott, 2000, p. 126). This later came under criticism, and later work has found that people do not make decisions solely out of rational self-interest but also as resulting from their prior experiences and beliefs. "...all social information processing is affectively charged and prone to biases." (Redlawsk, 2002) In short, our preexisting ideologies make certain decisions more pleasing and attractive, even if they are objectively not in our best interest. (Kunda, 1990).

Kunda focuses on two major categories of motivated reasoning: the first is the motivation to come to an accurate conclusion, and the second is the motivation to come to a particular, directional conclusion (Kunda, 1990). Kunda argues that people do not simply conclude whatever they want simply because they want to- they don't have the liberty to do so. Instead, they are motivated to be rational and

to be just in the eyes of the observer when it comes to their decisions (Kunda, 1990).

2.2 MOTIVATED SKEPTICISM AND PARTY BIAS

Taber and Lodge propose another model, which they call “motivated skepticism.” This model helps explain why people are biased information processors. They do two experiments that show people tend to be accommodating with supportive evidence to their belief while rejecting the evidence that counters their prior beliefs. They find that people, especially the ones who strongly believe in a particular issue, may actually strengthen their prior beliefs rather than moderating it even when they are confronted with evidence that directly goes against what they believe (Taber & Lodge, 2006).

Any possibility of updating previously learned or believed information with new information from new sources is always affected by many unconscious prejudices, and there may be many sources of motivation to support and replicate previous information (Redlawsk, 2002). At the same time, another issue that needs to be considered here is that people tend to treat the information that presents negative content more carefully and find it more reliable (Fiske, 1980). Although people are limited to some degree to being accurate, they are incapable of controlling their prior beliefs even though they are encouraged to be objective (Taber & Lodge, 2006). Two concepts can help us understand the issue: first, the desire to be accurate, which would be the case that people understand and carefully process the evidence to come up with the best results. Second, the existence of partisan bias, which is more about people being defensive about their arguments. In the latter case, evidence would not necessarily sway their opinions in the process of coming to a conclusion (Kruglanski & Webster, 1996).

2.3 DECISION MAKING

In their motivated reasoning experiment, Taber and Lodge have taken their statements directly from politicians and political interest groups to make it more in line with political discourse and to have strong responses. Their results are in line with the argument that people's prior experiences and beliefs make it harder for them to change their ideas and consider facts carefully to the accurate directions. The authors believe that an average citizen does not meet the requirements to be a rational subject to democracy because of their inability to process evidence in order to make objective decisions. As they explain, "...homo politicus would seem to be a creature of simple likes and prejudices that are quite resistant to change" (Taber & Lodge, 2006).

They also suggest that, for some people, bias might be less valid, but certain ideologues and bigots that are seen in the society are outside of any assumption of rational persuasion, and they will insist on their ideas no matter how much information counters their prior beliefs. In contrast, they also found in their research that people with weak and uninformed views can be less biased while processing political arguments (Taber & Lodge, 2006).

Redlawsk in his work, does not agree with political scientists who argue that voters will judge the candidates in a fair and qualified manner if they are given sufficient information and resources, and that they will make their choices based on these sources of information. He argues that this understanding is missing a crucial point; when people make a choice, how the outcome of this choice will affect them emotionally and how will they feel about the results of that choice is a big factor in their decision-making process. In short, we are no longer free from these emotional factors when making choices. Accordingly, we are able to reason and make causation for certain choices, even without tangible information (Redlawsk, 2002).

Motivated reasoning has far-reaching implications for both voting behavior and the behavior of politicians and other decision-makers in a democratic system.

Under normal circumstances, the votes of the voters shall be entered into the system accordingly with the voter's decision. Otherwise, a re-counting or evaluation of votes - such as wrongly marked ballots - takes place. Especially when it comes to the elections where the gap between the sides is very small, re-counting the votes and evaluating the invalid votes become a major problem. In this study by Kopko and others (Kopko, Bryner, Budziak, Devine & Nawara, 2011), it is possible to see how political psychology plays a role in the process of recounting invalid votes. This is a study that tries to see how effective motivated reasoning and party bias is on the authorities that will decide whether the vote is valid. The authors propose that, as the intensity of the party affiliation of the decision-makers increases, they will try to take steps to count the votes written to their parties as valid. In addition, the fact that the laws are unclear and uncertain is one of the factors that increase these tendencies. As they explain, "...an individual's decisions are motivated by the knowledge that she has a stake in the outcome of the reasoning task." (Kopko, Bryner, Budziak, Devine and Nawara, 2011:288).

Kearns et. al.'s work (Kearns, Betus & Lemieux, 2019) sheds more light on how motivated reasoning works. In his research, people were asked questions about terrorist attacks in the United States. They were asked to give an estimated number of the frequency of these attacks and the number of people killed in the attack and after getting the results from them, the real figures were given to them. As a result of this test, it is wondered how many people will update their prior knowledge with the right information. While 82% found the information reliable, 18% did not. Participants were asked, before being given the information from press releases, how often terrorist attacks occurred in the United States between 2006 and 2015, and how many people died in these attacks. The press release is then read to them, and after this statement, which contains real figures, people were asked if they have changed their minds. There are two options here, the first is the frequency of the attacks and the second is the number of people killed in the attacks (Kearns, Betus & Lemieux, 2019).

In the answers given, separately for these variables, it is seen that the majority change their opinions on both frequency and number of deaths. The results are 68% and 63.6%, respectively. They increase the variables to 4 in the continuation of their research and decide to provide information from 4 different sources in total. Thus, people's partisan tendencies, their trust in the media and their trust in the academy can be seen and revealed. When it comes to the conclusions, the fact that the source of the information is coming from a shared ideology (from the party which the participant votes for) increases the confidence in the given information. In addition, a media statement, detailing the disclosure and providing statistics, increases the reliability of the information. Given that the information coming from academics who are experts on terrorism, it is observed that this information also finds high reliability amongst the participants. In summary, how detailed the information is plays a big role here. In addition to that, trust in science and trust in the media is directly related to motivated reasoning (Kearns, Betus & Lemieux, 2019).

In Kearns et. al.'s work (Kearns, Betus & Lemieux, 2019), "When data do not matter", people's knowledge of terrorism seems to be wrong and incompatible with reality. If this is true, then the question is, if some people believe in certain facts and others do not, then what makes the difference? We know that decision-making is an active process, and according to Zaller, people's views on a particular political issue, such as terrorism, are shaped by the various information they have already acquired in the past (Zaller, 1992).

People are more likely to accept new information if it does not contradict their current, preexisting worldview. This may be why we often fail in our efforts to change people's incorrect ideas. For example, voters who associate themselves with a party tend to ignore information about the performances of their favorite political figures according to Lebo and Cassino. They ignore negative information and do not take this information into account when evaluating the person. Working on motivated reasoning in their research, Lebo and Cassino, also shows that partisan voters do actually reward or punish the performance of some political

figures and presidents, but not the president of their own party. Both rewarding and punishing processes occur for the other party's candidates (Lebo and Cassino, 2007).

2.4 BACKFIRE EFFECT

Motivated reasoning comes into play here and helps people who encounter an opposite view and develop a defense mechanism (Kunda, 1990). Some people not only reject the new information given, but they can also embrace the old and wrong ones more tightly, which we call “the backfire effect” (Nyhan and Reifler, 2010). People who have been misinformed about a topic often think that they understand it well and have enough knowledge, and thus show more resistance reactions to the new information which conflicts their old ideas (Kuklinski, Quirk, Jerit and Rich, 2001). In addition, people with a high level of partisan loyalty are more resistant to information coming from the opposing side and have much less trust in the information coming from there. The higher the level of partisanship, the more the backfire effect and motivated reasoning is likely to occur, and the more difficult it is to provide people with accurate, non-partisan information in the decision-making process (Edwards and Smith, 1996).

2.5 VOTERS BEHAVIORS AND SYMMETRIC ASYMMETRY

The polarization of the electorate took an important part of the politics in the United States as it is in Turkey. Voters' judgments in evaluating political events, economic performance, unemployment, and the facts associated with the rulers and the opposition differ greatly, and are arguably more distant than ever before (Lebo and Cassino, 2007). Stephen, in his research on American voters (Stephen, 2013), finds that people who associate themselves with a party seem to ignore policy-related facts and interpret similar facts differently. Partisan bias comes to the forefront when the information challenges their political views and requires a change in their thoughts. In his own work, Stephen tries to find how he can reduce these differences and polarizing effects, or in what situations these are reduced, and he came to some interesting findings. It seems that if the US economy is

performing both good and bad at the same time, this polarization increases. People are thus likely to choose the option that suits them, according to whether they want to be positive or negative about the situation. In contrast, when the economy is moving to a certain point, that is, either positively or negatively affecting the people, these disjointed and partisan ideas begin to be moderated and approach a relatively common point(Stephen, 2013).

In addition to this, the case of the unemployment problem in the U.S can be used as an example can be given about how different interpretations of the same reality occur in the society. They confront both the Republicans and the Democrats with the fact that unemployment has increased by 1% and ask them to interpret this. While those who associate themselves with the Republican party see it as “big” and a great negative impact, the voters who associate themselves with the Democratic party interpret it in the opposite manner (it should be noted that this work was done in 2013, and at the time Obama was the president from the Democrat Party). Democrats called this change “small” and unimportant. As a result, we find a different interpretation of the same reality by two different groups. Another, similar example of different interpretation of the same facts and the effects of the partisan media is that Republican and Democratic voters interpret the losses of the US military in Iraq very differently and give numbers that are very different from each other (Stephen, 2013).

Stephen's hypothesis is simply that, under normal circumstances, in a political situation, it is easier for the party identifiers to interpret the economic or political situation according to their positions, because they have both positive and negative data in their hands and they can use it according to their wishes. Here, the cost of rationalization is mild (Stephen, 2013).

It is clear that partisanship and party-alignment plays a huge role in decision making and rationalization. There are some cases where the presented framework is more effective. In less polarized societies and in the absence of party references, the information provided and the framework drawn on this information are more

widely accepted and observed by voters. However, when parties and their arguments are included in the event, opinion formation is much more influenced from outside (Druckman, Peterson and Slothuus, 2013).

