Studying (De-)Politicization of the EU from a Citizens Point of View:

A New Comparative Focus Group Study

Accepté pour publication dans *Politique Européenne*

Laurie Beaudonnet, *Université de Montréal*, laurie.beaudonnet@umonteal.ca

Céline Belot, *Université Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Sciences-Po Grenoble, Pacte*, celine.belot@umrpacte.fr

Hélène Caune, *Université Grenoble Alpes, Sciences-Po Grenoble, Pacte*, helene.caune@sciencespo-grenoble.fr

Claire Dupuy, *UCLouvain*, claire.dupuy@uclouvain.be

Anne-Marie Houde, *University of Warwick*, Anne-Marie.Houde@warwick.ac.uk

Morgan Le Corre Juratic, *European University Institute*, Morgan.LeCorre@eui.eu

Damien Pennetreau, *FNRS - UCLouvain*, damien.pennetreau@uclouvain.be

Tiago Silva, *Social Sciences Institute, University of Lisbon*, tiago.silva@ics.ulisboa.pt

Virginie Van Ingelgom, *FNRS - UCLouvain*. virginie.vaningelgom@uclouvain.be

Abstract:

Whilst the politicization of the EU has been increasingly studied over recent years, the analysis has been focusing mainly on political parties and media. Thus, although not completely overlooked, studies looking at EU politicization amongst individuals remain scarce. This article presents a new qualitative dataset from 21 focus groups conducted across social groups and four countries. It was designed to observe processes of (de-)politicization at citizens' level, how they talk about the EU and along which cleavages are their attitudes structured. This comparative research design sheds new light on discourses and opinions on Europe, mechanisms of politicization and political discussions.

Résumé:

Alors que la politisation de l'UE a été de plus en plus étudiée ces dernières années, l'analyse s'est principalement concentrée sur les partis politiques et les médias. Ainsi, les études de la politisation de l'UE chez les individus, sans être absentes, restent rares. Cet article présente un nouveau set de données qualitatives de 21 groupes de discussion dans quatre pays européens et avec des profils sociaux variés, permettant d'étudier les processus de (dé)politisation au niveau des citoyens, la manière dont ils parlent de l'UE et les clivages qui structurent leurs attitudes. Cette recherche comparative offre un nouvel éclairage sur les discours et les opinions sur l'Europe, les mécanismes de politisation et les discussions politiques.

Introduction:

The European Union (EU) had for long been sheltered from mainstream political contestation and had relied, almost exclusively, on output legitimacy (Scharpf, 1999; Moravcsik, 2002). But its growing involvement in policy making, the increasing significance of European issues and actors at the domestic level, as well as the recent weakening of the consensus on the rationale for integration (Eichenberg and Dalton, 2007; Down and Wilson, 2008; Hooghe and Marks, 2009) have unsettled this situation. The European issue has been politicized. Over the last two decades, citizens have been increasingly vocal in displaying their discontent with the EU, notably when given a chance to express themselves via referendum – such as illustrated very recently with Brexit (Hobolt, 2016; Andreouli and Nicholson, 2018; Carreras *et al*., 2019). Alternative visions of the European project have emerged (Cautrès, 2012; Dufour, 2010; Binzer Hobolt and Brouard, 2011) and in the aftermath of the economic and financial crisis that affected the Eurozone countries for

nearly a decade, political parties (in particular the Greens and Left) have vividly pushed for the elaboration of an alternative European project.

Yet, while the politicization of the EU by political parties and media is now well documented (Statham and Trenz, 2013; Hurrelmann *et al.*, 2013; Costa Lobo and Karremans, 2018; Braun *et al.*, 2016; Grande and Hutter, 2016; Hurrelmann *et al.*, 2020; De Bruycker, 2017), the picture is muddier when it comes to citizens. While some studies report the increased impact of European issues on individual vote choice (Belot and Van Ingelgom, 2015; Beaudonnet and Gomez, 2017; Le Gall, 2019; Goldberg *et al.*, 2020), others demonstrate citizens' indifference to and ambivalence over European integration (Duchesne *et al.*, 2013; Van Ingelgom, 2014; Baglioni and Hurrelmann, 2016; Delmotte *et al.*, 2017; Palonen *et al.*, 2019; Le Corre Juratic *et al.*, 2020). How, then, do European citizens see and talk about Europe?

The research detailed in this article – conducted within RESTEP (RÉSeau Transatlantique sur l'Europe Politique), an international research network bringing together researchers from ten European and Canadian universities, was designed to contribute to the scholarship on citizens' relations to European integration.[1] Specifically, drawing from a comparative qualitative design and building on the qualitative turn taken by European studies in the last decades (e.g. Belot, 2000; Diez Medrano, 2003; Duchesne *et al.*, 2013; White, 2011; Baglioni and Hurrelmann, 2016), it studies how citizens structure their discourses on Europe, when and how the European issues are politicized and whether citizens' opinions are by specific cleavages across social groups and

[1] The RESTEP (*RÉSeau Transatlantique sur l'Europe Politique*) was led by Laurie Beaudonnet and Frédéric Mérand (Université de Montréal) and funded by the 'Jean Monnet activities' component of the European Commission's Erasmus + Programme (project 587460-EPP-1-2017-1-CA-EPPJMO-NETWORK). In addition, this research has benefited from the support of the Fonds de Recherche Société et Culture du Québec via the Research Support for New Academics Program (grant agreement 2016-NP-191505 awarded to Laurie Beaudonnet, *Autre(s) Europe(s)* project), and the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement 716208 awarded to Virginie Van Ingelgom, *Qualidem* project).

national contexts. 21 focus groups were organized with different socio-economic groups in four countries (France, Belgium, Portugal, and Italy) during a four-month time span in 2019.[2]

This article is organized as follows. The first section will present the theoretical framework and the research question at the heart of the research project. Second, the design of our study will be outlined in order to clarify the methodological choices made to realize the 21 focus groups. Third, the recruitment and the selection of the participants will be documented. Finally, the last section will focus on the discussion of our preliminary results.

