Methodological Appendix for EU IDEA – WP3 Research Paper on Political Unity and Differentiation

This is the methodological appendix for the narrative analysis conducted by the researchers from the Institut für Europäische Politik e. v. Berlin (IEP) within the scope of the ongoing project “EU IDEA – European Integration and Differentiation for Effectiveness and Accountability”. The appendix provides comprehensive information on the conduction of the qualitative research that was carried out for the EU IDEA Research Paper within Work Package 3 “Narratives of Political Unity in Times of Differentiation”.

The research group for this study consisted of three researchers from the IEP, who undertook the qualitative research on the governmental and institutional documents from the European Union (EU) and 4 selected Member States (MS) within two specific timeframes. The two timeframes or ‘milestones’ that were chosen refer to the years in which differentiated integration became particularly manifest. The two milestones correspond to two main events in the EU’s history of differentiation: on the one hand, the EU ‘Big bang’ enlargement of 2004 including the years of negotiations starting from 2000 onwards and, on the other hand, the Euro crisis between 2010 and 2014.

The aim of this qualitative research is to identify and comparatively analyse the predominant narratives of political unity over time, extrapolate and better understand the particular and shared elements as well as to provide insights into the linkage between narratives and the future of differentiated integration in the EU.


All the documents were then imported into the MAXQDA software, which was deployed for coding.

The document selection represents the focus of the analysis on the official position of the EU and selected MS during the two milestones. The researchers’ subjectively selected the most relevant documents for the purpose of their study, i.e. tracing narratives of political unity. The documents were selected by time (speeches and statements of the selected years), topic (integration in the European Union) and actor relevance (institutional figures both at the national and at the European level, e.g. ministers, prime ministers and presidents). Any discourse analytical approach for the identification of specific narratives entails an
interpretation by the researcher. The software used does not interpret the texts automatically. It is the researcher who needs to read each text and turn the content of these texts into codified data. Hence, every step in the coding and analysis process of the data is the result of the researcher’s preference and interpretation. As a result, the narratives presented in the paper obviously reflect a (subjective) selection of the most relevant narratives, given the sources selected and collected. The research is hence offering a snapshot of changes in the narrative of political unity in the European Union according to the selection made. It does so by shedding some light on the overall discourse eventually leading to the notions of “united in diversity” and “divided in unity” as the two main identified overarching narratives of political unity.

The first step the researchers took was on the one side to forge links between the EU IDEA Project and the overall aim of Work Package 3 as a conceptual package and on the other side to trace narratives by building a completely new dataset. After the identification of the two main milestones in the history of differentiated integration, the researchers defined and operationalised political differentiation, political unity, and narratives respectively.

In a second step, the researchers created a provisional list of codes originated from the research question and the key elements of the project, by departing from the thematic dimensions of ‘political unity’. By doing a critical discourse analysis, which should not be considered per se a method (see Wodak and Meyer 2014), the researchers proceeded to an in-depth reading and interpretation of the documents collected from different institutions. Leaning towards the secondary literature on political unity and differentiated integration in the EU, they created a preliminary codebook with codes and sub-codes to trace the narrative in question, which was then continuously updated and integrated during the actual analysis of the document.

The third step consisted in reading the documents collected and proceed with the coding. Each relevant message within the speech of the actor in question was coded through the creation of a specific key word or expression that would summarise that passage at best (e.g. ‘ever closer union’, ‘different speeds’). For each code, the researchers assigned a memo, which describes in detail what the code means and stands for. A detailed list of all the codes deployed and their respective memo is attached to this appendix as the project’s codebook. Each document analysed was then further archived in the software indicating the specific actor giving the speech (either Commission, European Council, European Parliament for the EU or Ministry, Head of State/Government for the MS), the time (i.e. the year), the space (EU or Northern/Eastern/Southern/Western Member States) and the relationality, indicating on
which occasion the speech/statement was given (e.g. Speech in front of the French National Assembly).

The final step of the analysis was then to combine the most relevant and present codes/messages in order to subsume them under an overarching sub-narrative falling under the two main narratives identified for each milestone.
### Table Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European Union</th>
<th>Member States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals:</strong></td>
<td>José Manuel Barroso, Josep Borell, Jerzy Buzek, Pat Cox, Nicole Fontaine, Romano Prodi, Olli Rhen, Günter Verheugen;</td>
<td>Germany: Rainer Brüderle, Joschka Fischer, Angela Merkel, Friedrich Merz, Johannes Rau, Wolfgang Schäuble, Gerhard Schröder, Peer Steinbrück, Guido Westerwelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>France: Michel Barnier, Bernard Cazeneuve, Jacques Chirac, Laurent Fabius, Claudie Haigeneré, François Hollande, Alain Juppé, Noëlle Lenoir, Pierre Moscovici, Thierry Repentin, Nicolas Sarcozy, Dominique de Villepin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutions:</strong></td>
<td>European Commission, European Council, European Parliament</td>
<td>Italy: Giuliano Amato, Silvio Berlusconi, Carlo Azeglio Ciampi, Lamberto Dini, Franco Frattini, Enrico Letta, Mario Monti, Giorgio Napolitano, Giulio Terzi di Sant’Agata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>European Commission Reports, Communications, Statements and Press Releases;</td>
<td>- Speeches and Statements by Presidents;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speeches by EU leaders;</td>
<td>- Speeches and Statements by Prime Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Council conclusions;</td>
<td>- Speeches and Statements by Ministers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Parliament Legislative Texts Adopted;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestone #1</strong></td>
<td>Big bang Enlargement (2000-2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Documents</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestone #2</strong></td>
<td>Euro area crises (2010-2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Documents</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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