According to Druckman, Peterson and Slothuus, "...when individuals engage in strong partisan motivated reasoning, they develop increased confidence in their opinions. This means they are less likely to consider alternative positions and more likely to take action based on their opinion" (Druckman, Peterson and Slothuus, 2013:74).

"Symmetric asymmetry" is another phenomenon that can be seen in the behavior of partisan voters according to Lebo and Cassino. It is observed that despite the voters who have closed their eyes to the economic performance of the candidates of their own parties, the opposition voters react differently and can change the position of their views of the opposition's president or candidates. There can even be an objective evaluation of the "other" party's candidates. With this being seen in both the Republican and the Democratic party, Lebo and Cassino highlight the concept of symmetric asymmetry and explain that in the end, we see that the opposition's "blind" hostility is more moderate than the "blind" commitment of the voters of the president's party and therefore the opposition appears to be more open to a change (Lebo and Cassino, 2007). As an example, we can give Bill Clinton's term, which achieved a high approval rate in the late 90's, thanks to his success in economic affairs and stable policies. He was able to increase the approval rate among the Republican Party voters as well as the Democratic Party voters. Consequently, it can be said that in-party voter behaviors are higher than those outside the party when it comes to commitment (Lebo and Cassino, 2007).

One of the factors that Lebo and Cassino are trying to explain here is anxiety (Lebo and Cassino, 2007). Opposition voters seem to be more psychologically affected by the ruling president's policies, making it part of the motivated reasoning concept. The concept of anxiety has something to do with the previous issue, the opposition voters who are affected by the policies are likely to

encounter anxiety therefore follow the policies of the president they are opposing more carefully and in detail. This increases their rate of exposure to these policies and increases their likelihood of changing their assessment both in positive and negative directions. The voters of the president's own party, on the other hand, see confidence in themselves because of being in power and living under a president elected by their own party. For this reason, they continue to live with their a priori knowledge and their evaluations are more superficial. Accordingly, their ideas about the president's performance do not change easily because they are not interested in it as much as the opposition is (Lebo and Cassino, 2007).

In other words, when there is a Democratic president in the office, we expect that his economic performance will affect the opposition voters rather than his own and, this will further affect opposition voter approval ratings for the president (Lebo and Cassino, 2007). We should note that when talking about the influence of the partisans here, it is necessary to state that while they are more passive compared to the opposition voters, although not at the desired level. Partisans also occasionally react to the president's performance (Lebo and Cassino, 2007).

Lebo and Cassino consider this to be an optimistic finding since it can be measured in the research. "Certainly, political bias and motivated reasoning have their limits. For example, they do not seem to play as strong a part in the processing of political events. Almost uniformly, we see partisans of both the in- and out-party responding in traditionally predictable ways to positive and negative events. One possible explanation is that political events are more starkly revealed than are economic indicators. That is, political events such as military interventions or presidential responses to crises are front page events begging for voters to evaluate them and making motivated reasoning a more cognitively taxing process." (Lebo and Cassino, 2007:742). This may be due to the fact that economic and political changes affect not only voters outside the party, but also people who associate themselves with the ruling party. This can lead to changes in party preferences, and the possibility of voters questioning their party's policies (Lebo and Cassino, 2007) should not be ignored.

2.6 COGNITIVE DISSONANCE AND CONFIRMATION BIAS

The basic premise of Cognitive Dissonance Theory is that people tend to reject information that contradicts their preexisting beliefs, and will choose to listen or overly value information that confirms or is able to rationalize their beliefs. This theory was first proposed in 1957 by Leon Festinger, after he studied the behavior of members of a cult who thought that the world was going to end soon in a flood. He observed the way these people ignored contradicting information. After the date of the “flood” had passed and the world had not ended, Festinger observed that the more hardcore cult members twisted the new evidence to make it so they had been right all along, saying that the World didn’t end because the cult’s faithfulness had stopped it (Saul McLeod, 2018). Even though this was an extreme example, Festinger saw similarities to the way that all people behave in their everyday lives. His theory became popular and there have been many different and newer versions or additions to it. Some new theories that developed later claimed that the human mind is a rational but also fallible information operating system (Batson, 1975). In other words, people who have a strong commitment to their ideas on complex social issues will approach any information or findings about these issues with a prejudiced attitude. While they are naturally more prone to accept the views that confirm their ideas, they tend to approach critically the facts, information, or ideas that contradict their preexisting beliefs (Lord, Ross & Lepper, 1979).

Cognitive dissonance theory has also been the subject for Batson’s experiment. When information was given to religious women who live their beliefs publicly that conflicted with the beliefs of their religion, the study found that after a while this contradictory information actually made the women’s beliefs more intense. People who are so committed to their beliefs, the urge to defend their beliefs outweighs the rational response to conflicting information (Batson, 1975).

What we like, what leaders and opinion leaders say and what we have assumed, learned and known about the issues plays a big role in our decisions, especially when we make decisions on social issues. Even, this decisions consist of sum of them, and for the same reason, even people with a high level of social status and education seem to have gone into sharp disagreements when expressing opinions on complicated social issues (Lord, Ross & Lepper, 1979). Therefore, people tend to interpret the findings and evidence according to their own pre existing positions, and tend to characterize the evidence confirming themselves as strong and that which is contradictory as weak. They will point out the prejudices in the sources or opinions that contradict their own, but will not necessarily consider their own prejudices. (Lord, Ross & Lepper, 1979).

Similarly to this, Edward and Smith's experiments show that subjects generally scrutinize any findings that are contradictory to their own ideas, often finding them weak. This process of examination, critique and evaluation is generally much longer than any evaluation of sources they already agree with would be.. Smith says that his experiment is in the direction of proving 4 different hypotheses; categorizing the argument as weak, prolonging the time to analyze the argument, producing too many relevant arguments during the analysis, and producing more and more arguments that contradicts the given information (Edwards & Smith, 1996).

The findings of Matthew Levendusky (Levendusky, 2013), whose experiment on the polarizing effects of the partisan media on voters helped us to see the motivated reasoning theory in practice, also support this theory. It is seen that confrontation continues to effect people even days after initial exposure, leading people who already have extreme thoughts to even more extreme points. This effect is an important explanation for why, even though highly-partisan media is followed by comparatively few people, it has a very high impact on society. Partisan media distorts news, and when people who already are inclined to agree with those positions watch it, the motivated reasoning effect is felt more intensively. Thus, partisan media is especially influential over people whose

views mostly fall in the same place with the news outlet, and who can then be pushed to even more extreme views. (Levendusky, 2013).

With the techniques developed by the voters against the person they are positioned against, the motivated reasoning effect, together with negativity and partisan bias, affects people's and governments' decision-making mechanisms. (Goren, 2002). Just as we position the people we come across in our daily lives according to their personalities, we examine the political candidates through this positioning filter, too. One of the differences here is that we usually know candidates only from television and news, and these sources are likely to be partisan sources. (Goren, 2006).

People can use the heuristic methods to choose the easier way to express ideas or make decisions on complex issues, which can be achieved through partisan media. Although heuristic methods are useful, they cause systemic errors and deficiencies in judgment. (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974).

Kahneman and Tversky focuses on three of these heuristic approaches: "(i) representativeness, which is usually employed when people are asked to judge the probability that an object or event A belongs to class or process B; (ii) availability of instances or scenarios, which is often employed when people are asked to assess the frequency of a class or the plausibility of a particular development; and (iii) adjustment from an anchor, which is usually employed in numerical prediction when a relevant value is available." (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974, p. 1131) These approaches which are very useful but also causes errors, and can be given as examples of the pressure that motivated reasoning creates on the influence of people's decision-making mechanisms according to Goren (Goren, 2006). In addition to the fact that the partisans were motivated not to like the opposition candidates, this decision of dislike, as the motivated reasoning theory claims, could be based on a logical ground. If they feel unsatisfied by the fact that they come to a conclusion just because they wanted to, they can support it with

biased secondary resources to convince themselves and decide that the outcome is fair (Goren, 2006).

Partisan belonging may disrupt the proper functioning of decision-making mechanisms: in the case of lack of approval from the party institution, it may cause a negative opinion on issues that can be expressed in a positive way. This is due to partisan motivated reasoning (Bolsen, Druckman & Cook, 2014). One of the contributions of motivated reasoning theory is that it illustrates the effect of this partisanship on political decision-making mechanisms. This effect may also vary with people's motivations, their knowledge from the political arena and the effort they put into the issue – in other words, how much they care about it and how much they are willing to act (Leeper & Slothuus, 2014). Issue framing is also one of the determinants of the intensity of this impact and indicates its impact on the public. As motivated reasoning theory describes, a situation arises where people with strong party affiliation will be more influenced when the frames are formed by parties. The parties' impact will thus be exacerbated, especially in matters that are controversial and that can cause easy divisions between parties (Slothuss & Vreese, 2010).

Leeper and Slothuus argue that there is partisanship inherent in politics and political reasoning, and although it appears to be a pessimistic approach, parties can be good and partisanship can have positive consequences from time to time (Leeper & Slothuus, 2014). However, one of the suggestions we find in motivating reasoning theory is that people are motivated not only to find the right and fair outcomes, but at the same time will strive to defend and maintain their present values, identities, and attitudes. This inherently leads to partisanship becoming a matter of identity, and makes Slothus and Vreese's claim questionable. (Slothuss & Vreese, 2010).

As Nickerson mentions in his article, academics have been theorizing about confirmation bias for a long time. An example of older theorization on the issue can help us to see the way these theorizations have changed. In his 1968 article,

Elliot Aronson discusses dissonance theory, which he defines as “a negative drive state which occurs whenever an individual simultaneously holds two cognitions (ideas, beliefs, opinions) which are psychologically inconsistent.” This is not exactly the same as confirmation bias, but it is related. When people experience two things to be true that cannot both be true at the same time, it is uncomfortable for them. For example, if people a) believe that their political party is always correct and b) see a piece of evidence suggesting they are wrong about something, they will feel dissonance. This is uncomfortable, so they will try to end the dissonance by choosing one truth over the other (Nickerson, 1998).