Theoretical framework and research questions

Until recently, the EU was considered exclusively as a depoliticized object. On the one hand, the neo-functionalist thesis that drove the foundation of the EU, as well as the first generations of scholars, emphasized the technocratic as opposed to the political dimension, deemed too conflictual (Haas, 1958; Lindberg and Scheingold, 1970).[3] On the other hand, Europe appeared too complicated or distant to citizens to play any part in their daily political considerations (Gaxie *et al.*, 2010; Duchesne *et al.*, 2013; Van Ingelgom, 2014; Baglioni and Hurrelmann, 2016; Delmotte *et al.*, 2017). Moreover, as in most of the Member States the main political parties avoided opposing each other on European integration issues, citizens did not encounter diverging views on integration. Overall, the EU and European issues were (almost) isolated from political conflict. However, since the beginning of the 2000s, European studies have reconsidered the process of

[2] We are very thankful to colleagues who participated in the research design and greatly facilitated fieldwork: Ece Özlem Atikcan, Marina Costa Lobo, Tullia Galanti, Cal Le Gall, Heidi Mercenier, and to the research assistants without whom data collection and coding would not have been possible: Chloé Alexandre, Loli Battesti, Chloé Bérut, Mauro Caprioli, Glenda Cinotti, Risto Conte Keivabu, Maria De Bortoli, Jeanne-Lise Devaux Pelier, Marie Faucogney, Jacob Fortier, Édouard Francq, Costanza Gasparo, Théo Gratiollet, Florent Guntz, Marouane Joundi, Yani Kartalis, Tullia Pagani, Benedetta Rizzo, Susana Rogeiro Nina, Nelson Santos, Camilla Thiffault.

[3] Note however that for the first neo-functionalists, politicization was a desirable stage that European issues and institutions would finally reach through the spillover mechanism once actors and issues would be much engaged in the EU political system.

politicization, starting from a theoretical and normative perspective (Bartolini and Hix, 2006; Follesdal and Hix, 2008), and then moving on to empirical analysis. By politicization, we refer to "the process through which an issue, previously considered as non-political, becomes the source of conflicts and cleavages in a given social space" (Beaudonnet and Mérand, 2019: 10). De Wilde (2011) describes it more precisely as the result of a process of polarization carried out by a growing number of actors and resulting in high salience in the public sphere. An issue is politicized when it generates a cleavage, a polarization of positions among political actors (primarily political parties), public discourse and public opinion (Rokkan, 1999; Kriesi *et al.*, 2008; de Wilde, 2011; Hurrelmann *et al.*, 2015; Beaudonnet and Mérand, 2019). Somehow, citizens have been overlooked in this debate on the politicization of the EU as most of the discussions focus on political parties and media discourses. When considered, existing research points to distinct, if not opposing, directions.

First, the literature on citizens' support for Europe has focused on explaining the determinants of such attitudes (Hobolt and de Vries, 2016), rather than how they might revolve around potential political cleavages. Indeed, if the left-right dimension is central to explain European party systems and domestic voting behaviour (Rokkan, 1999; Bartolini, 2005), it has not directly translated into European politics. Due to the nature of the EU's political system (Papadopoulos and Magnette, 2010) and its policies based on the development of the market, or as Majone (1994) put it, the EU "regulatory state", the role of the state in socio-economic policies has been challenged. The impact of economic integration on monetary and budgetary policies and hence on national redistributive policies tends to undermine the structuring power of the left/right divide and new politics has emerged with European integration (Hooghe *et al.*, 2002). Research explaining support for integration with left-right positioning shows contradictory results (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2010;

van Elsas and van der Brug, 2015). By generating costs and benefits to different social groups and countries, European integration (and beyond it, globalization) has created a cleavage that pits the winners of integration against the losers (Fligstein, 2008; Kriesi *et al.*, 2008). Research on the utilitarian approach shows how the (possible) benefits reaped from the financial, professional, and social opportunities related to European integration shape the level of support for Europe, highlighting high-skilled workers as the biggest supporters of integration (see for instance Anderson and Reichert, 1995; Gabel and Palmer, 1995; Fligstein, 2008). Other theoretical explanations stress the role of identity-driven support towards European integration, depending on collective, regional and national identities (Diez Medrano and Gutiérrez, 2001; Carey, 2002; McLaren, 2002). Other scholars underline the role of political cues, such as partisanship or the level of trust in national political institutions and in governmental action in order to understand citizens' EU support (Van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996; Anderson, 1998).[4]

Whilst the literature has focused on the variables of individual support towards European integration, these questions have been renewed with changes in politics at the EU and domestic levels. More specifically, the rise of Eurosceptic parties has been attracting a lot of scholarly attention, mostly on the realignment of European political parties and its electoral consequences. However, a strand of research has studied the politicization of the European issue and its role in individual vote choice at national (Gabel, 2000; De Vries, 2007; Belot *et al.*, 2013; Beaudonnet and Gomez, 2017; Le Gall, 2019; Goldberg *et al.*, 2020; Hobolt and Rodon, 2020) as well as European elections (Belot and Van Ingelgom, 2015; van Elsas and Goldberg, 2019). Others have shown how political mobilisations have become increasingly directed towards the EU (Crespy, 2012).

