



Directorate General for Communication
Directorate C - Relations with Citizens
PUBLIC OPINION MONITORING UNIT

Brussels, 22 June 2011

EUROPEANS AND THE CRISIS

European Parliament Eurobarometer (EB Parlemeter 75.2) Summary

Coverage: EU 27 (26 825 European citizens)
Population: Europeans aged 15 years or over
Methodology: Face-to-face (CAPI)
Fieldwork: 13 April - 02 May 2011, carried out by TNS opinion

I. EUROPEANS AND THE TAX ON FINANCIAL TRANSACTION (TFT).....	10
A. What support is there for a TFT?.....	10
B. Why do Europeans support or oppose a TFT?.....	13
II. EUROPEANS AND THE POST-CRISIS.....	14
A. What is the situation as regards a return to growth?.....	14
III. EUROPEANS AND THE ROLE OF THE EURO.....	17
IV. THE REACTIONS OF THE MEMBER STATES TO THE CRISIS.....	19
A. How do Europeans believe the Member States should react?.....	19
B. Should priority be given to reducing public spending or boosting the economy?.....	21
V. TODAY: WHICH POLICIES SHOULD THE EP PURSUE AS A MATTER OF PRIORITY?.....	23
VI. EUROPEANS AND FOOD SECURITY.....	25
A. Helping agriculture in developing countries and combating speculation.....	25
B. Precise objectives to improve food security.....	27

Eurobarometers used for the trend questions:

EB 75 **Fieldwork:** 13 April - 2 May 2011
Coverage: 26 825 people in face-to-face interviews.
Population: Europeans aged 15 years or over
TNS opinion for the European Parliament

EB 74 **Fieldwork:** 26 August - 16 September 2010
Coverage: 26 635 people in face-to-face interviews.
Population: Europeans aged 15 years or over
TNS opinion for the European Parliament

EB 72 **Fieldwork:** October-November 2009
Coverage: 26 731 people in face-to-face interviews.
Population: Europeans aged 15 years or over
TNS opinion for the European Parliament

EB 71 **Fieldwork:** 16 January - 22 February 2009
Coverage: 26 718 people in face-to-face interviews.
Population: Europeans aged 15 years or over
TNS opinion for the European Parliament

Introduction

This Eurobarometer survey on "**Europeans and the crisis**" is the third such survey realised by the European Parliament. The first one was carried out in January-February 2009, six months before the European elections, while the second was conducted in September 2010. This fieldwork for this survey was carried out by TNS opinion between 13 April and 2 May 2011 on the basis of face-to-face interviews with 26 825 European citizens.

In the seven months since the previous survey, the national and international context has been marked by several major events which have undoubtedly played an important role in shaping the answers of Europeans to the questions posed.

Without listing all these events, it is clear that the Sendai tsunami and Fukushima nuclear disaster, as well the uprisings in the Arab world are the events that had the most telling effect on Europeans during this period.

An analysis of the results also shows that the financial, economic and social crisis has equally played a major role.

Other factors are also noteworthy: the ongoing work of the EU and its Member States on economic governance, the situation of the euro, the national, regional and local elections which have been held in thirteen Member States since September 2010, climate change, in particular increasingly frequent natural disasters (Hungary's Red Tide, flooding in numerous Member States, etc.).

Before analysing the results of this survey in detail, it is worth highlighting the main findings:

- **In seven months, public opinion at EU level has moved only marginally**, whereas there were major shifts between the first and second surveys (January - August 2010). It should be borne in mind however that the six most populous Member States account for approximately 70% of the EU average.

On the other hand, there are **very marked differences** between the two surveys **in a significant number of Member States**.

- Europeans are **strongly in favour of the principle of a tax on financial transactions** at global level, or failing that at EU level initially.
- A majority of Europeans believe that **overall the euro has not mitigated the effects of the crisis**.
- To combat the crisis, a majority of Europeans above all want **the Member States to act in a more coordinated way**.
- In the **debate on whether to boost the economy or reduce public spending**, we note that the economic situation of the Member States has a direct impact on answers. In seven months, they have sometimes varied by between 10 and 38 points.
- **Tackling exclusion and poverty** is still the first political priority of Europeans, although there have been very significant variations in several Member States between the two surveys.

- **Food security:** helping agriculture in developing countries seems to be the most effective measure to the respondents, followed by combating speculation on food products. In terms of objectives, Europeans strongly support several measures of which ensuring that everyone has access to food products at affordable prices and also that farmers have a fair income.

⇒ **Europeans are in favour of a tax on financial transactions**

On 8 March 2011, the European Parliament adopted Mrs Anni Podimata's report on innovative financing at a global and European level (by 529 votes "for", 127 "against" and 14 abstentions)

In the process, MEPs have dealt, inter alia, with issues relating to euro bonds, the carbon tax and the financing of development aid.

