

CZECH CITIZENS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE EU

REPORT OF A QUALITATIVE STUDY IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC

Mareco, s.r.o

This Synthesis presents the results of a group discussion held in Prague on 19 December 2013 on the subject of citizens' involvement in the European Union. It is part of a wider citizenship project managed by Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, with the support of national partners of the European Qualitative Network coordinated by OPTEM, on behalf of the European Commission.

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of a group discussion held in Prague on 19 December 2013 on the subject of citizens' involvement in the European Union.

It is the Czech section of a pan-European qualitative study involving 18 of the Member States.

In each country the study was carried out by the national partner of the European Qualitative Network coordinated by OPTEM: in the Czech Republic by Mareco, s.r.o.

This study forms a part of a wider Citizenship Project managed by Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute on behalf of the European Commission.

BOX 1 ► Composition of the group of respondents

Gender

Women: 5

Men: 4

Age

20-34 years: 3

35-49 years: 3

50-60 years: 2

Social class

Lower-middle social class: 5 (professions of head of household: 3 office employees, manual worker, warehouse worker)

Higher-middle class: 4 (professions of head of household: entrepreneur, IT manager, self-employed plumber, middle level manager)

Political opinion

The respondents were also recruited so that diverse political opinions were represented in the group.

1. Initial thoughts about the European Union

The present EU image among the Czech Republic citizens is rather negative, when spontaneously discussing EU **negative associations** and topics concerning especially the following prevail:

- **Excessive EU bureaucratic apparatus** and from that arising the EU expensiveness and inefficient spending of (financial) resources within the EU.
- **Regulations and directive dictate** – regulations and directives are frequently perceived as useless, sometimes even as stupid, bringing only another burden to citizens and (business) firms within the EU. The regulations often deal with issues that have already been solved better and more efficiently at national levels. There are a lot of regulations and directives there, the situation is frequently confused and the orientation within them is thus difficult.
- **Identity, tradition and freedom restrictions** of Member States – a feeling of necessity to submit to orders/regulations coming from the EU centre.
- **Impossibility of making small Member States' voices and interests being heard** and the necessity of submission to the dominant stakeholders' interests.
- The set **rules do not apply to all Member States equally** – the large/significant countries such as Germany, France do not meet the proper requirements/terms over a long period and are not punished; when the EU interests change, the rules are changed (Greece, Ukraine) – the rules are not enforced thoroughly if it is suitable for the EU.

- **Economic instability and uncertainty** due to the Southern States issues – Spain, Greece, Portugal.
- **Joining of economically weak members in the EU** – the fear of deepening economic instability within the EU (Bulgaria, Romania).
- **Negotiations with Ukraine or Turkey about joining the EU** – these States are perceived as States that do not belong to the EU either economically or culturally.
- **Negative attitude towards the European currency euro** – it is an instable currency, its acceptance/joining means that prices go up. Preserving the national currency is perceived as a safer option.

The attitude is not entirely critical though, spontaneously mentioned are also the **EU positives**:

- **Education freedom** – possibilities to get high-quality education, language knowledge and their mastering
- **Travel freedom** – the Schengen Area is perceived as a huge asset, great comfort/luxury
- **Freedom to work anywhere in the EU** – the possibility to work abroad
- **Shared healthcare system** – the possibility to receive the medical treatment in whichever country within the EU under the standard health insurance
- **The EU as a whole is a stronger partner when negotiating within international relations** and is able to negotiate better terms than smaller Member States individually
- **System of grants and programs** – financial support towards regions, specific benefits for citizens (social, economic, infrastructural...)

All in all, the negative views of the EU prevail but the attitude is not entirely negative and the respondents can clearly see also some positive sides/impacts of the EU membership.

The level of interest in the EU affairs is not that intensive though, respondents are aware of various developments in the EU, they take their stands on them but those issues are not perceived as too urgent or burning for them personally.

2. Sources of information and knowledge on the EU

Citizens **are not active** in searching for information about the EU, are not interested in trying to find out more detailed information about the EU, in extending their level of information about the current EU topics or their level of knowledge about the EU generally.

