

Understanding Enlargement: discourses in six countries

Antoaneta Dimitrova and Elitsa Kortenska

European Union Studies Association Conference,
5-7 March, 2015
Boston



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 320115.

1. Introduction: Enlargement and the citizens¹

Enlargement of the European Union involves a process of asymmetric intergovernmental negotiations, in which the candidate state negotiates how and when it would adopt the rules of the Union (Avery/Cameron, 1998: 31-33). Accession negotiations have been part of the EU's development since its inception and especially in the last three decades have been almost a continuous process: the fifth enlargement of the EU took place between 1998, when the first seven of the group of twelve candidates began negotiating for membership with the EU, and 2007 when the last two of the second group, Bulgaria and Romania, joined the Union. The 'Eastern' or 'big bang' enlargement did not mark the end of the process of EU expansion: the next candidate, Croatia, was already negotiating and joined in 2013, followed by Serbia and Montenegro, negotiating at the time of writing. Negotiations with Turkey have been resumed and the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia (FYROM) has the status of a candidate, ready to start.

Traditionally, there has been little place for the citizens in such high level intergovernmental negotiations. We do not expect citizen consultation on the EU-US trade agreement or WTO negotiation rounds of similar scope and complexity. And yet little more than a year ago, citizens in Ukraine took to the streets in favor of the negotiated Association agreement with the EU, as the start of what is nowadays called the *euromaidan* movement. Despite being overshadowed by subsequent events in Ukraine, this massive citizen action to defend a rather complex trade and cooperation agreement shows that citizens can and do have opinions on basic values and orientations underlying agreements between the EU and its neighbours and candidates. Furthermore, with regard to the citizens of the European Union, the desire to be consulted with respect to treaties of major importance for the Union was clearly manifested as one of the key motivations in the referendum rejecting the Constitutional treaty in the EU in the Netherlands (Voermans, 2010).²

The very intergovernmental nature of accession negotiations, the secrecy of negotiating positions, and the leading role of elites: member states' officials, expert negotiation teams seem to preclude citizen involvement in the process of enlargement. Yet we believe that it is

¹ Fieldwork for this deliverable was conducted by a number of researchers in the six countries. The core empirical work has been conducted by: Tanja Hafner-Ademi, Elitsa Kortenska, Dorota Liszczyk, Jelena Mirkovic, Oleksandra Matushenko, Anna Plachkova, Jan Porth, Biljana Stojanoska, Stoycho Stoychev, Robin van der Zee, Carina Schott and Sarah Giest, with additional contributions by Tanja Börzel, Daniela Chodorowska, Antoaneta Dimitrova, Georgi Dimitrov, Adam Fagan, Julia Langbein, Nele Reich, Indraneel Sircar, Marie-Christine Dähn and Maarja Beerkens. We thank especially these friends and colleagues who have volunteered to assist us with empirical work and translations: Ellen Mastenbroek, Yordan Nikolov and Milena Stoimenova. The authors are responsible for the analysis and interpretation of results and any mistakes and omissions.

² Thirty two per cent of 'no' voters in the Netherlands cited 'lack of enough information' as the main reason for their rejection (Flash Eurobarometer, 2005). As Voermans has argued, this should be interpreted as a reaction against the process of 'integration by stealth' and against the forging of a constitutional treaty without consulting the population (Voermans 2010).

important to assess societal acceptance of past enlargements and citizens' views of future enlargements before Accession treaties are concluded. Our interest in more citizen involvement does not stem only from the normative conviction that the quality of democracy is enhanced when deliberation among citizens is taken into account in decision-making, but also from the conviction that public opinion on such questions will play an increasing role in political decisions on future enlargements. In candidate states, consultation and debate should be part of the preparation for accession with a view to forthcoming referendums required for ratification or informal, but no less important approval of Accession Treaties.

In the older member states, the increased attention of political parties on the extreme right or extreme left of the political spectrum for European integration in general and issues of immigration and identity in particular (Boomgaarden et al. 2011; de Vreese/Boomgaarden 2005; Hooghe/Marks 2005, 2008) means parliamentary ratification of future accession treaties is not likely to be an easy or de-politicized process. As we have argued previously (Toshkov et al. 2014), the shift of general attitudes to European integration from "permissive consensus" to "constraining dissensus" observed by scholars of European integration (Boomgaarden et al. 2011; Dixon 2010; Eichenberg/Dalton 2007; Hooghe/Marks 2005, 2008) makes it both prudent and desirable to take citizens' views on potential future enlargements more seriously than practitioners and scholars have done in the past.

This paper attempts to address this problem by presenting key discourses on enlargement from six European countries. The data and discussions used to define these discourses are the results of an intensive, two-stage fieldwork exercise which ultimately consulted a sample of approximately 80 citizens per country, reaching 100 in one of our cases. The analysis, using the steps of a Q methodological study to model the orientations of people towards a particular domain, in this case EU enlargement, aimed at attitudes and understandings of the fifth enlargement (from 1998 to 2004-2007), but also, potential future enlargements.

What we present here are accounts of the experiences and expectations of citizens in two of the oldest member states, Germany and the Netherlands, in Poland, one of the member states that joined the Union in 2004 and in Bulgaria, which joined in 2007. Next to this we investigated understandings and expectations of enlargement of citizens of Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, countries which hope to join the Union in the coming decades.

2. Discourses in the context of enlargement research

There is a growing body of studies that have examined the key moments and actors in the process of enlargement and its effects on policies and democracies in Central and Eastern Europe (Agh et al. 2014; Avery/Cameron 1998; Baun 2000; Dimitrova 2004; Maniokas et al. 2005; Schimmelfennig/Sedelmeier 2005, Vachudova 2005; Vassiliou 2007). Another, considerably larger body of public opinion literature has taught us that citizens' opinions vary along two essential dimensions, the utilitarian and identity ones (Azrout et al. 2013; Gabel 1998; Hooghe/Marks 2008; Lubbers 2008; McLaren 2002, 2007; Risse 2010). We build on insights from both of these literatures, but aim to provide a different perspective on the motivations of citizens and their preferences and beliefs when it comes to enlargement.

This study aims to make an innovative contribution by using a reconstructive method that allows citizens themselves to define the components and parameters of the discussion on the topic of enlargement, or as it is referred to in the relevant literature, the *concourse*³. By focusing on citizens' perceptions and understandings of a process that has been elite-driven, this study seeks to shed some light on the societal acceptance of past enlargements, especially the 2004-2007 one, as well as prospects of future ones. Furthermore, in contrast to public opinion studies, the identification of discourses by using a combination of Q methodology and Dryzek and Berejikian's political discourse analysis does not define a priori major cleavages between such citizens who are in favor or against enlargement.

The methods we have used to gather and analyse data for this paper serve to aggregate and present the shared views and understandings of citizens in a way that leaves little room for researchers to impose their own pre-conceptions about the main lines of argument – or emotion – in accepting or rejecting future enlargements. Our interpretation of the process and results is still represented in the research choices made at the key stages of the research as well as in labelling and interpreting of the final sets of statements' configurations, labelled as discourses.

Since 2013, the European Commission, as the key institution leading the negotiations and evaluating the candidates' progress, has introduced a new enlargement strategy (European Commission, 2013) incorporating the lessons of previous enlargements. Despite the upgrade in approach to enlargement, tools and timing provided by the new strategy, public opinion in the EU's member states does not reflect a great confidence or enthusiasm for the project (Azrout et al. 2013; Boomgaarden et al. 2011; Dixon 2010; Eichenberg/Dalton 2007; Hooghe/Marks 2005, 2008; Kemmerling 2008; Toshkov et al. 2014). Public opinion results,

³ We define a *concourse* as the total population of discussions about a certain domain (Brown 1980; Dryzek/Berejikian 1993: 49; Watts/Stenner 2012:34).

furthermore, have been affected by the formulation of questions on enlargement and the perceptions of specific candidates (Azrout et al. 2013; Dixon 2010; Hatipoğlu et al. 2014; McLaren 2002; McLaren 2007). While it appears certain that the tide of public opinion is turning against enlargement, driven by utilitarian and identity considerations, we have little understanding of the meaning and motivation behind citizens' apparent scepticism or of possibilities for persuasion of some citizens by a different policy approach.

Even among key participants, enlargement has been experienced differently: the process of negotiating for membership was reported to be seen as quite slow towards candidate states (Telicka/Bartak, 2007: 144), whereas commentators in the older member states have often suggested it was completed too early. Therefore, it is appropriate to explore how citizens in different member and candidate states have experienced enlargement, based on their vantage point in a candidate or member state, information, personal situation, location and prior beliefs.

To reveal the understandings, expectations and emotional motivations behind citizens' attitudes to past and future enlargements, we have employed Q methodology, a reconstructive methodology that investigates the way individuals construct reality in relation to a certain domain. Q methodology is an approach relying on interviews and statistical techniques, conducted in a way that puts respondents and their views at the centre. The approach seeks to establish individuals' beliefs and perceptions in a context of 'subjective communicability', that is, looking for the meanings ascribed to information by participants in a discourse, a discussion about a certain topic (McKeown/Thomas 2013: 3). Dryzek and Berejikian (1993:49) describe Q methodology as a reconstructive approach because it draws on citizens' original language and statements, thereby letting them speak for themselves. We employ Q methodology in combination with Dryzek and Berejikian's matrix for political discourse analysis⁴, resulting in a research design that involves two stages of fieldwork with different sets of respondents, intermediate political discourse analysis, final factor analysis and interpretation.

Our primary data, the basis for further interviews and analyses consists of statements sourced from citizens' own conversations and debates about enlargement. Before we

⁴ We recognize the vast literatures on discourse analysis and the variety of approaches embedded in the studies of written and verbal language and communication, however, we apply political discourse analyses by following Dryzek's pioneer work on discourses (Dryzek/Berejikian 1993; Dryzek, 2000:18; Dryzek/Holmes 2002; Dryzek/Braithwaite 2000: 243; Dryzek/Niemeyer 2008:1) in order to explore the existing ones among citizens. A discussion of the broader range of approaches to analysing discourses is beyond the aims of the paper, as it could encompass a range of theoretical and methodological differences dating as far back as the work of Michel Foucault.

present the citizens' discourses, in the next section we explain the method and approach we have used in some more detail.

3. Method and approach

3.1. *The Q method*

To reveal the variety of shared narratives among citizens of different EU member states, we conducted six identical country studies exploring citizens' understandings of enlargement or accession. The approach used here combines Dryzek's political discourse analysis with Q methodology, a method originally developed and used in psychology (Dryzek/Berejikian 1993).

Q methodology was created by William Stephenson (1953) and developed by Brown (1980) and others as a method for the study of subjectivity. The method is based on the assumption that subjective points of view are possible to communicate and that they are advanced from a position of self-reference (McKeown/Thomas 2013: xvii). Therefore, it is an approach eminently suited to a study the purpose of which is to capture citizens' perceptions of certain phenomena from their own point of reference (McKeown/Thomas 2013:1). The Q method in itself combines interview techniques and the basic principles of factor analysis to produce results that capture intersubjective understandings of a specific domain, in our case enlargement. The method involves the selection of representative items from the total volume of discussion on a topic (the concourse) and presents these items to a set of participants as a Q sample (or Q set). To make this selection of representative items, we use Dryzek and Berejikian's matrix for political discourse analysis.

Each Q study consists of the following elements: identifying the concourse, selecting a Q sample (or Q set), identifying a variety of respondents, or the P-set, administering the Q sorts, factor analyses and interpretation (Watts/Stenner 2012). These stages of Q method implementation determine the steps and the strategies we applied in each country study, guaranteeing the comparability of the six sets of country results.

The configuration of statements each respondent produces at the end of each interview is what Q methodologists call a Q sort, the core of the data we collected (an example of a completed Q sort is available in Appendix II). The groups of participants to whom the Q set are presented are called a P-set.

In Q methodology, a number of Q sorts are administered by researchers and then correlated, producing a correlation matrix which is subjected to factor analysis to identify 'the range and nature of any truly independent viewpoints embedded in the concourse' (McKeown/Thomas 2013:3).

The factor analyses in Q method aim to identify those portions of the unique subjective viewpoints represented in each Q sort, which a single individual holds in common with any other individual in the interviewed group, as well as those portions by which he/she differs in a systematic and structural way (Brown 1980; 1993 cited in van Excel/ de Graaf 2005). The factors represent the shared viewpoints and understandings among participants, expressed in configurations of statements (on the topic of enlargement), which most closely represent the viewpoints of those respondents who cluster on the respective factor. The extent to which an individual's Q sort is associated with each factor is captured in its factor loading. These respondents whose factor loadings are statistically significant on a single factor are defining for scores of the statements for the respective factor (van Excel/de Graaf 2005:8-9).

The final sets of factors are generalizations of points of view, narratives or, as we call them here - discourses. Following the work of John Dryzek and several collaborators we define discourses as shared means of making sense of the world, embedded in language. As described in this literature, discourses are grounded in assumptions, judgments, contentions, dispositions and capabilities and enable their adherents to put together information and experiences with regard to a certain domain into coherent wholes, organized around common storylines (Dryzek/Berejikian 1993; Dryzek 2000:18; Dryzek/Holmes 2002; Dryzek/Braithwaite 2000: 243; Dryzek/Niemeyer 2008:1).⁵

The method not only allows respondents to speak with their own terms and voice about enlargement, but it also provides a holistic view, as views on enlargement are embedded in people's views on European integration in general. In our case, the discussions that formed the basis of primary data gathering linked enlargement to domestic developments to European integration in an essentially political discussion. As Dryzek and Berejikian have argued, all political discourses, albeit at a basic level, feature an ontology of entities recognized as existing or relevant, some ascribed an agency and motivation and also contain an account of relationships seen as natural or prevailing between these actors and entities (Dryzek/Berejikian 1993; see also Dryzek/Niemeyer 2008).

⁵ On the basis of this definition we use the terms discourse and narrative interchangeably in this paper.

3.2. Our approach

In keeping with the key principle of the method to let the subjects speak for themselves, we have striven to gather a Q set of statements in which our own ideas and knowledge about enlargement played no part at all. Data collection started with gathering a large volume of statements on the topic of EU enlargement. A very broad initial set of statements on enlargement, consisting of about 1000 statements per country, was gathered in focus group discussions at different locations in each of our countries of interest.⁶ A total of 241 citizens of the six countries took part in the 24 focus groups we conducted throughout the countries. Each group discussion consisted of at least 12 participants.⁷ We selected participants based on four major socio-economic characteristics – gender, age, education and occupation – to ensure variety which is crucial for capturing as many independent views and narratives as possible.

The group discussions were conducted in the respective native languages and moderators did not structure the discussion. The groups discussing enlargement were moderated by our researchers to the extent needed to ensure that all participants could voice their opinion and no one dominated the discussion. Each group discussion was documented, recorded⁸, transcribed and eventually translated in English. The selection of locations was guided by our understanding that urban/rural divides are important, as well as the differences between small towns and large cities, which we take to reflect socioeconomic differences.⁹ From the unemployed citizen in the village to the manager in the capital city, this format of gathering statements captured a broad range of opinions, views, beliefs, experiences and claims on the topic of enlargement.

From the databases generated in the first stage, we selected a sample of 64 statements, called, in Q methodology jargon, the Q set. The Q set selection is of crucial importance for the reliability and soundness of each Q study (Brown 1980; Watts/Stenner 2012). The Q set must be representative of the concourse and balanced in terms of the range of positions and views it consists. To ensure such a selection, we applied Dryzek and Berejikian's (1993) political discourse analysis matrix (Dryzek/Berejikian 1993: 51/2; Dryzek/Holmes 2002; Dryzek/Niemeyer 2008).

⁶ The first stage of fieldwork was conducted simultaneously in all countries between February and June, 2014 and the second stage took place between June and December 2014.

⁷ The only exceptions are the Netherlands and Germany, where we had some larger or smaller groups.

⁸ The total time of audio-records for all focus groups amounts to approximately 33 hours and 496 pages of transcribed text in six different languages.

⁹ A map with the list of locations for the focus group discussions can be found [here](#).

This process involved a group of researchers, among which at least one native speaker, analysing the whole country dataset and distributing all relevant statements throughout the cells of the matrix. The purpose of this stage is not only a reduction of the huge set of country data to one set of 64, but of making a selection which varies according to the above mentioned political science categories of ontology, actors, relationships and so on (see Table 1 in Appendix I).

Having selected a Q set for each country, we proceeded to the third stage of the research, which consists of presenting the Q set to a different and varied set of respondents. In this stage, respondents are asked to model their personal viewpoints by using the representative statements and rank-ordering those to produce the so called Q sort (McKeown/Thomas 2013:3). What is important for this interviewing technique is that the “respondent’s reaction to any one statement only makes sense in the context of his reaction to every other statement in the set” (Dryzek/Berejikian 1993:50). In face-to-face, hour-long interviews, each participant was asked to agree or disagree with the statements from the Q set, ultimately ranking them in a quasi-normal distribution (as shown in Appendix III).

We reached out to citizens of diverse socio-economic backgrounds in many different locations within each country in order to capture as many of the possibly existing discourses among them. While ensuring variety in terms of the same socio-economic characteristics as in the first stage of data gathering, we also aimed at diversity in terms of political views and ethnic background, where this was applicable. The major criterion for the participants in the individual interviews was that they were not part of the group discussions and that they have voting rights as citizens in the respective country. For the Q sort stage, we conducted 240 individual interviews in sixty locations¹⁰.

The collected Q sorts were then analysed by means of factor analysis for every country and interpreted by us. It must be noted that, in contrast to the usual approach to factor analysis, in Q method, analyses correlate persons’ viewpoints, rather than tests (see Brown 1980, Dryzek/Berejikian 1993, van Excel/de Graaf 2006; Watts/Stenner 2012).

We performed centroid factor extraction as this is the analytical technique recommended by most Q methodologists (Watts/Stenner 2012; Brown 1993)¹¹. For each country analysis we extracted seven or eight un-rotated centroids as a first step. After examining the original set of factors, we reduced the number of factors and then performed a Varimax rotation. In deciding on the best final factor solution, we tried to balance between statistical reliability

¹⁰ A list of the locations, where interviews were conducted and a virtual visit to them can be found on the link [here](#).

¹¹ We used the PQMethod program (Release 2.35), developed by Peter Schmolck and publicly available at: <http://schmolck.userweb.mwn.de/qmethod/> (last accessed on 23rd of January, 2015).

criteria and meaning and significance of the factors, following Brown (1980; see also Watts/Stenner 2012). The six country sets of 64 original statements (the Q sets) and their ranking are available in Tables 2 to 7, in Appendix II. They provide a complete picture of the results by reporting on the factor arrays – configuration of the statements by idealized factor scores for each factor (Watts/Stenner 2012).