At the same time, **they have "recommended" the introduction of a tax on financial transactions (TFT)**, adopted by 360 votes "for", 299 "against" and 13 abstentions. It seemed therefore important to ascertain the views of Europeans on this topical subject, as regards the actual principle of the tax, the level at which it should be introduced and the reasons why they support or oppose such a tax.

➤ **Clear support for the principle of a TFT**

61% of Europeans support the principle of a tax on financial transactions, while 26% are opposed and 13% expressed no opinion.

The wording of the question clearly indicated that the proposed tax would not apply to the general public but only to transactions between financial operators.

- We note first of all that 63% of respondents in euro zone countries are in favour of this tax, compared with 54% in non-euro zone countries.
- There is a difference of 50 points between the highest (80% in Austria) and the lowest levels of support (30% in Malta). Support was below the 50% threshold in seven countries.
- In socio-demographic terms, 63% of men support the principle, compared with 58% of women.

➤ **Support among Europeans is almost identical, irrespective of the level at which the TFT would be introduced.**

The 61% of respondents who said that they would be in favour of the principle of a TFT were then asked at which level they felt it should be introduced.

- 85% of them are in favour of the introduction of a TFT, but only at global level if international agreement is reached; 11% disagreed.
- 81% support the idea of introducing a TFT initially in the EU, if international agreement cannot be reached; 14% disagreed.

➤ **Reasons for supporting a TFT:**

We then asked to the 61% of respondents who were in favour of the principle of a TFT why they supported this idea.

- 41% of the respondents answered “to combat excessive speculation and so help to prevent future crises.”
- 35% answered “to make financial players contribute to the costs of the crisis.”
- 11% mentioned reducing public deficits.
- 10% answered “to finance innovative policies (e.g. fighting climate change, the environment, development aid, etc.).

We note therefore that tackling the causes and effects of the crisis is the core concern reflected in the answers.

➤ **The reasons why respondents are opposed to introducing a TFT in the EU as a first step:**

Although 81% are in favour of this proposal, 14% oppose it. We therefore asked the latter why they were against the idea. They answered that such a tax:

- is not feasible, as it can only be introduced at a global level (26%);
- would weaken the competitiveness of the European financial market (22%);
- would make only European financial players contribute to the costs of the crisis (22%);
- would cause an outflow of capital from the EU (21%).

Their objections, therefore, are based above all on questions of feasibility and competitiveness.

⇒ **Europeans are sceptical about the end of the crisis and a return to growth**

Whereas 7 months earlier, respondents were not overly pessimistic about the future, that is no longer true.

- 36% (+10) of respondents now believe that the crisis will last for many years.

Not surprisingly, the countries the most affected by the crisis are the most sceptical: Greece (63%), Portugal (57%), Ireland (50%) and Spain (44%).

However, only 9% of citizens in Sweden, 18% in Denmark and 20% in Finland share this view.

- Conversely, only 14% believe that we are already returning to growth.

Once again, not surprisingly, this view is the most widely held in the countries with the highest growth: Sweden (58%), Germany (35%), Finland (34%), Austria, Luxembourg and the Netherlands (29%).

⇒ **A majority of Europeans believe that the euro has not globally mitigated the negative effects of the crisis**

The euro zone's problems are reflected in the views of Europeans on the euro's role.

- 57% (+7) of respondents now believe that overall the euro has not mitigated the negative effects of the crisis, compared with 44% when this question was asked for the first time at the beginning of 2009.
- 34% of respondents instead think that overall the euro has mitigated the negative effects of the crisis, compared with 39% in 2009.
- This polarisation of opinion is further confirmed by the fact that only 9% (-8) of respondents did not express an opinion.

⇒ **To combat the crisis, a majority of Europeans want Member States to give priority to coordinated action at EU level**

The results clearly demonstrate this support for coordinated action:

- 56% (-4) want measures to be coordinated with other EU countries.
- 36% (+3) feel that they would be better protected if their country adopted measures and applied them individually.
- The 'don't know (DK)' rate has decreased (as for all the other questions) and is now 8%, compared with 15% at the time of the previous survey.

⇒ **Should Member States adopt measures to boost their economy or reduce public spending?**

Boosting growth and/or putting public finances on a healthier footing is one of the major issues currently facing the EU and its Member States. However, in the reactions to the crisis, and in States in similar situation, we note that the answers of citizens are rarely identical.

In seven months, although there have been no significant shifts of opinion in the EU overall, there have been considerable variations in some Member States.