This can be done in many ways, as Aronson argues. A person could “belittle the evidence” that caused the dissonance, by saying it is unreliable or false (Aronson, 1969). They could also try to associate themselves with other people who believe the same thing. Aronson uses the example of cigarette smokers who do not want to get cancer. They may try to say that the evidence that smoking causes cancer is ridiculous or not yet proven. Or they could try to associate themselves with all the other people who smoke and say it can’t be that bad if all these people are doing it. They might even make it part of their identity or a kind of rebellion against what other people want them to do. This gets rid of the dissonance, because now they don’t have to believe two opposite things are true at the same time. Aronson says “dissonance theory does not rest upon the assumption that man is a rational animal; rather, it suggests that man is a rationalizing animal—that he attempts to appear rational, both to others and to himself.” (Aronson, 1969, p.3) This is a bit different from Nickerson, who argues that rationality is a real, objective thing that confirmation bias can get in the way of. For Aronson, rationality is just a process when people try to make their decisions less dissonant. He discusses how people, after choosing something or someone – like a political candidate – will then try to minimize the negative things and maximize the positive things about that person (Aronson, 1969).

While Aronson believes that dissonance theory is valuable as a theory, he also criticizes it (Aronson, 1969). Amongst other things, he argues that it is difficult to

use it to make predictions. For something to be dissonant, it must be logically inconsistent. But logic is psychological, in the way that people can find different things to be logical or illogical based on their personality, their experiences, and their cultural background. He gives an example that a professor who believes that a student-professor relationship should always be polite, but then gets angry and yells at a student, would experience dissonance. But a professor from a different culture that believed it is okay to yell at students would not experience dissonance. In this way it is not the event, but the specific psychology of the person that determines whether something is dissonant or not (Aronson, 1969).

Even this is sometimes not enough to explain what causes dissonance. Aronson gives the example of finding out that his favorite novelist is abusive to his wife (Aronson, 1969). This creates dissonance but it is not because being a good writer and being a wife beater are inconsistent. A person could be both. But for Aronson, the dissonance comes from having a specific set of moral values – not believing that it is okay to beat your wife – and liking someone who goes against these values. People experience this all the time, when they like an artist who is found to have done something bad. In this case the dissonance does not come from something being illogical, but from how it sounds to you personally and how it goes against other things you believe. “Thus, a knowledge of the kinds of situations in which dissonance can occur is not always useful in determining whether dissonance does occur.” (Aronson, 1969, p.7).

Confirmation bias is one of the most important aspects that I tried to examine in the surveys. Confirmation bias is the interpreting evidence how we wish to see it, in ways that confirm what we already believe or want to be true. Nickerson discusses confirmation bias in his 1998 article, “Confirmation Bias: A Ubiquitous Phenomenon in Many Guises”. Nickerson defines confirmation bias as “a generic concept that subsumes several more specific ideas that connote the inappropriate bolstering of hypotheses or beliefs whose truth is in question.” (Nickerson, 1998, p.175). He argues that confirmation bias is the most difficult challenge to human reasoning, and that it might be the cause of many or even most political problems

and disputes. This is a statement that has arguably become even more true since he wrote the article, as I will discuss later, with the rise of social media and media outlets that are increasingly controlled by special interests (Nickerson, 1998).

Nickerson discusses the difference between “deliberate versus spontaneous case building” (Nickerson, 1998). Deliberate case building is like what lawyers and debaters do, intentionally ignoring sources that do not help their argument. They have an obligation to help their client or to support only their side, and so what they do is deliberate. Spontaneous case building is more a true example of confirmation bias, because people do it without knowing that they are doing it. He explains that “The assumption that people can and do engage in case-building unwittingly, without intending to treat evidence in a biased way or even being aware of doing so, is fundamental to the concept.” (Nickerson, 1998, p.176). People will unintentionally choose information that confirms what they want to be true, especially if they have a personal motivation or stake in whatever it is. Nickerson also argues that people will do this even if they don’t have a personal interest (Nickerson, 1998). In other words, when something that is very important or valued to a person is at risk, they will defend it using only sources that agree with this position. However, people will also do this for things they care less about, and it is harder to explain why. Nickerson discusses this phenomenon but does not fully explain it (Nickerson, 1998).

With regard to government decisions, Nickerson argues that once a policy has been decided, all efforts become about supporting this policy. Even if this requires misinformation campaigns, like the ones that justified American invasion of Vietnam. This requires “assessing a situation in terms of preconceived fixed notions while ignoring or rejecting any contrary signs” (Nickerson, 1998, p.191). While this can be seen as an example of intentional bias, Nickerson argues that there is also an unintentional aspect here. “In situations characterized by interactions among numerous variables and in which the cause-effect relationships are obscure, data tend to be open to many interpretations. When that is the case, the confirmation bias can have a great effect, and people should not be surprised

to see knowledgeable, well-intentioned people draw support for diametrically opposed views from the same set of data.” (Nickerson, 1998, p.192). In other words, when the situation is complicated people -including government officials in charge of making policy – will rely on what they already believe subconsciously. They will not necessarily see that this is happening. However, this does not mean that they have no stake in the issue or that they are indifferent, and thus Nickerson does not really explain why people would be biased about things they do not necessarily care about (Nickerson, 1998).

He also talks about the “Pollyanna principle”, the psychological phenomenon where people want to believe in nice things instead of unpleasant ones (as cited in Nickerson, 1998, p.197). This even relates to people’s personal memories: when we remember old relationships, for example, we like to remember only the good things that happened instead of the bad things. This relates to confirmation bias because it is about how we process information. Nickerson acknowledges this, and says “It is not the case, for most of us at least, that we are free to believe anything we want...We can be selective with respect to the evidence we seek, and we can tilt the scales when we weigh what we find, but we cannot completely ignore counter indicative evidence of which we are aware.” (Nickerson, 1998, p.197).

2.7 EFFECTS OF THE MEDIA AND INFORMATION SOURCING

We see that when people receive their knowledge of social issues from partisan media organizations (which are based on biased interpretation and framing of any and all political issues), they tend to repeat the information they have learned and believed to be true when asked to comment on or make assessments of the political situation. With the inclusion of partisan actors, the rate of acceptance of any new information by polarized partisans tends to decline (Anson, 2016). The fact that the media plays a major role in understanding and interpreting the problems by the people who are living in the country in which the problems have arose is a reality that emerges in many studies. For example, the American media's comments on the American economy and the reflecting of the economic situation on the citizens affect the citizens' choice to vote. In addition, the growing influence of the media in economic evaluations is in parallel with the rise and expansion of partisan media outlets. The rise of ideologically motivated media outlets reached its peak through internet and social media technology that has been developing since the 1990's. These monophonic, partisan media outlets, which reach many of the citizens, also significantly affect their partisan bias (Anson, 2016).

It should be noted that no matter from which side partisan interpretations are made, the result is the same; increased polarization level, a separate political sphere, and opinions completely disconnected from each other. (Anson, 2016).

In U.S. politics, parties are more deeply polarized than ever before. According to Druckman et. al.'s thesis, no matter how vague or weak the framework of the party's information to the voters, it will be accepted by the voters in some way. When the information provided confirms the desired outcomes that the electorate previously had in his mind, this effect strengthens itself. On the other hand, they will refuse information given by the opposing party and continue to believe their own party, regardless of how strong and detailed the framework of the information or account of another party is, if they know that it goes against their

party (Druckman, Peterson and Slothuus, 2013). This is one of the things we are trying to test in our study: to see under what circumstances the voters who have expressed a positive or negative opinion on the given issue will or will not update or alter their views. This is an effective way to test Druckman et. al.'s thesis (Druckman, Peterson and Slothuus, 2013), and it also offers us an opportunity to see what factors people are influenced by outside of their own party and party spokespersons. Additionally, we were able to observe what types of reactions participants had when they were exposed to new information coming from a political party or a figure that they feel contradicts their views. Throughout, we attempted to gauge if the views of average Turkish voters were becoming more radical or more moderate with regard to partisan loyalty and the willingness to receive information that contradicts their preexisting views.

In my research, I applied a similar method to a total of four sources. Two of these represented partisan interests, while the other two represented universities and non-governmental organizations. One partisan source was a government official, while the other was the main opposition party spokesman. While Kearns et. al. (2019) acknowledges that conceptual factors and personal causes play a major role in whether we are capable of challenging ourselves to update our preexisting information, it is not clear why and when this happens or will happen, according to the results of his study. The majority expressed their confidence in the information provided, adding that only those who believe in science really change their minds. While it is a fact that elaboration and addressing partisan feelings increase the acceptability rate, they are not strong enough to change the reality in people's minds. According to the results of the research, it is possible to change the thoughts people that they have developed on terrorism, but it is not clear how to do this (Kearns, Betus & Lemieux, 2019).

Here, Kearns et. al.'s (2019) idea of observing long-term changes reveals an important aspect of our research. It is a question of whether or not people will accept the factual information correctly in the long term; that is, in a week, a month or a year later.

CHAPTER 3

FIELD RESEARCH

3.1 ELECTION AND POPULATION IN BEYOĞLU

In order to reflect the attitudes of the general population, I have chosen Beyoğlu district of Istanbul as my area of research. Beyoğlu is one of the oldest districts of Istanbul where the first municipality in the Ottoman Empire has been founded. Beyoğlu hosts 230.000 people in its borders which 51% male and 49% female (TUIK, 2018). In the 2018 presidential elections, Erdoğan has reached 52,6% of the votes all over the country and 52,2% in Beyoğlu. A similar pattern has been seen in the 2019 local elections where the ruling party's candidate received 50% of the votes. In a place where voter turnout is slightly higher than 80%, a pattern that shows a division between the ruling party and the opposition as 50-50%, I thought it would be a good example for us to show the effects of polarization and motivated reasoning theory.

