

**Considered Opinions on Further EU Enlargement:
Evidence from an EU-Wide Deliberative Poll***

Robert C. Luskin (University of Texas at Austin)
James S. Fishkin (Stanford University)
Stephen Boucher (Notre Europe, Paris)
Henri Monceau (Notre Europe, Paris)

*An earlier version of this paper was prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Paris, France, July 9-12, 2008.

In October 2007, the first EU-wide, indeed the first transnational, Deliberative Poll®, called *Tomorrow's Europe*, gathered a random sample of 362 citizens from all 27 EU member states to the European Parliament building in Brussels, where they spent a weekend deliberating about a variety of social, economic, and foreign policy issues affecting the European Union and its member states. The deliberation, in a total of 23 languages, with simultaneous translation, alternated between small group discussion led by trained moderators and plenary question-and-answer sessions with leading policy experts and prominent politicians. The participants' were queried about their views on first contact, before being invited to the deliberative weekend, again on arrival, and again, finally, at the end. (For more on the method and the rationale, see Fishkin 1997; Luskin, Fishkin, and Jowell 2002.)

The object, as always in Deliberative Polling, was to estimate what the public would think about the issues if it thought, knew, and talked much more about them and how that would differ from what they currently think about them (what ordinary polls measure). This Deliberative Poll, however, was unprecedented in bringing together a random sample from all the EU's member states. The public whose views were being measured was not that of Germany, France, the U.K., or any other single member state but of the whole EU.

The issues deliberated included what the EU should do to preserve its pension systems, what role it should play in the world, how it can remain competitive in an increasingly global economy, and what if anything it should do about admitting additional member states. The results shed light on deliberation's effects on all these issues. They also shed light on the possibilities of creating a European public sphere and on deliberation's effects on mutual respect across national boundaries.

Here, however, we focus on the results concerning the issue of enlargement, which were striking and ran counter to what many of the EU's supporters would have anticipated. On three of the four enlargement questions we asked—about enlargement as a general proposition, about admitting Turkey, and about admitting Croatia—the participants cooled on enlargement. We examine some possible reasons below.

We should emphasize that this is still a very preliminary report. The models may be refined, the extensive excerpts from the small group discussions more thoroughly folded into the overall discussion. Indeed we expect to try incorporating variables based on the codings into these or parallel models.

Sampling and Representativeness

The rationale of Deliberative Polling requires beginning with a sample representative of the public as it is—knowing, having thought, and having talked about the issues only as much as usual in everyday life, which in most cases is not much. In this case, the first step was parallel random sampling of all 27 member states, conducted by TNS Sofrès (the firm responsible for the Eurobarometer). We then randomly invited a subset of the 3,550 interviewees to the Deliberative Poll. Of these 362 made their way to Brussels for the weekend.

The aim was to wind up with a sample in which each country's representation would be roughly proportional to the size of its delegation in the European Parliament. This is also roughly proportional to the country's population, with some intentional over-representation of small countries, just as in the European Parliament itself, to ensure that they too have some voice.

Table 1 shows the distribution by country of those who showed up for the weekend. All 27 member states were in fact represented, and the percentages of the sample and of the European Parliament from given countries are indeed a very close match. In no case is the difference statistically significant. Even the match to the percentage of the EU population is close. None of these differences is statistically significant either.

But of course country is hardly the only dimension on which we should want the participants to be representative. One way of addressing the question of how well the participants represented the population of Europe is to compare them to the "nonparticipants": the respondents to the initial survey who either were not invited or declined to attend.

Table 2 presents these results for sociodemographic variables. As can be seen, there were a fair number of statistically significant differences between the participants and the nonparticipants. Most, however, were relatively small. Somewhat more of the participants were men. Somewhat more of them were single, somewhat fewer of them widowed. Distinctly more of them were working full-time, distinctly fewer retired, slightly fewer unemployed and looking for work, somewhat more completing their education full-time, and somewhat fewer looking after the home. Perhaps the largest and most important differences, predictably, were with respect to education. Decidedly fewer of the participants had only a secondary education or less, decidedly more a university education or more. To the extent that the better educated start off knowing and having thought more about the issues, this probably makes the observed knowledge gains and attitude changes conservative.

We can also compare the participants and nonparticipants with respect to their pre-deliberation attitudes, as we do in Table 3 for four of the most relevant policy attitude indices. Here too there are some statistically significant differences, but here too they tend to be modest. As can be seen, the participants were significantly more in favor of admitting Ukraine than the nonparticipants, but neither more nor less in favor of admitting Turkey or the idea of enlargement in general. The participants were also less euro-skeptic than the non-participants on a series of ten questions asking about where decisions in given policy areas should be made, from 0 (by the individual member states) to 10 (by the EU)—rescaled in the table to 0 (EU) to 1 (individual member states). But these differences were modest. Across all 59 individual policy items we asked, not just those in these four indices, the average difference between participants and nonparticipants on these questions was only 4.0 % of the maximum it could possibly have been (given the ranges of the scales).

Attitudes toward EU Enlargement

As always in Deliberative Polling, there are two basic questions to be asked about deliberation's attitudinal effects: (1) What do the participants think after deliberating? What, i.e., is the distribution of post-deliberation attitudes? (2) How did deliberation change what the participants thought? How, i.e. did the post deliberation distribution of attitudes differ from the pre-deliberation distribution?

The Tomorrow's Europe survey contained four questions about what the EU should do about enlargement: a general question asking whether "additional countries that meet all the political and economic conditions for membership should be admitted to the EU" and three country-specific questions asking whether Turkey, Ukraine, and Croatia "should be admitted to the EU," in each case, "if it meets all the political and economic conditions for membership. Originally on 0-10 scales, these, like, all our policy attitude measures, have been linearly translated into 0-1 scales, where 1 represents the highest level of whatever the variable's name suggests (here, the most pro-enlargement attitude), 0 the lowest level (here, the most anti-enlargement attitude), and .5 neutrality.

We asked these four questions at three points: an initial interview (T1), by phone in most countries, in-person in four; a self-completion questionnaire on arrival (T2); and another self-completion questionnaire at the end (T3). The one exception was the Croatia question, asked only at T2 and T3. There may well be some learning and some attitude change from T1 to T2, a period during which the prospective participants tend to start paying heightened attention to media stories concerning the topics they knew they would be talking about in Brussels, to talk more about those topics with family, friends, and coworkers, and even, in some cases, to research them, in the library or on the web. We certainly expect there to have been learning and some attitude change from T2 to T3, the period of the deliberative weekend.

On all three questions asked at T1, the participants started with attitudes that, on average, tilted toward enlargement (as indicated by mean scores exceeding .5). The same was true of the Croatia question as of T2. There was less support for admitting Turkey than for admitting Ukraine (or for admitting Croatia at T2) or for the general idea of enlargement. Attitudes on all but one remained pro-enlargement following deliberation. The exception was the Turkey question, where the pre-deliberation mean favored enlargement, but the post-deliberation mean was right around (insignificantly to the anti side of) neutrality. On all three items we can track from T1 to T3 (the general, Turkey, and Ukraine questions), there was a statistically significant and sizable decrease in support for enlargement, largest for Ukraine, but appreciable for Turkey and the general question as well.

On the general and Ukraine questions almost all this change occurred during the anticipatory period from T1 to T2. On the Turkey question, by contrast, the bulk of it occurred during the deliberative weekend, from T2 to T3. On the Croatia item, which we can track only from T2 to T3, there was no sizable or statistically significant change, but the timewise pattern of change for the general and Ukraine items, where almost all the change occurred before the weekend, suggests that there could have been a decrease in support for admitting Croatia as well, just one that occurred before the weekend (in this case, before we began measuring).

New versus Old Member States

These results pertain to the sample as a whole, but they hide some important variation. On some of these questions, the participants from new versus old member states reacted somewhat differently. On the general enlargement question, essentially all the change came from the new member state participants. The old member state participants changed scarcely at all. The new member state participants decreased their support sharply—by a bit more than 15% of the scale. About half of that decrease came before arrival, and the other half over the weekend.

By contrast, the decreases in support for the admission of Turkey and Ukraine occurred both among the new and old member state participants. Regarding Turkey, the decrease, among both sorts of participants, came almost entirely during the weekend. Regarding the Ukraine, it came almost entirely before the weekend among the old member state participants but both before and during (though still more before than during) the weekend among the new member state participants.

Explaining Attitudes toward Enlargement and How They Changed

The results so far have been descriptive. The next questions are explanatory: (1) Why did some participants emerge with more pro- or anti-enlargement attitudes than others? (2) Why did some participants' attitudes change in more a pro- or anti-enlargement direction than others? In the first case we look simply at T3 attitudes; in the second, ideally we should look at the differences between T3 and T1 attitudes. Unfortunately, many of the relevant explanatory variables were not present in the T1 questionnaire, so we look instead at the differences between T3 and T2 attitudes. That is, we examine the changes over the deliberative weekend, from arrival to departure, rather than the changes from the moment of first contact. We examine the T3 attitudes and T3 – T2 changes for the general enlargement, Turkey, and Ukraine items. We set aside the Croatia item, since attitudes toward admitting Croatia hardly budged.