But they are exposed to a relatively **high level of information inflow about the EU affairs** from the media. The level of awareness of current issues regarding the EU is relatively high although it comes entirely from the passive information reception. The most common information sources are represented by the **nation-wide media** – television and radio broadcasting, news servers, papers, magazines – mainly the common news coverage/service about the current affairs.

The highest credibility is attributed to the **public television** (ČT) and **public radio** (ČRo), the lowest credibility then goes to private entities (televisions and radios) – e. g. the most commonly used media in the Czech Republic – TV Nova, Blesk (the most popular papers with readers in here, a tabloid-aimed one).

The economic magazines such as Ekonom, E15 are considered to be reliable sources of information, although the majority of respondents stated they did not read these types of magazines very often.

The official information sources about the EU – servers, printed materials, databases are **not mentioned** at all.

Respondents agree that **negative pieces of information about the EU (problems) are more likely to be communicated via the media** because these media consumers are interested in them the most. The positive pieces of information are not communicated in these types of media very often and thus it is difficult for citizens to reach them, which adds to a building of rather negative perceptions about the EU.

Face-to-face contacts are also mentioned as a source of information – contacts with friends, families, co-workers. It is about information exchange on current affairs; information is supposed to have been gathered again from the nation-wide media though.

Television debates with politicians and experts are passingly mentioned as an information source. But

they are not very popular, they are considered to be rather boring.

Information sources about the EU and the EU affairs are concentrated on the nation-wide media oriented on news coverage/service. Citizens are not active in looking up those pieces of information, that's why they do not even try to extend the amount of information sources and to search for new ones.

Generally lack of information regarding the EU affairs is not perceived. Information about positive aspects of the EU activities are more likely to be absent - what went well, what good the EU activities brought. These kinds of information do not reach citizens via the nation-wide media.

3. Questions regarding the future of the EU

Respondents realize that there are important issues connected with the current shape and future of the EU. They are **aware** of them **but** they are **not too intensively interested** in them though. If the issue does not affect them personally or some of their family members directly, they do not take interest in them in a more profound way and the issues do not trouble them.

As the most **significant current issues of the EU** are perceived:

- Enlargement of the EU with economically weaker countries - deepening of economic instability and uncertainty of the EU
- The common European currency euro - currency instability. A dissenting approach towards adopting the euro as a sole currency in the Czech Republic.
- Generally the economic instability of the EU - fear of the economic/financial crisis deepening.
- Potential downfall of the EU. There is an impression there that some States might want to resign their membership in the EU which means that there is a high level of uncertainty there of what might happen if any of the current member countries left.
- Waste of financial resources (inefficient management of the EU funds - bureaucracy, corruption) - This problem is related rather to the national level of management than the European one though.
- Dividing the Member States into groups labelled "better/stronger" and "worse/weaker" - an uneven

development of the EU and an unequal approach towards individual countries regarding the enforcement of adhering to the terms and the rules.

Citizens feel there is a **sufficient amount of information** about all the important issues there and whoever wants to get all the information needed they have no problem to find and get them. But people are very little interested in actively searching for them (and so put their concerns to rest). Citizens consider their level of awareness of the EU affairs and its future to be sufficient for their personal lives / for their needs and they feel that if they need more information, they will be able to find them. Citizens expect that they find these types of information in the nation-wide media, on the websites or information sources that deal with the European Union. They do not have real experience in using these specialized sources of information, they only have a hunch they exist and can be found.

The not very high level of interest in searching for additional information about key issues in the EU and its aims and plans for the future comes not only from the fact that these issues are not perceived as too burning for citizens themselves but also from the **scepticism that in reality they will not be able to do / change / influence anything regarding those issues.**

Citizens would agree to have **more information about positive aspects of the EU** (what the real benefits are, what was built thanks to the EU, what they can achieve thanks to the EU), not just have the ones about what is failing, about problems. These types of information should be communicated actively by the EU (itself) so there would be no need for citizens to look them up by themselves.

As an important (and currently missing) source of information is perceived the more active performing and communication done by the **MEPs**. Citizens would welcome the MEPs to be seen more - they should be more active in communicating with citizens, in using the media (TV appearances, articles, regular annual reports, regular appearances/debates) to explain what have happened, what have been approved, what the plans for the future are, what direction the EU will take. They have been currently missing this type of information source and would welcome it as an important one about the EU working/operating and the directions the EU heads for. It would be a way to get the EU closer to citizens.