[4] For a summary of these three approaches of the determinants of citizens' attitudes, see Hobolt and de Vries (2016).

Second, the qualitative shift in European studies has shed a different light on what we know about the factors that favour or hinder European citizens' support toward European integration. Research particularly illuminated the great ambivalence of citizens towards the EU and how little their views are actually politicized (Duchesne *et al.*, 2013; Van Ingelgom, 2014; Le Corre Juratic *et al.*, 2019). Hurrelmann and his co-authors show that politicization seldom happens amongst citizens, and when it does, it is not often linked to institutions or specific dimensions of the project (Hurrelmann *et al.*, 2015). Conversely, the lack of knowledge about the EU, its institutions and politics led to a specific form of uninformed politicization, not based on actual knowledge and evaluation but on a generic feeling of disenfranchisement, especially among young citizens (Delmotte *et al*., 2017).

To narrow the gap between these strands of literature, the research presented here focuses on how citizens from different Member States, age, gender, socio-economic and education backgrounds, relate to European integration, how they not only react to but also reconstruct the visions and preferences of political parties and use them in political discussions. It studies the logics of (de)politicization of the European question at the individual level.

Design of the study

Building on previous qualitative studies (e.g. Duchesne *et al.*, 2010), our research has been designed to empirically investigate how citizens' opinions and attitudes are formulated, shaped and expressed, by relying on the very terms used by citizens. In order to access these discourses, in our project, we set out to gather discussions between citizens on the subject of Europe. Thus, we convened 21 focus groups with 95 European citizens in four countries. For each focus group, a set of people were invited by our team to discuss European politics and were queried concerning their

ideas, beliefs, or perceptions. Our research design follows the classical definition of David Morgan – an author who was essential in developing this method in the social sciences – defining a focus group 'as a research technique that collects data through group interaction on a topic determined by the researcher' (Morgan, 1996: 130). When it comes to citizens' attitudes, the choice of focus groups as a research tool is based on the conviction that individual attitudes are not given, but instead result from a process of construction that occurs using speech in a collective and sometimes even contradictory context (Duchesne and Haegel, 2004; Duchesne *et al*., 2013). Thus, focus groups assume – contrary to surveys – that attitudes, opinions, and perceptions are developed in part in interaction with other people and opinions cannot be observed in a vacuum as individuals do not form opinions in isolation. At the heart of the method is the analysis of shared meanings and disagreements (Van Ingelgom, 2020). Thus, obviously, if focus groups are not an appropriate method to *measure* attitudes (Barbour, 2007: 19), they are well-suited to study citizens' discourses and how an object is – or not – politicized therein (Duchesne, 2017).

In particular, the data was collected to study conflict over European integration amongst citizens by following five general lines of inquiry: How do citizens envision the European project and talk about it (the meaning of European integration for citizens)? How do they perceive their relationship to politics, power distribution, and legitimacy within the EU? How do they hold various levels of government responsible for the stakes they care for? What frames do citizens use and how do they rely on political parties in the process? How do citizens mobilise knowledge when talking about the EU and about politics more broadly, and how do discussion dynamics within the focus group setting influence this mobilisation?

In order to account for differences in characteristics and contexts that are likely to influence citizens' discourses we chose to study those questions in group discussions set in four countries

and with five different socioeconomic backgrounds.[5] Keeping in mind the potential sociological and cultural differences, it was crucial to look for specific characteristics while recruiting the participants, thus allowing for a comparison across the different groups.

As a means to primarily test the setting in two different national contexts and fine-tune the verbatim and logistics if needed, we conducted two pilot-focus groups, one in Belgium and one in France. For logistics reasons, we recruited students. Following some slight revisions to the scenario, minor differences in the actual phrasing and vignettes exist between these two tests and the rest of the corpus. However, data collection turned out to be similar enough to allow us to include these discussions in the final data set. To increase comparability across countries, we also conducted a student focus group in Italy.

Pilots aside, the first groups to be organised were with seniors with political skills, so as to provide the best opportunity to study politicization. As we know from previous studies (Gabel and Palmer, 1995; Karp *et al.*, 2003), proximity with and knowledge on the European Union vary greatly among social groups. Considering the strong consensus in the literature (Duchesne, 2017), we postulate that people with higher education and professional skills feel more competent politically speaking and therefore are more likely to express articulated views on the EU. To study the effects of political discussions and deliberations over time, we designed a series of sequential focus groups (each group would meet three times, over a four-month time span). We chose retired citizens (60-

Commenté [CG1]: "[...] and therefore are more likely to express articulated views on the EU" ?

[5] As we were oriented towards cumulative social sciences, we built not only theoretically but also methodologically on previous existing comparative qualitative studies. Thus, our research design has been largely inspired by earlier successful and rigorous comparative research studies on Europe (e.g. Duchesne *et al.*, 2013; White, 2011). In particular, the filiation with the CITAE research project is clearly assumed as one of us was part of both research teams. For a presentation of this project, see in this journal for the making of the survey (Duchesne and Van Ingelgom, 2008) and for the preliminary results (Duchesne *et al.*, 2010).

year-old or older and retired) to minimize attrition rate (assuming that retired citizens will be more easily available for a series of three meetings).