The distinguishing statements and their scores provide the most crucial information about major differences in the rankings of specific statements between any two of the final sets of factors. While we present the narratives in terms of the distinguishing statements for each factor (as provided by the analytical software), we looked at all statements in relation to one another in order to capture the factor in its entirety and reflect the entire perspective in the assigned labels (see Brown 1980; Dryzek/Berejikian 1993; Stephenson 1953; van Excel/de Graaf 2006; Watts/Stenner 2012).

The order of presentation of country factors/discourses below reflects the explained variance by the respective factor in our sample. However, since the country samples are small, they are not statistically representative of the population of the countries and therefore the discourses cannot be rated in terms of what percentage of the country populations ascribe to them. Nevertheless, as Dryzek and Berejikian have argued, discourses are representative of the ideas and arguments, which exists among the larger population of subjects. As in other Q studies, we found that after a certain point adding additional Q sorts did not yield new insights, unless the extra individuals added were truly very different from the previously interviewed group (Dryzek/Berejikian 1993:52).

Until the last stage of this analysis we refrained from imposing our ideas over the data, but carefully examined the structural patterns it carries. The same procedure was followed for all countries' analyses. Finally, we subsequently interpreted the resulting rotated factors to resolve internal contradictions or remove repetitions (for a similar approach see Dryzek/Holmes 2002). We interpreted factors to build a coherent narrative in the way statements are ordered. The translated statements were edited minimally to remove redundancies or unclear language. The numbers in brackets after each statement represent the corresponding number of the statement in each country Q set from one to 64.¹²

We decided, in contrast to other studies, to present the separate factors or discourses by means of the statements that respondents strongly agreed with, but also by showing which statements they strongly disagreed with. Another caveat to be borne in mind is that when we

¹² The list of all 64 statements for each country is presented in Appendix II.

look at statements respondents disagree with double negation does not necessarily mean that respondents agree with the opposite argument.

The presented discourses can be read as internally consistent narratives, although they still exhibit the inconsistencies inherent in people's subjective understandings and communications. It must be noted that the statements, which are part of every factor or discourse, cannot be interpreted in isolation but must be understood in relation to all other statements the respondents agree or disagree with.

We introduce the two sides of each story with a brief commentary. The results together with our final interpretation are captured in a label, which we have given to every discourse. An overview of all discourses in the six countries is shown in *Figure 1*.

Figure 1. Discourses in six countries

Country	Discourses on EU enlargement among citizens			
	A	B	C	D
Poland	Celebrating EU Values & Ideals	Rejecting a Bureaucratic Monster	Pragmatic Evaluation	-
Bulgaria	The More the Merrier	Striving for a Union of Rules & Values	The Forgotten Village	-
The Netherlands	Ideals Driven Acceptance	Utilitarian Rejection	Deepening before Widening	-
Germany	Questioning Integration	Enlargement for the People	Rules Driven, More Gradual Enlargement	Realizing Europe's Global Potential
Serbia	Cautiously Positive Expectations	Mistrust & Hostility	The Devil's in the Conditions	Favoring EU Rules & Institutions
FYR Macedonia	Façade Readiness	Thwarted Enthusiasm	Expectations for Better Governance	Apprehension & Ambiguity

4. Country Discourses

4.1. *The Central and Eastern European member states: Poland*

4.1.1. *Discourse A “Celebrating European Values & Ideals”*

The proponents of this discourse celebrate Poland’s accession to the EU as the culmination of historical processes and efforts. They agree with statements that define the 2004 enlargement as a source of opportunities and the EU as a multicultural community in which differences between countries are resolved in deliberation. Respondents sharing this narrative praise the multicultural characteristics of the EU and view the diversity within the Union as one of its crucial features.

Respondents agree that:

“I don't want to look at Europe in political and economic terms only. For me it is a conglomeration of communities, multicultural, facilitating the exchange of information and ideas. (1) What incredible times we live in, to have landed in the EU. This is the result of aspirations dating hundreds of years back. This is why we build Europe together, to expand and to enjoy it. There will always be flaws. (52)”

“This is the idea behind the EU, we talk, discuss, come up with this or that. I still believe that the European Union civilizes us, if it weren't for it, there would be more corruption, less attention to environment. (8) The European Union gives the opportunity to organize Poland in such a way so as precisely with the help of the European funds to give the opportunity to people to stay here or even to come back. And maybe this is our opportunity to take advantage of the chance which the EU gives us. (16)”

“I think that I am “for” the future development of the European Union. (59) From my point of view, the fact that the EU creates satellites around it that strive for certain standards promoted by the EU is a long-term policy. I don't see anything wrong with that, it is ok both for these countries and the EU. (35)”

“Perhaps in the future our children and the children of our children will live a bit better thanks to the European Union. The growth of the EU is inevitable, if only everything follows goes well. (49) Every country has to take account of the fact that it shall not be just a receiver. If it squanders and does not use the funds in compliance with the set provisions and fails to repay those funds, then there should be a threshold and an “end”. (54)”

This group of respondents also strongly disagrees with statements rejecting both European integration and Polish membership in the EU. Their position is one of equal partners, not of

suplicants who expect only assistance from the EU. They are also positive towards future enlargements as they see the EU as an open, multicultural community. This is also evident in their refusal to exclude Turkey on the basis of its cultural and/or religious difference. Furthermore, respondents reject the idea that EU can be a closed club, and stress the importance of an ever enlarging Union.

These are the statements they most disagree with:

“Let’s hope the EU will just fall apart. (51) I am afraid of one thing, mainly that in a while the EU will realize that the biggest mistake it could have made is that it admitted the Poles. Because they will destroy the European Union and will ruin it. (34) To sell the goods they are producing. This is why they admitted us in the European Union, as a market. (26) EU enlargement will result in a big melting pot, where everyone could come in, pick up the best, but never return to bring it back. (14) The EU took a turn to become some kind of absolute, crazy, degenerate bureaucratic giant, which aims to regulate all aspects of our lives and takes away our freedom bit by bit. (39) If it were not for the European Union, we would have had nothing, nothing. (33) If we are not satisfied by the European Union, we have to step out of it. Everyone can leave, if at some point one is not satisfied by the European Union. (22) Croatia joined the European Union using the power of momentum. In which direction shall the European Union enlarge to the East? To Belarus? To Ukraine? At this point, this is quite unrealistic. Or we may admit Russia and start with the Kaliningrad district. (48) As far as future enlargements are concerned, there are not many states left to include. I just don’t see which state can be as peaceful and willing to join in, maybe some smaller county. (32)”

4.1.2. Discourse B “Rejecting a Bureaucratic Monster”

The proponents of this discourse disapprove above all of the EU but also of Poland’s accession. They see accession as a source of corruption and the EU as a bureaucratic monster or an empire, doomed to fall apart from its own overextension and its own lack of flexibility.

“I think that some Members of Parliament view the fact that we are members of the European Union as a way to get hold of a whole lot of money. (27) “They say: “we all are equal in the EU”. But we are not, because there are differences in size and how big a say we have in decision-making, so don’t speak to me about solidarity. (38) The EU is turning into some kind of crazy, absolutely unnatural bureaucratic monster, seeking to regulate all aspects of our lives and taking away, bit by bit, our freedom. (39) There are too many commissions in the European Union, that monitor curved cucumbers and

bent bananas, and a few commissions, who actually work well. (6) The admission of every new member of the European Union is related to costs and the EU authorities will consider arguments “for” and “against” and in the end it is all about the money. (10)”

“The European Union will have everything, all countries it wants, and then it will fall apart. This is what happens to all empires. All empires have toppled down. They had everything. And the Union is headed in the same direction. (5) I would not admit all countries. Then it is going to be a world union, not just a European one. (57). I think the European Union is not capable of enlarging to the Balkans. The Balkans is a very unstable region. (36) We need to wait, to wait until the EU collapses on its own. (17) I think the European Union is such a rigid structure that without any internal reforms it will not be able to enlarge. I even have the feeling that if nothing changes in the end the EU may fall apart. (21)”

The proponents of this discourse strongly disagree that the EU in general and accession in particular are important and positive factors for Polish development. They also reject future enlargement because they reject the European integration as a whole. These views co-exist with a belief that the EU would fall apart of its own accord.

Respondents disagree with the following statements:

“If it were not for the European Union, we would have had nothing, nothing. (33) The European Union cannot become a closed club, it should continue expanding. (55) I would admit all countries because then this Balkan “melting pot” will settle down. In the past, Tito would control them strictly and it was peaceful, if they are admitted in the EU this will be beneficial for them. (42) I think that I am “for” the future development of the European Union. (59) I voted “for” Poland’s accession to the EU in order to counteract this inferiority complex and servility – not in the racial meaning, but in terms of mentality. I thought the West was something better than this poor Poland. (43)”

“These small countries have to be admitted in the EU. The more, the better. The whole thing started off from just a few countries to further expand. Every time we admitted a new member state, the situation improved. (40)”

4.1.3. Discourse C “Pragmatic Assessment”

The proponents of this discourse anticipate a moderate improvement of well-being because of enlargement. They are positive on the whole, but are careful to weigh costs and benefits. For these respondents, an emphasis on market integration, on the economic aspects of European integration determines their evaluation of the whole process of enlargement. They

consider decision-making effects, economic effects and migration in their assessment. They are open to future enlargements, but conditionally, if there are no economic risks for Poland.

“Perhaps in the future our children and the children of our children will live a bit better thanks to the European Union. The growth of the EU is inevitable, if only everything goes well. (49) We have been part of this EU for ten years now, so we cannot act in the same way as those who adopt the decisions in this EU. (63) Unfortunately, the accession to the European Union has both advantages and disadvantages. The advantages are that the young go to the EU, while the disadvantages are that we would have wanted them to stay here; (29) The EU cannot become a closed club, it should continue expanding. (55) I don’t think that the enlargement of the European Union will put our labor market at significant risk. (7) To sell the goods they are producing. This is why they admitted us in the European Union, as a market;(26) The admission of every new member of the European Union is related to costs and the EU authorities will consider arguments “for” and “against” and in the end it is all about the money. (10)”

“If the other member states or those top decision-makers agree, let the country join the EU. Only this should not put Poland at risk. (64) The European Union gives the opportunity to organize Poland in such a way so as precisely with the help of the European Funds to give the opportunity to people to stay here or even to come back. And maybe this is our opportunity to take advantage of the chance which the EU gives us. (16)”

The attitude of the proponents of this discourse is clearly pragmatic, in contrast to the idealism and value driven approach evident in the first factor. They disagree with statements that highlight rights and values as the basis of the Union, but they also reject culture and identity as criteria for future enlargements. They do not agree with arguments that Poland should exit the EU, but do not reject the notion that exit is possible should accession not fulfil economic expectations.

Respondents disagree with the following statements:

“I will address the value system of the European Union. I mean the system of Western values, not the Asian one that Ukraine is fighting against right now. The enlargement of the EU to the East begins from the adoption of this system of Western values: respect for human rights. Such values, which the countries in Central and Eastern Europe have not observed under the cover of the Iron Curtain. (12) Turkey has a different culture. The culture there is quite different. This will not be compliant with us, this is an Islamic state. (2) Croatia joined the European Union using the power of the momentum. In which direction shall the European Union enlarge to the East? To Belarus? To Ukraine? At this point, this is quite unrealistic. Or we may admit Russia and start with

the Kaliningrad district. (48) We think about whether we have to let in the entire Turkey into the European Union, since it is half in Asia, a different culture, yet the EU member states do not admit only individual people. (13) We need to wait, to wait until the EU collapses on its own. (17)”

“I would not admit all countries. Then it is going to be a world union, not just a European one. (57) Every country has to take account of the fact that it shall not be just a receiver. If it squanders and does not use the funds in compliance with the set provisions and fails to repay those funds, then there should be a threshold and an “end”. (54)”

4.2. The Central and Eastern European member states: Bulgaria

4.2.1 Discourse A “The More the Merrier”

These respondents find European integration and Bulgaria’s accession a great benefit and further enlargement a logical and almost inevitable process. Participants subscribing to this discourse are enthusiastically in favor of enlargement with all remaining countries in Europe and further. Their motivation is linked to perceived economic and security benefits:

“I am “for” the EU enlargement. (50) All Balkan countries should become EU members and stop fighting with each other [...]. (63) It will be easiest if Russia were to join in. (7) I want the EU to enlarge towards the Scandinavian states, because in this way rich countries will become EU members. (57) I think that it is important for EU to enlarge, because after all this is the goal of every organization. Whether it would be a good thing or not, we will find out only after the enlargement. (38) EU’s enlargement to the Western Balkans is a good thing. The more secure and free borders we have in this region, given the complicated historical relations in the Balkans, the better it will be: to have someone above it all to smooth out the relations. (46)”

“If Turkey joins in, they will not be as close to the third world and will have better connections with Europe. They produce a lot of vegetables, etc., so they will be able to export all that to Europe at low prices. (18) The benefit of EU enlargement for the Western Balkans will come from the fact that there will be no customs officers and border guards at border check points. (5) One of the benefits of EU enlargement towards the Western Balkans is that maybe in this way Bulgaria is not so much an external border of the EU. (48) I think what will be achieved [with enlargement] will be a settlement of the conflicts in former Yugoslavia. Then the Macedonians won’t care if they are Bulgarians or Macedonians or if the Bulgarians are Macedonians. This issue should be settled. This however will not happen too soon even if they join the EU, it will still take time. (32)”

“In my opinion, the EU has to enlarge to provide education and work. This way you have a choice. (53)”

The proponents of this discourse strongly disagree with statements which express rejection of enlargement in general and Bulgaria’s accession in particular.

“I don’t want the EU to enlarge. (51) The enlargement is positive for the European Union, but negative for us. (16) Let’s break this EU apart. It seems a bit of a chimera to me the idea to become a common European community, after all these are different countries, each of which has its own mentality, traditions, laws, and lifestyle. (64) There are no benefits for Bulgaria from the enlargement at this stage. (9) The enlargement means more taxes for the country. (2)”

“Bulgaria’s “benefit” (from joining the EU) was that we lost the biggest market in the world, Russia. This is our mistake. All our products went out to Russia. (47) We do what they (EU) tell us to do. This is a problem. One can’t take a decision by oneself, someone else imposes those decisions. So they say, for instance, we need to shut down the two nuclear reactors, deal, we shut them down, in the end, then we will be buying electricity from other countries, if needed, but we cut down our production. (43)”

4.2.2. Discourse B “Striving for a Union of Rules and Values”

Proponents of this discourse are stressing the importance of the EU as a source of better governance, a community with clear rules and criteria, but they also stress the responsibility of Bulgaria itself to make something out of enlargement. When they are skeptical, it is because they see Bulgaria’s failure to use the opportunities provided by membership.

They most agree with the following statements and arguments:

“So, you see, a lot of people thought that when we join the EU our wages will be rocketing; that everything will be handed on a silver platter to us, yet, unfortunately, it didn’t happen for us. (10) The EU has to enlarge, only under clear-cut criteria. The enlargement mainly takes place on a political basis. The states that are not ready in legal, political and economic terms, should not be let in, they cannot become members in this way. (61)”

“[The EU] helps societies in certain ways, for instance by programs, yet only certain people get access to these programs. The majority of people and those who have no clear idea about the administrative part hardly ever get hold of the money. (24) The

entire European Union shall reach the same level of development, so that everyone lives under the same standards. I mean – same union, same community, same standards. (52) EU membership is something like imposing common rules on common borders, common laws which should be observed in some way. (4)”

“Even if we were not EU members, it would all be the same. Because in general the problems are not related to the European Union, but to the way in which they have been handled in this country. With or without the European Union, we would not start working in a different way. (31)”

“The EU enlargement gives opportunities for education, many people will go abroad, see for themselves what it is like there and may come back and apply what they have learnt in Bulgaria. (23) The good things after accession to the European Union that are obvious even before that are related to the infrastructure, general improvement for the community in Bulgaria, while Bulgarians just fail to appreciate and see those improvements. (34)”

The respondents do not see a stop to European integration as the answer to their disappointed expectations. They still believe in the EU and disagree with the following:

“Let’s break this EU apart. It seems a bit of a chimera to me - the idea to become a common European community, after all these are different countries, each of which has its own mentality, traditions, laws, and lifestyle. (64) I don’t want the EU to enlarge. (51)”

“It will be easiest if Russia were to join. (7) Bulgaria’s population would have shrunk to 2 million, if we had not joined the EU. There would be no people living here anymore, everyone would have moved out elsewhere. (19)”

“The enlargement is positive for the European Union, but negative for us. (16) In our case, since we give more money to Europe than we receive from them, it makes no difference for us as a state and as citizens whether the EU will enlarge or not, we neither gain, nor lose. (17)”

4.2.3. Discourse C “The Forgotten Village”

The proponents of this discourse voice a strong disappointment in the lack of improvement in their lives after accession. They agree with a number of statements that express feelings of being abandoned, forgotten and of not having had any say in or benefit from enlargement. They also express a clear and strong disagreement with potential Turkish accession:

“In the countryside, people are more interested in their everyday lives, their daily survival...people hardly take any interest in the EU...the people living in the rural areas... (42)”

“They (the EU) have completely forgotten about us, the people living in the smaller towns and villages... (20) Has anyone asked us if we want to join the European Union or not? The politicians took that decision... (40) Our politicians should have done it differently and have the EU come and ask us to join and not us begging them to let us in. (56) We do what they (EU) tell us to do. This is a problem. One can't take a decision by oneself, someone else imposes those decisions. So they say, for instance, we need to shut down the two nuclear reactors, deal, we shut them down, in the end, then we will be buying electricity from other countries, if needed, but we cut down our production. (43) There is no equality, different rules apply to everyone. The problem is part of the EU. (15) In my opinion, what is wrong about the EU is that it is influenced by the US, and I think it should be otherwise, we have to defend our positions. (14)”

“If it was for me, I would not let Turkey in. (55) Europe does not want Turkey, because it is against the Islamization of Europe. (58) The major argument so far for Europe to turn down Turkey's membership in the EU has been religion. It is seen as a risk for escalating tensions. (33)”

“We were so excited before we joined the EU. Our expectations were different. Mostly related to work and good earnings. (11) So, you see, a lot of people thought that when we join the EU our wages will be rocketing; that everything will be handed on a silver platter to us, yet, unfortunately, it didn't happen for us. (10) The enlargement means more taxes for the country. (2)”

In the statements they disagree with, the proponents of this discourse show they are not against European integration or the EU, neither do they consider Bulgaria's joining the EU to have had no purpose. They seem to think further enlargement would be a problem, but do not regret Bulgaria's accession. The statements they disagree with confirm their worry about Turkey and about economic issues.