4. Current means of expression of citizens' views

Respondents do not spontaneously feel the need to express their disapproval or their objections to the current EU affairs and its future headings. They do not consider the EU issues to be so burning and affecting them personally to such extent to have to give their opinions.

Generally respondents admit that **it is possible in principle to express their opinion on EU issues** and name various ways to do it. **But the act of expressing an opinion is not considered to be easy**, it demands a lot of effort, enthusiasm and activity from citizens and often a language barrier plays its role. Apart from that respondents do not believe that their laboriously expressed opinions would be heard and would account for something the EU would deal with. That contributes to lack of interest to express opinions, potential dissatisfaction, and reluctance to try to change something.

The only way of expressing opinions and the possibility to influence something at the European level the citizen use is their participation in **elections to the European Parliament**. Although after the election they feel the lack of any feedback from the MEPs who were elected and the lack of any information about what they managed to push through based on their election programme the citizens voted for.

Another perceived possibility of expressing their opinions is connected with the **election to the European Parliament** and is represented with pre-election meetings held by electoral candidates. Citizens can see a leeway for expressing their opinions here but their trust /beliefs in any appropriate / active response and reaction is minimal.

Another expected way of expressing opinions is referenda. Referenda are considered to be a suitable/good form but they are not held very often (neither at a national level). But it is a way to express opinions which can be even heard.

A direct letter / E-mail addressed to the MEP are also perceived as a possibility of expressing opinions - though again with a minimal level of trust that their voices will be heard and answered/acted upon accordingly.

Generally people consider **expressing their opinions** on the EU affairs or its future heading to be extremely **difficult** and they do not believe their voices to be heard / answered. That's why they do not tend to express their opinions and do not feel the need to do so.

Expressing their opinions and the possibility of their voices being heard and answered is **difficult already at a national level** (there is a possibility here to visit their Parliament deputies in their offices, write a letter to them or visit sessions of the Parliament of the Czech Republic), **at a European level** they find it **even more difficult**.

Respondents cannot clearly describe reasons why expressing their opinions should be that difficult - they do not have experience in doing it. Citizens more likely do not know the way to express their opinions effectively so they consider it to be complicated and rather unnecessary.

Only at a municipal level citizens can see a possibility to express their opinions and still have beliefs that their voices will be heard. At a municipal level the problems are solved that totally tangibly affect citizens' lives and the willingness to express their opinions is much higher. The direct contact with people who decide at a municipal level is important and therefore their belief in the fact that their voices will be heard is higher. More respondents admit that they attend their local council sessions.

5. Perceptions of new ways for citizens to get their voice heard

Respondents mentioned some ways to enable them to express their opinions on the EU and EU affairs. The **most suitable** way would be a **face-to-face meeting in any form that is available and easily accessible**. A face-to-face meeting represents the most suitable form of communication, it is possible to ask all the questions, get everything clear and discuss all. Very easy accessibility of that contact person is the essential condition.

Suggested possibilities of direct contact:

- A direct mediator - a person who would visit the European Parliament, would meet citizens and then interpret their opinions directly in the EP
- A city/town centre office - an information centre in every larger town where people can ask

questions, express their opinions and get any feedbacks

- Open debates with citizens – a MEP, a deputy or an expert have a discussion directly with citizens (in a vicinity of their places of residence so it would be easily accessible)

Other suggestions:

- There would be a letterbox at the post office in which people could drop their suggestions and they would be responded accordingly
- An E-mail alternative of the above-mentioned suggestion

Suggestions of new ways of keeping people informed about the EU (but not for expressing their opinions):

- Regular (live) television broadcasts from European parliamentary sessions – people know them from the Czech Parliament but have never seen one from the European one
- Regular EP reports – once a month – what was approved, pushed through, declined

6. Assessment of several propositions for improved citizens' involvement

A. An information service on the functioning of the EU and EU policies, comprising an information office open for the public in every large city, a web site, and a service quickly answering any questions asked by telephone, mail or email.

