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“The EU in the Eyes of Asia-Pacific”
The EU’s global relevance challenge

- Economic giant, but military pigmy and political dwarf
- Sleeping giant
- Financial Gargantua, but political Frankenstein, and financial Behemoth
- Global pigmy, local giant
- ‘Hobbled giant’
“civilian” power, or derived from the EC's early economic international role and “economic diplomacy”; exertion of international influence by non-conventional (non-military) means; preference for using supranational institutions (Duchene1970s)

“soft” power, or “the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes one wants through attraction rather than coercion or payment ... rest[ing] on its resource of culture, values and policies” (Ney 2008)

“Gentle” power (Merlini 2001)

“normative” power, or a peaceful power of ideas and values distinctly different from the aggressive power of economic or military coercion; emphasis on “ideas and norms” over traditional focus on a physical expression of power; EU considered to be a “post-national” entity; Norms are “collective expectations for the proper behaviour of actors with a given identity” (Manners 2002)

“ethical” power, a cosmopolitan power that is characterised by a global impact and ‘moral’ quality of the values and principles that inform its policies ... First, it pertains to the belief that the values and norms conveyed by the EU have local moral validity. Second, it results in security practices that are oriented towards the protection of the rights of individuals, rather than those of states (Nunes 2011)

“smart” power, or “the capacity of an actor to combine elements of power and soft power in ways that are mutually reinforcing” (Wilson 2008)

“meterosexual” power (or a more effective and attractive global power by virtue of “cleverly deploying both its hard power and its sensitive side” (Khanna 2004)

“morphing” power (or a power transitioning “from a regional Zivilimacht into a more fully fledged global superpower” (van Ham 2008)

“Scandinavia of the world” (Therborn 1997)
• a preference for long-term non military instruments aimed mainly at structural prevention;
• a specific translation of its values and norms in its foreign policy;
• an ability to influence the international normative environment through example and active policies;
• a preference for multilateralism with respect to unilateralism

S. Lucarelli, work in progress
Theorising Reception


- ‘[I]t is often impossible to explain crucial decisions and policies without reference to the decision makers’ beliefs about the world and their images of others. That is to say, these cognitions are part of the proximate cause of the relevant behaviour (sic).’ (Jervis 1976)

- Enemy/capability/threat – ally/capability/opportunity continuum
interacting factors that shape perceptions (Hermann et al., 1997; Hermann, 1985)

- the perceived relative capability of an actor
- the perceived threat/or opportunity represented by that actor
- the perceived culture of that actor
external images are driven by both the perceptions of developments within the sender and within receivers of diplomatic messages

• **Endogenous factors**: those which operate in the third countries on which the producer of IR and diplomacy has little influence, evolve almost regardless of what the actor is actually doing (Tsuruoka 2008.)

• **Exogenous factors**: emanate[e] from the producer for IR and diplomacy, what the actor is and is actually doing in the real world (Tsuruoka 2008)

• **Global factors**: are shaped by the global order, regardless of the sender and consumer (Chaban and Magdalena 2014)
Why to study images is important?

• ‘reputation, the reflection of the reality of power in the mind of the observers can be as important as the reality of power itself. What others think about us is as important as what we actually are’ (Morgenthau, 1965; emphasis added).

• great powers need to be ‘recognized by others to have certain special rights and duties’ (Bull 1977: 196).
‘Normative Power Europe’

• peaceful power of ideas and values distinctly different from the aggressive power of economic or military coercion (Manners 2002)

• cultural filters: ‘the interplay between the construction of knowledge and the creation of social and political identity by the subjects of norm diffuse on’ (Manners 2002, 245)

• the range of external reactions to NPE messages – from adoption and adaption to resistance and rejection (Björkdahl et al. 2015).

• “to be a normative power is oftentimes less important than to appear to be a normative power” (emphasis original) (Kavalski 2013, 250)
Strategic Narratives

• Narratives are the stories that “have always shaped the way humans understand the world” (Roselle et al., 2014, p.74).

