GERMAN CITIZENS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE EU
REPORT OF A QUALITATIVE STUDY IN GERMANY

Echanges Marktforschung in relation with Psyma

T his Synthesis presents the results of a group discussion held in Cologne on 13 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 Cologne on 13 December 2013 on the subject of citizens' involvement in the European Union.

It is the German 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 Germany, by echanges marktforschung in relation with psyma.

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	**Age**
Women: 4	20-34 years: 3
Men: 5	35-49 years: 3
	50-60 years: 3

Social class
Lower-middle social class: 4 (professions of respondents/heads of household: office employees (2), salesman, waiter)
Higher-middle class: 5 (professions of respondents: mid-level managers (2), small business owner (contractor), secretary, office employee – the latter two married to head of household in higher-middle class)

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

---

1. Initial thoughts about the European union

Spontaneous associations with the European Union made by respondents in the group were of three orders:

- Associations with **the nature of the EU** and its **founding values**: *"a vast community"*, *"solidarity with the weakest members"*, *"feeling a community of interest"*, *"a will to integrate"*, *"trade exchanges"*, *"something which must be lasting to bear its fruit, something fragile that must be protected and cherished"*, *"it is like a kindergarten which must accommodate and federate children from various backgrounds and make them live together on an equal footing"*.
- References made to **institutions** and **institutional processes** that are particularly symbolic, *"the European central bank"*, *"the euro"*, *"European summits"*, *"European directives"*, *"the rules of the game"*.
- More or less positive remarks and opinions on current events, *"membership criteria"*, *"rettungsschirm"* (European stability mechanism).
- On the whole those remarks reflected a degree of **distrust or disappointment**, together with feelings that *"it is no longer what it used to be"*.

The overall impression left by these associations is that of **an ambivalent relation with the European Union, and an often disillusioned attitude**, which the respondents explained by:
- **Negative reports** prevailing **in the information given by the media** about the EU.
- The problem created by **countries becoming eligible for membership on the basis of hard to define criteria**, which are shown to be ineffective or rigged. Greece is obviously an emblematic

NOTRE EUROPE
|||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| JACQUES DELORS INSTITUTE ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

GERMAN CITIZENS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE EU

illustration of the problem, and so is the rescue plan for the euro regarded as *"a bottomless pit"*.

- *"The problem is that a partner is fine only as long as he is honest. But today, as we can see it with Greece, let us call things by their name, what has happened is corruption, taking liberties with the truth"*
- **The positive idea of solidarity between members being perverted** and turning into competition for jobs.
- **The fear of uncontrolled migratory flows** (inflows of citizens from eastern European countries who are attracted by the social benefits prevailing in western European countries).
"What worry me are borders becoming completely open and all those people arriving thinking that Germany is a heaven. Right now, it is Romania and Bulgaria. The eligibility criteria for membership should absolutely be made more stringent. Otherwise, it will turn out like Greece they will be bankrupt and at some stage the European Union will no longer be able to cope"

Here we find an expression of the German's lasting fear of "having to pay for the others" and running the risk of being drawn into a general bankruptcy in the end:
"At the beginning i felt the European Union was quite fine, it seemed to work, but afterwards you notice that more and more countries are running into debt, that those who still have some money hardly manage to cope and must support the others in addition, so for Germany's sake it's not terrific. All this makes me dubious"
"I wonder if some countries may be obliged to leave the European Union, countries who continue to get into debt. One day, the rescue plan will be empty, the union will no longer be able to finance anything"

On the positive side, we will note that **the majority of the participants continue to value the euro highly**, both as a symbol of European identity and for making travel easier. Lastly those who are best informed (aged above 50 years mainly) recall the role played by the union to establish a long period of **stability and peace**, and they see in the European union the only possibility to **speak on an equal footing with the emerging powers**, primarily china.
"I am personally in favour of the euro because we benefit by it. Greece is not being given any money, everything returns to us and the most important thing is that you do not wage war on your partners. We have

not had wars in Europe for 60 years. Just to achieve that, it was worth it"
"I am favourable to the European union. I think that in the era of globalisation, at a time when emerging countries like china are more and more powerful, it is essential for the European countries to be united, otherwise they stand no chance"

2. Sources of information and knowledge on the EU

Except for the youngest participant (aged 20) who mentioned school as a source of information on the European Union, **the respondents hardly mentioned any source other than the media**:

Television was primarily mentioned. The respondents spontaneously made a distinction between **"serious" TV channels** (public channels: ard, zdf) and **private channels** which were regarded as less credible – although they were watched by most.