What may account for the individual-level variation in T3 attitudes and T3 – T2 attitude change? We consider a mix of relevant empirical premises (arguments) about enlargement's effects, values, attitudes toward particular countries, and sociodemographic characteristics:

Old member state. This is a dummy variable scored 1 for participants from old member states and 0 for participants from new ones. The differences of means above suggest that the new member state participants may have particularly reduced their support for enlargement.

Education. Another dummy variable, defined as 1 for those having a university education or more, and 0 for everyone else.

Adding a Muslim country would improve the EU's relations with the Muslim world. This is the extent to which the participant agreed with this statement, the first of several empirical

premises about the consequences of adding (certain kinds of) countries. These are arguments for (in this case) or against (in other cases) enlargement.

Adding a Muslim country would make the EU too diverse. A second empirical premise/argument.

Adding more countries would help our economy. Another.

Adding more countries would help our security. Yet another.

Adding more countries would make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions. And another.

Keeping prices down. This is the first of several items and indices capturing relevant values—the importance attached by the participant to things many people think good for themselves or society. These were originally gauged on 0-10 scales, translated to 0-1.

Helping people in other parts of the world. Another value.

Having Europe play a larger role in the world. And another.

Traditionalism. Another.

Autonomy. Another.

Economic growth. Another.

Personal economic security. Another.

Protecting the less well off. And another.

Liking/Disliking Turkey. This was one of series of questions asking how much the participant liked or disliked various nationalities. This one was obviously relevant for attitudes toward admitting Turkey.

Liking/Disliking Russia. Another, relevant to attitudes toward admitting Ukraine.

Attitude towards migration policy. The thought here was that enlargement could affect immigration and internal migration and that attitudes toward migration might therefore affect attitudes toward enlargement.

Your country's ability to provide for its own security. The thought here was that people from countries they see as less able to protect themselves might favor enlargement to the extent they think it serves their country's security (or oppose it to the extent they think it undermines their country's security).

Europe's dependency on Russian energy supplies. Seeing this as a problem might have affected attitudes toward admitting Ukraine.

Russian interference in Eastern European and Central Asian. Seeing this as a problem might have also affected attitudes toward admitting Ukraine.

Most of these variables are part of the explanation for all three of our dependent variables (general enlargement, Turkey, Ukraine). Some are part of the explanation of only some of them (for example liking/disliking Turkey for admitting Turkey and liking/disliking Russia for admitting Ukraine). We estimate two models for each dependent variable, one for its value at T3 (post-deliberation), the other for the change from T2 to T3 (over the course of the weekend). In the first case, we use the explanatory variables at T3 as well. In the second case, we use the T3 – T2 changes in the explanatory variables, explaining change with change.

In all, then, we estimate six models, which we write as linear regression models and estimate by ordinary least squares. To maximize the effective sample size, we place “no opinion” responses to the attitudinal questions in these analyses at the midpoint and impute responses when the whole questionnaire is missing, as a number at T2 were, owing to an administrative glitch. The imputation is described in an appendix.

The results, in Tables 6-12, are generally satisfying and enlightening. The F 's and adjusted R^2 's suggest that these models perform quite at the explaining post-deliberation attitudes and moderately well at explaining post-deliberation attitudes. (It is generally harder to explain change scores.) Many of these explanatory variables have some significant effect, and almost always in the direction one would have expected. The tables also show the results when the equations are estimated separately for participants from new versus old member states.

Enlargement in General

We begin with the post-deliberation attitudes toward enlargement in general. Participants who thought that adding a Muslim country would improve the EU's relations with the Muslim world or that adding more countries would help its economy or its security smiled distinctly more on the idea of enlargement. Those who thought that adding a Muslim country would make the EU too diverse frowned distinctly more on it.

The one significant but apparently anomalous coefficient estimate in these results belongs to the empirical premise that adding more countries would make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions. The more the participants endorsed this proposition, the more they wanted to see the EU admit new member states. The anomaly disappears for the equation explaining the pre- to post-deliberation change in attitudes toward enlargement in general, does not appear in either of the equations explaining attitudes toward admitting Turkey, but then reappears in the equation explaining post-deliberation attitudes toward admitting Ukraine. We are unsure what to make of this, but one possibility is that some segment of the sample would prefer that the EU have a hard time making decisions—that decision making rest as much as possible with the individual member states. From that point of view, admitting more countries, if it impaired EU-

level decision-making, might be a plus. It may be worth noting that this effect appears to be confined to old-member-state participants.

But what of the change from pre-deliberation attitudes? Here too a belief that adding a Muslim country would improve the EU's relations with the Muslim world was important. Those who came to believe this more came to approve more of enlargement. So did those who came to place a higher value on traditionalism or their personal economic security. In addition, the more the participants believed their country could take care of its own security, the more favorably they viewed the prospect of enlargement. It is worth noting that the effect of personal was confined to the participants from the new member states, suggesting that part of the slide in support for enlargement was a matter of these participants realizing that their countries' contributions from the EU might be reduced if they had to be shared with additional new member states.

Turkey

Many of the influences on the post-deliberation attitudes toward admitting Turkey are similar. Again most of the empirical premises matter. The more participants believed that adding a Muslim country would improve relations with Muslim world, that adding more countries would help our economy, or that adding more countries would help our security, the more they tended to favor admitting Turkey. The more they believed that adding a Muslim country would make the EU too diverse, however, the less they tended to favor it. The more participants valued helping people in other parts of the world, Europe's playing a larger role in the world, or traditionalism, the more they also tended to favor admitting Turkey. Finally, unsurprisingly, the more the participants liked the Turks, the more they favored admitting Turkey.

Again the influences on the changes in attitude toward admitting Turkey look similar. Participants who came to believe more that adding a Muslim country would improve the EU's relations with the Muslim world or that adding more countries would help our security came to look more kindly on admitting Turkey, while those who came to believe more that adding a Muslim country would make the EU too diverse came to look more askance at admitting Turkey. People who came to place higher value on helping people in other parts of the world came to favor admitting Turkey more, as of course did people who came to like Turks more.

Ukraine

Attitudes toward admitting Ukraine were affected by education. In addition, those who believed that adding more countries would help the EU's economy, help its security, or (again perhaps anomalously) make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions were more inclined to support admitting Ukraine, as were those who cared more about keeping prices low.

As for changes in attitudes toward admitting Ukraine, the more one came to believe that adding more countries would help our economy and, similarly, the more one came to value keeping prices down, the more one came to favor admitting Ukraine.

Implications

The statistically significant (and near-significant, since there is nothing God-given about the conventional .05 threshold) coefficient estimates suggest potential levers for moving public opinion under the sort of good conditions—balanced, informative, mutually respectful—Deliberative Polling tries to create. For example, attitudes toward enlargement in general could be made more positive to the extent that more people could be persuaded that adding a Muslim country would improve the EU's relations with the Muslim world, that adding more countries would help its economy, or that adding more countries would help its security—or made more negative to the extent that they could be persuaded of the opposite.

Knowledge Gains

One way of assuring ourselves that these policy attitude changes were not adventitious, that the participants were indeed seriously deliberating is to examine their scores on a series of factual and quasi-factual knowledge questions. The questionnaire included factual knowledge questions about the European Union and the policy areas under discussion, as well as two quasi-factual questions asking respondents to place the views of Nicholas Sarkozy and Gordon Brown on a left/right scale (where placements of Brown on the right and of Sarkozy on the left may be regarded as wrong). All these questions are described in an appendix. Table 3 shows that the participants learned a lot. The participants from increased their knowledge scores by about 15%, a sizable increase. (Think of it as a 15% increase in the average mark on an exam.)

Note the results for the Brown and Sarkozy placements are, on average, very similar to those from the purely factual items. The percentages knowing the correct side of the left-right scale rose by roughly 9% for Sarkozy and by roughly 15% for Brown. This even though no leader's ideological position (or party affiliation) was mentioned in the briefing document or likely to surface in the discussion and even though only a decided minority of the sample came from Britain or France. This result suggests the effect that the prospect of attending the Deliberative Poll had on the participants' attention to political news.

Since, as we have seen, there were some differences between the participants from new versus old member states when it came to policy attitude change, Table 6 also examines the knowledge gains separately for the two groups. Although the new member state participants started from a somewhat (roughly 5%) lower level, the two groups learned about equally. Averaging across all the knowledge items, the new member state participants gained 15.1%, the old member state participants 15.5%. The only large differences were with respect to the Role of EU in employment benefits, where the new member state participants gained 20.9%, and the old member state participants only 10.5%; with respect to 1/3 of EU Budget, where the new member state participants gained 26.4%, and the old member state participants only 13.3%; and with

respect to EU vs. US Foreign Aid, where the new member state participants gained only 10.5%, and the old member state participants only 30.5%.

What Was Said: Insights from the Transcripts

We are in the process of examining the transcripts of the discussion of enlargement to identify the opinions expressed and arguments used by participants. We adopted a coding scheme distinguishing 16 themes, including: whether the European Union is adding too many countries too fast, whether some countries are too different, whether enlargement would make the EU's decision-making capacity easier, and whether enlargement would improve the EU's relations with the Muslim world. Below we present the frequencies of statements exhibiting these themes and provide examples.