• Strategic narratives are a “tool for political actors to extend their influence, manage expectations, and change the discursive environments in which they operate” (Miskimmon et al., 2013).

• Through strategic narratives, a polity seeks to be an actor “other nations listen to, rely on and emulate out of respect and admiration” (Slaughter 2011).
Strategic Narratives

• Burke 1969: The narrative must have: an actor, an action, a goal or intention, a scene and instrument

• Roselle et al. 2104: A five member paradigm in a strategic narration: character or actors; setting/environment/space; conflict or action; and resolution or suggested resolution
Strategic Narratives

• **Formation** is about the process flow

• **Projection** is about communication flow

• **Reception** is about answers to two questions – how is an IR actor is recognised? and Is it seen to be worth emulating?

  – Reception also aspires to trace the connectivity between the producers of IR outcomes and the international receivers of those outcomes – via the producer or bypassing it.
  
  – Reception remains an under-researched area in the studies informed by the ‘strategic narrative’ theory.
The 2000- on going: EU external perceptions

• “the importance to the EU of international perception is higher than for a state actor, as the Union does not possess any of the traditional advantages of statehood” (Marsh and Mackenstein 2005)

• knowledge of EU external images is the key to “evaluate whether gaps between expectations and realities have affected the ‘reach’ of EU influence” (Rhodes 1998: 6).
Common trends: across countries, across time, across projects

- Knowledge about the EU in non-European world is not widespread.
- Among those who have an opinion, the EU is seen as a relatively ineffective power, far less powerful than the US.
- More recent studies indicate that the EU’s importance is perceived to be in decline, losing ground to the US and a group of ‘emerging’ powers.
- When perceived as a ‘great power’, it is accorded this status due to its commercial might, which is, however, perceived as protectionist and characterized by double standards and inconsistency.
- The EU is credited with potential international leadership qualities, but internal divisions are seen as an obstacle to the Union becoming a fully-fledged leader.
- Importantly for this investigation, the EU is often evaluated in neutral terms.
- The EU’s ‘normative’ international identity is recognized only occasionally.
- Significantly, the EU’s experiences in regional construction are seen as inspiring – the EU is regarded as an undisputed success story for its achievements in regional economic integration.
- Only occasionally, the EU is held to be a champion of multilateralism and environmental standards.
Mis-measured or under-measured images and perceptions

inappropriate policy

misallocation of resources

under- or over-evaluation of the performance
WHY STUDY IMAGE OF THE EU IN ASIA-PACIFIC?

a “transition to a very different world – a world in which Asia is likely to become a key player” (Renard & de Swielande, 2011, 4)

The incoming “Asian century” (Greenway 2008)

“Getting EU relations right with this region [Asia] is one of the major challenges facing Europe” (EU, EEAS, on line)

HOWEVER:
“Europe’s recent pre-occupation with its internal restructuring, institutional problems and acrimonious turf battles between senior politicians, has prompted many in Asia to warn the EU [that it] is becoming irrelevant and unimportant in the region” (Islam 2010)
According to EEAS:

‘Asia’ as an arena for the EU’s involvement with:

- individual countries: ‘Asia’ is geopolitically defined by the EEAS and consists of the following actors: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, DPRK (North Korea), Korea, RoK (South Korean), Laos, Macao, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar (Burma), Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan (Chinese Taipei), Thailand and Vietnam

- a number of regional organisations (ASEAN, SAARC, ARF and ASEM)

*Asia’s defining dichotomy:* it “comprises high-income industrialised partners and dynamic emerging economies but is also home to two thirds of the world’s poor”
The 2003 ESS:
1. global challenges and key threats,
2. building stability in Europe and beyond
3. Europe in a changing world

The arsenal of EU responses (aid, export controls, diplomatic pressure and sanctions)

EU-ASIA:
- **multilateral level** inside international political and economic organizations (such as the UN or WTO) and various other international forums (dedicated to such issues as nuclear non-proliferation, security, human rights, environment, etc.);
- **interregional** (e.g. ASEM, or the EU dialogues with ASEAN, SAARC, or ARF)
- **bi-lateral** (EU with individual Asian countries)
- **country-to-country** level engagement (EU Member States in their relations with individual Asian countries).