On the disagree side of this story:

“On the one hand, Turkey's accession is a good thing. On the other hand, this may possibly lead to some kind of ethnic conflict. (6) For Bulgaria there are neither advantages, nor disadvantages related to Turkey's EU membership. We would neither gain, nor lose from it. (39) Turkey has stated its interest to join in and on all occasions is way more advanced economically, at least as compared to Bulgaria. What might give rise to a conflict is that it maintains a policy of dictatorship. (21) If Turkey joins in, they will not be as close to the third world and will have better connections with Europe. They produce a lot of vegetables, etc., so they will be able to export all that to Europe at low prices. (18)”

“Let’s break this EU apart. It seems a bit of a chimera to me the idea to become a common European community, after all these are different countries, each of which has its own mentality, traditions, laws, and lifestyle. (64) The EU enlargement is important for me. The workforce from poor member-states will go to rich countries and may one day come back with some capital to help recover our small country Bulgaria. (62) The countries that are getting ready for the enlargement are not economically strong to lead ahead. Because on the other hand the rich countries need workforce. (45)“

4.3. The founding member states: The Netherlands

4.3.1. Discourse A “Ideals Driven Acceptance”

This discourse stresses the EU is not only about money and that enlargement should not be decided on the basis of the welfare of the candidates. Respondents feel enlargement and the EU should not be only about economic issues, but also about ideals. They acknowledge the challenges presented by the arrival of cheaper labor force from the CEE member states, but stress that the Dutch have not been interested in the jobs in agriculture that citizens of CEE member states have taken in the Netherlands. The proponents of this discourse are in favor of further enlargement if the candidate states fulfill the conditions for accession.

“If we look only at money and prosperity (when enlarging), we will never have a European Union in the spirit in which it was intended. (29) You cannot say that the Union can only be enlarged if a country brings added value in the sense that we (the Netherlands) gain from the accession. (49) No, I don’t (i.e. have the feeling that the immigrants steal away the work from the Dutch), since that is entirely up to us, what jobs we are prepared to take. Many people tend to think: “picking tomatoes is not for me, picking peppers is not for me either”. (31)“

“In principle, if a country fulfills the conditions, let them come. (59) For me the most important thing about the European Union and its enlargement is the security in Europe, so this is what guarantees security. We haven’t been at war ever since the European Union was established, and we haven’t been part of an arms race either. (34) More countries in the European Union enrich us, so we need to be positive and stay positive [about enlargement]. (4) When I look back at the process of EU enlargement, I see that the media have been paying attention only to the risks. Poland was the first to join in, followed by Lithuania, and then you see the media debated only the risks. You start focusing only on the risks. You get used to that. (7) We don’t do this (i.e., a given job). Then you don’t blame the Poles. We have to say “thank you” to the Poles. (53) I don’t mind if Switzerland joins the European Union. (6)“

“One also realizes that in terms of market operation we will have a bigger market for selling goods, that we will make bigger concessions to other countries yet more will come our way too, I believe that. (22)”

In this discourse, respondents reject the idea that enlargement has made the Dutch worse off; they also reject prosperity as the only criterion making a candidate eligible to join. They do not find that the EU has reached its limits either.

These are the statements they disagree with:

“Our situation has not become better, it has only become worse. (12) So I am against enlargement and for limiting the current 27 member states, that is, let’s have fewer members. (58) Yes, richer countries may join Europe. But I think that countries like Greece should better go bankrupt and then start recovering. (60)”

“Actually, I think it should not be allowed: (enlargement) Europe is growing poorer and poorer by letting each new candidate in. (36) Enough is enough! Since now we have 27 (i.e. 28 member states) and if we leave only 25 of them...or 24, then we will get rid of a great burden; because with them we will lose also the criminal gangs, they don’t come from Ireland, well, maybe sometimes, but most of them came from the Eastern block; (61)”

“I have no idea which countries exactly have joined in, yet the countries that have become members should not have joined the EU; they do not belong with us, they are one step behind. (33)”

4.3.2. Discourse B “Utilitarian Rejection”

The proponents of this discourse voice above all their dissatisfaction that they have had no say in the decision to enlarge the EU. They feel they have no influence in terms of future enlargements either. This discourse emphasizes a perception of enlargement as an elite project that has moved on without consulting citizens, brought job losses and made the EU poorer. It also emphatically rejects the possibility of Turkish membership or any further enlargement. However, respondents are also clearly aware that job losses are also a result of companies and consumers’ reaction to the availability of cheaper labor.

“Ultimately, as I see it, the population was never asked, what do you think about this (EU enlargement). It has been pushed down our throats from above, you put the news

on and what do you see, yet another country has joined us. (32) Yes, the decision (i.e. for more countries in the Union) will be made by politicians in the end. Yet I believe that if you go out and ask the ordinary Dutch people, they will say: “no, no, no, no, no, no, this is too much. (28)”

“For me unemployment is a huge problem. It does have to do with enlargement, and also now when the Romanians and Bulgarians do not need a permit, they can go work anywhere in the EU and many companies think: “this is cheaper for us and we won’t look back”. (24)”

“I now think that it (i.e. the enlargement) has been too expensive. (20) Yet it is a fact that Wilders is constantly talking about how Europe costs us money. Literally, we pay more since the new member states receive a great deal of money... (30) I think the European Union is a big money eating machine. Too many people work there and everyone wants to work there...we are talking about big money and I think that for now it can’t enlarge. (2)”

“People want to have something for nothing. If this Polish guy comes and you want your house painted and he can earn a couple of euros, he will get the work. This is the Dutch mentality. (25) And do we need to sit and wait the cheap workforce come into the Netherlands? While our people are being sacked? And experience financial problems? This is the actual state of affairs, isn’t it? (56) I see this in a totally different way, because Bulgarians and Romanians concern me just a little, while I am worried more about the countries ridden by corruption, I mean also Macedonia and Serbia. (42)”

“I believe that Europe has made a historical mistake by letting so many countries become member states so fast. (35) I think that some of the countries that joined in could have waited longer or maybe even a decade or so. (5) Our situation has not become better, it has only become worse. (12)”

The statements these respondents disagree with are those advocating enlargement. The respondents do not accept the notion that there has been a historical debt to accept CEE countries, nor do they favor further enlargement.

“I could guarantee you that the majority of the Dutch people would say “yes, we want Turkey in the European Union.” (19) More countries in the European Union enrich us, so we need to be positive and stay positive [about enlargement]. (4)”

“So when 1989 came, then I get the feeling, these countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia and so on, they were abandoned in Yalta, left to Stalin, these people have had a terrible time, so come and join us, it’s a kind of a debt of honor that we have to pay back. (51)”

“In principle, if a country fulfils the conditions, let them come. (59)”

“The goal of the EU is to prevent excessive actions. This is why countries join in only if they meet the requirements in the field of democracy. (14) For sure, sooner or later it will be possible (i.e. before the Union expands further). (23)”

4.3.3. Discourse C “Deepening before Widening”

This discourse stresses selection, preparation, allowing candidates to join only when ready based on objective criteria. The emphasis on preparation is not only on economic growth but on democracy, institutions. The respondents are concerned about the EU’s response to recent developments such as the crisis and want to deepen integration, before continuing with enlargement. The proponents of this discourse share some feelings with the ones that unequivocally reject enlargement in the previous discourse, but they emphasize they do not reject enlargement – they just want it to happen more gradually. Furthermore, these respondents condition their approval of future enlargements also on the development of the EU itself, its institutions, policies and governance.

“Let’s try to make the European Union meaningful by keeping an eye on recent developments. I support the enlargement, yet it should be done selectively, not only in terms of money, but also looking at other things [attributes of the candidates]. (62) I believe that the enlargement has to be prepared better, it has to follow a more consistent course, and certain conditions have to be strictly met. Also by the candidate country. (50)”

“I don’t mind if Switzerland joins the European Union. (6)”

“Enlargement could mean that countries with deeply rooted democratic traditions might want to go further with integration but are sabotaged by newcomers that do not have such a tradition...So I would first like to see a consolidation and stabilization (of the current EU). (9)”

“What I think should happen is that the EU should clarify what people are required to do. And in what direction we are headed. We haven’t heard a thing in four years and suddenly we find ourselves moving forward with new people around. (38)”

“To go together, I think there should be some form of equality [between members]. Whereas now everything is swept in one pile. (64)”

“It is difficult to say, but I think that it is difficult to have Turkey become a full-fledged member of the Union, because it is mostly Asian. (21) Now, Serbia may have to wait for a few more years (i.e. to become EU member). (39) We can see that corruption is flourishing in countries like Italy or Ukraine, one of the new countries. And this is something that we, in Western Europe, detest. (41) Yet if Poland is a country where the

accession has proved successful, then I think I can understand. So, the outcome could be positive. (11)”

Just like the respondents from the previous discourse, the proponents of this discourse do not accept that the Eastern enlargement was paying a historic debt. They do not agree that the logic of integration requires enlargement to continue further either.

“So when 1989 came, then I got the feeling, these countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia and so on, they were abandoned in Yalta, left to Stalin, these people have had a terrible time, so come and join us, it's a kind of a debt of honor that we have to pay back. (51)”

“As they say, the Netherlands, a trading country, saw an enlargement in forming the Benelux with Belgium and Luxembourg, we took the initiative. When one says ‘A’, one should follow with ‘B’. (55) I could guarantee you that the majority of the Dutch people would say “yes, we want Turkey in the European Union. (19)”

“I have no idea if the situation of countries like Croatia and Bulgaria will improve or more money will come in, if they join the European Union. (48) I see this in a totally different way, because Bulgarians and Romanians concern me just a little, while I am worried more about the countries ridden by corruption, I mean also Macedonia and Serbia. (42)”

“If someone wants to join a choir, we ask them, can you sing? And they say, I can't sing, but I have a lot of money. Then you cannot join. I think we need to say that in the European Community too. (10) I believe that all these countries, here, on the European continent, need to see how wonderful the idea to join the European Union is. (63)”

4.4. The founding member states: Germany

4.4.1 Discourse A “Questioning Integration”

This discourse expresses skepticism in the original sense of this term; the respondents are questioning not only enlargement but European integration as a whole. They agree with statements that are skeptical about the EU as a regulatory system, but also with statements that simply express doubt that citizens understand what enlargement has been about. They wonder whether all member states are happy in the European Union. By and large, economics and prosperity of candidates are considered important by these respondents.

There is a clear sense of apprehension about the economic shape of new member states and candidates and a concern that new members might be a burden for Germany. There is also a clear reference to the 'deepening before widening' discourse which is familiar from policy debates on enlargement.

"Is this a union of independently working states, who ideally help each other grow richer and balance between one another? (47) If the roots (of the EU) are in fact yet too weak, i.e. it grows wider and bigger, yet the roots are weak, then it will topple down fast, simply because there are too many contradictory debates. (6) The economic relations, the relations of dependency, also political dependency - this is not the purpose and the goal of the EU. And in any case it is not what I imagine it to be. (63) If we look at it, we always come to think that everyone's happy to be in the EU, and maybe this is not true at all. At present, we have too little information about that in [the new member states]. (18)"

"Currently, unfortunately, I think Europe behaves more like an octopus, a regulating octopus. (8) I think that rather a system of dependencies (EU) is thus generated. (13) Prior to the next expansion, we need to take care of our internal affairs and build the respective structures [in the EU]. (53) What exactly is Europe, can we define it only in terms of territory? (4) I personally think that the direct membership into the EU would be a complete disaster for many countries. Since I would sustain the presumption that many states have little economic power. (48)"

The skepticism of these respondents about enlargement and European integration and the economic balance between EU member states is confirmed by their disagreement with statements which are positive about enlargement and expect it to be positive for all member states. The statements they reject clarify the position of these respondents as fairly Euro-sceptic, anti-federalist, anti-enlargement.

"For me above all I am an advocate for Europe, no question about that. I see it very important. (52) Definitely enlargement and I think that under certain conditions it is good for everyone. I have no problem with that. (34)"

"From this point of view, I really support the enlargement. Especially in the context of what needs to be our [EU] image in front of the US, China, India, the developing African states, to some extent, to achieve a certain balance. (58) There are weak states [in the EU], there are strong states, this balance works sometimes. I believe that if we look at the example of the US and the Federal Republic of Germany, a Federal Republic of Europe may operate just as well. (21)"

"We need to think about the next enlargement and how far it may reach. I think of enlargement to include up to 50 states, such as the United States of America. I can

imagine that. If we build our common fundamental rules. (54) This (Federal Republic of Europe) would be my wish. This would be reasonable, because then this big economic space can be brought down to work in harmony. (50) This is what I would say too. One may agree, maybe it's better to continue with the enlargement, because the more countries are in there, the bigger the pressure for structural reform. (62)”

4.4.2. Discourse B “Enlargement for the People”

The proponents of this discourse are just as concerned about economic development in Europe as the previous group but they see enlargement as contributing to economic growth and power. Yet while supportive of enlargement, these respondents are also concerned that it happens without citizens’ participation and that the process should be about people too and their personal development, a mutually beneficial arrangement. These are the statements they agree with:

“The question is while we add economic connections and increase the size of the economy - which is wonderful thing - that we do not forget to consider cultural differences which also must be preserved. That is very important too. (56) Well, for me, the question about the enlargement is first of all the question where to enlarge? And for me, the involvement of citizens plays a crucial role. (57) People and personal development have to go to the foreground as priority; this is why everyone should be invited to join the EU. It is quite a different matter if this is financially feasible. (64) I think the whole issue with accession in EU stands and falls with communication. There are many arguments for the accession, for the enlarged Europe, as well as [many arguments] in favor of a tighter union of states in Europe. (38) In the long run, we speak in about 50 years - there is no way to avoid a complete solution to Europe through unification. (55)”

“For me above all I am an advocate for Europe, no question about that. I see it very important. (52) I think that Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, the Baltic states are all European countries. (2) There is one Europe and if we set aside those crises outside the EU, in the next few years we will be able to say that it is a Europe of mutual support. (3) Somewhere those exchange stories [between countries] have reached what we needed and wanted. And so [enlargement] cannot proceed on economic track solely, by which everyone says that Germany and France get something [out of enlargement]. (30)”

The statements these respondents disagree with attempt to establish geographical or cultural borders of Europe and limit enlargement on these grounds. These respondents are not worried about differences between the people of Europe, neither are they concerned that

enlargement affects one's culture or individuality. These are the most important statements they disagree with:

"I personally think - that the direct membership into the EU would be a complete disaster for many countries. Since I would sustain the presumption that many states have little economic power. (48) I believe that we don't have to fear too much this enlargement, because it is about the expansion of Europe, i.e. in the direction of Eastern Europe. As far as it stays within the circle of Christian culture, which means common roots for all of us, I would generally agree. (41) I think that the enlargement has to be contained within certain borders. Where this border shall lie, possibly it should reach as far as Ukraine. Ukraine shall not belong to the EU, because it is Russia. (59) Currently, unfortunately, I think Europe behaves more like an octopus, a regulating octopus. (8) The EU acts like a firefighting service, so to speak, which is called in when a country does not want to join in. This is the reason behind the phenomenon that so many countries actually want to join the EU. (10) I believe that then (after further EU enlargement) one can identify less as an individual. One says: "Ok, I belong to this home now. (33)"

"One important question ahead of us - now that we see this financial crisis, which is raging across Europe - one can assume it is rather difficult and ask oneself if this is the right time (for EU enlargement). (43) If the living conditions in Bulgaria are not changed, and we are in the EU, and if people have to migrate to Germany, and only then have their life improved, then I believe any such enlargement is pointless. (32)"

4.4.3. Discourse C "Rule-driven, More Gradual Enlargement"

The proponents of this discourse are not as skeptical as our first group, they are prepared to accept enlargement but on the basis of clear criteria, rules, better communication about candidates and member states, a more incremental approach that strengthens the existing Union and member states first.

On the positive side:

"Prior to the next expansion, we need to take care of our internal affairs and build the respective structures [in the EU]. (53) It is easy to see that this ship in the open sea is still somehow looking for its way. About the enlargement, well, I think it should happen when it is supposed to happen; there is some kind of insecurity now. (11) If the living conditions in Bulgaria are not changed, and we are in the EU, and if people have to migrate to Germany, and only then have their life improved, then I believe any such

enlargement is pointless. (32) Therefore enlargement at all costs, right now in the current situation [Turkish integration] there is no way I would support it. (25)”

“It would be difficult for me to list all 28 states. And who joined when. I lose track sometimes. (20) Yes, it has already started. It is not at all clear any more who is joining in and under what conditions. What is the situation? Where are the advantages? What are the chances? What are the consequences of all this? This form of transparency is just not there. (37) What scares me a bit is the pace at which attempts will be made (to admit) states, who come from a different political system, have different history. (35) If you want to join in, you need to meet strictly our rules. Yet, the rules are not clear for all 28 members. If you live in Bulgaria or Croatia, they have a completely different EU there. (16) I also think that when the states are faced with certain conditions, which they have to meet, in order to join the EU, this happens more in theory, rather than in practice in the system. (40) We need to think about the next enlargement and how far it may reach. I think of enlargement to include up to 50 states, such as the United States of America. I can imagine that. If we build our common fundamental rules. (54)”

The statements these respondents disagree with confirm their wish to see a slower process of enlargement, but not to stop it or define Europe’s final borders. While they do not reject Ukraine’s accession, they disagree with the idea that the EU should negotiate with Russia strongly.