To compose the other groups we bore in mind the education and employment factors. Indeed, education has long been established as a key factor to explain levels of support, assessing that the more educated citizens are, the more likely they are to talk about and frame the EU in positive terms, and benefit from it (Gabel and Palmer, 1995; Hakhverdian, 2013). Similarly, unemployed people generally favour more antagonistic views of the EU as they do not perceive it to be beneficial to them. For those reasons, we included three other groups in our design: (1) white collars, (2) young unemployed individuals and (3) young professionals (without a university degree). Table 1 below displays the details.

Table 1. Presentation of focus group data

	Grenoble (France)	**Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium)**	**Lisbon (Portugal)**	**Florence (Italy)**
March 2019	Seniors - 1st sequential	Seniors - 1st sequential	Seniors - 1st sequential	
	Students	Students		
May 2019	Seniors - 2nd sequential	Seniors - 2nd sequential	Seniors - 2nd sequential	
	Young unemployed	Young unemployed	Seniors - 3rd sequential	
June 2019	Seniors - 3rd sequential	Seniors - 3rd sequential		Young unemployed
	Young without diploma	Young without diploma		Young without diploma
	White-collar workers	White-collar workers		Students

White-collar workers

Recruitment process and selection of the participants

The recruitment process and the strategy implemented to achieve it were crucial. Indeed, the match between the profiles identified theoretically and those actually gathered by the research team determines the validity of the data produced. The focus groups were not pre-existing and were artificially constructed by the research team. These groups were not, nor were they meant to be, representative of the national or even social groups composition. Of course, this does not yet prejudge the quality of the data produced, which depends on the conduct of the discussions themselves. In addition to pilot discussions with students, different groups were targeted: senior citizens (pensioners); middle-aged white-collar workers; young professionals (without a university degree); young unemployed (with university degree). The selection of specific participants responded to several principles: First, a certain level of homogeneity was needed to ensure some degree of "shared meaning" for focus groups participants, to avoid self-censorship behaviours, to enable groups comparison across countries (Garcia and Van Ingelgom, 2010: 132), and guarantee gender balance. Second, heterogeneity was key to observe confrontations on the objects of study and gain access to a qualitative variety of individuals' experiences. Hence, participants were selected to differ in terms of Left-Right positioning, on their partisan identity and on their attitudes towards European integration.

Recruitment was done first through various general channels (advertisements were placed in supermarkets, local shops, neighbourhood associations message boards and Facebook pages related to the specific geographical areas). This process worked relatively well in Grenoble and in Florence, but the results were mixed in Louvain-la-Neuve.

Second, more specific channels according to the target groups were also mobilised. Senior participants were targeted through local University of the Third Age. In Lisbon, all senior participants came from the same course on the EU,[6] while the absence of such a channel in Florence led to an insufficient number of potential participants (two people only were recruited, so eventually no senior group was organised in this city). This strategy provided mixed results in Louvain-La-Neuve and Grenoble, and groups had to be completed with other seniors recruited elsewhere (diffusion via Lions club networks, retired associations). To recruit unemployed young people, ads were placed on social media and universities alumni groups and leaflets were left at the town hall, in post offices and in libraries. In some cases, the targeting strategy was further refined to recruit specific missing profiles (in terms of socioeconomics or political profile). Recruitment was therefore complemented with leafleting in local spots, such as outside evening classes, churches, demonstrations, or targeted workplaces. Candidates were contacted by phone and answered a pre-selection questionnaire. To limit self-selection and the recruitment of participants interested in politics and/or sophisticated politically, participants received 50€ per focus groups.

Overall, 95 participants were selected according to these criteria. However, focus groups composition varied due to national contexts, candidates' availability, and in rare exceptions, fieldwork flaws. For instance, groups' diversity in terms of support for the EU was relatively achieved according to nationality and age groups. Seniors or Belgian groups tended to be more consensual about further European integration compared to their younger or French and Italian counterparts. Similarly, groups composition in French, Italian and to a lesser extent Portuguese groups are skewed to the Left on the political spectrum whilst Belgian participants are skewed to

[6] Even though all the participants were enrolled in the same university course, they did not know, or were close to, each other.

the Right. These political attitudes can be partly explained by the national and local political contexts that this qualitative cross-national and cross-age/education design directly aims to address and study. Yet, cases of self-censorship and self-selection bias should not be overlooked. To address the issue of bias in focus groups participants, a post-discussion questionnaire inquired about the motivations behind interviewees' participation and whether they felt at ease to participate in the discussion. Table in Appendix 3 provides a summary description of all groups.

To investigate the research questions mentioned above, we asked participants to speak about four main topics: (1) the important current issues and political actors' responsibility, (2) the European election that was coming two months after the first focus group, and how they felt about the campaign and the results, (3) the status of their country and of different actors within the EU and (4) how they felt when confronted with different visual or discursive framings of Europe promoted by political parties or based on the traditional institutional narratives. Discussions were structured with broad questions (cf. Appendix 1) and minimal interventions from the moderator,[7] leaving time and space for participants to elaborate. From those four main categories stemmed a series of questions asked over the course of around 3 hours (or, in the case of the seniors, over the three encounters[8]). Our non-directive moderation technique did allow participants to engage in conflict,

[7] The moderator would ask the first question and then write down words used by participants on a board, to provide visual support for the discussion and signal disagreement when a participant reported it. On some occasions, participants spent a few minutes looking at vignettes in smaller group, to encourage discussion. The participants can thus see the discussion progress, as well as participate in its production. In front of them, they have a summary of the comments and can therefore react to these later. This display technique is useful insofar as participants often need time to think, and seeing points written helps them to react, and in particular to express their disagreement. Duchesne and Haegel had used this technique, adapted from a method developed by a consultancy company, in their previous work on politicisation (Duchesne and Haegel, 2004: 882; Duchesne *et al.*, 2013: 185).