Besides being less credible, private channels were thought to be more eurosceptical by certain respondents.
"The problem with the media is that you should watch several channels. If you watch rtl or sat 1, they are slating the European Union, if you switch over to information channels like ntv or BBC, it is much more objective. They do not only give negative news, they also talk about projects being developed"

The participants were very critical of the quality of information given by these media.

Criticisms generally apply to:
- Information being too sparse on the functioning and the institutions of the EU, etc. – sometimes it is attributed to a deliberate political will to "evade the issue".
"I think a better information policy should be designed. The media and the government tend to conceal a lot of things because nowadays the majority of laws are made in Brussels and the governments are scared to confess that they have delegated, that is, lost, their power"
- Lacking information on subjects which suddenly appear in the forefront, such as the membership eligibility criteria together with the Greek question:
"I do not know the eligibility criteria, and the media do not tell us about them. All of a sudden we are

wondering what they are. It should be explained to the European citizens"

- A certain tendency of the media to delight only in scandals and excesses:
  "There are so many subsidies for things that do not deserve it. In Romania, someone received a subsidy to create a farm with 1.800 cows which existed only in Farmville on Facebook. Now they are going to court on the ground that it was not stipulated that the cows should be real!"

The **youngest** participants and those who are very **familiar with using the internet** mentioned the possibility of **searching information on the website of the European union** or to order brochures from it; but the majority of the group questioned the interest of this medium for the public at large, and they admitted not to be eager to make the effort themselves.

Finally, the **expectations regarding EU related information** as voiced by the respondents are fairly consistent with what we had observed in previous studies:

- **Information that you do not need to go and look for** and that reaches you at your home place.
  "Information we should receive twice a year in our letter box. Nobody will say: well, what about ordering a brochure"
- **Information that is presented in an attractive way** or by a friendly character who can play the role of opinion leader for certain population targets:
  "The problem is that you must keep informed on a permanent basis, otherwise you forget. As far as i am concerned, my information source is my boyfriend. Because i find it boring on the internet whereas i can ask my boyfriend stupid questions"
  "It should start at school, but in an attractive way. I can see my goddaughter who is 15, she only has Justin Timberlake in mind, i do not think she is interested in politics"
  "On phoenix there is a history programme that i like because it is done in a modern, very lively manner, with testimonies. Something of that kind should be done on the European Union. The history of the EU, nobody knows it. People only know what they hear from one day to the next and in general it is negative"
  "They could set up a sort of political talk show, a news programme presented by a well-known character; Stephan Rab for example, he was involved in

the parliamentary election campaign, he is someone who appeals to young people.
– or Kaya Yanar for instance, you can be sure that people would remember what he has said"
"They could produce clips, "the EU in 100 seconds". Rtl does it with the bible, why not with the EU"
"Something which should be both educational and amusing. Like in "sendung mit der maus"

- The **means, other than television**, which the respondents thought of for spreading this information were:
  - • The radio – which you listen to when doing something else, or when driving.
  - "Many people listen to the radio 24 hours a day, even at the office"
  - Internet
  - School

Both are regarded as more educational and more objective than the media.

3. Questions regarding the future of the EU

Questions emerging at this stage on the future of the EU naturally correspond to the preoccupations and doubts which the respondents had spontaneously stated at the beginning of the discussion.

Two issues are considered crucial:
- **The rescue plan for the euro** (rettungsschirm – esm): how it works, how "real" it is (what kind of money are we talking about? Real or virtual money? By whom is it provided?). From there, some respondents were led to discuss the wider question of the EU budget.
  "I would like to know how the rescue plan for the euro (esm) is financed"
  "Regarding the European budget, i would be interested to know what the EU does with it. I think there has just been a vote for a budget of 18 billion"
  "What would be interesting to me is to know where the money comes from. How can one quote figures if it is virtual money? They show us graphs and we do not even know what it is about!"
- **More transparency** (hence more information) on the "important" topics. The most pressing need for information in the group seemed to be about eligibility criteria for membership. Another question asked in the group was about the banks' power which was assumed to influence political decisions.