All 19 statements made about the timing of EU expansion expressed the view that the European Union is adding countries too quickly. For example, one participant from Group 14 said, *"...the EU should slow down the enlargement process, and it should provide us as members to improve..."* On similar lines, a participant from Group 18 said, *"First three, then one, then two, and then three again. And then, all of a sudden, ten countries joined...This was a very large step...And I think if one keeps pushing the borders further and further out, and keeps pushing faster and faster, it won't be possible in this area to sufficiently attend to the countries to get them adjusted..."*

A participant from group 16 offered a similar view, that it takes time to digest, indeed to unify or deepen the union, before further enlargement proceeds: *"... a Community when it gets larger needs also to "digest" its new members and produce more unity by defeating reciprocal resistances. Once united it can then try to enlarge itself once again. I think that lately we have done more than it was necessary. Besides economic assessments, or evaluations based upon human rights standards, all things that are very important indeed, we should try to find a way to divide enlargement as according to a certain amount of time, that is for instance, that we cannot proceed every year to enlarge Europe. Otherwise, we risk to run into problems..."*

Some of the concerns about enlargement were economic, 3 of 3 statements made about EU aid to EU's current countries said that enlargement would decrease EU Aid to its current member states. On this topic, a participant from Group 18 said, *"...5% is support for the joining candidates. Joining candidates at the time are Macedonia, Croatia, and Turkey...one has to subsequently think about the fact that, since these countries have been accepted and even more countries are going to join, the new federal states in Germany all of a sudden are above the average and actually will not receive aid anymore..."*

Regarding the effect of enlargement on EU's decision making capacity, the statements were mixed, with 5 statements indicating enlargement would make decision making easier, but 9 statements indicate decision making would be harder. For one participant from Group 7, the decision making capacity would be easier, because *"...we might become less dependent vis à vis the United States. It might be nice to have – and possible, in that case – to define our own EU policy."* While on the other side, another participant from Group 7 said, *"...there is not enough*

cohesion in Europe between the countries and that can be felt in our external policies because countries can have differences, but they should be more cohesive to make it stronger...”

When discussing the issue of enlargement and relations with the Muslim world, 7 of 7 statements said enlargement would improve relations with the Muslim World. In Group 14, a participant said, *“...if we accept Turkey in Europe, then all Muslims would understand and therefore we would gain respect. This is the reason for having Turkey in the EU. I know how they live, let’s try to mentally accept them...there are at least 70 percent of Turkish that would join Europe. If we isolate Turkey than this would be a damage for us.”* However, 35 of 50 statements made on the topic of whether a country is too different said that a particular country is too different from the existing member countries. In the same discussion group, Group 14, within minutes of the previous participant’s statement, another participant said, *“They are extremist, they dialogue in a different way. I see them as very far away from us. I don’t see you for instance as very far from us, there might be other kinds of problems ok, different speeds, but all these problems can be solved. In their case, instead, they are very much far away, their religion is a very heavy impediment, they are Muslims and therefore very much different.”* Meanwhile, 15 of the 50 statements said a particular country is not so different and an example of this view is from Group 17, where a participant said, *“...I think that Turkey could add some color...it could allow Europe to initiate a dialogue with other countries...start a dialogue with Asian countries...So Turkey would add some differences. So the present member states of Europe have more in common...”* Even though some participants feel a country like Turkey is quite different from the countries within the European Union, other participants believe that admitting a Muslim country would not be a problem. Of the 37 statements on admitting a majority Muslim country, 21 of the statements felt it would not be a problem. A statement from a Group 18 participant pointed out that *“...Europe is already multi-cultural, so the Muslim culture won’t make such a difference...”* The remaining statements, 16 statements, said that admitting a majority Muslim country would be a problem. Here is a statement from Group 17, *“...I’m very skeptical about Turkish membership. Obviously, we must keep the door open and perhaps Turkey will one day be ready to join the European Union, but the fact that Turkey is an Islamic country, this is something that we really need to be cautious about and take a moment before we make any decisions...”*

Regarding human rights, 19 of 19 statements made said countries that violate human rights should not be permitted to join the European Union. From Group 18, a participant said, *“...I would definitely have a problem...the violations of human rights in Turkey, the set of problems concerning the treatment of Kurds in Turkey, and the reaction of Turkey to the US calling the crime against the Armenians genocide...the way Turkey reacted...”*In addition, participants also expressed that being a part of the EU would reduce human rights violations in member countries. 5 of 5 statements made said enlargement would reduce human rights violation. Here is an example from a participant in Group 12, *“Concerning Turkey, I think you have to think about the alternative if Turkey doesn’t become a member of the EU. Are they going to be pushed further eastwards? Is this going to be a disadvantage for Europe...”*

Four topics covered the effects of enlargement on the economy. On the economy in general, the participants expressed mixed views. Half of the statements indicated enlargement would stimulate economic growth and the other half of the statements indicated enlargement would be an economic burden. A participant from Group 14 with the latter view said, *“It is out of question that we should enlarge to Turkey and this is for economic reasons. Also with*

Muslims we have to deal since they cannot stand us, they feel uncomfortable with us. It is an economic reason...” While a participant from Group 1 felt that enlargement would stimulate economic growth, this participant said, “*Well, when the EU went into effect back then, when the union started, I thought: Thank god, this has been due for a long time. That people find each other and go with each other more. Economically, it had incredibly positive effects.*”

The second code for the economy was the personal financial impact of enlargement. Only two statements were made on this topic; one statement indicated its positive impact and the second statement indicated its negative impact. A participant from Group 1 had positive experiences with enlargement and said, that “*...Since I am working in export.. I am happy about it, about every expansion, because they mean less work for me personally and less complication...you can simply order a truck and have things picked up, from Estonia, Latvia, everywhere we were doing trade...*” While a participant from Group 7 felt that, “*...If we allow a country like Turkey in right now, it’s going to generate enormous expenses ...I think it’s going to make a nice difference in our personal budget.*”

The third code for the economy was the financial impact of enlargement on the participant’s own country. No participant indicated there has be positive financial impact for their own country, but two statements were made indicating enlargement had negative impacts on their own country. An example of this view comes from a participant from Group 14, the participant said, “*Slovenia is part of the EU since 3 years, notwithstanding this the common opinion is that the EU has enlarged too much and has included too much diversity within itself. Due to this diversity, it has lost its strength as far as its economy is concerned as well as its unique position...*”

The last code for the economy was the financial impact of enlargement on the European Union. For this topic, 6 statements said enlargement would have a good financial impact and 7 statements said enlargement would have a bad financial impact. A participant from Group 1 with a good outlook for the EU said, “*...And I think, especially Turkey is indispensable for us...Turkey could offer us a lot of support or at least communicate experience in the direction of the Arabic world...Furthermore, one has to say, it has never been harmful for Europe to grow, when the market area grew at the same time..*”. And, on the other end, a participant from Group 11 said, “*...I just wanted to talk about the economic problem... As long as we haven’t successfully completed the standardization work ...as long as we haven’t managed to raise the standard of living of those who just joined...bringing another country...would create more problems...*”

In regards to military and security, 9 out of the 10 statements made said that enlargement would help EU’s military and security. An example of this view comes from a participant from Group 6, this participant said, “*I wouldn’t think the approaches dictated with difficulty by the various nations could lead to the creation of a European army, an army whose objective would be to keep the peace. That would be its objective, an army to defend the European territory. Well, I see things this way: instead, we should try to encourage coordination of the police forces rather than the army. Police forces in charge of the security of the movement of people and goods within the European Union ...*” The one statement that felt enlargement would hurt EU’s military and security said, that “*I think if certain countries try to achieve certain supremacies, whatever country that may be, that this is regarded as very suspicious by the others. I think that,*

in this regard, the citizens of Europe still have a long way ahead of themselves in order to really take a back seat, so that when some country Y makes a suggestion, they can all accept it.”

On the topic of EU’s influence in the world, 6 of 7 statements made on this topic said enlargement would increase EU’s influence in the world. A participant from Group 1 said, *“Globally, it would certainly be desirable for the EU to have a considerably stronger position, since globally, nowadays everything happens with the US and China involved, and maybe India in the future...”* The one participant that felt enlargement would decrease EU’s influence in the world said, *“Starting with the enlargement, for me, there is not enough cohesion in Europe between the countries and that can be felt in our external policies because countries can have differences, but they should be more cohesive to make it stronger.”*

Finally, on the topic of immigration and migration, two statements were made. One statement said immigration and migration would be a plus and this participant said, *“...Turkey did not have to enter the EU but I have said that we have taken a commitment, it could be even a good thing, we have already Turks in Europe...”* While the second statement argued that immigration and migration would be a minus, this participant said, *“...But if they come and accept our law, then they are welcome....but at the same time in Germany they make immigrants sign an agreement where they endorse the responsibility to respect the German law. Whereas in Italy, they arrive, they want to work but there are no jobs even for Italians...so what should we do? They come from Slovenia, Romania from all countries of the world, I don’t know if they would accept this same situation...”*

Conclusion

Among other things, Deliberative Polls are “polls with a human face.” The small group discussions allow us to see public opinion reshaping itself as people think, learn, and talk about the issues under good conditions. These good conditions include vetted and balanced briefing materials, the small group discussions with trained moderators, the question-and-answer sessions with competing experts and policy makers, and in this case, simultaneous interpretation, permitted transnational discussion. All this is deliberately counterfactual—an effort to see what the views of a more ideal citizenry would be like.

