

Leiden University  
Faculty of Humanities



Universiteit Leiden

Master Thesis  
**The relations between knowledge and public attitudes towards  
the EU and Euroscepticism: A case study of Slovakia**

Dominika Barillova  
25/08/2017  
Leiden

## **Master Thesis**

**Title:** The relations between knowledge and public attitudes towards the EU and Euroscepticism: A case study of Slovakia

**Research question:** What is the knowledge about the EU and what are the opinions towards the EU among the last year students of the high schools in Slovakia and what conclusions can be drawn from these findings towards explaining the rise of Euroscepticism?

**Name:** Dominika Barillova

**Date:** 25/08/2017

**Word count:** 14990

**Course:** MA in International Relations, specialisation European Union Studies

**Supervisor:** Dr. B. Shaev

**Second reader:** Dr. M. E. L. David

## Abstract

The research dealing with public attitudes has been around for many years. Citizens and their opinions have become very important in modern democracies as it is they who are the cornerstone of democratic systems. More attention has been paid to opinions at the EU level. Support for the EU among all Europeans has decreased and an era of Euroscepticism started. Scholars blamed many different reasons and events for increasing discontent with the EU, the lack of knowledge about the EU is just one of many. Slovakia has always been one of the most enthusiastic member states. In fact, this has not changed much despite the continental increase in Eurosceptic thinking. Moreover, Slovaks belong to more knowledgeable half of Europeans according to Eurobarometer and also this thesis. Despite a small drop in the positive views towards the EU among Slovak people in recent years, they stay on a positive side of thinking about the EU. This demonstrate no significant presence of Euroscepticism in Slovakia. However, the EP election turnout of Slovakia remains the lowest of all the member states and people are not interested in the EU affairs to a great extent at all. Hence, Slovaks in general cannot be classified as Eurosceptic as they express more positive views than negative, yet they definitely classify as indifferent.

## Table of Contents

Title page	
Abstract	
Table of Contents	
Introduction	5
Chapter 1	The background to Euroscepticism, public opinion and citizens' knowledge about the EU
	1.1 Public opinion/attitudes of citizens towards the EU 6
	1.2 Euroscepticism and its rise until Brexit 9
	1.3 Peoples' knowledge about the EU and a lack thereof 12
Chapter 2	Methodology: Methods, Survey Design and Data
	2.1 The choice of Method 16
	2.2 Survey design 17
	2.3 The case study 19
	2.4 Administering surveys and data collection 20
Chapter 3	Empirical Part: Statistical Results
	3.1 General results 22
	3.2 Bivariate analysis 35
Chapter 4	Concluding Discussion 44
Bibliography	48
Appendix A	53

## Introduction

‘Bringing Europe closer to its citizens’ – this phrase has been used in a vast amount of cases by politicians, scholars, media and other actors with an intention to demonstrate that the EU is taking steps towards better citizen involvement. Without any doubt citizens and their views are vital for both domestic and European democratic political systems. The peoples of the European Union are more and more important for the functioning of the EU. Support is essential for the democratic legitimacy of any political system. (Coicaud 1997, pp.10-11) Thus, researching why the support decreases and how it could be restored is of utmost importance for the EU to become more legitimate. The prominent position of the citizens in the EU has increased to a great extent since the Maastricht Treaty. (Cini and Borragan 2010, p.10) Nevertheless, with the rise of people’s participation a rise in critical views about the EU has occurred. The decrease in public support for the EU is mostly known as Euroscepticism. It has been on a rise in all European countries according to Eurobarometer opinion polls as well as according to scholars. Slovakia belongs to one of those countries where the rise of Euroscepticism was noticed. However, the studied group of this research shows fairly positive attitudes towards the EU but demonstrates almost no interest in it.

The aim of this thesis is to answer the research question which is also explained in the rest of the paragraph: *What is the knowledge about the EU and what are the opinions towards the EU among the last year students of the high schools in Slovakia and what conclusions can be drawn from these findings towards explaining the rise of Euroscepticism?* By doing this, we aim at reducing the lack of empirical evidence by conducting a survey and making conclusions based on the responses and to the academic literature about public attitudes, the citizens' knowledge of the EU and the rise of Euroscepticism. All of these three interconnected topics are of a great interest and importance to the public, politicians as well as to scholars these days. The purpose of the thesis is to explore to what extent each of the phenomena influences the others and to lay foundations for further academic research in the area of education and public opinion. The thesis is divided into four chapters each with its own introductory part. The first chapter provides a brief overview of the literature concerning the main concepts. The second chapter introduce the methodology used for this research which is of a quantitative character. The third chapter is the empirical part which

S1830309

presents the data collected from the questionnaires. Finally, the last chapter is also a concluding part which discusses the findings from chapter three and draws broader conclusions.

## Chapter 1

### The background to Euroscepticism, public opinion and citizens' knowledge about the EU

#### Introduction

The role of citizens in the European Union (EU) has increased significantly. Their views are increasingly being taken into account and they want to be heard by more decision-makers, not just at home, but also at EU level. However, the decision-making in the EU is overly complicated and not many citizens admit to understand it, or know a lot about the EU. (McCormick 2011, pp.100-101) On top of this lack of knowledge, citizens seem to be more critical of the EU. Thus, the theme of this thesis involves several concepts and phenomena that need to be examined from a wider perspective. This chapter will be organised into several subchapters, each one dealing with a broad view of one concept. However, the concepts are interrelated and linked to a great extent which means that the topics of these subchapters may intersect. The first subchapter examines public opinions and the attitudes of European citizens towards the EU. The second subchapter focuses on Euroscepticism and its rise within EU member states and the third seeks to analyse peoples' knowledge about the EU. In addition, more attention will be paid particularly to Slovakia, which is the case study of this thesis.

#### 1.1 Public opinion/attitudes of citizens towards the EU

Studying people's behaviour and attitudes is extremely important for politics in democracies as it is the citizens themselves that are the heart of democracy and who endow the political system with legitimacy. The EU has been criticized as suffering from a democratic deficit and lack of legitimacy. The democratic deficit has been studied mainly from an institutional perspective. However, a socio-psychological perspective of the EU's democracy and legitimacy has played an increased role in academia recently. This perspective focuses on the extent of the democratic deficit and lack of legitimacy caused by citizens themselves. Some of the reasons for this might include the EU citizens' lack of knowledge of the EU,

decreasing support for and trust in the EU and a lack of shared identity among them etc. (Chrysochoou 2010, p.378-382) Scruton expressed the importance of citizens' opinions for a legitimate and democratic political regime as follows: 'The consulting of public opinion is an important part of politics, and presumably a necessary prelude to the conciliation which, on some views, is the essence of the political process.' (2007, p.570) In general, public opinion can be defined as 'an aggregate of the individual views, attitudes, and beliefs about specific topic, expressed by a significant proportion of a community.' (Encyclopaedia Britannica 2017)

Public opinion is formed by a number of factors in the life of individuals. Newton and van Deth (2016) argue that public attitudes depend on individuals' political ideas, personal circumstances and interest and how they believe they fit into the world. They further argue that one of the dimensions of political orientation is cognitive mobilisation, i.e. the process of activating people to play a part in the world by increasing knowledge and understanding of it. Political participation is strongly influenced by class, status, education, income, family background and by many others elements. These different factors also influence the voter turnout. The person with a higher socio-economic status is more likely to vote. These aforementioned factors are considered the determinants of public opinion in general.

Positive attitudes towards the EU seemed to be rising until 1991. Scholars identified this so called 'permissive consensus' among the citizens from the beginning of the integration until the 1990s. The permissive consensus was a tacit agreement towards integration, which most European citizens were either not interested in, and thus had no opinions towards, or they supported their government's actions concerning European integration. The permissive consensus ended in the 1990s. (Hix 1999, pp.135-137) Thus, it might seem that people were more supportive until the 1990s and thereafter there has been a decline in the support for integration. The public opinion towards the EU has deteriorated to a great extent over the past few years as a consequence of several ongoing crises. Nevertheless, there is a notable new pattern of growing support within the EU since the Brexit vote. People seem to be increasingly supportive of the EU again. (Wagstyl 2016)

The general public attitude towards the EU varies between the member states and also over time. The attitudes of the people towards the EU and integration do not necessarily have to be influenced by the same factors as attitudes towards national politics. There are several



variations in public opinions towards integration, such as cross-policy variation and cross-national variation (Dalton and Eichenberg 1998). In general, there are some recognised Eurosceptic countries either with Eurosceptic politics or Eurosceptic people, e.g. the UK, Hungary, Latvia, and some more Euro enthusiastic countries, e.g. Original Six and Southern Enlargement. (McLaren 2010, pp.391-395) McLaren further discusses different types of public opinion towards the EU such as 'Eurorejects', 'Euroenthusiasts', 'Europragmatists' and last but not least 'Eurosceptics'. There is one particularly discussed type of support for the EU. It is 'Egocentric utilitarianism', which expresses support on the basis of the economic costs and benefits of the EU for individuals. One more type of public attitude that McLaren briefly mentions, is 'Sociotropic utilitarianism', which explains the support in terms of how a country benefits from the EU. (2010, pp.391-397)

There are also important differences between groups of citizens inside the member states, such as difference between generations or low and high income people. For instance, Gabel and Whitten (1997) tested the influence of economic conditions on peoples' perception of the EU. They found out that 'subjective' economy, i.e. the economic conditions of individuals, plays a big role in Europeans views of the EU. People base their support on economic criteria, i.e. the support changes with the fluctuating economic situation. This theory and other theories related to economic criteria correlate with the 'Egocentric utilitarianism' mentioned earlier. Gabel (1998) tested five explanations of individual level support for the European integration. He studied and compared cognitive mobilization; political values; utilitarian appraisals of integrative policy; class partisanship and support for government as reasons for individuals' support. He concluded that utilitarian theory, i.e. again the economic benefits, and class partisanship propose the strongest account for explaining the support for integration while cognitive mobilization and political values offer only limited explanation.

Gabel's general findings can be supported by a specific study directly relevant to the case study of this thesis. This study was carried out among students at Slovak and Czech economy oriented universities. The authors concluded that this studied group showed that positive attitudes towards the EU coincided with economic and individual benefits as well as with the personal identity of studied people. (Lukášová, R. et al. 2015) The studied group, i.e. Slovak and Czech university students, is only slightly older and in higher education than the study group of this thesis, i.e. Slovak last year high school students. However, an observation of opinion patterns among young people in Slovakia can be noted. These very broad

observations are made as there is a notable gap in the literature revolving around the attitudes towards the EU among the young people from Slovakia.

