

## EVENT DESCRIPTION SHEET

*(To be filled in and uploaded as deliverable in the Portal Grant Management System, at the due date foreseen in the system.)*

 *Please provide one sheet per event (one event = one workpackage = one lump sum).*

PROJECT	
<b>Participant:</b>	EUROPEUM Institute for European Policy
<b>PIC number:</b>	949668122
<b>Project name and acronym:</b>	RevivEU

EVENT DESCRIPTION			
<b>Event number:</b>	9.1		
<b>Event name:</b>	Focus Groups in Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland		
<b>Type:</b>	Focus group seminars		
<b>In situ/online:</b>	in-situ		
<b>Location:</b>	Czechia, Hungary, Slovakia, Poland		
<b>Date(s):</b>	20.4. – 25.5.2023		
<b>Website(s) (if any):</b>	<a href="http://reviveu.net/activities/research/focus-groups-2/">http://reviveu.net/activities/research/focus-groups-2/</a>		
Participants			
Female:	69		
Male:	68		
Non-binary:	1		
From country 1 [Czechia]:	32		
From country 2 [Slovakia]:	33		
From country 3 [Poland]:	36		
From country 4 [Hungary]:	37		
Total number of participants:	138	From total number of countries:	4
Description			
<i>Provide a short description of the event and its activities.</i>			
<p>The consortium conducted 17 focus groups across the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia. These took place in the second half of April 2023 and throughout May 2023, in various cities in the four countries. Specifically, in Ďurčiná, Žilina, Trnava and Košice in Slovakia; in Brno, Prague, Ostrava and Česká Lípa in Czechia; in Poznań and Śrem in Poland; and in Debrecen, Mezőkövesd and Mosonmagyaróvár in Hungary.</p> <p>The goal was to supplement the results of the quantitative citizens' consultations, implemented as part</p>			

of the RevivEU project, with a qualitative research gained during the focus groups. Each of the country held a number of events with a minimum of 30 participants. The respondents were recruited based on pre-defined criteria that targeted the “grey zone” in each of the societies – those who are lukewarm supporters of the EU but simultaneously politically active. The reason for this was to approach undecided voters that would have an impact of a potential EU membership referenda.

The consortium created a standardized script focusing on four topics – migration, NGEU, climate and Rule of Law. The goal was to test argumentation strategies and narratives that could be employed in each country to explain EU policies in the aforementioned dossiers. The sessions, lasting from 75 to 90 minutes, were split into two parts – brainstorming (a part which, in average, lasted about 30 minutes), and a discussion about fake articles presenting a concrete narrative (lasting the remainder of the time, between 45 and 60 minutes, based on the activity from the participants).

The focus group questioning and the feedback from the participants proved that climate change is not an excessively polarizing issue vis-à-vis its existence and its cause in human activity. There was, however certain uncertainty as to how the problem should be solved and whether it is the most important challenge to be tackled. Migration was perceived as an important topic, and we could identify a distinct difference between the younger and older generations, where the former seemed more open-minded and avoided cultural clichés. Furthermore, the respondents throughout the V4 agreed that the Rule of Law is an essential feature of democracies and is worth maintaining. There were, however, disagreements as to what extent the EU should be involved.

Besides these general findings, the discussion with the participants and their feedback also showed which topics are the most important in the four project countries – in line with the current affairs, the question of rule of law and EU funds conditionality saw stronger reactions from the focus groups’ participants in Poland and Hungary. Another example is that though the public consultations showed that climate change is not the most pressing topic in Czechia or Slovakia, once the topic of decarbonisation is connected with energy efficiency and/or energy dependence, the participants were more interested, involved in the discussions, and gave their feedback more readily.

HISTORY OF CHANGES		
VERSION	PUBLICATION DATE	CHANGE
1.0	01.04.2022	Initial version (new MFF).