“I also believe that the expansion to the East will end up with a run forward. That is, as many as possible countries will be thus bound together, rather than separate to other blocks. (12) To the South it is necessary to include the former Yugoslav republics too. Sooner or later this will happen. (31)”

“Why doesn’t anybody ever talk about it? Why had nothing been ever done? Russia should be told to join the EU. I support that. I would be holding talks with the Russian oligarchs, i.e. Putin in this case, and I would be holding those talks reasonably. (61) What exactly is Europe, can we define it only in terms of territory? (4) I think that the enlargement has to be contained within certain borders. Where this border shall lie, possibly it should reach as far as Ukraine. Ukraine shall not belong to the EU, because it is Russia. (59) I believe that we don’t have to fear too much this enlargement, because it is about the expansion of Europe, i.e. in the direction of Eastern Europe. As far as it stays within the circle of Christian culture, which means common roots for all of us, I would generally agree. (41)”

“In general, my attitude to the European Union is rather positive. Nationalism is too strong and will block any developments, if we isolate from everything that goes on abroad. (60) I am for more members and less or none bureaucracy. The countries will always stay independent, because people tend to have independence too. (15)”

4.4.4. Discourse D “Realizing Europe’s Global Potential”

The proponents of this discourse seem to look at the whole of Europe and further afield and approve of enlargement as a source of power, freedom of movement. They look forward to a federal type of Union, a United States of Europe, not a regulatory union dealing with everyday issues and technical standards. Respondents agree with the following statements:

“For me above all I am an advocate for Europe, no question about that. I see it very important. (52) Prior to the next expansion, we need to take care of our internal affairs and build the respective structures [in the EU]. (53)”

“The issues related to the enlargement of Europe are strongly related to the fears that people don't have a clue about these countries. What are their economic systems? What kind of problems may affect us too? (42) Europe has so much more potential, and this could be used, even if it proves difficult. I don't see any other way. What would be the alternative? In the long run, we will be moving behind, if we don't want it. (23) Definitely enlargement and I think that under certain conditions it is good for everyone. I have no problem with that. (34) Switzerland and so forth, they wish to remain neutral. (26)”

“This freedom of movement from the North to the South or from the East to the West, this is a huge advantage for everyone because everyone is capable of something. (24) The countries that joined the EU in 2004, the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, are already enjoying big advantages, because nowadays it is way easier to be economically active in those states. (51) This is the problem. More and more regulation is put into something that actually can't be regulated on this level. But we need to highlight the important things that are important for each separate country, which is not regulated. This is why there is this significant discomfort among the public. (27) Electric bulbs or something else, my goal, my true dream and goal, would be to form a unified state of Europe, where separate states do not matter (such as Germany). (49)”

“From this point of view I really support the enlargement. Especially in the context of what needs to be our image in front of the US, China, India, the developing African states, to some extent, to achieve a certain balance. (58)”

The proponents of this discourse find that enlargement can continue. The statements they disagree with stress the problems of enlargement and seek to exclude certain candidates. Yet they also strongly disagree the EU should start membership talks with Russia:

“We are now 28. I think that we talk about the EU, this means Europe, and the discussion is about Turkey included, this is also an option. But I say, no, and I say why not include Russia then too. (28) Why doesn't anybody ever talk about it? Why is nothing ever done? Russia should be told to join the EU. I support that. I would be

holding talks with the Russian oligarchs, i.e. Putin in this case, and I would be holding those talks reasonably. (61) Now, word is here again of frauds involving subsidies, EU subsidies, who, where and how much subsidies receives and where they disappear. If what is written there is true, then this is a catastrophe. (7) It is true, I believe that the EU is too far from its original idea and only slowly begins to work more geostrategically. I believe this is totally wrong. (44) Therefore enlargement at all costs, right now out of the current situation [Turkish integration] I would by no means support. (25)”

“I would rather say that for me personally the EU is very abstract. That in fact its influence for me is not that significant. (36) Somewhere those exchange stories [between countries] have reached what we needed and wanted. And so [enlargement] cannot proceed on economic track solely, by which everyone says that Germany and France get something [out of enlargement]. (30) It would be difficult for me to list all 28 states. And who joined when. I lose track sometimes. (20)”

4.5. The candidates: Serbia

4.5.1. Discourse A “Cautiously Positive Expectations”

The proponents of this discourse are in favor of Serbia’s joining the EU as a way to improve the next generations’ economic and educational prospects. The EU is seen as a community of rules and rights and the contrast with present day Serbia is painfully felt. These respondents realize that Serbia is not ready yet and has some way to go. There are no great expectations of immediate improvement after joining the EU, either, yet the accession process is embraced as a learning process, but above all, as a way to a better life. The respondents are realistic about the difficulties in Serbia’s path to fulfilling the EU’s conditions:

“I want us to join the EU, since I want better life for my children. It is better for their education, it means higher employment levels, sufficient income, it means they will be able to set up their own families. (10) I think it would be better for everyone, but mostly for the young people, if we join the EU, because they will maybe have a window to the world, they can escape this poverty and leave. (50)”

“I like the EU because it is supported by three pillars, which we don’t have and are swaying back and forth. These are human rights and freedoms, free movement of people, capitals and ideas and independent justice and police. (6) The advantage of the EU is that authority and power are held by the institutions. Here they are held by individual people. (38)”

“We are still kind of “green” as far as EU accession goes. We want to just jump in, instead of go step by step. (5) If they let us in the EU – I will thank them, but how are we going to survive there, I don’t know, because we are quite away from where they stand. (41)”

“With Kosovo or without Kosovo, we need to go for a united Europe. (58) I think that we will be better off for sure when we enter the EU. (34)”

“I think that something that can be of great benefit during our accession to Europe is that it will make us and is already forcing us work to change our legislation. (53) Before we reform anything that is subject to reform and before we bring society to a normal state, I think we will not be able to see any good use of the EU. (54) I think that we are not ready to enter the EU, either economically, or socially. (35)”

Statements of disagreement in this discourse are those that reject the accession process. Respondents disagree that joining the EU would lead to a loss of Serbia’s identity. Those subscribing to this discourse believe Serbia needs the EU and they expect its economy will benefit from accession. They reject the argument that Serbia’s agriculture or economy in general would be uncompetitive in the EU.

These are the statements these respondents disagree with:

“I have no idea at all what the EU may bring for us. (42) The only positive thing related to the EU is that it gives work. One can go there and work. (43) I am against EU membership. (12) What the countries have lost upon becoming EU members is their own identity. They don’t have their own identity. (18) The states have to preserve their identity and integrate only on equal terms. The positions in the EU are not equal. (16)”

“Let’s join the EU and see how it goes, then, if we don’t want that anymore we can leave the EU. (60) There is no other union in Europe now, no other opportunity except the EU. (32) If all 28 leading countries are EU member states, then the EU is the future of the world. (2) Perhaps it suits the EU to let in separately the member states of former Yugoslavia. (44)”

“My opinion about the major problem ahead of Serbia’s integration into the EU - our Eastern culture and western technologies. (3)”

4.5.2. Discourse B “Mistrust and Hostility”

This discourse sees Serbia to be put in an unequal and unfair position in the enlargement negotiations and rejected the idea of accession. Respondents view Serbia as self-sufficient economically and do not believe that accession has led to economic development for

previous applicants. They also find the conditions of Serbia's accession unfair and more stringent than for previous candidates. They do not believe the EU wants Serbia to join, neither do they believe that Serbia is ready for joining.

They agree with the following statements:

"Which one of the less developed countries that has become EU member is better off at present? None. (19) It would have been nice to have our own economy. So that we don't need the EU. To be able to export our own products and not pay any duties. (49)"

"I am against EU membership. (12)"

"Serbia shall not accept everything offered to it by the EU. (61) The terms for EU membership that are imposed on Serbia have not been imposed on the other countries, in the political sense for instance - the separation of Kosovo. I am afraid this tension will continue to build up. (47) All this talk about the integration into EU is quite meaningless – "empty stories" - the way it is used by the politicians to convince the people to do things that politicians otherwise can't. (48)"

"I think that we are not ready to enter the EU, either economically, or socially. (35) A big percent of the population lost their will for a number of things, including their will for joining the EU. (28) Europe does not need Serbia in its present day condition. (59) Those who don't want to get into the EU are not obliged to. This is a voluntary accession. This is like a marriage. This is a community of free will. (4) The EU will destroy even what little Serbia has. (37) The question is whether we are competitive at all in the EU in the field of agriculture. (24)"

"It is necessary to keep track and find out whether those who have established the EU and have been the first to join in have the benefit to get richer or as unbelievable as it may seem just have the good intention to make life better for everyone else. This is a big question for me. (11)"

"The EU would sooner fall apart rather than we would become a member. (17)"

"It will be harder for any country that wishes to enter the EU now because 27 member states have to approve of anything that happens. (29) I have no idea at all what the EU may bring for us. (42)"

The statements these respondents disagree with carry a similar message: they mistrust the EU and Serbia's future prospects in the EU. They expect countries that accede to the Union also lose something and they do not agree accession would mean a better life for their children.

These are the statements they disagree with:

“I think that we will be better off for sure when we enter the EU. (34) Simply the countries that are not as developed, for instance Serbia and the other countries in the region, are welcome in the EU due to the opening of some new markets, the investments and expansion in some new fields of influence. (25) Let’s join the EU and see how it goes, then if we don’t want that anymore we can leave the EU. (60) No, the countries that have become EU member states have not lost anything. They have not lost absolutely anything. (20)”

“I want us to join the EU, since I want better life for my children. It is better for their education, it means higher employment levels, sufficient income, it means they will be able to set up their own families. (10) I think it would be better for everyone, but mostly for the young people, if we join the EU, because they will maybe have a window to the world, they can escape this poverty and leave. (50) I see Europe and the EU integration as an inevitable process of globalization of the new world order. (15)”

““Yes” to the integration into the EU, in the course of time this integration means a better life, higher standard, better living conditions and that is. (7) I expect that our integration into the EU will influence among other things the economy, agriculture, healthcare, as well as produce a significant segment of results related to the field of education. (56) I am all for joining the EU as early as tomorrow and have some order and discipline observed. (55) The only positive thing related to the EU is that it gives work. One can go there and work. (43) The people living in the villages here will not be able to brew their own brandy once Serbia becomes a EU member. (22)”

“There is no other union in Europe now, no other opportunity except the EU. (32)”

4.5.3. Discourse C “The Devil’s in the Conditions”

These respondents see accession as a source of opportunities for jobs and travel and for future generations, yet they are preoccupied with domestic issues and concerns, from the making of brandy (*rakia*) to the issue of Kosovo. They expect economic benefits, improvements in infrastructure, but are concerned about identity. Still, the statements they most agree with, favor accession:

“The people living in the villages here will not be able to brew their own brandy once Serbia becomes a EU member. (22) It would have been nice to have our own economy. So that we don’t need the EU to be able to export our own products and not pay any duties. (49) The only positive thing related to the EU is that it gives work. One can go there and work. (43) I don’t want Europe to give me money. Let Europe help the infrastructure. That’s all I want. (64) I want us to join the EU, since I want better life for my children. It is better for their education, it means higher employment levels,

sufficient income, it means they will be able to set up their own families. (10) I think that something that can be of great benefit during our accession to Europe is that it will make us and is already making us work to change our legislation. (53) I expect that our integration into the EU will influence among other things the economy, agriculture, healthcare, as well as produce a significant segment of results related to the field of education. (56)”

“We are not well-informed whether all of Serbia is going into the EU, what is the pace of progress, what it is going to receive. (36) The process of enlargement of the European Union is something that citizens personally, themselves with their actions cannot contribute to, nor can they disrupt it. (23)”

“If we are speaking only of grants from the EU, then this EU is not attractive to me. I see the EU differently. It shall create conditions so that we can work and earn in our country, then there is our Europe. (8)”

The statements these respondents disagree with clarify their position considerably, by making the Kosovo question the most crucial condition of support or rejection of accession. These respondents see Kosovo as a loss and one that is linked to accession. They do not see European integration as a way to stabilize the whole of the Balkans. The discourse is defined by the disagreement with the following statements:

“With Kosovo or without Kosovo, we need to go for a united Europe. (58) No, the countries that have become EU member states have not lost anything. They have not lost absolutely anything. (20)”

“Europe does not need Serbia in its present day condition. (59) I think that we will be better off for sure when we enter the EU. (34) All states are part of Europe, the richest and most developed, as well as the poorest, and the most civilized countries. The European countries are members of the EU, except Switzerland. (13) If all 28 leading countries are EU member states, then the EU is the future of the world. (2) The question is whether we are competitive at all in the EU in the field of agriculture. (24)”

“The Balkans would become a zone of stability once they join the EU. (62) My opinion about the major problem ahead of Serbia’s integration into the EU. Our Eastern culture and western technologies. (3)”

“Perhaps it suits the EU to let in separately the member states of former Yugoslavia. (44) If our financial and any other position had been better, the benefits from joining the EU would be bigger. (63) They, the EU, do not set standards in every aspect. Each state may retain something of its own when joining the EU. (21)”

“For me it is way more important what we will learn from the EU when Serbia becomes EU member, rather than what we will gain from it. Because we will spend what we are going to receive. While, if we learn to do something, it will be priceless.

(57) Another advantage of the accession to the EU is that the country indeed is weakened and the local self-government gets a little bit more power. Little by little the third sector, the citizens are also involved in these political processes. (39) Once you join them in the EU, this means you accept their values, their value system, their institutions and you adapt to them. This is why they will want to invest in our country tomorrow. While they will never invest right now. (14)

4.5.4. Discourse D “Favoring EU Rules and Institutions”

This discourse sees the EU as a source of better governance and impersonal rules and procedures. These are seen as something Serbia can benefit from. The discourse outlines agreement with the notion that:

“The advantage of the EU is that authority and power are held by the institutions. Here they are held by individual people. (38) The process of enlargement of the European Union is something that citizens personally, themselves with their actions cannot contribute to, nor can they disrupt it. (23) I think it is certainly in the interest of the European Union to expand, especially in the regions of Europe, where this system of rules and regulations that the EU is, is not yet developed. I think the EU enlargement is needed. (9)”

“Those who don’t want to get into the EU are not obliged to. This is a voluntary accession. This is like a marriage. This is a community of free will. (4) Let’s join the EU and see how it goes, then, if we don’t want that anymore we can leave the EU. (60) Some states in the EU have more rights than others. (30)”

“The only positive thing related to the EU is that it gives work. One can go there and work. (43) I see Europe and the EU integration as an inevitable process of globalization of the new world order. (15)”

“I think that the EU has to enlarge. (52) Before we reform anything that is subject to reform and before we bring society to a normal state, I think we will not be able to see any good use of the EU. (54) I am all for joining the EU as early as tomorrow and have some order and discipline observed. (55)”

“The states have to preserve their identity and integrate only on equal terms. The positions in the EU are not equal. (16) The Balkans would become a zone of stability once they join the EU. (62)”

The statements these respondents disagree with confirm their position that enlargement would be a good thing, something Serbia would gain from. They do not think Serbia is not ready and are not as skeptical as the respondents from the first discourse in terms of the period of preparation. The statements they disagree most significantly with are:

“The EU will destroy even what little Serbia has. (37) We are still kind of “green” as far as EU accession goes. We want to just jump in, instead of go step by step. (5) The question is whether we are competitive at all in the EU in the field of agriculture. (24)”

“If they let us in the EU – I will thank them, but how are we going to survive there, I don’t know, because we are quite away from where they stand. (41) I do not believe that Serbia will join the EU in this way. Regardless whether with or without Kosovo, there is no state of law, there is no education, there is not a single moral value any more. (40) Once you join them in the EU, this means you accept their values, their value system, their institutions and you adapt to them. This is why they will want to invest in our country tomorrow. While they will never invest right now. (14) I think that we are not ready to enter the EU, either economically, or socially. (35) We are not well-informed whether all of Serbia is going into the EU, what is the pace of progress, what it is going to receive. (36) I have no idea at all what the EU may bring for us. (42)”

“I think that we will be better off for sure when we enter the EU. (34) Which one of the less developed countries that has become EU member is better off at present? None. (19) All this talk about the integration into the EU is quite meaningless the way it is used by the politicians to convince the people to do things that politicians otherwise can’t. (48). I am against EU membership. (12)”

4.6. The candidates: the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

4.6.1. Discourse A “Façade Readiness”

The respondents subscribing to this discourse see their country’s inability to start negotiations not as one caused by external factors, but as the result of lack of political will by domestic elites. They find their country is not ready, in terms of statehood, rule of law, and the Copenhagen criteria. They expect accession to bring better governance in terms of rule of law, accountability and opportunities.

“I honestly think that the government does not want us to join the EU because in that way all the government loans will be controlled, and it’s obvious that they take advantage of the situation with the name issue... (32) EU requires that the criteria for entrance are fulfilled because the European Union will not accept a member which does not have a well - functioning state, if the state doesn’t fulfill the accession criteria. (19)”

“We are not yet ready to join the EU. (21) Even if we join the EU the small problems will still have to be fixed by the government inside. (50) We should not wait for the others to come solve our problems. No one will come help us, if we don’t help us ourselves. It doesn’t matter if you are in or out of the EU. (54) We need to be prepared to join the EU and after we join in we need to be ready to request [assistance] in order to be able to receive. (49)”

“I think the problem with our name is used by our state, the government structures, as well as by the Greeks, to manipulate, and to make only certain circles richer. (46) We may have laws but they are not observed. On the one hand, we want the EU, on the other hand, we think, God Forbid and hope to keep the status quo. (27) The thing is that if the conditions here are the same as in France, I will not go to France, but would rather stay here. (60)”

“What do I hope to happen once we join the EU: I hope we have well-functioning state institutions, an operating legal system – i.e. rule of law, improvement of the economic environment and improved quality of life. (9) If we are in the EU, then there will be an authority above the state authorities and it will exercise control. (63) If you are in the EU, the law applies equally to everyone, regardless of political affiliations. There is no umbrella to protect you. (31) I know that it will be better for our future if we join the EU. Perhaps the gates will open and it will be easier for us to find a job, to implement our plans, what we want to do in the future. (39) For me personally, the EU enlargement is the exact opposite of defeat. Opportunities for further education, opportunities for exchange of capital, labor opportunities ... So opportunities in every possible sphere. (41)”

“We don’t show any political will to join Europe. Europe does not have a clue if we want to become members or not. Obviously, we don’t have a clue about this either. (25)”

The statements these respondents disagree with are the ones concerned with domestic criticism against the EU, grievances over the deadlock over the country’s name and the argument that their country has been subjected to special conditions and additional requirements by the EU.