Attitudes towards the EU are mostly studied from positive or negative perspective. However, Stoeckel (2012) offers a different perspective on peoples' attitudes towards the EU which are particularly vital for this thesis. He proposes two new categories, ambivalent citizens and indifferent citizens of the EU. He proved that Europeans are notably ambivalent towards the EU. The ambivalence is strengthened by the cognitive cues, e.g. EU knowledge and news media consumption. However, these cues decrease indifference. Affective cues, e.g. attachment to the EU or trust in the EU institutions, diminish both ambivalence and indifference. He concludes that ambivalent people have a high level of knowledge and are well informed while on the other side indifference is caused by low level of knowledge and understanding of the EU.

To sum up, attitudes have become more important, but have also been changing. Many scholars have conducted research to determine the factors of influence and causes of varying attitudes towards the EU. Several studies have proved that an individual's economic condition plays a crucial role in forming one's opinions. Furthermore, the attitudes towards the EU have been divided to subcategories based on the causes for support or the reasons for no support of the EU. Euroscepticism, as mentioned earlier, belongs to one of these subcategories. It is another concept that needs to be looked at more closely.

### 1.2 Euroscepticism and its rise until Brexit

The presence and rise of Euroscepticism across all of the EU member states is more than obvious these days. It is so especially due to British Euroscepticism which climaxed on the 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2016 when the UK voted in a referendum about Union membership to leave the EU by 3-4 per cent of casted votes. (Hunt and Wheeler 2017) The word Euroscepticism first appeared in 1986 in a British newspaper and gained popularity with Thatcher's famous 'Bruges Speech' in 1988. (Information guide 2013, p.2; McLaren 2010; Startin 2015) Nevertheless, there are many other Eurosceptic countries and an increasing number of politicians who express discontent with the EU to a great extent, such as Marine le Pen or Geert Wilders. It is unquestionable that Euroscepticism has been on a rise throughout the entirety of European member states in both political and public spheres until recent positive

changes in the public attitudes. (BBC 2016)

It is very important to try to understand the concept of Euroscepticism. It is complicated and contested with many types and definitions of Euroscepticism being proposed over time. One of the main and the most used classification of Euroscepticism was proposed by Szczerbiak and Taggart. (2008, pp.7-8) They divided Euroscepticism into 'soft' and 'hard' forms. 'Soft Euroscepticism' is defined as some kind of opposition towards some EU policy areas and 'hard Euroscepticism' is a stronger form of opposition to the extent that the country or its citizens wish to withdraw from the EU. Kopecky and Mudde (2002) criticise the simplicity of the division proposed by Taggart and Szczerbiak. Instead they offer a new two-dimensional conceptualization of positions towards the EU based on 'diffuse' and 'specific' support for integration. Diffuse support represents the support for general ideas about European integration. They further divide diffuse support into Europhobes, those who do not support these general ideas and Europhiles, those who do support the general ideas. Specific support focuses on the general practice of the EU and within this category there are further distinctions between Euro-optimist and Euro-pessimists.

There are some other types of studies about various kinds of Eurosceptic citizens. One of them, Wessels (2007), mainly talks about 'critical Europeans' who identify with the EU but also criticize it at the same time. These citizens are oriented towards enhancing the EU project instead of undermining it. However, he also found that in more than half of the EU member states (25 at that time) the presence of adamant Eurosceptics was higher than the critical Europeans. The adamant Eurosceptics' ideas about the EU were dominated by very strong opposition. Slovakia was one of the countries where the number of adamant Eurosceptics was above 20 per cent. Wessels thus argued that critical Europeans are well informed, politically interested and better educated compared to adamant Eurosceptics who are less informed, less interested in politics with a lower than average education.

As was mentioned in the previous subchapter, the general support for integration started declining in the 1990s. Since then, several events and crisis have occurred in the EU which strengthened or caused Eurosceptic sentiment. One of the most notable events was the Euro Crisis in 2008. The countries which were considered in general as pro-European, such as Germany and Italy, noticed the biggest drop in the support level. (Information Guide 2013) Most recently, the migration crisis spread Euroscepticism among all the EU countries for

different reasons. Countries of V4, Slovakia among them, were united on the anti-immigrant sentiment. Governments have fought against the refugee quotas and declined to accept refugees in the countries. (The Economist 2016) The migration crisis triggered particularly strong anti-EU movement in V4 countries for various reasons. For instance, Slovak people are not content with the idea of the EU ‘forcing migrants in their country’ where they are not wanted. Hence, the frustration with the EU has risen dramatically in Slovakia recently. The role of media is particularly important in the Eurosceptic discourse. Media, being one of the main concept providers for citizens, exerts a large amount of influence over shaping public opinion. For example, people are influenced negatively by media to a greater extent if they already possess negative attitudes towards the EU. (Azrout et al. 2012)

The rise of Euroscepticism has been very noticeable in the last few European Parliamentary elections. The elections in May 2014 were marked as the most Eurosceptic ever, with far-right parties gaining support across all the EU member states. (Halikiopoulou and Vasilopoulou 2014) However, not only right-wing parties are Eurosceptic. There are many Eurosceptic left-wing parties as well. When counted altogether, 212 out of 751 seats in the EP belong to Eurosceptic MEPs. (Treib 2014, pp.1541-1543)

Not attending and thus not casting votes in the elections is another way that people demonstrate that they are either unhappy or not interested in the EU at all. Hence, not-attending the EP elections and the decreasing voter turnout can be considered as a sign of rising Euroscepticism. However, Schmitt and van der Eijk (2008) argue that there is no proof that Eurosceptic ideas among voters influence their elections turnout. They believe that abstention from elections is more likely caused by individuals’ social-cultural indicators. On the other hand, Sinnott (2000) argues that non-voting in the EP elections is influenced by peoples’ attitudes towards the EU which is in agreement with the way media and politicians present low and decreasing turnout in the EP elections. This leads us to Slovakia that had the lowest turnout in the last two EP elections. Slovakian citizens have always been seen as among the most positive about the EU among the countries of CEE. Nevertheless, people have become more and more sceptical due to several factors and events, such as Greek loans, negative media and politicians’ narrative to blame Brussels for whatever went wrong, nationalistic rhetoric and Christian conservative values. (Virostkova 2014)

There is not much literature available to date about the Euroscepticism among Slovak citizens in general, yet some research concerning Slovak Eurosceptic parties and thus also their voters has been conducted. The research usually starts with analysing pre-accession politics of the Slovak Republic and its difficult transition to democracy. In the period after the break-up of Czechoslovakia and before joining the EU, Slovak politics and the Slovak population experienced many tumults on the way. Hence, the EU discourse did not play such a significant role in Slovakia. The EU was not a controversial issue compared to domestic politics the same way in Slovakia as it was in other CEE countries. (Grabbe and Hughes 1999) Karen Henderson (2008) has studied CEE countries in the EU with several case studies of Slovakia. She argues that the most important expressed negative attitudes were based on the EU's criticism of Slovakia and not based on criticism of the EU itself. These negative attitudes came from the idea that Slovakia's actions were again dictated by an outsider. Considering Slovakia's history and all the outsiders occupying its territory, this attitude might stand ground to some extent. Nevertheless, Slovaks in general have always been considered Europhiles with a will to be united with the rest of Europe. Naturally, there are differences between Slovaks based on their demographic profiles. Such as, the less educated, the elderly and the unemployed are usually less exposed to EU issues and usually more Eurosceptical. Henderson concludes that Slovakia is a unique case within the concept of Euroscepticism because of its past and domestic politics.

### 1.3 Peoples' knowledge about the EU and a lack thereof

Moving to the last topic of this chapter, there are different factors that influence peoples' thinking and decision-making. One of these possible factors explaining the attitudes, i.e. level of knowledge, is a subject of this subchapter but is directly linked to concepts discussed previously, namely public opinion and Euroscepticism. Many scholars considered the level of knowledge about the EU among the public as insufficient and as a cause of low and decreasing support for the EU, in other words as a cause of rising Euroscepticism. The lack of knowledge about EU affairs among many European citizens is unquestionable. However, the question to what extent it influences peoples' attitudes towards the EU has been contested in the literature. This discussion will be briefly introduced in this final subchapter.

The biggest survey of public opinions on the EU level, i.e. Eurobarometer, reported on the area of knowledge in spring 2016. 54 per cent of respondents answered positively when

asked if they understood how the EU works. 42 per cent of respondents did not understand and 4 per cent did not know. Despite the fact that most of the respondents answered positively, the number of respondents who did not understand how the EU works was still very high. Nevertheless, this is subjective knowledge. It means that the respondent defines the knowledge himself/herself. In the objective test of knowledge about the EU, i.e. respondents answering quiz questions, only 35 per cent of respondents were able to give 3 right answers to the 3 questions. Slovakia belonged to the more informed half. For the three questions posed, 78, 74 and 68 per cent of people answered correctly. These are some of the numbers that show that knowledge about the EU, among its citizens is indeed low. Next, the causes for this and its implications will be discussed briefly.

One of the first and most influential studies in the field of knowledge and education in relation to support for the EU was conducted by Ronald Inglehart in 1970. He proved his hypothesis that people exposed to more education and mass communications about the EU, thus possessing more information, were more likely to support European integration. Based on his data from several European countries, he argued that people with higher income and better education tended to favour the EU more and they also maintain their views even in times of crisis and other events. However, Inglehart argued that support for the EU depends on two steps, cognitive mobilization and internationalization of values. By this he meant that cognitive mobilization understood as a process of individual's increased capacity to cope with information related to political community is necessary, but not the only condition for securing support for the EU.

Since Inglehart's research in 1970, other scholars have conducted similar studies. Another, more recent study, questioned whether more knowledge generates more support for integration. Karp et al. argue that it can also generate bigger awareness of the flaws, especially the contested democratic deficit that the EU suffers from. (Karp et al. 2003, pp.275-276) Nevertheless, citizens should be more knowledgeable about the community they belong to, whether it increases support or not. In general, people who have a higher income or higher skill level, are better informed about the EU. (Clark 2014) Thus, we can observe that more educated people are more likely to demonstrate interest in the EU affairs compared to lower educated and low skilled people, Clark (2016) supported this claim after he conducted an empirical study, concluding that better educated, higher earning individuals tend to know more about politics. Thus, it has been proven that higher education leads to

better informed citizens, yet it does not necessarily lead to stronger support and a more positive attitude towards the EU.