I have lived in Beyoğlu since 2001 and I have witnessed the transformation of a conservative neighborhood which has supported the current government from the start. As I was growing, I have been living in two different worlds, one of them is the environment and the people around us and the other one is my family's political background as strong opposers of the AKP. I have always looked for ways to understand both sides as I would struggle to understand where I was standing on the political sphere. I went to an elementary and middle school in the same neighborhood and my highschool was also in Beyoğlu district. I would be going from Taksim (the heart of the night life of the city) and back to my conservative neighborhood every weekend. My interest in politics and voters' behaviour has always been derived from my daily life and my interest only grew bigger in the university and also during my master's. I have chosen this topic in order to make an understanding of the polarisation and the division in the public by using theories like Motivated Reasoning and supporting it with field research in a district which I knew and also reflect the Turkey general population in terms

of election results. Beyoğlu's living population would go up during the day since it is one of the centers of tourism, business life and entertainment thus I was careful to select my samples. I have surveyed people in their own neighborhood and in their homes in order to reflect the residents not the daily visitors. I have divided my sample to the neighborhoods accordingly with their populations and conducted each survey face to face.

3.2 METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION

We have conducted our survey in Beyoğlu with 400 interviews sampling based on the population of each neighborhood in the district. We have asked demographic questions alongside with the general understanding of Turkey's political situation which followed by the question on the daylight saving time implementation.

We asked respondents to tell us which party they support and to what extent they are aligned themselves with the party and how important is it for them to be supporting their party in order to analyze the party bias tendencies of our research. We also asked a question on which candidate they voted for in the local elections of 2019 in Istanbul to see how closely we represent the reality.

In the following section we wanted them to give a number which represents their feeling of the daylight saving time implementation on the scale of 0 to 100 where "0" stood for completely negative feelings whereas "100" stood for full support to it. After their prior evaluation, we have chosen four different sources that represent the following; ruling party, opposition, non-governmental organization and university. As this source of information was given to them, we asked them so read the given pages about the outcome of the implementation and after that we wanted them to reevaluate the situation. Accordingly, we asked them again to give a number on the same scale and we analyzed the change.

The first one was a supporting document from Istanbul Technical University. They present their results of watching the effects of the implementation during its first year and claim that the change has saved nearly 540 million Turkish Lira (Sputnik, 2017).

The second one is a statement by Berat Albayrak, former minister of Energy and Natural Resources. During the 2018 Budget talks, he claims that the implementation has received a positive response from the citizens, nearly 80% of the feedbacks are positive and that the change has saved 540 million lira to the economy (Milliyet, 2017).

The third source of information is the Chamber of Electrical Engineers of Turkey. The Chamber claims that the implementation has far from saving energy, on the contrary it caused a rise in the use of natural gas and electricity as nearly as 6,5%. And also stated that if the government insists on the continuation of the change, the numbers will be more than current ones (Sputnik, 2017).

Our last source of information is a deputy from the opposition party CHP. Ömer Fethi Gürer, in his speech in the parliament, stated that the change only brought more energy consumption and the only winner of this situation is the electricity distribution companies. He added that, this change has forced kids to go school in the dark and that it causes traffic accidents even more than before.

As seen above, two of our sources are supportive of the change and two are opposing. We have randomly given the source of information to our respondents independent of their party identity and thus analyzed the effects of the source party by party.

3.3 HYPOTHESES

In this study, we aimed to test 5 main hypotheses, which were generated in order to analyze the results in an effective way. They continue as follows;

Hypothesis 1. The extent of the support for the implementation depends with the partisan identification of the voters. We would be expecting higher support for the change from the people who support the current government and lower support from the voters aligned with the opposition.

Hypothesis 2. People's perceptions of the topic differ according to the source of information presented to them. More authoritative sources such as university publications and the Chamber of Engineers affect people's opinions more than the arguments of the politicians, independent of direction.

Hypothesis 3. People's perceptions differ according to the source of information in conjunction with their partisan affiliation. In other words, people become more confident in their opinions after reading a confirming piece of information. The opinion of the supporters of the government about the policy will be more positive after reading the positive arguments and the opinion of the supporters of the opposition will be more negative after reading the negative arguments.

Hypothesis 3a. People's perceptions about the policy won't change after getting the opposite information.

Hypothesis 4. The degree of change in the opinions of the respondents will be affected by their a priori opinions on the subject. Those who have a more positive or negative opinion about the topic will have a higher level of change after reading information confirming their a priori idea.

Hypothesis 5. Opinions of the people will be affected by their objective living conditions, such as age, education and having a child in the household. These variables will influence the partisan effect.

3.4 ANALYSIS TOOL

A survey has been conducted with 400 people which were analyzed using SPSS software. Before the analyzing process, we tested the data for normality. Necessary parametric tests were used since the data showed normal distribution by checking the compliance of the data with the normality conditions on the basis of each assumption. Paired-Sample T Test, Independent Sample T Test and GLM Model have been used to test our hypotheses.

3.5 RESULTS

In this section, I will be presenting the results of the hypotheses that are given in the section 3.3. An evaluation of the each hypotheses alongside with the tables will be given below.

Hypothesis 1. The extent of the support for the implementation depends with the partisan identification of the voters. We would be expecting higher support for the change from the people who support the current government and lower support from the voters aligned with the opposition.

Table 1. The Effect of Partisan Identification

Party	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	F	p
People's Alliance	188	41,05	22,77		
Nation Alliance	186	27,40	26,71	5.520	0.00**

People's Alliance consist of AKP and MHP while Nation Alliance consist of CHP, İYİ Party and HDP.

In our first hypothesis; in order to test the partisan identification effect, we used "Independent Sample T Test". Considering that the daylight saving time policy change came from the ruling party, we would be expecting relatively higher support for the policy from the voters of the ruling party AKP. In addition to that,

People's Alliance was founded as an umbrella for AKP and its political ally MHP in order to win the elections in 2018. As such, the responses of MHP voters in our study were included under the People's Alliance. Similarly, the responses of İYİ Party voters were included under the Nation Alliance. HDP voters were also included under this category because their responses to the survey question were closely aligned with those of CHP and İYİ Party voters. Supporters of the People's Alliance have a higher average of support (41,05) for the policy change compared to the supporters of Nation Alliance (27,40). Our hypothesis holds that the partisan identification of the voters predictably changes their opinion of the topic. Results shows us that our data is statistical significant and supports our hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2. People's perceptions of the topic differ according to the source of information presented to them. More authoritative sources such as university publications and the Chamber of Engineers affect people's opinions more than the arguments of the politicians, independent of direction.

Table 2. The Effect of the Source of Information

Version	Variables	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
İTÜ	Before	100	37,37	28,67		
	After	100	51,52	28,25	+8,419	0.00
Albayrak	Before	100	34,88	25,55		
	After	100	36,28	29,86	+,970	0.33
EMO	Before	100	32,99	27,30		
	After	100	35,09	27,67	+,990	0.32
CHP MP	Before	100	37,08	26,78		
	After	100	32,03	28,38	-3,445	0.00

In our second hypothesis; in order to test the effect of the source of information, we used "Paired Sample T Test". The table above shows people's approaches to different sources of information. Accordingly, we see that İTÜ and CHP MP had

a significant effect on people's opinions while Berat Albayrak and EMO did not. One particular example was the response of CHP voters to Berat Albayrak's statements, as they became even less likely to support the policy after reading his endorsement of it. Our hypothesis holds that more specialized, non partisan sources such as university (İTÜ) and the Chamber of Engineers (EMO) affect people more than the arguments of the politicians (Albayrak&CHP MP). Our data shows that our hypothesis holds accurate for the İTÜ (University) and for Berat Albayrak (politician), since people's opinions across the political spectrum changed noticeably after reading İTÜ's argument, but Berat Albayrak did not have the same effect, even on AKP voters. When it comes to EMO, we did not see a similar effect as we saw with İTÜ; this might suggest that people did not recognize EMO as a non partisan source on the topic, or did not know their political stance. Thus, their influence was not statistically significant. The CHP MP, on the other, hand had a significant effect on people's opinions, as did İTÜ. In contrast to our hypothesis this suggests that some voters view politicians from their party as more trustworthy than organizations specialized in a given topic.

Hypothesis 3. People’s perceptions differ according to the source of information in conjunction with their partisan affiliation. In other words, people become more confident in their opinions after reading a confirming piece of information. The opinion of the supporters of the government about the policy will be more positive after reading the positive arguments and the opinion of the supporters of the opposition will be more negative after reading the negative arguments.

Table 3. The Effect of Confirming Sources of Information

Tested Parties	Political Version	Variables	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
AKP/MHP	İTÜ-Albayrak	Before	93	40,75	20,18		
		After	93	50,86	22,92	+8,955	0.00
CHP/İYİ Party	EMO-CHP MP	Before	79	25,06	25,56		
		After	79	19,48	25,37	-2,135	0.03

In our third hypothesis; in order to test the effect of confirming sources of information, we used “Paired Sample T Test”. In the table above, we examined the effects of İTÜ and Albayrak’s statements, on the supporters of AKP and MHP since their support for the implementation of daylight saving time was higher than CHP and İYİ Party. And second, we examined the effects of EMO and CHP MP’s statement, on the supporters of CHP and İYİ Party since their support was significantly lower than the supporters of AKP and MHP. In accordance with our hypothesis, when faced with a confirming source of information, the support of AKP and MHP voters for the implementation increased, while CHP and İYİ Party voters decreased their support even further. Our data shows that İTÜ’s statement was the major factor to change people’s opinion in a positive direction (See table 2). And when it comes to the EMO and CHP MP’s statements, CHP MP was the deciding factor that changed people’s perspectives in a more negative way.

Hypothesis 3a. People’s perceptions about the policy won’t change after getting the opposite information.

Table 4. The Effect of Contradicting Sources of Information

Tested Political Parties	Version	Variables	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
CHP/İYİ Party	İTÜ-Albayrak	Before	75	26,49	26,68		
		After	75	33,61	31,83	+2,678	0.00
AKP/MHP	EMO-CHP MP	Before	95	41,35	25,16		
		After	95	43,09	24,88	+1,389	0.16

In the table above, we examined the effects of İTÜ and Albayrak’s statements, on the supporters of CHP and İYİ Party since their supports to the implementation was significantly lower than the supporters of AKP and MHP. And second, we examined the effects of EMO and CHP MP’s statement on the supporters of AKP and MHP, since their support was higher then the voters of CHP and İYİ Party. In accordance with our hypothesis, when faced with a conflicting source of information, AKP and MHP voters’ perceptions did not change (not significant), while CHP and İYİ Party voters changed their ideas and showed a more supportive attitude towards the change (statistical significance $<0,05$). This shift was mostly in response to the information that came from the Istanbul Technical University (See table 2). This might suggest that, even though the information conflicts with their preexisting opinion, opposition voters tend to change their stance when the source is a non-partisan institute such as İTÜ.

