The EU Cohesion Monitor is a quantitative index describing the willingness of the 28 member states of the European Union and their societies for joint action and cooperation.

By using a set of ten indicators the monitor illustrates the diverse foundations of European cohesion.

The data presented here offer in-depth access to the monitor’s results. They are intended as an invitation for further analysis and debate of the different cohesion resources and potentials held by the EU and its individual member states.

The EU Cohesion Monitor is part of the Rethink: Europe project, a joint initiative of the European Council on Foreign Relations and Stiftung Mercator. The project examines the underlying forces shaping European cohesion and our continent’s capacity to act on the global stage.
What is the EU Cohesion Monitor?
The EU Cohesion Monitor is a quantitative index to assess the willingness of the 28 member states of the European Union and their societies for joint action and cooperation.

Why do you study cohesion?
Cohesion is an essential precondition for the capacity of collective actors to take action. We assume that strong actors will need a high level of cohesion, and that acting together successfully will in turn strengthen cohesion. In the current crisis, the EU shows weaknesses in its response. Therefore we want to know how strong cohesion still is, how it has changed, and how far it differs between member states.

What does cohesion actually mean?
Defining as broad a term as cohesion is tricky. People may answer the question differently depending on whether you ask a sociology professor, an economist, or a bureaucrat managing the EU’s regional cohesion funds. The EU Cohesion Monitor approaches cohesion in terms of willingness and readiness of Europeans to act together. We assume that strong cohesion is a precondition for a strong capacity to act, and we assume that acting together successfully will in turn strengthen cohesion.

Why do you differentiate between individual and structural cohesion?
We do this in order to deconstruct the term “cohesion” itself. Cohesion understood as the willingness to cooperate of countries and societies essentially has these two dimensions: the people, their beliefs, and experiences on the one hand, and decisions and practices on the macro-level, including the actions of the economic, political and cultural elites of a country. The two dimensions often complement each other, but this is not necessarily so. We want the monitor to display differences in the micro and macro levels of cohesion.

Why do states differ so much concerning the level of cohesion?
The EU Cohesion Monitor points to the variety of sources cohesion is drawing from. For example, Italy has a central geographic position in Europe, Romania lies more on the periphery but is strongly connected through trade with other EU member states, Austria is centrally located and is an EU trade champion. All three show different results in the EU Cohesion Monitor. The differences stem from the monitor’s combination of several cohesion indicators and factors, each representing a different source of cohesion.

What effect did the financial crisis have on cohesion?
There is no single or clear-cut effect. While many countries, especially in the south of Europe, show a decline in cohesion through the years of the financial crisis, the EU Cohesion Monitor also reveals significant cohesion gains across East-Central Europe. This has to do with the diverse composition of cohesion: there is more to it than a country’s fiscal solvency and economic health.

Does the EU Cohesion Monitor lead to policy recommendations?
First, there is no single recipe and quick fixes. The EU Cohesion Monitor shows that cohesion is never stable. It changes over time and stems from different sources. As a result, each EU member state has its own unique level of cohesion. This means that any catch all cohesion strategy is bound to fail.

Second, differentiation and investment into the various resources on the individual level of citizens and the structural level of policies is the way forward. It also means that not only policy makers and governments are encouraged to address cohesion. Cohesion is as much a field of engagement for civil-society organizations as well as EU citizens.
How is the EU Cohesion Monitor compiled?
To determine cohesion in all 28 member states we look at a total of 32 variables. These datasets were gathered for 2007 and 2014 to allow for comparisons of the most current available data (2014) with the last year before the financial crisis hit Europe (2007).

Where did you get all this data and why did you choose it?
The EU Cohesion Monitor relies entirely on datasets that are publicly available. The most prominent sources include Eurostat tables and Eurobarometer surveys. Where we encountered “data gaps” and could not find alternative data sources we used approximations. For example, even at the end of 2015, when the EU Cohesion Monitor was compiled, not all countries had reported disposable income for 2014 to Eurostat. In this case we used data from a proxy year, say 2013, to fill a country’s gap. Similarly, when no data was available from other years, we used data from “proxy countries”, e.g. using Cyprus data for Malta.