➤ **At EU level**

- 40% (+ 2 points) of respondents consider that priority should be given to boosting the economy, while 34% (-1) believe instead that the Member States should focus on reducing public deficits.
- It is important to note that one in five Europeans (22%; +3) answered spontaneously that the Member States should adopt both types of measures simultaneously.
- Once again opinion is becoming increasingly polarised, and the 'DK' rate has fallen sharply from 8% to 4% (-4).

➤ **At Member State level**

- An analysis reveals clear differences between euro zone and non-euro zone countries.

In the countries of the euro zone, opinions are fairly evenly divided: 35% (=) of respondents want priority to be given to boosting the economy, while 33% (-1) think that Member States should first reduce their deficits and 28% (+4) said both equally.

However, in the non-euro zone countries, there are significant differences of opinion: 50% (+5) are in favour of stimulus measures, while 34% (-2) favour reducing spending and 12% (+1) support both types of measures equally.

- There is also a difference of ten points regarding the recovering measures between the pre-2004 (38%) and the post-2004 (48%) countries.

In twenty-two Member States, there has been a sometimes very significant increase in the number of respondents who want economic stimulus measures and debt reduction measures to be implemented at the same time.

In Germany, this is still the most frequently mentioned option with 42% (+7) and the Netherlands is now the second country to put it in first place, with 46% (+38).

This option was also mentioned fairly frequently in Ireland 36% (+20), Belgium 24% (+10) and Hungary 27% (+9).

⇒ **Priority policies: few changes between the two surveys at European level, but very strong variations in certain Member States**

The trepidation felt by Europeans about the crisis is once again reflected in their answers regarding the policies which they feel should be given priority by the European Parliament.

The order of priorities in Europe as a whole has changed little between the last two surveys, but this should not conceal the fact that opinions have changed profoundly in some countries (the six most populous Member States account for 70% of the EU).

There have been profound changes in 12 Member States, where some policies may have gained as much as 15 points, while others have lost as much as 13 points.

➤ **With 51% (-1 point), tackling exclusion and poverty is still by far the first priority on which Europeans believe that the European Parliament should focus.**

The table on page 26 demonstrates how far opinions can change at national level from one survey to the next.

- In several countries, support for this policy has increased significantly: +10 percentage points in Cyprus, + 7 in Estonia and Portugal, + 6 in Bulgaria, Romania and Lithuania.
- However, support has declined considerably in other Member States: - 10 points in the Netherlands, -8 in Italy and the Czech Republic, and - 5 in Germany.

➤ **Consumer and public health protection is once again ranked in second place with a score of 33% (-1).**

Support for this policy has only increased significantly in Italy (+5) and Estonia (+5). Conversely, it has fallen sharply in Cyprus (-12), Malta (-8) and Romania (-7).

➤ **Coordinating economic, budget and tax policies is ranked in third place, with 28% (+1).**

The national changes are very interesting to observe, in particular in the light of the financial, economic and social situation of the Member States.

- In the three countries which have benefited from financial aid plans from the European Union and the IMF, support for this policy has increased, sometimes very significantly: + 10 points in Ireland, + 9 in Portugal and + 3 in Greece.
- Conversely, the only country where support for EU-wide coordination has fallen sharply is France (-9).

- **As regards giving priority to an immigration policy implemented in consultation with countries of origin (ninth position at EU level),** the results in some Member States are worth analysing closely.

Support for this policy has risen, sometimes very sharply, in the EU countries which have experienced a significant increase in migratory flows as a result of events in countries on the southern shore of the Mediterranean: Malta (+15), Italy (+13) and Cyprus (+12). Furthermore, this policy is now the first priority of respondents in Italy.

⇒ **Food security: how can we combat rising food prices while ensuring supplies?**

The question of food security has been on the European Parliament’s agenda for a long time. **In 2011**, it adopted two resolutions on this subject (18 January and 17 February 2011). Financial speculation on food prices, harvesting uncertainties as a result of climate change, the increase in world food consumption and the absence of a targeted global system of food stocks are among the major reasons which have caused prices to surge on world markets in recent years.

In some developing countries, the sometimes very substantial increases in the prices of basic necessities have forced households to devote sometimes as much as 80% of their monthly budget to food. The ensuing "food riots" undoubtedly contributed, with numerous other factors, to the outbreak of uprisings in the Arab world.

When asked about the various measures which would be the most effective in combating rising food prices, Europeans listed in order of priority:

- helping agriculture in developing countries (34%);
- installing mechanisms to coordinate and prevent excessive speculation (32%);
- giving the new European Authorities for Financial Regulation more power to prevent excessive speculation (25%).

To achieve these objectives, there is huge support among Europeans for several measures, in particular access to food products at affordable prices while ensuring a fair standard of living for farmers; maintaining agricultural activity in the EU in order ensure food security for the EU; a commitment to combating food shortages and the creation of a global system of food-stocking favoured by the European Parliament.