Different research conducted by Verhaegen and Hooghe (2015) on whether more knowledge about the EU leads to a stronger European identity was not solely based on the explanatory power of cognitive mobilization, but involved two other approaches, an economic utilitarian explanation and a political trust explanation. They came to a conclusion that knowledge has 'a significant but limited effect on European identity'. In contrast, citizens' personal economic situation and trust in national political institutions are more important determinants. Their research focused on the relation between cognitive mobilization and economic and political trust explanations and the European identity, not directly the level of support for the EU. However, a stronger European identity undoubtedly means deeper support for European integration. Similar conclusions, particularly the economic situation of individuals playing an important role in the level of support of the EU, can be seen in some of the literature discussed in subchapter one. Such studies do not support the hypothesis that the level of knowledge concerning the EU influences the opinions and the rise of Euroscepticism to a great extent or not at all.

There are some studies dealing directly with the question as to what extent better education at primary or secondary levels would enhance the support of the EU. In general, it seems that the more information students get, the more capable they are of understanding and assessing the EU and consequently this should lead to greater support for the EU. Lödén et al. concluded that 'citizenship education ought to include the EU as an arena for political action and relevant "EU knowledge" ought to be part of the curriculum.' (2014, p. 386) This, according to them, would allow citizens to influence issues that are out of the reach of their nation-state. Furthermore, they argue that possessing knowledge about the EU is crucial for a functioning democracy and that more EU education would bring about more engagement of citizens in Union politics. However, even an increased amount of information about the EU in school curricula does not necessarily add to students' knowledge. Weisseno and Landwehr (2015) claim that successful political education depends on the students' interest in the subject. In other words, only if a student is generally interested in politics, then the student is able to increase his/hers understanding and widen their knowledge of politics.



Even though scholars do not agree to what extent, if at all, the level of knowledge influences the support for the EU or Euroscepticism among citizens, they all agree that more educated and better informed citizens are more interested and more likely to participate in the politics of the EU. Moreover, they all agree that more education about the EU is needed in order to understand this highly complex system of governance better. All in all, better educated people with higher level of knowledge about the EU are in better position to make sensible judgements.

### Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to introduce the main concepts and the main academics related to the theme of this thesis. This chapter might seem extensive with an attempt to cover many complicated and contested concepts. Nevertheless, it was needed in order to understand the complexity of the issues studied further in this thesis. There has been much controversy in all of the fields. However, some facts can be stated without any doubt. These include: People and their opinions are increasingly important within the EU; The rise of Euroscepticism over past couple of decades throughout all the EU member states has been self-evident until Brexit; The level of knowledge about the EU is very low; and the reasons and explanations for all three statements are very contested and need to be studied further. To add empirical evidence to these studies, we will examine the opinions and the level of objective knowledge of a group of last year high-school students from Slovakia in following chapters.



## Chapter 2

### Methods, Survey Design and Data

#### Introduction

The purpose of this thesis, as outlined in the introduction, is to explore the attitudes of the public. It aims to identify to what extent, if at all, the three phenomena; (1) the level of knowledge about the EU, (2) public opinions towards the EU and (3) the rise of Euroscepticism are interrelated or dependent. In other words, to what extent does the level of knowledge influence the opinions of peoples and what are the implications for the rise of Euroscepticism? This thesis intends to add empirical data to the existing research. This chapter describes the chosen research methods, explains and justifies the selection of the case study and describes the procedures of carrying out the research.

#### 2.1 The choice of Method

One of the best ways to determine peoples' knowledge and their attitudes is to create and carry out a survey. Survey research aims to understand causes behind some phenomena and find correlations between these and consequently make causal inferences, i.e. identify whether one variable influences another. Given that a survey research in a form of questionnaires was carried out, the data for this thesis' empirical part is of a primary character. Surveying is a specific methodological design used to collect data from a population or its sample. (Robson 2011) Hence, in order to choose the correct research design, quantitative methods are used here, since survey research is almost always of quantitative and positivistic character. Quantitative methods, even though criticised for being unimaginative, provide us with the hard empirical evidence which is vital for presenting facts in social science. Quantitative findings are considered accurate, valid and reliable. (Hague and Harrop 2013, pp.368-369) It has been argued that quantitative methods undoubtedly provide a valuable contribution to political research. Furthermore, researchers who are able to support their arguments with evidence are able to convince others about the value of their research more easily. (Burnham et al. 2004, p.82)

There are some limitations, however. The main weakness is the vast number of variables which make it difficult to determine causality or correlation. In certain cases, some of the variables are ignored in order to simplify research and in order to make some conclusions at all. (Pierce 2008, pp.44) For instance, a person's positive or negative attitude towards the EU might be caused by wider socio-economic background. However, if we want to focus our attention to the knowledge of this respondent, those socio-economic variables get ignored for this purpose. Other disadvantages of surveys need to be acknowledged too. Poor response rate, accuracy, inappropriate tools for the subject and different interpretation of questions by respondents are all very likely to occur while surveys are designed or carried out. (Robson 2011, pp.239-241) Moreover, we need to keep in mind that surveys provide us with only a snapshot of opinions at one time. (Burnham 2004, p.90)

## 2.2 Survey design

It was very important for the success of this thesis to design a good survey. First, the right wording of the questions is the primary focus so that the questions do not lead the responses so that they can reflect real differences. They must be as self-explanatory and concise as possible. Second, the length of the questionnaire must not be too excessive in order not to alienate the respondents. (Burnham et al. 2004, pp.95-98) Furthermore, testing the reliability of respondents' answers and the validity of the questions should be one of the first steps taken before carrying out the actual survey. Some of the sources of unreliability include bad wording of questions or error whilst coding. Validity tests focus on checking whether the questions measure what is intended to be measured. If reliability and validity are missing at that point there is a measurement error. Pilot testing can be used in order to avoid this error or increase reliability and validity. (de Vaus, 2002, pp.52-54) Nevertheless, it was not feasible, neither possible for the purposes of this thesis to conduct pilot testing.

The questionnaire consists of 14 questions. They are all anonymous in order to preserve the confidentiality of respondents. A logical flow to questions, including grouping questions into sections and a variety of questions formats, was designed for this survey. (de Vaus, 2002, pp.62-63, pp.110-111) Closed and scale questions were chosen as they are easier to administer and are more convenient. The scale questions are used to get better and more precise responses by giving respondent a bigger scale of answers to choose from. However, the limitation of closed question is that they do not allow the respondent to justify her choice

and the limitation of the scale question is that respondents interpret the questions subjectively and differently. (Pasek and Krosnick 2010)

The questionnaire is divided into 4 parts. The first part focuses on the sources of information the respondents have. The second part seeks to find out the opinions towards the EU. For the purposes of this thesis, two questions were posed in this part. The first deals with the opinion about the EU in general and the second question asks about Slovakia's membership in the EU. The same type of questions has been used in Eurobarometer surveys and in other public opinion studies. The third section of the questionnaire is designed to measure the level of knowledge of the respondents. Six questions were asked about the general and basic knowledge of the EU. More complex questions were eliminated. Four answers were offered for every knowledge question including one correct answer, two incorrect answers and one 'don't know' answer. The final part poses two questions about respondent's interests. The official design of the questionnaire in English language can be found attached in appendix A. The version used in the field was in Slovak language.

Lastly, after collecting the questionnaires from the schools in paper form, the data needed to be transferred to a numerical form in excel. The coding used in this thesis is not overly complicated due to the fact that all questions were closed-ended. Numerical and arbitrary coding is used to transfer the data collected from the questionnaires to excel form. For instance, for the first question asking about the sex of the respondent, answers were coded as follows: male=1; female=2; prefer not to say=3. The questions which have five answers were coded from 1 to 5. The answers for the knowledge questions were coded as follows: 1=correct answer; 2=incorrect answer; 3='don't know' answer. Non-response bias needs to be mentioned. If respondents do not answer one or several question in their surveys which happens to a great extent in several questionnaires, this would mean that the findings are biased and not valid. (Robson 2011, pp.260-261) Fortunately, the non-response rate in the questionnaires collected was very low and therefore do not affect the results. After all the data was successfully entered in the excel form and checked for errors, it was ready to be analysed.

### 2.3 The case study

The case study of Slovakia has been chosen on the basis of the European Parliament elections voter turnout in 2014. The turnout was only 13,05 per cent, which was the lowest among all the EU member states. (European Parliament 2016) Moreover, the public attitudes of Slovak citizens have been changing. The opinions towards Slovakia's membership of the EU being 'a good thing' has been decreasing over past seven years and membership being 'a bad thing' and 'neither bad nor good' has been increasing. (Eurobarometer 2016) These facts might indicate the rise of Euroscepticism. In addition, there is no extensive existing literature dealing with Slovakia and its citizens, as a case study within the EU member states research. One of the reasons for this is that Slovak people were and to some extent still are, usually considered one of the most optimistic about the EU among the member states. Despite the fact that Slovakia is seen as mostly pro-European country, its participation in the European Parliament elections has been the worst in the EU, never crossing more than 20 per cent turnout in the elections. The turnout in the national elections in Slovakia is significantly higher. In the last parliamentary elections in 2016 was 59,82 per cent. (SME 2017)

To further narrow down the sample for the purposes of this thesis, the group of students attending the last year of Slovak secondary grammar schools and vocational schools has been chosen. These students are usually 17, 18 or 19 years old. Studying the whole population of Slovakia or alternatively, bigger or more groups within the country is impossible due to the size and level of the thesis and resources available. The last year students of high schools have been chosen as they are still in schooling, hence they should have been in contact with the information relating the EU on a daily basis as part of their educational content in some study subjects. In addition, most of the last year students are eligible to vote and are in process of deciding whether to continue into further education or to enter the job market after graduation. Special attention to this group of the population was drawn in the last parliamentary elections in Slovakia in 2016. According to exit polls, almost 23 per cent of first time voters, i.e. most of them were last year students of high schools or recent graduates, voted for a far right party with some extremist expressions which subsequently gained seats in the parliament. This far right party, LS Naše Slovensko, was the one that gained the most votes from a total number of first time voters. (Onuferová and Čevela 2016) For these reasons mentioned, it is very important to study and understand this group of people.

