

euro-barometre

PUBLIC OPINION IN THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

EUROBAROMETER No 5

Initial results

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
 <u>I. POLES OF INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL MATTERS OF CONCERN TO THE PUBLIC</u>	 3
A. <u>POLES OF INTEREST</u>	3
B. <u>THE MAIN PROBLEM:</u> <u>INFLATION OR UNEMPLOYMENT?</u>	 9
 <u>II. INFORMATION ON EUROPEAN PROBLEMS</u>	 10
A. <u>INTEREST IN INFORMATION ON COMMUNITY PROBLEMS</u>	 10
B. <u>ASSESSMENT OF INFORMATION ON THE COMMUNITY</u>	 15
 <u>III. THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY, POLITICAL UNION AND THE ELECTION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT BY UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE</u>	 22
A. <u>THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY</u>	22
B. <u>EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION</u>	26
1. Movement towards European unification -- speeded up, slowed down, or continued as at present	 26
2. For or against European political union by 1980	34
3. Powers to be accorded to the European union	42
C. <u>ELECTION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT BY DIRECT UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE</u>	 48
1. The principle of the election	48
2. Powers of the European Parliament	53
3. Likely voting practice of the political groups represented in the European Parliament	 56
 <u>CONCLUSIONS</u>	 59

INTRODUCTION

Following a well-tried procedure (the first large-scale opinion poll in the nine countries of the European Community was conducted in autumn 1973) more than 8 500 people aged fifteen and over were questioned about the same problems, in May 1976, by interviewers from eight specialist institutes¹.

There is, however, an important new feature in Eurobarometer No 5: all the results are presented in such a way that the answers given by the "general public" can be compared with those given by the "opinion leaders".

Some explanation is required here.

To begin with, who are the "opinion leaders"? They are people who, in their roles in society, tend to influence the opinions of others more than others influence them. If all the members of a social group had equivalent and substitutable weight in forming opinions, attitudes and behaviour patterns in the group, the group would, at all events continue to function even if one or other member disappeared. Leaders are those whose presence makes things different: they influence the others, as was said above, more than others influence them; this influence is not on isolated issues, but is relatively constant and predictable.

One of the objectives of market surveys and opinion polls - and of socio-psychological studies in general - is to identify the leaders. Only three ways of doing this are known:

- (1) Sociometric study of respective powers of influence in a given group, but this method is really practicable only in laboratory conditions or in small groups.
- (2) Interviews of selected informants, who say who they think exercises leadership in a given group. This method shares the same limitations as the preceding one and, in addition, is liable to identify those occupying prominent positions in society, rather than the real leaders in the life of the group.
- (3) Automatic selection of the leaders on the basis of the results of a survey, i.e., the method of defining leaders as persons with certain characteristics generally considered to be the qualities of leadership: interest in certain problems, wide-ranging and intense activities in the life of the group, etc.

¹All relevant technical details are attached concerning the institutes which carried out the survey, the date of the interviews in each country, the size of the representative national samples, etc.

This last method is the one used, because it seemed to be the only one which could be applied in a survey based on representative samples of large and diverse populations.

Analysis of the results of the previous polls shows that it can be statistically significant to produce a leadership index from the answers given by all the people interviewed to two questions, concerning the tendency to discuss politics among friends and the capacity to convince others of a strongly held opinion.

This index has four levels, the highest representing "opinion leaders", about 15% of the European population, and the lowest representing non-leaders (approximately 25%); the two intermediate degrees represent those whose leadership qualities are slightly above or slightly below the average¹.

¹The following table shows how the leadership index was produced.

	Persuade others				
	often	from time to time	rarely	never	don't know
Discuss political matters					
frequently	++	++	+	+	+
occasionally	+	+	-	-	-
never	-	-	- -	- -	- -
don't know	-	-	- -	- -	- -

The distribution (in percentages and absolute numbers) of the population interviewed in the Community countries by level on the index is as follows:

		Aggregate of polls May and Oct.-Nov. 1975		Eurobarometer No 5 May 1976	
		%	Number (N)	%	Number (N)
Leaders	++	13	2427	14	1241
	+	29	5446	31	2637
	-	31	5892	31	2660
Non-leaders	- -	27	4995	24	2018
<u>Total</u>		<u>100</u>	<u>18 760</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>8556</u>

I

POLES OF INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL MATTERS OF CONCERN TO THE PUBLIC

Previous Eurobarometers already contained a number of questions on poles of interest and the principal matters of concern to the public. One of these questions may have produced biased answers because it referred to the importance attached to a number of shared problems "which the countries of the European Community are together dealing with"; another asked about a few very diverse problems: health, housing, prices, unemployment, etc., without reference to the Community.

After analysis of the results, it seemed preferable, for the May 1976 survey, to ask two different questions: the first, coming at the beginning of the questionnaire and without reference to the Community, concerned the importance attached to twelve problems affecting society in general; the other related solely to the two major socio-economic problems causing concern to the public: rising prices and unemployment.

A. POLES OF INTEREST

"Here is a list of problems the people of your country are more or less interested in. Could you please tell me for each problem whether you personally consider it a very important problem, important, of little importance or not at all important?¹"

The May survey revealed that the two main problems - to which almost equal importance was attached - are fighting unemployment and fighting rising prices: seven out of ten people (72 and 71% respectively) consider each of these to be "very important".

Next come

protecting nature and fighting pollution ("very important": 57%),
protection of the public against fraudulent selling and misleading advertising ("very important": 54%)

The two problems at the bottom of the list are:

strengthen our military defence against possible enemies ("very important": 18%),
more self-government for the regions ("very important": 13%).

See Table 1.

¹The problems were listed in alphabetical order of the letters shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1
IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO DIFFERENT PROBLEMS¹
(in the Community as a whole)

	Very impor- tant	Impor- tant	Of little impor- tance	Not at all impor- tant	Don't know	Index ²
E. Fighting unemployment ³	72%	23%	3%	1%	1%	2.71
H. Fighting rising prices	71	24	3	1	1	2.68
B. Protecting nature and fighting pollution	57	34	6	1	2	2.49
L. Protection of the public against fraudulent selling and misleading advertising	54	35	7	2	2	2.43
D. Provide for sufficient housing	45	40	10	3	2	2.30
J. Modernize education to meet today's needs	35	41	13	5	6	2.14
C. To try and reduce the number both of very rich and very poor people	37	35	17	7	4	2.06
I. Defend our interests against the super powers (United States, Soviet Union, etc.)	32	39	16	5	8	1.95
F. Controlling activities of the multinational and international firms	26	30	18	8	18	1.90
A. Reducing the differences between regions of the country by helping the less developed regions	22	46	18	7	7	1.90
K. Strengthen our military defence against possible enemies	18	31	25	19	7	1.51
G. More self-government for the regions	13	31	25	16	15	1.48

¹ The items are listed in descending order of importance as shown in the index in the final column.

² "Very important" = 3, "important" = 2, "of little importance" = 1, "not at all important" = 0. The totals for each possible reply, weighted according to the above scale, were divided for each item by the percentage actually giving a reply for the item concerned. The maximum is 3.00, the minimum 0.00 and the central point 1.50. All the calculations were done by computer, using percentages expressed to the first decimal place. Differences of less than 0.10 between scores can be considered negligible.

³ Not including Italy, where the question was asked wrongly.

Leaders and non-leaders

The twelve problems are ranked in practically the same order of importance by opinion leaders and by non-leaders; but for a given problem the degree of importance attached may be different as between one group and the other.

Three groups of problems can be distinguished:

- (1) Problems worrying the entire population in almost the same way; for example unemployment, rising prices, consumer protection and house building; the reduction of social inequalities also comes into this category.
- (2) The problems which cause more concern to leaders than to non-leaders: control of multinationals, education reform, reduction of the differences between regions, self-government in regions, protection of the environment and defence against the super-powers.
- (3) Finally a problem which preoccupies non-leaders more than leaders: the strengthening of military defence against possible enemies¹.

¹The quality of opinion leader being in positive correlation with the level of education, this result probably reflects a widespread anti-militarist attitude in the European intelligentsia. This point alone would clearly be a suitable subject for much more thorough study.

Table 2
IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO DIFFERENT PROBLEMS
BY NON-LEADERS AND LEADERS¹

(in the Community as a whole)

	Non-leaders (number - 2018)		Leaders (number - 1241)		Difference between importance attached by leaders and non- leaders
	Percentage of replies "very important"	Level on index of impor- tance	Percentage of replies "very important"	Level on index of impor- tance	
1. Unemployment	75%	2.71	68%	2.73	not significant
2. Rising prices	75	2.73	69	2.64	"
3. Protection of nature	50	2.41	65	2.60	+0.19
4. Consumer protection	51	2.43	60	2.51	not significant
5. House building	44	2.31	52	2.38	"
6. Education reform	27	2.02	48	2.32	+0.30
7. Reduction of the number both of very rich people and very poor people	36	2.11	44	2.13	not significant
8. Defence of the country's interests against the super powers	25	1.98	39	2.12	+0.14
9. Control of activities of multinationals	16	1.76	45	2.13	+0.37
10. Reduction of differences between regions	17	1.79	32	2.04	+0.25
11. Strengthening of military defence	17	1.59	20	1.37	-0.22
12. More self-government for the regions	9	1.40	24	1.59	+0.19

¹ The items are listed as in Table 1. For the definition of leaders and non-leaders, see the introduction. For the exact wording of each problem, see Table 1.
Differences of less than 0.10 can be considered negligible.

Differences between countries

Differences between the nine countries of the Community are not very marked; this once again confirms that a European public does exist; affected by the same current issues, it is concerned by the same major problems and ranks them in much the same order of importance.

In nearly every country the fight against unemployment, the fight against rising prices and the protection of nature rank as the most important problems. The last of these seems to be of slightly less interest to the British, the Italians and the Irish who are more concerned with improvement of the housing situation.

The spread of average national scores is limited overall, but a little more pronounced in the case of problems in which ideologies probably have some influence: "strengthen our military defence against possible enemies" (higher scores in the United Kingdom and Ireland) and "to try and reduce the number both of very rich people and of very poor people" (higher scores in Italy and France).

Details of the answers for individual countries are given in the Annex (Table 1). Table 3 below gives the six principal problems for each country in order of importance.

Table 3
POLES OF INTEREST
IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE BY COUNTRY

BELGIQUE/BELGIE	DANMARK	DEUTSCHLAND
1. <u>Unemployment</u> (2.72)	1. <u>Unemployment</u> (2.76)	1. <u>Unemployment</u> (2.66)
2. <u>Rising prices</u> (2.69)	2. <u>Protection of nature</u> (2.70)	2. <u>Rising prices</u> (2.63)
3. <u>Protection of nature</u> (2.53)	3. <u>Rising prices</u> (2.58)	3. <u>Protection of nature</u> (2.36)
4. Consumer protection (2.50)	4. Consumer protection (2.57)	4. Consumer protection (2.36)
5. Modernization of education (2.29)	5. Control of multinational companies (2.36)	5. Modernization of education (1.97)
6. Reduction of the numbers of both very rich and very poor (2.17)	6. Modernization of education (2.30)	6. Housing construction (1.91)
FRANCE	IRELAND	ITALIA
1. <u>Unemployment</u> (2.75)	1. <u>Rising prices</u> (2.87)	1. <u>Unemployment</u> ()
2. <u>Protection of nature</u> (2.73)	2. <u>Unemployment</u> (2.85)	2. <u>Rising prices</u> (2.75)
3. <u>Rising prices</u> (2.68)	3. Housing construction (2.69)	3. Housing construction (2.60)
4. Consumer protection (2.51)	4. Consumer protection (2.56)	4. Consumer protection (2.56)
5. Reduction of the numbers of both very rich and very poor (2.33)	5. Modernization of education (2.42)	5. <u>Protection of nature</u> (2.46)
6. Housing construction (2.30)	6. <u>Protection of nature</u> (2.38)	6. Reduction in the numbers of both very rich and very poor (2.45)
LUXEMBOURG	NERderland	UNITED KINGDOM
1. <u>Rising prices</u> (2.64)	1. <u>Unemployment</u> (2.74)	1. <u>Rising prices</u> (2.70)
2. <u>Protection of nature</u> (2.57)	2. <u>Protection of nature</u> (2.58)	2. <u>Unemployment</u> (2.63)
3. <u>Unemployment</u> (2.47)	3. <u>Rising prices</u> (2.46)	3. Housing construction (2.49)
4. Modernization of education (2.35)	4. Consumer protection (2.41)	4. <u>Protection of nature</u> (2.41)
5. Housing construction (2.33)	5. Housing construction (2.75)	5. Consumer protection (2.31)
6. Reduction of the numbers of both very rich and very poor (2.31)	6. Modernization of education (2.20)	6. Defending the country's interests against the super powers (2.12)

B. THE MAIN PROBLEM:

INFLATION OR UNEMPLOYMENT?

As expected, rising prices and unemployment came at the top of the list of problems considered important by the European public in general. A second question was asked in order to find out from people interviewed which for them was the more important, rising prices or unemployment;

"What do you think the government (of the relevant country) should give greater priority to, curbing inflation or reducing unemployment?"

In the Community as a whole, unemployment (50%) comes out ahead of inflation (42%), both among the general public and among leaders. But differences exist from country to country: in the United Kingdom and in Luxembourg the majority of people interviewed believe that their government should give priority to fighting inflation; in the other countries, particularly in the Netherlands, Ireland and France, the fight against unemployment is most often viewed as the priority objective.

Table 4

COMBATING INFLATION OR UNEMPLOYMENT

	Problem to be given priority			Unemployment/ ¹ inflation ratio
	Inflation	Unemployment	Don't know	
Belgique/België	38%	54%	8%	1.39
Danmark	36	49	15	1.34
Deutschland	40	52	8	1.28
France	37	57	6	1.57
Ireland	37	61	2	1.66
Italia ²	-	-	-	-
Luxembourg	66	27	7	0.41
Nederland	25	64	11	2.50
United Kingdom	56	36	8	0.64
COMMUNITY ³	42	50	8	1.16

¹Calculated from percentages expressed to the first decimal place.