Hypothesis 4. The degree of change in the opinions of the respondents will be affected by their a priori opinions on the subject. Those who have a more positive or negative opinion about the topic will have a higher level of change after reading information confirming their a priori idea.

Table 5. The Effect of A Priori Opinion on the Degree Of Change

Tested Group	Version	Variable s	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
Support ≥ 50	İTÜ-Albayrak	Before	69	66,88	17,87		
		After	69	72,70	20,13	+3,291	0.00
Support < 50	EMO-CHP MP	Before	135	19,56	13,82		
		After	135	21,96	19,37	+1,389	0.09

In this analysis, we have also used “Paired Sample T Test” and we tried to see people’s approach to the topic by dividing them into two groups as supporters of the implementation and opposers of the implementation, independent of their partisan ties. Supporters of the implementation are people who gave 50 or more score to the change in our 0 to 100 scale. And the opposers are who evaluated the change below 50. We tried to examine how much further they would take their stance when faced with information that favors their opinions. We analyzed the change between the evaluations before reading the information and after reading the information and the data showed us that people who already favored the implementation (Before ≥ 50) increased their support to the change significantly (statistical significance = 0.002). This supports our hypothesis. However, we also found that people who opposed the implementation (Before < 50) did not significantly lower their support further. There was a slight decrease in response to the CHP MP’s statement, but no decrease in response to EMO’s statement. This

might again suggest that people did not recognize EMO as a specialized source on the topic, or did not know the organization's political stance. In addition, those opposed to the policy already had a considerably low level of support for the change; thus, this might have hindered them from lowering their support any further.

Hypothesis 5. Opinions of the people will be affected by their objective living conditions, such as age, education and having a child in the household. These variables will influence the partisan effect.

Table 6.1. Demographic factors that affect people's opinions (People's Alliance)

People's Alliance	B	Std. Error	Hypothesis Test		
			Wald Chi-Square	df	Sig.
(Intercept)	82,03	12,56	42,64	1	0,00
Male	-1,58	3,93	0,16	1	0,69
Female	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Single	2,99	6,45	0,21	1	0,64
Married	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Married without children	-10,20	3,93	6,72	1	0,01**
Married with children	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Primary School Graduate	-32,27	10,81	8,91	1	0,00**
Secondary School Graduate	-25,67	10,90	5,54	1	0,02*
Highschool Graduate	-27,31	10,15	7,24	1	0,01**
Collage Graduate (2 Years)	-19,78	11,77	2,82	1	0,09
University Graduate	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Working	1,53	4,06	0,14	1	0,72
Not Working	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Age	-0,17	0,16	1,06	1	0,30
(Scale)	438,02 ^b	48,66			

Dependent Variable: Genel olarak düşündüğünüzde, 2016 yılında uygulamaya giren Kalıcı Yaz Saati uygulaması hakkında görüşünüzü kart üzerindeki cetveli kullanarak belirtir misiniz? 0 Hiç olumlu değil, 100 çok olumlu olarak işaretler misiniz?

Model: (Intercept), Female, Male, Single, Married,, Married, Married without children, Married with Children, Working, Not Working, Age, Education Status

**p is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* p is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In the table above, a GLM model analysis of the criteria that affect the opinions of supporters of People's Alliance on the daylight saving time implementation is presented. The data has been provided by the responses given to the question regarding the people's opinion before reading our source of information.

Our data shows that male respondents had more negative opinion towards the change on daylight saving time than female respondents. In addition, in terms of marital status, single individuals stated more positive attitudes towards the implementation compared to married individuals. When I divided the married people into two categories, with children and without children, it became clear that married people without children had a more negative attitude towards the policy change than married people with children.

Another criteria that affected the results was the level of education of the respondent. It can be observed that the tendency towards permanent summertime is more favorable; this was particularly noticeable among those with secondary education, college and university degrees, in contrast with the graduates of primary school. In short, as the education level increases, the tendency towards a positive view of the change increases. Additionally, even though unemployed people have a positive tendency towards the policy change compared to the working people, work status criteria did not make a statistically significant difference in people's opinions according to the data.

Table 6.2. Demographic factors that affect people's opinions (Nation Alliance)

Nation Alliance	B	Std. Error	Hypothesis Test		
			Wald Chi-Square	df	Sig.
(Intercept)	58,08	13,20	19,35	1	0,00
Male	5,71	4,02	2,01	1	0,15
Female	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Single	-4,00	6,34	0,39	1	0,52
Married	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Married without children	-3,42	5,82	0,34	1	0,55
Married with children	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Primary School Graduate	-7,92	12,60	0,39	1	0,52
Secondary School Graduate	-17,40	13,57	1,64	1	0,20
Highschool Graduate	-17,97	9,48	3,59	1	0,05
Collage Graduate (2 Years)	-10,92	11,21	0,94	1	0,33
University Graduate	-20,47	9,20	4,94	1	0,02*
Master's or Doctoral Degree	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Working	-0,92	4,58	0,04	1	0,84
Not Working	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Age	-0,34	0,20	2,97	1	0,08
(Scale)	590,53 ^b	65,61			

Dependent Variable: *Genel olarak düşündüğümüzde, 2016 yılında uygulamaya giren Kalıcı Yaz Saati uygulaması hakkında görüşünüzü kart üzerindeki cetveli kullanarak belirtir misiniz? 0 Hiç olumlu değil, 100 çok olumlu olarak işaretler misiniz?*

Model: (Intercept), Female, Male, Single, Married,, Married, Married without children, Married with Children, Working, Not Working, Age, Education Status

**p is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* p is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In the table above, a GLM model analysis of the criteria which affect supporters of Nation Alliance's opinions on the daylight saving time implementation is presented. The data has been provided by the responses given to the question regarding respondents' opinions before reading our source of information.

Our data shows that male respondents had more positive opinions towards the change on daylight saving time compared to female respondents. In addition, in terms of marital status, single individuals reported more negative attitudes towards the implementation compared to married individuals. By dividing married people into two categories – those with children and those without children - I found that married people without children had more negative attitude towards the policy change compared to married people with children.

Other criteria that affected the respondents' attitudes towards the policy was the level of education. It is observed that the perspective towards permanent summer time is more negative, especially among those with secondary education, college (two year) and university degrees compared to the graduates of primary school, differentiating from the results of People's Alliance. As the education level increases, the tendency towards a negative view of the change increases. In addition, the work status criteria did not make a statistically significant difference on people's opinions according to my data.

Table 6.3. Demographic factors that affect people's opinions (General Public)

General Public	B	Std. Error	Hypothesis Test		
			Wald Chi-Square	df	Sig.
(Intercept)	52,32	11,45	20,88	1	0,00
People's Alliance	20,68	3,01	46,90	1	0,00**
Nation Alliance	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Male	-0,57	2,82	0,04	1	0,83
Female	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Single	-0,49	4,46	0,01	1	0,91
Married	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Married without children	-9,19	3,37	7,42	1	0,00**
Married with children	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Primary School Graduate	-17,28	10,89	2,51	1	0,11
Secondary School Graduate	-11,74	11,07	1,12	1	0,29
Highschool Graduate	-13,07	10,15	1,65	1	0,19
Collage Graduate (2 Years)	-0,53	10,93	0,00	1	0,96
University Graduate	-11,76	10,14	1,34	1	0,24
Master's or Doctoral Degree	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Working	-1,40	3,11	0,20	1	0,65
Not Working	0 ^a	.	.	.	.
Age	-0,22	0,13	2,84	1	0,09
(Scale)	560,76 ^b	43,07			

In the table above, a GLM model analyze of the criterias which affect the general public's opinions on the daylight saving time implementation is presented. The data has been provided by the responses given to the question regarding the people's opinion before reading our source of information.

It has been observed that there is a statistically significant difference in the views of the people in the Nation Alliance regarding the permanent summer time. It is

seen that supporters of the Nation Alliance has a strong negative opinion on the implementation compared to the supporters of the People's Alliance.

In this data, I have combined supporters of People's Alliance and Nation Alliance and given the results of the analysis of general public opinion. Our data shows that male respondents had more negative opinion towards the change on daylight saving time than female respondents. In addition, in terms of marital status, single individuals stated more negative attitudes towards the implementation compared to married individuals. When I divided the married people into two categories, with children and without children, it became clear that married people without children had a more negative attitude towards the policy change than married people with children.

Another criteria that affected the results was the level of education of the respondent. It can be observed that the tendency towards permanent summertime is more favorable; this was particularly noticeable among those with secondary education, college (2 years) and university degrees, in contrast with the graduates of primary school. In short, as the education level increases, the tendency towards a positive view of the change increases. Additionally, even though unemployed people have a negative tendency towards the policy change compared to the working people, work status criteria, alongside with the age criteria, did not make a statistically significant difference in people's opinions according to the data.

Table 7. Albayrak's Effect on the Supporters of the Nation Alliance

Nation Alliance	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	F	p
Before Albayrak	42	25,90	25,33	3,90	
After Albayrak	42	21,38	29,30	4.52	0.07

In the table above I have presented the results of Nation Alliance voters when facing Berat Albayrak's statement. As you can see, even though Albayrak's statement is in favor of the permanent summer time, people's attitude towards the change decrease even further after reading the source of information by Albayrak. This can be interpret that Albayrak's political stance created a "backfire effect" on the supporters of the Nation Alliance voters. This is even more significant when compare the voter's behaviors between Albayrak's and ITU's tests. As seen below (Table 8), Nation Alliance voters when facing ITU's supportive argument towards the permanent summer time, voters have changed their negative attitude and took a relatively positive attitude.

Table 8. ITU's Effect on the Supporters of the Nation Alliance

Nation Alliance	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	F	p
Before ITU	43	26,02	28,73	4,38	
After ITU	43	45,19	29,16	4.44	0.00

Table 9. CHP MP'S Effect on the Supporters of the People's Alliance

People's Alliance	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	F	p
Before CHP MP	49	44,27	25,12	3,58	
After CHP MP	49	44,37	25,80	3.68	0.92

In the table above, I have tried to test the backfire effect on the supporters of the People's Alliance. We can see that people's opinion on the issue did not change after reading the opposing argument of CHP MP's on the permanent summer time. Differentiating from the Nation Alliance voters, we do not observe a backfire effect here.

CONCLUSION

Turkey is a politically divided and polarized country in which the political party supporters do not even want to see their children marry with people who are aligned with the political parties they feel distant from their ideologies. They don't want to do business with them nor they want to be their neighbors (Erdoğan and Semerci, 2018). Elections in Turkey, whether it is local or general ends up one side winning with a small margin. Current president, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has won the presidency with 52.59%. In 2017, a new constitution was accepted by a popular vote with 51.41% against 48.59%. Even in local elections the margin is too narrow. The same election we asked to our respondents in our survey, Istanbul's municipal elections, in 2019 March, CHP's candidate Ekrem İmamoğlu has won the popular vote with 48.77% against the ruling party's candidate Binali Yıldırım who also got a very close percentage (48.61%).

Political decisions, arguments have had a divider effect on the public and tend to create two different sides, one of them backing the ruling party's decision, the other opposing it with a similar number of people. Traditional and social media also have a big impact on this polarizing effect since people follow the news sources they like, the people they agree with and thus creating echo chambers and only hearing voices and arguments that are alike with theirs (Erdoğan and Semerci, 2018).

In my research, I wanted to see the effect of polarization, party bias and motivated reasoning on the voters, using the change in the daylight saving time system. Experiencing the arguments that are created around the change, seeing how a direct daily life change, primarily with an intent to decrease use of energy, became a huge political debate. I have selected my sources of information in order to represent both sides of the politics and also other non partisan sources such as universities and professional chambers. This research could have been done with a more direct political topic as abortion, political candidates or foreign policy but I

wanted to test the theories with a relatively less politicized issue such as daylight saving time.

In order to do that, we have conducted face to face surveys with random sampling methods. We have asked them many demographic and political questions to analyze where they are standing in the political sphere. Then we have learned their opinions on our topic. As we expected, voters' primary opinions on the topic varied accordingly with their party preferences. Supporters of the ruling party and its People's Alliance tend to support the change more than the supporters of opposition parties.

After receiving their primary opinions, we wanted to see how different people from different political parties reacted to a variety of sources of information. Some of them encountered information that is similar to what they think, some of them also faced opposing arguments to their opinions.

The alliances that are founded in 2018 also played its part in the process. People's Alliance partners, AKP and MHP voters have had a similar stance on the topic; and also Nation Alliance partners, CHP and İYİ Party voters were on the same page when it comes to oppose the change. Accordingly with our hypothesis, partisan identification of the voters has a defining effect on their opinion on the topic. One note that, İYİ Party was not in the political arena when the change in daylight saving time was enacted. The party was founded in 2017 October.

We have also found that even though partisan identification and polarization is strong, voters of the opposition parties, when facing opposing information from the Istanbul Technical University, they have changed their views and have taken a more positive attitude towards the policy. This might suggest that people tend to pay more attention to non-political actors who are also specialized in the issue and consider their primary preferences once again, even changing their stances. This finding might be one of the few positive outcomes of the research. Suggesting a possible way to reach people in polarized societies. When combined with the response of people who are supporters of the main opposition party CHP to Berat

Albayrak's statement on the issue, non political actors' effects emerge more clearly. We have witnessed a rising support for the change amongst CHP voters who faced İTÜ's statement and a backfire effect when facing Berat Albayrak's statement, CHP voters backfired and lowered their support further down. The source of information, its alignment with political parties and their political agenda matters even more when it comes to reaching people from the opposite side.

It was a striking experience to see what people do when faced with supportive information of their primary opinions. When testing the AKP/MHP voters' responses after reading the information provided from İTÜ and Albayrak; we have seen a salient rise in their support to the implementation. Especially when combined with Istanbul Technical University's statement, people's self confidence on their ideas ascended and they gave stronger and more positive responses towards the change.

Although AKP/MHP voters have had a more positive stance after facing supportive arguments, and CHP/İYİ Party voters increased their support with the same information. We did not see the same pattern with AKP/MHP supporters. One of our tests was to analyze the effect of information that falsifies one's opinion; our test subjects were AKP/MHP voters and we did not see any change on their opinions. In this case, our hypothesis suggests that when faced with conflicting sources of information , partizans do not change their stance and stick with their primary opinions.

In addition, opposition voters reacted strongly to the CHP MP who gave a statement opposing the change. CHP and İYİ Party voters, who were already having a negative opinion about the implementation, facing the CHP MP's statement, decreased their support even lower. EMO on the other hand did not have the same effect even though they were also opposing the change; people might fail to picture their political stance or did not see them as a specialized source on the topic.

As we have presented, our research aimed to analyze the people's approaches to different sources of information in the context of motivated reasoning and partisanship. We have collected many important results such as people's reactions to the information provided from a university. A partisan source of information such as a minister or a deputy and how it affected the opinions of people. We have seen increasing self confidence on one's opinion when facing affirmative information. And also people's reluctance to reevaluate their primary opinions when encountered with falsifying information when it comes from a political source that one feels distant from.

We have also seen the effects of non political organizations such as Istanbul Technical University and its effect on the people. Both on the supporters of the government and on the oppositions they had a big impact and resulted in a positive outcome in terms of showing us people's openness to the new information when it is provided in a less political frame and from a non partisan, well known institution.

Turkey as a politically divided and polarized country, will need more examples of this. Both the government and the opposition needs to find new ways to reach to "other side" in order to make themselves heard. Building bridges with democratical and non partisan approach might have a positive effect on the public. Further researches are necessary in order to monitor the society and find new ways to connect people and give them a new space outside of their "echo chambers".

REFERENCES

- 140 Journos (2016). Murat Bakan'dan ve Elektrik Mühendisleri Odası'ndan Yaz Saati Hakkında Açıklama. Retrieved June 30 2019, from <https://140journos.com/murat-bakandan-ve-elektrik-m%C3%BChendisleri-odas%C4%B1-ndan-yaz-saati-hakk%C4%B1nda-a%C3%A7%C4%B1klama-3a13fb963412>
- Anson, I. G. (2016). Just the facts? Partisan media and the political conditioning of economic perceptions. *Political Research Quarterly*, 69(3), 444-456.
- Aronson, E. (1969). The theory of cognitive dissonance: A current perspective. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 1-34). Academic Press.
- Batson, C. D. (1975). Rational processing or rationalization? The effect of disconfirming information on a stated religious belief. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32(1), 176.
- Bolsen, T., Druckman, J. N., & Cook, F. L. (2014). The influence of partisan motivated reasoning on public opinion. *Political Behavior*, 36(2), 235-262.
- Browning, G., Halcli, A. & Webster, F. (2000). *Understanding Contemporary Society: Theories of the Present*. SAGE Publications.
- CNN, (2020). Daylight Saving Time Fast Facts. Retrieved January 4 2021, from <https://edition.cnn.com/2013/08/22/world/daylight-saving-time-fast-facts/index.html>
- Druckman, J. N., Peterson, E., & Slothuus, R. (2013). How elite partisan polarization affects public opinion formation. *American Political Science Review*, 107(1), 57-79.
- Edwards, K., & Smith, E. E. (1996). A disconfirmation bias in the evaluation of arguments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(1), 5.
- EMO (2016). Kış saatine geçilmemesi tasarruf değil israf getirdi. Retrieved June30 2019, from https://www.emo.org.tr/genel/bizden_detay.php?kod=116230

Erdoğan, E., & Semerci, P. U. (2018). Dimensions of polarization in Turkey. *Istanbul Bilgi University Center for Migration Research Report*, https://goc.bilgi.edu.tr/media/uploads/2018/02/06/dimensions-of-polarizationppt_Tz7XeBg.pdf.

Erdoğan, E., & Semerci, P. U. (2018). *Fanusta diyaloglar: Türkiye'de kutuplaşmanın boyutları*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Fiske, S. T. (1980). Attention and weight in person perception: The impact of negative and extreme behavior. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 38(6), 889.

Goren, P. (2007). Character weakness, partisan bias, and presidential evaluation: Modifications and extensions. *Political Behavior*, 29(3), 305-325.

Goren, P. (2002). Character weakness, partisan bias, and presidential evaluation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 627-641.

Kearns, E. M., Betus, A. E., & Lemieux, A. F. (2019). When Data Do Not Matter: Exploring Public Perceptions of Terrorism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 1-22.

Kopko, K. C., Bryner, S. M., Budziak, J., Devine, C. J., & Nawara, S. P. (2011). In the eye of the beholder? Motivated reasoning in disputed elections. *Political behavior*, 33(2), 271-290.

Kruglanski, A. W., & Webster, D. M. (1996). Motivated closing of the mind: "Seizing" and "freezing". *Psychological review*, 103(2), 263.

Kunda, Z. (1987). Motivated inference: Self-serving generation and evaluation of causal theories. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 53(4), 636.

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(3), 480.

Kuklinski, J. H., Quirk, P. J., Jerit, J., & Rich, R. F. (2001). The political environment and citizen competence. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(2), 410-424.