Yet, the EU’s influence on Asian security issues remains marginal in contrast with the USA

the EU’s lack of a “political and security profile in the region” translates to its lack of definition of intentions in Asia” (Tsuruoka’s 2011, p. 96).
The Lisbon Treaty (2009)

Article 21.1 lays out the Union’s external action in the following terms: to
(a) safeguard its values, fundamental interests, security, independence and integrity;
(b) consolidate democracy, the rule of law, human rights and the principles of international law;
(c) preserve peace, prevent conflicts and strengthen international security in accordance with the UN Charter;
(d) foster the sustainable economic, social and environmental development of developing countries with the primary aim of eradicating poverty;
(e) encourage the integration of all countries into the world economy, including through the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade;
(f) help develop international measures to preserve and improve the quality of the environment and the sustainable management of global natural resources, in order to ensure sustainable development;
(g) assist countries and regions confronting natural or man-made disasters;
(h) promote an international system based on stronger multilateral cooperation and good global governance.

In the eyes of Asian commentators: Lisbon Treaty is a “trajectory that enables its global neighbors, partners and antagonists to start taking Europe seriously” (Mishra 2009).
Five strategic partnerships in Asia-Pacific: Japan, China, India, South Korea and Russia

Relations with regional organisations:

**ASEAN:**
Established in 1967, members are Brunei Darussalam, Burma/Myanmar, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam

**SAARC:**
Established in 1985, members are Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri-Lanka

**ASEM:**
On EU side, ASEM embraces solely EU member states.
On Asian side, seven ASEAN member states in 1996, China, Japan and Korea were ASEM founding members.
The first enlargement, in ASEM5, added three new ASEAN members, Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar to ASEM Asian side.
The second enlargement, in ASEM6, brought Mongolia and two South Asian countries, India and Pakistan to the group.
The ASEAN Secretariat was granted membership to ASEM on its own in ASEM8, Australia, New Zealand and Russia joined ASEM at the same time but were not grouped into the Asia or European group thus far. The three are still classified as “Temporary Third Category”.
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Multi-polar world

• the shifts of power from the ‘West’ (the US and the EU) to ‘South’ and ‘East’ (BRICS)
• the shifts of power from governments to non-state actors
• increasing interdependence of the global ‘poles’

(Keukeleire & Bruyninckx 2011; Renard and Biscop 2012).

THE EU’s SELF-VISIONS:
• one of the affluent and benevolent ‘poles’
• emanates its international influence by diffusing certain values and norms

Goal: to become “...a major actor in global affairs” (Emerson et. al., 2011)

Euro debt crisis

re-channeled the EU’s priorities and actions from external to internal modes

the EU has become even more ‘inward looking’

Global images of ‘sick man Europe’

revamp of EU external relations (Lisbon Treaty innovations of 2009)

the EU’s credibility as able ‘soft power’ and a well-governed entity was jeopardised by the sovereign euro debt crisis (EUobserver, 2011),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 dailies + 1 TV news bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 media outlets, 2006-11, Daily monitoring (6-12 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 news items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 dailies + 1 TV News bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept- Nov 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,770 news items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Media analysis  Public opinion survey  National elite interviews
“...the world consists of individual and national actors, and since it is axiomatic that action is case[d] on the actor’s image of reality, international action will be based on the images of international reality. This image is not shaped by the news media... alone; personal impressions and contacts, professional relations abroad, diplomatic dispatches, etc., count too – whether less, equally, or more, we do not know. But the regularity, ubiquity and perseverance of news media will in any case make them first-rate competitors for the number-one position as international image-former”

Galtung and Ruge 1965
Cascade Activation Theory
(Entman 2003, 2004)
• An image is a reference to some aspect of the world which contains within its own structure and in terms of its own structure a reference to the act of cognition which generated it. It must say, not that the world is like this, but that it was recognized to have been like this by the image-maker, who leaves behind this record: not of the world, but of the act.