## 2.4 Administering surveys and data collection

Since collecting data from all the secondary school last year students in Slovakia is not viable, a representative sample has been chosen. In order to obtain a representative sample of the students, the high schools contacted were chosen on the geographical basis and on the basis of the study content. There are eight regions in Slovakia with the number of high schools ranging from 121 to 204 in each of them. I contacted 10 to 13 schools from each region from different towns within that area. There is also a division among the schools depending on the content of the study programs. In Slovakia there are vocational schools, high schools with specialisation and secondary grammar schools. Only those schools where students finish their education with 'Maturitná skúška' (school leaving exam) were chosen to be contacted, as this is the level required for university admission. All types of schools, i.e. secondary grammar schools and vocational schools, were chosen proportionally to the total number of these schools in every region. The list of all schools divided according to regions and the study content was obtained from the website of Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic. ('Network of schools of the Slovak Republic', 2017)

In total, I contacted 87 schools via email or a phone. However, as was expected, the positive reply rate was very low. Some of the reasons schools gave for not being willing to take part in the research included, policies of the schools which were supported by parents of the students and no time or space for filling in the questionnaires in the school day. Nevertheless, most of the schools just simply did not respond. An additional problem that might occur while trying to achieve representative sample is discrimination within a sample. It is very likely that some groups of respondents are underrepresented in the sample or they are not present at all. This might be caused by the fact that we do not know the respondents' socio-economic background and it is overly complicated to determine it since these pieces of information about students are not freely available.

The final number of schools which were willing to participate in my research was twelve. This number was achieved after more detailed communication with the headmasters or teachers in these schools who administered the questionnaires with their students. The locations of these schools are spread throughout the territory of Slovakia, which means that geographical representative sample has been achieved. However, two regions are not

represented as no response was received from any of the schools. The variety in the types of schools has also been reached to some extent, though the highest response rate was obtained from secondary grammar schools. Students of seven secondary grammar schools and five vocational schools with different study focuses took part in the survey. The difference between secondary grammar schools and vocational schools is in the content of students' education. Secondary grammar schools are focused on more theoretical knowledge in all different study areas and they aim to prepare students mainly for continuing their education at the university level afterwards. Vocational schools, except the theoretical knowledge, focus on teaching practical skills which students can use in the job market right after graduating. According to statistics, students of secondary grammar schools have a higher employment rate and also higher university attendance than students who finished vocational school. (Tunega 2014)

To sum up, 87 schools were contacted. The response rate was low, approximately 20 per cent. However, not all schools which responded were willing to take part. The number of schools that took part in the surveys was 12. The total number of the questionnaires filled in and collected was 472. These questionnaires were transferred from paper form to excel numerical form. Finally, this data in excel will be analysed and explained in the next chapters.

## Chapter 3

### Empirical Part: Statistical Results

#### Introduction

The literature concerning the subjects of this thesis, i.e. public opinions towards the EU, the level of knowledge about the EU and Euroscepticism, is extensive as could be seen in chapter 2. Despite this, there is always a space to study these phenomena further. The case study as mentioned in previous chapters is Slovakia and last year students of high schools in Slovakia. The first part of this chapter reports the data from all schools generally. Consequently, it discusses more detailed differences between types of schools and regions. The second part looks at bivariate relationships between the questions posed in the questionnaires. It aims to determine the correlations between different outcomes.

#### 3.1 General results

To start the analysis of the data, this part will first state the results of collected information. It will be divided to parts according to the questions of the Questionnaire. Part A looks briefly at the gender of respondents. Part B deals with Questions 1 to 3 which ask about the sources of information the respondents have. Part C describes the Questions 4 and 5 which focus on respondents' opinions towards the EU. Part D analyses the answers to knowledge questions. Lastly, part E deals with the last two questions which ask about students' interest in the EU.

### A. Gender of respondents

The only question determining the demographic background of the respondents asked about their gender. As was mentioned in previous chapters, other demographic and socio-economic conditions of respondents have great impact on their opinions, knowledge and interest, yet asking more detailed questions about respondent's backgrounds was not viable for the purposes of this paper. Therefore, for the rest of the analysis most of the other possible independent variables will be overlooked. Table A.1 demonstrates the percentages of sex of the respondents. A considerably larger number of female took part in the survey. 61% of the respondents were female with just 36% being male. 3% of respondents preferred not to state their sex.

Table A.1 – Sex of respondents

<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	36%
Female	61%
Prefer not to say	3%
Total	100%



### B. The sources of information – Questions 1 to 3

The following tables show the percentage of all the responses to Questions 1, 2 and 3. The questions are as follows:

Q1: To what extent have you learnt about the EU in the school?

Q2: To what extent do you follow news and information about the EU? For example, in the newspapers, on the internet or on radio?

Q3: Do you talk about the EU at home with your family or with friends?

Respondents could choose the answer on a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being ‘A lot’ and 5 being ‘Not at all’.

Table B.1 demonstrates the answers of the total number of respondents (472) to Questions 1, 2 and 3. For Question 1, only 5% of students think they learn about the EU in the school ‘a lot’, but 20% chose response 2. Thus, answers 1 and 2 together demonstrate that 25% of students think they learn about the EU in the school a lot or enough. 40% chose answer 3 which is neutral. Again if we count 4 and 5 together as they are on the other side of the scale, 35% of students think they do not learn about the EU at school enough or at all. The answers for Question 2 are similar. 25% of students follow news and information about the EU a lot or to a certain extent and 30% are neutral. However, 45% of students do not follow any news and information about the EU or they do only to a limited extent. For Question 3, only 12% of students talk about the EU at home with family or friends. 20% are neutral. However, 68% of students do not talk about the EU at all or only to a limited extent. The numbers demonstrate that most of students do not talk about the EU and they do not follow news about it to a great extent.

Table B.1 – Questions 1, 2, 3 – all respondents (472)

Code	Response Item	Q1-Percentage	Q2-Percentage	Q3-Percentage
1	A lot	5%	6%	3%
2		20%	19%	9%
3		40%	30%	20%
4		29%	30%	34%
5	Not at all	6%	15%	34%
	Total	100%	100%	100%

Some differences between types of school might occur. This might be caused by different study content and focus between secondary grammar schools and vocational schools or by different socio-economic backgrounds of students attending these schools. Table B.2

shows the results for Questions 1, 2, 3 for secondary grammar schools and Table B.3 does the same for vocational schools. There are some differences between the two tables that need to be mentioned. First, students of secondary grammar schools think they learn less in school about the EU than the students of vocational schools. Only 18% of secondary grammar school students responded that they learn a lot while 34% of students of vocational schools think they learn a lot. On the other side, 46% of secondary grammar school students think they do not learn enough or not at all while only 18% of students think the same in vocational schools. One more noticeable difference is in the answers to Question 3. Only 26% of secondary grammar school students do not talk about the EU at home and with friends while there are 20% more of vocational school students who do not discuss the EU at all. Other differences in these tables are not significant.

Table B.2 – Questions 1, 2, 3 – secondary grammar schools (283)

Code	Response Item	Q1-Percentage	Q2-Percentage	Q3-Percentage
1	A lot	2%	6%	3%
2		16%	20%	12%
3		36%	31%	23%
4		39%	31%	36%
5	Not at all	7%	11%	26%
	Total	100%	100%	100%

Table B.3 – Questions 1, 2, 3 – vocational schools (189)

Code	Response Item	Q1-Percentage	Q2-Percentage	Q3-Percentage
1	A lot	8%	6%	4%
2		26%	17%	5%
3		47%	29%	14%
4		15%	28%	31%
5	Not at all	3%	20%	46%
	Total	100%	100%	100%

The last distinction in the answers of respondents is between three different regions of Slovakia. These are West, Centre and East. Some difference might occur among these regions due to the various socio-economic backgrounds of the people living here. Tables B.4, B.5 and B.6 demonstrate the results for Questions 1, 2 and 3 according to the regions of Slovakia. However, no substantial differences occurred in these tables. The percentage changes slightly in every answer, yet it is not striking. All three tables show similar results as Table B.1. The only odd number might be observed in Table B.5 for Question 1. The respondents from

Central Slovakia think they do not learn about the EU at all or not enough to a greater extent than the students from other two regions. However, the sample from Central Slovakia was the smallest, in fact only one school took part. Hence, inference for the entire region cannot be made.

Table B.4 – Questions 1, 2, 3 – Western Slovakia (270)

Code	Response Item	Q1-Percentage	Q2-Percentage	Q3-Percentage
1	A lot	5%	5%	2%
2		21%	21%	8%
3		39%	28%	21%
4		29%	33%	35%
5	Not at all	5%	13%	34%
	Total	100%	100%	100%

Table B.5 – Questions 1, 2, 3 – Central Slovakia (51)

Code	Response Item	Q1-Percentage	Q2-Percentage	Q3-Percentage
1	A lot	2%	4%	2%
2		8%	20%	22%
3		24%	39%	27%
4		53%	25%	29%
5	Not at all	14%	12%	20%
	Total	100%	100%	100%

Table B.6 – Questions 1, 2, 3 – Eastern Slovakia (151)

Code	Response Item	Q1-Percentage	Q2-Percentage	Q3-Percentage
1	A lot	5%	10%	5%
2		21%	16%	7%
3		48%	30%	15%
4		22%	25%	34%
5	Not at all	3%	19%	39%
	Total	100%	100%	100%

### C. The attitudes of students – Questions 4 and 5

The next section and tables in this section deal with the results for Questions 4 and 5. The questions are as follows:

Q4: Do you think the EU in general is ...?

Q5: Generally speaking, do you think that Slovakia's membership of the EU is ...?

Respondents could choose the answer from five options: 'A good thing'; 'More good than bad'; 'Neither good nor bad'; 'More bad than good'; 'A bad thing'.

Table C.1 depicts the opinions of all the students who took part in the survey. For Question 4, 22% of respondents think the EU is in general a good thing and as many as 46% believe that the EU is more good than bad. In total, 68% of respondents have positive view of the EU. 23% stayed neutral and think that the EU is neither good nor bad. Finally, only 9% of all respondents have negative attitudes towards the EU in general. 7% think that the EU is more bad than good and only 2% think that the EU is a bad thing. Very similar numbers of students think positively about Slovakia's membership in the EU. 31% think it is a good thing and 38% believe it is more good than bad. 17% of respondents chose the answer neither good nor bad. Whilst 9% think the membership is more bad than good and 4% think it is a bad thing. In total, 135 of the total number of respondents have negative attitudes towards Slovakia's membership of the EU. In general, it can be safely said that the attitudes among surveyed students are more on a positive side than a negative one.