- **A very positively accepted suggestion** that clearly shows to people where to go, where to turn to in case they have questions or in case they need to express their opinions to a specific EU issue.
- There is the possibility of face-to-face contact, a possibility of discussion, a possibility to ask detailed questions when needed and a possibility/certainty of a direct and immediate answer.
A face-to-face meeting is not so anonymous as a written form of communication so there is a higher level of belief here that everybody can get their answers / find an appropriate response.
- It is easily accessible for everyone and it does not demand so much activity/effort to try to find a way to express opinions (on paper, via E-mail, personally). It strengthens a feeling of easy accessibility for wide masses of people.

- It is clearly defined and set where a citizen can turn to – people have not been exactly aware so far where to turn with their questions to. An exhaustive part of finding out where to turn with a given issue to fall off, which is a highly discouraging factor.

B. Debates to be organized in major media between average citizens and experts of EU issues on the directions taken by the EU.

- **This concept was accepted rather contradictorily.**
- Debates tend to be long and boring, citizens more likely ask for quick answers, a quick flow of information.
- A debate between an average citizen and an expert is not perceived as equal, an expert has always clearly the upper hand, which limits the level of interest in these debates.
- There is also a distrust here of how the participants/citizens are selected for these types of public debates – a distrust that the invited experts' acquaintances enter these debates, pre-selected people. The objectivity of these debates is thus questioned.
- Similar types of debates between experts and Czech politicians at a national Czech level are not very popular, which thus discourage citizens to watch/enter similar debates at European level.
- On the other hand, if citizens believed that the invited participants are chosen objectively, then this would give a real possibility to express their opinions, get important information and find answers to problems that really trouble them. It is a very comfortable way to get information and find answers. It does not demand a high level of pro-activity from citizens.

C. Opinion polls on the EU organized regularly in the whole of Europe, allowing citizens to know both what their fellow countrymen and what the citizens of the other countries think.

- **A positively accepted concept** – its great benefit is a comparison with what other individual nations agree or disagree about on a specific issue.
- Also, in such opinion polls large numbers of people participate and the survey then reflects the opinions of a wide spectrum of country citizens.
- This way of expressing citizens' opinions does not demand any strenuous activity from them – it is very easy, citizens only answer pre-prepared questions when they are addressed

- A part of respondents do not perceive this as a reliable source of information, they do not believe/trust objectivity of such surveys and they are afraid that the results can be easily tampered with.
- And also a long period between a fieldwork and a result presentation is regarded as a discouraging factor for this way to express opinions. Respondents expect that the time lag between fieldwork and result presentation for all countries of the EU might take several months and the issue will not have been hot any more when results come.
- Another negative aspect of this opinion expressing form is a distrust of getting any real response from appropriate authorities. There is a distrust here that an in opinion poll expressed opinion will not be really heard and any appropriate response will come.
- There is also a fear here (even though not very strong) that conducting such surveys within the whole EU might cause and create a kind of "animosity" among Member States. If a survey shows that citizens of several Member States feel negative because of some other member countries, it can be received negatively and cause or increase "tension" among individual member countries.
- Opinion polls are rather perceived as a source of interesting and important information than as a tool for finding an appropriate response to an expressed problem.

D. The possibility, given several times per year, to meet with your Members of the European Parliament or other EU politicians in the vicinity of where you live.

- A **very positively accepted concept for expressing opinions**. Similar ideas had been repeatedly mentioned earlier in the discussion.
- It brings the EU closer to citizens quite substantially - they can see and meet the MEP face-to-face, can get feedback about parliamentary affairs, about current issues being discussed. Citizens can thus see what their elected deputies do directly and what from their campaign programme they manage to push through. They have not had this possibility so far and because of that they feel the EU distant - citizens cannot see their MEPs and cannot hear a lot about their activities, which only strengthens their distrust that an average citizen stands a chance to express or achieve something at the European level.