²Not including Italy, where the question was asked wrongly.

³Weighted average.

II

INFORMATION ON EUROPEAN PROBLEMS

Three questions, first asked in September 1973, were repeated, in order to see what changes had occurred in public interest in newspaper articles or television programmes on the European Community and also to discover how the public judged information available on the Community.

A. INTEREST IN INFORMATION ON COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

"There is not always time to read everything you want to. When you see in your newspaper, or in a magazine or such like an article about the European Community, do you read it almost always, from time to time, or never?"

"And on television, when there is a programme about the European Community, do you watch it almost always, from time to time, or never?"

In the case of both the press and television, public interest in information on the European Community is, on the whole, very steady: in 1976 as in 1973, a little less than two people in ten said that they read such articles or watch such programmes "almost always" and five in ten "from time to time".

The difference in behaviour between leaders and non-leaders is striking, particularly as regards the press; there are seven times more leaders than non-leaders in the category of those who read information in the press "almost always", and four times more frequently into the category of those who "almost always" watch television broadcasts¹. This bears out findings of many earlier studies, which indicate that:

- (a) Community problems mainly interest an educated public with a high degree of socio-political awareness;
- (b) The general public - and also opinion leaders - are more receptive to television broadcasts (see Tables 5 and 6).

¹The leadership index, as described above, was derived from the answers to two questions concerning the tendency to discuss politics and the ability to convince others. Leaders read a daily newspaper more often than others:

	Read a daily newspaper				
	Every day	Several times a week	From time to time	Never	Don't know
Entire population	56%	16%	18%	9%	1%
Non-leaders (---)	38	16	25	19	2
(-)	54	16	20	9	1
(+)	63	17	15	4	1
Leaders (++)	72	15	9	4	.

It can be seen that the difference between leaders and non-leaders is more marked as regards the tendency to read information on the Community frequently than as regards the simple fact of reading or not reading a newspaper every day.

The differences between countries are fairly pronounced, and very much the same for the two questions; there has been very little change since 1973, except for a slight decline in interest in Denmark and Ireland.

In 1976 as in 1973, the people of Luxembourg show most interest and the Belgians least in both newspaper articles and television broadcasts on the European Community.
(see Table 7).

Table 5

INTEREST IN NEWSPAPER ARTICLES OR TELEVISION PROGRAMMES
ABOUT THE COMMUNITY

(in the Community as a whole)

	Almost always	From time to time	Never	Don't know
Read articles in the press				
September 1973	19%	51%	27%	3%
May 1976	17	51	30	2
Watch television programmes				
September 1973	20%	53%	24%	3%
May 1976	16	53	28	3

Table 6

INTEREST IN NEWSPAPER ARTICLES OF TELEVISION
BROADCASTS ABOUT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
BY LEADERSHIP RANKING
(in the Community as a whole)

	Almost always	From time to time	Never	Don't know
Read articles in the press:				
non-leaders (--)	5%	37%	54%	4%
(-)	13	53	32	2
(+)	19	59	20	2
leaders (++)	36	52	11	1
Watch television programme:				
non-leaders (--)	7%	40%	48%	5%
(-)	13	58	27	2
(+)	19	60	19	2
leaders (++)	30	54	15	1

Table 7

INTEREST IN NEWSPAPER ARTICLES OR TELEVISION PROGRAMMES ABOUT
THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

BY COUNTRY¹

	Almost always	From time to time	Never	No reply
<u>Read articles in the press</u>				
Luxembourg				
Sept. 1973	23%	56%	18%	3%
May 1976	28	53	17	2
Nederland				
Sept. 1973	24	47	26	3
May 1976	21	55	24	.
Deutschland				
Sept. 1973	23	57	16	4
May 1976	20	55	21	4
Danmark				
Sept. 1973	27	58	14	1
May 1976	19	58	22	1
France				
Sept. 1973	18	47	32	3
May 1976	17	46	36	1
United Kingdom (2)				
Sept. 1973	20	59	18	3
May 1976	16	62	21	1
Ireland				
Sept. 1973	21	58	21	.
May 1976	13	58	28	1
Italia				
Sept. 1973	15	40	42	3
May 1976	13	40	44	3
Belgique/België				
Sept. 1973	11	43	38	8
May 1976	9	39	48	4
<u>Watch television broadcasts</u>				
Luxembourg				
Sept. 1973	20%	52%	22%	6%
May 1976	26	52	19	3 ./.

		Almost always	From time to time	Never	No reply
Danmark					
	Sept. 1973	31	56	12	1
	May 1976	24	58	17	1
Nederland					
	Sept. 1973	20	47	30	3
	May 1976	22	52	25	1
Ireland					
	Sept. 1973	28	52	19	1
	May 1976	21	58	21	.
United Kingdom ²					
	Sept. 1973	21	60	17	2
	May 1976	18	61	20	1
Deutschland					
	Sept. 1973	20	60	16	4
	May 1976	16	57	23	4
France					
	Sept. 1973	18	48	29	5
	May 1976	15	49	33	3
Italia					
	Sept. 1973	19	46	32	3
	May 1976	13	47	37	3
Belgique/België					
	Sept. 1973	15	44	34	7
	May 1976	10	42	44	4

¹ Countries are listed in descending order of frequency of the answer "Almost always" in May 1976.

² Not including Northern Ireland in 1973.

B. ASSESSMENT OF INFORMATION ON THE COMMUNITY

"Considering the news with regard to the information about the European Community put out by the press, radio and television, how would you rate the information that is given?"¹

The general impression that emerges from the replies given is, in 1976 as in in 1973, that the public, insofar as opinions are expressed², thinks that information available about the European Community is useful, complicated (59% and 52%, on average), interesting (48%) and too rare (40%).

The answers given by the opinion leaders of course differ somewhat from those of the non-leaders but less so than would have been expected:

- the proportion of leaders finding that information is "too rare" is two and a half times that of non-leaders (56% as against 23%); twice as many consider it to be "interesting" (60% as against 29%) and "useful" (70% as against 40%), but as many leaders as non-leaders find it complicated (50%), (and almost as many find it not interesting: 25% as against 34%);
- slightly more leaders than non-leaders - probably because they are more strongly influenced by the media, which reflect, highlight and discuss difficulties encountered - think the information is mainly bad news (38% as against 27%); but, because more leaders than non-leaders give an answer one way or the other, there are also more of them who find the information mainly good news (31% as against 17%);
- finally, as they are more critical of the media, leaders believe more often than non-leaders that the information tends to be biased. (see Table 8).

A relationship can also be traced between the views on information about the Community and the regularity with which the subject reads a daily newspaper, but it is not as pronounced as the relationship with the leadership index.

¹There followed a list of opposing adjectives: "too rare/too frequent", "simple/complicated", etc.

²See footnote to Table 8.

Table 8

VIEWS ON INFORMATION ABOUT THE EUROPEAN
COMMUNITY BY LEADERSHIP RANKING¹

(in the Community as a whole)

	Entire Population	Non- leaders (--)	(-)	(+)	Leaders (++)
	%	%	%	%	%
Too rare	40	23	38	48	56
Too frequent	18	18	20	16	15
Simple	23	12	23	26	32
Complicated	52	50	53	55	50
Not interesting	28	34	29	24	25
Interesting	48	29	47	57	60
Useful	59	40	59	68	70
Not useful	16	18	17	15	17
Mainly good news	24	17	22	29	31
Mainly bad news	34	27	36	35	38
Biased	31	22	29	34	46
Not biased	25	16	26	30	27

¹ In order not to make the table too cumbersome, the "don't knows" are not shown; they can be easily calculated by subtracting from 100 the total of the percentages shown opposite each pair of descriptions. The proportion of "don't knows" in the entire population ranges from 25% on average for certain items (simple/complicated, not interesting/interesting, useful/not useful) to approximately 40% for the others.

Differences between countries

The differences between countries can be considered from two angles: differences in the order in which the descriptions rank by percentage of replies, and differences in the actual percentages, regardless of positions in the rankings, i.e., the frequency with which each description is mentioned.

- (a) The description "useful" comes in first or second place everywhere; "complicated" is likewise first or second (except in Italy or Denmark) and "interesting" is second or third. Behind these, in third, fourth or fifth place, (except in Luxembourg and Italy), comes "mainly bad news"; this connotation of European information is probably associated with the socio-economic and socio-political situation when the survey was carried out¹.
- (b) In the nine countries, information about Europe is most frequently termed "useful" in the Netherlands (84%). "Complicated" is most frequently mentioned in Ireland, (67%), the United Kingdom (65%) and the Netherlands (64%); "interesting" in the Netherlands (58%) and and Ireland (56%); "too rare" in the Netherlands (56%) and the United Kingdom (50%); "mainly bad news" in the Netherlands (58%); "biased" also in the Netherlands (50%). It can be seen that the Dutch hold the most contradictory opinions on information about the European Community.

(see Table 9, and, in the Annex, Table 2).

¹ See below "Changes between 1973 and 1976".

TABLE 9

ORDER OF CLASSIFICATION OF DESCRIPTIONS APPLIED
TO INFORMATION ABOUT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

BY COUNTRY ¹

BELGIQUE/BELGIE		DANMARK		DEUTSCHLAND	
1. <u>Useful</u>	(57%)	1. <u>Useful</u>	(55%)	1. <u>Useful</u>	(55%)
2. <u>Complicated</u>	(48%)	2. <u>Interesting</u>	(41%)	2. <u>Complicated</u>	(54%)
3. <u>Interesting</u>	(41%)	3. <u>Mainly bad</u>		3. <u>Interesting</u>	(45%)
4. <u>Mainly bad</u>		news	(36%)	4. <u>Too rare</u>	(37%)
news	(37%)	4. <u>Not biased</u>	(34%)	5. <u>Mainly bad</u>	
5. <u>Too rare</u>	(35%)	5. <u>Not interesting</u>	(33%)	news	(32%)
6. <u>Biased</u>	(34%)	6. <u>Complicated</u>	(30%)	6. <u>Not interesting</u>	(29%)
7. <u>Not interesting</u>	(32%)	6a <u>Too rare</u>	(30%)	7. <u>Not biased</u>	(28%)
8. <u>Mainly good</u>		8. <u>Biased</u>	(27%)	8. <u>Biased</u>	(25%)
news	(27%)	9. <u>Too frequent</u>	(24%)	9. <u>Mainly good</u>	
8a <u>Not biased</u>	(27%)	10. <u>Mainly good</u>		news	(24%)
8b <u>Too frequent</u>	(27%)	news	(22%)	10. <u>Simple</u>	(21%)
11. <u>Simple</u>	(24%)	11. <u>Not useful</u>	(17%)	11. <u>Too frequent</u>	(19%)
12. <u>Not useful</u>	(17%)	12. <u>Simple</u>	(13%)	12. <u>Not useful</u>	(15%)
FRANCE		IRELAND		ITALIA	
1. <u>Useful</u>	(67%)	1. <u>Complicated</u>	(67%)	1. <u>Useful</u>	(56%)
2. <u>Complicated</u>	(55%)	2. <u>Useful</u>	(61%)	2. <u>Interesting</u>	(47%)
3. <u>Interesting</u>	(45%)	3. <u>Interesting</u>	(56%)	3. <u>Too rare</u>	(37%)
4. <u>Too rare</u>	(36%)	4. <u>Mainly bad</u>		4. <u>Complicated</u>	(35%)
5. <u>Mainly bad</u>		news	(43%)	5. <u>Mainly good</u>	
news	(32%)	5. <u>Too rare</u>	(42%)	news	(33%)
6. <u>Biased</u>	(31%)	6. <u>Not interesting</u>	(33%)	6. <u>Simple</u>	(29%)
7. <u>Not interesting</u>	(26%)	7. <u>Not biased</u>	(32%)	7. <u>Biased</u>	(27%)
8. <u>Mainly good</u>		8. <u>Biased</u>	(27%)	8. <u>Not interesting</u>	(20%)
news	(23%)	8a <u>Too frequent</u>	(27%)	9. <u>Not biased</u>	(19%)
8a <u>Not biased</u>	(23%)	10. <u>Mainly good</u>		10. <u>Mainly bad</u>	
10. <u>Simple</u>	(20%)	news	(25%)	news	(11%)
11. <u>Too frequent</u>	(12%)	11. <u>Simple</u>	(21%)	10a <u>Useful</u>	(11%)
12. <u>Not useful</u>	(9%)	11a <u>Not useful</u>	(21%)	12. <u>Too frequent</u>	(10%)
LUXEMBOURG		NEDERLAND		UNITED KINGDOM	
1. <u>Useful</u>	(69%)	1. <u>Useful</u>	(84%)	1. <u>Complicated</u>	(65%)
2. <u>Complicated</u>	(59%)	2. <u>Complicated</u>	(64%)	2. <u>Useful</u>	(53%)
3. <u>Interesting</u>	(50%)	3. <u>Interesting</u>	(58%)	2a <u>Interesting</u>	(53%)
4. <u>Biased</u>	(46%)	3a <u>Mainly bad</u>		2b <u>Mainly bad</u>	
4a <u>Too rare</u>	(46%)	news	(58%)	news	(53%)
5. <u>Mainly bad</u>		5. <u>Too rare</u>	(56%)	5. <u>Too rare</u>	(50%)
news	(44%)	6. <u>Biased</u>	(50%)	6. <u>Biased</u>	(39%)
6a <u>Too frequent</u>	(44%)	7. <u>Not interesting</u>	(34%)	7. <u>Not interesting</u>	(33%)
8. <u>Mainly good</u>		8. <u>Simple</u>	(28%)	8. <u>Not useful</u>	(31%)
news	(40%)	9. <u>Not biased</u>	(26%)	9. <u>Not biased</u>	(28%)
9. <u>Not biased</u>	(39%)	10. <u>Mainly good news</u>		10. <u>Too frequent</u>	(24%)
			(25%)		

CAB/3/86/76-E

9a. Not interesting (39%)	11. Too frequent (22%)	11. Simple (21%)
11. Simple (31%)	12. Not useful (10%)	12. Mainly good news (15%)
12. Not useful (21%)		

¹The items underlined are the ones which occupy the first three places for the Community as a whole. The percentages in brackets give the frequency with which the corresponding term is used by the people questioned in each country; where percentages are markedly higher in one country than in the others they are underlined.