Tomorrow’s Europe was even more counterfactual than other Deliberative Polls, aiming, for its sample, for a weekend, to create an EU-wide public sphere that does not in fact exist in the real world. We hope that this may be merely the first of a series of pan-EU Deliberative Polls, as Europe develops its capacities for collective self understanding and political expression. In any case, the results of this maiden voyage are wide-ranging and rich. This report has focused simply on the issue of enlargement, but deliberation changed opinions on a variety of issues, not just enlargement, and tended to increase cross-national understanding and respect.

It is worth reiterating that the deliberations in Deliberative Polling provide a testing ground for the competing arguments. The regression coefficients suggest some of the empirical premises capable of moving opinion under these good conditions. So may the recurring themes that marked the discussions. The results thus help identify some of the levers proponents or

opponents of enlargement might effectively use—in the sort of fair debate the conditions of Deliberative Polling are intended to create.

Table 1
Representativeness by Country

	% of sample	% of EU Parliament	% of EU Population	Number of Participants
Austria	3.0%	2.3%	1.7%	11
Belgium	3.0	3.1	2.1	11
Bulgaria	2.5	2.3	1.6	9
Cyprus*	0.8	0.8	0.2	3
Czech	3.3	3.1	2.1	12
Denmark	2.5	1.8	1.1	9
Estonia*	0.8	0.8	0.3	3
Finland	2.2	1.8	1.1	8
France*	11.3	10.0	12.4	41
Germany	13.0	12.6	16.8	47
Great Britain	7.7	10.0	12.3	28
Greece	3.0	3.1	2.3	11
Hungary	3.0	3.1	2.1	11
Ireland	1.7	1.7	0.9	6
Italy	7.7	9.8	12.0	28
Lithuania	1.1	1.7	0.7	4
Luxembourg*	0.6	0.8	0.1	2
Latvia	1.9	1.1	0.5	7
Malta*	0.8	0.6	0.1	3
Netherlands	4.1	3.4	3.3	15
Poland	7.2	6.9	7.8	26
Portugal	3.0	3.1	2.2	11
Romania	4.4	4.3	4.4	16
Spain	5.5	6.9	8.9	20
Sweden	2.5	2.4	1.8	9
Slovenia	1.1	0.9	0.4	4
Slovakia	1.9	1.8	1.1	7

NOTE: The EU population data and numbers of seats are from EUROPA, <http://europa.eu/>.

Table 2
Demographic Representativeness

	Participants	Nonparticipants	Whole Sample
Gender*			
Male	54.4%	48.3	48.9
Female	45.6	51.7	51.1
Age			
18 - 24 years old	9.9	10.3	10.2
25 - 39 years old	30.7	25.1	25.6
40 - 54 years old	32.9	28.5	29.0
55 - 69 years old	19.9	24.4	23.9
70 years old or older	6.6	11.3	10.8
Marital Status			
Single*	26.8	22.1	22.6
Married	49.4	53.9	53.5
Unmarried but living with a partner	7.2	7.2	7.2
Separated or Divorced	11.6	8.6	8.9
Widowed*	4.7	8.0	7.6
Occupation			
Working full-time*	58.3	47.1	48.2
Working part-time	8.8	8.2	8.3
Not working (seeking work)*	1.7	3.9	3.7
On a government training scheme	0.8	0.4	0.5
Retired*	15.5	24.4	23.5
In full-time education*	9.1	5.9	6.2
Looking after the home*	2.2	5.9	5.5
Permanently sick or disabled	1.1	1.5	1.4
Not working (and not seeking work)	0.8	1.4	1.3
Caring for an elderly or disabled person full-time	0.0	0.2	0.2
Other	1.7	1.0	0.1
Education			
Did not finish secondary school*	8.6	19.0	17.9
Finished secondary school*	33.4	45.3	44.1
Some university*	11.9	8.3	8.7
University degree*	31.2	19.3	20.5
Some postgraduate*	4.7	1.9	2.2
Postgraduate degree*	9.9	5.6	6.0
<i>N</i>	362	3188	3550

*Statistically significant difference (by a two-tailed test at the .05 level) between participants and non participants.

Table 3
Attitudinal Representativeness

Policy Index	Participants	Non-Participants	P-NP	Sig. (2-tailed)
General Enlargement	0.667	0.679	-0.016	0.537
Turkey Enlargement	0.556	0.540	0.017	0.435
Ukraine Enlargement	0.690	0.648	0.041	0.034
Euroskepticism	0.404	0.439	-0.035	0.005

Table 4
Enlargement Attitudes

Enlargement Item	T1	T2	T3		T2-T1	T3-T2	T3-T1		<i>p</i> (T2-T1)	<i>p</i> (T3-T2)	<i>p</i> (T3-T1)
General	.667	.609	.599		-.058	-.010	-.068		.031	.614	.007
Turkey	.556	.547	.496		-.009	-.051	-.060		.697	.004	.007
Ukraine	.690	.593	.581		-.097	-.012	-.109		.000	.678	.000
Croatia	-	.648	.642		-	.006	-		-	.677	-

Table 5
Enlargement Attitudes: New versus Old Member States

Enlargement Item	T1	T2	T3		T2-T1	T3-T2	T3-T1		p(T2-T1)	p(T3-T2)	p(T3-T1)
New Member States											
General	.775	.686	.608		-.089	-.078	-.167		.084	.008	.000
Turkey	.577	.576	.488		-.001	-.088	-.089		1.000	.032	.016
Ukraine	.782	.600	.541		-.182	-.059	-.241		.000	.043	.016
Croatia	-	.686	.652		-	-.034	-		-	.208	-
Old Member States											
General	.622	.577	.595		-.045	.018	-.027		.215	.083	.344
Turkey	.548	.535	.499		-.013	-.036	-.049		.648	.040	.081
Ukraine	.650	.590	.599		-.060	.009	-.051		.033	.513	.081
Croatia	-	.619	.633		-	.014	-		-	.170	-

**Table 6
Knowledge Gains**

	Whole Sample			Old Member States			New Member States		
	T1	T3	Gain	T1	T3	Gain	T1	T3	Gain
Official candidate of the EU	62.7%	77.2%	14.5%	69.5%	81.0%	11.4%	69.5%	81.0%	11.4%
Members of EU Parliament	54.0	77.2	23.1	54.3	76.0	21.7	53.3	80.0	26.7
New Employment laws	8.6	19.2	10.6	10.2	20.9	10.6	4.8	15.2	10.5
Role of EU in employment benefits	32.0	49.9	17.8	31.9	52.8	20.9	32.4	42.9	10.5
1/3 of EU Budget	51.0	73.5	22.6	45.3	71.7	26.4	64.8	78.1	13.3
2050 Population > 65	51.0	61.0	10.0	53.2	62.2	9.1	45.7	58.1	12.4
EU vs. US Foreign Aid	22.3	44.0	21.7	25.2	43.3	18.1	15.2	45.7	30.5
% of foreign aid spending	20.6	35.1	14.5	26.4	39.4	13.0	6.7	24.8	18.1
Country without nuclear weapons	51.3	61.0	9.7	57.1	65.4	8.3	37.1	50.5	13.3
N. Sarkozy Placement	55.4	64.6	9.2	62.2	71.6	9.5	39.1	47.6	8.6
G. Brown Placement	18.7	33.7	15.0	19.7	36.6	16.9	16.2	26.7	10.5
Knowledge Index	38.9	54.2	15.4	40.5	55.9	15.5	35.0	50.0	15.1

Table 7
Explaining General Attitude toward Enlargement T3

	Overall		New		Old	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Old member state	0.013	0.699				
Education	0.013	0.643	-0.043	0.477	0.008	0.811
Adding Muslim country would improve relations with Muslim world	0.097	0.051	0.163	0.101	0.084	0.153
Adding a Muslim country would make the EU too diverse	-0.129	0.004	0.153	0.084	-0.241	0.000
Adding more countries would help our economy	0.427	0.000	0.207	0.099	0.444	0.000
Adding more countries would help our security	0.204	0.001	0.307	0.007	0.152	0.042
Adding more countries would make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions	0.168	0.000	0.058	0.535	0.218	0.000
Attitude towards open migration policy	-0.079	0.200	-0.273	0.036	0.013	0.849
Your Country relied on to protect your country's peace and security	0.059	0.272	0.168	0.120	0.019	0.761
Economic Growth	0.037	0.734	-0.027	0.915	0.074	0.524
Personal Economic Security	0.059	0.596	-0.095	0.694	0.240	0.058
Protecting less well off	0.039	0.736	0.412	0.101	-0.041	0.770
Autonomy	-0.011	0.911	0.006	0.978	-0.074	0.518
Traditionalism	-0.045	0.526	-0.104	0.589	-0.088	0.248
Keeping prices down	0.084	0.250	0.063	0.653	0.079	0.355
Helping people in other parts of the world	-0.012	0.880	0.031	0.831	-0.025	0.805
Having Europe play a larger role in the world	0.014	0.876	-0.333	0.116	0.106	0.275
Like/Dislike Turks	0.030	0.662	0.086	0.536	0.000	0.996
Important a problem Europe's dependency on Russian energy supplies	0.047	0.562	-0.305	0.108	0.094	0.293
Important a problem Russian interference in Eastern European and Central Asian	-0.068	0.350	0.111	0.456	-0.121	0.164
Like/Dislike Russia	-0.061	0.391	0.208	0.133	-0.142	0.089
R^2		0.402		0.500		0.478
Adj R^2		0.367		0.380		0.434
F		11.39		4.910		11.25
Sig. F		0.000		0.000		0.000