“You join in with your name, but when you join in, you will not have that name. They will still take away everything from you and will do what they want with the country. (16) The EU is just a nice myth. (3) The EU will be expanding so its territories are complete like in the United States. (11) We may have some ideals about the EU – family, community, yet in fact the EU does not exist. (2) The question is whether Europe believes in the basic principles it is founded on, whether this whole time they want from us to give up on something that is our fundamental human right. The right of self-determination is a fundamental human right, that’s it. (1)”

“I understand that there are criteria for EU membership, but I think they are different for Macedonia from those set for the other applicants. My opinion is this. (37) I find consequences of enlargement striking. The state would be practically lost, nothing could be done, it would be lost. (42) I think that the cheap workforce we offer is one of the benefits for the companies that wish to expand. This is one of the positive aspects because of which the EU would expand. (59) Even if there are some preparations, there will surely be a crisis [in Macedonia] after joining the EU. (48)”

4.6.2. Discourse B “Thwarted Enthusiasm”

The proponents of this discourse see the enlargement process and future accession as a source of opportunities. At the same time they feel their country is treated differently, less fairly than other candidates. The discourse is defined by agreement with these statements:

“For me personally, the EU enlargement is the exact opposite of defeat. Opportunities for further education, opportunities for exchange of capital, labor opportunities ... So opportunities in every possible sphere. (41)”

“I understand there are requirements for joining the EU, but I think they are different for Macedonia from those set for the other applicants. (37) It is ridiculous that they cannot decide whether to admit Macedonia in the EU or not, we are talking about a population of two million people. And it is ridiculous to set hurdles on our way especially in view that the number of people here is almost like that of a suburb in Paris. (53)”

“That’s right, we are now thrown out. There are restrictions imposed on the people, markets, funds. (7) As we said, what does EU offer to us? To go find work without the Bulgarian passports. (24) In any case, after we join the EU, it would not be as easy as we think. It’s certain, because this is what happened in Bulgaria: the standard improves first and only then the salaries. After EU accession it is worse for people, it’s hard to have a breather as we say. (34)”

“I believe that Macedonia is not capable to recover economically and politically all by itself. It needs an engine, and the first engine it can attach to is the EU – God has given us a place in Europe. (23) If what happens now can be defined as chaos, when we join the EU it will not be so chaotic. (8) I think that the EU makes it easier for both the business and the politics; problems are solved more easily, when you are in the same Union, it is easier on the business, the barriers along the borders are simplified, as for employment, people are able to move anywhere without any obstacles. (38)”

The discourse reveals disagreement with the notion that enlargement would be a loss of sovereignty or identity. The respondents find they do need the EU. Yet they do not agree

that accession is only a matter of their country being ready and of objective criteria. These are the statements they disagree with:

“The EU is not a donor or Mother Theresa to let everyone in... come on, anyone can come. (58) We may have laws but they are not observed. On the one hand, we want the EU, on the other hand, we think, God Forbid and hope to keep the status quo. (27) The people in the EU are not stupid, they know what kind of country we are and in what condition we are. This is why they are giving us the chance to get us ready, the companies, the people and everything that is necessary, so in the end we will join in. (40)”

“We are not yet ready to join the EU. (21) We need to be prepared to join the EU and after we join in we need to be ready to request [assistance] in order to be able to receive. (49) We talk of enlargement. This means that we need to adopt everything from the EU and apply it here. (5) We should not get angry by the fact that the EU asks us to do something, that it expects us to be part of the Union. (47) Even if there are some preparations, there will surely be a crisis [in Macedonia] after joining the EU. (48) I think that we do not ask ourselves the question whether we want to join Europe or not. (22)”

4.6.3. Discourse C “Expectations for Better Governance”

The proponents of this discourse expect accession to make politics and business climate better and are prepared to work for it. They see the road to the EU as a road to better governance, rule of law, more opportunities.

“I think that it is good for us to join the EU. First of all because of the corruption and then all things will fall into place. (44) I think that the EU makes it easier for both business and politics; problems are solved easier, when you are in the same Union, it is easier for business, the barriers along the borders are lifted, as for employment, people are able to move anywhere without any obstacles. (38) If what happens now can be defined as chaos, when we join the EU it will not be so chaotic. (8)”

“We should not wait for the others to come solve our problems. No one will come help us, if we don't help us ourselves. It doesn't matter if you are in or out of the EU. (54) What do I hope to happen once we join the EU: I hope we have well-functioning state institutions, an operating legal system – i.e. rule of law, improvement of the economic environment and improved quality of life. (9) For me personally, the EU enlargement is the exact opposite of defeat. Opportunities for further education, opportunities for exchange of capital, labor opportunities ... So opportunities in every possible sphere. (41) We need to be prepared to join the EU and after we join in we need to be ready

to request [assistance] in order to be able to receive. (49) The thing is that the EU may give you a lot of things, but then will require a whole lot more. No one is ready to give you anything without requesting something in exchange. (30) I think that the cheap workforce we offer is one of the benefits for the companies that wish to expand. This is one of the positive aspects because of which the EU would expand. (59)”

“The EU organizes the imports and for those that are not member states it is restricted. It is free among the member states. When we become EU member states, our markets will be open. So that people will be able to import and export. (64)”

The proponents of this discourse disagree with those statements that question the legitimacy and credibility of the EU. They disagree that EU does not have the capacity to drive the country to positive change. They do not expect enlargement to be a loss.

“The European Union does not exist as a single body. It does not have a president, there is no single institution. (6) The EU is a supranational institution, it does not play a role in the judiciary of the country, it does not have any jurisdiction in the country. (18) I find consequences of enlargement striking. The state would be practically lost, nothing could be done, it would be lost. (42)”

“We are not yet ready to join the EU. (21) There is time for us to join the EU. We don’t need the EU now. (26)”

“The act of getting this country into the EU seems very difficult for us as people living on the Balkans, in the sense that we are used to a different pace of life and now suddenly this is about to change, because someone sets new rules for us. (36) I honestly think that the government does not want us to join the EU because in that way all the government loans will be controlled, and it’s obvious that they take advantage of the situation with the name issue. (32)”

“You cannot blame the EU that it does not let us in, because it does not want to do this or because it does not grant sufficient funds. (57) Not everything in the EU is perfect though. The production is pre-planned, however: what the country needs and what actions need to be taken in which area. (17) If we are in the EU, then there will be an authority above the state authorities and it will exercise control. (63)”

4.6.4. Discourse D “Apprehension and Ambiguity”

This is a discourse that suggests accession may be possible on geopolitical grounds but that it would not be beneficial for the citizens. The respondents agree with statements that anticipate cultural and economic difficulties after accession. The experience of new member

states is taken to be an example that accession will not be a cure for all problems and might even bring a crisis. These are the statements that the respondents agree with:

“Even if there are some preparations, there will surely be a crisis [in Macedonia] after joining the EU. (48) The act of getting this country into the EU seems very difficult for us as people living on the Balkans, in the sense that we are used to a different pace of life and now suddenly this is about to change, because someone sets new rules for us. (36)”

“There is time for us to join the EU. We don’t need the EU now. (26) The EU will be expanding so its territories are complete like in the United States. (11) Europe does not want to admit only Serbia, Bulgaria and with Russia close by, and to leave only Macedonia – this small piece of land – out. (45) The European Union does not exist as a single body. It does not have a president, there is no single institution. (6)”

“In any case, after we join the EU, it would not be as easy as we think. It’s certain, because this is what happened in Bulgaria: the standard improves first and only then the salaries. After EU accession it is worse for people, it’s hard to have a breather as we say. (34) Bulgaria is a member of the EU since 2007, yet the young leave the country, since Bulgaria is governed by criminal structures. (12) There, Bulgaria reports a record high number of emigrants [leaving the country] in the period from 2007 to 2013. If the situation in general is on the mend, that doesn’t mean that once the country joins the EU it will improve immediately. The EU membership will change nothing automatically, but it is an incentive. (28) The EU is just a nice myth. (3)”

The disagree side of this discourse emphasizes again the belief of the respondents that enlargement will not result in more opportunities for citizens. Instead, the respondents anticipate problems and crisis.

“I honestly think that the government does not want us to join the EU because in that way all the government loans will be controlled, and it’s obvious that they take advantage of the situation with the name issue. (32)”

“The people in the EU are not stupid, they know what kind of country we are and in what condition we are. This is why they are giving us the chance to get us ready, the companies, the people and everything that is necessary, so in the end we will join in. (40) We only think we are ready, the politicians tell us so. If we were ready though, we would have already been a member. (56) Even if we join the EU the small problems will still have to be fixed by the government inside. (50) I know that it will be better for our future if we join the EU. Perhaps the gates will open and it will be easier for us to find a job, to implement our plans, what we want to do in the future. (39) For me personally, the EU enlargement is the exact opposite of defeat. Opportunities for

further education, opportunities for exchange of capital, labor opportunities ... So opportunities in every possible sphere. (41)"

5. Conclusions

The discourses presented here suggest there are more ways of understanding past and future enlargements than being in favor or against them. There are surprising views and understandings that unite arguments and preferences in ways which are counter intuitive even for the experienced student of enlargement and public opinion. An example of this is the Bulgarian discourse which we labelled, 'the more the merrier', which approves of trying to make not only the remaining countries of the Western Balkans but also Russia an EU member. Respondents in Germany also made a similar statement. Regardless of how unrealistic some of the citizens' expectations and desires may seem, capturing these provides a glimpse in motivations that may appear inconsistent and illogical in public opinion surveys and play a role in people's reactions to events and policies.

We see these discourses as containing both rational and emotional responses, rooted in history and geography as much as in recent events. They are durable, not changing as fast as enlargement strategies and policies or economic conditions in the countries we examine, yet influenced by them. In terms of the overarching question which we have been occupied with in the context of this project, whether the European Union will be able to continue enlarging in the future, the narratives presented above outline the current boundaries of societal acceptance of enlargement, but also, understandings, assumptions and arguments that may inform a new way of making enlargement possible in the future. Following Dryzek and Holmes, we assume that the discourses that we have found 'help condition what is possible and likely in terms of political development, while political development can change the terms of discourses' (Dryzek/Holmes 2002:6).

In terms of the policy implications of these discourses, any evaluation should start from the normative premise that future policy actions should not disregard the expression of preferences stated in key discourses, just as we do not disregard public opinion data results. Given the presence of discourses with a strong note of scepticism in the Netherlands, Germany and even Poland, political debate and discussion on enlargement, at a time well before Accession treaties come for ratification, would be not only normatively desirable, but also prudent.

We do not claim that the narratives found by us convey a representative picture of public opinion in the traditional sense. While we have made every effort to establish that these discourses are representative in terms of the arguments that exist and the overall volume of discussions among citizens is captured, it should not be forgotten that the method used does not allow us to establish what percentage of the population subscribes to a certain discourse. Further research to establish this or relate discourses to core values among citizens could open the way to new policy insights and methodological innovation. At the same time the bottom-up method has allowed us to find the voices and stories of some European citizens that have not been captured by other methods. An example is the clear and coherent discourse ‘the Forgotten Village’, which we found in Bulgaria.

The question arises then to what an extent existing views expressing a clearly negative position towards future enlargement can be changed through deliberation.

Looking at the arguments and sentiments expressed in our six countries, it is possible to argue that some discourses unite respondents that are genuinely searching and unsure whether enlargement and even further integration would be beneficial for them and their countries. Others still – for example the respondents subscribing to the discourse labelled ‘Questioning integration’ in Germany, are clearly not inclined to leave space for persuasion. Yet such sceptic discourses are very few and far between. The positive, idealistic, open first discourse in the Netherlands is an illustration that enlargement can be promoted on the basis of ideals rather than defended as a necessity on economic or geopolitical grounds.

In the spirit of much of the literature that inspired this research (Dryzek/Holmes 2002; Dryzek/Niemeyer 2008; Steunenberg et al. 2011), we see the multi-layered, complex nature of the discourses presented here as evidence that deliberation is possible and could open ways to develop certain policies by changing people’s beliefs and preferences. Many of the country discourses cited above indicate that an open conversation about enlargement with citizens is possible. The discourses also share a number of common themes and understandings between countries, which we will explore in our further work on this topic.

6. References

- Agh, A., Kaiser, T. and Koller, B. (eds.) (2014) *10 Years After: Multi-level Governance and differentiated integration in the EU*, King Sigismund Business School: Budapest Blue Ribbon Research Center.
- Avery, G. and Cameron, F. (1998) *The Enlargement of the European Union*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Azrout, R., van Spanje, J. and de Vreese, C. (2013) 'A threat called Turkey: Perceived religious threat and support for EU entry of Croatia, Switzerland and Turkey', *Acta Politica* 48 (1): 2-21.
- Baun, M. J. (2000) *A Winder Europe: The Process and Politics of European Union Enlargement*, Lanham and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Boomgaarden, H. G., Schuck, a. R. T., Elenbaas, M. and de Vreese, C. H. (2011) 'Mapping EU attitudes: Conceptual and empirical dimensions of Euroscepticism and EU support', *European Union Politics* 12(2): 241-266.
- Brown, S. R. (1980) *Political subjectivity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, available at: <http://qmethod.org/about>: or <http://qmethod.org/papers/Brown-1980-PoliticalSubjectivity.pdf>, accessed 13 January 2015.
- Brown, S. R. (1993) 'A primer on Q methodology', *Operant Subjectivity* 16: 91-138, available at: <http://facstaff.uww.edu/cottlec/QArchive/Primer1.html>, accessed 13 January 2015.
- de Vreese, C. H. and Boomgaarden, H. G. (2005) 'Projecting EU Referendums: Fear of Immigration and Support for European Integration', *European Union Politics* 6(1): 59-82.
- Dimitrova, A. (ed.) (2004) *Driven to Change: The European Union's Enlargement viewed from the East*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Dixon, J. C. (2010) 'Opposition to enlargement as a symbolic defence of group position: multilevel analyses of attitudes toward candidates' entries in the EU-25', *The British journal of sociology* 61(1): 127-154.
- Dryzek, J. S. and L. T. Holmes (2002) *Post Communist democratization: Political discourses among across thirteen countries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dryzek, J. S. and V. Braithwaite (2000) 'On the process for democratic deliberation: values analysis applied to Australian politics', *Political Psychology* 21(2): 241-266.
- Dryzek, J.S. (2000) *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dryzek, J.S. and J. Berejikian (1993) 'Reconstructive Democratic Theory', *The American Political Science Review* 87(1): 48-60.
- Dryzek, J.S. and Niemeyer, S. (2008) 'Discursive Representation', *The American Political Science Review* 102(4): 481-493.

Eichenberg, R. C. and Dalton, R. J. (2007) 'Post-Maastricht Blues: The Transformation of Citizen Support for European Integration, 1973–2004', *Acta Politica* 42: 128-152.

European Commission (2013) 'Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-13', COM (2013) 700 final, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2014/20141008-strategy-paper_en.pdf, accessed 13 January 2015.

Flash Eurobarometer no. 172 (2005) 'The European Constitution: Post Referendum Survey in the Netherlands', *Flash poll 172, June 2005*, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl172_en.pdf, accessed 13 January 2015.

Gabel, M. (1998) 'Public Support for European Integration: An Empirical Test of Five Theories', *The Journal of Politics* 60(2): 333-354.

Hatipoglu, E., Muftuler-Bac, M., Karakoc, E. (2014) 'Explaining Variation in Public Support to Turkey's EU Accession, Turco-skepticism in Europe: A Multi-Level Analysis', *MAXCAP Working Paper Series No. 04*, "Maximizing the integration capacity of the European Union", Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin.

Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2005) 'Calculation, Community and Cues: Public Opinion on European Integration', *European Union Politics* 6(4): 419-443.

Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2008) 'A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus', *British Journal of Political Science* 39(1): 1-23.

Kemmerling, A. (2008) 'When 'No' Means 'Yes, But': Why Some Poles Voted Against Enlargement But for EU Accession', *Rationality and Society* 20(3): 283-309.

Lithuania's status', in K. Maniokas, R. Vilpiskauskas and D. Zeruolis (eds), *Lithuania's Road to the European Union: Unification of Europe and Lithuania's EU Accession Negotiation*, Vilnius: Eugrimas, pp. 19-59.

Lubbers, M. (2008) 'Regarding the Dutch 'Nee' to the European Constitution: A Test of the Identity, Utilitarian and Political Approaches to Voting 'No'', *European Union Politics* 9(1): 59-86.

Maniokas, K. (2005) 'Road to negotiations: enlargement instruments and the development of McKeown, Bruce & Thomas, Dan (2013): *Q Methodology*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

McLaren, L. (2007) 'Explaining Mass-Level Euroscepticism: Identity, Interests, and Institutional Distrust', *Acta Politica* 42(2-3): 233-251.

McLaren, L. M. (2002) 'Public Support for the European Union: Cost/Benefit Analysis or Perceived Cultural Threat?', *The Journal of Politics* 64(2): 551-566.

Risse, T. (2010) *A European Community? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Schimmelfennig, F. and Sedelmeier, U. (2005) *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*, Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.

- Stephenson, W. (1953) *The Study of Behavior. Q-technique and its methodology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Steunenberg, B., Petek, S. and R uth, C. (2011) 'Between Reason and Emotion: Popular Discourses on Turkey's Membership of the EU', *South European Society and Politics* 16(3): 449-468.
- Telicka, P. and K. Bartak (2007) 'The Accession of the Czech republic to the EU' in Vassiliou, G. (ed.), *The Accession Story: The EU from 15 to 25 Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 144-156.
- Toshkov, D., Kortenska, E., Dimitrova, A., Fagan, A. (2014) 'The 'Old' and the 'New' Europeans: Analyses of Public Opinion on EU Enlargement in Review', *MAXCAP Working Paper Series No. 02*, "Maximizing the integration capacity of the European Union", Berlin: Freie Universit t Berlin.
- Vachudova, M. A. (2005) *Europe Undivided: Democracy, leverage and integration after communism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Exel, N. Job A. and de Graaf, G. (2005) Q methodology: A sneak preview, available at www.qmethodology.net, accessed 13 January 2015.
- Vassiliou, G. (2007) *The Accession Story: The EU from 15 to 25 Countries*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Voermans, W. J. (2010) 'Voting for Europe? Lessons from Dutch referendums?' *Journal of the Japan-Netherlands Institute* 10: 220-243, available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1210462>, accessed 13 January 2015.
- Watts, S., and Stenner, P. (2012) *Doing Q Methodological Research: Theory, Method and Interpretation*, London, Thousand Oaks CA, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications.

Appendix I

Table 1. Matrix for Sampling Concourse – Political Discourse Analyses

Type of claim	Discourse Element			
	Ontology	Agency	Motivations	Natural/Unnat. Relationships
Definitive	1	2	3	4
Designative	5	6	7	8
Evaluative	9	10	11	12
Advocative	13	14	15	16

*Dryzek/ Berejikian (1993:52)

Appendix II

Tables 2 to 7: Factor Arrays, Idealized Factor Scores per country and factor

The idealized factor scores for each statement represent the way a respondent who loads 100% on this factor would have hypothetically ordered the statements. Defining for the idealized factor scores are those respondents, whose factor loading exceeds the threshold for statistical significance.