Harold Cohen. What is an Image?
http://crca.ucsd.edu/%7Ehcohen/cohenpdf/whatisanimage.pdf
the more random the sample is and the larger the size, the less the chance of error

Chang et al., 2001: 431

the sample should be kept narrow in scope and nature in order to facilitate realistic execution of a large scale, transnational, comparative project

Sreberny-Mohammadi, 1985: 10
Sampling criteria for media outlets

- the influential reputation of the media outlet in a country
- the high circulation numbers or audience ratings
- ownership features
- political diversity
- national and regional distribution
- a range of styles and formats (tabloid/broadsheet)
- and even linguistic diversity
Representations in daily coverage in three newspapers and on prime time news on one TV channel in each country
## The Asian Media Studied: Post-Lisbon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Popular daily</th>
<th>Business daily</th>
<th>English-language daily</th>
<th>TV news</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>People’s Daily</td>
<td>International Finance News</td>
<td>China Daily</td>
<td>CCTV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 300 000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>500 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Chosun</td>
<td>Maeil Business</td>
<td>Korea Herald</td>
<td>KBS News 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 850 000</td>
<td>880 000</td>
<td>35 500</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yomiuri</td>
<td>Nikkei</td>
<td>Japan Times</td>
<td>News Watch 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 931 370</td>
<td>3 015 485</td>
<td>66 958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Dainik Jagran</td>
<td>The Economic Times</td>
<td>The Times of India</td>
<td>Doordarshan News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 791 000</td>
<td>757 000</td>
<td>13 347 000</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Lianhe Zaobao</td>
<td>The Business Times</td>
<td>The Straits Times</td>
<td>Channel 8 at 10pm, 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 000</td>
<td>30 000</td>
<td>400 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Utusan Malaysia</td>
<td>The Edge Financial Daily</td>
<td>The STAR</td>
<td>Buletin Utama (TV3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>542 721</td>
<td>22,729</td>
<td>581,961</td>
<td>2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thai Rath</td>
<td>Manager Daily</td>
<td>Bangkok Post</td>
<td>ITV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>100 000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>The Herald-Sun</td>
<td>The Australian Financial Review</td>
<td>The Australian</td>
<td>ABC News at 7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>530 000</td>
<td>90 000</td>
<td>136,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>The New Zealand Herald</td>
<td>The National Business Review</td>
<td>The Press</td>
<td>One News at 6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>599 000</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>81 017</td>
<td>766,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian Newspaper</td>
<td>Vedomosti</td>
<td>The Moscow Times</td>
<td>Channel One Russia at 9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186 000</td>
<td>75 000</td>
<td>35 000</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Media Analysis

Key Search Terms:

EU/Europe Union
European Commission/EC
European Parliament/EP
European Central Bank/ECB
European Court of Justice/ECJ
Asia-Europe Meeting/ASEM

Monitoring of the daily coverage of the EU, its institutions and ASEM in the selected media outlets for six/twelve months).
Analysis of content of media representations

Formal characteristics
the analysis of manifested, surface, extensive characteristics of an issue coverage

Substantive features
the analysis of the latent, in-depth, intensive mechanisms of image formation
Formal characteristics

- volume
- news sources
- degree of centrality
- focus of domesticity
EU coverage: Post-Lisbon
January-June, monthly average, 01-06.2011,
EU COVERAGE in China, India and Russia
12 news outlets
monthly average, January-June 2011, 2412 pieces of news
### EU COVERAGE: China, India, Russia
January-June, 2011, 12 media outlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Monthly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Total Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular daily</td>
<td>486 81 19</td>
<td>20 3.3 0.8</td>
<td>155 26 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business daily</td>
<td>398 66 15</td>
<td>192 32 8</td>
<td>185 31 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-language daily</td>
<td>387 65 15</td>
<td>99 16 4</td>
<td>213 36 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV news</td>
<td>81 13.5 3.4</td>
<td>10 1.7 0.4</td>
<td>34 5.6 1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing with the coverage of the other global leaders (China, ‘popular’ daily and TV)
Comparing with the coverage of the other global leaders (Russia, ‘popular’ daily and TV)
Comparing with the coverage of the other global leaders (India, ‘popular’ paper and TV)
1) **main perspective**: a story focuses solely on the event in the EU;

2) **secondary perspective**: events in the EU are described as equally important to other events in the story;

3) **minor perspective**: the EU have been alluded in passing as a minor reference angle in reporting.
Intensity of the EU coverage
Leading or Supporting Actor?
Intensity of the EU coverage

China
India
Russia

main secondary minor
Focus of Domesticity ("local hook")

*pure foreign*, external angle

*EU-focused news*, or stories originating in the EU without any involvement of third country)

‘EU news abroad’, or EU in the context of news about a third country, neither your own country, nor the EU

*local*, domesticated angle

*EU-news-in-the-home-country*, or your third country own local news characterized by a considerable involvement

*EU-news-in-the-region*, or news characterized by a considerable involvement of the EU in the immediate geo-political region
Focus of Domesticity

Figure 5: Focus of domesticity of EU representations in Asian ‘popular’ news media (22 outlets, 2006-09)
Framing of the EU’s political external actions in Asia-Pacific media (2006-8: 22 news outlets)
Sources

**International wire**, e.g. international news agency *Reuters, CNN, AP, AFP, BBC*

**Foreign correspondent** (a foreign journalist/author who is published in a local newspaper)

**Local wire**, the home agency (e.g., *NZPA* in NZ, or *MATP* in Australia)

**Local correspondent** -- the outlet staffers: either writers inside the country (i.e., editors, the regular opinion columnists, financial writers, etc.) or correspondents in foreign locations (in-house foreign correspondents who ensure their organizations have timely, tailored, international intelligence or a stringer)

**N/A** (in some cases the sources were unknown or impossible to identify)
Sources of EU News Stories

![Bar chart showing sources of EU news stories in Asian media (22 'popular' news outlets, 2006-09)]

Figure 7: Sources of EU news stories in Asian media (22 'popular' news outlets, 2006-09)
Substantive categories

Thematic framing and sub-framing

Actors

Evaluation

Visual analysis
Thematic framing

- political frame
- economic frame
- social, cultural and intellectual affairs frame
- environmental frame
- developmental frame
Thematic priorities: China (post-Lisbon)

- Political: 29%
- Economic: 53%
- Social: 13%
- Environment: 3%
- Development: 2%
Thematic framing
(not business dailies)

EU state of economy (euro debt crisis)
EU as a trading partner
What is NOT Seen?

The diagram compares the developmental, social, economic, environmental, and political aspects of China, India, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand. The bars indicate the percentage of each aspect for each country.
**Actors**

EU officials

EU Member State Officials

EU Institutions:
- EC
- ECB
- EP
- ECJ

EU Member States

EU Enlargement Candidates

Other (media, universities, NGOs, people)
Visibility – Faces of the EU
Visibility – Faces of the EU

Typical Asia-Pacific

EU officials

1. Jean-Claude Trichet
2. Jose Manuel Barroso
3. Catherine Ashton
4. Herman van Rompuy

Member state officials

1. Angela Merkel
2. Nicholas Sarkozy
3. David Cameron

CHINA

EU officials

1. Catherine Ashton
2. Herman van Rompuy
3. Jose Manuel Barroso
4. Jean-Claude Trichet

Member state officials

1. Nicholas Sarkozy
2. Angela Merkel
3. David Cameron
Visibility – EU institutions
Visibility – EU institutions

Typical Asia-Pacific

1. European Central Bank / ECB
2. European Commission
3. European Parliament
4. European Court of Justice (tied)
5. European Council (tied)
6. EU Delegations
7. Hungarian EU Presidency

CHINA

1. European Commission
2. European Central Bank / ECB
3. European Parliament
4. European Council
5. EU Delegation to China
6. European Court of Justice
7. Hungarian EU Presidency
Visibility – EU member states
Visibility – EU member states

Other 9
1. Germany
2. Greece
3. Ireland
4. Portugal
5. France
6. Spain
7. Italy
8. UK

CHINA
1. Germany
2. UK
3. France
4. Greece
5. Spain
6. Portugal
7. Ireland
8. Italy
Evaluation

- negative
- positive
- neutral
Evaluation: post-Lisbon

- Positive: 14%
- Neutral: 75%
- Negative: 11%
The most negative

The most positive

Not pulling any string? Post-Lisbon Evaluations
Not pulling any string? Evaluations
Photographs and cartoons

• PHOTOGRAPHS: “readers assume photographs are objective slices of reality” (Sontag, 1977); “intended to be read as a piece of objective, factual information of distant events” (Konstantinidou 2008: 151)

• POLITICAL CARTOONS: condensed and simplified portrayals of complex situations in order to aid audience cognition
Media analysis

Public opinion survey

National elite interviews
“When thinking about the European Union, what three images/words spring to mind…?”

- EU as model of unity: unity, friendship, association, etc.
- EU as an actor: strong, bloc, adjectives applying to the whole
- EU as a crisis: crisis, disunity, etc
- EU as a political system: Schengen, borderlessness, institutions, etc
- EU as a partner: trade, protectionist, etc
- EU- negative mirror: individual countries, cities, etc
- Europe as a civilisation: culture, sports, tourism. etc
Word cloud for China
“When thinking about the European Union, what three images/words spring to mind...?” (before-crisis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>Enlargement</td>
<td>Union/Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japan</strong></td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>Union/Integration</td>
<td>EU Big 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. Korea</strong></td>
<td>Union/Integration</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>EU Big 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malaysia</strong></td>
<td>Sports (football, F1)</td>
<td>Union/Integration</td>
<td>Advancement (esp in technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singapore</strong></td>
<td>Union/Integration</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>Economic power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thailand</strong></td>
<td>EU Big 3</td>
<td>Economic power</td>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong></td>
<td>Business/Trade</td>
<td>Union/Integration</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“When thinking about the European Union, what three images/words spring to mind...?” (circa-crisis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>France/ Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Euro/UK</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>“EU”</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>“EU”</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>“EU”</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The set of stereotypical public visions of the EU pre- and circa-crisis was found to be limited:

- the euro
- the EU’s economic power
- integration/union
- EU individual countries

The most easily recognised ‘EU attributes’ in Asia!
H2: the EU is EU as a power in decline/minor or secondary power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'circra-crisis' surveys</th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st} place in the present</th>
<th>EU rank in the future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Positive and negative perceptions of the EU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principal perceptions of the EU

- Overall       Modern    Peaceful    United    Likeable
- China         Modern    Efficient   Strong    Arrogant
- Japan         Modern    Peaceful   Likeable   United
- Korea         Modern    Peaceful   Likeable   United
- India         Modern    Efficient   Peaceful   United
- Malaysia      Modern    Efficient   Peaceful   Likeable
- Singapore     Modern    Peaceful   Fair      Likeable
- Thailand      Modern    Efficient   Strong    Likeable
- New Zealand   Modern    Peaceful   Fair      Arrogant
- Australia     Modern    Peaceful   Fair      Arrogant
- Russia        Modern    United     Likeable   Strong
Mix of endogenous, exogenous and global factors

• The EU’s strategic partners?

• Categorisation is easier than re-categorisation?

• Media agenda setting in action?