The EU Cohesion Monitor was compiled with the goal to minimize these approximations or avoid them in the first place. When selecting our range of variables and indicators we excluded some for lack of data or because quantifying them would have been unfeasible.

How do you compare such a variety of data points?
We transform each specific data point to a 1-10 point scale, say German disposable income in 2007 or turnout to the European Parliament elections in Belgium in 2014. These transformations are made transparent in the appendix.

What is the logic behind choosing precisely these indicators and variables? For example, how is a member state’s Funding related to cohesion?
Each of the EU Cohesion Monitor’s ten indicators rests on a cohesion assumption, or hypothesis. For a country’s Funding we argue that the inflow of resources through EU funds will strengthen awareness of EU benefits, for example through the presence of EU funded projects to improve local infrastructure. At the same time, being a net contributor to the EU budget will increase that country’s stake and commitment to shape the EU and thus will strengthen its engagement with it.

Do you weigh your data?
Since weighing data is a methodological minefield we only did it where we saw a compelling reason. For example, the maximum score in the Security indicator is seven points rather than ten. The scale ends at seven, rather than ten, because we are aware of policy debates about stronger cooperation and deeper integration in the area of security and defence. The scaling has to give room for such steps. Please see the appendix for all details on how variables and indicators are composed.

Are you sharing how all the indicator conversions were made?
Yes. The appendix makes our methodology fully transparent. You may look even deeper by accessing the entire set of raw data online.

I want to use EU Cohesion Monitor scores for my work. Where do I get the complete data?
The set of data underlying and generated by the EU Cohesion Monitor can be accessed in its entirety and free of charge at ecf.re/eucohesionmonitor.

Citizens of other EU countries % of population
Visited another EU country
Socialised with people from other EU country
Foreign language skills
Metadata

Turnout in EP elections
Anti-EU/populist share in EP elections
Anti-EU/populist share in national elections
Metadata

Trust in EU
Positive image of EU
National interest well taken into account
Perception as European
Metadata

Support for economic and monetary union
Support for common foreign policy
Support for common defence and security policy
Euro among most positive results of EU
Free movement among most positive results of EU
Peace in Europe among most positive results of EU
Metadata

Individual Cohesion is strengthened by:

+ Citizens’ first-hand EU experience, proximity of other EU countries, and foreign language skills

+ A high turnout in elections to the European Parliament and low voting preferences for anti-EU/populist parties in the EP and national parliaments

+ Positive views on the benefits of integration and on the EU at large

+ Support for and positive views on areas of deeper integration
Structural Cohesion is strengthened by:

+ A society’s resilience in terms of its affluence and equality fostering EU engagement and solidarity

+ High connectedness and integration of a country’s economy with other EU economies through trade and investment flows

+ Inflow of resources through EU funds as well as being a net contributor to the EU’s budget

+ A high number of regions sharing a border with other EU member states as well as with non-EU countries

+ No or a low number of opt-outs from the generally accepted state of integration

+ Deep multinational cooperation in the area of defence and security
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RETHINK: EUROPE
SPAIN 2007 vs. 2014

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

RESILIENCE

EXPERIENCE

ECONOMIC TIES

FUNDING

NEIGHBOURHOOD

POLICY INTEGRATION

ATTITUDES

APPROVAL

SECURITY

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland
Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
UK

4.8
6.2

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
FAQ
Design
Overall Results
Countries
Indicators
RETHINK: EUROPE
SWEDEN  2007 vs. 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2007 Score</th>
<th>2014 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INDIVIDUAL COHESION

