

Appendix

This article belongs to the qualitative research tradition. We forward the argument that the literature on EU sanctions would benefit from widening their lenses in two ways: by including social sanctions into their analyses and by taking into account inter-institutional differences between EU institutions. To illustrate the value of our argument we make use of two cases studies in the article. These cases have been selected because they are ‘typical’ or ‘common’ cases of how the EU approaches violations of LGBTI human rights, namely by using social sanctions and with a differentiated response among EU institutions. Hence, these cases are used as illustrative examples of the argument that we make.

To analyse these case studies, we use the method of a systematic interpretation of the justifications provided by EU policymakers within different EU institutions for their choice of approach. Hence, the study belongs to an interpretative tradition which analyses the EU’s choice of actions from the perspective of decision-makers (Biegoń, 2013; Hellquist, 2019, Lord & Tamvaki, 2013; Pansardi & Battezzar, 2018). While one can never know whether policymakers’ justifications are truthful or not, we view justifications from policymakers, whether made in a private or public setting, as reason-giving and political acts in themselves (Abulof & Kornprobst, 2017). We make use of the identified justifications, to empirically trace the responses of the different EU institutions. We show that these reactions are intentional and something different than “doing nothing”. While we do not fully tap into the question of why social sanctions were used instead of or in combination with material ones (see however our discussion of possible reasons in the conclusion), these justifications help us to capture how different EU institutions respond to violations of LGBTI human rights.

We have systematically collected justifications from the following data sources: official documents, media outlets and interviews. First, we have identified the EU’s responses in public official documents. We have reviewed documents from the following EU institutions: the European Parliament, the Council of the EU, the European Commission, and the External Action Service. Second, we have systematically searched for statements by EU policymakers in online news databases and in the digital archives of ILGA-Europe and the Lithuanian Gay League. Third, we have identified EU responses through interviews with EU policymakers. Interviews were conducted in a semi-structured manner and the interviewees were asked to explain their response to LGBTI rights violations in Lithuania and Uganda respectively.

List of Interviews

Interview 1 – Interview with Lithuanian Gay League representative, 8.11.2016

Interview 2 – E-mail correspondence with EU delegation in Uganda, 16.11.18

Interview 3 – Interview with EEAS official 28.5.18

Interview 4 – Interview with EEAS official 28.5.18

Interview 5 – Interview with EU delegation in Uganda, 20.10.18