[8] Due to severe technical problems, the third meeting of the French seniors couldn't be recorded. We thus organized a fourth meeting to complete data collection. Question phrasing was slightly changed to maximize comparability with other meetings while avoiding having participants feel like they were repeating themselves.

but on issues that were important to them; in order words, to discuss European integration in their own words.

Discussion of the data and conclusion

Our data allows for the studying of elements of the politicization, depoliticization or even non-politicization processes of the EU and of integration in its different dimensions. It seeks to supply the tools to study the salience and polarization of European integration in citizens' discourses through different indicators and give insights into the rationales of individuals and how they build common understanding when talking about European integration. This section provides an overview of our first results.

Because of the large number of groups studied and people involved, of the time span of the focus groups and of some of the images presented to the interviewees - some of them chosen especially in order to provoke reactions -, the data facilitates the study of politicization through one of its often hidden dimensions: emotions. When confronting ideas with other people who do not share the same opinions, people often become very emotional, from uneasiness to anger, from affection to rejection. The data allows to analyse the place of emotions in discussions about Europe and their role in the politicization process (Delmotte, Mercenier and Van Ingelgom, 2017a). First results tend to show that European integration and politics in general are likely to elicit some emotional reactions, especially when discussing issues like Brexit and the future of the EU (see Houde, ongoing), and that citizens' affective attachment to the EU tend to shape how they see it.

These focus groups also enable us to study European narratives from a citizens' perspective. In the context of growing protest about the EU, studies devoted to institutional, political elites' and media narratives on European integration have arisen (Gilbert, 2008; Bouza Garcia, 2013; Kaiser, 2015).

By analysing political framing of the European project, this scholarship aims at providing a comprehensive answer to the Eurosceptic, ambivalent or indifferent European attitudes of citizens. Yet, so far, not much attention has been given to the reception of such narratives by citizens. The present research design aims at investigating such use of narratives, through prompting (using political cartoons, campaign ad and party statements) or without input. The focus groups show that citizens rely on institutional narratives to talk about the European project, but that they also challenge and broaden them. Looking at two specific prominent institutional narratives, the peace narrative, and the free movement one, our results thus show that institutional narratives are received by citizens, but they are also (re-)constructed by them while being anchored in their own personal or national experiences. (Beaudonnet *et al.*, 2021).

The data also provide ample evidence on how citizens view political parties and their role in discussing the European issue. When visions of Europe are directly suggested by political elites, prompted by polarized parties' statements and policy proposals, many citizens seem to withdraw from the discussion and/or to reject these narratives altogether. Even though citizens are conscious that strong alternative projects are offered to them by parties (acknowledging it during the discussion), whether they believe in these narratives and make them their own appears to strongly depend on their level of trust in parties and democratic functioning. For instance, many negative traits are attributed to parties without distinction, such as private interest seeking, manipulative, distorting citizens mandate through dubious coalitions, vote-seeking. This mistrust is observed throughout the scope of participants and seems to prevent citizens from taking ownership of these political elites' alternative narratives (Le Corre Juratic, ongoing). By providing first-hand empirical evidence on how citizens envision Europe, discuss it and connect it with political actors and beliefs,

these examples offer promising avenue to better understand the (de-)politicization process of European integration.

Bibliography

Anderson, Christopher J. (1998), "When in doubt, use proxies: Attitudes toward domestic politics and support for European integration", *Comparative political studies*, vol. 31 (5), p. 569-601.

Anderson, Christopher J. and Reichert, Shawn (1995), "Economic Benefits and Support for Membership in the EU: A Cross-National Analysis", *Journal of Public Policy*, vol. 15 (3), p. 231-249.

Baglioni, Sebastian and Hurrelmann, Achim (2016), "The Eurozone Crisis and Citizen Engagement in EU Affairs", *West European Politics*, vol. 39 (1), p. 104-124.

Bartolini, Stefano (2005), « La formation des clivages », *Revue internationale de politique comparée*, vol. 12 (1), p. 9-34.

Bartolini, Stefano and Hix, Simon (2006), « Politiser l'UE : Remède Ou Poison ? », *Notre Europe–Études et Recherches. Policy Paper*, vol. 19.

Beaudonnet, Laurie, Belot, Céline, Caune, Hélène, Houde, Anne-Marie and Pennetreau, Damien (2021), "The Battle for Europe: Looking at Competing Visions of the European Project in Citizens' Discussions", Restep Final Conference, 5-7 January 2021, online.

Beaudonnet, Laurie and Gomez, Raul (2017), "Red Europe versus No Europe? The Impact of Attitudes towards the EU and the Economic Crisis on Radical-Left Voting", *West European Politics*, vol. 40 (2), p. 316-335.

Beaudonnet, Laurie and Mérand, Frédéric (2019), « Qu'est-ce que l'Europe politique ? », *Politique européenne*, vol. 64 (2), p. 6-30.