2007 2014

Trend

Gains

No Change

Losses

INDIVIDUAL COHESION

STRUCTURAL COHESION

Experience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Neighbourhood

Policy Integration

Security

INDIVIDUAL COHESION

Experience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Neighbourhood

Policy Integration

Security

Czech Rep. 0.8
Lithuania 0.7
Estonia 0.7
Latvia 0.7
Malta 0.7
Romania 0.6
Sweden 0.6
Austria 0.5
Croatia 0.5
Finland 0.5
Germany 0.5
Luxembourg 0.5
Slovakia 0.5
Belgium 0.4
UK 0.4
Netherlands 0.3
Poland 0.2
Denmark 0.2
Portugal 0.2
Bulgaria 0.1
Ireland 0.1
Slovenia 0.1
France 0.1
Spain 0.1
Hungary 0.1
Cyprus 0.1
Italy 0.1
Greece 0.1

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
FAQ
Design
Overall Results
Countries
Indicators

RETHINK: EUROPE
EXPERIENCE 2007 2014 Trend

Citizens of other EU countries share of total population
Visited another EU country
Socialised with people from other EU country
Foreign language skills

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Neighbourhood
Policy Integration
Security
EXPERIENCE  2007  2014  Trend

Gains
No Change
Losses

Citizens of other EU countries share of total population
Visited another EU country
Socialised with people from other EU country
Foreign language skills

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
Experience  Engagement
Attitudes  Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Neighbourhood
Policy Integration
Security

Design Overall Results Countries Indicatorsecfr.eu/ eucohesionmonitor
FAQ  Design  Overall Results  Countries  Indicators

RETHINK: EUROPE
ENGAGEMENT  2007  2014  Trend

8.10 or more
7.21 to 8.09
6.62 to 7.20
less than 6.61

Turnout in EP elections
Anti-EU/populist share in EP elections
Anti-EU/populist share in national elections

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Neighbourhood
Policy Integration
Security
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10.0  Malta  #1
9.7  Luxembourg  2
9.5  Belgium  3
9.1  Ireland  4
8.5  Germany  5
8.3  Spain  6
8.2  Estonia  7
7.8  Lithuania  8
7.4  Sweden  9
7.3  Slovenia  10
7.1  Croatia  11
7.0  UK  12
6.9  Finland  13
6.8  Bulgaria  14
6.6  Austria  16
6.5  Italy  10
6.2  Portugal  20
5.9  Slovakia  21
5.8  Cyprus  22
5.3  France  25
4.8  Romania  24
4.4  Greece  25
1.8  Czech Rep.  26
1.8  Poland  27
1.8  Hungary  28
Gains
No Change
Losses

Turnout in EP elections
Anti-EU/populist share in EP elections
Anti-EU/populist share in national elections

ENGAGEMENT 2007 2014 Trend

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
Experience Engagement
Attitudes Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
Resilience Economic Ties
Funding Neighbourhood Policy Integration Security

Gains: Czech Rep. 3.2
Belgium 1.4
Romania 1.0
Sweden 0.6
Estonia 0.4
Croatia 0.3
Luxembourg 0.3
Denmark 0.1

No Change: Germany 0.0
Malta
Portugal
Slovenia

Losses:
Slovakia -0.1
Poland -0.2
Bulgaria -0.3
Ireland
Latvia
Spain
UK -0.4
Austria -0.6
Netherlands
Cyprus -0.7
France -0.9
Finland -1.1
Hungary -1.4
Greece -1.4
Italy -2.9
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ATTITUDES  

2007   2014   Trend

6.51 or more
6.01 to 6.50
5.52 to 6.00
less than 5.51

Trust in EU
Positive image of EU
National interest well taken into account
Perception as European

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Neighbourhood
Policy Integration
Security

Design Overall Results Countries Indicator secfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor FAQ Design Overall Results Countries Indicators RETHINK: EUROPE
ATTITUDES 2007 2014 Trend

Gains
No Change
Losses

Trust in EU
Positive image of EU
National interest well taken into account
Perception as European

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Neighbourhood
Policy Integration
Security
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Support for economic and monetary union
Support for common foreign policy
Support for common defence and security policy
Euro among most positive results of EU
Free movement among most positive results of EU
Peace in Europe among most positive results of EU