- Less importantly, interest was expressed for information on "real people" and their problems, as that tends to be hidden behind the stereotyped speech of national politicians whose motivations are not always clear, and who do not seem to worry very much about the citizens' condition.

"I saw a debate with Maybritt Illner. There was a Greek restaurant owner from cologne who said that we were not helping Greece with that rescue plan. We do not know what we should think any more! I would like someone to explain to me if it is or not a good thing! Does it really help them?"

"I would like to be informed on the people. Now are they faring? How are we helping them? Not only the country"

"I saw in the media that 50% of young Spanish graduates do not find a job. And then the subject disappeared (from the media). I would like to know what has become of them"

"Personally what i would like to know is how a country like Greece has arrived at the point where it now is? Who is responsible? Some people committed suicide and nobody is interested, at least not the European Union"

- In the same line of thought, some respondents would like to know what the other countries think of Germany, although they are afraid to hear the answer.

"I would like to know what countries like Greece think of Germany. They must feel rushed.
– Sure! They hate us and they don't conceal it"

4. Current means of expression of citizens' views

Spontaneously, the respondents mentioned the **European elections** as a means of expression to make one's voice heard on future directions of the union, **yet** it soon appears that those elections are **little (or not) known**.

"I think the last elections were 2 years ago, so the next ones should be in 3 years.
– We don't really have the impression that the votes matter.
– Anyhow, at the last election, no party suited me and now we have a coalition of 3 parties in the same boat, we don't know in what direction they're going to sail!
– It's the same at European level. Germany sends its MEPs, the other countries send their own and then let's see if they can collaborate.
– It will always be difficult. The countries' interests are too different"

Three aggravating circumstances contribute to further reducing the perceived importance of the European elections:

- **The low rate of participation in the vote**.
- The feeling that the **representatives sent by Germany to Brussels are second-class politicians**.

"The elections would be a good way of getting one's voice heard but, firstly the turnout is very low, and then you have a feeling that the parties send to Brussels the old timers whom nobody wants here anymore"

- **The absence of referendum in the German legal system**.

"We are not in a direct democracy, so what do we really make decisions about?"

As regards the **themes on which the citizens in the group would like to give their opinion**, one finds again those expressed earlier, in particular **enlargement**: a subject by which they feel deeply concerned and rather a source of worry (cf. The Greek experience and the Turkish question).

The **aid provided to countries experiencing difficulties** is another topic on which explanations would be particularly welcome.

"Generally speaking, the people have little decision power in Germany. In other countries, the referendum is widely used"

"We should be able to decide by referendum on enlargements for example"

"The people should be able to decide on questions which really matter to everyone"

There is no unanimity however on the issue of referendum. Some respondents (a minority) warn against its dangers:

"Personally, i rather see the danger of a referendum. Let us take Greece again: let us imagine a referendum in which the Germans had refused to help. What would have happened? Perhaps everything would have exploded"

"The priority would be to create a feeling of general interest prevailing above each nation's particular interests"

Following the discussion on the pros and cons of elections, the group requested that MEPs should make themselves known and put themselves in charge of part of the information burden.

NOTRE
EUROPE
|||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| JACQUES DELORS INSTITUTE ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

GERMAN CITIZENS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE EU

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

The participants did not evoke any new way by which the European citizens could make their voice heard, apart from referenda which are crowned with the prestige of direct democracy **and institutionalized contacts with MEPs** of their constituency (availability for consultation at predetermined times).
"I voted, but i do not know for whom.
– We do not know the others either (laughter!).
– Because we are not really interested. The chancellor we do know!"

