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# Nature of the Data

In this NVivo 12 textual analysis package files and Stata 17 datasets, the focus is on the arguments presented by 40 leading analysts of European security in their arguments for their view on whether NATO enlargement was a mistake. The selection of the experts was done by the Foreign Affairs journal that published an opinion survey of 62 experts of which 40 published their arguments in addition to their opinions in this survey publication of Foreign Affairs (Foreign Affairs Survey 2022). These arguments by 40 of the 62 surveyed experts is the textual material of this dataset. The textual data was coded to reveal premises of these experts. The coding was based on distinctions that the creator of this dataset created on the basis of literature reviewed in his article “Theoretical Premises of Support of and Opposition to NATO Enlargement.”

Variables the Basic Coding Rules

The Stata 17 file reveals two kinds of variables. Two variables reveal that overall conclusions of the 40 experts on whether the expansion of NATO was a mistake or not. This has been measured by using two types of scales. Some of the experts adopted a neutral position, for which reason this data will use a three-step cardinal scale for variable “NATOsupport”: agree (1), neutral (1.5), disagree (2) with the sentence “NATO enlargement since the end of Cold War has been a mistake”. However, since the journal allowed each expert to say whether s/he strongly agreed (1), agreed (2), was neutral (3), disagreed (4) or strongly disagreed (5), this data will also measure agreement in the variable “NATOlevelSupport” with a five-step scale.

The other type of variables in the Stata file measure 18 premises related to framings of world politics. These premises belong to three main clusters of premises, related to a) the focus of analysis: agent or relationship b) level of analysis: international and domestic together or international separately and c) centrality of power in world politics: power central or restraint central in the creation of security. The unit of observation in the Stata file is argument, 40 of them by different expects. The unit of coding for each argument is one sentence. As a sentence either does or does not reflect a premise, each one either does or does not receive a value of 1 (reflects) per premise. Since arguments (units of observations) are of differing lengths, the frequencies of each framing are derived by counting the sentences that reflect a premise, and by dividing this number by the total number of codings in a given argument. This way it is possible to determine the weight that every premise has in each of the argument. Since relational framing consists of four framings, the Stata-file presents such general framing as an arithmetic mean of its four components. The same applies to agent-centricity, power-centricity and restraint-orientation.

The data on framings and premises of conclusions on European security and NATO enlargement are taken from coding of sentences that uses NVivo 12 package.

NVivo file reveals the arguments and the coding of each of the sentences in each argument. The coding sentences to representatives of various framings are based on 18 framing categories that demonstrate agent-centricity, relationality, cosmopolitan view of the sameness of domestic and international spheres, realist separation of international and domestic spheres, power-bias and restraint-orientation. The 18 framings that sentences reflect in arguments reveal are the following. Below are also the coding rules for these 18 framings:

**Agent-centric framings:**

1. Geopoliticalinterests: Russian (and all state) policies are driven by relatively stable geopolitical interests
   1. References to the Russian spheres of interests, and territorial expansion as Russian objectives justify coding of a sentence as geopolitical.
2. VicNotPerp: Assumption according to which victimhood and perpetrator identity can be seen as separable: security is threatened by perpetrators, while one’s own side is seen as victims of aggression of such perpetrators.
   1. This assumption can be coded if a sentence talks about victimhood or perpetration as something that belongs to the actor. Such sentences do not focus on victimhood as something that is related to war, but as something that is related to the aggressor and perpetrator.
3. DemonizedRussia: The enemy/Russia is being seen as an evil agent, not someone that reacts to threats or relationship problems, but as someone who does evil things due to its nature.
   1. Sentences that characterise the enemy/Russia, on the basis of characteristics, as bad will be coded as belonging to this category of framings.
4. PowerExpansion: world view according to which world politics is about battle for power.
   1. Sentences that talk about power, and expansion as natural interests of states are coded in this category of framings.

**Relational framings:**

1. RelationsDefineRuss: Russian foreign affairs react to relational developments.
   1. Sentences that reveal an assumption according to which Russia or any other enemy reacts to changes in the relationship between Russia/enemy and “us” are coded into this framing.
2. VictimsAreperpetrators: Both sides are victims and perpetrators.
   1. Sentences that talk about the enemy also as a victim, or talk about “us” also as perpetrators, are coded to this framing.
3. Empowerment: Russian behaviour is likely to be uncooperative if Russia is humiliated, while it will be more cooperative if Russia is offered a positive role and place in European security.
   1. Sentences that prescribe empowerment, inclusion and positive roles for Russia/enemy, and proscribe humiliation and poor, unfair treatment of Russia, are coded into this framing.
4. SecurityDefenceInterests: Russian foreign policy is mostly focused on its defensive rather than offensive security interests.
   1. Sentences that demonstrate an assumption that Russia’s behaviour follows legitimate defensive interests are coded in this framing.

**Framing according to which domestic and international realms are united:**

1. UnitDomInternat: Foreign policy is connected with domestic policies.
   1. Sentences that justify or predict policies referring to the characteristics of agents domestic political system are coded into this framing

**Framing according to which it is useful to separate the domestic from the international:**

1. RealistSeparation: Foreign policy is sufficiently separate from domestic policies, so that it is not useful to mix them in the prediction or prescription of foreign policy moves.
   1. Sentences that ignore domestic concerns where they could be taken into account for prediction or prescription will be coded to this framing.

**Power-biased framings:**

1. OthersThreat: Security is threatened by Russia or other enemies.
   1. Sentences that simplify threats to actions of Russia/enemies, rather than also considering actions on “our side” that upset stability, are coded into this framing.
2. Powercentr: World politics is about the exercise of power.
   1. Sentences that reveal a simplified assumption according to which security can only be achieved or attempted by changing the behaviour of others, are coded to this framing.
3. Justice: World politics and European security is essentially a matter of justice.
   1. Sentences that refer to questions of justice in their prescription or description of Western action in world politics are coded into this framing. Sentences that focus on enforcement of norms, and sending signals of disapproval or approval in world politics are coded into this framing.
4. PerpetraotorFocus: The focus of security policy should be on the perpetrators likely to cause security threats on us.
   1. Sentences that focus security analysis on the perpetrators, enemies, aggressors, are coded into this framing.

**Restraint-orientated framings:**

1. ThreatByUs: Security can also be threatened by our own provocative, upsetting, humiliating and destabilising acts, not just by the enemy.
   1. Sentences that talk about the contributions of “our side” to threats are coded into this framing.
2. Restraint: Security can also be achieved by not using power but rather by using self-restraint and mutual restraint with other actors of world politics.
   1. Sentences discussing agreements, restraint or direct protective action without affecting other agents are coded into this framing.
3. Peace: Peace, rather than one’s own interpretation of justice or partisan interests is the focus on world politics.
   1. Sentences that talk about peace and solutions rather than terms of solutions are coded into this framing.
4. VictimFocus: Security politics and analysis should be focused also on the victim, not just on the perpetrator.
   1. Sentences that discuss the victim will be coded into this framing.
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