Table C.1 – Questions 4 and 5 – all respondents (472)

Code	Response Item	Q4-Percentage	Q5-Percentage
1	A good thing	22%	31%
2	More good than bad	46%	38%
3	Neither good nor bad	23%	17%
4	More bad than good	7%	9%
5	A bad thing	2%	4%
	Total	100%	100%

The comparison of results between secondary grammar schools and vocational schools shows a difference between them. Table C.2 depicts answers from all the secondary

grammar schools to Questions 4 and 5 and Table C.3 does the same for all vocational schools. Students from secondary grammar schools are slightly more positive about the EU in general as well as about Slovakia's membership compared to students from vocational schools. 26% of students from secondary grammar schools think the EU is a good thing and 55% thinks it is more good than bad. Together, 81% of students from secondary grammar schools have positive view of the EU while only 48% of students from vocational schools have the same attitudes. On the other side, only 6% of secondary grammar school students think badly about the EU while 13% of students from vocational schools are negative about the EU. The largest amount of students from vocational schools, 39%, stayed neutral and chose the answer that the EU is neither good nor bad. Similar contrast can be observed for Question 5. 82% of students from secondary grammar schools are positive about Slovakia's membership compared to only 50% of students from vocational schools. By contrast, 24% of vocational school students are negative about Slovakia's membership compared to only 6% of secondary grammar school students.

Table C.2 – Questions 4 and 5 – secondary grammar schools (283)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Q4-Percentage</b>	<b>Q5-Percentage</b>
1	A good thing	26%	37%
2	More good than bad	55%	45%
3	Neither good nor bad	13%	12%
4	More bad than good	5%	5%
5	A bad thing	1%	1%
	Total	100%	100%

Table C.3 – Questions 4 and 5 – vocational schools (186)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Q4-Percentage</b>	<b>Q5-Percentage</b>
1	A good thing	16%	22%
2	More good than bad	32%	28%
3	Neither good nor bad	39%	26%
4	More bad than good	9%	15%
5	A bad thing	4%	9%
	Total	100%	100%

The differences among the regions do not seem to vary to a great extent for the Questions 4 and 5. Table C.4, C.5 and C.6 demonstrate the percentage of peoples' attitudes in these three regions. Despite the fact that the differences are only a few percent among individual numbers, the Eastern Slovakia seems to be slightly more negative towards the EU

than other two regions. For instance, positive attitudes towards the EU in general in Western Slovakia are expressed by 72% of respondents while in East they are 54%.

Table C.4 – Questions 4 and 5 – Western Slovakia (269)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Q4-Percentage</b>	<b>Q5-Percentage</b>
1	A good thing	23%	32%
2	More good than bad	49%	41%
3	Neither good nor bad	20%	16%
4	More bad than good	7%	9%
5	A bad thing	1%	3%
	Total	100%	100%

Table C.5 – Questions 4 and 5 – Central Slovakia (51)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Q4-Percentage</b>	<b>Q5-Percentage</b>
1	A good thing	31%	37%
2	More good than bad	55%	47%
3	Neither good nor bad	8%	6%
4	More bad than good	4%	8%
5	A bad thing	2%	2%
	Total	100%	100%

Table C.6 – Questions 4 and 5 – Eastern Slovakia (150)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Q4-Percentage</b>	<b>Q5-Percentage</b>
1	A good thing	17%	28%
2	More good than bad	37%	31%
3	Neither good nor bad	35%	23%
4	More bad than good	7%	11%
5	A bad thing	3%	7%
	Total	100%	100%

D. Knowledge about the EU – Questions 6 to 11

The following information demonstrates the answers of students to basic knowledge questions about the EU. These questions are as follows:

Q6: How many member states does the EU have?

Q7: Which institutions of the EU are involved in producing EU legislation (Regulations and Directives)?

Q8: What does ‘the free movement of persons’ within the EU mean?

Q9: Who is the current president of the European Council?

Q10: What is the Erasmus programme which is funded by the EU?

Q11: How much money per year does Slovakia approximately receive from the EU?

Respondents could choose from four options, one being correct, two incorrect and one ‘don’t know’.

Table D.1 demonstrates the percentage of correct, incorrect and don’t know answers of all surveyed respondents. Six various questions were posed to gain an understanding of the level of knowledge about the EU among students. Four questions out of six, Questions 6, 7, 8 and 10, clearly indicate that the general knowledge is high as the percentage of correct answers is higher than 70% in these cases. Most of the students knew how many member states the EU has, which institutions take part in producing EU legislation, what is ‘free movement of persons’ and what is Erasmus programme. For question 11, less people knew how much money per year Slovakia gets from the EU. 58% answered correctly, 11% incorrectly and 31% did not know. There was one question that students mostly answered incorrectly. Most of the respondents did not know who the current president of the European Council is. Only 30% of them answered correctly and 43% were incorrect.

Table D.1 – Questions 6 to 11 – all respondents (472)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Q6-Percentage</b>	<b>Q7-Percentage</b>	<b>Q8-Percentage</b>	<b>Q9-Percentage</b>	<b>Q10-Percentage</b>	<b>Q11-Percentage</b>
1	Correct	84%	72%	80%	30%	86%	58%
2	Incorrect	7%	17%	19%	43%	6%	11%
3	Don't know	9%	11%	2%	27%	8%	31%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Tables D.2 and D.3 show, separately, the responses to knowledge questions of secondary grammar schools and vocational schools. Looking at the numbers, there are no significant differences between these two types of schools despite their diverse content of studies.

Table D.2 – Questions 6 to 11 – secondary grammar schools (283)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Q6-Percentage</b>	<b>Q7-Percentage</b>	<b>Q8-Percentage</b>	<b>Q9-Percentage</b>	<b>Q10-Percentage</b>	<b>Q11-Percentage</b>
1	Correct	81%	74%	83%	24%	89%	60%
2	Incorrect	7%	15%	16%	50%	4%	12%
3	Don't know	12%	11%	1%	26%	7%	28%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table D.3 – Questions 6 to 11 – vocational schools (189)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Q6-Percentage</b>	<b>Q7-Percentage</b>	<b>Q8-Percentage</b>	<b>Q9-Percentage</b>	<b>Q10-Percentage</b>	<b>Q11-Percentage</b>
1	Correct	88%	69%	74%	39%	83%	54%
2	Incorrect	7%	20%	23%	32%	9%	11%
3	Don't know	5%	12%	3%	29%	8%	35%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Tables depicting the percentage of answers to knowledge questions according to the three regions provide us with no noticeable differences. Hence, it was not necessary to include these tables here. The regional analysis agrees with Table D.1 where all respondents' answers were analysed.



### E. Interest in the EU – Questions 12 and 13

The last two questions of the questionnaire sought to find out the interest of the students in the EU. The questions are as follows:

Q12: To what extent are you interested in the EU?

Q13: Would you like to learn/know more about the EU?

Respondents could choose from five options for each question. However, these options differed. For Question 12 the options were: ‘very interested’; ‘fairly interested’; ‘neutral’; ‘not very interested’; ‘not interested at all’. For Question 13 the options were: ‘definitely yes’; ‘maybe/a bit’; ‘neutral/don’t know’; ‘not really’; ‘definitely no’.

The last few tables focus on the interest in the EU. Table E.1 deals with all the respondents to Question 12. Only 3% of all respondents are very interested in the EU and 25% are fairly interested, whereas 29% are not very interested and 12% are not interested at all. 31% are neutral. As can be observed, students are not interested in the EU to great extent.

Table E.1 – Question 12 – all respondents (472)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1	Very interested	3%
2	Fairly interested	25%
3	Neutral	31%
4	Not very interested	29%
5	Not interested at all	12%
	Total	100%

Table E.2 includes the answers to Question 12 separately from secondary grammar schools and vocational schools, and from the three regions of Slovakia. The figures in the first two columns represent secondary grammar schools and vocational schools. A small difference can be noticed. Students of secondary grammar schools are slightly more interested, 3% very interested, 28% fairly interested and only 8% not interested at all, in the EU than students of vocational schools, 2% very interested, 19% fairly interested and 18% not interested at all. The differences between the regions are not very notable as can be seen in the last three columns of Table E.2.

Table E.2 – Question 12 – secondary grammar schools (283), vocational schools (189), Western Slovakia (270), Central Slovakia (51), Eastern Slovakia (151)

Code	Response Item	Sec.Gram. %	Vocation. %	West.Slov.%	Centr.Slov.%	East.Slov.%
1	Very interested	3%	2%	2%	4%	3%
2	Fairly Interested	28%	19%	25%	33%	21%
3	Neutral	29%	34%	31%	29%	30%
4	Not very interested	31%	27%	32%	25%	26%
5	Not interested at all	8%	18%	9%	8%	19%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table E.3 describes the answers of all respondents together to the very last question. 20% of surveyed students would definitely like to know or learn more about the EU and 37% would like to learn a little more. 16% are neutral or not decided. Only 5% of total number of respondents definitely does not want to know or learn more about the EU and 22% are not very interested in learning more. Overall, despite the fact that in previous question more students expressed that they are not very interested in the EU, they want to learn about it a little more.

Table E.3 – Question 13 – all respondents (472)

Code	Response Item	Percentage
1	definitely yes	20%
2	maybe/a little	37%
3	neutral/don't know	16%
4	not really	22%
5	definitely no	5%
	Total	100%

The last table of this section, Table E.4, depicts the answers to Question 13 separately from secondary grammar schools and vocational schools and from the three regions. There is again a small variation between secondary grammar school students and vocational school students. 65% of students from secondary grammar schools either want to learn about the EU definitely or maybe a little bit compared to 45% of students from vocational school. Where the regions are concerned, there are no significant differences once again. The only difference is that students from Eastern Slovakia are very slightly less interested in learning more about the EU than other two regions according to numbers in the last three columns of Table E.4.

Table E.4 – Question 13 - secondary grammar schools (283), vocational schools (189),  
Western Slovakia (270), Central Slovakia (51), Eastern Slovakia (151)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response Item</b>	<b>Sec.Gram.%</b>	<b>Vocation.%</b>	<b>West.Slov.%</b>	<b>Cent.Slov.%</b>	<b>East.Slov.%</b>
1	definitely yes	25%	12%	20%	35%	15%
2	maybe/a little	40%	33%	40%	43%	31%
3	neutral/don't know	14%	19%	14%	14%	20%
4	not really	17%	30%	23%	4%	26%
5	definitely no	4%	6%	3%	4%	9%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### 3.2 Bivariate analysis

This section allows us to analyse possible relations and determine correlation between two sets of values. Bivariate analysis is a simple form of statistical analysis using cross tabulation in Excel. First, the cross tabulation between opinion questions (Question 4 and Question 5) and knowledge questions (Question 6 to Question 11) will be analysed. Second, the rest of the questions will be analysed in relation with Question 4 and 5 in order to see to what extent, if at all, these questions influence attitudes. Last, other correlations between the questions will be described. Many small tables will be included in this section as there was no other way to include all the data which would still allow us to read and understand the results easily.

a. Correlation between attitudes (Questions 4 and 5) and knowledge questions (Questions 6 to 11)

Tables a.1 to a.6 show the correlation between answers for Question 4 and for all six knowledge questions. The strongest correlation is highlighted in every table. Five out of six tables bring us to the same finding that most of the students who answered the knowledge questions correctly also think that the EU is generally more good than bad. The only differing table is Table a.5, which analyses knowledge Question 9 and as was mentioned in previous subchapter, most of the students did not answer this question correctly. Hence, the largest number of students who answered Question 9 incorrectly also think that the EU is more good than bad. The only significant correlation here is answering knowledge questions correctly and thinking that the EU is more good than bad. All the other numbers in tables do not provide us with any notable relations between answers.