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Neighbourhood
Policy Integration
Security

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
Support for economic and monetary union
- Support for common foreign policy
- Support for common defence and security policy
- Euro among most positive results of EU
- Free movement among most positive results of EU
- Peace in Europe among most positive results of EU

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Neighbourhood Policy Integration Security
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Support for economic and monetary union
Support for common foreign policy
Support for common defence and security policy
Euro among most positive results of EU
Free movement among most positive results of EU
Peace in Europe among most positive results of EU

Support for economic and monetary union
Support for common foreign policy
Support for common defence and security policy
Euro among most positive results of EU
Free movement among most positive results of EU
Peace in Europe among most positive results of EU
STRUCTURAL COHESION

2007  2014  Trend

INDIVIDUAL COHESION  STRUCTURAL COHESION

Experience  Resilience
Engagement  Economic Ties
Attitudes  Funding
Approval  Neighbourhood
Policy Integration
Security
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STRUCTURAL COHESION

2007  2014  Trend

Gains
No Change
Losses

Hungary  1.5
Estonia  1.4
Poland  1.2
Lithuania  1.1
Czech Rep.  0.8
Latvia  0.7
Romania  0.6
Slovakia  0.6
Bulgaria  0.2
Malta  0.1
Slovenia  0.1
Sweden  0.1
Finland  0.1
Greece  0.1

Austria  -0.1
Belgium  -0.1
Croatia  -0.1
Denmark  -0.1
Germany  -0.1
Luxembourg  -0.1
Portugal  -0.1
Cyprus  -0.3
France  -0.4
Ireland  -0.5
UK  -0.6
Italy  -0.7
Spain  -0.7
Netherlands  -0.7

Design  Overall Results  Countries  Indicators
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INDIVIDUAL
COHESION  STRUCTURAL
COHESION

Experience  Resilience
Engagement  Economic Ties
Attitudes  Funding
Approval  Neighbourhood
Policy Integration
Security
ECONOMIC TIES

2007  2014  Trend

- 6.54 or more
- 5.71 to 6.53
- 5.33 to 5.70
- less than 5.32

EU trade to total trade
EU trade to GDP ratio
EU investments to total investments
EU investments to GDP ratio

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Neighbourhood
Policy Integration
Security
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ECONOMIC TIES 2007 2014 Trend

- EU trade to total trade
- EU trade to GDP ratio
- EU investments to total investments
- EU investments to GDP ratio

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Neighbourhood
- Policy Integration
- Security

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Neighbourhood
- Policy Integration
- Security

6.54 or more
5.71 to 6.53
5.33 to 5.70
less than 5.32

7.9 Malta #1
7.6 Luxembourg 2
7.4 Belgium 3
7.3 Czech Rep. 4
7.1 Slovakia
7.0 Slovenia 6
6.8 Estonia 7
6.3 Latvia 9
5.9 Lithuania 10
5.8 Finland 13
5.3 Austria 15
5.2 Cyprus 16
5.1 Germany 17
5.0 Spain 18
4.9 Netherlands 19
4.8 Ireland 20
4.6 Greece 21
4.5 France 22
4.0 Sweden
3.9 Denmark 24
3.6 Croatia 25
3.4 Bulgaria 26
2.8 Italy 27
2.6 UK 28
**SECURITY** 2007 2014 Trend

- **6.36 or more**
- **4.51 to 6.35**
- **3.92 to 4.50**
- **less than 3.91**

- Permanent multinational command structures and cooperations
- Joint development and procurement
- Multinational deployments

---

**INDIVIDUAL COHESION**
- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval

**STRUCTURAL COHESION**
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Neighbourhood Policy Integration

**Security**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Design Overall Results Countries Indicator secfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor FAQ]
SECURITY 2007 2014 Trend

Gains
No Change
Losses

- Permanent multinational command structures and cooperations
- Joint development and procurement
- Multinational deployments

INDIVIDUAL COHESION
- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Neighbourhood Policy Integration
- Security