Here again the idea of a **television programme** having much impact because **well designed**, regularly broadcast **at prime time hours** and presented by **a charismatic personality** emerged spontaneously.
"We could imagine a programme called "news from the EU". That would be well made, interesting and not broadcasted at 11 P.M. when you doze off in front of your TV. It should be short and interesting"

6. Assessment of several propositions for improving 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**.
This proposition is among those most favoured by the respondents – who, incidentally, were completely unaware of the existence of Europe direct centres. It appears as combining the advantage of expertise, and thus credibility, with that of personalized contact. Some people asked to add to those centres' range of action direct mailing operations (as spontaneously requested earlier).
"It would be super. We would know where to go when looking for information.
– If you don't understand, there is someone to talk to, we would be dealing with specialists.
– And personal contact, i find that is important.
– We would know that there is a centre in the city where we can go when we feel the need to get informed. And when we just pass by, we can pick up a brochure"

B. **Debates to be organised in major media between average citizens and experts of EU issues on the directions taken by the EU**.
Reactions to this proposition were quite controversial. The participation of average citizens tends to be a positive factor. It is believed that they would ask the "real" questions. But there is a certain inflation of talk shows on television in Germany. And, as regards the interest of such debates, it depends very much on the quality of the participants and their capacity to arouse viewers' interest.
"It's always the same thing. It's like "hart aber fair". It depends on the participants, once it is interesting, another time not. And the personality of the moderator also plays a great part"

Also reminded is the importance of broadcasting at peak viewing hours.

C. **Opinion polls on the EU organised regularly in the whole of Europe, allowing citizens to know both what their fellow countrymen and what the citizens of the other countries think. This proposition is the second best liked in the group**.
The interest it arouses among the respondents is two-fold:
  • The representativity of the results.
  • The possibility to know the opinion of other countries, in comparison with one's own country.

The credibility of the proposition may be negatively affected, according to a few persons, by the known gaps between pre-election polls and the results of the election.

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**.
This proposition was the least preferred in the group. The participants visibly acknowledge their own low propensity to go out and follow such debates.
"It is a totally unrealistic idea. It is terribly time and energy consuming to put oneself on the move to go and attend such a debate"
"On the occasion of the recent election, there was a debate in the bar down the street from my home with an SPD deputy. I listened to him for 5 minutes because i was there, but not more. It was terribly boring"

A minor positive remark is that it would be an occasion to meet one's MEP.

E. Consultations through the internet organised by the European commission whenever major decisions have to be taken in the EU, open to all citizens.
This proposition seemed to be attractive because of the representativity of the results and the possibility to give one's opinion to the commission through a relatively direct channel.
However, people not using the internet regularly do not feel concerned.
"I am personally not very comfortable with the internet, i would not go and reply to a survey.
– yes, but we check our emails every day, so if you are asked to spend 5 minutes to reply to a survey, it's easy, fast, and afterwards you can have a look at the results"

Here again, convenience is a must: an email found in one's box seems preferable to having to search on a website.

We can remark that the respondents tend to interpret the proposition as being a (maybe improved) kind of survey – thus limiting its scope.

F. Similar consultations, organised by our national government.
The respondents did not always differentiate this proposition from the previous one. **To deal with European issues, the commission may be a little more credible**: the German government is sometimes suspected of raising a barrier between Europe and the citizens in order to conceal certain inadequacies.

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 idea was widely approved. What is most attractive is the continuity in the collection of opinions. It would be a forum in which one could express his/her views in an informal way on all subjects deemed interesting enough to generate a reaction or raise a question. One hopes to receive detailed answers.
Social networks are thought to be a communication tool for the future.
It seems to be important for the citizens to receive

a valid answer to their remarks (no standard reply).
"It is important to choose a modern enough tool to keep being performant in the future. Facebook is highly performant"
"But the answers must be up to the point, no standard replies"

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.
Advertising campaigns seem to be familiar and **performant tools if they are well designed**. Making the voters more aware seems to be a good way to increase voters' participation.
"It would be fine to increase the number of voters; the turnout is always miserable.
– it's not surprising if we don't know the date"

Overall, the most liked propositions were a, c, e, g and h.

APPENDIX - DISCUSSION GUIDE

Einleitung, Vorstellung (5 Minuten)

Begrüßung, Vorstellung, Erklärung d. Ablaufs etc.