Table 8
Explaining Change in General Attitude toward Enlargement T3 – T2

	Overall		New		Old	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Old EU Dummy	0.073	0.033				
Education	-0.006	0.840	0.009	0.873	-0.005	0.880
Adding a Muslim country would improve the EU's relations with the Muslim world	0.102	0.107	0.169	0.124	0.061	0.457
Adding a Muslim country would make the EU too diverse	-0.058	0.233	-0.140	0.104	-0.033	0.592
Adding more countries would help our economy	0.148	0.011	-0.030	0.763	0.265	0.001
Adding more countries would help our security	0.141	0.013	0.108	0.268	0.100	0.176
Adding more countries would make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions	-0.013	0.795	-0.047	0.596	0.024	0.688
Keeping prices down	0.001	0.986	0.073	0.545	-0.007	0.932
Helping people in other parts of the world	-0.141	0.094	-0.155	0.318	-0.165	0.125
Having Europe play a larger role in the world	0.037	0.649	0.236	0.183	-0.005	0.957
Traditionalism	-0.150	0.111	0.045	0.773	-0.239	0.055
Autonomy	-0.052	0.623	-0.164	0.491	0.002	0.989
Economic Growth	0.004	0.972	-0.263	0.307	0.064	0.665
Personal Economic Security	0.198	0.096	-0.117	0.623	0.320	0.027
Protecting less well off	0.162	0.157	0.293	0.120	0.192	0.217
Like/Dislike Turks	-0.013	0.874	0.123	0.412	-0.013	0.897
Attitude towards migration policy	-0.012	0.809	0.066	0.331	-0.097	0.249
Your country can provide security	0.124	0.025	0.083	0.449	0.158	0.018
Like/Dislike Russia	0.005	0.955	0.002	0.987	-0.082	0.467
Important a problem Europe's dependency on Russian energy supplies	0.031	0.661	0.105	0.447	-0.001	0.987
Important a problem Russian interference in Eastern European and Central Asian	-0.014	0.832	0.038	0.778	-0.055	0.489
R^2		0.156		0.190		0.194
Adj R^2		0.104		-0.002		0.124
F		3.150		1.060		2.820
Sig. F		0.000		0.409		0.002

Table 9
Explaining Attitude toward Admitting Turkey T3

	Overall		New		Old	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Old EU Dummy	0.018	0.586				
Education	0.048	0.092	0.025	0.623	0.058	0.089
Adding Muslim country would improve relations with Muslim world	0.593	0.000	0.687	0.000	0.565	0.000
Adding a Muslim country would make the EU too diverse	-0.179	0.000	-0.287	0.000	-0.149	0.008
Adding more countries would help our economy	0.130	0.040	-0.065	0.529	0.197	0.015
Adding more countries would help our security	0.111	0.074	0.166	0.091	0.127	0.110
Adding more countries would make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions	-0.176	0.000	0.019	0.810	-0.190	0.001
Attitude towards open migration policy	0.052	0.396	-0.120	0.270	0.129	0.072
Your Country relied on to protect its peace and security	-0.037	0.481	-0.083	0.367	-0.059	0.377
Keeping prices down	0.020	0.853	-0.453	0.042	0.160	0.194
Helping people in other parts of the world	0.207	0.061	0.165	0.416	0.218	0.103
Having Europe play a larger role in the world	0.236	0.042	0.329	0.129	0.359	0.016
Economic Growth	-0.072	0.478	-0.257	0.172	-0.109	0.373
Personal Economic Security	0.013	0.856	0.110	0.503	0.011	0.895
Autonomy	-0.104	0.148	-0.079	0.499	-0.099	0.270
Traditionalism	-0.203	0.013	0.095	0.451	-0.372	0.000
Protecting less well off	-0.028	0.757	0.116	0.519	-0.070	0.489
Like/Dislike Turks	0.129	0.020	0.295	0.006	0.097	0.137
R^2		0.551		0.655		0.577
Adj R^2		0.527		0.587		0.547
F						
Sig. of F						

Table 10
Explaining Change in Attitude toward Admitting Turkey T3 – T2

	Overall		New		Old	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Old member state	0.035	0.320				
Education	0.006	0.839	-0.034	0.581	0.040	0.267
Adding a Muslim country would improve the EU's relations with the Muslim world	0.352	0.000	0.444	0.000	0.348	0.000
Adding a Muslim country would make the EU too diverse	-0.098	0.057	-0.225	0.016	-0.024	0.708
Adding more countries would help our economy	0.059	0.331	-0.123	0.249	0.150	0.058
Adding more countries would help our security	0.163	0.006	0.171	0.100	0.116	0.127
Adding more countries would make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions	-0.062	0.217	-0.194	0.047	-0.007	0.909
Keeping prices down	0.017	0.802	0.098	0.455	-0.004	0.960
Helping people in other parts of the world	-0.190	0.033	-0.033	0.843	-0.249	0.024
Having Europe play a larger role in the world	-0.011	0.902	0.053	0.776	-0.040	0.687
Traditionalism	0.033	0.733	0.252	0.119	-0.025	0.844
Autonomy	0.096	0.391	0.369	0.147	0.138	0.291
Economic Growth	-0.116	0.371	-0.354	0.203	-0.105	0.491
Personal Economic Security	0.003	0.983	-0.566	0.026	0.149	0.310
Protecting less well off	0.078	0.519	0.075	0.709	0.074	0.643
Like/Dislike Turks	0.109	0.103	-0.093	0.480	0.198	0.016
Attitude towards migration policy	0.102	0.060	0.176	0.019	-0.018	0.830
Your country can provide security	-0.010	0.867	0.047	0.692	0.009	0.896
R^2		0.201		0.346		0.217
Adj R^2		0.159		0.218		0.161

Table 11
Explaining Attitude toward Admitting Ukraine T3

	Overall		New		Old	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Old member state	0.072	0.038				
Education	0.089	0.003	0.078	0.232	0.086	0.015
Adding more countries would help our economy	0.446	0.000	0.516	0.000	0.431	0.000
Adding more countries would help our security	0.197	0.003	0.248	0.043	0.193	0.015
Adding more countries would make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions	0.090	0.060	-0.042	0.658	0.158	0.006
Support for Open Migration	-0.102	0.114	-0.484	0.001	0.023	0.750
Your Country relied on to protect your country's peace and security	0.078	0.167	0.193	0.094	0.011	0.868
Important a problem Europe's dependency on Russian energy supplies	-0.121	0.155	0.192	0.304	-0.220	0.024
Important a problem Russian interference in Eastern European and Central Asian	-0.108	0.155	-0.206	0.162	-0.105	0.263
Keeping prices down	0.191	0.012	0.147	0.321	0.207	0.025
Helping people in other parts of the world	0.061	0.474	0.147	0.352	-0.020	0.850
Having Europe play a larger role in the world	0.006	0.946	-0.084	0.709	0.051	0.627
Economic Growth	0.053	0.640	-0.267	0.329	0.183	0.145
Personal Economic Security	-0.171	0.137	-0.196	0.436	-0.098	0.466
Autonomy	0.056	0.602	0.393	0.101	-0.079	0.524
Traditionalism	0.037	0.619	0.041	0.842	0.004	0.963
Protecting less well off	-0.146	0.226	-0.061	0.816	-0.124	0.407
Like/Dislike Russia	-0.012	0.844	-0.147	0.280	-0.037	0.592
R^2		0.362		0.496		0.360
Adj R^2						
F		10.910		4.950		7.860
Sig. F		0.000		0.000		0.000

Table 12
Explaining Change in Attitude toward Admitting Ukraine T3 – T2

	Overall		New		Old	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Old member state	0.061	0.076				
Education	0.017	0.557	-0.050	0.350	0.053	0.135
Adding more countries would help our economy	0.234	0.000	0.158	0.094	0.332	0.000
Adding more countries would help our security	0.043	0.442	0.116	0.204	-0.065	0.375
Adding more countries would make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions	-0.023	0.629	-0.179	0.031	0.080	0.172
Keeping prices down	0.132	0.046	-0.009	0.936	0.181	0.025
Helping people in other parts of the world	-0.019	0.824	-0.058	0.681	-0.040	0.711
Having Europe play a larger role in the world	-0.104	0.205	0.083	0.618	-0.159	0.105
Traditionalism	-0.167	0.079	-0.248	0.096	-0.130	0.298
Autonomy	0.055	0.609	-0.043	0.845	0.140	0.272
Economic Growth	0.182	0.141	-0.004	0.987	0.212	0.152
Personal Economic Security	0.162	0.170	0.198	0.357	0.142	0.328
Protecting less well off	-0.051	0.655	0.237	0.172	-0.169	0.272
Attitude towards migration policy	0.007	0.896	0.019	0.770	-0.051	0.545
Your country can provide security	0.011	0.846	0.097	0.349	-0.011	0.869
Like/Dislike Russia	-0.078	0.259	0.122	0.263	-0.211	0.018
Important a problem Europe's dependency on Russian energy supplies	-0.049	0.486	0.127	0.336	-0.107	0.197
Important a problem Russian interference in Eastern European and Central Asian	0.047	0.495	0.064	0.613	0.042	0.604
R^2		0.125		0.229		0.167
Adj R^2		0.078		0.078		0.107
F		3.080		1.440		3.280
Sig. F		0.000		0.138		0.000

Table 13
Number of Statements offered by small groups

Topic	Position	No. of Statements
Position on Enlargement	For	39
	Against	35
On Economy, Enlargement would...	Stimulate Economic Growth	4
	Be an Economic Burden	4
EU Aid to EU's current countries would...	Increase	0
	Decrease	3
The personal financial impact of enlargement would be...	Good	1
	Bad	1
Own country's financial impact of enlargement would be...	Good	0
	Bad	2
EU's financial impact of enlargement would be...	Good	6
	Bad	7
EU is adding countries...	Too Fast	19
	Not Fast Enough	0
Enlargement would make EU's decision-making capacity...	Easier	5
	Harder	8
Increased immigration/migration would be...	Plus	1
	Minus	1
Relations with Muslim World would...	Improve	7
	Worsen	0
The effect of enlargement on pensions would be...	Positive	0
	Negative	0
Enlargement would help/hurt EU's Military/Security	Help	9
	Hurt	1
Influence of EU in the World would...	Increase	6
	Decrease	1
Countries with human rights violations should...	Not be permitted EU admittance	19
	Be permitted EU admittance	0
Enlargement would reduce/not reduce human rights violations	Reduce	5
	Not reduce	0
Country X would be...	Too different	35
	Not so different	15
The admittance of a Muslim country would be...	Problem	16
	Not a problem	21

Appendices

Appendix A: Knowledge Questions

Appendix B: Components for Enlargement Indices

Appendix C: EU Regressions Codebook

Appendix D: Brief outline of variables incorporated in regressions but found wanting

Appendix E: Imputation Information

Appendix F: Coding Scheme – EU-wide Deliberative Poll on EU Enlargement

Appendix A: Knowledge Questions (correct answers in bold)

1. Which of the following countries is an official candidate to join the EU? Answer options: Romania, Montenegro, **Croatia**, or Morocco
2. Are the members of the European Parliament...? Answer options: **directly elected by the citizens of their country**, elected for three year terms, elected by the parliament of their country, or appointed by their national head of government
3. Are new EU laws in the field of employment adopted by...? Answer options: the European Commission and in some cases with the European Parliament, **the Council of Ministers and in some cases with the European Parliament**, the European Parliament by itself or the European commission by itself
4. Is the EU's role regarding unemployment benefits to...? Answer options: Finance the member states' unemployment benefit systems, decide the level and length of unemployment benefits in the member states, require that the member states merge their unemployment benefit systems by 2010 or **guarantee that all EU citizens have access to unemployment benefits where they live**
5. Roughly a third of the EU's budget is devoted to one of the following. Is it ...? Answer options: **Helping the EU's less prosperous regions**, subsidizing the EU's fishing industry, financing diplomatic missions abroad or maintaining the EU's administration and bureaucracy
6. By 2050, is the percentage of the adult EU population that is 65 or older projected to be...? Answer options: About one quarter of what it is now, about half of what it is now, about the same as what it is now, **about twice what it is now** or about four times what it is now
7. Which of the following is true of the amount of foreign aid given by the EU and its member states, combined, versus the amount given by the US? Answer options: The EU and its member states give roughly four times as much, **the EU and its member states give roughly twice as much**, the EU and its member states and the US give about the same amount, the US gives roughly twice as much, or the US gives roughly four times as much
8. On average, what percentage of the total spending by the governments of the EU member states for foreign aid? Answer options: About **1%**, 5%, 9%, 13%, or 17%
9. Which of the following countries does NOT possess nuclear weapons? Answer options: Pakistan, India, North Korea or **Japan**

Appendix B: Components for Enlargement Indices

EU Membership Policy (Single-item index): “Some people think that your country’s membership in the EU is an extremely bad thing. Suppose these people are at one end of a 0-to-10 scale, at point 0. Other people think that your country’s membership in the EU is an extremely good thing. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 10. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 5, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 0 and 10. Where would you place your views on this scale, or do you have any opinion about that?”

Privatization (Single-item index): “Some people think the government should provide a pension for all retirees. Suppose these people are at one end of a 0-to-10 scale, at point 0. Other people think that individuals should make their own decisions about investing in their pensions. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 10. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 5, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 0 and 10. Where would you place your views on this scale, or do you have any opinion about that?”

How to Pay for Pension (The index is constructed as the mean of 5b and 5c minus the mean of 5a and 5d.): And how strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following as ways of paying for pensions? 5a) Letting more immigrants enter the labor market; 5b) Making it more attractive to work longer before retiring; 5c) Raising the retirement age; 5d) Encouraging people to have more children

Migration (Single-item index): How much would you favor or oppose “Making it easier for workers to move between EU countries” as ways of competing in today’s global economy?

Free Trade (The index is constructed as the average of 7d minus 7a and question 8.): How much would you favor or oppose each of the following as ways of competing in today’s global economy? 7d) Lowering barriers to international trade; 7a) Increasing taxes on imported products; 8) “Some people think that your country’s industries should be protected against foreign competition. Suppose these people are at one end of a 0-to-10 scale, at point 0. Other people think that your country’s industries should be left to compete freely in the global economy. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 10. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 5, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 0 and 10. Where would you place your views on this scale, or do you have any opinion about that?”

Military (The index is constructed as the average of the mean of 11a and 11c and mean of 12a, 12b, 12c, 12d, then minus 11b.): 11) How strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements? 11a) My country should strengthen its military power, 11b) Military action by EU countries is never justifiable and 11c) EU countries may sometimes have to use force without a UN mandate. 12) On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is completely unjustifiable, 10 is completely justifiable, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how justifiable would you say military intervention by EU countries for each of the following purposes could be, or do you have any opinion about that? 12a) To prevent genocide in other countries, 12b) To remove the threat of weapons of mass destruction, 12c) To defend economic interests, 12d) To defend another EU country against military attack.

General Enlargement (Single-item index): How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? 16a. Additional countries that meet all the political and economic conditions for membership should be admitted to the EU.

Turkey Enlargement (Single-item index): How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? 16b. If it meets all the political and economic conditions for membership, Turkey should be admitted to the EU.

Ukraine Enlargement (Single-item index): How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? 16c. If it meets all the political and economic conditions for membership, Ukraine should be admitted to the EU.

Croatia Enlargement (Single-item index): How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? 16f. If it meets all the political and economic conditions for membership, Croatia should be admitted to the EU.

Level of Decision Making (The index is constructed as the mean of 17 a through i.): “Let’s start with a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means that the individual member states make all the decisions, 10 means that the EU makes all the decisions, and 5 is exactly in the middle. Higher numbers mean more coordination between countries, while lower numbers mean more independent decision making by individual countries. On this 0 to 10 scale, how much of the decision-making in each of the following areas should be made by the individual member states versus the EU, or do you have any opinion about that?” 17a) Immigration; 17b) International trade; 17c) Employment; 17d) Pensions; 17e) Military action; 17f) Climate change; 17g) Foreign aid; 17h) Taxation; 17i) Energy supply

EU Veto Support (The index is constructed as the mean of 18 a through d.): “Some people think all the decisions made at the EU level should require only the agreement of a large majority of member states, representing a large majority of the EU’s population. Suppose these people are at one end of a 0-to-10 scale, at point 0. Other people think all the decisions made at the EU level should require the unanimous agreement of all the member states. Suppose these people are the other end of the scale, at point 10. People who are exactly in-between are at point 5, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 0 and 10. Where would you place your views on this scale, when it comes to ...” 18a) Taxation decisions? 18b) Social policy decisions? 18c) Foreign policy decisions? 18d) Defense decisions?

Appendix C: EU Regressions Codebook

Old EU Dummy: Takes value 1 when participant belongs to old country

Countries in 'New Europe': Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia

Countries in 'Old Europe': Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Spain, Finland, France, United Kingdom, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden

Education University or above dummy: Takes value 1 when participant has education equivalent or beyond university. Recoded from Education variable measured with six categories.

Here are some things that people find more or less important for themselves or society to have. On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all important, 10 is very important, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how important would you say each of the following is to you?

Single item: Values - Helping people in other parts of the world

Single item: Values - Having Europe play a larger role in the world

General Economic Growth Value: mean of the following questions

Promoting economic growth

Making our economy competitive in the global arena

Personal Economic Growth Value: mean of the following questions

38l. Earning as much money as possible

38o. Being able to retire comfortably

38j. Not having to worry about being fired

Protect Less Well off Values Index: mean of the following questions

38a. Ensuring equal opportunity

38b. Making sure nobody goes hungry or lacks medical care
38d. Minimizing the gap between rich and poor

Traditionalism Values Index: mean of the following questions

38c. Preserving traditional industries
38h. Preserving traditions and customs

Single item: Keeping prices down - important for themselves or society to have

How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? (5 points scale recoded to 0 to 1)

Adding Muslim country to EU would improve relations with Muslim world

Adding a Muslim country to the EU would make the EU too diverse

Adding more countries to the EU would help our economy

Adding more countries to the EU would make it more difficult for the EU to make decisions

Attitude towards open migration policy at Index (5 point scale, recoded to 0 to 1)

How much would you favor or oppose each of the following as ways of competing in today's global economy?

Making it easier for workers to move between EU countries

Your Country -relied on to protect your country's peace and security

On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is none at all, 10 is complete, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much can each of the following be relied on to protect your country's peace and security, or do you have any opinion about that? (10 point scale, recoded to 0 to 1)

Your country

Turks Like/Dislike

T3 Russia Like/Dislike

One last 0 to 10 scale. If 0 means disliking as much as possible, 10 means liking as much as possible, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much would you say you like or dislike each of the following, or couldn't you say about that?

Turkish

Russians

And on a scale from 0 to 10, where now 0 is extremely unimportant, 10 is extremely important, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how important a problem is

Important a problem Europe's dependency on Russian energy supplies

Important a problem Russian interference in Eastern European and Central Asian

Appendix D: Brief outline of what variables were incorporated in regression equations but found wanting

On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is none at all, 10 is complete, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much can each of the following be relied on to protect your country's peace and security, or do you have any opinion about that? (10 point scale, recoded to 0 to 1)

UN can provide security
US can provide security
NATO can provide security

One last 0 to 10 scale. If 0 means disliking as much as possible, 10 means liking as much as possible, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much would you say you like or dislike each of the following, or couldn't you say about that?

Americans Like/Dislike
Chinese Like/Dislike
EU Like Dislike
UN Like Dislike

And how strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements?
Allowing employers more freedom in hiring and firing increases economic growth
Increasing job security allows workers to become more skilled
Allowing employers more freedom in hiring and firing increases the number of jobs

And how strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Freer trade leads to lower prices
Freer trade expands the markets for our products
Freer trade costs more jobs than it creates at home
Freer trade leads to lower prices
Freer trade puts our industries at a disadvantage
Freer trade leads to more economic and social inequality
Freer trade makes all the countries involved more prosperous
Freer trade leads to lower quality jobs at home

Appendix E: Imputation Information

There were two kinds of missing data – one emerging from participants who failed to submit their questionnaires in time, and the other one imagines due to ambivalent attitudes on the question. We deal with missing values in three ways –

- 1) Where there is row-wise missing data (people who failed to submit questions etc.), we impute using ‘impute’ command in STATA (details below)
- 2) In case of “missing value” being part of a multi-item index, we simply let the ‘mean’ function assign the mean value. The value isn’t assigned if we have missing data on all constituent.
- 3) In case of single item indices or cases where responses were missing in an ad hoc fashion- we code the attitudes to the midpoint. This was done at each time point (pre and post deliberation) and change scores (post minus pre) were calculated based on imputed attitudes at those time points.

Missing data: No t2 data due to unfilled questionnaires

There was a significant amount of missing data at t2 due to the fact that participants from 2 groups failed to submit their questionnaires. Looking at T2, one can see that there is no real pattern among the missing participants. You can see the whole chart, and there is a slight skew towards new member states among the missing 23 participants: AT-2, BG-3. EG/WG-1, ES-6, GB-4, IE-2, LV-1, PL-3, RO-1. Given the circumstance, we can assume that “Missing at Random” assumption was fulfilled. We used “impute” command in STATA to impute missing data for the missing values. Impute command depends on we providing a regression equation. We made the following assumptions (which should bias us from finding significance in t3 t2 differences) – how participants marked their entries in t3 on the same attitude scales were significant predictors of how they marked them at t2.

The r squares for estimating equations were consistently over .6.

Specific estimations used

Sociodem = oldnew married single fulltime parttime student

Know = Knowledge at other time points = t1pkindex t2pkindex

Know1 = Knowledge at other time points = t1pkindex t3pkindex

OtherAtt = Fellow items in the battery at other time points = t1q13a t1q13b t1q13c t1q13d t2q16ar

t2q16br t2q16cr t2q16dr t2q16er t2q16fr t2q16gr t2q16hr t2q16ir t2q16jr

OtherAtt1 = Fellow items in the battery at other time points = t1q13a t1q13b t1q13c t1q13d t3q16ar

t3q16br t3q16cr t3q16dr t3q16er t3q16fr t3q16gr t3q16hr t3q16ir t3q16jr

t3q16ar to t3q16jr < - OtherAtt sociodem know

t2q16ar to t2q16jr < - OtherAtt1 sociodem know1

Similar procedure was applied to values and to like-dislike.

	T2	T1-RDD	T1- Participants	Missing Participants	T2	T1-RDD	T1- Participants
AT	9	80	11	2	2.7%	2.3%	3.1%
BE	10	92	10	0	3.0%	2.6%	2.8%
BG	6	83	9	3	1.8%	2.3%	2.5%
CY	3	84	3	0	0.9%	2.4%	0.8%
CZ	12	90	12	0	3.6%	2.5%	3.3%
DK	9	82	9	0	2.7%	2.3%	2.5%
EE	3	80	3	0	0.9%	2.3%	0.8%
EG/WG	43	380	44	1	12.8%	10.7%	12.3%
EL	11	90	11	0	3.3%	2.5%	3.1%
ES	14	202	20	6	4.2%	5.7%	5.6%
FI	8	80	8	0	2.4%	2.3%	2.2%
FR	41	300	41	0	12.2%	8.5%	11.4%
GB	25	302	29	4	7.4%	8.5%	8.1%
HU	11	90	11	0	3.3%	2.5%	3.1%
IE	4	80	6	2	1.2%	2.3%	1.7%
IT	27	301	27	0	8.0%	8.5%	7.5%
LT	4	80	4	0	1.2%	2.3%	1.1%
LU	3	80	3	0	0.9%	2.3%	0.8%
LV	6	82	7	1	1.8%	2.3%	1.9%
MT	3	80	3	0	0.9%	2.3%	0.8%
NL	15	106	15	0	4.5%	3.0%	4.2%
PL	23	200	26	3	6.8%	5.6%	7.2%
PT	11	90	11	0	3.3%	2.5%	3.1%
RO	15	146	16	1	4.5%	4.1%	4.5%
SE	9	80	9	0	2.7%	2.3%	2.5%
SI	4	87	4	0	1.2%	2.5%	1.1%

SK	7	103	7	0	2.1%	2.9%	1.9%
Total	336	3550	359	23	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Appendix F: Coding Scheme – EU-wide Deliberative Poll on EU Enlargement

Code 1: Position on Enlargement – “1” = For Enlargement; “-1” = Against Enlargement; “4” = Neutral

Topic 2: Enlargement would stimulate economic growth = “1”; be an economic burden = “-1”; made reference to economic growth and remained neutral = “0”

Statement from Group 1, coded “1”: *“Well, when the EU went into effect back then, when the union started, I thought: Thank god, this has been due for a long time. That people find each other and go with each other more. Economically, it had incredibly positive effects.”*

Statement from Group 14, coded “-1”:

“It is out of question that we should enlarge to Turkey and this is for economic reasons. Also with Muslims we have to deal since they cannot stand us, they feel uncomfortable with us. It is an economic reason. I want that Turkey joins the EU.”

Topic 3: Enlargement would increase EU Aid to EU countries = “1”; decrease EU Aid to EU countries= “-1”; made reference to EU Aid and remained neutral = “0”

Statement from Group 18, coded “-1”:

“Regarding the numbers: 5% is support for the joining candidates. Joining candidates at the time are Macedonia, Croatia, and Turkey. The aid for new members, countries that have already joined, comes for a significant part from the areas of regional and cohesion politics. And one has to subsequently think about the fact that, since these countries have been accepted and even more countries are going to join, the new federal states in Germany all of a sudden are above the average and actually will not receive aid any more. These are considerations one also has to look at.”

Topic 4: Enlargement would be good for me financially= “1”; bad for me financially= “-1”; made reference to personal financial impact and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 1, coded “1”:

“...Since I am working in export, I can only speak for myself. And of course, I am happy about it, about every expansion, because they mean less work for me personally and less complication. Back in 2004, when many countries joined, it was great, we very happy about it at my workplace. And we had a lot of fun with so many bureaucratic hindrances, import licenses, all this stuff that went with it being eliminated and you can simply order a truck and have things picked up, from Estonia, Latvia, everywhere we were doing trade, Poland. Well, I was very delighted.”

Statement from Group 7, coded “-1”:

“I fully agree with Mr. Wesling. If we allow a country like Turkey in right now, it’s going to generate enormous expenses and we’re going to have to provide for much more than we do already. Take a look at Germany. East Germany is still costing the country a lot and if, indeed, we need to raise rural Turkey to our level, I think it’s going to make a nice difference in our personal budget.”