Countries
- Hungary 3.2
- Poland 3.1
- Sweden 3.0
- Croatia 2.9
- Bulgaria 2.8
- Romania 2.4
- Greece 2.3
- Estonia 2.2
- Finland 1.9
- Czech Rep. 1.5
- Slovenia 1.3
- Austria 1.2
- Ireland 1.0
- Portugal 0.8
- Luxembourg 0.8
- Malta 0.7
- Slovakia 0.6
- Denmark 0.6
- UK 0.6
- Lithuania 0.4
- Cyprus 0.3

FAQ Design Overall Results Countries Indicators
**EXPERIENCE - Indicator Factors and Metadata**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Citizens of other EU countries as share of total population | 2012: Eurostat News release 112/2013, page 3; Eurostat migr_pop1ctz, Eurostat demo_pjan | 2007 = 2012, MT, PL, RO: 2007 = 2014 | \(((\text{value-minimum})/(\text{maximum-minimum})) \times 9\) + 1  
maximum = 10% = 10 points  
minimum = 0.1% = 1 point |
| 2 | Visited another EU country (% of respondents) | Eurobarometer 73 and Eurobarometer 82: "In the last 12 months have you visited another EU country?" | 2007 = 2006, HR 2007 = HR 2013 (Total 'Yes') | \(((\text{value-minimum})/(\text{maximum-minimum})) \times 9\) + 1  
maximum = 80% = 10 points  
minimum = 10% = 1 point |
| 3 | Socialized with people from other EU countries (% of respondents) | Eurobarometer 73 and Eurobarometer 82: "In the last 12 months have you socialized with people from another EU country?" | 2007 = 2006, HR 2007 = HR 2013, BG, RO 2007 = BG, RO 2010 (Total 'Yes') | \(((\text{value-minimum})/(\text{maximum-minimum})) \times 9\) + 1  
maximum = 80% = 10 points  
minimum = 10% = 1 point |
| 4 | Foreign language skills (% of respondents) | Special Eurobarometer 386: "Foreign languages that you speak well enough in order to be able to have conversation" ('At least 1') | 2007 = 2005, 2014 = 2012, HR 2014 = HR 2007 | \(((\text{value-minimum})/(\text{maximum-minimum})) \times 9\) + 1  
maximum = 80% = 10 points  
minimum = 10% = 1 point |