Im Wesentlichen wird es um Informationen an Bürger über die EU und wie sich Bürger besser bei EU-Themen beteiligen könnten gehen.

Vorstellungsrunde: Am Beginn des Interviews würde ich Sie bitten, dass Sie sich kurz vorstellen: Alter, Familienstand, Beruf, Hobbys etc.

1. Einstieg – Allgemeines zum Thema EU (10 Minuten)
Ich möchte mich heute mit Ihnen über die Europäische Union unterhalten.
Was kommt Ihnen spontan in den Sinn, wenn Sie an die Europäische Union denken? Was verbinden Sie mit der Europäischen Union?
Moderator nachfragen/untersuchen:

- Welche **Themen** fallen Ihnen gleich einmal ein, wenn Sie an die EU denken?
- Welche **positiven**, welche **negativen Aspekte** verbinden Sie mit der EU?
- Anfängliches Interesse und Involvierungsgrad der Teilnehmer an Angelegenheiten, welche die EU betreffen erfragen

2. Quellen Wissen über & Einstellung gegenüber der EU (10 Minuten)
Basis Ihres Wissens und Ihrer Einstellung gegenüber der EU, ausgehend davon was Sie über die EU wissen und denken:
Woher kommt Ihr Wissen über die Europäische Union?
Wie sind Sie zu Ihrem Wissen über und Ihrer Einstellung gegenüber der EU gekommen?
Wodurch wurden Sie sagen, wurden Einstellungen gegenüber der EU beeinflusst?
Welche Quellen nutzen Sie, um sich über EU-Themen zu informieren?
Mit wem tauschen Sie sich über EU-Themen aus?
(Moderator anmerken: hier sind „Quellen" im weitesten Sinn gemeint, reichend von offiziellen Informationen bis hin zu informelle Gespräche mit Freunden, Verwandten, Bekannten etc.)
Moderator nachfragen/untersuchen:

- Wie vielfältig sind die genannten Informationsquellen bzw. die eigene Meinung beeinflussende Quellen?
- Welcher Art sind die Inputs, die das Wissen der Teilnehmer über und deren Einstellung gegenüber der EU beeinflussen?

- Interesse/Glaubwürdigkeit jedes einzelnen erfragen

3. Zukünftige Herausforderungen der EU (15-20 Minuten)
Lassen Sie uns nun konkret über die Zukunft der Europäischen Union sprechen und über Fragen, die Sie in diesem Zusammenhang beschäftigen:
Gibt es bestimmte Aspekte, die Sie für wichtig erachten bzw. die Sie gerne wissen würden, um die Arbeits- und Funktionsweise der EU und die Zielrichtung der EU besser zu verstehen?
Ich meine damit auch Aspekte, die Sie eventuell nicht oder nur schwer über die vorhin genannten Quellen in Erfahrung bringen können?
Welche Aspekte bzw. Themen sind das konkret, über die Sie gerne Näheres erfahren würden?
Was hat Sie bisher daran gehindert Näheres über diese Dinge zu erfahren?
Moderator nachfragen/untersuchen:

- Allgemeiner Eindruck zum Wissensstand bzw. dem Verständnis in Zusammenhang mit diesen Themen
- Wahrnehmung der zentralen Herausforderungen der EU in den nächsten Jahren (**Welchen zentralen Herausforderungen steht die EU Ihrer Meinung nach in den nächsten Jahren gegenüber?**)
- Inwieweit äußern die Teilnehmer die Notwendigkeit eines höheren Wissensstands und besseren Verständnisses – insbesondere in Bezug auf welche Themen?
- In welcher Hinsicht sind die aktuell vorliegenden Informationen bezüglich dieser Themen nicht zufrieden stellend?