Changes between 1973 and 1976

In the Community as a whole, the difference between the results in 1976 and in 1973 is slight. In the 1973 poll the descriptions most frequently chosen were: "useful", "complicated", "interesting" and "too rare". The only outstanding difference is the drop in the frequency of the answer "mainly good news" and the corresponding increase in the opposite answer.

Table 10

VIEWS ON INFORMATION ABOUT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY IN SEPTEMBER 1973 AND MAY 1976¹ (in the Community as a whole)

	Sept. 1973	May 1976	Difference ²
1. Useful (1)	55%	59%	negligible
2. Complicated (2)	54	52	"
3. Interesting (4)	43	48	+ 5
4. Too rare (3)	46	40	- 6
5. Mainly bad news (9)	26	34	+ 8
6. Biased (7)	30	31	negligible
7. Not interesting (8)	29	28	"
8. Not biased (6)	31	25	- 6
9. Mainly good news (5)	35	24	- 11
10. Simple (10)	18	23	+ 5
11. Too frequent (10a)	18	18	negligible
12. Not useful (12)	16	16	"

¹The twelve items are listed in descending order of percentages representing answers in May 1976. The order of 1973 is shown in brackets.

²Differences of less than five points are considered negligible.

Despite this appearance of steadiness, appreciable changes have occurred in individual countries. To give a clearer picture of these changes, Table 11 below shows, by country and for each pair of opposite answers, the significant differences between the percentages in 1976 and 1973.

This table reveals that:

- (a) The public in several countries feels that it is receiving more information now than in 1973, particularly in Ireland, but that it is still not getting enough, except in Luxembourg, (but the results for this country should always be interpreted with caution because of the size of the sample);
- (b) There is a stronger tendency in the United Kingdom today for the public to judge this information "interesting" and "useful";
- (c) The public in almost all the countries has shifted towards the view that this information is "mainly bad news" (and away from the view that it is "mainly good news").

TABLE 11
VIEWS ON INFORMATION ABOUT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY¹
(Increase or drop in the percentages between
September 1973 and May 1976)

	B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK ²
Too rare	-9	-7	-14	x	-25	-11	x	x	x
Too frequent	x	+8	x	-5	x	-7	+17	+5	-11
Simple	x	x	x	x	x	+6	+21	+10	+11
Complicated	-16	-20	-6	x	-9	-13	-11	x	+13
Not interesting	-10	+10	x	x	-8	x	x	-8	x
Interesting	x	x	-7	x	x	x	+8	+15	+26
Useful	-9	+5	-9	+6	x	x	-9	+14	+22
Not useful	x	+7	x	x	-10	x	+6	x	+6
Mainly good news	-15	-18	-7	-12	-35	-16	-5	-10	x
Mainly bad news	x	+16	x	+13	+9	x	+9	+25	+19
Biased	-9	x	x	+5	-15	x	x	+10	+6
Not biased	-5	+5	-13	-6	-20	-16	+12	x	+10

¹ Differences of less than five points, which are considered negligible, are indicated by "x" (see the percentages in the Annex, Tables 2 and 2a).

² Not including Northern Ireland in 1973.

To sum up, the public, and in particular opinion leaders, take a fairly favourable view of the information available on the European Community in its "Common Market" guise. The public would be willing to have a lot more of this information which it considers useful and interesting, but much of what is available is so technical and complex that it is difficult to understand, even for opinion leaders, that is to say, the 15% of the population most likely to discuss the subjects involved and to try to convince others.

However, the replies reveal that the information about the European Community and the Common Market does not conjure up bright prospects in the mind of the public. This is not surprising in a poll carried out in May 1976, a few weeks after what most of the press called the failure of the European Council in Luxembourg (beginning of April), in a difficult socio-economic climate (inflation, unemployment, agricultural problems) and in a political situation where the plan for Europe (election of the European Parliament, Tindemans report on European Unity) looked likely to be held back for some time to come by conflicts of interests and the traditional bargaining between governments.

The answers to the other questions given in the following pages will show that the European public is disturbed - or at least disenchanted.

III

THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY, POLITICAL UNION AND THE ELECTION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT BY UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE

A. THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

"Generally speaking, do you think that (your country's) membership of the Common Market is a good thing, a bad thing, or neither good nor bad?"

In almost all the countries, the European Community (Common Market) was held in lower esteem in May 1976 than in the previous poll. On average, for the Community as a whole, the difference amounts to ten points:

	Membership of the European Community is			
	Good thing	Bad thing	Neither good nor bad	Don't know
October-November 1975	63%	9%	21%	7%
May 1976	53	14	24	9
Difference	- 10	+ 5	+ 3	+ 2

Favourable opinions are fewer virtually everywhere: -17 points in Ireland, -13 in Germany, -12 in Italy and Luxembourg, -11 in the United Kingdom and -10 in France. Only in the Netherlands (+8 points) and in Belgium do favourable opinions increase or remain steady¹.

About half of those formerly in favour were this time probably uncertain ("neither good nor bad") or did not reply. But in three countries the increase in negative replies ("a bad thing") is significant: +14 points in Ireland, +11 in the United Kingdom and even +6 in the United Kingdom and even +6 in one of the six founder countries of the Community, the Federal Republic of Germany (see Table 12).

This general drop in approval of the European Community as it operates at present ("Common Market") should be read as a warning. The replies were most probably influenced by events in April, which was considered a bad month for Europe by all the European press; it is not surprising to find a fall-out from the press reports in the answers given by the public; in fact the reliability of Eurobarometer as a measuring instrument, would be highly suspect if it did not register such changes in the tide of opinion. The next survey will confirm or infirm this trend depending on what events occur and what decisions are taken in the meantime.

¹ Replies to all the questions concerning Europe followed the same pattern in the Netherlands; the proportion of those giving no reply fell and favourable replies increased. A special investigation will be held to try and find out why this happened, no explanation being immediately apparent.

TABLE 12

THE COMMON MARKET: A GOOD THING OR A BAD THING BY COUNTRY¹

	Good thing	Bad thing	Neither good nor bad	Don't know	Total
Nederland					
Sept. 1973	63%	4%	20%	13%	100%
May 1975	64	3	18	15	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	67	3	12	18	100
May 1976	75	4	15	6	100
Luxembourg					
Sept. 1973	67	3	22	8	100
May 1975	65	7	19	9	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	78	4	12	6	100
May 1976	66	5	21	8	100
Italia					
Sept. 1973	69	2	15	14	100
May 1975	71	3	21	5	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	75	4	16	5	100
May 1976	63	6	20	11	100
Belgique/België					
Sept. 73	57	5	19	19	100
May 1975	57	3	21	19	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	59	3	21	17	100
May 1976	62	5	17	16	100
France					
Sept. 1973	61	5	22	12	100
May 1975	64	4	25	7	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	67	4	24	5	100
May 1976	57	7	30	6	100
Ireland					
Sept. 1973	56	15	21	8	100
May 1975	50	20	25	5	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	67	12	17	4	100
May 1976	50	26	18	6	100
Deutschland					
Sept. 1973	63	4	22	11	100
May 1975	56	8	28	8	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	61	6	27	6	100
May 1976	48	12	30	10	100

TABLE 12 (Contd)

	Good thing	Bad thing	Neither good nor bad	Don't know	Total
United Kingdom					
Sept. 1973 ²	31%	34%	22%	13%	100%
May 1975	47	21	19	13	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	50	24	18	8	100
May 1976	39	35	18	8	100
Danmark					
Sept. 1973	42	30	19	9	100
May 1975	36	25	28	11	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	41	27	24	8	100
May 1976	36	29	22	13	100
COMMUNITY ³					
Sept. 1973	56	11	20	13	100
May 1975	59	9	23	9	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	63	9	21	7	100
May 1976	53	14	24	9	100

¹ Countries are listed in descending order of frequency of the reply "a good thing" in May 1976.

² Not including Northern Ireland in 1973.

³ Weighted average.

Leaders and non-leaders

A particularly interesting analysis using the leadership index was to see, on the basis of the results of the surveys in October-November 1975 and May 1976, to what extent leaders' attitudes had changed in line with those of the general public.

Table 13 shows the results:

- (a) The decrease in favourable opinions is general; this indicates that all categories of the population, leaders and non-leaders, view the situation unfavourably - probably through the media (press, radio and television). It can be seen, however, that those most affected are in the category just above the average on the leadership index (down fourteen points), i.e., fairly well educated people with a comfortable income; this category is relatively larger in Germany than in the other countries;
- (b) Unfavourable replies were up by a uniform five or six points in all four categories: this opposition is not therefore linked to leadership rankings, thus tending to confirm the hypothesis that the swing was caused by events at the time of the survey;

(c) Other differences are few and not significant¹.

¹ A similar analysis could be carried out for individual countries, but it would not be significant unless results of several polls were combined or compared.

TABLE 13

THE COMMON MARKET: A GOOD THING OR BAD THING BY LEADERSHIP RANKING
(in the Community as a whole)

	Good thing	Bad thing	Neither good nor bad	Dont know
<u>- October-November 1975</u>				
non-leaders (--)	43%	10%	31%	16%
(-)	62	9	22	7
(+)	73	8	16	3
leaders (++)	74	11	13	2
<u>- May 1976</u>				
non-leaders (--)	37	15	29	19
(-)	53	14	25	8
(+)	59	13	22	6
leaders (++)	63	17	17	3
<u>Difference</u>				
non-leaders (--)	-6	+5	-2	+3
(-)	-9	+5	+3	+1
(+)	-14	+5	+6	+3
leaders (++)	-11	+6	+4	+1

B. EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION

The rapid movement of the Community towards "European Union" still attracts the interest and support of a large majority of the European public, even though the governments of the Member States have shown no urgency in examining the "Report on European Union" that Mr Leo Tindemans, the Belgian Prime Minister, presented at the end of 1975 as requested by his colleagues in December 1974. Oddly enough, there has been no reduction either in frequency or in intensity of favourable attitudes towards European union. This may be because the plan is felt to be political and therefore viewed in the light of individual systems of values and ideologies; attitudes are therefore less open to the influence of difficult socio-economic circumstances, conflicts of interest and what can be read in the press. The replies to the three questions on this subject, which have remained unchanged, were as follows.

1. Movement towards European unification - speeded up, slowed down or continued as at present.

"Some people consider the European Community - Common Market - as being a first step towards a more close union between the Member States. Personally, do you think the movement towards the unification of Europe should be speeded up, slowed down or continued as it is at present?"

In the Community as a whole, four out of ten people (40%) still think that the movement towards the unification of Europe should be speeded up, compared with three out of ten (33%) who would prefer it to be "continued as at present", one out of ten (11%) who would like it to be slowed down, and nearly two out of ten (16%) "don't know".

Significant differences between replies in October-November 1975 and in May 1976 are evident in only three countries:

Germany (-8 points)

Netherlands (+11 points)

United Kingdom, where, while the frequency of positive replies changes little, negative replies are seven points up¹.

Italy and Luxembourg still head the list, while the Netherlands, France and Belgium have overtaken Germany. However, only in Italy and Luxembourg is there a large majority of favourable replies; in the Netherlands, France and Belgium, there are roughly as many unfavourable and neutral replies as favourable ones. In the three new member countries, unfavourable or neutral replies are once again more frequent, and this is also true of Germany, for the first time² (see Table 14).

¹"Neutral" replies ("continued as it is at present") and "don't know" are less frequent.

²A distinction should be made, however, between Denmark, where three out of ten people said "continued as it is at present" and three out of ten "slowed down", and the UK and Ireland where the modal reply was "continued as it is at present".

Table 14

SHOULD THE UNIFICATION OF EUROPE BE SPEEDED
UP, SLOWED DOWN OR CONTINUED AS AT PRESENT?

	Speeded up	Continued as at present	Slowed down	Don't know	Total
Italia					
Sept. 1973	55%	18%	2%	25%	100%
Oct.-Nov. 1975	61	17	4	18	100
May 1976	58	16	4	22	100
Luxembourg					
Sept. 1973	56	29	1	14	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	52	33	4	11	100
May 1976	55	20	9	16	100
Nederland					
Sept. 1973	32	47	6	15	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	33	38	4	25	100
May 1976	44	36	7	13	100
France					
Sept. 1973	36	40	3	21	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	45	36	6	13	100
May 1976	43	37	7	13	100
Belgique/België					
Sept. 1973	33	43	3	21	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	39	28	3	30	100
May 1976	40	32	5	23	100
Deutschland					
Sept. 1973	49	34	4	13	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	47	36	6	11	100
May 1976	39	34	10	17	100
Ireland					
Sept. 1973	25	45	12	18	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	35	40	12	13	100
May 1976	31	40	14	15	100
United Kingdom					
Sept. 1973 ¹	17	40	24	19	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	24	45	17	14	100
May 1976	23	42	24	11	100
Danmark					
Sept. 1973	12	44	36	8	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	13	33	37	17	100
May 1976	13	33	32	22	100

Table 14 (contd)

COMMUNITY ²	Speeded up	Continued as at present	Slowed down	Don't know	Total
Sept. 1973	38	34	9	19	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	43	34	8	15	100
May 1976	40	33	11	16	100

¹Not including Northern Ireland in 1973.

²Weighted average.