Indicator score = Factor 1 50%, Factors 2-4 50%

---
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**RETHINK: EUROPE**
## ENGAGEMENT - Indicator Factors and Metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National turnout in EP elections</td>
<td>Eurostat tsdgo310</td>
<td>2007 = 2004</td>
<td>$\frac{((value-minimum)/(maximum-minimum)) * 9}{1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BG, RO 2004 = BG, RO 2009</td>
<td>Maximum = 70% = 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HR 2004 = 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Share of vote for populist/anti-EU parties in EP elections</td>
<td>European Parliament election results; <a href="http://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2014-results/en/turnout.html">http://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2014-results/en/turnout.html</a></td>
<td>Turnout shares only counted when party won at least one seat in parliament</td>
<td>$\frac{((value-maximum)/(maximum-minimum)) * 9}{1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Share of vote for populist/anti-EU parties in national parliament</td>
<td>Wikipedia for national election results and political parties; <a href="http://www.parties-and-elections.eu">http://www.parties-and-elections.eu</a></td>
<td>Turnout shares only counted when party won at least one seat in parliament</td>
<td>$\frac{((value-maximum)/(maximum-minimum)) * 9}{1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator score = Average of Factors 1-3
# ATTITUDES - Indicator Factors and Metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trust in the EU</td>
<td>Eurobarometer 68 and Eurobarometer 82: &quot;How much trust do you have in The European Union?&quot;</td>
<td>No data gaps</td>
<td>$\frac{((\text{value-minimum})}{(\text{maximum-minimum})} \times 9} + 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maximum = 80% = 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimum = 10% = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive image of the EU</td>
<td>Eurobarometer 68 and Eurobarometer 82: &quot;In general, does the European Union conjure up for you a very positive, fairly positive, neutral, fairly negative or very negative image?&quot;</td>
<td>No data gaps</td>
<td>$\frac{((\text{value-minimum})}{(\text{maximum-minimum})} \times 9} + 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maximum = 80% = 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimum = 10% = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>National interest well taken into account in EU</td>
<td>Eurobarometer 68 and Eurobarometer 82: &quot;Are the interests of (YOUR COUNTRY) well taken into account in the EU?&quot;</td>
<td>HR 2007 = HR 2013</td>
<td>$\frac{((\text{value-minimum})}{(\text{maximum-minimum})} \times 9} + 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maximum = 80% = 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimum = 10% = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perception as European</td>
<td>Eurobarometer 73 and Eurobarometer 82: &quot;Do you see yourself as...? (‘NATIONALITY and European’; ‘European and NATIONALITY’; ‘European only’ combined)?&quot;</td>
<td>2007 = 2010 HR 2007 = HR 2013</td>
<td>$\frac{((\text{value-minimum})}{(\text{maximum-minimum})} \times 9} + 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maximum = 80% = 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimum = 10% = 1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator score = Average of Factors 1-4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Support for common economic and monetary union | Eurobarometer 68 and Eurobarometer 82: "What is your opinion on a European economic and monetary union with one single currency, the euro?" | No data gaps           | $((\text{value-minimum})/\text{(maximum-minimum)}) \times 9 + 1$  
maximum = 80% = 10 points  
minimum = 10% = 1 point |
| 2  | Support for common foreign policy            | Eurobarometer 68 and Eurobarometer 82: "What is your opinion on a common foreign policy among the Member States of the EU?" | No data gaps           | $((\text{value-minimum})/\text{(maximum-minimum)}) \times 9 + 1$  
maximum = 80% = 10 points  
minimum = 10% = 1 point |
| 3  | Support for common defence and security policy | Eurobarometer 68 and Eurobarometer 82: "What is your opinion on a common defence and security policy among EU Member States?" | No data gaps           | $((\text{value-minimum})/\text{(maximum-minimum)}) \times 9 + 1$  
maximum = 80% = 10 points  
minimum = 10% = 1 point |
| 4  | Euro is most positive result of EU           | Eurobarometer 67 and Eurobarometer 82: "Euro among most positive results of European integration" | No data gaps           | $((\text{value-minimum})/\text{(maximum-minimum)}) \times 9 + 1$  
maximum = 80% = 10 points  
minimum = 10% = 1 point |
| 5  | Free movement is most positive result of EU  | Eurobarometer 67 and Eurobarometer 82: “Free movement of people, goods and services within the EU among most positive results of European integration” | No data gaps           | $((\text{value-minimum})/\text{(maximum-minIMUM)}) \times 9 + 1$  
maximum = 80% = 10 points  
minimum = 10% = 1 point |
| 6  | Peace in Europe is most positive result of EU | Eurobarometer 67 and Eurobarometer 82: “Peace in Europe among most positive results of European integration” | No data gaps           | $((\text{value-minimum})/\text{(maximum-minimum)}) \times 9 + 1$  
maximum = 80% = 10 points  
minimum = 10% = 1 point |

Indicator score = Average of Factors 1-6
## RESILIENCE - Indicator Factors and Metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Debt-to-GDP ratio</td>
<td>Eurostat teina225</td>
<td>No data gaps</td>
<td>(((value-maximum)/(maximum-minimum)) *9)+1 If debt-to-GDP-ratio ≤ 40% = 10 points If debt-to-GDP-ratio ≥ 120% = 1 point (The Euro convergence benchmark for debt-to-GDP-ratio is 60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social Justice Index (SJI)</td>
<td>Social Justice Index, Bertelsmann Stiftung</td>
<td>BG, HR, CY, EE, LV, LT, MT, RO, SI 2007 = 2014</td>
<td>No conversion (the SJI is already on a 1 to 10 point scale).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator score = Average of Factors 1-3
# ECONOMIC TIES - Indicator Factors and Metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intra-EU trade in goods (sum of imports and exports) as share of total trade</td>
<td>Eurostat tet00047, Eurostat tet00002</td>
<td>HR 2014 = HR 2013</td>
<td>(((\text{value-minimum})/(\text{maximum-minimum})) * 9) + 1) max = 80% = 10 points min = 20% = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intra-EU trade (sum of imports and exports) to GDP ratio</td>
<td>Eurostat tet00047, Eurostat tec00001</td>
<td>No data gaps</td>
<td>(((\text{value-minimum})/(\text{maximum-minimum})) * 9) + 1) max = 1 = 10 points min = 0,05 = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intra-EU FDIs (sum of inward and outward flows) as share of country's global FDIs (sum of inward and outward flows)</td>
<td>Eurostat tec00056, Eurostat tec00053, Eurostat tec00049</td>
<td>NL 2007 = NL 2005; ALL 2014 = ALL 2012; SK 2014 = SK 2011</td>
<td>(((\text{value-minimum})/(\text{maximum-minimum})) * 9) + 1) max = 80% = 10 points min = 20% = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intra-EU FDIs (sum of inward and outward flows) to GDP ratio</td>
<td>Eurostat tec00056, Eurostat tec00001</td>
<td>NL 2007 = NL 2005; ALL 2014 = ALL 2012; SK 2014 = SK 2011</td>
<td>(((\text{value-minimum})/(\text{maximum-minimum})) * 9) + 1) max = 1 = 10 points min = 0,05 = 1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator score = Average of Factors 1-4
## FUNDING - Indicator Factors and Metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Indicator score = Both Factor scores are added
## NEIGHBOURHOOD - Indicator Factors and Metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Population of NUTS-3 border regions as share of total population</td>
<td>Eurostat demo_r_pjangerp3</td>
<td>Only 2014 data available; value is set to 1 for CY and MT because they have no land border to any other EU country but are also not completely isolated</td>
<td>[((\text{value} - \text{minimum}) / (\text{maximum} - \text{minimum})) \times 9 \right] + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of non-EU neighbours that are not part of EFTA and not likely to join the EU in the foreseeable future</td>
<td>European Commission <a href="http://europa.eu/about-eu">http://europa.eu/about-eu</a></td>
<td>No data gaps</td>
<td>1 point counted for each country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator score** = Both Factor scores are added
## POLICY INTEGRATION - Indicator Factors and Metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 possible opt-outs:  - EMU/Euro  - Schengen area  - CSDP  - Area of freedom, security and justice  - Charter of Fundamental Rights  - Social Chapter</td>
<td>Wikipedia: Opt-outs in the European Union</td>
<td>No data gaps</td>
<td>Default score for having no opt-outs = 7; 1 negative point each for EMU/Euro and Schengen area; 0.5 negative point each for CSDP, Area of freedom, Security and Justice, Charter of Fundamental Rights, Social Chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator score = Sum of opt-outs is subtracted from 7
## SECURITY - Indicator Factors and Metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data Gaps, Exceptions</th>
<th>Conversion to 1-10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Joint development and procurement (participation in: Eurofighter, A400M, Eurocopter Tiger, NH90)</td>
<td>Wikipedia: European multilateral defence procurement (incl. related articles)</td>
<td>No data gaps</td>
<td>1 point for each participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multinational deployments (participation in: NATO, EU, and OSCE missions)</td>
<td>IISS Military Balance</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1 point for each participation in a NATO, EU, OSCE; Multiyear averages: 2007 = average number of deployments 2004-2007; 2014 = average number of deployments 2008-20122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator score = Total sum of all three factors is converted to a 1-10 scale. Lowest sum of all three factors = 1. All scores ≥ 7 are set 7. (European integration not advanced enough to merit 10 points)