Tables a.1 (Q4-Q6), a.2 (Q4-Q7), a.3 (Q4-Q8), a.4 (Q4-Q9), a.5 (Q4-Q10), a.6 (Q4-Q11)

Count of ID-ALL	Q6					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q7					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q8					Grand Total
Q4	1	2	3	(blank)			Q4	1	2	3	(blank)		Q4	1	2	3	(blank)			
1	92	5	6			103	1	76	19	8		103	1	89	12	1	1		103	
2	179	15	21			215	2	154	35	25	1	215	2	168	42	5			215	
3	90	10	10			110	3	80	18	12		110	3	84	22	3	1		110	
4	25	2	4			31	4	20	5	6		31	4	23	8				31	
5	5	2	2	1		10	5	5	2	3		10	5	9	1				10	
(blank)	3					3	(blank)	3				3	(blank)	1	2				3	
Grand Total	394	34	43	1		472	Grand Total	338	79	54	1	472	Grand Total	374	87	9	2		472	

  

Count of ID-ALL	Q9					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q10					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q11					Grand Total
Q4	1	2	3	(blank)			Q4	1	2	3	(blank)		Q4	1	2	3	(blank)			
1	32	47	24			103	1	90	6	7		103	1	61	9	33			103	
2	54	95	64	2		215	2	190	8	17		215	2	129	27	59			215	
3	42	39	29			110	3	94	8	8		110	3	55	10	45			110	
4	8	15	8			31	4	25	3	3		31	4	18	4	8	1		31	
5	3	5	2			10	5	7	1	2		10	5	6	3	1			10	
(blank)	2		1			3	(blank)	2	1			3	(blank)	2		1			3	
Grand Total	141	201	128	2		472	Grand Total	408	27	37		472	Grand Total	271	53	147	1		472	

The following tables demonstrate the relations between the second attitude question, Question 5 and the answers for all the knowledge questions again. The tables a.7 to a.12 show the same findings as the previous tables. The strongest correlation is between the correct answers for knowledge questions and the opinion that membership of Slovakia in the EU is more good than bad. Other relations between answers are not significant.

Table a.7 (Q5-Q6), a.8 (Q5-Q7), a.9 (Q5-Q8), a.10 (Q5-Q9), a.11 (Q5-Q10), a.12 (Q5-Q11)

Count of ID-ALL	Q6					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q7					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q8					Grand Total
Q5	1	2	3	(blank)			Q5	1	2	3	(blank)		Q5	1	2	3	(blank)			
1	127	7	12			146	1	113	22	11			1	120	22	3		1	146	
2	151	14	14			179	2	125	30	24			2	146	28	4		1	179	
3	68	8	6			82	3	55	17	9		1	3	65	15	2			82	
4	31	2	10			43	4	30	9	4			4	28	15				43	
5	14	3	1		1	19	5	12	1	6			5	15	4				19	
(blank)	3					3	(blank)	3					(blank)	3					3	
Grand Total	394	34	43		1	472	Grand Total	338	79	54		1	472	Grand Total	374	87	9	2	472	

  

Count of ID-ALL	Q9					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q10					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q11					Grand Total
Q5	1	2	3	(blank)			Q5	1	2	3	(blank)		Q5	1	2	3	(blank)			
1	43	67	36			146	1	132	5	9			1	91	16	39			146	
2	52	81	45			179	2	157	8	14			2	100	18	61			179	
3	26	29	26		1	82	3	65	9	8			3	45	10	26		1	82	
4	12	17	14			43	4	34	3	6			4	21	7	15			43	
5	6	7	6			19	5	18	1				5	12	2	5			19	
(blank)	2		1			3	(blank)	2	1				(blank)	2		1			3	
Grand Total	141	201	128		2	472	Grand Total	408	27	37			472	Grand Total	271	53	147		1	472

b. Correlation between attitudes (Questions 4 and 5) and the questions dealing with sources of information (Questions 1, 2 and 3)

In this part, the attempt was to find a relationship between attitudes and whether students think they learn about the EU in school a lot or not at all, if students follow news about the EU or if they talk about the EU with family or friends. There were no significant correlations found for any of these questions combinations. In other words, first, whether the students think they learn a lot or not at all about the EU at school does not correlate with their opinions about the EU. Second, whether the students follow news and information about the EU does not correlate with their opinions about it and last, talking about the EU at home with family or friends does not correlate with their attitudes. To illustrate these findings only one table from this analysis is included. Table b.1 shows the strongest relation that was found in all six tables. It is correlation between Question 4 and Question 1. The rest of the values in the other tables showed no stronger relations than the one in Table b.1. Hence, these surveyed students' attitudes towards the EU does not correlate with either how much they think they learn at school about the EU, with how much they follow news about the EU or with how much they talk about the EU with friends and family.

Table b.1 – Question 4 and 1

Count of ID-ALL	Q1					Grand Total
Q4	1	2	3	4	5	
1	4	24	36	31	8	103
2	6	37	96	68	8	215
3	7	26	46	26	5	110
4	3	6	8	11	3	31
5	2	1	3	2	2	10
(blank)	1		1	1		3
Grand Total	23	94	190	139	26	472

c. Correlation between attitudes (Question 4 and 5) and the interest in the EU (Questions 12 and 13)

This section looks at relationships between the attitudes towards the EU and whether the students are interested in it at all or if they would like to learn more about it. Similarly like in the previous part b., there were no significant correlations found between the opinions about the EU and the interest in it. The strongest correlation found is demonstrated in Table c.1. It is correlation between Question 4 and 13. Most of the respondents who think the EU is generally more good than bad, would also like to learn a little more about it. Other tables expressing correlations between Questions 4 and 5 and Questions 12 and 13 are not needed to be included as there were no notable relations found in them.

Table c.1 – Question 4 and 13

Count of ID-ALL	Q13					Grand Total
	Q4	1	2	3	4	
1	34	38	15	14	2	103
2	44	95	33	37	6	215
3	12	28	21	42	7	110
4	3	11	5	10	2	31
5	1	2	1	1	5	10
(blank)		2			1	3
Grand Total	94	176	75	104	23	472



d. Correlation between the sources of information (Questions 1, 2 and 3) and knowledge questions (Questions 6 to 11)

This section aims to determine the correlation between the answers to knowledge questions and questions dealing with the sources of information the respondents have. Tables d.1 to d.6 show correlation between six knowledge questions and Question 1. The strongest correlation in almost all of the tables is between neutral answer to the question about how much the students think they learn about the EU in school and correct answers to knowledge questions. In other words, most of the students who answered correctly to knowledge questions also think that they do not learn about to EU neither a lot nor not at all.

Tables d.1 (Q1-Q6), d.2 (Q1-Q7), d.3 (Q1-Q8), d.4 (Q1-Q9), d.5 (Q1-Q10), d.6 (Q1-Q11)

Count of ID-ALL	Q6					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q7					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q8					Grand Total
Q1	1	2	3	(blank)			Q1	1	2	3	(blank)		Q1	1	2	3	(blank)			
1	21	1			1	23	1	21	2			23	1	20	3				23	
2	85	6	3			94	2	67	15	12		94	2	74	18	1	1		94	
3	158	15	17			190	3	128	36	25	1	190	3	149	36	5			190	
4	111	10	18			139	4	106	20	13		139	4	113	23	2	1		139	
5	19	2	5			26	5	16	6	4		26	5	18	7	1			26	
Grand Total	394	34	43	1		472	Grand Total	338	79	54	1	472	Grand Total	374	87	9	2		472	

  

Count of ID-ALL	Q9					Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q10				Grand Total	Count of ID-ALL	Q11					Grand Total
Q1	1	2	3	(blank)			Q1	1	2	3		Q1	1	2	3	(blank)			
1	8	10	5			23	1	21	1	1	23	1	13	3	7			23	
2	33	36	24		1	94	2	80	7	7	94	2	55	12	27			94	
3	59	79	52			190	3	164	9	17	190	3	101	21	68			190	
4	32	63	43		1	139	4	123	8	8	139	4	87	11	40	1		139	
5	9	13	4			26	5	20	2	4	26	5	15	6	5			26	
Grand Total	141	201	128	2		472	Grand Total	408	27	37	472	Grand Total	271	53	147	1		472	

The next six tables show the relations between knowledge questions and Question 2. A small difference can be observed in tables d.7 to d.12 compared to tables in previous part. More respondents who answered knowledge questions correctly also stayed neutral about following the news about the EU or said that they do not follow news about the EU to a great extent.

Tables d.7 (Q2-Q6), d.8 (Q2-Q7), d.9 (Q2-Q8), d.10 (Q2-Q9), d.11 (Q2-Q10), d.12 (Q2-Q11)

Count of ID-ALL	Q6					Grand Total
Q2	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	26	3		1		30
2	72	10	8			90
3	127	6	9			142
4	118	11	11			140
5	51	4	15			70
Grand Total	394	34	43	1		472

Count of ID-ALL	Q7					Grand Total
Q2	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	22	6	2			30
2	69	16	4	1		90
3	102	24	16			142
4	104	19	17			140
5	41	14	15			70
Grand Total	338	79	54	1		472

Count of ID-ALL	Q8					Grand Total
Q2	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	29	1				30
2	73	14	2	1		90
3	104	34	3	1		142
4	116	24				140
5	52	14	4			70
Grand Total	374	87	9	2		472

Count of ID-ALL	Q9					Grand Total
Q2	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	10	16	4			30
2	28	44	17	1		90
3	48	61	32	1		142
4	32	60	48			140
5	23	20	27			70
Grand Total	141	201	128	2		472

Count of ID-ALL	Q10				Grand Total
Q2	1	2	3		
1	28	2			30
2	77	7	6		90
3	122	9	11		142
4	123	6	11		140
5	58	3	9		70
Grand Total	408	27	37		472

Count of ID-ALL	Q11					Grand Total
Q2	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	25	3	2			30
2	61	10	19			90
3	83	16	42	1		142
4	75	16	49			140
5	27	8	35			70
Grand Total	271	53	147	1		472

The last tables in this section, the tables d.13 to d.18, describe the relations between knowledge questions and Question 3. The strongest correlation is between the correct answer in knowledge questions and answers 4 and 5 in Question 3. This means that a certain amount of students who answered knowledge questions correctly also answered that they do not talk about the EU to a great extent or not at all with their friends and family. There are no other strong correlations between individual answers.

Tables d.13 (Q3-Q6), d.14 (Q3-Q7), d.15 (Q3-Q8), d.16 (Q3-Q9), d.17 (Q3-Q10), d.18 (Q3-Q11)

Count of ID-ALL	Q6					Grand Total
Q3	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	12	1	2			15
2	36	2	4			42
3	76	9	6		1	92
4	138	10	13			161
5	130	11	18			159
(blank)	2	1				3
Grand Total	394	34	43		1	472

Count of ID-ALL	Q7					Grand Total
Q3	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	13	1	1			15
2	29	8	5			42
3	72	13	7			92
4	116	28	16		1	161
5	105	29	25			159
(blank)	3					3
Grand Total	338	79	54		1	472

Count of ID-ALL	Q8					Grand Total
Q3	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	12	3				15
2	32	8	2			42
3	76	15	1			92
4	133	24	2		2	161
5	121	34	4			159
(blank)		3				3
Grand Total	374	87	9		2	472

Count of ID-ALL	Q9					Grand Total
Q3	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	6	7	2			15
2	6	22	12		2	42
3	27	44	21			92
4	48	70	43			161
5	52	57	50			159
(blank)	2	1				3
Grand Total	141	201	128		2	472

Count of ID-ALL	Q10					Grand Total
Q3	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	13	1	1			15
2	37	2	3			42
3	84	4	4			92
4	133	13	15			161
5	138	7	14			159
(blank)	3					3
Grand Total	408	27	37			472

Count of ID-ALL	Q11					Grand Total
Q3	1	2	3	(blank)		
1	7	5	3			15
2	30	3	9			42
3	64	6	22			92
4	82	21	58			161
5	85	18	55		1	159
(blank)	3					3
Grand Total	271	53	147		1	472

- e. Correlation between the sources of information (Questions 1, 2 and 3) and the interest in the EU (Questions 12 and 13)

The very last part of bivariate analysis focuses on a relation between sources of information and the interest in the EU. There are no notably significant correlations between any of the answers. The strongest relation is found in table e.1 where students do not think that they learn a lot or not at all (answer 3) but they would like to learn about the EU a little bit more. The correlations in other tables are not that significant. All the findings from this empirical part will be further discussed in the next chapter in order to examine the implications and make conclusions of the findings.

Table e.1 – Question 1 and 13

Count of ID-ALL	Q13					
Q1	1	2	3	4	5	Grand Total
1	1	12	4	5	1	23
2	18	37	14	23	2	94
3	32	76	28	43	11	190
4	36	41	27	30	5	139
5	7	10	2	3	4	26
Grand Total	94	176	75	104	23	472

## Chapter 4

### Concluding Discussion

The analysis of statistical results in the previous chapter leads us to several conclusions, findings and implications. First, this final part will conclude the section 3.1 and 3.2 of previous chapter and will focus on the findings. Lastly, it will draw broader implications in relation with the literature mentioned in chapter 1 and provide concluding thoughts for this thesis including an explicit answer to the research question.

The general results described in chapter 3, section 3.1 provided us with some findings. First of all, demographic and socio-economic conditions of respondents were overlooked to a certain extent despite the fact that they play very important role in the opinion formation. Second, the students do not talk about the EU very much nor do they follow news about the EU to a great extent. There is a difference between students from secondary grammar schools and vocational schools. More students from secondary grammar schools think they do not learn about the EU much at school and also more of them talk about the EU at home with friends and family compared to students from vocational schools. There are no significant differences between different regions.

Next, important results about the attitudes of respondents demonstrate they are generally positive towards the EU and also towards Slovakia's membership in it. Again, there is a difference between secondary grammar schools and vocational schools. Students from secondary grammar schools are more positive about the EU. In addition, slightly more people in Western Slovakia are more positive about the EU than people from Eastern Slovakia.

The level of knowledge among the students is fairly high. Most of students answered most of the knowledge questions correctly. The rate of correct answers was more than 70% except for one question where only 30% of students knew who the current president of the European Council is. It is interesting to mention is that there were no significant differences between secondary grammar schools and vocational schools despite the content difference of the curricula. Last in this section, the findings about interests of students show that they are not interested in the EU almost at all. However, despite this, they would like to learn more about

it. Again secondary grammar school students are more interested in learning more about the EU than vocational school students.

The results of the bivariate analysis in section 3.2 in the previous chapter provide us only with a limited number of findings. The correlation between the attitudes and knowledge of respondents was the strongest in the case of people answering knowledge questions correctly and thinking that the EU is more good than bad and Slovakia's membership in it too. The next mild correlation was found between respondents thinking that the EU is more good than bad, and them wanting to learn more about the EU. The correlations between the sources of information and knowledge brings us to findings that many students answering correctly also do not follow news about the EU greatly nor do they talk about the EU at home with family and friends. The last correlation found was between people who do not think they learn about the EU a lot nor not at all, most of these people would like to learn about the EU little bit more. No other significant correlations were found in the bivariate analysis. In order to determine the correlations better, a much bigger number of respondents would be needed.

By all means, these empirical findings lead us to discuss their implications in relation with the already existing research. One of the main aims of this thesis was to find out to what extent does the level of knowledge influences the attitudes towards the EU. The findings demonstrate that most of surveyed students who have positive view about the EU also knew the correct answers. However, this cannot be contrasted with the people who have low level of knowledge as most of respondents seem to have at least the basic level of knowledge. Most of the literature has agreed that there is a significant gap in citizens' knowledge about the EU. These findings do not agree to a great extent. However, determining the level of objective knowledge among people is very difficult. The last year students of high schools in Slovakia are quite knowledgeable about the EU which corresponds to the spring 2016 Eurobarometer research which showed that Slovakia belongs to more knowledgeable half of the entire EU.

The second aim is to look at the attitudes and what influences them. It is clear that this studied sample of students has more positive opinions about the EU than negative. However, more striking is that even though they are positive about the EU, they also are very uninterested in it or often choose to answer neutrally to questions relating the EU. This demonstrates a great level of indifference towards the EU. In the literature review, the

indifferent people were believed to be less knowledgeable about the EU. In this studied group, people are knowledgeable but indifferent. Furthermore, a large amount of literature came to the similar conclusions that individual economic situation/‘subjective economy’/‘egocentric utilitarianism’ are often the main determinant of citizen’s attitudes towards the EU. Hence, this theory should be tested in the future research as the economic conditions of the surveyed group were neglected for the purposes of this thesis.

The third main aim of the thesis was to determine the extent of Euroscepticism present in Slovakia among young people. We can clearly state that there is almost no presence of hard Euroscepticism. Soft Euroscepticism can be observed to a certain extent. This is mainly caused recently by the refugee crisis and the refugee quotas that all V4 countries strongly opposed. The opposition mainly comes from the historical memory that an outsider wants to impose rules on Slovakia and bring something to the country Slovaks do not want and not from direct criticism of the EU policies. Thus, Slovak people stay optimistic as they have always been about the EU because they realise the benefits Slovakia gets to a certain extent. However, they also stay very indifferent as they do not show interest in the EU, as can be seen in their political participation, i.e. the EP election turnout. In the words of Miroslav Lajčák, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Slovakia: ‘Euroscepticism in Slovakia is only a pose which has no rational foundation.’ (TASR 2014)

The answer for the research question of this thesis is as follows: (1) The knowledge about the EU among surveyed students is high as more than 70% of students answered questions correctly. However, it is important to remember that the questions posed were very basic and general. (2) The opinions towards the EU among these students are fairly positive. More than 60% answered the attitude questions in positive way. (3) The conclusions from these findings towards explaining the rise of Euroscepticism provide us with the argument that young students in Slovakia are not Eurosceptic almost at all. Thus, the findings show that there is presence of rising Euroscepticism only to a limited extent when considering the opinions of the people. Nevertheless, looking at the indifference of the respondents towards the EU can provide us with the argument that the rise of Euroscepticism in Slovakia is mainly based on the fact that people do not care about it to a great extent.

To sum up, the surveyed group seems to be well informed about the EU and have mostly positive views about the EU, yet they are not interested in it to a great extent. However, the

surveyed students are quite interested in learning more about the EU despite the fact that EU affairs do not belong among their top fields of interest. Thus, citizens should become more educated about the community that they belong to and which influences their lives on daily basis no matter if it increases support for the EU or not. More educated people are more likely to show an interest in the EU. Higher education leads to better informed citizens. In other words, if more civic education is provided, citizens understand the functioning and the role of the EU better and thus are more capable of political participation and influencing decision-making which has a direct effect on their lives. In general, a person with a higher socio-economic background is more likely to vote and participate in EU politics. This also translates to diminishing the democratic deficit from the socio-psychological perspective once citizens start taking part in politics to a greater extent. Hence, the studied group of students in this thesis should be resurveyed in few years. This should be done after those who decided to go to higher education have finished it successfully and the rest have entered job market after finishing the high school. This new research would provide us not only with evidence to test the theory of a difference between higher and lower educated people but also between higher and lower income people. Moreover, open-ended questions should be used in further research for knowledge questions as they are believed to indicate the level of knowledge in a more credible way. (Clark 2014, p.459)



## Bibliography

Azrout, R. and Van Spanje, J. and De Vreese, C. 2012. *When News Matters: Effects on Public Support For European Union Enlargement in 21 Countries*. Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol.50(5), pp.691-708.

BBC. 2016. *Euroscepticism on rise in Europe, poll suggests*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36471989>.

Burnham, P. and Lutz, K. G. and Grant, W. and Layton-Henry, Z. 2004. *Research Methods in Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chrysochoou, D. N. 2010. *Europe's Contested Democracy*. In: Cini, M. and Perez-Solorzano Borraran, N. *European Union Politics*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 377-389.

Cini, M. and Perez-Solorzano Borraran, N. *European Union Politics*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clark, N. 2014. *The EU's Information Deficit: Comparing Political Knowledge across Levels of Governance*. Perspectives on European Politics and Society, Vol.15(4), pp.445-463.

Clark, N. 2016. *Explaining Political Knowledge: The Role of Procedural Quality in an Informed Citizenry*. Political Studies, Vol.65(1), pp.61-80.

Coicaud, J. M. 1997. *Legitimacy and Politics. A Contribution to the Study of Political Right and Political Responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalton, R. J. and Eichenberg, R. C. 1998. *Citizens Support for Policy Integration*. In: Sandholtz, W. R. and Sweet, A. S. *European Integration and Supranational Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.250-282.

de Vaus, D. 2002. *Surveys in Social Research*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Routledge.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2017. *Public Opinion*. [Online] Available at: <http://academic.eb.com/levels/collegiate/article/public-opinion/109460>.

Eurobarometer, 2016. *Public Opinion*. [Online] Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Chart/getChart/chartType/lineChart/themeKy/3/groupKy/3/savFile/47>.

European Parliament, 2016. *Results of the 2014 European Elections*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2014-results/en/turnout.html>.

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

Gabel, M. and Whitten, G. D. 1997. *Economic Conditions, Economic Perceptions, and Public Support for European Integration*. *Political Behavior*, Vol.19(1), pp.81-96.

Grabbe, H. and Hughes, K. 1999. *Central and East European Views on EU Enlargement: political debates and public opinion*. In: Henderson, K. *Back to Europe. Central and Eastern Europe and the European Union*. London: UCL Press, pp.185-202.

Hague, R. and Harrop, M. 2013. *Comparative Government and Politics. An introduction*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Halikiopoulou, D. and Vasilopoulou, S. 2014. *Support for the Far Right in the 2014 European Parliament Elections: A Comparative Perspective*. *The Political Quarterly*, Vol.85(3), pp.285-288.

Henderson, K. 2008. *The Slovak Republic: Eurosceptics and Phoney Europhiles*. In: Szczerbiak, A. and Taggart, P. A. *Opposing Europe?: the Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism. Case Studies and Country Surveys*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.277-294.

Hix, S . 1999. *The Political System of the European Union*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Hunt, A. and Wheeler, B. 2017. *Brexit: All you need to know about the UK leaving the EU*. BBC. [Online] Available at: <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887>.

Information Guide. 2013. *Euroscepticism*. European Sources Online. Cardiff University European Documentation Centre.

Inglehart, R. 1970. *Cognitive Mobilization and European Identity*. *Comparative Politics*, Vol.3(1), pp.45-70.

Karp, J. A. and Banducci, S. A. and Bowler, S. 2003. *To Know It Is to Love It? Satisfaction with Democracy in the European Union*. *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol.36(3), pp.271-292.

Kopecky, P. and Mudde, C. 2002. *Two Sides of Euroscepticism. Party Positions on European Integration in East Central Europe*. *European Union Politics*, Vol.3(3), pp. 297-326.

Lödén, H. and McCallion, M. S. and Wall, P. 2014. *Teaching Citizenship: What if the EU Is Part of the Solution and Not the Problem?* Journal of Political Science Education, Vol.10, pp.386-399.

Lukášová, R. and Franková, E. and Onduferová Voľanská, Z. 2015. *Attitudes of Czech and Slovak Students of Economy Oriented Universities to the European Union.* Trends Economics and Management, Vol.9(22), pp.26-37.

McCormick, J. 2011. *Understanding the European Union. A Concise Introduction.* 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

McLaren, L. M. 2010. *Public Opinion and the EU.* In: Cini, M. and Perez-Solorzano Borrigan, N. *European Union Politics.* 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 391-404.

Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic. 2017. *Network of schools of the Slovak Republic.* [Online] Available at: <https://www.minedu.sk/siet-skol-a-skolskych-zariadeni-slovenskej-republiky/>.

Newton, K. and Van Deth, J. W. 2016. *Foundations of Comparative Politics.* 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Onuferová, M. and Čevela, J. 2016. *Koho najviac krížkovali, kolko budeme mať v parlamente žien a koho volili prvovoliči.* Dennik N. [Online] Available at: <https://dennikn.sk/396015/koho-kruzkovali-kolko-mat-parlamente-zien-koho-volili-prvovolic/>.

Pasek, J. and Krosnick, J. A. 2010. *Optimizing Survey Questionnaires Design in Political Science: Insights from Psychology.* In: Leighley, J. E. *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.28-51.

Pierce, R. 2008. *Research Methods in Politics. A practical guide.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Robson, C. 2011. *Real World Research.* 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Schmitt, H. and van der Eijk, C. 2008. *There is Not Much Eurosceptic Non-Voting in European Parliament Elections.* In: Szczerbiak, A. and Taggart, P. A. *Opposing Europe?: the Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism. Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.208-237.

Scruton, R. 2007. *Dictionary of Political Thought.* 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sinnott, R. 2000. *European Parliament Elections : Institutions, Attitudes, and Participation*. In: Angé, H. et al. *Citizens Participation in European Politics*. Stockholm: Statens Offentliga Utredningar, pp.57-74.

SME. 2017. *Parlamentné voľby 2016 – výsledky*. [Online] Available at: <https://volby.sme.sk/parlamentne-volby/2016/vysledky>.

Standard Eurobarometer 85. Spring 2016. *Public Opinion in the European Union*. European Commission. [Online] Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/2130>.

Startin, N. 2015. *Have we reached a tipping point? The mainstreaming of Euroscepticism in the UK*. *International Political Science Review*, Vol.36(3), pp.311-323.

Stoeckel, F. 2012. *Ambivalent or indifferent? Reconsidering the structure of EU public opinion*. *European Union Politics*, Vol.14(1), pp.23-45.

Szczerbiak, A. and Taggart, P. A. 2008. *Opposing Europe?: the comparative party politics of Euroscepticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TASR, 2014. *M. Lajčák: Euroskepticizmus v SR je póza, ktorá nemá racionálny základ*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.teraz.sk/slovensko/lajcak-euroskepticizmus-freso/83198-clanok.html>.

The Economist, 2016. *Illiberal Central Europe. Big, Bad Visegrad*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.economist.com/news/europe/21689629-migration-crisis-has-given-unsettling-new-direction-old-alliance-big-bad-visegrad>.

Treib, O. 2014. *The voter says no, but nobody listens: causes and consequences of the Eurosceptic vote in the 2014 European elections*. *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol.21(10), pp.1541-1554.

Tunega, M. 2014. *Dáte svoje dieťa na gymnázium alebo odbornú školu?* INEKO. Blog SME. [Online] Available at: <https://ineko.blog.sme.sk/c/367885/date-svoje-dieta-na-gymnazium-alebo-odbornu-skolu.html>.

Verhaegen, S. and Hooghe, M. 2015. *Does more knowledge about the European Union lead to a stronger European identity? A comparative analysis among adolescents in 21 European member states*. *The European Journal of Social Science Research*, Vol. 28(2), pp.127-146.

Virostokova, L. 2014. *Slovakia's eurosceptics end EU honeymoon*. Euobserver. [Online] Available at: <https://euobserver.com/eu-elections/123960>.

Wagstyl, S. 2016. *Support for EU rises since Brexit vote, survey shows*. Financial Time. [Online] Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/9cfdad52-ada7-11e6-9cb3-bb8207902122>.

Weisseno, G. and Landwehr, B. 2015. *Knowledge about the European Union in Political Education: What are the Effects of Motivational Predispositions and Cognitive Activation?* McGill Journal of Education, Vol.50(2-3), pp.413-432.

Wessels, B. 2007. *Discontent and European Identity: Three Types of Euroscepticism*. Acta Politica, vol.42, pp.287-306.

## Appendix A

### Design of the Questionnaire used in the research:

#### QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out the relationship, if there is any, between the knowledge about and the opinions on the European Union (EU). The data collected will be used in the Master thesis.

This questionnaire is completely anonymous. For the results of this research to be the most objective and reliable, you are kindly asked to respond to the questions truly and individually without discussing it with your fellow course mates and without using the internet. This questionnaire consists of 3 pages.

Please choose your sex:  Male  Female  Prefer not to say

To start with, please tell me where you get the information from, if any, about the EU.

1. To what extent have you learnt about the EU in the school?

A lot      Not at all

2. To what extent do you follow news and information about the EU? For example, in the newspapers, on the internet or on radio?

A lot      Not at all

3. Do you talk about the EU at home with your family or with friends?

A lot      Not at all

Let me ask you about your opinions towards the EU.

4. Do you think the EU in general is ...?

- A good thing
- More good than bad
- Neither good nor bad
- More bad than good
- A bad thing

5. Generally speaking, do you think that Slovakia's membership of the EU is ...?

- A good thing
- More good than bad
- Neither good nor bad
- More bad than good
- A bad thing

Now, let me ask you questions about your knowledge of the EU. You are provided with four options, please choose only one option to answer and please remember to answer truly without consulting the answers in order for the study to be objective and valuable.

6. How many member states does the EU have?

- a.  18
- b.  30
- c.  28
- d.  don't know

7. Which institutions of the EU are involved in producing EU legislation (Regulations and Directives)?
- a.  the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council
  - b.  the European Commission, the European Central Bank and the European Parliament
  - c.  the European Council, the European Court of Auditors and the European Court of Justice
  - d.  don't know
8. What does 'the free movement of persons' within the EU mean?
- a.  the right to travel in any EU country with some constraints
  - b.  the right to move freely to any country in the world
  - c.  the right to travel, work and live in any EU country without constraints
  - d.  don't know
9. Who is the current president of the European Council?
- a.  Robert Fico
  - b.  Donald Tusk
  - c.  Jean Claude Juncker
  - d.  don't know
10. What is the Erasmus programme which is funded by the EU?
- a.  it supports young people to get integrated into the labour market
  - b.  it aims to increase citizens' awareness and understanding of the EU
  - c.  it enables students to spend part of their studies at different university or organisation in Europe
  - d.  don't know
11. How much money per year does Slovakia approximately receive from the EU?
- a.  less than one million Euros
  - b.  more than 3 billion Euros
  - c.  Slovakia doesn't get any money
  - d.  don't know

Last, tell me a bit about your interests.

12. To what extent are you interested in the EU?
- a.  very interested
  - b.  fairly interested
  - c.  neutral
  - d.  not very interested
  - e.  not interested at all
13. Would you like to learn/know more about the EU?
- a.  definitely yes
  - b.  maybe /a little
  - c.  neutral/don't know
  - e.  not really
  - d.  definitely not

Thank you very much for your time and your responses. If you are interested further in this research, you can contact me via email: [dominika.barilova@gmail.com](mailto:dominika.barilova@gmail.com).