- Lebo, M. J., & Cassino, D. (2007). The aggregated consequences of motivated reasoning and the dynamics of partisan presidential approval. *Political Psychology*, 28(6), 719-746.
- Leeper, T. J., & Slothuus, R. (2014). Political parties, motivated reasoning, and public opinion formation. *Political Psychology*, 35, 129-156.
- Levendusky, M. S. (2013). Why do partisan media polarize viewers?. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(3), 611-623.
- Lord, C. G., Ross, L., & Lepper, M. R. (1979). Biased assimilation and attitude polarization: The effects of prior theories on subsequently considered evidence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 37(11), 2098.
- McLeod, S. A. (2018, Feb 05). Cognitive dissonance. *Simply Psychology*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/cognitive-dissonance.html>
- Milliyet, (2019). Sürekli yaz saatiyle 1 milyar TL tasarruf. Retrieved November 30 2019, from <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/ekonomi/surekli-yaz-saatiyle-1-milyar-tl-tasarruf-6066191>
- Milliyet, (2017). Son dakika: Bakan Albayrak'tan flaş yaz saati açıklaması! Retrieved June 30 2019 from <https://www.milliyet.com.tr/ekonomi/son-dakika-bakan-albayraktan-flas-yaz-saati-aciklamasi-2558637>
- Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of general psychology*, 2(2), 175-220.
- Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions. *Political Behavior*, 32(2), 303-330.
- Parker-Stephen, E. (2013). Tides of disagreement: How reality facilitates (and inhibits) partisan public opinion. *The Journal of Politics*, 75(4), 1077-1088.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In *Communication and persuasion* (pp. 1-24). Springer, New York, NY.
- Redlawsk, D. P. (2002). Hot cognition or cool consideration? Testing the effects of motivated reasoning on political decision making. *The Journal of Politics*, 64(4), 1021-1044.

- Slothuus, R., & De Vreese, C. H. (2010). Political parties, motivated reasoning, and issue framing effects. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(3), 630-645.
- Sputnik Türkiye (2017). İTÜ: Yaz saati uygulamasıyla yaklaşık 538 milyon lira tasarruf sağlandı. Retrieved June 30 2019 from <https://tr.sputniknews.com/ekonomi/201710171030628493-itu-yaz-saati-tasarruf/>
- Sputnik Türkiye (2017). Kalıcı yaz saati uygulaması 2.8 milyar TL'ye mal oldu. Retrieved June 30 2019 from <https://tr.sputniknews.com/ekonomi/201710091030495187-kalici-yaz-saati-uygulamasi/>
- Taber, C. S., & Lodge, M. (2006). Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(3), 755-769.
- TUİK. (2018). Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemi. From http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1059
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *science*, 185(4157), 1124-1131.
- Yeni Şafak (2016). Yaz saati uygulaması nedir - Avantajları neler. Retrieved June 29, 2019, from <https://www.yenisafak.com/yaz-saati-uygulamasi-nedir---avantajlari-neler-h-2528646>
- Zaller, J. R. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. Cambridge university press.

ATTACHMENTS

Questionnaire

-A-

Project ID: 2019-004-001

- A -

Anket No: id. [.....]

Versiyon: [1]

İl: il. [.....]

İlçe: ilçe. [.....]

Mahalle / Köy: mah. [.....]

Sokak: sokak. [.....]

Bina Numarası: bina. [.....]

Daire Numarası: daire. [.....]

Yerleşim Birimi: [KENT (1), KIR (2)] yerleşim. [.....]

Görüşmenin yapıldığı tarih: [-/-/ "GÜN/AY/YIL" SEKLİNDE KODLAYIN] tarih. [..... / / 2019]

Görüşmeye başlama saati: [-/-/ 24 SAATLİK SİSTEME GÖRE KODLAYIN (ÖRN: 14:30)] bas_saat. [..... :]

"Günaydın/ İyi günler/ akşamlar, benim adım Soruların doğru ya da yanlış cevabı olmayıp, biz sadece sizin verdiğiniz cevaplarla ilgilenmekteyiz. Vereceğiniz bütün bilgiler, YALNIZCA akademik amaçlar için değerlendirilecek ve kişisel bilgileriniz etik kurallar gereği, tamamen gizli tutulacaktır. Bu çalışma için sizden yaklaşık 15 dakikanızı ayırmanızı rica ediyoruz. Bize ayracağınız vakit için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz.

Temel Demografi

dtarih. Öncelikle hangi yıl doğduğunuzu öğrenebilir miyim? dtarih. [.....]

[-/-/ LÜTFEN YAZIN] 19 99. [-/-/ OKUMAYIN] Bilmiyor / Cevap yok

[-/-/ GÖRÜŞTÜĞÜZ KİŞİ 2002 YILINDAN SONRA DOĞMUSSA, 18 YAS VEYA ÜSTÜ BİRİYLE GÖRÜŞMEYİ TALEP EDİN, UYGUN YAS SINIRI İÇİNDE BİRİ YOKSA TEŞEKKÜR EDİP GÖRÜŞMEYE SON VERİN.]

cins. Görüşülen kişinin cinsiyeti [-/-/ KODLAYIN] cins. [.....]

1. Erkek 2. Kadın

Bölüm A:

A.01. Genel olarak düşündüğünüzde hayatınızdan ne kadar memnunsunuz? "Çok mu memnunsunuz", "oldukça memnun" musunuz, "pek memnun değil" misiniz, "hiç memnun değil" misiniz? a01. [.....]

1. Çok memnunum 99. [-/-/ OKUMAYIN] Bilmiyor/Cevap yok

2. Biraz memnunum

3. Pek memnun değilim

4. Hiç memnun değilim

A02. Kendinizi okuyacağım partilerden hangisine yakın hissediyorsunuz? a02. [.....]

[PARTİ]

1. Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AKP) 90. Diğer [-/-/ İLGİLİ ALANA AÇIK OLARAK YAZIN]

2. Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (CHP) 99. Fikri Yok / Bilmiyor / Cevap Yok

3. Halkın Demokrasi Partisi (HDP)

4. İyi Parti (İYİ)

5. Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi (MHP)

A.03. 31 Martta yapılan yerel seçimlerde İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediye Başkanlığı için hangi partinin adayına oy verdiniz? [-/-/ SEÇENEKLERİ KESİNLİKLE OKUMAYIN.] a03. [.....]

[-/-/ OY VERİLEN PARTİ]

1. Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AK Parti) 90. Diğer [-/-/ İLGİLİ ALANA YAZIN]

2. Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (CHP) 96. Hiçbiri

3. Demokratik Sol Parti (DSP) 99. Cevap yok

4. Saadet Partisi (SP)

5. Türkiye Komünist Partisi (TKP)

A04. Desteklediğiniz partinin taraftarı olmak sizin için ne kadar önemli? a.04 [.....]

1. Hiç önemli değil
2. Pek önemli değil
3. Önemli
4. Çok önemli
99. Fikri Yok / Bilmiyor / Cevap Yok

A.05. Genel olarak düşündüğünüzde, 2016 yılında uygulamaya giren Kalıcı Yaz Saati uygulaması hakkında görüşünüzü kart üzerindeki cetveli kullanarak belirtir misiniz? 0 Hiç olumlu değil, 100 çok olumlu olarak işaretler misiniz? [-/- KART A.03'Ü GÖSTERİN] a.05 [.....]

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	99
Hiç olumlu değil										Cok olumlu	[-/- OKUMAYIN] FY / Bilmiyor / CY

A06. Şimdi size bir metin sunacağız, bu metni dikkatlice okumanızı rica ederiz. [-/- KART A.04'Ü GÖSTERİN] a.06 [.....]

A.06a. Şimdi, biraz önce okuduğunuz metin üzerinden düşündüğünüzde, 2016 yılında uygulamaya giren Kalıcı Yaz Saati uygulaması hakkında görüşünüzü kart üzerindeki cetveli kullanarak belirtir misiniz? 0 Hiç olumlu değil, 100 çok olumlu olarak işaretler misiniz? a.06a [.....]

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	99
Hiç olumlu değil										Cok olumlu	[-/- OKUMAYIN] FY / Bilmiyor / CY

A.07. Biraz önce okuduğunuz haberin kaynağını okuyacağım kriterlerde değerlendirir misiniz? Hiç mi katılmıyorsunuz, pek katılmıyorsunuz, ne katılıyor ne katılmıyor musunuz, biraz katılıyor musunuz yoksa kesinlikle katılıyor musunuz? a.07 [.....]



		Hiç katılmıyorum	Pek katılmıyorum	Ne katılmıyorum ne katılmıyorum	Biraz katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum	[-/- OKUMAYIN] Bilmiyor/CY	(A.07)
1	Haber kaynağı tarafsızdı	1	2	3	4	5	99	a0701. [.....]
2	Haber kaynağı güvenilirli	1	2	3	4	5	99	a0702. [.....]
3	Haber kaynağı görüşümü değiştirmeye yönelikti	1	2	3	4	5	99	a0703. [.....]

A.08. Genel olarak düşündüğünüzde kalıcı yaz saati uygulaması sizin hayatınızı nasıl etkiledi? Çok kötü mü etkiledi, biraz kötü mü etkiledi, biraz iyi mi etkiledi yoksa çok iyi mi etkiledi? a.08 [.....]

1. Çok kötü etkiledi
2. Biraz kötü etkiledi
3. Biraz iyi etkiledi
4. Çok iyi etkiledi
99. [-/- OKUMAYIN] Bilmiyor / Cevap Yok

A08a. Peki sizi hangi yönden iyi ya da kötü etkiledi?

[LÜTFEN YAZINIZ]..... a08a. [.....]

Bölüm Z: Sosyo-ekonomik ve demografik faktörler

[I-I- HERKESE SORUN]

Z.01. Çalışma durumunuz için okuyacağım seçeneklerden hangisi daha uygundur?

z01. [.....]

1. Tam zamanlı (haftada 40+saat) çalışıyor
2. Kısmi zamanlı (part-time) çalışıyor
3. Mevsimlik işte çalışıyor
4. Ücretsiz aile işçisi (ailenin işyerinde, bahçesinde, vs. çalışıyor)
5. Ev kadını
6. Emekli
7. Öğrenci ve çalışmıyor
8. İşsiz fakat gelir sahibi (Bir işte çalışmıyor, iş aramayan, kira-faiz benzeri gelirle geçinen)
9. İşsiz (Herhangi bir işte çalışmıyor iş arayan)
10. Hastalık ve benzeri nedenlerle çalışmıyor

99. [I-I- OKUMAYIN] Cevap yok

[I-I- ÇALIŞANLARA VE ÖĞRENCİLERE SORUNUZ]

Z.01a. Çalışıyorsanız (Okuyorsanız), işe (okula) gitmek için sabah kaçta kalktığınızı söyler misiniz?