4. Meinungsäußerung (10-15 Minuten)
Staatsbürger sollten insbesondere in Zusammenhang mit den zukünftigen Entwicklungen und Zielsetzungen der EU die Möglichkeit haben, Ihre Meinung kundzutun und gehört zu werden.
Auf welche Weise ist das derzeit möglich? Welche Wege stehen Ihnen aktuell zur Verfügung, um Ihre Meinung zur zukünftigen Entwicklung der EU kundzutun und gehört zu werden?
Wie einfach ist es derzeit, die eigene Meinung zu EU-Themen und vor allem zur zukünftigen Entwicklung der EU kundzutun?
Mit welchen Schwierigkeiten sehen Sie sich in diesem Zusammenhang konfrontiert? Welche Hindernisse sind hier für Sie bemerkbar?
Welche Aspekte/Themen sind das zum Beispiel ganz konkret? Zu welchen Aspekten/Themen, die Zukunft der EU betreffend, würden Sie gerne Ihre Meinung äußern und auch gehört werden?

Was erwarten Sie sich in diesem Zusammenhang?
Moderator nachfragen/untersuchen:

- Welche Schwierigkeiten/Problematiken werden geschildert? Bemerkbare Schwierigkeiten/Hindernisse bei dem Versuch seine Meinung kundzutun und gehört zu werden
- Bemerkbare Gründe warum das schwierig ist
- Erwartungen in diesem Zusammenhang

5. **Spontane Ideen - Mittel & Wege der Meinungsäusserung (15 Minuten)**
Es gibt verschiedene Wege und Mittel, wie wir uns als europäische Bürger Gehör verschaffen können.
Ich möchte Sie dazu anregen, an alle erdenklichen Möglichkeiten diesbezüglich zu denken.
Lassen Sie Ihrer Phantasie freien Lauf und greifen Sie bitte auch jene Ideen auf, von denen wir im Moment noch nicht wissen, wie sie in der Praxis umgesetzt werden können.
Was stellen Sie sich alles vor? (Spontane Reaktionen)
Moderator: Regen Sie die Kreativität der Gruppe an, indem Sie die Teilnehmer ermutigen, von einer Idee zur anderen zu springen

6. **Mittel zur Meinungsäusserung (25 Minuten)**
Ich werde Ihnen jetzt ein paar Vorschläge vorlegen, die umgesetzt werden könnten, um es den Bürgern zu ermöglichen, sich bei EU-Fragen besser Gehör zu verschaffen.
Ich werde Sie dann bitten, Ihre Meinung zu jedem Vorschlag zu äußern.
Moderator: Sorgen Sie dafür, dass sich die Teilnehmer zu jedem Vorschlag äußern und fragen Sie sie nach dem Grad ihres Interesses an jedem einzelnen dieser Vorschläge.

6.1. Ein Informationsdienst über die Funktionsweise der EU und der EU-Politik, bestehend aus einem öffentlich zugänglichen Informationsbüro in jeder größeren Stadt/Großstadt, einer Website und einem Service, das eine schnelle Beantwortung der Fragen per Telefon, Post oder E-Mail anbietet.

6.2. Diskussionen in bedeutenden Medien zwischen den Durchschnittbürgern und den Experten für EU- Fragen über die von der EU vorgegebenen Entwicklungen.

6.3. Meinungsumfragen über die EU, die regelmäßig in ganz Europa durchgeführt werden und den Bürgern ermöglichen sollen zu erfahren, was einerseits ihre Landsleute und anderseits die Bürger anderer europäischen Ländern denken.

6.4. Die Möglichkeit, mehrmals im Jahr die nationalen Mitglieder des EU-Parlaments oder andere EU-Politiker in Ihrer Wohnnähe zu treffen.

6.5. Beratungen über das Internet, welche die EU-Kommission bei allen großen Entscheidungen organisieren würde und welche für alle Bürger zugänglich wären.

6.6. Vergleichbare Beratungen, aber von unserer Regierung ausgehend bzw. organisiert.

6.7. Ein interaktives Service, das Internet und soziale Netzwerke einbezieht um Meinungen, Wünsche und Kritikpunkte von einem Stammpool der Bürger bezüglich der Entwicklungen, die EU einschlägt, zu sammeln.

6.8. Informationskampagnen sollen viel aktiver als in den vergangenen Jahren entwickelt werden, um die Bürger zu ermutigen, sich an Diskussionen und der kommenden Wahl der Abgeordneten des Europäischen Parlaments im nächsten Frühjahr zu beteiligen.

On the same themes…

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