- A possibility of face-to-face communication represents a very good aspect of the proposition - without any mediators and time lags citizens can get immediately and directly their questions answered by responsible people.
- There is a fear here that such debates will not be held in the vicinity of their places of residence or that it will not be scheduled conveniently (they will not be able to come because of their work). There is again a very strong call here for everything to be accessible in the easiest way and to demand little to none effort from citizens.
- This concept can raise the level of willingness to express their opinions on European issues - it is an easy way that in addition brings the European Union closer to citizens.
- The majority of this focus group participants expressed their interest in participation in a meeting with their MEPs.
- There is also again distrust here whether in this way expressed opinions get any appropriate reactions at the European level. Whether the MEP will be able to interpret their opinions, will be a skillful mediator and negotiator and will get an appropriate response.

E. Consultations through the Internet organized by the European Commission whenever major decisions have to be taken in the EU, open to all citizens.

- A **contradictorily accepted concept for expressing opinions** - on the one hand it is a very comfortable and easy way to express opinions via the Internet, on the other hand it is a very anonymous way. Their trust that their voices will be heard and will bring any appropriate response is limited.
- They are afraid that it is a tool that gives people a (misleading) feeling of a totally easy way how to express their opinions but their opinions can be ignored even in an easier way at the same time.
- They are afraid that in a flood of on-line discussion participants it is impossible to easily express or push through their opinions, or to easily reach a consensus or find a solution.

F. Similar consultations, organized by our national government.

- Similar consultations organized by the Czech government were immediately and unequivocally **rejected** by the overwhelming majority of respondents. As a result of what has been happening on Czech political scene for the last few

months scepticism and negative mood towards Czech political representatives prevail, citizens do not believe that in a situation where the Czech political representatives are not able to manage important issues at national level they would be able to manage issues connected with the EU responsibly and in a performant way.

- Because of this current distrust and frustration about the current political situation in the Czech Republic this concept is declined totally and unequivocally.

G. An interactive service using the Internet and social networks, to collect on a permanent basis citizens' views, wishes or criticisms on directions taken by the EU.

- This is a **contradictorily accepted concept** – respondents are very much afraid that the target group that actively uses social networks is very specific – concentrated to young people, and thus this tool is suitable only for a small part of citizens whose opinions are specific
- They are also worried about the demanding character of evaluation of this opinion collection
- Although this way is perceived as a comfortable and easy one, it is not accepted very positively by respondents.

H. Information campaigns to be developed much more actively than in past years, in order to encourage citizens to involve themselves in the debates that are to take place and to take part in the coming election of Members of the European Parliament next spring.

- This proposition is **received negatively** by the overwhelming majority of respondents. The connection with the European elections strongly evokes election campaigns where people expect political candidates to listen, but after they are elected, nothing tends to happen.
- Election campaigns are not perceived to be objective generally, which further inspires distrust of the proposition.

Because of the respondents' passivity and their rather low level of interest in expressing their opinions on European issues the only appealing forms of expressing opinions are the ones that do not demand an excessive activity / effort from citizens. The feeling that expressing their opinions is **easy, quick, and not demanding excessive activity** is crucial and can inspire citizens to express their opinions.

Citizens are more likely to express their opinions on topics that affect their and their families' lives directly – so more likely only local issues are in questions – to express their opinions on projects funded by the EU, to take interest in possibilities of their children' education abroad, to a possibility to use medical treatment abroad and the like.

Also a possibility of **face-to-face contacts**/meetings when asking questions or expressing opinions is very important for citizens – it gives them a feeling they can get an appropriate response immediately, a feeling their voices are easily and better heard.

And therefore the concept A is evaluated as the most interesting one by this group. It offers a wide range of possibilities to express opinions. But it is really necessary to clearly communicate the effortlessness and easy accessibility of these tools for expressing their opinions or asking questions, so when they need it they immediately know where to turn to.

Another particularly interesting concept is the concept D – direct meetings with the MEPs. In addition it brings the EU nearer to citizens to a substantial degree, enables them to see all what is happening at the EU level and gives them a clear feeling they can really get involved in these affairs.

APPENDIX - DISCUSSION GUIDE

Kvalitativní průzkum zapojení občanů do evropské unie (Prosinec 2013)

Scénář skupinové diskuse

(ÚVOD: Požádejte každého respondenta, ať se ve stručnosti představí. Ať řekne, kdo je a co dělá, apod.)