Table 2. Factor Arrays Poland	Factor Scores		
	A	B	C
Statement			
1. I don't want to look Europe in political and economic terms only. For me it is a conglomeration of communities, multicultural, facilitating the exchange of information and ideas.	6	0	-3
2. Turkey has a different culture. The culture there is quite different. This will not be compliant with us, this is an Islamic state;	-1	3	-6
3. There was an enlargement boom. The European Union lets in states, whose economy is certainly worse than that of the leading states. It was necessary that the European Union became a two-speed Union;	2	0	-3
4. Turkey is the only state with an economy structured in this way. There is no other country like that in Europe any more, I think. Forget Ukraine;	-4	-2	-2
5. The European Union will have everything, all countries it wants, and then it will fall apart. This is what happens to all empires. All empires have toppled down. They had everything. And the Union is headed in the same direction;	-4	4	-2

6. There are too many commissions in the European Union, that monitor curved cucumbers and bent bananas, and a few commissions, who actually work well.	-1	5	3
7. I don't think that the enlargement of the European Union will put our labor market at significant risk;	2	-4	5
8. This is the idea behind the EU, we talk, discuss, come up with this or that. I still believe that the European Union civilizes us, if it weren't for it, there would be more corruption, less attention to environment.	5	-1	-2
9. I think that the states that want to join the EU, and for us such state is most obviously Ukraine (because, to be honest, Turkey has achieved average success), also want to become part of this great idea of a community, unity;	3	1	-2
10. The admission of every new member of the European Union is related to costs and the EU authorities will consider arguments "for" and "against" and in the end it is all about the money;	2	5	4
11. It would be a rejection of democracy in general and the principal of equality and importance of states if the EU member states are selected the way raisins are selected for a cake – these are good to be EU member states, those are not good;	-1	-2	-3
12. I will address the value system of the European Union. I mean the system of Western values, not the Asian one that Ukraine is fighting against right now. The enlargement of the EU to the East begins from the adoption of this system of Western values: respect for human rights. Such values, which the countries in Central and Eastern Europe have not observed under the cover of the Iron Curtain;	3	1	-6
13. We think about whether we have to let in the entire Turkey into the European Union, since it is half in Asia, a different culture, yet the EU member states do not admit only individual people;	-2	-2	-5
14. EU enlargement will result in a big melting pot, where everyone could come in, pick up the best, but never return to bring it back;	-4	3	1
15. Ukraine is solely and exclusively a buffer between us and Russia. Thus for instance, Ukraine means only wild fields for the Netherlands, Germany or France. As politics shows no one would deal with the events happening there;	1	2	-4
16. The European Union gives the opportunity to organize Poland in such a way so as precisely with the help of the European funds to give the opportunity to people to stay here or even to come back. And maybe this is our opportunity to take advantage of the chance which the EU gives us.	5	-1	4
17. We need to wait, to wait until the EU collapses on its own;	-5	3	-5
18. Do we want the enlargement of the European Union? As I am a layman I don't even have a clue who makes effort to join the EU, I don't even care. If they want to join the Union, let them join it;	-3	-2	-1

19. Ukraine wasn't so lucky and didn't join the EU. I think it even had a higher Gross Domestic Product than us, Ukraine pulled it off from better than our positions. Yet we joined the European Union, while Ukraine hasn't. Now our GDP is three or four times higher than theirs;	1	-1	0
20. To sum it up, we would have been way, way, way behind without the European Union. Because we would have been at the same spot where Ukraine is actually now;	1	-2	2
21. My position is different. I think the European Union is such a rigid structure that without any internal reforms it will not be able to enlarge. I even have the feeling that if nothing changes in the end the EU may fall apart;	-1	3	-1
22. If we are not satisfied by the European Union, we have to step out of it. Everyone can leave, if at some point it is not satisfied by the European Union;	-3	1	3
23. Yet even if those countries are not in the European Union, the EU decisions will always be influencing these countries;	2	0	2
24. The principle is the following, generally speaking, the EU is advised not to enlarge, or if it enlarges, to do this to a minimum extent. Yet in reality, everything changes, no one knows what will happen after a while;	0	0	-4
25. Up to now the European Union has been enlarging gradually. It is not clear if it is going to encompass all European states. I don't think it's possible to have the whole of Europe become one big Union, yet they pursue this;	1	2	-1
26. To sell the goods they are producing. This is why they admitted us in the European Union, as a market;	-4	2	4
27. I think that some Members of Parliament view the fact that we are members of the European Union as a way to get hold of a whole lot of money;	2	6	1
28. The European Union is aware that by admitting Ukraine it will render Russia weaker. Ukraine will be followed by another Soviet country and then after 3-4 more countries Russia will be weaker;	0	1	1
29. Unfortunately, the accession to the European Union has both advantages and disadvantages. The advantages are that the young go to the EU, while the disadvantages are that we would have wanted them to stay here;	1	2	5
30. If the EU admits a new member, then the costs will be allocated among everyone;	3	2	0
31. I thought that after Poland joins the EU, it would be good, fun and that they would help us.	0	-1	3
32. As far as future enlargements are concerned, there are not many states left to include. I just don't see which state can be as peaceful and willing to join in, maybe some smaller county;	-2	-1	2

33. If it were not for the European Union, we would have had nothing, nothing;	-3	-6	3
34. I am afraid of one thing, mainly that in a while the EU will realize that the biggest mistake it could have made is that it admitted the Poles. Because they will destroy the European Union and will ruin it;	-5	-3	1
35. From my point of view, the fact that the EU creates satellites around it that strive for certain standards promoted by the EU is a long-term policy. I don't see anything wrong with that, it is ok both for these countries and the EU;	4	1	0
36. I think the European Union is not capable of enlarging to the Balkans. The Balkans is a very unstable region;	-2	4	-1
37. Nobody has said that all poorer countries shall be EU members. I am not sure that after that the EU will be able to cope financially. Will it be able to help everyone?	1	1	2
38. "They say: "we all are equal in the EU". But we are not, because there are differences in size and how big a say we have in decision-making, so don't speak to me about solidarity.	4	6	-1
39. The EU took a turn to become some kind of absolute, crazy, degenerate bureaucratic giant, which aims to regulate all aspects of our lives and takes away our freedom bit by bit.	-3	5	-1
40. These small countries have to be admitted in the EU. The more, the better. The whole thing started off from just a few countries to further expand. Every time we admitted a new member state, the situation improved;	0	-4	-1
41. I approve of Turkey joining the EU. They are quite ok;	-1	-5	-3
42. I would admit all countries because then this Balkan "melting pot" will settle down. In the past, Tito would control them strictly and it was peaceful, if they are admitted in the EU this will be beneficial for them;	-2	-5	0
43. I voted "for" Poland's accession to the EU in order to counteract this inferiority complex and servility – not in the racial meaning, but in terms of mentality. I thought the West was something better than this poor Poland;	-3	-4	1
44. The EU enlargement will not affect us. What happens is meant to happen. It will affect those countries which are about to join in. Maybe later, during the expansion of the Schengen borders, when there will be free movement of workers;	0	-2	2
45. Moldova too wants to enter the EU. They seem to be a bit ahead of us. But we think these are poorer countries. People there are doing worse than we do here;	1	0	-1
46. In the past, the UK and Germany would think the same of Poland: "They will just come in to get money out and steal and then we will have nothing because of them." Now the politicians act in the same way;	-1	-1	-2

47. The admission of Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia did not have a beneficial effect on the European Union. If the EU decides to cut the provision of funds from its budget, because Bulgaria is experiencing such levels of corruption, which it just can't handle... The situation was similar in Romania. The opinions in Croatia were split in half, 50/50 "we want to join the EU or not";	-1	0	0
48. Croatia joined the European Union using the power of the momentum. In which direction shall the European Union enlarge to the East? To Belarus? To Ukraine? At this point, this is quite unrealistic. Or we may admit Russia and start with the Kaliningrad district;	-2	0	-5
49. Perhaps in the future our children and the children of our children will live a bit better thanks to the European Union. The growth of the EU is inevitable, if only everything goes well.	4	-3	6
50. The idea was to build a community of nations in Europe, so it will be created on the principle of equal access or it better not exist;	3	4	1
51. Let's hope the EU will just fall apart;	-6	3	-3
52. What incredible times we live in, to have landed in the EU. This is the result of aspirations dating hundreds of years back. This is why we build Europe together, to expand and to enjoy it. There will always be flaws.	6	-3	1
53. Since we seem incapable to rule, let Poland join the EU;	-6	-6	-2
54. Every country has to take account of the fact that it shall not be just a receiver. If it squanders and does not use the funds in compliance with the set provisions and fails to repay those funds, then there should be a threshold and an "end";	4	2	-4
55. The European Union cannot become a closed club, it should continue expanding.	1	-5	5
56. A country decides on the enlargement not only in a referendum, the voters have to decide whether they want to join the EU. The member states – mainly the first member states Germany, France, Brussels – will have to decide whether to let this country in;	2	0	0
57. I would not admit all countries. Then it is going to be a world union, not just a European one;	0	4	-4
58. Are only countries that are supposed to give us something admitted in the EU? How do we know what we are going to need at some point? Maybe Ukraine will have something in the future that we all are going to need;	3	-1	0
59. I think that I am "for" the future development of the European Union;	5	-4	3
60. I think that after 2004 the EU has been having a civilizing effect. Sooner or later it will affect anybody in any form whatsoever in the future. I think this pertains to all countries except Ukraine. Because at present Ukraine is too big and too divided internally;	-1	-1	2
61. In my opinion all European countries should be members of the EU. Then this would be a genuine European Union	0	-3	1

62. Let the countries applying for EU membership, like Serbia, Macedonia and the rest of the former Yugoslavia, smoke their meat products the way they like, let them use whatever electricity bulbs they want in their homes, because a bureaucrat from Brussels is not going to pay a visit to their homes;	-2	1	0
63. We have been part of this EU for ten years now, so we cannot act in the same way as those who adopt the decisions in this EU;	-5	-3	6
64. If the other member states or those top decision-makers agree, let the country join the EU. Only this should not put Poland at risk.	0	1	4

Table 3. Factor Arrays Bulgaria	F-r Arrays		
	A	B	C
Statement			
1 I think the enlargement takes place mainly on a political basis.	1	2	3
2 The enlargement means more taxes for the country.	-4	-2	2
3 There is no use of EU enlargement. Nothing is going to happen.	-4	-4	-5
4 EU membership is something like imposing common rules on common borders, common laws which should be observed in some way.	5	5	2
5. The benefit of EU enlargement for the Western Balkans will come from the fact that there will be no customs officers and border guards at border check points.	3	0	0
6. On the one hand, Turkey's accession is a good thing. On the other hand, this may possibly lead to some kind of ethnic conflict.	-1	-1	-6
7. It will be easiest if Russia were to join.	5	-6	-3
8. The Serbs are ahead of us, their country is more developed. If they join the EU, their progress will slow down.	-4	-3	-2
9. There are no benefits for Bulgaria from the enlargement at this stage.	-5	-1	-2
10. So, you see, a lot of people thought that when we join the EU our wages will be rocketing; that everything will be handed on a silver platter to us, yet, unfortunately, it didn't happen for us.	0	6	3
11. We were so excited before we joined the EU. Our expectations were different. Mostly related to work and good earnings.	1	5	6
12. It may be good for us if Ukraine joins in, but it will not be good for Ukraine.	0	-4	-1
13. Russia will not let Ukraine join the EU.	1	2	1
14. In my opinion, what is wrong about the EU is that it is influenced by the US, and I think it should be otherwise, we have to defend our positions.	4	4	4
15. There is no equality, different rules apply to everyone. The problem is part of the EU.	-1	1	3
16. The enlargement is positive for the European Union, but negative for us.	-6	-4	0
17. In our case, since we give more money to Europe than we receive from them, it makes no difference for us as a state and as citizens whether the EU will enlarge or not, we neither gain, nor lose.	-1	-5	0

18. If Turkey joins in, they will not be as close to the third world and will have better connections with Europe. They produce a lot of vegetables, etc., so they will be able to export all that to Europe at low prices.	3	0	-5
19. Bulgaria's population would have shrunk to 2 million, if we had not joined the EU. There would be no people living here anymore, everyone would have moved out elsewhere.	2	-5	-4
20. They (the EU) have completely forgotten about us, the people living in the smaller towns and villages...	-2	1	5
21. Turkey has stated its interest to join in and on all occasions is way more advanced economically, at least as compared to Bulgaria. What might give rise to a conflict, is that it maintains a policy of dictatorship.	0	1	-5
22. Sooner or later the EU will fall apart, because the rich countries cannot afford to drag along smaller countries like Macedonia, etc.	-3	-2	-3
23. The EU enlargement gives opportunities for education, many people will go abroad, see for themselves what it is like there and may come back and apply what they have learnt in Bulgaria.	2	3	0
24. (The EU) helps societies in certain ways, for instance by programs, yet only certain people get access to these programs. The majority of people and those who have no clear idea about the administrative part hardly ever get hold of the money.	2	5	-1
25. In my opinion, by this enlargement they (the EU) aim exactly this - to use cheap workforce and to sell and expand their own markets.	-2	-1	1
26. There are arguments "for" and "against" Turkey's accession to the EU. "For" stands for the fact that it is very rich economically. "Against" because as an external border neighboring to other Islamic states it increases the levels of risk.	0	0	1
27. I don't see why a state, which is great, powerful, economically stable, should try to make its way into the European Union?	-3	0	-2
28. I think that if we go out in the street and ask the people there, they will just not care if the European Union is going to enlarge any further or fall apart.	-3	1	-1
29. In political terms, the EU enlargement to the Western Balkans will hopefully result in higher stability in the region. Otherwise, there would be hardly any benefit for the ordinary people.	1	4	1
30. Ukraine's accession to the EU would tighten up tensions between the EU and Russia	0	3	2
31. Even if we were not EU members, it would all be the same. Because in general the problems are not related to the European Union, but to the way in which they have been handled in this country. With or without the European Union, we would not start working in a different way.	-1	2	-1
32. I think what will be achieved will be a settlement of the conflicts in former Yugoslavia. Then the Macedonians won't care if they are Bulgarians or Macedonians or if the Bulgarians are Macedonians. This issue should be settled. This however will not happen too soon even if they join the EU, it will still take time.	1	-1	0
33. The major argument so far for Europe to turn down Turkey's membership in the EU has been religion. It is seen as a risk for escalating tensions.	0	-3	2

34. The good things after the accession to the European Union that are obvious even before that are related to the infrastructure, general improvement for the community in Bulgaria, while Bulgarians just fail to appreciate and see those improvements.	2	3	-2
35. What comes to my mind is that it should have been better, while in fact it has become worse (EU membership).	-5	-3	-3
36. In my opinion, when the European Union falls apart, the countries that are not EU members will be in a better position. There could be any benefits at the point of EU accession and not when coming out of the EU.	-4	-2	-1
37. In fact, after we joined the EU they have started imposing their requirements on us without us gaining anything from this whole thing.	-3	-4	0
38. I think that it is important for the EU to enlarge, because after all this is the goal of every organization. Whether it is going to be a good thing or not, we will find out only after the enlargement.	4	2	-2
39. For Bulgaria there are neither advantages, nor disadvantages related to Turkey's EU membership. We would neither gain, nor lose from it.	-2	-2	-6
40. Has anyone asked us if we want to join the European Union or not? The politicians took that decision...	-1	1	5
41. It will not be a good thing. I think it is not a good idea to enlarge the EU further. It will not be beneficial for Bulgaria. It will not be what we want, mainly have new job places open and have salaries meet some kind of standard...	-2	-3	-4
42. In the countryside, people are more interested in their everyday lives, their daily survival...people hardly take any interest in the EU...the people living in the rural areas...	1	3	6
43. We do what they (EU) tell us to do. This is a problem. One can't take a decision by oneself, someone else imposes those decisions. So they say, for instance, we need to shut down the two nuclear reactors, deal, we shut them down, in the end, then we will be buying electricity from other countries, if needed, but we cut down our production.	-2	1	3
44. The only good thing about EU is that it allowed for no more visa regimes, borders... This is the only advantage, which is bad for parents, on the other hand.	-1	1	3
45. The countries that are getting ready for the enlargement are not economically strong to lead ahead. Because on the other hand the rich countries need workforce.	0	0	-3
46. EU's enlargement to the Western Balkans is a good thing. The more powerful and free borders we have in this region, in light of the complex historical relations we have on the Balkans, the better it will be to have someone on the top to smooth out the relations.	4	0	0
47. Bulgaria's "benefit" (from joining the EU) was that we lost the biggest market in the world, Russia. This is our mistake. All our products went out to Russia.	-3	-1	2
48. One of the benefits of EU enlargement towards the Western Balkans is that maybe in this way Bulgaria is not so much an external border of the EU.	3	0	-1
49. So what if it (EU) does not enlarge, let it just aim to achieve some kind of economic stabilisation [...], invest in industry, fund agriculture in all countries that have become EU members and that's it.	1	2	1
50. I am "for" the EU enlargement.	6	3	-1
51. I don't want the EU to enlarge.	-6	-5	0

52. The entire European Union shall reach the same level of development, so that everyone lives under the same standards. I mean – same union, same community, same standards.	2	4	1
53. In my opinion, the EU has to enlarge in terms of education and work. This way you have a choice.	4	2	4
54. EU enlargement may not be a good idea. Countries with similar problems and then we will be the last in the queue again. Which of the acceding countries will attract most attention? If they are interested in a particular country, or in two or three countries, Bulgaria will be once again forgotten.	-2	-2	-1
55. If it was for me, I would not let Turkey in.	-1	-1	5
56. Our politicians should have done it differently and have the EU come and ask us to join and not us begging them to let us in.	-1	-3	4
57. I want the EU to enlarge towards the Scandinavian states, because in this way rich countries will become EU members.	5	1	2
58. Europe does not want Turkey, because it is against the islamisation of Europe.	0	-1	4
59. If Macedonia fails to deal away with its negative attitudes to history and join hands equally with us and the Greeks, I am strongly against.	1	-1	1
60. The same criteria for equal rights shall be applicable to all EU member-states, e.g. those related to the income in all EU member states.	3	4	-2
61. The EU has to enlarge, only under clear-cut criteria. The enlargement mainly is attained on a political basis. The states that are not ready in a legal, political and economic terms, shall not be let in, they shall not become members in this way.	2	6	1
62. The EU enlargement is important for me. The workforce from poor member-states will go to rich countries and may one day come back with some capital to help recover our small country Bulgaria.	3	0	-4
63. All Balkan countries shall become EU members and stop fighting with each other because of their hot temperament.	6	-2	-4
64. Let's break this EU apart. It seems a bit of a chimera to me the idea to become a common European community, after all these are different countries, each of which has its own mentality, traditions, laws, and lifestyle.	-5	-6	-3