Topic 5: Enlargement would be good for my country financially= “1”, bad for my country financially= “-1”; made reference to financial impact to my country and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 13, coded “-1”:

“Slovenia is part of the EU since 3 years, notwithstanding this the common opinion is that the EU has enlarged too much and has included too much diversity within itself. Due to this diversity, it has lost its strength as far as its economy is concerned as well as its unique position.”

Topic 6: Enlargement would be good for EU financially= “1”; bad for EU financially= “-1”; made reference to financial impact to the EU and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 18, coded “1”: *“...And I think, especially Turkey is indispensable for us...Turkey could offer us a lot of support or at least communicate experience in the direction of the Arabic world...Furthermore, one has to say, it has never been harmful for Europe to grow, when the market area grew at the same time..”*

Statement from Group 11, coded “-1”:

“...I just wanted to talk about the economic problem. It is time anyway for Europe to take a time out with regard to new members. I think we haven’t... As long as we haven’t successfully completed the standardization work we talked about at length this morning, as long as we haven’t managed to raise the standard of living of those who just joined, I think bringing another country into the European Union would create more problems than not...”

Topic 7: EU is adding countries to fast= “1”; EU is not adding countries fast enough= “-1”; made reference to timing of enlargement and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 14, “1”:

“I wanted to say that I completely agree, since a Community when it gets larger needs also to “digest” its new members and produce more unity by defeating reciprocal resistances. Once united it can then try to enlarge itself once again. I think that lately we have done more than it was necessary. Besides economic assessments, or evaluations based upon human rights standards, all things that are very important indeed, we should try to find a way to divide enlargement as according to a certain amount of time, that is for instance, that we cannot proceed every year to enlarge Europe. Otherwise, we risk to run into problems...”

Topic 8: Enlargement would make easier EU’s decision-making capacity= “1”; make harder EU’s decision making capacity= “-1”; referenced to EU’s decision-making capacity and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 7, “1”:

“Well, you might even say that if the EU is enlarged, we might become less dependent vis à vie the United States. It might be nice to have – and possible, in that case – to define our own EU policy.”

Statement from Group 7, “-1”:

“Well, there are two main issues here. One is something concerning Turkey and the other one is the enlargement in general. Starting with the enlargement, for me, there is not enough cohesion in Europe between the countries and that can be felt in our external policies because countries can have differences, but they should be more cohesive to make it stronger. When we were 12 and when we were 15, there wasn’t enough cohesion and now, we’re 27, it’s much, much harder and the more countries there are, the harder it is. But the point is there’s not a big difference between 27 and 30, so I don’t think that should hinder the enlargement to other countries.”

Topic 9: Increased immigration/migration would be a plus= “1”; increased immigration/migration would be a minus= “-1”; made reference to immigration/migration and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 13, “1”: *“...Turkey did not have to enter the EU but I have said that we have taken a commitment, it could be even a good thing, we have already Turks in Europe...”*

Statement from Group 14, “-1”:

“...But if they come and accept our law, then they are welcome, we all need this not only Italy, Slovenia, Germany....but at the same time in Germany they make immigrants sign an agreement where they endorse the responsibility to respect the German law. Whereas in Italy, they arrive, they want to work but there are no jobs even for Italians...so what should we do? They come from Slovenia, Romania from all countries of the world, I don’t know if they would accept this same situation...”

Topic 10: Enlargement would improve relations with the Muslim world= “1”; worsen relations with the Muslim world= “-1”; made reference to relations to the Muslim’s world and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 7, “1”:

“...If Turkey joined, it would help the Middle East by creating a bridge between Europe and the Islam. That would possibly be one of the advantages to create a bridge between Europe and the Middle East, and that’s it...”

Topic 11: Enlargement would have positive impacts on pensions = “1”; Enlargement would have negative impacts on pensions = “-1”; made reference to pensions and remained neutral= “0”

No Statements

Topic 12: Enlargement would help military/security for the EU= “1”; would hurt military/security for the EU= “-1”; made reference to military/security and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 6, “1”:

“I wouldn’t think the approaches dictated with difficulty by the various nations could lead to the creation of a European army, an army whose objective would be to keep the peace. That would be its objective, an army to defend the European territory. Well, I see things this way: instead, we should try to encourage coordination of the police forces rather than the army. Police forces in charge of the security of the movement of people and goods within the European Union...”

Statement from Group 1, “-1”: *“...I think if certain countries try to achieve certain supremacies, whatever country that may be, that this is regarded as very suspicious by the others. I think that, in this regard, the citizens of Europe still have a long way ahead of themselves in order to really take a back seat, so that when some country Y makes a suggestion, they can all accept it.”*

Topic 13: Enlargement would increase influence of EU’s role in the world= “1”; decrease influence of EU’s role in the world= “-1”; made reference to EU’s role in the world and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 1, “1”:

“Globally, it would certainly be desirable for the EU to have a considerably stronger position, since globally, nowadays everything happens with the US and China involved, and maybe India in the future...”

Statement from Group 7, “-1”: *“Starting with the enlargement, for me, there is not enough cohesion in Europe between the countries and that can be felt in our external policies because countries can have differences, but they should be more cohesive to make it stronger.”*

Topic 14: Countries that violate human rights should not be permitted admittance to the EU= “1”; countries that violate human rights should be permitted admittance to the EU= “-1”; made reference to human rights & admittance and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 18, “-1”:

“...The things I would definitely have a problem with at this point are the violations of human rights in Turkey, the set of problems concerning the treatment of Kurds in Turkey, and the reaction of Turkey to the US calling the crime against the Armenians genocide - or was it the Senate or the Congress? – the way Turkey reacted...”

Topic 15: Admitting countries will reduce human rights violation in EU countries= “1”; Admitting countries will not reduce human rights violations in EU countries= “-1”; made reference to human rights reduction & admittance and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 12, “1”:

“Concerning Turkey, I think you have to think about the alternative if Turkey doesn’t become a member of the EU. Are they going to be pushed further eastwards? Is this going to be a disadvantage for Europe...”

Topic 16: Country X is just too different= “1”, country X is not so different= “-1”; made reference to country X and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 17, “1”:

“...I think that Turkey could add some color, couldn’t reach Europe, and it could allow Europe to initiate a dialogue with other countries. So it could allow Europe to start a dialogue with Asian countries. It should help us resolve the most depressing issues that regard Asia, so they could help us in this sense maybe. So Turkey would add some differences. So the present member states of Europe have more in common, so Turkey could bring in some differences...”

Statement from Group 16, “-1”:

“On Turkey, I’m skeptical when it comes to Turkey because Turkey is not a European country. When it comes to accession of Turkey, I’m doubtful and I’m skeptical. And there we have an issue of religion. I disagree with you and I think that religion does play a role. I think that religion is quite important and the question of religion is of importance, of some importance. Turkey is not Christian, so it may pose a problem – but this is my personal opinion.”

Topic 17: Admitting majority Muslim countries is a problem= “1”, admitting majority Muslim country is not a problem= “-1”; made reference to Muslim countries and remained neutral= “0”

Statement from Group 18, “1”:

“... Well, regarding multi-cultural, Europe is already multi-cultural, so the Muslim culture won’t make such a difference. We already have half of Germany, well half of Germany is not full of Muslims, but still, the bottom line is that they are already integrated. I think, to blame it on the religion is always the worst argument...”

Statement from Group 17, “-1”:

“...I’m very skeptical about Turkish membership. Obviously, we must keep the door open and perhaps Turkey will one day be ready to join the European Union, but the fact that Turkey is an Islamic country, this is something that we really need to be cautious about and take a moment before we make any decisions...”

Appendix G

Small Group Effects: Polarization

Indices	Proportion of small group means moving away from midpoint	Proportion with decreasing variance
Support EU Membership	0.000	0.333
Attitude towards Privatization	0.611	1.000
How to Pay for Pension Indices - single index	0.222	0.000
Attitude towards migration	0.000	0.833
Free trade attitudes	0.389	0.444
Mil. Attitudes	0.556	0.667
Turkey Enlargement	0.278	0.778
General Enlargement Attitude	0.611	0.667
Level of Decision Making	0.611	0.611
EU Veto Support	0.333	0.444
Average	0.3611	0.5777

Appendix H

Small Group Effects: Social Dominance

Indices	T1 Mean	T3 Mean	Male's T1 Position	Movement Toward/Away from T1 Male	Higher Educated's T1 Position	Movement Toward/Away from T1 Higher Educated
Support EU Membership	.740	.830	.737	Away	.769	Toward
Attitude towards Privatization	.521	.403	.514	Toward	.498	Toward
How to Pay for Pension	.539	.539	.549	-	.542	-
Attitude towards migration	.820	.791	.826	Away	.839	Away
Free trade attitudes	.583	.596	.590	Toward	.588	Toward
Military. Attitudes	.156	.117	.191	Away	.175	Away
Turkey Enlargement	.560	.495	.550	Toward	.556	Toward
General Enlargement Attitude	.600	.594	.615	Away	.600	Away
Level of Decision Making	.589	.611	.600	Toward	.608	Toward
EU Veto Support	.584	.582	.548	Toward	.564	Toward
Proportion of small groups moving towards:				.500		.600