Belot, Céline, Cautrès, Bruno and Strudel, Sylvie (2013), « L'Europe comme enjeu clivant », *Revue française de science politique*, vol. 63 (6), p. 1081-1112.

Belot, Céline and Van Ingelgom, Virginie (2015), « Les attitudes européennes ont-elles enfin joué un rôle dans les élections au Parlement européen ? », *Revue Européenne Des Sciences Sociales. European Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 53 (1), p. 49-78.

Binzer Hobolt, Sara and Brouard, Sylvain (2011), "Contesting the European Union? Why the Dutch and the French Rejected the European Constitution", *Political Research Quarterly*, vol. 64 (2), p. 309-322.

Bouza García, Luis (2013), "The Significance of the European Citizens' Initiative for Pan-European Participatory Democracy", Stockholm, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA).

Braun, Daniela, Hutter, Swen and Kerscher, Alena (2016), "What Type of Europe? The Salience of Polity and Policy Issues in European Parliament Elections", *European Union Politics*, vol. 17 (4), p. 570-592.

Carey, Sean (2002), "Undivided Loyalties: Is National Identity an Obstacle to European Integration?", *European Union Politics*, vol. 3 (4), p. 387-413.

Cautrès, Bruno (2012), "Multidimensionality of EU Attitudes in France: An Issue for the Understanding of the Politicization of Attitudes towards the EU", *European Integration Online Papers*, vol. 16 (2).

Costa Lobo, Marina and Karremans, Johannes (2018), "Revisiting the Politicization of the EU. A Three-Dimensional Approach", *in* Marina Costa Lobo, Filipe Carreira da Silva and José Pedro Zúquete (eds), *Changing Societies: Legacies and Challenges. Citizenship in Crisis*, Lisboa, Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, p. 51–71.

Crespy, Amandine (2012), *Qui a peur de Bolkestein ? Conflit, résistances et démocratie dans l'Union européenne*, Paris, Economica.

De Bruycker, Iskander (2017), "Politicization and the Public Interest: When Do the Elites in Brussels Address Public Interests in EU Policy Debates?", *European Union Politics*, vol. 18 (4), p. 603-619.

Delmotte, Florence, Mercenier, Heidi and Van Ingelgom, Virginie (2017), « Sentiment d'appartenance et indifférence à l'Europe. Quand des jeunes s'en mêlent (ou pas) », *in* Alain Faure, et Emmanuel Négrier, *La politique à l'épreuve des émotions*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, p .125-140.

Delmotte, Florence, Mercenier, Heidi and Van Ingelgom, Virginie (2017), "Belonging and Indifference to Europe: A Study of Young People in Brussels", *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, vol. 42 (4), p. 227-249.

De Wilde, Pieter (2011), "No Polity for Old Politics? A Framework for Analyzing the Politicization of European Integration", *Journal of European Integration*, vol. 33 (5), p. 559-575.

Down, Ian and Wilson, Carole J. (2008), "From "Permissive Consensus" to "Constraining Dissensus": A Polarizing Union?", *Acta Politica*, vol. 43 (1), p. 26-49.

Duchesne, Sophie (2017), "Using focus groups to study the process of (de)politicization", *in* Rosaline Barbour and David L. Morgan (eds), *A new era in focus group research*, Houndmills, Palgrave MacMillan, p. 365-387.

Duchesne, Sophie, Frazer, Elizabeth, Haegel, Florence and Van Ingelgom, Virginie (2013), *Citizens' Reactions to European Integration Compared: Overlooking Europe*, Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Duchesne, Sophie and Haegel, Florence (2004), « La politisation des discussions au croisement des logiques de spécialisation et de conflictualisation : contribution à un rapprochement des analyses en termes de 'policy' et 'politics' », *Revue Francaise de Science Politique*, vol. 54 (6), p. 877-909.

Duchesne, Sophie, Haegel, Florence, Frazer, Elizabeth, Van Ingelgom, Virginie, Garcia, Guillaume and Frognier, André-Paul (2010), "Europe between Integration and Globalisation Social Differences and National Frames in the Analysis of Focus Groups Conducted in France, Francophone Belgium and the United Kingdom", *Politique Européenne*, vol. 30 (1), p. 67-105.

Duchesne, Sophie and Van Ingelgom, Virginie (2008), « Recherche en cours : Comment les discussions deviennent politiques, lorsque des Français, des Anglais ou des Belges francophones parlent de l'Europe », *Politique européenne*, vol. 24 (1), p. 145-149.

Dufour, Pascale (2010), "The Mobilization against the 2005 Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe: A French Mobilization for Another Europe", *Social Movement Studies*, vol. 9 (4), p. 425-441.

Eichenberg, Richard C. and Dalton, Russell J. (2007), "Post-Maastricht Blues: The Transformation of Citizen Support for European Integration, 1973–2004", *Acta Politica*, vol. 42 (2), p. 128-152.

Eijk, Cees van der and Franklin, Mark (1996), *Choosing Europe? The European Electorate and National Politics in the Face of Union*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

Elsas, Erika van and Brug, Wouter van der (2015), "The changing relationship between left–right ideology and euroscepticism, 1973–2010", *European Union Politics*, vol. 16 (2), p. 194-215.

Elsas, Erika J. van, Goldberg, Andreas C. and Vreese, Claes H. de (2019), "EU Issue Voting and the 2014 European Parliament Elections: A Dynamic Perspective", *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, vol. 29 (3), p. 341-360.

Fligstein, Neil (2008), *Euroclash: The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Follesdal, Andreas and Hix, Simon (2006), "Why There Is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 44 (3), p. 533-562.

Gabel, Matthew J. (2000), "European Integration, Voters and National Politics", *West European Politics*, vol. 23 (4), p. 52-72.

Gabel, Matthew and Palmer, Harvey D. (1995), "Understanding Variation in Public Support for European Integration", *European Journal of Political Research*, vol. 27 (1), p. 3-19.

Garcia, Guillaume and Van Ingelgom, Virginie (2010), « Étudier les rapports des citoyens à l'Europe à partir d'entretiens collectifs : Une illustration des problèmes de la comparaison internationale en méthodologie qualitative », *Revue internationale de politique comparée*, vol. 17 (1), p. 131-163.

Gaxie, Daniel, Hubé, Nicolas, De Lassalle, Marine and Rowell, Jay (dirs) (2010), *L'Europe des Européens. Enquête comparative sur les perceptions de l'Europe*, Paris, Economica.

Gilbert, Mark (2008), "Narrating the Process: Questioning the Progressive Story of European Integration", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 46 (3), p. 641-662.

Goldberg, Andreas C., Elsas, Erika J. van and Vreese, Claes H. de (2020), "Mismatch? Comparing Elite and Citizen Polarisation on EU Issues across Four Countries", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 27 (2), p. 310-328.

Grande, Edgar and Hutter, Swen (2016), "Beyond Authority Transfer: Explaining the Politicisation of Europe", *West European Politics*, vol. 39 (1), p. 23-43.

Haas, Ernst B (1958), *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economical Forces, 1950–1957*, London, Stevens & Sons.

Hakhverdian, Armen, Elsas, Erika van, Brug, Wouter van der and Kuhn, Theresa (2013), "Euroscepticism and Education: A Longitudinal Study of 12 EU Member States, 1973–2010", *European Union Politics*, vol. 14 (4), p. 522-541.

Hobolt, Sara B. and Rodon, Toni (2020), "Cross-Cutting Issues and Electoral Choice. EU Issue Voting in the Aftermath of the Brexit Referendum", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 27 (2), p. 227-245.

Hooghe, Liesbet and Marks, Gary (2009), "A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining", *British Journal of Political Science*, vol. 39 (1), p. 1-23.

Hooghe, Liesbet, Marks, Gary and Wilson, Carole J. (2002), "Does Left/Right Structure Party Positions on European Integration?", *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 35 (8), p. 965-989.

Houde, Anne-Marie (ongoing), *An Ever-Closer Union or Further Disintegration? Citizens' Perspectives Towards More (or Less) European Unification*, PhD thesis, Coventry, University of Warwick.

Hurrelmann, Achim, Gora, Anna and Wagner, Andrea (2013), "The Legitimation of the European Union in the News Media: Three Treaty Reform Debates", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 20 (4), p. 515-534.

Hurrelmann, Achim, Gora, Anna and Wagner, Andrea (2015), "The Politicization of European Integration: More than an Elite Affair?", *Political Studies*, vol. 63 (1), p. 43-59.

Hurrelmann, Achim, Kerr, Stephanie, Gora, Anna and Eibl, Philipp (2020), "Framing the Eurozone Crisis in National Parliaments: Is the Economic Cleavage Really Declining?", *Journal of European Integration*, vol. 42 (4), p. 489-507.

Kaiser, Wolfram (2015), “Clash of Cultures: Two Milieus in the European Union’s “A New Narrative for Europe” Project”, *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, vol. 23 (3), p. 364-377.

Karp, Jeffrey A., Banducci, Susan A. and Bowler, Shaun (2003), “To Know It is to Love It? Satisfaction with Democracy in the European Union”, *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 36 (3), p. 271-292.

Kriesi, Hanspeter, Grande, Edgar, Lachat, Romain, Dolezal, Martin, Bornschier, Simon and Frey, Timotheos (2008), *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Le Corre Juratic, Morgan (2021), “(De)Mobilizing Europeans – Citizens Reaction to Party Polarization”, Restep Final Conference, 5-7 January 2021, online.

Le Corre Juratic, Morgan, Le Gall, Cal and Van Ingelgom, Virginie (2019), « Euroscepticisme, ambivalence, indifférence ? », *in* Simon Persico and Sabine Saurugger (eds), *Sauver l’Europe ? Citoyens, élections et gouvernance européenne par gros temps*, Paris, Dalloz, p. 54-60.

Le Gall, Cal (2019), “EU Authority, Politicization and EU Issue Voting”, *Politique Européenne*, vol. 64 (2), p. 32-55.

Lindberg, Leon N. and Scheingold, Stuart A. (1970), *Europe’s Would-Be Policy*, New York, Prentice-Hall.

Lubbers, Marcel and Scheepers, Peer (2010), “Divergent trends of Euroscepticism in countries and regions of the European Union”, *European Journal of Political Research*, vol. 49 (6), p. 787-817.

Majone, Giandomenico (1994), “The Rise of the Regulatory State in Europe”, *West European Politics*, vol. 17 (3), p. 77-101.

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

Medrano, Juan Díez and Gutiérrez, Paula (2001), "Nested Identities: National and European Identity in Spain", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 24 (5), p. 753-778.

Moravcsik, Andrew (2002), "Reassessing Legitimacy in the European Union", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 40 (4), p. 603-624.