Table 4. Factor Arrays The Netherlands		F-r Arrays		
No.	Statement	A	B	C
1	I have yet another question – what do the people in Norway and Switzerland think about Europe? Do they want to join the European Union? What do they think about that? They don't want to join in? Why? Because then they will have to surrender their government to Brussels and they don't see a reason to do that.	1	4	2
2	I think the European Union is a big money eating machine. Too many people work there and everyone wants to work there...we are talking about big money and I think that for now it can't enlarge.	-4	3	-2
3	If we talk about differences, then I want there to be completely different types of unions within the frames of Europe, as it used to be during the original establishment in Rome in 1956 (i.e., the Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community). And the differences shall be not only in terms of structure!	-1	-2	2
4	More countries in the European Union enrich us, so we need to be positive and stay positive [about enlargement].	4	-6	-4
5	I think that some of the countries that joined in could have waited longer or maybe even a decade or so.	0	1	2
6	I don't mind if Switzerland joins the European Union.	3	2	5
7	When I look back at the process of EU enlargement, I can see that the media have been paying attention only to the risks. Poland was the first to join in, followed by Lithuania, and then you see the media debated only the risks. You start focusing only on the risks. You get used to that.	4	-1	-1
8	I haven't noticed anything than much unusual during the last enlargement.	1	1	1
9	Enlargement could mean that countries with deeply rooted democratic traditions might want to go further with integration but are sabotaged by newcomers that do not have such a tradition...So I would first like to see a consolidation and stabilization (of the current EU).	1	-1	5
10	If someone wants to join a choir, we ask them, can you sing? And they say, I can't sing, but I have a lot of money. Then you cannot join. I think we need to say that in the European Community too.	2	0	-5
11	Yet if Poland is a country where the accession has proved successful, then I think I can understand. So, the outcome could be positive.	3	1	3
12	Our situation has not become better, it has only become worse.	-6	2	-1
13	This is why I don't think we need to talk about what would be our advantage from this, but that too, of course, has to fit in somehow. It should be mutual.	2	-2	2
14	The goal of the EU is to prevent excessive actions. This is why countries join in only if they meet the requirements in the field of democracy.	1	-4	4
15	15. For me, culture is important. People come together, togetherness, solidarity, doing something, being proud of your own country.	1	3	-1
16	Thus I can see, for instance, that Russia will not join the European Union.	6	5	-2
17	It is possible, countries that lag behind significantly in their political culture to be on the rise. To this end, however, we need to work well with rules.	2	-2	-2

18	I personally think that it is all about decision making power. The more countries join, the more it waters down. So, this is white wine, but if it were red wine, then you add some water and gradually it becomes a rose.	0	3	-1
19	I could guarantee you that the majority of the Dutch people would say "yes, we want Turkey in the European Union."	-1	-6	-5
20	I now think that it (i.e. the enlargement) has been too expensive.	-2	5	-1
21	It is difficult to say, but I think that it is difficult to have Turkey become a full-fledged member of the Union, because it is mostly Asian.	0	-4	3
22	One also realizes that in terms of market operation we will have a bigger market for selling goods, that we will make bigger concessions to other countries yet more will come our way too, I believe that.	4	-3	3
23	For sure, sooner or later it will be possible (i.e. before the Union expands further). This pertains to Ukraine too, yet it may take tens of years.	1	-4	-1
24	For me unemployment is a huge problem. It does have to do with enlargement, and also now when the Romanians and Bulgarians do not need a permit, they can go work anywhere in the EU and many companies think: "this is cheaper for us and we won't look back".	-2	6	-2
25	People want to have something for nothing. If this Polish guy comes and you want your house painted and he can earn a couple of euros, he will get the work. This is the Dutch mentality.	0	4	0
26	The way I see it, as we discussed what has happened to Iceland, when they were in need they wanted to join in. Now they are better off, they are aware of their fish wealth and don't want to be EU members any more.	-1	0	0
27	This is why Norway does not want to join in (i.e. to the EU), because they are rich in minerals.	0	0	0
28	Yes, the decision (i.e. for more countries in the Union) will be made by politicians in the end. Yet I believe that if you go out and ask the ordinary Dutch people, they will say: "no, no, no, no, no, no, this is too much".	-2	5	4
29	If we look only at money and prosperity (when enlarging), we will never have a European Union in the spirit in which it was intended.	6	-2	1
30	Yet it is a fact that Wilders is constantly talking about how Europe costs us money. Literally, we pay more since the new member states receive a great deal of money...	-4	4	2
31	No, I don't (i.e. have the feeling that the immigrants steal away the work from the Dutch), since that is entirely up to us, what jobs we are prepared to take. Many people tend to think: "picking tomatoes is not for me, picking peppers is not for me either".	5	2	-3
32	Ultimately, as I see it, the population was never asked, what do you think about this (EU enlargement). It has been pushed down our throats from above, you put the news on and what do you see, yet another country has joined us	-1	6	0
33	I have no idea which countries exactly have joined in, yet the countries that have become members should not have joined the EU; they do not belong with us, they are one step behind.	-5	0	-3

34	For me the most important thing about the European Union and its enlargement is the security in Europe, so this is what guarantees security. We haven't been into a war ever since the European Union exists, and we haven't been into any arms races either.	4	-3	0
35	I believe that Europe has made a historical mistake by letting so many countries to become member states so fast.	-2	2	-1
36	Actually, I think it should not be allowed: (enlargement) Europe is growing poorer and poorer by letting each new candidate in	-5	2	1
37	In general, I personally think that it is a little too rush to let so many countries join in, that are too weak. While the other part of Europe, i.e. the countries that are already member states, have to pay for this.	-1	1	0
38	What I think should happen is that the EU should clarify what people are required to do. And in what direction we are headed. We haven't heard a thing in four years and suddenly we find ourselves moving forward with new people around.	2	1	5
39	Now, Serbia may have to wait for a few more years (i.e. to become EU member)	-1	-3	3
40	Yes, I am "for" for all the rest, but it is not a matter of whether you are for or against it, it just happens anyway. It is either an old conflict or a way to let it go.	-1	1	-2
41	We can see that corruption is flourishing in countries like Italy or Ukraine, one of the new countries. And this is something that we, in Western Europe, detest.	1	-1	3
42	I see this in a totally different way, because Bulgarians and Romanians concern me just a little, while I am worried more about the countries ridden by corruption, I mean also Macedonia and Serbia.	-4	4	-4
43	In fact, the enlargement means to expand for most people, but more countries need to join in, to enlarge.	-3	-4	4
44	The more of diversity, the less of the Netherlands.	-3	0	0
45	[It is necessary to apply] a more comprehensive approach than a more strict system of assessment. This works fine economically, since this creates outright discontent, people are not interested anymore, there are differences as in Eastern Germany or as between the North and the South. It will become even worse if you constantly make an assessment based on economic terms, so I believe that we have to start precisely there.	3	-3	-1
46	In fact, you need to compare Europe to a girl of 17 years, who is pregnant. Because Europe, as it is now, is a 17-year-old girl, which already has children, but in general will have ten more. This does not work. She is too young to give birth to all these children now.	-2	-3	1
47	The problem is that Western Europeans are very tolerant. But if you look at the new Europeans, the Turks, maybe Albanians too, who are Muslims, they are not so tolerant.	-3	-1	-3
48	I have no idea if the situation of countries like Croatia and Bulgaria will improve or more money will come in, if they join the European Union.	0	1	-5
49	You cannot say that the Union can only be enlarged if a country brings added value in the sense that we (the Netherlands) gain from the accession.	5	-1	-2

50	I believe that the enlargement has to be prepared better, it has to follow a more consistent course, and certain conditions have to be strictly met. Also by the candidate country.	2	0	6
51	So when 1989 came, then I get the feeling, these countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia and so on, they were abandoned in Yalta, left to Stalin, these people have had a terrible time, so come and join us, it's a kind of a debt of honor that we have to pay back.	-2	-5	-6
52	I would say, the accession of countries such as Turkey and the Balkan countries, should be put on hold, also Albania, Ukraine (or at least part of those countries, that want to join Europe, because have high expectations about the accession), yet we have to be very strict here. The time has not come yet.	1	1	2
53	We don't do this (i.e., a given job). Then you don't blame the Poles. We have to say "thank you" to the Poles.	3	-1	-4
54	Enlargement? They first have to prove they have the capacity to achieve something.	-3	3	1
55	As they say, the Netherlands, a trading country, saw an enlargement in forming the Benelux with Belgium and Luxembourg, we took the initiative. When one says 'A', one should follow with 'B'.	0	-2	-6
56	And do we need to sit and wait the cheap workforce come into the Netherlands? While our people are being sacked? And experience financial problems? This is the actual state of affairs, isn't it?	-3	3	-4
57	And then I think that we should not accept more countries where corruption is flourishing. This is what I think.	2	2	1
58	This is why I am against enlargement and am for limitations set to only the 27 countries (i.e. member states) and the reduction of the number.	-6	-1	1
59	In principle, if a country fulfills the conditions, let them come.	5	-5	1
60	Yes, richer countries may join Europe. But I think that countries like Greece should better go bankrupt and then start recovering.	-5	-1	0
61	Enough is enough! Since now we have 27 (i.e. 28 member states) and if we leave only 25 of them...or 24, then we will get rid of a great burden; because with them we will lose also the criminal gangs, they don't come from Ireland, well, maybe sometimes, but most of them came from the Eastern block.	-4	0	-3
62	Let's try to make the European Union meaningful by keeping an eye on recent developments I support the enlargement, yet it should be done selectively, not only in terms of money, but also looking at other things [attributes of the candidates].	3	-2	6
63	I believe that all these countries, here, on the European continent, need to see how wonderful the idea to join the European Union is.	0	-5	-4
64	To go together, I think there should be some form of equality [between members]. Whereas now everything is swept in a heap.	-1	0	4

Table 5. Factor Arrays Germany		Factor Arrays			
No.	Statements	A	B	C	D
1	Unified Europe means that I have to feel good there. I have to be able to integrate, etc., while in fact all these criteria are missing.	0	-4	-3	0
2	I think that Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, the Baltic states are all European countries.	1	3	-1	0
3	There is one Europe and if we set aside those crises outside the EU, in the next few years we will be able to say that it is a Europe of mutual support.	0	3	-3	1
4	What exactly is Europe, can we define it only in terms of territory?	3	-2	-4	0
5	Enlargement does not mean admission into some circle of nobles. It means that people get together and make good use of benefits together.	2	2	0	3
6	If the roots (of the EU) are in fact yet too weak, i.e. it grows wider and bigger, yet the roots are weak, then it will topple down fast, simply because there are too many contradictory debates .	6	0	1	-3
7	Now, word is here again of frauds involving subsidies, EU subsidies, who, where and how much subsidies receives and where they disappear. If what is written there is true, then this is a catastrophe.	0	-3	0	-5
8	Currently, unfortunately, I think Europe behaves more like an octopus, a regulating octopus.	4	-5	2	0
9	I think that this whole enlargement thing is a necessary and logical culmination for Europe, since it is obvious it could be related to great problems.	-4	1	2	1
10	The EU acts like a firefighting service, so to speak, which is called in when a country does not want to join in. This is the reason behind the phenomenon that so many countries actually want to join the EU.	-1	-4	0	1
11	It is easy to see that this ship in the open sea is still somehow looking for its way. About the enlargement, well, I think it should happen when it is supposed to happen; there is more some kind of insecurity now.	2	1	6	-1
12	I also believe that the expansion to the East will end up with a run forward. That is, as many as possible countries will be thus bound together [in the EU], rather than separate to other blocks.	1	-2	-6	-1
13	I think that rather a system of dependencies (EU) is thus generated.	4	-2	2	-2
14	Enlargement, yes. Everyone is invited, yet a European constitution would mean we need to sit together, to discuss and analyze, and, honestly, what we want is more important for me.	-2	0	1	-1
15	I am for more members and less or none bureaucracy. The countries will always stay independent, because people tend to have independence too.	0	2	-4	0

16	If you want to join in, you need to meet strictly our rules. Yet, the rules are not clear for all 28 members. If you live in Bulgaria or Croatia, they have a completely different EU there.	0	-2	3	-4
17	Other countries to the North, etc., that have not joined in, have their reasons for this, one never knows if they will ever join in.	1	1	3	1
18	If we look at it, we always come to think that everyone's happy to be in the EU, and maybe this is not true at all. At present, we have too little information about that in [the new member states].	5	1	0	4
19	I think that many people hardly even feel affected by this. People feel it happens just like that, among other things.	3	4	3	0
20	It would be difficult for me to list all 28 states. And who joined when. I lose track sometimes.	1	0	4	-3
21	There (EU) are weak states, there are strong states, this balance works sometimes. I believe that if we look at the example of the US and the Federal Republic of Germany, a Federal Republic of Europe may operate just as well.	-5	-1	-1	-3
22	This (the enlargement of 2004) repeats the unification of Eastern and Western Germany.	-3	-3	-4	-4
23	Europe has so much more potential, and this could be used, even if it proves difficult. I don't see any other way. What would be the alternative? In the long run, we will be moving behind, if we don't want it.	-3	4	-1	5
24	This freedom of movement from the North to the South or from the East to the West, this is a huge advantage for everyone because everyone is capable of something.	-3	1	-2	3
25	Therefore enlargement at all costs, right now in the current situation [Turkish integration]there is no way I would support it.	-2	2	5	-5
26	Switzerland and so forth, they wish to remain neutral.	-2	2	2	4
27	This is the problem. More and more regulation is put into something that actually can't be regulated on this level. But we need to highlight the important things that are important for each separate country, which is not regulated. This is why there is this significant discomfort among the public.	-1	-1	1	3
28	We are now 28. I think that we talk about the EU, this means Europe, and the discussion is about Turkey included, this is also an option. But I say, no, and I say why not include Russia then too.	-1	-2	-2	-6
29	These are permanent political slogans, which are promoted here, yet no one understands the true advantages related to this and they are truly unintelligible.	-2	0	1	-3
30	Somewhere those exchange stories [between countries] have reached what we needed and wanted. And so [enlargement] cannot proceed on economic track solely, by which everyone says that Germany and France get something [out of enlargement].	0	3	-1	-4

31	To the South it is necessary to include the former Yugoslav republics too. Sooner or later this will happen.	-1	-1	-6	-2
32	If the living conditions in Bulgaria are not changed, and we are in the EU, and if people have to migrate to Germany, and only then have their life improved, then I believe any such enlargement is pointless.	2	-2	5	2
33	I believe that then (after further EU enlargement) one can identify less as an individual. One says: "Ok, I belong to this home now."	2	-4	1	-3
34	Definitely enlargement and I think that under certain conditions it is good for everyone. I have no problem with that.	-6	5	-3	4
35	What scares me a bit is the pace at which attempts will be made (to admit) states, who come from a different political system, have different history.	-1	-3	4	-2
36	I would rather say that for me personally the EU is very abstract. That in fact its influence for me is not that significant.	3	-1	-1	-4
37	Yes, it has already started. It is not at all clear any more who is joining in and under what conditions. What is the situation? Where are the advantages? What are the chances? What are the consequences of all this? This form of transparency is just not there.	1	0	4	1
38	I think the whole issue with accession in the EU stands and falls with communication. There are many arguments for the accession, for the enlarged Europe, as well as [many arguments] in favor of a tighter union of states in Europe.	-1	5	4	0
39	The bigger the EU grows, the more heterogeneous the member states become. This is why sometimes the factor for identification is missing.	1	-4	0	-2
40	I also think that when the states are faced with certain conditions, which they have to meet, in order to join the EU, this happens more in theory, rather than in practice in the system.	-1	0	3	1
41	I believe that we don't have to fear too much this enlargement, because it is about the expansion of Europe, i.e. in the direction of Eastern Europe. As far as it stays within the circle of Christian culture, which means common roots for all of us, I would generally agree.	-5	-6	-5	-2
42	The issues related to the enlargement of Europe are strongly related to the fears that people don't have a clue about these countries. What are their economic systems? What kind of problems may affect us too?	5	2	5	5
43	One important question ahead of us - now that we see this financial crisis, which is raging across Europe - one can assume it is rather difficult and ask oneself if this is the right time (for EU enlargement).	2	-3	1	2
44	It is true, I believe that the EU is too far from its original idea and only slowly begins to work more geostrategically. I believe this is totally wrong.	-1	1	-2	-5

45	I think that it is not wrong if Turkey joins Europe, in this way it may observe human rights more.	0	0	-3	-1
46	In a working Europe, if one has the mentality of a European, this (territorial division) will be useless anyway.	0	2	-1	-1
47	Is this a union of independently working states, who ideally help each other grow richer and balance between one another?	6	3	1	2
48	I personally think that the direct membership into the EU would be a complete disaster for many countries. Since I would sustain the presumption that many states have little economic power.	3	-6	2	-1
49	Electric bulbs or something else, my goal, my true dream and goal, would be to form a unified state of Europe, where separate states do not matter (such as Germany).	-4	-5	-3	2
50	This (Federal Republic of Europe) would be my wish. This would be reasonable, because then this big economic space can be brought down to work in harmony.	-4	-1	0	1
51	The countries that joined the EU in 2004, the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, are already enjoying big advantages, because nowadays it is way easier to be economically active in those states.	-2	-1	-2	2
52	For me above all I am an advocate for Europe, no question about that. I see it very important.	-6	4	0	6
53	Prior to the next expansion, we need to take care of our internal affairs and build the respective structures [in the EU].	4	0	6	6
54	We need to think about the next enlargement and how far it may reach. I think of enlargement to include up to 50 states, such as the United States of America. I can imagine that. If we build our common fundamental rules.	-4	-1	3	-2
55	In the long run, we speak in about 50 years - there is no way to avoid a complete solution to Europe through unification.	-3	4	-2	4
56	The question is while we add economic connections and increase the size of the economy - which is wonderful things - that we do not forget to consider cultural differences which also must be preserved. That is very important too.	3	6	0	-1
57	Well, for me, the question about the enlargement is first of all the question where to enlarge? And for me, the involvement of citizens plays a crucial role.	4	6	1	5
58	From this point of view, I really support the enlargement. Especially in the context of what needs to be our [EU] image in front of the US, China, India, the developing African states, to some extent, to achieve a certain balance.	-5	-3	-2	2
59	I think that the enlargement has to be contained within certain borders. Where this border shall lie, possibly it should reach as far as Ukraine. Ukraine shall not belong to the EU, because it is Russia.	-2	-5	-5	0

60	In general, my attitude to the European Union is rather positive. Nationalism is too strong and will block any developments, if we isolate from everything that goes on abroad.	1	3	-4	3
61	Why nobody ever talks about it? Why nothing is ever done? Russia should be told to join the EU. I support that. I would be holding talks with the Russian oligarchs, i.e. Putin in this case, and I would be holding those talks reasonably.	1	1	-5	-6
62	This is what I would say too. One may agree, maybe it's better to continue with the enlargement, because the more countries are in there, the bigger the pressure for structural reform.	-3	-1	-1	-1
63	The economic relations, the relations of dependency, also political dependency - this is not the purpose and the goal of the EU. And in any case it is not what I imagine it to be.	5	1	2	1
64	The economic relations, the relations of dependency, also political dependency. This is not the purpose and the goal of the EU. And in any case it is not what I imagine it to be.	2	5	-1	3