N.B.: It is important for readers to bear in mind that the results of a survey are estimates, the accuracy of which, everything being equal, depends on the sample size and the observed percentage. For samples of around 1 000 interviews (sample size generally used at the level of a Member State), the actual percentage, that is to say if the whole population had been interviewed, varies within the following confidence intervals:

Observed percentages	10% or 90%	20% or 80%	30% or 70%	40% or 60%	50%
Confidence limits	+/- 1.9 points	+/- 2.5 points	+/- 2.7 points	+/- 3.0 points	+/- 3.1 points

I. EUROPEANS AND THE TAX ON FINANCIAL TRANSACTION (TFT)


A. What support is there for a TFT?

Q6 The European Parliament has recently endorsed the introduction of a tax on financial transactions at a global level, or at least in the EU at first. This tax would be very low: 0.05% on each financial transaction. It would not apply to the general public, but only to transactions between financial players (banks, hedge funds, etc.).

Please tell me if you are in favour or opposed to each of the following statements related to this tax:

Support for the principle of introducing a TFT

1) European average




*Total 'In favour': the total of "Totally in favour" and "Fairly in favour"
Total 'Opposed': the total of "Totally opposed" and "Fairly opposed"*

2) Socio-demographic differences

The principle of a tax on financial transactions		Total 'In favour'	Total 'Opposed'	DK
EU27		61%	26%	13%
Gender	Man	63%	27%	10%
	Woman	58%	26%	16%
End of education	15-	53%	26%	21%
	16-19	61%	27%	12%
	20+	66%	25%	9%
	Still studying	59%	28%	13%
Left-Right scale	(1-4) Left	68%	22%	10%
	(5-6) Centre	63%	27%	10%
	(7-10) Right	59%	32%	9%
Euro during the crisis (Q2)	Mitigated negative effects of the crisis.	69%	22%	9%
	Did not mitigate negative effects of the crisis.	57%	30%	13%
Measures to improve protection (Q3)	Individually	58%	29%	13%
	Coordinated with the other MS	64%	25%	11%
To boost the economy (Q4)	Reduce public spending	61%	28%	11%
	Invest in measures to boost the economy	62%	27%	11%
Return of growth (Q5)	Already	70%	23%	7%
	In the coming months	69%	23%	8%
	In the coming years	61%	27%	12%
	Crisis will last for many years	54%	29%	17%

3) National differences

The principle of a tax on financial transactions - EU27



Total 'In favour': the total of "Totally in favour" and "Fairly in favour"

Total 'Opposed': the total of "Totally opposed" and "Fairly opposed"

Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

Groupings of Member States	Total 'In favour'	Total 'Opposed'	DK
EU27	61%	26%	13%
Euro zone	63%	25%	12%
Non-euro zone	54%	30%	16%
Pre-2004	64%	25%	11%
Post-2004	48%	32%	20%


Support for the level at which a TFT would be introduced

Question put to the 61% of the respondents "in favour" of a TFT


There is strong support for both scenarios, i.e. globally or in the EU initially.

1) European average

- Support for the introduction of a TFT but only at a global level, if international agreement is reached



- Support for the introduction of a TFT in the EU at first, if international agreement is not reached




B. Why do Europeans support or oppose a TFT?

Question put to the 61% of the respondents "in favour" of a TFT

Reason for supporting the principle of a TFT

Q7. *What is the main reason why you are in favour of a tax on financial transactions?*


A tax on financial transactions would make it possible to:



Reason for opposing the introduction of a TFT at EU level

Q8. *What is the main reason why you are opposed to a tax on financial transactions in the EU?*

A tax on financial transactions in the European Union:




II. EUROPEANS AND THE POST-CRISIS

A. What is the situation as regards a return to growth?


Q5. *When it comes to a return to growth in your country, which one of the following opinions is closest to your own?*

1) European average



Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

2) Differences between Member States



Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

Trends between Member States

Source: EB75.2/European Parliament


	The crisis is going to last for many years			A return to growth will start in the coming years			We are already returning to growth			A return to growth will start in the coming months			DK		
	EB 74.1 August - Sept 2010	EB 75.2 April-May 2011	Diff. EB 75.2-EB 74.1	EB 74.1 August - Sept 2010	EB 75.2 April-May 2011	Diff. EB 75.2-EB 74.1	EB 74.1 August - Sept 2010	EB 75.2 April-May 2011	Diff. EB 75.2-EB 74.1	EB 74.1 August - Sept 2010	EB 75.2 April-May 2011	Diff. EB 75.2-EB 74.1	EB 74.1 August - Sept 2010	EB 75.2 April-May 2011	Diff. EB 75.2-EB 74.1
EU 27	26%	36%	+10%	37%	33%	-4%	13%	14%	+1%	17%	13%	-4%	7%	4%	-3%
Euro zone	26%	37%	+11%	36%	31%	-5%	14%	16%	+2%	18%	13%	-5%	6%	3%	-3%
Non-Euro zone	25%	36%	+11%	38%	36%	-2%	12%	10%	-2%	16%	13%	-3%	9%	5%	-4%
BE	23%	29%	+6%	34%	29%	-5%	16%	21%	+5%	25%	20%	-5%	2%	1%	-1%
BG	30%	43%	+13%	44%	38%	-6%	2%	1%	-1%	13%	12%	-1%	11%	6%	-5%
CZ	31%	32%	+1%	37%	38%	+1%	10%	13%	+3%	20%	16%	-4%	2%	1%	-1%
DK	16%	18%	+2%	61%	57%	-4%	10%	15%	+5%	12%	9%	-3%	1%	1%	=
DE	21%	31%	+10%	25%	19%	-6%	31%	35%	+4%	16%	11%	-5%	7%	4%	-3%
EE	24%	28%	+4%	36%	38%	+2%	21%	23%	+2%	15%	9%	-6%	4%	2%	-2%
IE	38%	50%	+12%	38%	37%	-1%	3%	3%	=	14%	6%	-8%	7%	4%	-3%
EL	47%	63%	+16%	39%	30%	-9%	1%	1%	=	8%	5%	-3%	5%	1%	-4%
ES	26%	44%	+18%	52%	45%	-7%	3%	2%	-1%	15%	8%	-7%	4%	1%	-3%
FR	35%	48%	+13%	35%	28%	-7%	7%	10%	+3%	17%	11%	-6%	6%	3%	-3%
IT	24%	29%	+5%	42%	37%	-5%	5%	9%	+4%	22%	22%	=	7%	3%	-4%
CY	12%	29%	+17%	43%	41%	-2%	11%	4%	-7%	22%	16%	-6%	12%	10%	-2%
LV	33%	53%	+20%	52%	36%	-16%	5%	4%	-1%	7%	4%	-3%	3%	3%	=
LT	45%	48%	+3%	39%	35%	-4%	6%	8%	+2%	5%	5%	=	5%	4%	-1%
LU	18%	29%	+11%	32%	25%	-7%	29%	29%	=	15%	13%	-2%	6%	4%	-2%
HU	32%	42%	+10%	41%	37%	-4%	8%	5%	-3%	13%	14%	+1%	6%	2%	-4%
MT	19%	29%	+10%	23%	29%	+6%	18%	19%	+1%	18%	14%	-4%	22%	9%	-13%
NL	16%	22%	+6%	37%	34%	-3%	22%	29%	+7%	22%	13%	-9%	3%	2%	-1%
AT	18%	23%	+5%	22%	20%	-2%	28%	29%	+1%	26%	24%	-2%	6%	4%	-2%
PL	25%	35%	+10%	33%	34%	+1%	11%	8%	-3%	17%	15%	-2%	14%	8%	-6%
PT	40%	57%	+17%	32%	24%	-8%	2%	3%	+1%	15%	12%	-3%	11%	4%	-7%
RO	38%	38%	=	39%	41%	+2%	1%	3%	+2%	13%	11%	-2%	9%	7%	-2%
SI	36%	42%	+6%	40%	43%	+3%	6%	3%	-3%	13%	9%	-4%	5%	3%	-2%
SK	18%	29%	+11%	40%	39%	-1%	17%	15%	-2%	23%	15%	-8%	2%	2%	=
FI	6%	20%	+14%	29%	33%	+4%	38%	34%	-4%	25%	12%	-13%	2%	1%	-1%
SE	4%	9%	+5%	23%	22%	-1%	53%	58%	+5%	16%	9%	-7%	4%	2%	-2%
UK	21%	38%	+17%	38%	35%	-3%	14%	8%	-6%	17%	15%	-2%	10%	4%	-6%

III. EUROPEANS AND THE ROLE OF THE EURO

Q2. Could you tell me to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statement:

Overall the euro has mitigated the negative effects of the crisis.

1) European average



Total 'Agree': the total of "Totally agree" and "Tend to agree"

Total 'Disagree': the total of "Tend to disagree" and "Totally disagree"


Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

Groupings of Member States	Total "Agree"	Total "Disagree"	DK
UE27	34%	57%	9%
Euro zone	38%	56%	6%
Non-Euro zone	57%	28%	15%
Pre-2004	57%	35%	8%
Post-2004	56%	31%	13%

2) Differences between Member States

The Euro - EU 27

Q2 Could you tell me to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statement: Overall the euro has mitigated the negative effects of the crisis.




Source: EB 75.2 /European Parliament

IV. THE REACTIONS OF THE MEMBER STATES TO THE CRISIS

A. How do Europeans believe the Member States should react?

Q3. As a citizen would you say that you would be better protected in the face of the current crisis if...?

1) European average



Source: EB75.2/European Parliament


- We note therefore that there is **clear preference for coordination**. **More than half of Europeans (56%, +4 compared with EB 74 of September 2010)** consider that they would be better protected if the Member States adopted a coordinated approach, with scores ranging from 29% to 72%.
- More than **one in three respondents (36%, +3 compared with EB 74)** consider that they would be better protected if their country adopted measures individually.

2) Differences between Member States

Reaction towards the crisis

Q3 As a citizen would you say that you would be better protected in the face of the current crisis if... ?

- (OUR COUNTRY) adopted measures and applied them in a coordinated way with the other EU countries
- (OUR COUNTRY) adopted measures and applied them individually
- DK




Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

B. Should priority be given to reducing public spending or boosting the economy?

Q4. Personally, would you say that to emerge from the crisis rapidly, EU Member States should first reduce their public spending or first invest in measures to boost the economy?

1) European average



Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

2) *Differences between Member States*


QA4 - Personally, would you say that to emerge from the crisis rapidly, EU Member States should ...?	First invest in measures to boost the economy			First reduce their public spending			Both equally (SPONTANEOUS)			DK		
	EB 74.1 August- Sept. 2010	EB 75.2 April - May. 2011	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1 August - Sept. 2010	EB 75.2 April- May 2011	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1 August- Sept. 2010	EB 75.2 April- May 2011	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1 August- Sept. 2010	EB 75.2 April- May 2011	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74
EU 27	38%	40%	+2	35%	34%	-1	19%	22%	+3	8%	4%	-4
Euro zone	35%	35%	=	34%	33%	-1	24%	28%	+4	7%	4%	-3
Non-euro zone	45%	50%	+5	36%	34%	-2	11%	12%	+1	6%	4%	-2
Pre-2004	37%	38%	+1	34%	34%	=	21%	24%	+3	8%	4%	-4
Post-2004	45%	48%	+3	35%	33%	-2	14%	15%	+1	8%	4%	-4
BE	43%	43%	=	41%	32%	-9	14%	24%	+10	2%	1%	-1
BG	46%	49%	+3	25%	23%	-2	23%	25%	+2	6%	3%	-3
CZ	42%	44%	+2	42%	44%	+2	13%	10%	-3	3%	2%	-1
DK	69%	63%	-6	18%	23%	+5	8%	12%	+4	5%	2%	-3
DE	26%	22%	-4	32%	31%	-1	35%	42%	+7	7%	5%	-2
EE	37%	42%	+5	42%	37%	-5	13%	18%	+5	8%	3%	-5
IE	47%	39%	-8	29%	19%	-10	16%	36%	+20	8%	6%	-2
EL	36%	43%	+7	35%	30%	-5	27%	26%	-1	2%	1%	-1
ES	35%	41%	+6	22%	27%	+5	30%	26%	-4	13%	6%	-7
FR	38%	39%	+1	46%	47%	+1	8%	9%	+1	8%	5%	-3
IT	38%	43%	+5	31%	29%	-2	24%	26%	+2	7%	2%	-5
CY	37%	35%	-2	33%	29%	-4	28%	34%	+6	2%	2%	=
LV	48%	52%	+4	41%	38%	-3	8%	8%	=	3%	2%	-1
LT	65%	62%	-3	23%	26%	+3	4%	6%	+2	8%	6%	-2
LU	35%	37%	+2	35%	31%	-4	20%	27%	+7	10%	5%	-5
HU	41%	39%	-2	38%	33%	-5	18%	27%	+9	3%	1%	-2
MT	42%	46%	+4	34%	31%	-3	12%	16%	+4	12%	7%	-5
NL	51%	28%	-23	36%	24%	-12	8%	46%	+38	5%	2%	-3
AT	35%	28%	-7	27%	37%	+10	34%	33%	-1	4%	2%	-2
PL	45%	49%	+4	36%	35%	-1	11%	11%	=	8%	5%	-3
PT	25%	24%	-1	35%	41%	+6	36%	32%	-4	4%	3%	-1
RO	48%	54%	+6	31%	25%	-6	14%	14%	=	7%	7%	=
SI	34%	33%	-1	36%	32%	-4	28%	33%	+5	2%	2%	=
SK	33%	43%	+10	50%	44%	-6	14%	10%	-4	3%	3%	=
FI	52%	40%	-12	34%	41%	+7	10%	16%	+6	4%	3%	-1
SE	51%	50%	-1	32%	34%	+2	8%	13%	+5	9%	3%	-6
UK	41%	49%	+8	41%	38%	-3	7%	9%	+2	11%	4%	-7

Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

V. TODAY: WHICH POLICIES SHOULD THE EP PURSUE AS A MATTER OF PRIORITY?

1) European average

Q1. *The European Parliament promotes the development of certain policies at an EU level. In your opinion, which of the following policies should be given priority?*



2) Differences between Member States

	Tackling poverty and social exclusion			Improving consumer and public health protection			Coordinating economic, budget and tax policies			Combating climate change			An agricultural policy that is environmentally friendly and contributes to the global food balance			Combating terrorism while respecting individual freedoms			A security and defence policy that enables the EU to face up to international crisis			A common energy policy intended to ensure the EU's energy independence			An immigration policy implemented in consultation with countries of origin			A foreign policy that enables the EU to speak with one voice on the international stage			A research and development (R&D) policy that ensures competitiveness and innovation			The assertion of a European social model		
	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74	EB 74.1	EB 75.2	Diff. EB 75 - EB 74			
EU27	52%	51%	-1	33%	32%	-1	27%	28%	+1	26%	26%	=	27%	25%	-2	28%	25%	-3	23%	24%	+1	20%	23%	+3	20%	22%	+2	17%	16%	-1	14%	13%	-1	13%	12%	-1
BE	60%	61%	+1	34%	37%	+3	27%	24%	-3	34%	32%	-2	26%	23%	-3	31%	24%	-7	17%	17%	=	21%	22%	+1	33%	30%	-3	16%	15%	-1	17%	14%	-3	16%	19%	+3
BG	56%	62%	+6	48%	48%	=	22%	24%	+2	19%	27%	+8	38%	41%	+3	29%	34%	+5	23%	26%	+3	29%	29%	=	6%	7%	+1	22%	20%	-2	10%	10%	=	15%	19%	+4
CZ	51%	43%	-8	35%	34%	-1	34%	30%	-4	16%	17%	+1	33%	35%	+2	29%	27%	-2	30%	31%	+1	23%	22%	-1	16%	19%	+3	16%	18%	+2	16%	15%	-1	13%	13%	=
DK	45%	50%	+5	30%	29%	-1	7%	8%	+1	47%	43%	-4	37%	30%	-7	42%	39%	-3	28%	26%	-2	27%	27%	=	31%	28%	-3	21%	21%	=	25%	20%	-5	9%	12%	+3
DE	56%	51%	-5	30%	34%	+4	35%	36%	+1	36%	38%	+2	22%	20%	-2	31%	27%	-4	23%	22%	-1	27%	42%	+15	26%	26%	=	20%	21%	+1	13%	13%	=	18%	18%	=
EE	48%	55%	+7	33%	38%	+5	39%	38%	-1	7%	7%	=	38%	35%	-3	14%	11%	-3	27%	23%	-4	21%	18%	-3	9%	11%	+2	17%	13%	-4	14%	13%	-1	13%	12%	-1
IE	51%	55%	+4	43%	48%	+5	28%	38%	+10	24%	29%	+5	24%	23%	-1	27%	22%	-5	23%	21%	-2	27%	25%	-2	12%	13%	+1	33%	19%	-14	19%	16%	-3	8%	5%	-3
EL	68%	69%	+1	48%	43%	-5	28%	31%	+3	28%	32%	+4	32%	28%	-4	23%	24%	+1	21%	23%	+2	21%	16%	-5	15%	20%	+5	19%	13%	-6	21%	18%	-3	15%	16%	+1
ES	61%	59%	-2	27%	29%	+2	22%	33%	+11	19%	25%	+6	16%	18%	2	29%	24%	-5	16%	18%	+2	8%	14%	+6	21%	21%	=	10%	11%	+1	16%	18%	+2	13%	12%	-1
FR	57%	60%	+3	36%	34%	-2	31%	22%	-9	25%	23%	-2	40%	34%	-6	30%	28%	-2	23%	26%	+3	13%	14%	+1	23%	21%	-2	21%	19%	-2	16%	11%	-5	16%	15%	-1
IT	40%	32%	-8	33%	31%	-2	24%	24%	=	18%	21%	+3	19%	20%	+1	20%	24%	+4	26%	35%	+9	20%	27%	+7	23%	36%	+13	20%	22%	+2	18%	20%	+2	12%	12%	=
CY	54%	64%	+10	74%	62%	-12	16%	23%	+7	36%	31%	-5	33%	23%	-10	41%	35%	-6	43%	35%	-8	14%	15%	+1	21%	33%	+12	26%	27%	+1	5%	8%	+3	5%	11%	+6
LV	54%	60%	+6	32%	35%	+3	41%	48%	+7	6%	10%	+4	42%	48%	+6	13%	10%	-3	19%	17%	-2	17%	18%	+1	8%	7%	-1	10%	8%	-2	15%	16%	+1	10%	10%	=
LT	62%	69%	+7	37%	39%	+2	48%	51%	+3	12%	12%	=	18%	23%	+5	14%	15%	+1	15%	14%	-1	30%	26%	-4	7%	12%	+5	8%	9%	+1	14%	15%	+1	10%	9%	-1
LU	49%	46%	-3	23%	23%	=	15%	14%	-1	30%	29%	-1	30%	27%	-3	26%	24%	-2	26%	29%	+3	16%	22%	+6	15%	15%	=	26%	24%	-2	10%	10%	=	12%	14%	+2
HU	56%	60%	+4	33%	29%	-4	43%	46%	+3	27%	25%	-2	32%	38%	+6	22%	18%	-4	30%	31%	+1	38%	35%	-3	6%	10%	+4	11%	12%	+1	16%	15%	-1	19%	17%	-2
MT	37%	35%	-2	47%	39%	-8	12%	15%	+3	30%	26%	-4	14%	17%	+3	20%	22%	+2	25%	27%	+2	23%	22%	-1	17%	32%	+15	19%	22%	+3	16%	9%	-7	4%	4%	=
NL	48%	38%	-10	35%	29%	-6	29%	31%	+2	37%	26%	-11	33%	26%	-7	43%	29%	-14	22%	19%	-3	27%	22%	-5	29%	25%	-4	18%	22%	+4	14%	12%	-2	10%	12%	2
AT	50%	51%	+1	35%	32%	-3	24%	30%	+6	44%	38%	-6	33%	29%	-4	22%	19%	-3	24%	24%	=	32%	38%	+6	35%	36%	+1	19%	17%	-2	21%	19%	-2	22%	22%	=
PL	55%	58%	+3	41%	40%	-1	24%	22%	-2	16%	15%	-1	26%	27%	+1	22%	17%	-5	19%	21%	+2	22%	23%	+1	7%	7%	=	12%	11%	-1	13%	11%	-2	11%	8%	-3
PT	64%	71%	7	31%	27%	-4	20%	29%	9	18%	20%	2	21%	18%	-3	17%	22%	5	15%	18%	3	14%	12%	-2	9%	9%	0	10%	9%	-1	10%	11%	1	19%	19%	0
RO	50%	56%	6	41%	34%	-7	28%	23%	-5	17%	27%	10	32%	45%	13	15%	21%	6	38%	38%	0	17%	14%	-3	4%	6%	2	24%	21%	-3	13%	10%	-3	7%	10%	3
SI	53%	55%	2	37%	37%	0	36%	37%	1	42%	36%	-6	34%	40%	6	14%	13%	-1	14%	15%	1	24%	24%	0	7%	10%	3	17%	8%	-9	20%	24%	4	24%	26%	2
SK	47%	49%	2	39%	39%	0	38%	33%	-5	26%	23%	-3	36%	40%	4	33%	29%	-4	28%	31%	3	25%	24%	-1	10%	11%	1	19%	18%	-1	15%	14%	-1	19%	18%	-1
FI	60%	63%	3	35%	34%	-1	27%	35%	8	40%	33%	-7	41%	35%	-6	21%	18%	-3	27%	22%	-5	22%	19%	-3	11%	11%	0	15%	16%	1	15%	11%	-4	14%	11%	-3
SE	50%	52%	2	21%	15%	-6	12%	15%	3	69%	56%	-13	41%	31%	-10	32%	27%	-5	34%	28%	-6	27%	22%	-5	19%	21%	2	23%	19%	-4	15%	16%	1	5%	6%	1
UK	43%	39%	-4	22%	25%	3	19%	22%	3	24%	19%	-5	24%	19%	-5	33%	32%	-1	19%	18%	-1	15%	14%	-1	25%	30%	5	10%	10%	0	7%	7%	0	3%	2%	-1


Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

VI. EUROPEANS AND FOOD SECURITY

A. Helping agriculture in developing countries and combating speculation


Q10. *Personally, which of the following measures do you think is the most efficient to fight against increasing price of food products?*

1) European average



Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

2) Differences between Member States




Source: EB75.2/European Parliament

B. Precise objectives to improve food security

Q9. *The European Parliament is concerned about the high increase in global prices of food due notably to financial speculation on agricultural raw materials. On this subject, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?*

1) European average



Public Opinion Monitoring Unit
EPEurobarometer@europarl.europa.eu

Jacques Nancy +32 2 284 24 85
 Trifot Jonas +32 2 284 06 45
 Hallaouy Said +32 2 284 60 73
 Lefèvre Nathalie +32 2 284 12 26
 Maggio Luisa +32 2 284 14 21
 Van de Calseyde Caroline +32 2 284 14 76

Survey and national data available on the "Eurobarometer" page of the European Parliament:
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/parliament/public/staticDisplay.do?language=EN&id=40>