[LUTFEN YAZIN] z03. [.....]

99. [I-I- OKUMAYIN] Cevap yok

Z.01b. Peki, ortalama bir günde eve kaçta dönüyorsunuz?

[LUTFEN YAZIN] z03. [.....]

99. [I-I- OKUMAYIN] Cevap yok

Z.02. En son mezun olduğunuz okul düzeyini öğrenebilir miyim?

[YAZIN] z02. [.....]

1. Okuma yazma bilmiyor
2. Okul mezunu değil, okuma yazma biliyor
3. İlkokul mezunu
4. Ortaokul (veya ilköğretim okulu) mezunu
5. Lise veya dengi okul mezunu
6. Yüksekokul (2 yıllık) mezunu
7. Üniversite (en az 4 yıllık) mezunu
8. Yüksek lisans veya doktora mezunu

99. [I-I- OKUMAYIN] Cevap yok

Z.03. Hanenizde siz dahil kaç kişi yaşıyor?

[LUTFEN YAZIN] z03. [.....]

99. [I-I- OKUMAYIN] Cevap yok

Z.04. Okuyacaklarımdan hangisi medeni durumunuzu en iyi açıklamaktadır?

z04. [.....]

1. Evli
2. Hiç evlenmemiş bekar
3. Boşanmış bekar
4. Eşi vefat etmiş
5. Resmi nikah olmadan beraber yaşayan

99. [I-I- OKUMAYIN] Cevap yok

Z.05. Çocuğunuz var mı?

z05. [.....]

1. Evet, var. [I-I- Z06A İLE DEVAM EDİN]
2. Hayır, yok. [I-I- Z07'E GEÇİN]

99. [I-I- OKUMAYIN] Cevap yok

[I-I- SORU Z06A VE Z06B "ÇOCUĞU OLANLARA" (Z06=1 İSE) SORULACAKTIR]

Z.06a. Kaç tane?

[YAZIN] z06a. [.....]

Z.06b. Okul çağında olan çocuğunuz var mı?

z06b. [.....]

1. Evet, var.
2. Hayır, yok.

99. [I-I- OKUMAYIN] Cevap yok

Z.07. Toplam aylık hane halkı gelirinizi öğrenebilir miyim? Hanenizin aylık geliri okuyacağım aralıklarından hangisine girmektedir *[-/- BÜTÜN AİLE FERTLERİNİN MAAS, KİRA, EMEKLİ AYLIĞI VB. GELİRLERİNİ DE GÖZ ÖNÜNDE BULUNDURARAK SORUNUZ]*

z07. [.....]

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| 1. 500 TL veya altı | 11. 5.001 - 5.500 TL |
| 2. 501 - 1.000 TL | 12. 5.501 - 6.000 TL |
| 3. 1.001 - 1.500 TL | 13. 6.001 - 6.500 TL |
| 4. 1.501 - 2.000 TL | 14. 6.501 - 7.000 TL |
| 5. 2.001 - 2.500 TL | 15. 7.001 - 7.500 TL |
| 6. 2.501 - 3.000 TL | 16. 7.501 - 8.000 TL |
| 7. 3.001 - 3.500 TL | 17. 8.001 - 8.500 TL |
| 8. 3.501 - 4.000 TL | 17. 8.501 - 9.000 TL |
| 9. 4.001 - 4.500 TL | 18. 9.001 TL veya üstü |
| 10. 4.501 - 5.000 TL | 99. <i>[-/- OKUMAYIN]</i> Bilmiyor/Cevap Yok |

Görüşülen Kişinin

Adı Soyadı:

isim. [...]

Araştırmamıza Katıldığınız İçin Tekrar Teşekkür Ederim

Görüşmenin bitiş saati: *[-/- 24 SAATLİK SİSTEME GÖRE KODLAYIN (ÖRNEK: 14:30)]*

bas_saat. [..... :]

Görüşülen kişi, görüşme sırasında yalnız mıydı?

yaln. [.....]

1. Evet

2. Hayır

Versiyon Kontrol Kodu:

verkont. [8]

Demographics and Political Preferences

Table 10. Gender of Participants

Gender	Male	49%
	Female	49,3%

Of those who stated their gender to our survey; 49,3% are female while, 49% are male.

Table 11. Satisfaction with Life

How Satisfied	Very much satisfied	12%
	Somewhat satisfied	55%
	Not very satisfied	27,5%
	Not satisfied at all	5%

12% of the participants stated that they are very much satisfied with their life while; 55% are somewhat satisfied, 27,5% are not very satisfied and 5% are not satisfied at all.

Table 12. Political Party Preferences

Political Party	AKP	38,8%
	CHP	32,3%
	HDP	8,3%
	MHP	8,3%
	İYİ Party	6%
	Other	1,3%
	No Answer	5,3%

38,8% of the participants stated that they support AKP while 32,3% of the participants prefers CHP. Support for HDP and MHP are the same as 8,3% while

İYİ Party is 6%. 1,3% stated that they support other political parties while 5,3% decided not to answer our question.

Table 13. Preferences in the 2019 Istanbul Municipal Elections

Political Party	CHP	47,3%
	AKP	45,8%
	None	2,8%
	Other	1,4%
	No Answer	3%

Of those who participated in our survey, 47,3% stated that they voted for CHP in the 2019 Istanbul's municipal elections while; 45,8% voted for AKP's candidate. 2,8% did not support any candidate and 1,4% voted for other candidates.

Table 14. Importance of Supporting Their Political Party

How Important	Very important	18,8%
	Important	40%
	Not very much important	28,8%
	Not important at all	6,3%

We asked our participants that "How important it is for you to support your party?". 18,8% said it is very important for them to support their political party while; 40% stated it is important. 28,8% of the participants responded it is not very much important while; for 6,3% it is not important at all.

Table 15.1. Opinions for the Sources of Information

The news source was neutral	I agree	34,3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	32,8%
	I do not agree	29,8%

We have asked our participants to evaluate our news sources in three sections. First one was “The news source was neutral”. 34,3% of those said they agree with the given sentence while; 32,8% neither agreed nor disagreed and 29,8% stated that they did not agree.

Table 15.2. Opinions for the Sources of Information

The news source was reliable	I agree	35,5%
	Neither agree nor disagree	36,8%
	I do not agree	24,3%

Second one was “The news source was reliable”. 35,5% of those said they agree with the given sentence while; 36,8 % neither agreed nor disagreed and 24,3% stated that they did not agree.

Table 15.3. Opinions for the Sources of Information

The news source was meant to change my view	I agree	37,5%
	Neither agree nor disagree	29%
	I do not agree	29,5%

Third and the last one was “The news source was meant to change my view”. 37,5% of those said they agree with the given sentence while; 29% neither agreed nor disagreed and 29,5% stated that they did not agree.

Table 16. Effects of the Permanent Daylight Saving Time in Daily Life

Effect	Effectuated very good	3,3%
	Somewhat good	14%
	Somewhat bad	52,3%
	Effectuated very bad	17,8%

We have asked our participants about the effects of the permanent daylight saving time in their daily lives. Only 3,3% of those said the implementation effected their life very good and 14% of those stated that their life have been effected by that somewhat good. A big portion of the participants, 52,3%, said that their life has been effected by the implementation somewhat bad while 17,8% responded it effected their daily life very bad.

Table 17. Work Status

Status	Full-time	42,3%
	Housewife	20,5%
	Not working (student)	12,3%
	Retired	10%
	Part-time	4,5%
	Unemployed	3,3%
	Unemployed with some income	1,8%
	Unpaid family worker	0,8 %

42,3% of our participants are working full-time while 20,5% of them are housewives. 12,3% are not working (student), 10% are retired and 4,5% are working part-time jobs. 3,3% are unemployed while 1,8% are unemployed but has some income. 0,8% are unpaid family workers.

Table 18. Education

Level of education	High school or equivalent	35,3%
	University	17,8%
	Primary school	15,5%
	Secondary school	11,5%
	Junior college	6,3%
	Master's or doctorate	2,5%
	Not a school graduate but literate	2,3%
	Illiterate	0,3%

35,3% of our participants are graduates of high school or equivalent while 17,8% are university graduates. 15,5% of those graduated from primary school while 11,5% are graduates of secondary school. 6,3% has graduated from junior college (2 years) while 2,5% have master's or doctorate degrees. Only 2,3% are not a school graduates but literate while 0,3% are illiterate.

Table 19. Number of People in the Household

Number of people	1-2	18,1%
	3-4	48,8%
	5+	23,9%

18,1% of our participants have 1 or 2 people living in the household while 48,8% of those have 3 to 4 people. 23,9% people responded that they have 5 or more people in their household.

Table 20. Marital Status

Status	Married	56%
	Never married, single	35,5%
	Widowed	1,8%
	Divorced, single	1,3%
	Not married, living together	0,5%

56% of our participants are married while 35,5% are never married before and are single. 1,8% are widowed and 1,3% are divorced, single. Only 0,5% are not married and living together with their partner.

Table 21.1 Having Children

Having children	Yes	53%
	No	47%

53% of our participants have children while 47% stated that they don't have any children.

Table 21.2 Number of Children

Number	1	14%
	2	20,3%
	3	13%
	4+	4,8%

14% of people have 1 child while 20,3% of participants have 2 children. 13% have 3 children and only 4,8% have 4 or more children.

Table 21.3 Child at the Age of School

Status	Yes	53,6%
	No	46,4%

53,6% of the participants have a child at school age while; 46,4% of those do not.

Table 22. Household Income

Income	501-2500₺	4,8%
	2501-3500₺	17%
	3501-4500₺	25,5%
	4501-5500₺	22,3%
	5501-7500₺	8,5%
	7501₺+	13,3%

4,8% of our respondents have an income between 501-2500₺, 17% are in between 2501 to 3500₺ while 25,5% are 3501 to 4500₺ and 22,3% are between 4501 to 5500₺. Only 8,5% of those have an income between 5501-7500₺ and 13,3% have 7501₺ or more household income.