Table 6. Factor Arrays Serbia		Factor Arrays			
No.	Statements	A	B	C	D
1	In view of what they “serve” to us at the EU, I think these are the options for us.	0	-2	-1	-2
2	If all 28 leading countries are EU member states, then the EU is the future of the world.	-2	-5	-4	0
3	My opinion about the major problem ahead of Serbia’s integration into the EU. Our Eastern culture and western technologies.	-4	-2	-4	0
4	Those who don’t want to get into the EU are not obliged to. This is a voluntary accession. This is like a marriage. This is a community of free will.	-1	3	-2	5
5	We are still kind of “green” as far as EU accession goes. We want to just jump in, instead of go step by step.	4	0	1	-5
6	I like the EU because it is supported by three pillars, which we don’t have and are swaying back and forth. These are human rights and freedoms, free movement of people, capitals and ideas and independent justice and police.	5	0	-2	-1
7	“Yes” to the integration into the EU, in the course of time this integration means a better life, higher standard, better living conditions and that is.	2	-2	0	3
8	If we are speaking only of grants from the EU, then this EU is not attractive to me. I see the EU differently. It shall create conditions so that we can work and earn in our country, then there is our Europe.	3	3	3	2

9	I think it is certainly in the interest of the European Union to expand, especially in the regions of Europe, where this system of rules and regulations that the EU is, is not yet developed. I think the EU enlargement is needed	0	-3	-2	5
10	I want us to join the EU, since I want a better life for my children. It is better for their education, it means higher employment levels, sufficient income, it means they will be able to set up their own families.	6	-4	4	-1
11	It is necessary to keep track and find out whether those who have established the EU and have been the first to join in have the benefit to get richer or as unbelievable as it may seem just have the good intention to make life better for everyone else. This is a big question for me.	-2	2	-2	1
12	I am against EU membership.	-6	5	-2	-2
13	All states are part of Europe, the richest and most developed, as well as the poorest, and the most civilized countries. The European countries are members of the EU, except Switzerland.	-1	-1	-5	-2
14	Once you join them in the EU, this means you accept their values, their value system, their institutions and you adapt to them. This is why they will want to invest in our country tomorrow. While they will never invest right now.	1	0	-2	-4
15	I see Europe and the EU integration as an inevitable process of globalization of the new world order.	-1	-2	-1	2
16	The states have to preserve their identity and integrate only on equal terms. The positions in the EU are not equal.	-3	3	2	2
17	The EU would sooner fall apart rather than we would become a member.	-4	2	3	-3
18	What the countries have lost upon becoming EU members is their own identity. They don't have their own identity.	-4	1	2	1
19	Which one of the less developed countries that has become EU member is better off at present? None.	-4	6	-1	-3
20	No, the countries that have become EU member states have not lost anything. They have not lost absolutely anything.	-1	-4	-6	-6
21	They, the EU, do not set standards in every aspect. Each state may retain something of its own when joining the EU.	0	0	-3	0
22	The people living in the villages here will not be able to brew their own brandy once Serbia becomes a EU member.	-5	-1	6	-4
23	The process of enlargement of the European Union is something that citizens personally, themselves with their actions cannot contribute to, nor can they disrupt it.	-3	-3	1	6
24	The question is whether we are competitive at all in the EU in the field of agriculture.	-2	1	-4	-5

25	Simply the countries that are not as developed, for instance Serbia and the other countries in the region, are welcome in the EU due to the opening of some new markets, the investments and expansion in some new fields of influence.	0	-6	0	-1
26	The monitoring, which the EU requires in reference to EU membership, is not acceptable for some people in this country, since they will not be able to do what they have been doing so far.	5	2	1	0
27	After the latest events in Greece, Italy and the member states in general as a result of the major economic crisis, I think that the EU will be much more cautious and stricter to let new states in as compared to before.	1	1	1	-1
28	A big percent of the population lost their will for a number of things, including their will for joining the EU.	3	4	5	0
29	It will be harder for any country that wishes to enter the EU now because 27 member states have to approve of anything that happens.	1	2	4	1
30	Some states in the EU have more rights than others.	0	1	2	4
31	The farmers in Serbia have never had the conditions that the Bulgarians have in the EU.	1	-1	-1	-2
32	There is no other union in Europe now, no other opportunity except the EU.	-3	-4	0	0
33	The people in Croatia do not live better at all now that they are members of the EU, their wages are not higher. I don't see how their life has improved or how they have more opportunities in their everyday life.	-2	0	2	0
34	I think that we will be better off for sure when we enter the EU.	3	-6	-5	-3
35	I think that we are not ready to enter the EU, either economically, or socially.	3	4	-1	-3
36	We are not well-informed whether all of Serbia is going into the EU, what is the pace of progress, what it is going to receive.	1	0	4	-3
37	The EU will destroy even what little Serbia has.	-6	2	0	-6
38	The advantage of the EU is that authority and power are held by the institutions. Here they are held by individual people.	5	1	1	6
39	Another advantage of the accession to the EU is that the country indeed is weakened and the local self-government gets a little bit more power. Little by little the third sector, the citizens are also involved in these political processes.	-1	-1	-3	-1
40	I do not believe that Serbia will join the EU in this way. Regardless whether with or without Kosovo, there is no state of law, there is no education, there is not a single moral value any more.	1	1	0	-4
41	If they let us in the EU – I will thank them, but how are we going to survive there, I don't know, because we are quite away from where they stand.	2	0	0	-4
42	I have no idea at all what the EU may bring for us.	-5	2	1	-2
43	The only positive thing related to the EU is that it gives work. One can go there and work.	-5	-1	5	3

44	Perhaps it suits the EU to let in separately the member states of former Yugoslavia.	-3	1	-3	2
45	If we think of the EU establishment, the idea has been to come up with an analogue of the US, so that America should not boss around Europe the way it wants, i.e. the European countries may stay united and counteract to America, but not in the bad sense.	0	-3	0	-1
46	The problem comes from the fact that we are swaying between the EU and Russia.	1	3	3	0
47	The terms for EU membership that are imposed on Serbia have not been imposed on the other countries, in the political sense for instance - the separation of Kosovo. I am afraid this tension will continue to build up.	-1	5	2	1
48	All this talk about the integration into the EU is quite meaningless the way it is used by the politicians to convince the people to do things that politicians otherwise can't.	-2	4	-1	-2
49	It would have been nice to have our own economy. So that we don't need the EU, to be able to export our own products and not pay any duties.	-1	5	6	4
50	I think it would be better for everyone, but mostly for the young people, if we join the EU, because they will maybe have a window to the world, they can escape this poverty and leave.	6	-3	1	1
51	Let's hope we join the EU in 2020, yet we will be needing yet another period of time after 2020, when the ordinary people will be able feel some improvement in the living standard and the operation of the institutions.	2	-1	1	-1
52	I think that the EU has to enlarge.	2	-3	-1	3
53	I think that something that can be of great benefit during our accession to Europe is that it will make us and is already making us to work to change our legislation.	4	1	4	-1
54	Before we reform anything that is subject to reform and before we bring society to a normal state, I think we will not be able to see any good use of the EU.	4	4	3	3
55	I am all for joining the EU as early as tomorrow and have some order and discipline observed.	2	-1	3	3
56	I expect that our integration into the EU will influence among other things the economy, agriculture, healthcare, as well as produce a significant segment of results related to the field of education.	3	-2	2	4
57	For me it is way more important what we will learn from the EU when Serbia becomes EU member, rather than what we will gain from it. Because we will spend what we are going to receive. While, if we learn to do something, it will be priceless.	2	0	-3	2
58	With Kosovo or without Kosovo, we need to go for a united Europe.	4	-4	-6	1
59	Europe does not need Serbia in its present day condition.	0	3	-5	-5
60	Let's join the EU and see how it goes, then, if we don't want that anymore we can leave the EU.	-3	-5	0	4

61	Serbia shall not accept everything offered to it by the EU.	-2	6	-1	5
62	The Balkans would become a zone of stability once they join the EU.	1	-5	-4	2
63	If our financial and any other position had been better, the benefits from joining the EU would be bigger.	-1	-2	-3	1
64	I don't want Europe to give me money. Let Europe help the infrastructure. That's all I want.	0	-1	5	1

Table 7. Factor Arrays FYR Macedonia		Factor Arrays			
No	Statement	A	B	C	D
1	The question is whether Europe believes in the basic principles it is founded on, whether this whole time they want from us to give up on something that is our fundamental human right. The right of self-determination is a fundamental human right, that's it.	-4	1	1	5
2	We may have some ideals about the EU – family, community, yet in fact the EU does not exist.	-4	-5	-4	-4
3	The EU is just a nice myth.	-5	-1	-1	2
4	I think the European Union operates on the principle of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.	0	-2	-3	-3
5	We talk of enlargement. This means that we need to adopt everything from the EU and apply it here.	-2	-3	1	-1
6	The European Union does not exist as a single body. It does not have a president, there is no single institution.	-2	-3	-6	4
7	That's right, we are now thrown out. There are restrictions imposed on the people, markets, funds.	-1	4	-2	-4
8	If what happens now can be defined as chaos, when we join the EU it will not be so chaotic.	0	2	5	-1
9	What do I hope to happen once we join the EU: I hope we have well-functioning state institutions, an operating legal system – i.e. rule of law, improvement of the economic environment and improved quality of life.	5	0	5	-1
10	Once we enter into the EU the old laws will not be restored, the laws that put workers in miserable conditions, not ensuring the payment of minimum wages. This is what the EU is for, this is why we want it, because it will make us observe the rules.	3	3	4	3
11	The EU will be expanding so its territories are complete like in the United States.	-5	2	3	5
12	Bulgaria is a member of the EU since 2007, yet the young leave the country, since Bulgaria is governed by criminal structures.	3	5	-1	4

13	First, if there were no consensus, the EU would not have survived 50 years; the consensus is a golden rule. And if we ever become a member of the EU, Macedonia will be the first to stand up against a change of that rule.	0	-1	-2	-2
14	The process of integration has taken too long and I think Greece is not our only problem, whether it is about the name or other criteria and problems. I think the other member states also have an influence.	2	3	-6	2
15	I don't mean that we don't have to observe EU standards, but even if we join EU they will not influence in any way directly the changes in the country.	-3	0	0	-1
16	You join in with your name, but when you join in, you will not have that name. They will still take away everything from you and will do what they want with the country.	-6	-1	-1	-1
17	Not everything in the EU is perfect though. The production is pre-planned, however: what the country needs and what actions need to be taken in which area.	2	1	-2	2
18	The EU is a supranational institution, it does not play a role in the judiciary of the country, it does not have any jurisdiction in the country.	-2	2	-5	1
19	EU requires that the criteria for entrance are fulfilled because the European Union will not accept a member which does not have a well - functioning state, if the state doesn't fulfill the accession criteria.	6	-4	2	0
20	Europe is moving on two speeds, and what is even more scarier – on three speeds now. We have the Western Europe – France and Germany and the rest, the Visegrad Group, only we, the Serbs, the Bulgarians are left behind...	-1	1	0	0
21	We are not yet ready to join the EU.	5	-3	-4	2
22	I think that we do not ask ourselves the question whether we want to join Europe or not.	0	-2	2	-1
23	I believe that Macedonia is not capable to recover economically and politically all by itself. It needs an engine, and the first engine it can attach to is the EU – God has given us a place in Europe.	1	3	0	1
24	As we said, what does EU offer to us? To go find work without the Bulgarian passports.	-1	4	-1	0
25	We don't show any political will to join Europe. Europe does not have a clue if we want to become members or not. Obviously, we don't have a clue about this either.	2	-1	2	-2
26	There is time for us to join the EU. We don't need the EU now.	-5	-5	-4	5
27	We may have laws but they are not observed. On the one hand, we want the EU, on the other hand, we think, God Forbid and hope to keep the status quo.	1	-1	4	3

28	There, Bulgaria reports a record high number of emigrants [leaving the country] in the period from 2007 to 2013. If the situation in general is on the mend, that doesn't mean that once the country joins the EU it will improve immediately. The EU membership will change nothing automatically, but it is an incentive.	1	1	-1	3
29	If Albania is the first to join the EU, no one could guarantee us that they will not force us to.	-3	3	-1	2
30	The thing is that the EU may give you a lot of things, but then will require a whole lot more. No one is ready to give you anything without requesting something in exchange.	0	-3	3	0
31	If you are in the EU, the law applies equally to everyone, regardless of political affiliations. There is no umbrella to protect you.	3	2	3	-1
32	I honestly think that the government does not want us to join the EU because in that way all the credits will be controlled, and it's obvious that they take advantage of the situation with the name issue.	6	1	-2	-6
33	In the context of EU enlargement, instead of having heterogeneity, we observe homogeneity. We can see the same style of clothes from Ireland to Greece, the same way of thinking... and as a result of this diversity of nations, we lose our own culture and it is shaped following foreign patterns that are imposed on us from abroad.	-4	-5	-4	-6
34	In any case, after we join the EU, it would not be as easy as we think. It's certain, because this is what happened in Bulgaria: the standard improves first and only then the salaries. After EU accession it is worse for people, it's hard to have a breather as we say.	0	3	0	4
35	Why the EU membership has proved no problem for Slovenia? Because they would first put their affairs in order, set up a system and work hard on it, so afterwards it was easy for them. While we want to join the EU, but we don't want a system. This is the problem.	1	-4	3	-4
36	The act of getting this country into the EU seems very difficult for us as people living on the Balkans, in the sense that we are used to a different pace of life and now suddenly this is about to change, because someone sets new rules for us.	-1	0	-3	6
37	I understand that there are criteria for EU membership, but I think they are different for Macedonia from those set for the other applicants. My opinion is this.	-4	6	-5	3
38	I think that the EU makes it easier for both the business and the politics; problems are solved easier, when you are in the same Union, it is easier on the business, the barriers along the borders are simplified, as for employment, people are able to move anywhere without any obstacles.	-1	4	6	1
39	I know that it will be better for our future if we join the EU. Perhaps the gates will open and it will be easier for us to find a job, to implement our plans, what we want to do in the future.	4	5	-1	-5

40	The people in the EU are not stupid, they know what kind of country we are and in what condition we are. This is why they are giving us the chance to get us ready, the companies, the people and everything that is necessary, so in the end we will join in.	3	-1	2	-5
41	For me personally, the EU enlargement is the exact opposite of defeat. Opportunities for further education, opportunities for exchange of capital, labor opportunities ... So opportunities in every possible sphere.	4	6	4	-2
42	I find consequences of enlargement striking. The state would be practically lost, nothing could be done, it would be lost.	-6	-6	-5	-4
43	On the other hand, EU membership can be worse for bigger companies, we know there are major producers in France, for instance, so I think our companies will not be able to compete.	-1	-6	1	1
44	I think that it is good for us to join the EU. First of all because of the corruption and then all things will fall into place.	0	4	6	-1
45	Europe does not want to admit only Serbia, Bulgaria and with Russia close by, and to leave only Macedonia – this small piece of land – out.	-3	-2	-1	4
46	I think the problem with our name is used by our state, the government structures, as well as by the Greeks, to manipulate, and to make only certain circles richer.	4	1	-3	0
47	We should not get angry by the fact that the EU asks us to do something, that it expects us to be part of the Union.	2	-2	0	3
48	Even if there are some preparations, there will surely be a crisis [in Macedonia] after joining the EU.	-3	-2	1	6
49	We need to be prepared to join the EU and after we join in we need to be ready to request [assistance] in order to be able to receive.	1	-2	4	-2
50	Even if we join the EU the small problems will still have to be fixed by the government inside.	5	1	1	-2
51	If we say that the EU has to decide for us, then they have to know that we still have not forgotten the conflicts in Yugoslavia, we still are experiencing these problems with the other countries.	-1	0	2	1
52	We were supposed to be in the EU already, yet we have been hindered. We are way behind. We were way ahead and now we are lagging behind.	1	2	-2	-3
53	It is ridiculous that they cannot decide whether to admit Macedonia in the EU or not, we are talking about a population of two million people. And it is ridiculous to set hurdles on our way especially in view that the number of people here is almost like that of a suburb in Paris.	-2	5	1	-3
54	We should not wait for the others to come solve our problems. No one will come help us, if we don't help us ourselves. It doesn't matter if you are in or out of the EU.	2	0	5	0

55	The EU does not make us copy the laws. The EU sets the requirements we have to meet, but does not say in what way, it just entitles the Macedonian legislators or the legislation to draw out the law.	1	0	1	2
56	We only think we are ready, the politicians tell us so. If we were ready though, we would have already been a member.	1	1	1	-5
57	You cannot blame the EU that it does not let us in, because it does not want to do this or because it does not grant sufficient funds.	0	-1	-2	-3
58	The EU is not a donor or Mother Theresa to let everyone in... come on, anyone can come.	-1	-4	-3	1
59	I think that the cheap workforce we offer is one of the benefits for the companies that wish to expand. This is one of the positive aspects because of which the EU would expand.	-3	-3	3	-2
60	The thing is that if conditions here are the same as in France, I would not go to France, but would rather stay here.	3	0	0	0
61	In any case, if the enlargement does not continue, if we do not join the European Union, we will become a center for exchange of fake asylum seekers, just to survive.	-2	0	0	-3
62	If we are the patriots we claim to be, let's not change the name. If we can survive, if we mark economic growth, then why do we want to get into the EU?	-2	-4	0	1
63	If we are in the EU, then there will be an authority above the state authorities and it will exercise control.	4	2	-3	0
64	The EU organizes the imports and for those that are not member states it is restricted. It is free among the member states. When we become EU member states, our markets will be open. So that people will be able to import and export.	2	-1	2	1

Appendix III Example of completed Q sort: configuration of rank-ordered statements according to the interviewee's own viewpoint

*This template was used by all researchers during the fieldwork to document the end result of each face-to-face interview



Respondent ID:/Date & Time:..... / Location:...../ Interviewer:.....

Distribution Board

most disagree	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	+6	most agree
	41	4	36	18	37	26	43	27	60	62	55	42	47	
	35	59	12	1	10	56	19	49	2	30	9	64	58	
	(2)	63	17	11	25	31	6	24	29	52	5	57	(2)	
		(3)	39	33	16	20	44	45	38	3	21	(3)		
			(4)	32	48	15	40	7	13	54	(4)			
				(5)	22	53	51	8	23	(5)				
					(6)	28	34	50	(6)					
						61	46	14						
						(8)	(8)	(8)						