Téma 1

Dnes jsme se tu sešli, abychom si společně pohovořili o Evropské unii.

Mohl/a byste mi prosím říct, co Vás první napadne, když se řekne Evropská unie?

- Spontánní reakce
- Zjišťujte:
- Povaha témat spontánně zmíněných ve spojitosti s EU
- Pozitivní a negativní aspekty/stránky spojené s EU
- Míru počátečního zájmu a zapojení respondentů do problematiky EU

Téma 2

Nyní, s ohledem na to, co víte a co si myslíte o EU: odkud to pramení? / z čeho vycházíte?

Z jakých zdrojů čerpáte informace nebo kde slyšíte/berete názory o EU – bereme slovo „zdroje“ v tom nejširším smyslu slova od oficiálních informačních kanálů až po neformální rozhovory s přáteli či jinými lidmi, atd.?

- Spontánní reakce
- Zjišťujte:
- Míru různorodosti zmíněných zdrojů
- Povahu (informačních) zdrojů každého z nich
- Zájem / důvěryhodnost každého z nich

Téma 3

Pojďme nyní konkrétněji hovořit o budoucnosti EU a otázkách, které si s ohledem na toto téma možná kladete. Jistě existují určité aspekty či otázky, které považujete za důležité a chtěl/a byste o nich vědět více a lépe porozumět způsobu, jakým EU funguje a jakým směrem se ubírá – protože je možné, že ze zdrojů, které jste zmínil/a dříve nezískáte všechny informace, které byste potřeboval/a. O kterých problematikách či otázkách byste chtěl/a vědět víc?

- Spontánní reakce
- Zjišťujte:
- Obecné dojmy z toho, do jaké míry dobré (či špatné) znalosti mají o této problematice/těchto otázkách a do jaké míry jim tedy rozumějí
- Vnímání hlavních výzev pro EU v nadcházejících letech

- Vyjádření respondentů o potřebě lepší/větší míře povědomí/znalostí a porozumění
- kterých témat se to obzvláště týká? V čem jsou v současné době dostupné informace k
- těmto tématům nedostatečné?

Téma 4

Jako občan byste měl/a mít možnost vyjádřit svůj názor na budoucí směřování EU a Váš hlas/názor by měl být vyslyšen – názor o tom, zda souhlasíte či nesouhlasíte s takovým či jiným směřováním EU, nebo jakýkoli jiný názor... Jakým způsobem to můžete udělat dnes?

- Spontánní reakce
- Zjišťujte:
- Vnímaná snadnost / obtížnost vyjádřit svůj názor a být vyslyšen/a s ohledem na témata spojená s problematikou EU – jak/čím?
- Důvody, proč je to vnímané jako obtížné
- Konkrétní témata, ke kterým by se respondenti chtěli obzvláště vyjádřit a být vyslyšeni jako občané; očekávání, která mají v tomto ohledu.

Téma 5

Lze vymyslet různé způsoby/prostředky, jež by umožnily občanům EU více a lépe vyjadřovat názory a být zároveň i vyslyšeni.

Dovolte mi, abych navrhl/a, že se zkusíme zamyslet nad všemi možnými způsoby/prostředky. Nechme volně rozběhnout naši představivost, nevzdávejme se žádného nápadu, i když v tomto okamžiku nevíme, jakým způsobem by (nápad) mohl být zaveden do praxe. Co si představíme?

- Spontánní reakce
- Podněťte kreativitu skupiny podporováním respondentů v "přeskakování" z jednoho nápadu na druhý.

Téma 6

Nyní Vám ukážu několik návrhů způsobů/prostředků, které by mohly být implementovány jako prostředky, jež by umožnily občanům více a lépe vyjadřovat názory na unijní problematiku a být zároveň i lépe vyslyšeni. Zeptám se Vás, co si o každém z nich myslíte.

- Přimějte respondenty, aby postupně reagovali na všechny předložené návrhy, ptejte se jich, jak moc je každý z návrhů zaujal a proč

A. Informační služby se zaměřením na fungování EU a její politiku, což by zahrnovalo otevření informačních center v každém velkém městě, webové stránky a službu/podporu, která by rychle zodpověděla jakékoli telefonické, písemné či elektronicky zaslané dotazy.