As was to be expected, there is a strong correlation between the replies to this question and the replies to the preceding one, on the European Community seen as the "Common Market". Among those who consider the Common Market a "good thing" (about 60% of replies given) an average of two out of three think that the movement towards European union should be speeded up. Of those who consider the Common Market a "bad thing" (less than two out of ten of those replying), a majority thinks that the movement towards unification should be "slowed down" (57%) or "continued as at present" (26%); some would even like to see the movement speeded up, which implies that a minority of those hostile to the Common Market, or sceptical about its current policies and achievements, are not opposed to the political unification of Europe. Finally those who are neutral in their attitude towards the Common Market (a quarter of those expressing an opinion) tend to favour continuing as at present (57%) or speeding up (30%), which would confirm the above observation.

(See Table 15).

Table 15

ATTITUDES TO THE MOVEMENT TOWARDS EUROPEAN UNIFICATION
IN RELATIONSHIP TO OPINIONS ON THE COMMON MARKET
(Community as a whole)

	Speeded up	Continued as at present	Slowed down	Total (not including "don't knows" ¹)
Think the Common Market is:				
a good thing	64%	33%	3%	100% (4155)
neither good nor bad	31	57	12	100 (1682)
a bad thing	17	26	57	100 (1054)
All persons answering both questions	48	38	14	100 (6891)

¹The figures in brackets indicate the number of people giving the reply that corresponds to each line, i.e., the basis for calculations.

It is also interesting to look at attitudes in the various countries of the European Community (Common Market), and their relationship to sentimental or ideological attachment to the movement for European political unification. The relationship varies considerably from country to country. For clarity, this relation is shown by expressing the combination of two given replies as a percentage of people who actually replied to both questions.

Table 16 spotlights the differences between opinions expressed in each country.

1. There is virtually no difference between total percentages of "Common Market = good thing" and of "speeded up" in Italy, whereas it is 31 points in the Netherlands and 25 points in Belgium and Denmark. This tends to indicate that in these three countries, a favourable attitude towards the Common Market (the frequency of such an attitude varies, of course, from country to country) does not in any way imply a favourable attitude to the acceleration of the movement towards European unification.
2. The difference between the total percentage of "Common Market = good thing" and the percentage of "Common Market = good thing" combined

with "speeded up" (last and first columns of each first line) measures the impact of this opinion of the Common Market on favourable attitudes towards speeding up unification. The smaller the difference, the closer the relationship: for example, in Italy the difference is 10 points, while in the United Kingdom it is 27 points, in Denmark 30, in Ireland 32 and in the Netherlands 35.

3. In the six founder countries of the Community and in Ireland, an absolute majority of people replying to both questions think that the Common Market is a good thing and that the movement should be speeded up or continued as at present. In the United Kingdom and in Denmark, this is true of 42% and 37% respectively of persons replying. Other combinations are fairly evenly spread, with a hard core of 22% in the United Kingdom and 28% in Denmark who seem resolutely hostile.
4. In the seven countries where attitudes are most favourable degrees of support may be established within the majority replying "Common Market = good thing" and "speeded up" or "continued as at present" on the basis of whether more preferred faster movement or whether more opted for the slower rate of progress. In the six founder countries, the balance tilts towards speeding up, while in Ireland there is a slight preference to continue as at present.
5. The reply "neither good nor bad" to the question about the Community as it is (33% in Germany and 30% in France) can be taken as an indication of a fairly favourable attitude, since this reply is usually combined with "speeded up" or (at least) "continued as at present". This minority is very important for the future of European unification.

Table 16

COMBINATION OF ATTITUDES TO THE COMMON MARKET AND TO
THE SPEED OF UNIFICATION,
BY COUNTRY¹

(as % of persons replying to both questions)

	Speeded up	Continued as at present	Slowed down	Total
ITALIA (N = 710)				
CM = good thing	64%	9%	1%	74%
= neither good nor bad	9	10	1	20
= bad thing	2	1	3	6
Total	75%	20%	5%	100%
LUXEMBOURG (N = 219)				
CM = good thing	57%	13%	5%	75%
= neither good nor bad	6	10	5	21
= bad thing	3	1	1	4
Total	66%	23%	11%	100%
NEDERLAND (N = 710)				
CM = good thing	47%	32%	3%	82%
= neither good nor bad	3	9	2	14
= bad thing	1	1	2	4
Total	51%	42%	7%	100%
BELGIQUE/BELGIE (N = 713)				
CM = good thing	46%	28%	2%	76%
= neither good nor bad	4	13	2	19
= bad thing	1	1	3	5
Total	51%	42%	7%	100%
FRANCE (N = 1041)				
CM = good thing	40%	22%	1%	63%
= neither good nor bad	9	18	3	30
= bad thing	1	2	4	7
Total	50%	42%	8%	100%
DEUTSCHLAND (N = 791)				
CM = good thing	35%	18%	2%	55%
= neither good nor bad	10	19	4	33
= bad thing	2	4	6	12
Total	47%	41%	12%	100%

Table 16 continued

	Speeded up	Continued as at present	Slowed down	Total
IRELAND (N = 824)				
CM = good thing	25%	29%	3%	57%
= neither good nor bad	5	10	3	18
= bad thing	6	8	11	25
Total	36%	47%	17%	100%
UNITED KINGDOM (N = 1124)				
CM = good thing	17%	25%	2%	44%
= neither good nor bad	5	11	3	19
= bad thing	5	10	22	37
Total	27%	46%	27%	100%
DANMARK (N = 696)				
CM = good thing	12%	25%	5%	42%
= neither good nor bad	3	11	9	23
= bad thing	2	5	28	35
Total	17%	41%	42%	100%

¹ Countries are listed in descending order of percentage of "CM = good thing" combined with "speeded up"

Leaders and non-leaders

Once again the use of the new leadership index produces interesting results. It shows that two and a half-times more leaders than non-leaders are in favour of speeding up the movement, but also that the percentage of leaders in favour went down by seven points between October-November 1975 and May 1976.

These results seem to indicate that leaders, who, as we have seen, do not differ significantly from the rest of the population in their attitude to the "Common Market", are beginning to have doubts about Europe's chances of rapid unification.

The following pages confirm this.

(See Table 17).

Table 17

SPEED UP, CONTINUE AS AT PRESENT OR SLOW DOWN THE

MOVEMENT OF EUROPEAN UNIFICATION

BY LEADERSHIP RANKING

(Community as a whole)

	Speeded up	Continued as at present	Slowed down	Don't know
<u>-October-November 1975</u>				
non-leaders (--)	26%	35%	9%	30%
(-)	39	39	8	14
(+)	51	34	7	8
leaders (++)	62	22	10	6
<u>- May 1976</u>				
non-leaders (--)	23%	35%	11%	31%
(-)	38	35	12	15
(+)	48	31	11	10
leaders (++)	55	26	11	8
non-leaders (--)	- 3	0	+ 2	+ 1
(-)	- 1	- 4	+ 4	+ 1
(+)	- 3	- 3	+ 4	+ 2
leaders (++)	<u>- 7</u>	+ 4	+ 1	+ 2

2. For or against European political union by 1980

"There is a proposal to create a European political union among the member countries of the Community by 1980, with a European government which would decide on major issues and a European Parliament to monitor its activities. Do you approve or disapprove of this plan for European political union?"

In the Community as a whole, six out of ten people interviewed (57%) still say they "totally approve" (24%) or "approve on the whole" (33%) of the plan for European political union. These results tend to indicate that replies to the preceding question ("speed up or slow down") reflect disenchantment rather than hostility, at least in the six original countries of the Community.

(See Table 18).

Table 18

FOR OR AGAINST POLITICAL UNION BY 1980

	September 1973	May 1975	Oct.-Nov. 1975	May 1976
	%	%	%	%
Totally approve	24	24	23	24
Approve on the whole	30	35	36	33
Disapprove on the whole	13	12	13	12
Totally disapprove	11	9	8	11
Deliberately and explicitly refuse to reply	} 22	20	20	2
Do not know, are not interested ¹				18
Total	100	100	100	100

¹ These two kinds of non-reply were experimentally distinguished in May 1976, so as to measure how many non-replies were motivated by downright negative attitudes ("I won't answer") and how many by simple lack of interest. The results are conclusive: in most cases people do not reply because they do not feel concerned, are not interested in politics, and so on. The proportion of "abstentions" (20% on average) is no higher than the percentage of non-votes in national elections in most countries where voting is not obligatory.

Once again there is a strong positive correlation between favourable replies to the question about European political union and favourable attitudes to the Common Market. Out of 100 people who think the Common Market is a good thing, 85 are equally divided between total approval and approval on the whole of European political union. Moreover, ~~and~~ this confirms the earlier analysis, two-thirds of those who are neutral towards the Common Market are in favour of political union, but tend to "approve on the whole" rather than "totally approve". Among those who express an unfavourable opinion of the Common Market, nearly one-third are nevertheless not opposed to political union. (See Table 19)¹.

¹The relationships between replies to these two questions for individual countries will be considered below.

Table 19

FOR OR AGAINST EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION BY 1980
ACCORDING TO OPINIONS ON THE COMMON MARKET
(Community as a whole)

	Totally approve	Approve on the whole	Disapprove on the whole	Totally disap- prove	Total (not includ- "don't knows") ¹
Think the Common Market is:					
a good thing	42%	43%	9%	6%	100% (3953)
neither good nor bad	14	52	23	11	100 (1468)
a bad thing	8	21	24	47	100 (1071)
All persons answering both questions	30	42	14	14	100 (6492)

¹The figures in brackets indicate the number of people giving the reply that corresponds to each line, i.e., the basis for calculations.

Differences between countries

Italy still leads in total favourable opinions, with 71%. However, this is six points less than in the last survey, with an increase in the number of people not answering.

Luxembourg is equal first with Italy, with a negligible drop of four points since the last survey. There were fewer people replying "approve on the whole", but more replying "totally approve".

The Netherlands gained sixteen points from 52 to 68%, with far fewer people not answering¹.

Germany fell from 67% to 64%, a negligible, but perhaps indicative, drop. The slight reduction is mainly among those who "approve on the whole".

France fell back eight points, from 66% to 58%: those totally approving were down three points and those approving on the whole down five points.

Belgium advanced three points, from 52% to 55%.

Ireland lost five points, from 49% to 44%, but still has a majority in favour among those who express an opinion.

In the United Kingdom the percentage of those totally approving and approving on the whole remained unchanged (34% in all), but there was an increase of nine points in the percentage of people who "totally disapprove", and the majority of opinions expressed were unfavourable.

In Denmark there was a slight increase in favourable replies, (+ three points), a decrease in fairly unfavourable replies ("disapprove on the whole") (- four points) and an increase in very unfavourable replies (+ five points). Most Danes are still hostile, but there is a very slight improvement in the ratio of supporters to opponents of European political union.

(See Table 20).

¹ See page 22, note 1.

Table 20
FOR OR AGAINST EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION BY 1980,
BY COUNTRY¹

	Totally approve	Approve on the whole	Disap- prove on the whole	Totally disap- prove	No answer or don't know	Total
Italie						
Sept. 1973	33%	32%	8%	4%	23%	100%
May 1975	32	39	8	3	18	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	41	36	6	3	14	100
May 1976	38	33	5	3	21	100
Luxembourg						
Sept. 1973	38	31	8	5	18	100
May 1975	36	35	8	3	18	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	31	44	6	2	17	100
May 1976	36	35	6	1	22	100
Nederland						
Sept. 1973	21	34	14	9	22	100
May 1975	25	29	8	7	31	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	26	26	8	6	34	100
May 1976	37	31	10	8	14	100
Deutschland						
Sept. 1973	31	39	8	4	18	100
May 1975	25	45	9	4	17	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	22	45	11	4	18	100
May 1976	23	41	9	5	22	100
France						
Sept. 1973	25	32	11	5	27	100
May 1975	30	36	11	6	17	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	24	42	10	5	19	100
May 1976	21	37	12	8	22	100
Belgique/België						
Sept. 1973	25	33	7	5	30	100
May 1975	23	28	6	3	40	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	25	27	6	5	37	100
May 1976	29	26	5	5	35	100
Ireland						
Sept. 1973	11	24	19	22	24	100
May 1975	11	26	19	19	25	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	15	34	20	8	23	100
May 1976	16	28	19	12	25	100
United Kingdom						
Sept. 1973 (2)	8	18	23	31	20	100
May 1975	14	22	23	23	18	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	10	24	25	20	21	100
May 1976	10	24	21	29	16	100
Danmark						
Sept. 1973	11	17	26	32	14	100
May 1975	7	14	22	32	25	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	7	14	23	28	28	100
May 1976	8	16	19	33	24	100

¹ Countries are listed in descending order of positive replies ("totally approve" and "approve on the whole") in May 1976.
² Not including Northern Ireland in 1973.

Opinion on the Common Market and attitude to European political union

After considering above the extent to which opinions on the Common Market influenced attitudes towards the speed of the political unification movement; the relationship, in individual countries, between opinions on the Common Market and attitudes to European political union is now examined here.

(See Table 21).

1. In most countries there are more in favour of European political union ("totally approve" or "approve on the whole") than consider the Common Market a "good thing". The only exceptions are Denmark, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, but even there the difference is slight. This lends support to the hypothesis that some of the people who are disappointed with the Common Market as it is at present are none the less in favour of European political union¹.
2. An overwhelming majority of those who think the Common Market a good thing are also in favour of European political union. However, in France, Ireland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom a fairly large proportion of the public is unenthusiastic about, or even hostile to, European political union, in spite of a favourable attitude towards the Common Market².
3. Those who think the Common Market a bad thing should, a priori, be unfavourable to European political union; the results bear this out almost everywhere.
4. Among those who are neutral towards the Common Market, there is a tendency to support European political union except in Denmark³. This confirms the importance which must be accorded to the evolution of attitudes towards the European Community (Common Market), but it also shows that attitudes to the plan for political union are a distinct, although related, aspect or attitudes to the reality of the Common Market⁴.

¹ See in Table 21 the percentages for each country of "CM = good thing" (total) and "totally approve" or "approve on the whole" (combined total).

² See in Table 21 the percentages for each country of "CM = good thing" (total) and on the same line, the total percentages of "totally approve" and "approve on the whole".

³ See in Table 21 the percentages for each country of "CM = neither good nor bad" (total) and, on the same line, the total percentages of "totally approve" and "approve on the whole", or of "disapprove on the whole" and "totally disapprove".

⁴ This distinction will be analysed later.

Table 21

OPINION OF THE COMMON MARKET AND ATTITUDE TO
EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION BY COUNTRY¹

(as a % of persons replying to both questions)

	Totally approve	Approve on the whole	Disapprove on the whole	Totally disap- prove	Total
<u>LUXEMBOURG (N = 204)</u>					
CM = good thing	42%	32%	3%	-	77%
= neither good nor bad	3	10	4	1	18
= bad thing	2	2	1	.	5
Total	47%	44%	8%	1%	100%
<u>BELGIQUE/BELGIE (N = 602)</u>					
CM = good thing	41%	32%	5%	2%	80%
= neither good nor bad	3	8	2	2	15
= bad thing	1	1	1	2	5
Total	45%	41%	8%	6%	100%
<u>ITALIA (N = 702)</u>					
CM = good thing	44%	27%	2%	1%	74%
= neither good nor bad	4	11	3	1	19
= bad thing	2	3	1	1	7
Total	50%	41%	6%	3%	100%
<u>NEDERLAND (N = 705)</u>					
CM = good thing	41%	29%	7%	5%	82%
= neither good nor bad	1	7	3	2	13
= bad thing	1		1	3	5
Total	43%	36%	11%	10%	100%
<u>DEUTSCHLAND (N = 749)</u>					
CM = good thing	24%	30%	2%	1%	57%
= neither good nor bad	4	19	6	1	30
= bad thing	1	5	3	4	13
Total	29%	54%	11%	6%	100%
<u>FRANCE (N = 932)</u>					
CM = good thing	22%	32%	7%	4%	65%
= neither good nor bad	4	14	7	3	28
= bad thing	1	1	2	3	7
Total	27%	47%	16%	10%	100%

Table 21 continued

	Totally approve	Approve on the whole	Disap- prove on the whole	Totally disap- prove	Total
IRELAND (N = 733)					
CM = good thing	17%	23%	10%	6%	56%
= neither good nor bad	2	7	5	3	17
= bad thing	3	6	10	8	27
Total	22%	36%	25%	17%	100%
UNITED KINGDOM (N = 1058)					
CM = good thing	9%	17%	9%	8%	43%
= neither good nor bad	2	6	5	4	17
= bad thing	2	5	10	23	40
Total	13%	28%	24%	35%	100%
DANMARK (N = 682)					
CM = good thing	8%	16%	8%	8%	40%
= neither good nor bad	1	5	8	9	23
= bad thing	2	1	7	27	37
Total	11%	22%	23%	44%	100%

¹Countries are listed in descending order of percentage of replies "CM = good thing" combined with "totally approve" of European political union.

Leaders and non-leaders

As the above results suggest, leaders' opinions are distinctly more favourable than non-leaders' opinions: 68% of the former "totally approve" or "approve on the whole" of European political union, compared with only 39% of the latter. The difference is mainly due to the fact that the leaders have an opinion, which they express; hostile opinions are equally distributed throughout the leadership rankings.

Compared with the October-November 1975 results, the latest results show a slight increase in the number of leaders of opinion who "totally disapprove" (+ 6 points), thereby repeating the warning mentioned above.

(See Table 22).

Table 22

FOR OR AGAINST EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION BY 1980 BY LEADERSHIP RANKING

	Totally approve	Approve on the whole	Disap- prove on the whole	Totally disap- prove	No answer or don't know
<u>-October-November 1975</u>					
non-leaders (—)	12%	26%	14%	9%	39%
(-)	22	37	13	8	20
(+)	26	43	12	7	12
leaders (++)	41	33	12	8	6
<u>-May 1976</u>					
non-leaders (—)	13%	26%	11%	10%	40%
(-)	20	36	12	11	21
(+)	27	39	12	11	11
leaders (++)	39	29	10	14	8
<u>Difference</u>					
non-leaders (—)	+ 1	0	- 3	+ 1	+ 1
(-)	- 2	- 1	- 1	+ 3	+ 1
(+)	+ 1	- 4	0	+ 4	- 1
leaders (++)	- 2	- 4	- 2	+ 6	+ 2

3. Powers to be accorded to the European union

As we have just seen, in the Community as a whole and in seven out of nine member countries, the majority of those interviewed supported the creation of European political union by 1980, with a European Government and Parliament. What does this idea conjure up in the minds of the public by way of form and content? It is not easy to give a comprehensive reply to this question. However the survey did try to get people to define their conception of European union, or more precisely, to say what they would or would not accept in the plan for European union that Mr Leo Tindemans has presented to the Heads of Government.

Four important items on the Tindemans Report were turned into questions about: foreign policy; economic and monetary policy; regional and social policy to eliminate inequalities; the protection of fundamental rights of citizens.

"Here is a list of important aspects of the idea of European political union, which is at present being discussed. Could you please tell me, for each one of these aspects, whether you agree totally, agree on the whole or disagree totally?"¹

The first finding is that throughout the Community, there are fewer than 20% "don't knows", which shows that, however well or badly informed people may be, and whatever their personal attitudes may be, they are no more likely to refuse to reply to difficult but precise questions than to a general question about the principle of European political union.

Secondly, favourable replies to the four precise questions - foreign policy, economic and monetary policy, regional and social policy, protection of fundamental rights - are on average more frequent than favourable replies to the more general question on political union with the European Government and Parliament: 57%, as we have seen, for the latter question and 65 to 69% for the other four. This means that some Europeans disapprove on the whole of the general principle, or are not sure, (or perhaps the words "government" and "European Parliament" put them off), but would still be prepared to accept the common policies without understanding clearly what this would mean².

¹The four aspects were mentioned in the order in which the results are set out (see Table 23).

²This apparent contradiction is of course not confined to opinions about Europe. Political theory and social psychology are now wary of the "implicit model" of the "rational" elector, and prefer to study people's observed attitudes and behaviour. This approach does not turn its back on the ideal of rationality, nor on the concern for critical education, but it does enable us to look at reality as it is and not as we would like it to be. See for example B. Berelson: "Democratic Theory and Public Opinion", Public Opinion Quarterly, No 16, 1952, pp 313-330.

Although the percentages in favour are much the same for each item, the items can be ranked using an index which takes account of the degree of support for each one:

	<u>Index</u> ¹
Protection of fundamental rights	0.874
Economic and monetary policy	0.809
Regional and social policy	0.737
Foreign policy	0.629

¹ The following formulas are used to calculate the coefficient of imbalance:

$$\frac{(2f + f')^2 - \sqrt{(2f + f') (u' + 2u)}}{10\ 000} \text{ or } \frac{(u' + 2u)^2 - \sqrt{(2f + f') (u' + 2u)}}{10\ 000}$$

depending on whether the weighted total of favourable replies $(2f + f')$ is greater or smaller than the weighted total of unfavourable replies $(u' + 2u)$. Scores vary between + 4 and - 4; the central point 0 corresponds to a situation where favourable and unfavourable tendencies cancel each other out.

Table 23

MAIN ASPECTS OF EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION

(Community as a whole)

	Agree totally	Agree on the whole	Disagree totally	Disagree on the whole	Don't know	Total
The member countries of the European union would have a common foreign policy	29%	36%	11%	7%	17%	100%
The member countries would have a common economic and monetary policy	34	34	10	7	15	100
The member countries would have a common regional and social policy which would aim to level out the differences in favour of the less favoured regions and social categories	30	38	10	5	17	100
All fundamental rights of the citizens of all member countries would be recognized and protected by the same laws in all countries. Every citizen would thus be able to appeal directly to the European Court of Justice.	35	34	8	7	16	100

Leaders and non-leaders

The protection of fundamental rights is most frequently first in the list of the four proposed objectives, whatever the ranking in the leadership index of the person questioned. But whereas non-leaders class regional and social policy second, leaders seem to prefer economic and monetary policy. Differences between the leadership categories are, however, very slight.

Table 24

INDEX OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE MAIN
ASPECTS OF EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION
BY LEADERSHIP RANKING¹
(Community as a whole)

	Non-leaders (--)	(-)	(+)	Leaders (++)
Common foreign policy	0.286	0.596	0.818	1.026
Common economic and monetary policy	0.366	0.727	1.098	1.343
Common regional and social policy	0.372	0.662	0.937	1.264
Protection of fundamental rights	0.432	0.815	1.136	1.407

¹For the calculation of the "agreement/disagreement" index, see p. 43 note 1.

Differences between countries

The order of countries by average percentage of positive replies to the four items (Table 23) is approximately the same as by positive replies to the question on European union (see Table 20). It is in fact logical that those who give a positive reply to the first question should do likewise for the second. But once again, in all the countries without exception, the phenomenon described above occurs: the public seems even more favourably disposed to the concrete aspects of European union than to the principle of the union. The difference is particularly significant in the three new member countries:

	Percentage in favour of European union in principle	Average percentage of favourable replies on the four aspects of European Union	Difference
Ireland	44%	71%	+ 27
United Kingdom	34	58	+ 24
Denmark	24	42	+ 18

This phenomenon can perhaps be explained by the existence of a priori support for the objectives of European political union, and of some prejudice against a global plan which is still unfamiliar, or which seems unlikely to be realized in the near future.

Although the average rankings of the four objectives are as expected for the Community as a whole (fundamental rights leading, followed by economic and monetary policy, regional and social policy, and finally foreign policy), there are some differences for individual countries:

economic and monetary policy ranks first in Belgium and Denmark;
regional and social policies rank first in Italy and France;
foreign policy is in second place in Germany and the United Kingdom.

There is no apparent relationship between the extent of favourable opinions in a given country and the ranking of objectives.

(See Table 25)

Table 25

MAIN ASPECTS OF EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION BY COUNTRY¹

LUXEMBOURG (80%)	ITALIA (72%)	FRANCE (71%)
1. Fundamental rights (1.797)	1. Reg. and soc. pol. (1.310)	1. Reg. and soc. pol. (1.194)
2. Eco. and mon. pol. (1.647)	2. Eco. and mon. pol. (1.262)	2. Eco. and mon. pol. (1.144)
3. Foreign pol. (1.438)	3. Fundamental rights (1.142)	3. Fundamental rights (0.881)
4. Reg. and soc. pol. (1.293)	4. Foreign pol. (0.800)	4. Foreign pol. (0.589)
IRELAND (71%)	NEDERLAND (71%)	DEUTSCHLAND (71%)
1. Fundamental rights (1.327)	1. Fundamental rights (1.155)	1. Fundamental rights (1.097)
2. Reg. and soc. pol. (1.063)	2. Eco. and mon. pol. (0.992)	2. Foreign pol. (0.949)
3. Eco. and mon. pol. (0.804)	3. Reg. and soc. pol. (0.921)	3. Eco. and mon. pol. (0.802)
4. Foreign pol. (0.643)	4. Foreign pol. (0.721)	4. Reg. and soc. pol. (0.486)
BELGIQUE/BELGIE (62%)	UNITED KINGDOM (58%)	DANMARK (42%)
1. Eco. and mon. pol. (0.958)	1. Fundamental rights (0.453)	1. Eco. and mon. pol. (0.229)
2. Fundamental rights (0.943)	2. Foreign pol. (0.297)	2. Reg. and soc. pol. (0.157)
3. Reg. and soc. pol. (0.793)	3. Eco. and mon. pol. (0.286)	3. Fundamental rights (0.068)
4. Foreign pol. (0.633)	4. Reg. and soc. pol. (0.277)	4. Foreign pol. (- 0.105)

¹ Countries are listed in descending order of average percentage of favourable replies ("agree totally" and "agree on the whole") to the four items. For each country items are listed in descending order of score on the "agreement/disagreement" index. For a detailed analysis of replies, see Table 4 of the Annex.

C. ELECTION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT BY DIRECT UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE

Although the governments of the nine member countries had not come to an agreement on the number of seats to be attributed to the various countries in a directly elected European Parliament, the subject had still been in the limelight. It has been discussed in the press and political party-leaders have begun their preparations. The public takes an interest (fewer than 20% "don't-knows" on average) but is not usually passionately committed; in seven of the nine countries attitudes are generally favourable.

In May 1976 three questions were asked. One of them, repeated every six months, concerns the principle of the election, and the other two, exploratory questions, were about the kind of powers the Parliament should have, and the probable behaviour of the political groups represented.

1. The principle of the election

"One of the proposals is to elect a European Parliament in 1978 - in other words within two years - by the direct vote of all citizens in the member countries of the European Community (Common Market). Are you, yourself, for/or against this proposal? How strongly do you feel about it?"

As in October-November 1975, and in May 1975, more than six out of ten people throughout the Community are in favour of the European Parliament being elected. The percentage of people who "completely favour" the proposal rose by three points, from 25% to 28%, between the end of 1975 and the middle of 1976, and the percentage of people who "favour on the whole" dropped by five points, from 39% to 34%. The change is thus negligible. The public seems to be waiting for a decision (for or against) to change its opinion.

(See Table 26)

Table 26
FOR OR AGAINST THE ELECTION OF THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT BY DIRECT UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE
(Community as a whole)¹

	September 1973	May 1975	Oct.-Nov. 1975	May 1976
	%	%	%	%
Completely favour	24	27	25	28
Favour on the whole	30	36	39	34
Disagree to some extent	12	9	10	11
Disagree completely	11	9	8	10
Don't know	23	19	18	17
Total	100	100	100	100

¹Weighted average.

There is a positive correlation between attitudes to the election of the European Parliament and opinions of the Common Market. Of 100 people who think the Common Market a "good thing", 86 support the proposal for a directly elected European Parliament, almost equally divided between "completely favour" and "favour on the whole". Two-thirds of those giving a neutral reply to the question about the Common Market support direct elections, and even among those who are most critical of the Common Market, 40% favour direct elections.

Table 27 can to some extent be compared with Table 19, but the relationship is not as pronounced. In other words, attitudes to European Parliamentary elections seem to be less dependent on opinions of the Common Market than are attitudes to political union.

Table 27
FOR OR AGAINST THE ELECTION OF THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT BY DIRECT UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE
ACCORDING TO OPINIONS ON THE COMMON MARKET
(Community as a whole)

	Complete- ly favour	Favour on the whole	Disagree to some extent	Disagree complete- ly	Total (not including "don't knows") ¹
Think the Common Market is:					
a good thing	46%	40%	9%	5%	100% (4079)
neither good or bad	19	50	21	10	100 (1594)
a bad thing	13	27	19	41	100 (1093)
All persons answering both questions	35	40	13	12	100 (6766)

¹The figures in brackets indicate the number of people giving the reply that corresponds to each line.

Leaders and non-leaders

Among opinion leaders attitudes are still much more favourable than among non-leaders, but there has been one very significant development over the past six months: the total of favourable replies has dropped slightly among leaders and gone up among non-leaders. It would appear that the leaders are beginning to grow weary of waiting, while the non-leaders are not yet reacting to the fact that no government decision is forthcoming.

(See Table 28)

Table 28

FOR OR AGAINST DIRECT ELECTIONS TO THE
EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT BY UNIVERSAL
SUFFRAGE BY LEADERSHIP RANKING
(Community as a whole)

	Complete- ly favour	Favour on the whole	Disagree to some extent	Disagree complete- ly	Don't know
<u>October-November 1975</u>					
non-leaders (- -)	11%	31%	11%	10%	37%
(-)	22	42	10	9	17
(+)	29	45	10	7	9
leaders (+ +)	40	37	10	8	5
<u>May 1976</u>					
non-leaders (- -)	17%	32%	9%	10%	32%
(-)	25	36	13	10	16
(+)	33	36	12	10	9
leaders (+ +)	43	29	10	11	7
<u>Difference</u>					
non-leaders (- -)	+ 6	+ 1	- 2	0	- 5
(-)	+ 3	- 6	+ 3	+ 1	- 1
(+)	+ 4	- 9	+ 2	+ 3	0
leaders (+ +)	+ 3	- 8	0	+ 3	+ 2

Differences and developments in individual countries

The Netherlands has now joined Italy and Luxembourg to rank among the countries most in favour of elections to the European Parliament. The United Kingdom and Denmark are still the most reticent.

Between October-November 1975 and May 1976, there was a significant increase in favourable replies in the Netherlands (+ 14 points), and in Denmark (+ 8); there was also a slight increase in Belgium (+ 6) and a slight decrease in Germany (- 6).

(See Table 29)

Table 29

FOR OR AGAINST THE ELECTION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

BY UNIVERSAL DIRECT SUFFRAGE

BY COUNTRY¹

	Complete- ly favour	Favour on the whole	Disagree to some extent	Disagree complete- ly	Don't know	Total
Italia						
Sept. 1973	34%	30%	8%	4%	24%	100%
May 1975	37	40	6	2	15	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	38	40	5	3	14	100
May 1976	42	32	6	2	18	100
Nederland						
Sept. 1973	32	30	11	5	22	100
May 1975	28	29	7	7	29	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	27	32	6	5	30	100
May 1976	43	30	8	6	13	100
Luxembourg						
Sept. 1973	40	27	8	4	21	100
May 1975	36	33	7	3	21	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	31	44	6	1	18	100
May 1976	36	35	5	4	20	100
Deutschland						
Sept. 1973	29	40	9	3	19	100
May 1975	28	48	6	2	16	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	23	50	9	2	16	100
May 1976	25	42	10	5	18	100
France						
Sept. 1973	22	29	11	7	31	100
May 1975	33	35	9	6	17	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	26	43	9	4	18	100
May 1976	28	38	10	7	17	100

Table 29 continued

	Complete- ly favour	Favour on the whole	Disagree to some extent	Disagree complete- ly	Don't know	Total
Belgique/België						
Sept. 1973	23	29	8	6	34	100
May 1975	23	32	6	3	36	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	20	33	5	4	38	100
May 1976	31	28	7	4	30	100
Ireland						
Sept. 1973	15	30	17	14	24	100
May 1975	20	35	13	9	23	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	19	37	15	8	21	100
May 1976	24	33	17	8	18	100
United Kingdom						
Sept. 1973 ²	11	22	19	30	18	100
May 1975	16	25	16	27	16	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	13	28	18	24	17	100
May 1976	14	26	19	29	12	100
Danmark						
Sept. 1973	20	16	18	25	21	100
May 1975	15	20	12	21	32	100
Oct.-Nov. 1975	13	19	18	25	25	100
May 1976	18	22	17	25	18	100

¹ Countries are listed in descending order of favourable replies ("completely favour" and "favour on the whole").

² Not including Northern Ireland in 1973.

2. Powers of the European Parliament

One argument used by some opponents of the direct election of the European Parliament is that people interviewed in surveys do not clearly understand what is involved, and in particular, do not consider that their "national members" might form a minority against a majority of "foreign members". This is why the following question was asked:

"In the European Parliament the Members of Parliament (for your country) would not have the majority, even if they were all in agreement. Would you, or would you not, accept that the European Parliament passes laws in the fields that I am going to list, which would be applicable to all countries of the European Community, including (your country)?"

- A. As far as taxation matters are concerned (e.g., create a European tax)
- B. As far as employment legislation is concerned (e.g., European regulations about professional training)
- C. As far as public works are concerned (e.g., a European programme on motorways, rivers and canals)
- D. As far as foreign relations are concerned (e.g., signing of a commercial treaty with a foreign country)."

Most people seem prepared to accept a majority vote in the European Parliament on matters of public works (68%), labour law (63%) and foreign relations (56%). The percentage is lower where taxation matters are concerned (44%), but here taxation itself is perhaps the reason for the public's hesitation rather than procedures for adopting tax laws.

(See Table 30)

Table 30

READINESS TO ACCEPT "SUPRANATIONAL" VOTING
IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
(Community as a whole)¹

	Would accept	Would not	Don't know	Total
C. European laws on public works	68%	16%	16%	100%
B. European laws on employment	63	19	18	100
D. European laws on foreign relations	56	20	24	100
A. European laws on taxation	44	34	22	100

¹Weighted average.

Leaders and non-leaders

Table 28 showed that the percentage of leaders in favour of direct elections to the European Parliament was one and a half times greater than the percentage of non-leaders; the proportion of leaders prepared to accept "supranational" voting in the four fields mentioned is even greater.

Table 31

READINESS TO ACCEPT "SUPRANATIONAL" VOTING
BY LEADERSHIP RANKING
(Community as a whole)

	Non-leaders (--)	(-)	(+)	Leaders (++)
	%	%	%	%
<u>Public works</u>				
would accept	52	66	77	79
would not	16	18	14	16
don't know	32	16	9	5
<u>Employment</u>				
would accept	46	62	70	75
would not	20	19	18	18
don't know	34	19	12	7
<u>Foreign relations</u>				
would accept	39	53	65	68
would not	18	21	19	24
don't know	43	26	16	8
<u>Taxation</u>				
would accept	31	41	51	55
would not	33	37	34	34
don't know	36	22	15	11

Differences by country

In general, average percentages of positive replies to the four items of this question were much the same as with the replies to the question on the principle of European Parliamentary elections (see Table 29). (The only exception is Italy, where the average here is 62%, compared with 74% of those interviewed who said they were in favour of direct elections to the European Parliament; this difference is due to the fact that more people replied "don't know" to the second, more difficult, question.)

This seems to prove that Europeans give coherent replies to the question about the principle of election to the European Parliament and to the ancillary question about the risk of their own country's representatives being in a minority. The second question reveals practically the same support for the election, although generally speaking taxation laws, European or other, seem less popular than laws in other fields, including foreign relations.

(See Table 32, and the more detailed Table 5 of the Annex)

Table 32
ACCEPTANCE OF "SUPRANATIONAL" VOTING IN THE
EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
BY COUNTRY¹
(Positive replies)

	Public works	Employment legislation	External relations	Taxation
Luxembourg	76%	76%	56%	59%
Nederland	80	70	60	56
France	80	73	62	42
Deutschland	73	63	58	47
Italia	70	68	62	48
Belgique/België	62	64	56	41
Ireland	60	67	45	43
United Kingdom	48	48	43	37
Danmark	48	46	40	18
Community ²	68	63	56	44

¹ Countries are listed in descending order of average positive replies to the four items.

² Weighted average.

3. Likely voting practice of the political groups represented in the European Parliament

The other exploratory question asked about a directly-elected Parliament concerned the manner in which the directly-elected members would - or should - vote in the European Parliament.

"In a European Parliament made up of MPs from all the countries of the Common Market, what do you think is most likely to happen:

The MPs from each country will form a group and all vote the same way,

The deputies from different countries will form groups along political lines such as a Socialist or Conservative group drawn from many countries?"

In the Community as a whole, the most frequent reply was "the deputies will form groups along political lines". This corresponds, in fact, to current European parliamentary practice; 45% of persons questioned, and six out of ten who actually replied, gave this answer.

The various countries fall into three broad groups:

France and the Netherlands, where the "European" reply was given by an absolute majority of those questioned;

Italy, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark and Belgium, where this reply was given by a relative majority;

Germany and Luxembourg, where the "national" reply was more frequent than the "European" one¹.

(See Tables 33 and 34)

¹Since both these countries are strongly in favour of elections to the European Parliament and of political union, this result should be interpreted with caution. It is probably connected with motives and situations that cannot be analysed in the light of available data, such as ethnocentrism, the conception of the role of political parties, the ideological distance between parties and so on.

Table 33

HOW WOULD EUROPEAN MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT VOTE:
BY NATIONALITY OR BY POLITICAL ALLEGIANCE?¹

(Out of 100 people questioned)

	MPs will form national groups	MPs will form groups along political lines	Don't know -	Total
France	23%	54%	23%	100%
Nederland	38	54	8	100
Italia	28	49	23	100
United Kingdom	23	47	30	100
Ireland	29	40	31	100
Danmark	26	37	37	100
Deutschland	40	34	26	100
Belgique/België	29	32	39	100
Luxembourg	46	20	34	100
COMMUNITY ²	30	45	25	100
Non-leaders (---)	24%	31%	45%	100%
(-)	30	43	27	100
(+)	32	51	17	100
Leaders (++)	30	60	10	100

¹Countries are listed in descending order of frequency of the reply "MPs will form groups along political lines".

²Weighted average.

Table 34

HOW WOULD EUROPEAN MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT VOTE:

BY NATIONALITY OR BY POLITICAL ALLEGIANCE?

(Out of 100 people actually replying)

	MPs will form national groups	MPs will form groups along political lines	Total
France	30%	70%	100%
United Kingdom	33	67	100
Italia	36	64	100
Danmark	41	59	100
Nederland	41	59	100
Ireland	42	58	100
Belgique/België	48	52	100
Deutschland	54	46	100
Luxembourg	70	30	100
COMMUNITY	40%	60%	100%
Non-leaders (--)	44%	56%	100%
(-)	41	59	100
(+)	39	61	100
Leaders (++)	33	67	100

¹See notes to Table 33.

CONCLUSIONS

In spring 1976, the principal poles of interest of the public are unemployment and rising prices. Only in Luxembourg and in the United Kingdom does the public seem more concerned by rising prices than by unemployment.

Public interest in information available on the European Community has changed very little since the end of 1973: two out of ten people say that they "almost always" read newspaper articles or watch television programmes on this subject and five out of ten "from time to time". In other words three out of ten people never take an interest.

Information on Europe mainly reaches opinion leaders, about 15% of the European public, among whom eight or nine out of ten take an interest in European news at least from time to time.

One reason why interest is not greater is that while information on European affairs is generally considered useful and interesting, it is nevertheless complicated. However, the fact that 40% of the public and 56% of opinion leaders consider it as too rare shows that the public is still a long way from hearing too much about the Community. What the public really wants - although it does not always manage to make this clear - is more straightforward and intelligible information concerning its centres of interest (inflation, unemployment, protection of nature, consumer protection, housing, etc.). In short, the public wants "good" information, which, of course, is impossible without "good" policies.

Europe seemed to be associated with bad news in May 1976. This is not surprising in a survey carried out the month after the meeting of the European Council in Luxembourg at the beginning of April which was unanimously qualified a failure in the press.

For the same reason, the proportion of favourable attitudes towards the Common Market dropped - by an average of ten points - for the first time since the end of 1973, when the first opinion poll was carried out in the nine countries of the enlarged Community. Opinion leaders reacted in the same way as the general public, - an indication that this change in attitude was influenced by events of the moment and that press reports of a European success would immediately re-enhance the credit that the Community enjoys in the eyes of the public in most of the Member States.

Although the Governments of the Member States have shown no urgency in examining the Tindemans report on European union, a large majority of the European public still expresses interest in and support for a rapid movement towards a political union of Europe. About four persons in ten, in 1976 as in 1975 and 1973, would like to see the unification movement speeded up; in Italy and Luxembourg, the majority of the public holds this view; in the Netherlands, France and Belgium, more called for it to be speeded up than preferred to see it continued as at present; this was also

the case in Germany, but advocates of a slower pace gained a little ground; in the three new Member States, the neutral - or cautious - answer ("continued as at present") attracted most support.

Among those who consider the Common Market a good thing, almost two-thirds are in favour of stepping up the pace. Governments therefore appear to have the go-ahead to advance in the direction indicated by the Tindemans report. This goodwill is confirmed by answers to the question on the creation by 1980 of a European political union with a government which would decide on major issues and a European Parliament to monitor its activities. In most of the Member States at least six out of ten people are in favour and one or two are hostile; only in the United Kingdom and in Denmark is the majority still hostile or reticent. On average, answers have hardly changed since autumn 1975, an indication that this attitude - which probably tends to be emotive or ideological, even among opinion leaders (among whom seven out of ten are in favour) - is different in nature from attitudes on the Common Market. Here the plans for the future appear more attractive than present achievements, but nevertheless a favourable attitude towards the present situation is a predominant factor in bringing people to approve of the future design.

European union, as seen by the public, does have form and content. Four important objectives of European union, as proposed by the Tindemans report - the European protection of fundamental rights of citizens, the establishment of a common economic and monetary policy, the implementation of a regional policy and a common foreign policy - are supported in varying degrees by seven out of ten people on average, but only six out of ten in the United Kingdom and four out of ten in Denmark. It could not of course be claimed that those questioned always had a clear idea of the precise implications of these options, but what citizen has really a clear idea of what is being proposed to him by his government or representatives? A point to note is that three and a half times more opinion leaders than non-leaders support these common policies.

The election of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage was already - or still - a topical issue in May 1976, although no decision had then been taken. The public continues to be largely in favour: six out of ten people on average, with differences ranging from around seven out of ten in Italy, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Germany and France to four out of ten in the United Kingdom and Denmark. The proportion of favourable answers is seven out of ten on average among opinion leaders.

The majority of people questioned in the Community as a whole would be quite prepared to give this elected Parliament "supranational" powers - i.e., where this might mean the members from their own country being in a minority - to make laws on public works, labour matters and even in the field of foreign relations. (The public is more hesitant on taxation matters, but voting for taxes has never been very popular, even at national or local level.)

Finally, in seven of the nine countries, a majority of those replying would expect Members of a European Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage to vote according to their political allegiance and not according to their nationality.

To sum up, in spite of the drop in the proportion of favourable attitudes to the European Community seen as the Common Market - as it is at present - a large majority of the European public in most Member States, is quite prepared to accept or to support progressive decisions, such as the election of the European Parliament or the creation of a European political union.

The results of this poll bear out what the Commission said in the report sent to Mr Tindemans in June 1975:

"European union will never be achieved unless vigorous action is taken to convince social and political forces of its necessity and of the benefits it will bring. The first priority must be to restore credibility and relevance to the common venture ... The election of the ... Parliament by direct universal suffrage ... by enhancing the democratic legitimacy of the Community venture, would also prepare the way for further progress... An election campaign which should be brought forward as much as possible, and the activities of the elected European Parliament would spark off a continuing debate between political, economic and social forces, national governments and the European institutions to define the basic objectives and content of European union."

EURO-BAROMETRE N° 5

EURO-BAROMETER Nr 5

ANNEXES ET TABLEAUX DETAILLES / APPENDIX AND DETAILED TABLES

NOMBRE DE PERSONNES INTERROGÉES / NUMBER OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

			<u>Fieldwork</u>
Belgique/België	(B)	963	13 - 24 mai / May
Danmark	(DK)	977	8 - 26 "
Deutschland	(D)	1004	12 - 26 "
France	(F)	1241	7 - 24 "
Ireland	(IRL)	1007	12 - 21 "
Italia	(I)	923	24 mai/May - 10 juin/June
Luxembourg	(L)	268	13 - 24 mai / May
Nederland	(N)	904	24 mai/May - 19 juin/June
United Kingdom	(UK)	1340	7 mai/May - 7 juin/June
		<u>Total</u>	<u>8627</u>

INSTITUTS CHARGES DU SONDAGE / INSTITUTES WHICH CARRIED OUT THE SURVEY

Belgique/België	DIMARSO / INRA
Danmark	GALLUP MARKEDSANALYSE
Deutschland (B.R.)	EMNID-INSTITUT
France	INSTITUT FRANCAIS D'OPINION PUBLIQUE (x)
Ireland	IRISH MARKETING SURVEYS
Italia	ISTITUTO PER LE RICERCHE STATISTICHE ET L'ANALISI DELL'OPINIONE PUBBLICA (DOXA)
Luxembourg	DIMARSO / INRA
Nederland	NEDERLANDS INSTITUUT VOOR DE PUBLIEKE OPINIE (NIPO)
United Kingdom	THE GALLUP POLL (xx)

(x) Chargé en outre de la coordination internationale et de l'analyse des résultats / Also responsible for international coordination and analysis of the results.

(xx) Le sondage en Northern Ireland a été fait en collaboration par le Irish Marketing Surveys et le Gallup Poll / The Northern Ireland poll was conducted jointly by Irish Marketing Surveys and the Gallup Poll.

NOTES TECHNIQUES

1. Cette annexe a été allégée par rapport à celles des Euro-Baromètres précédents:

- a) Les tableaux les plus importants figurent dans le texte même du rapport.
- b) Pour les tableaux de référence portant sur des sondages antérieurs, voir les annexes aux Euro-Baromètres précédents.

2. Il est rappelé au lecteur que, dans les enquêtes par sondage, on doit tenir compte d'une certaine marge pour erreur d'échantillonnage. Avec des échantillons de l'ordre de 1000 personnes interrogées, les différences de pourcentages inférieures à 5% ne devraient pas être normalement considérées comme statistiquement significatives.

3. Dans tous les tableaux, la colonne CE/EC donne la moyenne pour l'ensemble des personnes interrogées dans les neuf pays, moyenne pondérée suivant l'effectif de la population âgée de 15 ans et plus dans chacun des pays:

Belgique/België
Danmark
Deutschland
France
Irland
Italia
Luxembourg
Nederland
United Kingdom

4. Toutes les données relatives aux Euro-Baromètres sont déposées aux "Belgian Archives for the Social Sciences", (Van Evenstraat 2A, B-3000 Leuven). Elles sont tenues à la disposition des organismes membres du European Consortium for Political Research (Essex), du Inter-University Consortium for Political Research (Michigan) et des chercheurs justifiant d'un intérêt de recherche.

TECHNICAL NOTES

1. This appendix has been reduced in comparison with the previous Euro-Barometres:

- a) The most important tables appear in the text of the report itself.
- b) As far as tables referring to previous surveys are concerned, please see the appendix to previous Euro-Barometres.

2. Readers are reminded that in survey research, one should allow a certain margin for sampling error. With a sample of 1,000 cases, percentage differences of less than 5 points would not normally be regarded as statistically significant.

3. In all tables the column CE/EC gives the mean score for all people interviewed in the nine countries, weighted in terms of population aged 15 and over of each Community country:

Milliers / Thousands	%
7 477	3.84
3 858	1.98
47 835	24.56
39 214	20.13
2 098	1.08
41 543	21.33
274	0.14
9 828	5.05
42 639	21.89

4. All Euro-Barometre data are stored at the Belgian Archives for the Social Sciences (Van Evenstraat 2A, B-3000 Leuven). They are at the disposal of all institutes members of the European Consortium for Political Research (Essex), of the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research (Michigan) and of all those interested in social science research.

Tableau 1 / Table 1

L'IMPORTANCE RELATIVE ATTACHEE A DIFFERENTS PROBLEMES/
THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO SEVERAL PROBLEMS (1)

	B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
A. Réduire les écarts entre les régions en aidant les régions les moins développées / Reducing the differences between regions of the country by helping the less developed regions										
- Très important / Very important	17	29	13	21	33	40	25	20	16	22
- Important	44	44	33	57	45	44	55	59	49	46
- Peu important / Of little importance	14	16	31	15	10	9	8	15	18	18
- Pas important du tout / Not at all important	10	2	13	3	3	2	2	4	9	7
- Sans réponse / No reply	15	9	10	4	9	5	10	2	8	7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(1) "Voici une liste de différents problèmes (MONTRER CARTE) auxquels s'intéressent plus ou moins les gens (dans votre pays). Pouvez-vous me dire, pour chacun de ces problèmes, jusqu'à quel point c'est pour vous personnellement un problème très important, important, peu important ou pas important du tout?" / "Here is a list of problems (SHOW CARD) the people of (your country) are more or less interested in. Could you please tell me for each problem, whether you personally consider it a very important problem, important, of little importance, or not at all important?"

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
57	72	52	75	49	53	60	62	49	57
31	25	34	23	39	37	34	33	42	34
4	2	11	2	7	6	3	3	6	6
2	.	2	.	2	1	.	1	1	1
6	1	1	.	3	3	3	1	2	2
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

B. Protéger la nature et lutter contre les pollutions/
Protecting nature and fighting pollution

- Très important/
Very important
- Important
- Peu important /
Of little importance
- Pas important du tout/
Not at all important
- Sans réponse /
No reply

Total

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
36	35	30	49	39	55	42	36	18	37
41	37	33	35	38	34	40	42	33	35
12	16	24	9	12	8	10	15	25	17
4	4	9	4	5	1	1	5	16	7
7	8	4	3	6	2	7	2	8	4
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

C. Faire en sorte qu'il y ait moins de gens très riches et moins de gens très pauvres /

To try and reduce the number both of very rich people and of very poor people

- Très important /
Very important

- Important

- Peu important /
Of little importance

- Pas important du tout /
Not at all important

- Sans réponse /
No reply

Total

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
34	28	29	40	72	64	41	36	53	45
44	45	38	49	25	30	47	51	41	40
11	17	24	7	2	4	6	9	3	10
4	4	7	2	.	.	2	2	1	3
7	6	2	2	1	2	4	2	2	2
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

D. Construire des logements en nombre
suffisant /
Provide for sufficient housing

- Très important /
Very important
- Important
- Peu important /
Of little importance
- Pas important du tout /
Not at all important
- Sans réponse /
No reply

Total

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
71	62	70	70	88	76	65	53	72	71
20	31	23	27	11	21	29	37	24	24
3	3	5	2	1	1	3	7	2	3
1	1	1	1	1	1
5	3	1	1	.	2	3	2	1	1
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

E.Lutter contre la hausse des prix /
Fighting rising prices

- Très important /
Very important
- Important
- Peu important /
Of little importance
- Pas important du tout /
Not at all important
- Sans réponse /
No reply

Total

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
28	46	28	31	28	28	32	25	15	26
30	28	27	31	34	29	40	37	30	30
13	10	23	15	14	13	11	17	23	18
6	2	9	4	7	5	2	10	14	8
23	14	13	19	17	25	15	11	18	18
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

F. Contrôler l'action des sociétés
multinationales /
Controlling activities of the
multinational or international firms

- Très important /
Very important
- Important
- Peu important /
Of little importance
- Pas important du tout /
Not at all important
- Sans réponse /
No reply

Total

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
14	22	10	16	14	17	17	9	10	13
32	38	26	41	32	30	37	37	23	31
21	21	29	22	22	22	17	30	27	25
12	5	21	8	13	11	5	14	27	16
21	14	14	13	19	20	24	10	13	15
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

G. Augmenter l'autonomie des régions /
More self government for the regions

- Très important /
Very important
- Important
- Peu important /
Of little importance
- Pas important du tout /
Not at all important
- Sans réponse /
No reply

Total

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I (1)	L	N	UK	CE/EC (1)
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
73	78	72	77	87		51	76	67	72
19	17	21	19	11		39	21	28	23
2	2	5	2	1		5	1	2	3
1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1
5	2	1	1	.		4	1	2	1
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

H. Lutter contre le chômage /
Fighting unemployment

- Très important /
Very important
- Important
- Peu important /
Of little importance
- Pas important du tout /
Not at all important
- Sans réponse /
No reply

Total

(1) Non compris l'Italie où la question a été posée d'une façon erronée / Excluding Italy where the question has been asked in an erroneous way.

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
28	31	27	39	21	31	25	23	36	32
35	37	37	41	33	38	44	44	39	39
15	12	24	11	19	15	13	19	12	16
9	4	5	4	13	6	4	7	6	5
13	16	7	5	14	10	14	7	7	8
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

1. Défendre les intérêts de notre pays
face aux superpuissances (Etats-Unis,
Union soviétique, etc..) /
Defend our interests against the
super powers (United States, Soviet
Union, etc...)

- Très important /
Very important
- Important
- Peu important /
Of little importance
- Pas important du tout /
Not at all important
- Sans réponse /
No reply

Total

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
37	40	30	42	52	35	35	34	35	35
43	42	38	43	35	43	49	52	37	41
7	7	22	9	6	11	3	8	12	13
2	2	5	2	3	2	1	3	10	5
11	9	5	4	4	9	12	3	6	6
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

J. Adapter l'enseignement aux besoins de
l'homme moderne /
Modernise education to meet today's
needs

- Très important /
Very important
- Important
- Peu important /
Of little importance
- Pas important du tout /
Not at all important
- Sans réponse /
No reply

Total

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
8	22	15	15	19	9	11	17	32	18
18	25	29	35	33	27	25	29	38	31
26	23	28	28	21	30	20	27	15	25
38	21	20	17	19	23	27	21	10	19
10	9	8	5	8	11	17	6	5	7
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Total

K. Renforcer notre capacité de défense
militaire contre des ennemis éventuels/
Strengthen our military defence against
possible enemies

- Très important /
Very important
- Important
- Peu important /
Of little importance
- Pas important du tout /
Not at all important
- Sans réponse /
No reply

Tableau 1 / Table 1
(Suite / Continued)[illegible]

Tableau 2 / Table 2

SCORES MOYENS D'INTENSITE DE L'IMPORTANCE ATTACHEE A DIFFERENTS PROBLEMES /
MEAN SCORES OF INTENSITY OF THE IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO SEVERAL PROBLEMS (1)

	B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC (2)
1. Lutter contre le chômage / Fighting unemployment	2,72	2,76	2,66	2,75	2,85	(3)	2,47	2,74	2,63	2,71
2. Lutter contre la hausse des prix / Fighting rising prices	2,69	2,58	2,63	2,68	2,87	2,75	2,64	2,46	2,70	2,68
3. Protéger la nature et lutter contre les pollutions / Protecting nature and fighting pollution	2,53	2,70	2,36	2,73	2,38	2,46	2,57	2,58	2,41	2,49
4. Protéger les consommateurs contre les fraudes commerciales et les abus de la publicité / Protection of the public against frau- dulent selling and misleading adver- tising	2,50	2,57	2,36	2,51	2,56	2,56	2,17	2,41	2,31	2,43
5. Construire des logements en nombre suffisant / Provide sufficient housing	2,16	2,02	1,91	2,30	2,69	2,60	2,33	2,25	2,49	2,30
6. Adapter l'enseignement aux besoins de l'homme moderne / Modernise education to meet today's needs	2,29	2,30	1,97	2,29	2,42	2,21	2,35	2,20	2,04	2,14
7. Faire en sorte qu'il y ait moins de gens très riches et moins de gens très pauvres / To try and reduce the number of both very rich people and of very poor people	2,17	2,13	1,87	2,33	2,19	2,45	2,31	2,11	1,57	2,06

Tableau 2 / Table 2
(Suite / Continued)

	B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
8. Défendre les intérêts de notre pays face aux superpuissances / Defend our interests against the super powers	1,95	2,14	1,91	2,22	1,74	2,06	2,04	1,90	2,12	1,95
9. Contrôler l'action des sociétés multinationales / Controlling activities of the multinational or international firms	2,05	2,36	1,84	2,09	2,00	2,08	2,20	1,86	1,57	1,90
10. Réduire les écarts entre les régions / Reducing the differences between regions	1,81	2,11	1,52	2,00	2,19	2,29	2,15	1,98	1,79	1,90
11. Renforcer notre capacité de défense militaire / Strengthen our military defence	0,97	1,53	1,43	1,51	1,57	1,24	1,25	1,45	1,98	1,51
12. Augmenter l'autonomie des régions / More self government for the regions	1,61	1,89	1,30	1,75	1,56	1,66	1,87	1,46	1,19	1,48

(1) Scores calculés pour chaque pays en pondérant les pourcentages des réponses par les coefficients 3,2,1, 0 suivant l'intensité de l'importance attribuée au problème et en divisant le nombre obtenu par le pourcentage des personnes qui ont donné une réponse / Scores calculated for each country by weighting the percentages of the answers by the coefficients 3,2, 1, 0 following the intensity attached to the problem and by dividing the number obtained by the percentage of people having given an answer.

(2) Moyenne pondérée, pour la Communauté européenne, suivant la part relative de la population âgée de 15 ans et plus dans chaque pays / Mean weighted for the European Community, following the relative part of the population aged 15 years and over in each country.

(3) Non compris l'Italie, où la question a été posée de façon erronée / Excluding Italy where the question has been asked in an erroneous way.

Tableau 3 / Table 3

L'EVALUATION DES INFORMATIONS DIFFUSEES SUR LA COMMUNAUTE EUROPEENNE /
RATING OF INFORMATION ISSUED ABOUT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

(mai 1976 May)

	B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Trop rares / Too rare	35	30	37	36	42	37	46	56	50	40
Trop fréquentes / Too frequent	27	24	19	12	27	10	44	22	24	18
Sans réponse / No reply	38	46	44	52	31	53	10	22	26	42
Simple / Simple	24	13	21	20	21	29	31	28	21	23
Complicées / Complicated	48	30	54	55	67	35	59	64	65	52
Sans réponse / No reply	28	57	25	25	12	36	10	8	14	25
Ennuyeuses / Not interesting	32	33	29	26	33	20	39	34	34	28
Intéressantes / Interesting	41	41	45	46	56	47	50	58	53	48
Sans réponse / No reply	27	26	26	28	11	33	11	8	13	24
Utiles / Useful	57	55	55	67	61	56	69	84	53	59
Inutiles / Not useful	17	17	15	9	21	11	21	10	31	16
Sans réponse / No reply	26	28	30	24	18	33	10	6	16	25
Plutôt optimistes / Mainly good news	27	22	24	23	25	33	40	25	15	24
Plutôt pessimistes / Mainly bad news	37	36	32	32	43	11	45	58	53	34
Sans réponse / No reply	36	42	44	45	12	56	15	17	32	42
Tendancieuses / Biased	34	27	25	31	27	27	46	50	39	31
Objectives / Not biased	27	34	28	23	32	19	39	26	28	25
Sans réponse / No reply	39	39	47	46	41	54	15	24	33	44

Tableau 3bis / Table 3A
(septembre 1973 September)

	B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	GB	CE/EC
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Trop rares / Too rare	46	37	51	34	67	48	46	58	48	46
Trop fréquentes / Too frequent	30	16	22	17	29	17	27	17	13	18
Sans réponse / No reply	24	47	27	49	4	35	27	25	39	36
Simples / Simple	22	16	20	19	21	23	10	18	10	18
Complicquées / Complicated	64	50	60	52	76	48	70	65	52	55
Sans réponse / No reply	14	34	20	29	3	29	20	17	38	27
Ennuyeuses / Not interesting	42	23	28	25	41	23	41	42	34	29
Intéressantes / Interesting	45	38	52	46	56	47	42	43	27	43
Sans réponse / No reply	13	39	20	29	3	30	17	15	39	28
Utiles / Useful	66	50	64	61	65	57	78	70	31	55
Inutiles / Not useful	20	10	17	9	31	14	15	12	25	16
Sans réponse / No reply	14	40	19	30	4	29	7	18	44	29
Plutôt optimistes / Mainly good news	42	40	37	35	60	49	45	35	16	35
Plutôt pessimistes / Mainly bad news	34	20	34	19	34	13	35	33	34	26
Sans réponse / No reply	24	10	29	46	6	38	20	32	50	39
Tendancieuses / Biased	43	26	29	26	42	26	47	40	33	30
Objectives / Not biased	32	29	41	29	52	35	27	29	18	31
Sans réponse / No reply	25	45	30	45	6	39	26	31	49	39

Tableau 4 / Table 4

EVOLUTION DU JUGEMENT PORTE SUR L'APPARTENANCE A LA COMMUNAUTE EUROPEENNE
DEVELOPMENT OF ATTITUDE TO MEMBERSHIP IN THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (1)

	Belgique/België						France					
	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
- Bonne chose / Good thing	57	68	60	57	59	62	61	68	63	64	67	57
- Mauvaise chose / Bad thing	5	3	6	3	3	5	5	5	6	4	4	7
- Chose ni bonne ni mauvaise / Neither good nor bad	19	15	18	21	21	17	22	20	22	25	24	30
- Sans réponse / No reply	19	14	16	19	17	16	12	7	9	7	5	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	1266	1017	1505	1507	1000	963	2227	1308	1042	1000	1276	1241
	Deutschland						Italia					
	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
- Bonne chose / Good thing	63	59	62	56	61	48	69	77	82	71	75	63
- Mauvaise chose / Bad thing	4	8	10	8	6	12	2	5	3	3	4	6
- Chose ni bonne ni mauvaise/ Neither good nor bad	22	26	20	28	27	30	15	9	11	21	16	20
- Sans réponse / No reply	11	7	8	8	6	10	14	9	4	5	5	11
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	1957	1060	1042	1039	1002	1004	1909	1030	1021	1043	1110	923

(1) "D'une façon générale, pensez-vous que le fait (pour votre pays) de faire partie de la Communauté européenne (Marché commun) est une bonne chose, une mauvaise chose, ou une chose ni bonne ni mauvaise?" / "Generally speaking, do you think that (your country's) membership of the Common Market is a good thing, a bad thing, or neither good nor bad?"

Tableau 4 / Table 4
(Suite / Continued)

	Nederland						Luxembourg					
	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
- Bonne chose / Good thing	63	66	70	64	67	75	67	79	73	65	78	66
- Mauvaise chose / Bad thing	4	4	6	3	3	4	3	4	3	7	4	5
- Chose ni bonne ni mauvaise/ Neither good nor bad	20	14	15	18	12	15	22	12	13	19	12	21
- Sans réponse / No reply	13	16	9	15	18	6	8	5	11	9	6	8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	1464	1000	1012	1093	1006	904	330	308	297	311	297	268
	Danmark						Ireland					
	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76	IX/73	V/75	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
- Bonne chose / Good thing	42	35	33	36	41	36	56	48	50	50	67	50
- Mauvaise chose/Bad thing	30	31	35	25	27	29	15	25	24	20	12	16
- Chose ni bonne ni mauvaise/ Neither good nor bad	19	24	25	28	24	22	21	19	22	25	17	18
- Sans réponse / No reply	9	10	7	11	8	13	8	8	4	5	4	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	1199	1168	1100	1073	1023	977	1199	1000	1000	1000	998	1007
	Great Britain (1972-74) United Kingdom (1975 -)											
	X/72 (1)	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76					
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%					
- Bonne chose / Good thing	40	31	33	36	47	50	39					
- Mauvaise chose / Bad thing	21	34	39	35	21	24	35					
- Chose ni bonne ni mauvaise/ Neither good nor bad	22	22	19	20	19	18	18					
- Sans réponse / No reply	17	13	9	9	13	8	8					
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100					
N	1028	1933	1031	1039	1328	1438	1340					

(1) Social Surveys (Gallup Poll). Population of 18 years and more.

Tableau 4 / Table 4
(Suite / Continued)

	Ensemble des six pays / The six countries together						Ensemble des neuf pays / The nine countries together					
	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76	IX/73	V/74	XI/74	V/75	XI/75	V/76
- Bonne chose / Good thing	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
- Mauvaise chose / Bad thing	63	67	69	63	67	57	56	59	60	59	63	53
- Chose ni bonne ni mauvaise/ Neither good nor bad	4	6	6	5	4	8	11	14	14	9	9	14
- Sans réponse	19	18	17	24	22	26	20	18	18	23	21	24
	14	9	8	8	7	9	13	9	8	9	7	9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	9153	5723	5919	5993	5691	5303	13 484	8922	9058	9394	9150	8627

Tableau 5 / Table 5

	B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
- Les pays membres de l'Union européenne auraient une politique extérieure commune/ The member countries of the European union would have a common foreign policy Tout à fait d'accord / Agree totally Plutôt d'accord / Agree on the whole Plutôt pas d'accord / Disagree on the whole Pas du tout d'accord / Disagree totally Sans réponse / No reply Total	31 26 6 5 32 100	16 21 17 25 21 100	33 41 10 4 12 100	28 36 9 9 18 100	28 37 10 6 19 100	33 33 10 4 20 100	45 34 3 3 15 100	30 36 9 7 18 100	19 37 14 12 18 100	29 36 11 7 17 100
- Les pays membres auraient une politique économique et monétaire commune / The member countries would have a common economic and monetary policy Tout à fait d'accord / Agree totally Plutôt d'accord / Agree on the whole Plutôt pas d'accord / Disagree on the whole Pas du tout d'accord / Disagree totally Sans réponse / No reply Total	38 27 4 3 28 100	15 26 16 22 21 100	34 36 14 6 10 100	41 34 7 5 13 100	30 40 8 5 17 100	43 32 5 3 17 100	50 31 4 1 14 100	35 37 6 4 18 100	21 36 13 14 16 100	34 34 10 7 15 100

Tableau 5 / Table 5
(Suite / Continued)

B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
31	19	23	38	37	43	40	33	16	30
32	30	39	39	36	33	39	38	41	37
4	12	18	6	6	5	5	9	12	10
3	17	5	3	4	3	2	4	11	6
30	22	15	14	17	16	14	16	20	17
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

- Les pays membres auraient une politique régionale et une politique sociale communes tendant à corriger les inégalités en faveur des régions et des catégories sociales les moins favorisées /

The member countries would have a common regional and social policy which would aim to level out the differences in favour of the less-favoured regions and social categories

Tout à fait d'accord / Agree totally

Plutôt d'accord / Agree on the whole

Plutôt pas d'accord / Disagree on the whole

Pas du tout d'accord / Disagree totally

Sans réponse / No reply

Total

Tableau 5 / Table 5
(Suite / Continued)[illegible]

L'ACCEPTATION DE VOTES SUPRANATIONAUX AU PARLEMENT EUROPEEN /
THE ACCEPTANCE OF SUPRANATIONAL VOTES OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT (1)

[illegible]

Tableau 6 / Table 6
(Suite / Continued)

	B	DK	D	F	IRL	I	L	N	UK	CE/EC
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Accepteraient / Would accept	62	48	73	80	60	70	76	80	48	68
N'accepteraient pas / Would not accept	10	34	13	8	22	8	9	7	37	16
Sans réponse / No reply	28	18	14	12	18	22	15	13	15	16
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
D. Dans le domaine des relations extérieures (par exemple: ratification d'un traité de commerce avec un pays étranger) / As far as foreign matters are concerned (e.g. a signing of a commercial treaty with a foreign country)										
Accepteraient / Would accept	56	40	58	62	45	62	56	60	43	56
N'accepteraient pas / Would not accept	13	37	19	16	28	10	14	17	36	20
Sans réponse / No reply	31	23	23	22	27	28	30	23	21	24
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(1)"Dans un Parlement européen, les parlementaires (de votre pays) n'auraient, même s'ils sont tous d'accord, pas la majorité. Accepteriez-vous ou n'accepteriez-vous pas que le Parlement européen puisse faire, dans les domaines que je vais vous citer, des lois qui seraient applicables dans tous les pays de la Communauté européenne, y compris (le vôtre)? / In a European Parliament the Members of Parliament (for your country) would not have the majority, even if they were all in agreement. Would you, or would you not, accept that the European Parliament passes laws in the fields that I am going to list, which would be applicable to all countries of the European Community, including (your country)?"