Palonen, Kari, Wiesner, Claudia, Selk, Veith, Kauppi, Niilo, Trenz, Hans-Jörg, Dupuy, Claire, Van Ingelgom, Virginie and Liste, Philip (2019), "Rethinking Politicisation", *Contemporary Political Theory*, vol. 18 (2), p. 248-281.

Papadopoulos, Yannis and Magnette, Paul (2010), "On the Politicisation of the European Union: Lessons from Consociational National Polities", *West European Politics*, vol. 33 (4), p. 711-729.

Rokkan, Stein (1999), *State Formation, Nation-Building, and Mass Politics in Europe: The Theory of Stein Rokkan: Based on His Collected Works*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Scharpf, Fritz W (1999), *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Statham, Paul and Trenz, Hans-Jörg (2013), "How European Union Politicization Can Emerge through Contestation: The Constitution Case", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 51 (5), p. 965-980.

Van Ingelgom, Virginie (2014), *Integrating Indifference: A Comparative, Qualitative and Quantitative Approach to the Legitimacy of European Integration*, Colchester, ECPR Press.

Van Ingelgom, Virginie (2020), "Focus groups: from qualitative data generation to analysis", *in* Luigi Curini and Robert J. Franzese (eds), *Sage Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations*, London, Sage, p. 1190-1210.

Vries, Catherine E. de (2007), “Sleeping Giant: Fact or Fairytale? How European Integration Affects National Elections”, *European Union Politics*, vol. 8 (3), p. 363-385.

White, Jonathan (2011), *Political allegiance after European integration*, Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

1. Appendix 1: Scenario

see online appendix (attached pdf document for reviewers)

2. Appendix 2: Synoptic presentation of the 21 focus-groups

Location	**Type**	**Profile**	**Number of interviewees**	**date of focus group**	**Name**
Louvain-La-Neuve	Pilot	Students	9	March 2019	LLN_P_STU
	Sequential (3 meetings)	Educated seniors	7	March, May, June 2019	LLN_SEQ_1, LLN_SEQ_2, LLN_SEQ_3
	One-shot	White collars	7	May 2019	LLN_WC
	One-shot	Young unemployed	6	May 2019	LLN_YU
	One-shot	Young professionals	6	May 2019	LLN_YP
Grenoble	Pilot	Students	8	March 2019	GRE_P_STU
	Sequential (3 meetings)	Educated seniors	7	March, May, June 2019	GRE_SEQ_1, GRE_SEQ_2, GRE_SEQ_3
	One-shot	White collars	7	May 2019	GRE_WC
	One-shot	Young unemployed	5	May 2019	GRE_YU
	One-shot	Young without diploma	7	May 2019	GRE_YP

Lisbon	Sequential (3 meetings)	Educated seniors	6	March, May, June 2019	LIS_SEQ_1, LIS_SEQ_2, LIS_SEQ_3
Florence	One-shot	Students	6	June 2019	FI_STU
	One-shot	White collars	4	June 2019	FI_WC
	One-shot	Young unemployed	5	June 2019	FI_YU
	One-shot	Young without diploma	4	June 2019	FI_YP

3. Appendix 3: Summary of participants' profiles

Name	Age range	Gender	Education	Average Left-right score	Attitudes EU
LLN_P_STU	20 to 24	4 men, 5 women	Students	2 left, 3 centre, 4 right	9 pro-EU
LLN_SEQ_1, LLN_SEQ_2, LLN_SEQ_3	59 to 82	3 men, 4 women	High	6 centre, 1 right	6 pro-EU, 1 don't know
LLN_WC	25 to 36	4 men, 3 women	High	3 left, 4 centre	7 pro-EU
LLN_YU	23 to 30	3 men, 3 women	High	5 centre, 1 don't know	5 pro-EU
LLN_YP	19 to 26	5 men, 1 woman	No diploma or professional	1 left, 3 centre, 1 right	4 pro-EU, 2 don't know
GRE_P_STU	18 to 26	5 men, 3 women	Students	6 left, 1 centre, 1 no answer	4 pro-EU, 2 against, 1 not good nor bad, 1 don't know,
GRE_SEQ_1, GRE_SEQ_2, GRE_SEQ_3	61 to 77	4 men, 4 women	High	2 left, 3 centre, 1 right, 1 don't know	5 pro-EU, 2 not good nor bad, 1 it depends,
GRE_WC	28 to 33	3 men, 4 women	High	1 left, 6 centre	7 pro-EU
GRE_YU	24 to 29	2 men, 3 women	High	3 left, 2 centre	5 pro-EU
GRE_YP	22 to 36	3 men, 3 women	No diploma or	1 left, 4 centre, 1	2 pro-EU, 1

			professional	don't know	against, 2 not good nor bad, 1 don't know
LIS_SEQ_1, LIS_SEQ_2, LIS_SEQ_3	60 to 77	4 men, 2 women	High	3 left, 2 centre, 1 right	5 pro-EU, 1 against
FI_STU	23 to 26	3 men, 3 women	Students	3 left, 1 centre, 1 right, 1 don't know	3 pro EU, 2 not good nor bad, 1 against
FI_WC	28 to 40	2 men, 2 women	High	2 left, 2 centre	4 pro EU
FI_YU	23 to 27	3 men, 2 women	High	3 left, 2 centre	3 pro-EU, 1 against, 1 don't know
FI_YP	24 to 30	2 men, 2 women	No diploma or professional	1 left, 1 centre, 1 don't know, 1 refusal	3 pro-EU, 1 refusal