B. Mediální debaty v celostátních médiích mezi běžnými občany a odborníky na problematiku EU se zaměřením na kroky, které EU podnikla.

C. Pravidelně organizované celoevropské průzkumy veřejného mínění zaměřené na činnost EU, které by umožnily občanům vědět, co si myslí nejen jejich spoluobčané, ale i občané ostatních států EU.

D. Možnost setkat se několikrát do roka se zástupci České republiky v Evropském parlamentu nebo jinými unijními politiky v místě Vašeho bydliště.

E. Internetové konzultace přístupné všem občanům organizované Evropskou komisí pokaždé, když bude třeba učinit zásadní rozhodnutí v EU.

F. Podobné konzultace, ale organizované vládou České republiky.

G. Interaktivní služby, které by využívaly internetu a sociálních sítí a neustále by shromažďovaly názory, přání či kritiku občanů na kroky provedené EU.

H. Informační kampaně, které by se objevovaly mnohem častěji než v minulých letech. Jejich cílem by bylo podněcování občanů k aktivnímu přístupu a zapojování se do debat a k účasti ve volbách do Evropského parlamentu, které se budou konat na jaře 2014.

Znovu poděkujte respondentům, za to, že se dostavili a zúčastnili této diskuze.

Pokud Vás napadne cokoli dalšího s ohledem na tuto diskuzi, neváhejte a dejte nám vědět/kontaktujte nás na adrese

(Sdělte respondentům relevantní e-mailovou adresu, kterou mohou k tomuto účelu využít)

WHAT DO CITIZENS THINK THE FUTURE CHALLENGES OF THE EU ARE?

Virginie Timmerman, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, December 2014

HOW WOULD CITIZENS LIKE TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE EUROPEAN UNION?

Virginie Timmerman and Daniel Debomy, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, December 2014

HOW DOES THE EUROPEAN UNION COMMUNICATE WITH CITIZENS?

Virginie Timmerman and Daniel Debomy, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, November 2014

HOW DO CITIZENS SEE THE EUROPEAN UNION?

Virginie Timmerman, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, November 2014

▶ HOW TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE EU? THE OPINION OF EUROPEAN CITIZENS

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, November 2014

CITIZENS FACING "BRUSSELS' EUROPE"

Virginie Timmerman, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, August 2014

EUROPEAN CITIZENS IN BRUSSELS: WHAT MESSAGES?

Virginie Timmerman, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, August 2014

THE INVOLVEMENT OF EU CITIZENS IN THE EUROPEAN PROJECT

Daniel Debomy, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, July 2014

▶ WHAT THE FRENCH TOLD US ABOUT GLOBALISATION

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, May 2014

▶ WHAT THE FRENCH TOLD US ABOUT EURO

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, May 2014

▶ WHAT THE FRENCH TOLD US ABOUT THE EUROPEAN DEMOCRACY

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, May 2014

▶ WHAT THE FRENCH TOLD US ABOUT THE EMPLOYEMENT IN THE EU

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, May 2014

EU NO, EURO YES? EUROPEAN PUBLIC OPINIONS FACING THE CRISIS (2007-2012)

Daniel Debomy, *Policy Paper No. 90*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, March 2013

DO THE EUROPEANS STILL BELIEVE IN THE EU?

Daniel Debomy, *Studies & Reports No. 91*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, June 2012

MIGRANTS – EUROPEAN STORIES

Frédéric Praud, Florence Brêthes, Hamed Borsali and Kiel, *Comics*, Paroles d'hommes et de femmes / Notre Europe, May 2012

THE CITIZENS OF EUROPE AND THE EUROPEAN UNION IN THE CURRENT CRISIS

Daniel Debomy, *Policy Paper No. 47*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute / Fondation Jean Jaurès, November 2011

Managing Editor: Yves Bertoncini • The document may be reproduced in part or in full on the dual condition that its meaning is not distorted and that the source is mentioned • The views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the publisher • Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute cannot be held responsible for the use which any third party may make of the document • Translation from Czech: Eurologos • © Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute

