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An assessment of cohesion in the 28 member states of the European Union
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Introduction

Rationale

Cohesion is the glue that holds Europe together. It is shaped by a variety of factors that make Europeans more willing to cooperate with one another.

These factors include the connections between societies and economies, people-to-people contacts across borders, as well as attitudes and expectations.

The EU Cohesion Monitor brings all these factors together in a comprehensive measurement of European cohesion across time for all EU member states.

For the first time, this updated and extended edition of the Monitor includes the EU28 cohesion ranking and trends from 2007 to 2017.

The EU Cohesion Monitor is part of the Rethink: Europe project by the European Council on Foreign Relations and Stiftung Mercator.

To learn more about the project, please visit ecfr.eu/rethinkeurope and ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor.

To contact the project team please email rethink.europe@ecfr.eu
The EU Cohesion Monitor combines a total of 42 factors to measure cohesion along five individual and five structural cohesion indicators. The individual indicators quantify cohesion at the level of citizens’ experiences, opinions and expectations. The structural indicators measure cohesion at the macro level of the state and the economy.

To ensure comparability of different data types at the factor level, the EU Cohesion Monitor uses linear transformation to a scale from 1 to 10 for all but two of the ten indicators. The indicators ‘Policy Integration’ and ‘Security’ are limited to a scale of 1 to 7 to leave room for extending the scale to the full 10 points, should European integration progress further.

The transformation to scale requires setting boundary values for each factor’s minimum and maximum, which will score 1 and 10 (or 7) points respectively.

Starting with the 2019 edition, the EU Cohesion Monitor uses a relational approach to most transformations. It is based on the middle 50% of all factor observations for every year since 2007 and all 28 EU member states (interquartile range of all observations).

Exceptions to this global rule are only made for cases where we have set either more intuitive or more natural boundary values.

Thanks to the transformation of all factors to a common scale, the results for each of the ten cohesion indicators can usually be derived by determining the average of their factors.

For those factors that follow a counting logic, e.g. a country’s number of opt-outs in the ‘Policy Integration’ indicator, the factors are simply added.

The highest level of aggregation are the results for all individual and all structural indicators. They are referred to as the individual and structural dimensions if cohesion and are used to capture the full scope of all indicators and factors of each dimension in a single measurement. This aggregation of the EU Cohesion Monitor’s overall scores is done by drawing the simple average of all individual and structural indicators, respectively.

The chapter ‘Composition’ includes a detailed overview of all indicators, their factors, and sources. Further information on methodology and calculations can be found at www.ecfr.eu/eucohensionmonitor.
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In the first chapter, the EU Cohesion Monitor’s structure is described in detail.

It includes a complete overview of the 42 factors and 10 indicators, including their premises, definitions, and sources.

The chapter also includes the direct link to the raw data used to create the EU Cohesion Monitor.

Overall Results

In the second chapter, all EU member states and country groups are plotted along their cohesion trajectories since 2007.

The vertical axis represents the dimension of individual cohesion. The horizontal axis shows structural cohesion.

Rankings

In the third chapter, each country’s rank is directly compared.

The map view highlights trends, showing to what extent EU member states have gained or lost in individual and structural cohesion since 2007.

Countries & Groups

In the fourth chapter, each country’s results are shown along all ten indicators in a cohesion profile across both dimensions.

The profiles show rank and point changes since 2007. Sparklines allow comparisons over the timeline since 2007 and show position relative to the EU average.
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Country Groups
Results are not only presented for individual EU member states, but also for 11 country groups.

The illustration shows 9 of these 11 groups, their composition and the overlap between them. 'Eurogroup' members are marked by an asterisk, 'New Hanseatic League' members by a ring.

The impact of country groups on the politics of the EU and European integration at large has been changing over time and has often depended on the policy issue at stake. Some groups are more formalized or institutionalized than others.

Group data is provided by combining the scores of their respective member countries.
The Currency Union

The term ‘Eurogroup’ refers to the 19 members of the European Union that adopted the Euro as their common currency, and as such build the so-called Eurozone.

The Eurogroup shares the European Central Bank as a monetary authority and their members increasingly cooperate on fiscal policies. Challenges remain, however, such as the long aftermath of the Euro crisis, limited democratic oversight, and the economic government of the Eurozone.

Share of Population

- Germany: 16%
- France: 13%
- Italy: 12%
- Portugal: 9%
- Greece: 3%
- Belgium: 3%
- Netherl.: 2%
- Spain: 2%

Share of GDP Total

- Germany: 21%
- France: 15%
- Ireland: 11%
- Austria: 11%
- Belgium: 8%
- Netherl.: 5%
- Spain: 4%
- Italy: 4%

Share of Military Spending

- France: 22%
- Germany: 17%
- Greece: 16%
- Belgium: 11%
- Netherl.: 6%
- Spain: 6%
- Italy: 6%

Employed to Unemployed

- Eurogroup: 11:1
- Austria: 18:1
- Greece: 5:1
- Netherl.: 21:1
- Belgium: 14:1
- Ireland: 15:1
- Portugal: 11:1
- Cyprus: 9:1
- Italy: 9:1
- Slovakia: 12:1
- Estonia: 17:1
- Latvia: 11:1
- Slovenia: 15:1
- Finland: 11:1
- Lithuania: 14:1
- Spain: 6:1
- France: 11:1
- Luxemb.: 18:1
- Germany: 26:1
- Malta: 25:1

Sources: Eurostat 2017 (population tps00001, GDP tec00001, Employment lfsi_emp_a, Unemployment lfsa_ugan), Eurostat 2017 (Disposable income sdg_10_20), SIPRI 2017 (Military expenditure 2017)
The Fiscal Conservatives

The term ‘New Hanseatic League’ refers to Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, The Netherlands, and Sweden.

This group of countries shares a desire for increased fiscal cooperation and a deepening of the European Economic and Monetary Union. It started to voice common interests on these issues in early 2018.
The term ‘Affluent Seven’ refers to the group of seven countries consisting of Austria, the three Nordic EU members (Denmark, Finland, and Sweden), and the Benelux countries. This group has special economic clout among the EU28. Each one of the seven maintains an employment ratio of at least 10 to 1. In addition, the group’s disposable income per capita is significantly above the averages of both the EU and the Big Six.
The term ‘Southern Seven’ refers to the group of seven countries consisting of Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Spain.

Despite disparities in size, the countries in this group share socio-economic similarities. In recent years political initiatives have attempted to institutionalize this group. The Southern Seven have been particularly affected by the Eurozone debt crisis and increasing migration to Europe.
France

Country Groups

France

Country Groups

Big Six

The EU Powerhouse

The term ‘Big Six’ refers to France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Poland, and the UK. These countries are considered major European powers.

After Brexit, the group will eventually turn into the Big Five. Even without the UK, it will continue to be the EU’s powerhouse.
The term ‘Founding Six’ refers to Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. As signatories to the 1957 Rome Treaty, they created what has become the European Union.

With the Franco-German partnership at its centre, the Founding Six is the oldest group within the EU. It continues to have significant leverage and makes up about half the EU’s population, GDP, and defence spending.
The Newcomers

The term ‘Southeast Four’ refers to Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, and Slovenia.

They are among the youngest of the European Union’s members, with Slovenia joining the European Union in 2004, Bulgaria and Romania in 2007, and Croatia in 2013.

After their accession to the EU, these countries have fought to catch up to longer serving member states, now reaching middle ranks in important measures.
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Sources: Eurostat 2017 (populationtps00001, GDP tec00001, Employment lfsi_emp_a, Unemployment lfsa_ugan), Eurostat 2017 (Disposable income sdg_10_20), SIPRI 2017 (Military expenditure 2017)
The term ‘Visegrád Four’ refers to the group of countries consisting of the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. All four joined the European Union together in 2004.

More frequently than other groups the Visegrád Four act as a political coalition within the European Union. Their cooperation is based on common cultural values, history, and a similar outlook on economic and security policy.
The term ‘Baltics’ refers to the group of countries consisting of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The Baltics are united through history and politics, fortified through their struggle for independence. Today they are the only former Soviet republics that are members of both NATO and the EU. The coalition shares similar political and economic perspectives towards the European Union’s domestic and foreign affairs.
The term ‘Benelux’ refers to the group of countries consisting of Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. All three of them are founding members of the European Union. Their political and economic coalition was initiated through a customs agreement that is older than the European project itself. The group is institutionalized through its own parliament and court of justice, and united through many geographic, economic, and cultural commonalities.
Country Groups

Nordics

Nordic Voice

The term ‘Nordics’ refers to the group of countries consisting of Denmark, Finland and Sweden. The group is not only united geographically, but also through intertwinements of cultural and political history.

Although the group is not a legal entity, it cooperates through the Nordic Council and the Nordic Council of Ministers together with the non-EU Nordics. As such, the group is a hub of increasingly intensive and extensive cooperation.

Share of Population

4% Sweden
4% Denmark
4% Finland

Share of GDP Total

6% Sweden
6% Denmark
6% Finland

Share of Military Spending

5% Sweden
5% Denmark
5% Finland

Employed to Unemployed

14:1 Sweden
14:1 Denmark
14:1 Finland
14:1 Sweden

Sources: Eurostat 2017 (population tps00001, GDP tec00001, Employment lfsi_emp_a, Unemployment lfsa_ugan), Eurostat 2017 (Disposable income sdg_10_20), SIPRI 2017 (Military expenditure 2017)
The Monitor measures EU cohesion in two complementary dimensions:

**Individual cohesion** describes people’s experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and well-being.

**Structural cohesion** describes countries’ connections and practices within the EU.

### Individual Cohesion
- **Experience**
  - Citizens of other EU countries
  - Population living near EU border
  - Visited another EU country
  - Socialised with people from other EU countries
  - Press freedom
  - Participation in educational exchanges
  - Non-EFTA neighbours

- **Engagement**
  - Turnout in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

- **Attitudes**
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

- **Approval**
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

- **Expectations**
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country’s economic situation
  - EU’s economic situation
  - Optimism about EU’s future

### Structural Cohesion
- **Resilience**
  - Disposable income
  - Government debt
  - Poverty
  - Unemployment
  - Income equality

- **Economic Ties**
  - Trade in goods with the EU
  - Trade in services with the EU
  - Trade openness towards the EU

- **Funding**
  - EU spending in country
  - Contribution to the EU budget

- **Policy Integration**
  - Number of opt-outs
  - Single market transposition deficit
  - Single market infringements

- **Security**
  - Participation in multinational deployments
  - Multinational commands and forces
  - Multinational development and procurement

[Download Monitor Data (Excel)]
Individual Cohesion

Experience

1. Citizens of other EU countries
2. Population living near EU border
3. Visited another EU country
4. Socialised with people from other EU countries
5. Press freedom
6. Participation in educational exchanges
7. Non-EFTA neighbours

– Premise –
Interaction with other European citizens and cultures positively influences the willingness to cooperate.

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

– Composition –

Interaction with other European citizens and cultures positively influences the willingness to cooperate.

– Close Experience –
Individual Cohesion

Experience

1. Factor: Citizens of other EU countries
   - Definition: Share of population
   - Unit: Number
   - Abbrev.: eucitizenshare
   - Source: Eurostat

2. Press freedom
   - Participation in educational exchanges

3. Non-EFTA neighbours

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

- Premise -
Interaction with other European citizens and cultures positively influences the willingness to cooperate.
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**Individual Cohesion**

- **Experience**
  - Population living near EU border
    - **Definition**: Share of population
    - **Unit**: Number (NUTS-3 border region, 500K cities)
    - **Abbrev.**: borderpop
    - **Source**: Eurostat

- **Press freedom**
  - Participation in educational exchanges

- **Non-EFTA neighbours**

---

**EU Cohesion Monitor**

**Structural Cohesion**

- **Resilience**
  - Disposable income
  - Government debt
  - Poverty
  - Unemployment
  - Income equality

- **Economic Ties**
  - Trade in goods with the EU
  - Trade in services with the EU
  - Trade openness towards the EU

- **Funding**
  - EU spending in country
  - Contribution to the EU budget

- **Policy Integration**
  - Number of opt-outs
  - Single market transposition deficit
  - Single market infringements

- **Security**
  - Participation in multinational deployments
  - Multinational commands and forces
  - Multinational development and procurement

---

**Experience**

- Interaction with other European citizens and cultures positively influences the willingness to cooperate.

---

**Resilience**

- **Factor**: Population living near EU border
  - **Definition**: Share of population
  - **Unit**: Number (NUTS-3 border region, 500K cities)
  - **Abbrev.**: borderpop
  - **Source**: Eurostat

---

**Download Monitor Data (Excel)**

---

[ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor]
Individual Cohesion

Experience

1. Citizens of other EU countries
2. Population living near EU border
3. Visited another EU country
   - Definition: In the last 12 months have you visited another EU country?
   - Unit: Percent (Total 'Yes')
   - Abbrev.: visited
   - Source: European Commission

4. Socialised with people from other EU countries

5. Press freedom

6. Participation in educational exchanges

7. Non-EFTA neighbours

– Premise –
Interaction with other European citizens and cultures positively influences the willingness to cooperate.

EU Cohesion Monitor

Structural Cohesion

Resilience
- Disposable income
- Government debt
- Poverty
- Unemployment
- Income equality

Economic Ties
- Trade in goods with the EU
- Trade in services with the EU
- Trade openness towards the EU

Funding
- EU spending in country
- Contribution to the EU budget

Policy Integration
- Number of opt-outs
- Single market transposition deficit
- Single market infringements

Security
- Participation in multinational deployments
- Multinational commands and forces
- Multinational development and procurement
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Individual Cohesion

Experience

1. Citizens of other EU countries
2. Population living near EU border

Factor: Socialised with people from other EU countries
Definition: Q: In the last 12 months have you socialised with people from another EU country?
Unit: Percent (Total 'Yes')
Abbrev.: socialised
Source: European Commission
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Structural Cohesion

Resilience
- Disposable income
- Government debt
- Poverty
- Unemployment
- Income equality

Economic Ties
- Trade in goods with the EU
- Trade in services with the EU
- Trade openness towards the EU

Policy Integration
- Number of opt-outs
- Single market transposition deficit
- Single market infringements

Security
- Participation in multinational deployments
- Multinational commands and forces
- Multinational development and procurement
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Individual Cohesion

Experience

1. Citizens of other EU countries
2. Population living near EU border
3. Visited another EU country
4. Socialised with people from other EU countries
5. Press freedom

Definition: Press freedom score
Unit: Scale from 0 to 100 points
Source: Freedom House
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Individual Cohesion

Experience

1. Citizens of other EU countries
2. Population living near EU border
3. Visited another EU country
4. Socialised with people from other EU countries
5. Press freedom
6. Participation in educational exchanges

Factor: Participation in educational exchanges
Definition: Share of population
Unit: Percent
Abbrev.: eduexchange
Source: European Commission
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Individual Cohesion

Experience

1. Citizens of other EU countries
2. Population living near EU border
3. Visited another EU country
4. Socialised with people from other EU countries

Experience

Resilience

– Premise –
Interaction with other European citizens and cultures positively influences the willingness to cooperate.

Factors

Non-EFTA neighbours

Definition
Counted neighbours with land border

Unit
Number
Abbrev.
bordernonefta
Source
European Council

Close Experience

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

- **Engagement**
  1. Turnout in EP elections
  2. Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  3. Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

- **Experience**
- **Resilience**
- **Economic Ties**
- **Funding**
- **Policy Integration**
- **Security**

**Experience**

**Resilience**

**Economic Ties**

**Funding**

**Policy Integration**

**Security**

**Premise**

High voter turnout in EP elections and low support for anti-EU parties indicate a stronger willingness to cooperate.

**Download Monitor Data (Excel)**
Individual Cohesion

Engagement

- Premise -
High voter turnout in EP elections and low support for anti-EU parties indicate a stronger willingness to cooperate.
Individual Cohesion

Experience

Citizens of other EU countries
Population living near EU border
Visited another EU country
Socialised with people from other EU countries

Press freedom
Participation in educational exchanges
Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement

Turnout in EP elections
Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes

Trust in the European Union
Image of the European Union
National interests in the EU
Perception of European identity
Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval

Economic and monetary union
Common foreign policy
Common defence and security
Common migration policy

Expectations

Life in general
Personal job situation
Household financial situation
Country's economic situation
EU's economic situation
Optimism about EU's future

Security

Participation in multinational deployments
Multinational commands and forces
Multinational development and procurement

Policy Integration

Number of opt-outs
Single market transposition deficit
Single market infringements

Resilience

Disposable income
Government debt
Poverty
Unemployment
Income equality

Funding

EU spending in country
Contribution to the EU budget

Economic Ties

Trade in goods with the EU
Trade in services with the EU
Trade openness towards the EU

– Premise –
High voter turnout in EP elections and low support for anti-EU parties indicate a stronger willingness to cooperate.

Factor Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
Unit Percent
Abbrev. antieu_ep
Source Döring & Manow, ParlGov Database
Individual Cohesion

- Engagement
  1. Turnout in EP elections
  2. Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections

- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval
- Expectations

- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Policy Integration
- Security

---

- Premise –
  High voter turnout in EP elections and low support for anti-EU parties indicate a stronger willingness to cooperate.

- Factor: Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections
  Definition: Share of votes
  Unit: Percent
  Abbrev.: antieu_nat
  Source: Döring & Manow, ParlGov Database
Individual Cohesion

\[ \text{Experience} \quad \text{Engagement} \quad \text{Attitudes} \quad \text{Approval} \quad \text{Expectations} \quad \text{Resilience} \]

**Experience**
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries

**Engagement**
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges

**Attitudes**
- Non-EFTA neighbours
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

**Approval**
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

**Expectations**
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country's economic situation
- EU's economic situation
- Optimism about EU's future

---

**Resilience**
- Disposable income
- Government debt
- Poverty
- Unemployment
- Income equality

**Economic Ties**
- Trade in goods with the EU
- Trade in services with the EU
- Trade openness towards the EU

**Funding**
- EU spending in country
- Contribution to the EU budget

**Policy Integration**
- Number of opt-outs
- Single market transposition deficit
- Single market infringements

**Security**
- Participation in multinational deployments
- Multinational commands and forces
- Multinational development and procurement

---

Positive views of the European project and the EU at large are a precondition for European cohesion.
## Individual Cohesion

### Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries

### Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

### Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

### Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

### Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country's economic situation
- EU's economic situation
- Optimism about EU's future

## Structural Cohesion

### Resilience
- Disposable income
- Government debt
- Poverty
- Unemployment
- Income equality

### Economic Ties
- Trade in goods with the EU
- Trade in services with the EU
- Trade openness towards the EU

### Funding
- EU spending in country
- Contribution to the EU budget

### Policy Integration
- Number of opt-outs
- Single market transposition deficit
- Single market infringements

### Security
- Participation in multinational deployments
- Multinational commands and forces
- Multinational development and procurement

---

### Attitudes

**Factor** Trust in the European Union

**Definition** Q: Do you tend to trust or mistrust the EU?

**Unit** Percent ('Tend to trust')

**Abbrev.** trust

**Source** Eurobarometer

---

**Premise**
Positive views of the European project and the EU at large are a precondition for European cohesion.
Individual Cohesion

Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image of the European Union</td>
<td>Q: Does the EU conjure up a positive or negative image?</td>
<td>Percent (Total 'Positive')</td>
<td>Eurobarometer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience

Engagement

Approval

Attitudes

Expectations

Resilience

Security

Economic Ties

Policy Integration

Security

Structural Cohesion

Resilience

disposable income
Government debt
Poverty
Unemployment
Income equality

Economic Ties

Trade in goods with the EU
Trade in services with the EU
Trade openness towards the EU

Funding

EU spending in country
Contribution to the EU budget

Policy Integration

Number of opt-outs
Single market transposition deficit
Singe market infringements

Security

Participation in multinational deployments
Multinational commands and forces
Multinational development and procurement

---

Positive views of the European project and the EU at large are a precondition for European cohesion.

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Attitudes

Engagement

Approval

Expectations

Trust in the European Union

Image of the European Union

National interests in the EU

Q: Are the interests of your country well taken into account in the EU?

Percent (Total 'Agree')

Eurobarometer

Positive views of the European project and the EU at large are a precondition for European cohesion.

Factors: National interests in the EU

Definition: Are the interests of your country well taken into account in the EU?

Unit: Percent (Total 'Agree')

Source: Eurobarometer

Resilience

Disposable income

Government debt

Poverty

Unemployment

Income equality

Economic Ties

Trade in goods with the EU

Trade in services with the EU

Trade openness towards the EU

Funding

EU spending in country

Contribution to the EU budget

Policy Integration

Number of opt-outs

Single market transposition deficit

Single market infringements

Security

Participation in multinational deployments

Multinational commands and forces

Multinational development and procurement

Trust in the European Union

Image of the European Union

National interests in the EU

Perception of European identity

Satisfaction with democracy in the EU

Feeling of attachment to the EU

Economic Ties

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
The Monitor measures EU cohesion in two complementary dimensions:

**Individual cohesion** describes people's experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and well-being.

**Structural cohesion** describes countries' connections and practices within the EU.

---

**Trust in the European Union**

Positive views of the European project and the EU at large are a precondition for European cohesion.

**Image of the European Union**

**National interests in the EU**

**Perception of European identity**

**Satisfaction with democracy in the EU**

**Feeling of attachment to the EU**

---

**Experience**

**Engagement**

**Attitudes**

**Approval**

**Expectations**

---

**Resilience**

Disposable income
Government debt
Poverty
Unemployment
Income equality

**Economic Ties**

Trade in goods with the EU
Trade in services with the EU
Trade openness towards the EU

**Funding**

EU spending in country
Contribution to the EU budget

**Policy Integration**

Number of opt-outs
Single market transposition deficit
Single market infringements

**Security**

Participation in multinational deployments
Multinational commands and forces
Multinational development and procurement

---

Close Attitudes

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Attitudes

1. Trust in the European Union
2. Image of the European Union
3. National interests in the EU
4. Perception of European identity
5. Satisfaction with democracy in the EU

Definition Q: Are you satisfied with the way democracy works in the EU?
Unit Percent (Total 'Satisfied')
Abbrev. eusatisfaction
Source Eurobarometer

---

EU Cohesion Monitor

Experience
Engagement
Approval
Expectations
Attitudes
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Policy Integration
Security

Premise
Positive views of the European project and the EU at large are a precondition for European cohesion.

Resilience
- Disposable income
- Government debt
- Poverty
- Unemployment
- Income equality

Economic Ties
- Trade in goods with the EU
- Trade in services with the EU
- Trade openness towards the EU

Funding
- EU spending in country
- Contribution to the EU budget

Policy Integration
- Number of opt-outs
- Single market transposition deficit
- Single market infringements

Security
- Participation in multinational deployments
- Multinational commands and forces
- Multinational development and procurement

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Attitudes

1. Trust in the European Union
2. Image of the European Union
3. National interests in the EU
4. Perception of European identity
5. Feeling of attachment to the EU

Definition: Q: How attached do you feel to the EU?
Unit: Percent (Total ‘Attached’)
Abbrev.: euattachment
Source: Eurobarometer

– Premise –
Positive views of the European project and the EU at large are a precondition for European cohesion.

Experience
Engagement
Approval
Expectations
Resilience
Economic Ties
Policy Integration
Security

– Close Attitudes –

Resilience
- Disposable income
- Government debt
- Poverty
- Unemployment
- Income equality

Economic Ties
- Trade in goods with the EU
- Trade in services with the EU
- Trade openness towards the EU

Funding
- EU spending in country
- Contribution to the EU budget

Policy Integration
- Number of opt-outs
- Single market transposition deficit
- Single market infringements

Security
- Participation in multinational deployments
- Multinational commands and forces
- Multinational development and procurement

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

EU Cohesion Monitor

Structural Cohesion

Approval

1. Economic and monetary union
2. Common foreign policy
3. Common defence and security
4. Common migration policy

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Expectations

Attitudes

Engagement

Approval

– Premise –
Positive views of the EU’s policy output and of closer cooperation signal citizens’ support for further European integration.

Resilience

Disposable income
Government debt
Poverty
Unemployment
Income equality

Economic Ties

Trade in goods with the EU
Trade in services with the EU
Trade openness towards the EU

Funding

EU spending in country
Contribution to the EU budget

Policy Integration

Number of opt-outs
Single market transposition deficit
Single market infringements

Security

Participation in multinational deployments
Multinational commands and forces
Multinational development and procurement

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Approval

Factor: Economic and monetary union
Definition: Q: Are you for or against the European economic and monetary union?
Unit: Percent ('For')
Abbrev.: emu
Source: Eurobarometer

Experience
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Policy Integration
Security
Expectations
Approval
Engagement
Attitudes

Premise – Positive views of the EU’s policy output and of closer cooperation signal citizens’ support for further European integration.

Resilience
- Disposable income
- Government debt
- Poverty
- Unemployment
- Income equality

Economic Ties
- Trade in goods with the EU
- Trade in services with the EU
- Trade openness towards the EU

Funding
- EU spending in country
- Contribution to the EU budget

Policy Integration
- Number of opt-outs
- Single market transposition deficit
- Single market infringements

Security
- Participation in multinational deployments
- Multinational commands and forces
- Multinational development and procurement

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Abbrev.</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common foreign policy</td>
<td>Q: Are you for or against a common European foreign policy?</td>
<td>Percent (‘For’)</td>
<td>cfsp</td>
<td>Eurobarometer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

– Premise –
Positive views of the EU’s policy output and of closer cooperation signal citizens’ support for further European integration.

Economic and monetary union
Common foreign policy
Common defence and security
Common migration policy

Resilience
Disposable income
Government debt
Poverty
Unemployment
Income equality

Economic Ties
Trade in goods with the EU
Trade in services with the EU
Trade openness towards the EU

Funding
EU spending in country
Contribution to the EU budget

Policy Integration
Number of opt-outs
Single market transposition deficit
Single market infringements

Security
Participation in multinational deployments
Multinational commands and forces
Multinational development and procurement

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Approval

1. Economic and monetary union
2. Common foreign policy
3. Common defence and security

Definition: Q: Are you for or against a common European defence and security policy?

Unit: Percent ('For')
Abbrev.: defence
Source: Eurobarometer

Resilience
Positive views of the EU’s policy output and of closer cooperation signal citizens’ support for further European integration.

Economic Ties
- Disposable income
- Government debt
- Poverty
- Unemployment
- Income equality

Policy Integration
- Number of opt-outs
- Single market transposition deficit
- Single market infringements

Security
- Participation in multinational deployments
- Multinational commands and forces
- Multinational development and procurement

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Common migration policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Q: Are you for or against a common European policy on migration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Percent ('For')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbrev.</td>
<td>migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Eurobarometer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience

Resilience

Economic and monetary union

Common foreign policy

Positive views of the EU’s policy output and of closer cooperation signal citizens’ support for further European integration.

Economic Ties

Resilience

Disposable income

Government debt

Poverty

Unemployment

Income equality

Funding

Trade in goods with the EU

Trade in services with the EU

Trade openness towards the EU

Policy Integration

Number of opt-outs

Single market transposition deficit

Single market infringements

Security

Participation in multinational deployments

Multinational commands and forces

Multinational development and procurement

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

- Expectations
  1. Life in general
  2. Personal job situation
  3. Household financial situation
  4. Country's economic situation
  5. EU's economic situation
  6. Optimism about EU's future

- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval
- Expectations

- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Policy Integration
- Security

Premise - A positive outlook on life and one's economic future increases the willingness to cooperate with others.

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Expectations

1. Factor: Life in general
   Definition: Q: What are your expectations for the next 12 months?
   Unit: Percent ('Better')
   Abbrev.: life
   Source: Eurobarometer

2. EU's economic situation
3. Optimism about EU's future

Resilience

- Premise -
  A positive outlook on life and one's economic future increases the willingness to cooperate with others.

Experience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Experience

- Premise -
A positive outlook on life and one’s economic future increases the willingness to cooperate with others.

Engagement

Expectations

Approval

Attitudes

Security

Policy Integration

Economic Ties

Funding

Resilience

Structural Cohesion

EU Cohesion Monitor

Resilience
- Disposable income
- Government debt
- Poverty
- Unemployment
- Income equality

Economic Ties
- Trade in goods with the EU
- Trade in services with the EU
- Trade openness towards the EU

Funding
- EU spending in country
- Contribution to the EU budget

Policy Integration
- Number of opt-outs
- Single market transposition deficit
- Single market infringements

Security
- Participation in multinational deployments
- Multinational commands and forces
- Multinational development and procurement

Close Expectations

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Expectations

1. Life in general
2. Personal job situation
3. Household financial situation

Definition: Q: What are your expectations for the next 12 months?
Unit: Percent ('Better')
Abbrev.: household
Source: Eurobarometer

Resilience
- Premise -
A positive outlook on life and one's economic future increases the willingness to cooperate with others.

Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Expectations
Economic Ties
Policy Integration
Security
Funding

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

- Expectations

1. Life in general
2. Personal job situation
3. Country's economic situation
4. Q: What are your expectations for the next 12 months?

Definition: Q: What are your expectations for the next 12 months?
Unit: Percent ('Better')
Abbrev.: countryecon
Source: Eurobarometer

- Premise – A positive outlook on life and one’s economic future increases the willingness to cooperate with others.

EU Cohesion Monitor

Structural Cohesion

- Resilience
  - Disposable income
  - Government debt
  - Poverty
  - Unemployment
  - Income equality

- Economic Ties
  - Trade in goods with the EU
  - Trade in services with the EU
  - Trade openness towards the EU

- Funding
  - EU spending in country
  - Contribution to the EU budget

- Policy Integration
  - Number of opt-outs
  - Single market transposition deficit
  - Single market infringements

- Security
  - Participation in multinational deployments
  - Multinational commands and forces
  - Multinational development and procurement

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

- **Expectations**
  1. Life in general
  2. Personal job situation
  3. Household financial situation
  4. Country's economic situation
  5. EU's economic situation

**Experience**
- Engagements
- Approval
- Expectations

**Resilience**
- Economic Ties
  - Disposable income
  - Government debt
  - Poverty
  - Unemployment
  - Income equality

- Funding
  - EU spending in country
  - Contribution to the EU budget

- Policy Integration
  - Number of opt-outs
  - Single market transposition deficit
  - Single market infringements

- Security
  - Participation in multinational deployments
  - Multinational commands and forces
  - Multinational development and procurement

**Premise**

A positive outlook on life and one's economic future increases the willingness to cooperate with others.

---

**Factor EU's economic situation**

- **Definition**: Q: What are your expectations for the next 12 months?
- **Unit**: Percent ('Better')
- **Abbrev.:** euecon
- **Source**: Eurobarometer
Individual Cohesion

Experience

- Expectations
  1. Life in general
  2. Personal job situation
  3. Household financial situation
  4. Country's economic situation
  5. Optimism about EU's future
  6. Expectations

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Economic Ties

Resilience

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Structural Cohesion

- Resilience
  - Disposable income
  - Government debt
  - Poverty
  - Unemployment
  - Income equality

- Economic Ties
  - Trade in goods with the EU
  - Trade in services with the EU
  - Trade openness towards the EU

- Funding
  - EU spending in country
  - Contribution to the EU budget

- Policy Integration
  - Number of opt-outs
  - Single market transposition deficit
  - Single market infringements

- Security
  - Participation in multinational deployments
  - Multinational commands and forces
  - Multinational development and procurement

- Premise –
  A positive outlook on life and one's economic future increases the willingness to cooperate with others.

Factor: Optimism about EU's future
Definition: Q: How optimistic are you about the future of the EU?
Unit: Percent (Total 'Optimistic')
Abbrev.: euoptimism
Source: Eurobarometer
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Expectations
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Policy Integration
Security

Resilience

Premise
Societies that are prosperous and free of conflicts resulting from inequality are more inclined to cooperate with others.

Structural Cohesion

Resilience

Disposable income
Government debt
Poverty
Unemployment
Income equality

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

- Experience
  - Citizens of other EU countries
  - Population living near EU border
  - Visited another EU country
  - Socialised with people from other EU countries
  - Press freedom
  - Participation in educational exchanges
  - Non-EFTA neighbours

- Engagement
  - Turnout in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

- Attitudes
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

- Approval
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

- Expectations
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country’s economic situation
  - EU’s economic situation
  - Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Structural Cohesion

- Resilience

  - Premise –
    Societies that are prosperous and free of conflicts resulting from inequality are more inclined to cooperate with others.

  - Factor
    - Disposable income
  - Definition
    - Adjusted gross disposable income of households per capita
  - Unit
    - Euro
  - Abbrev.
    - income
  - Source
    - Eurostat, sdg_10_20

  - Income equality
Individual Cohesion

➤ Experience
  - Citizens of other EU countries
  - Population living near EU border
  - Visited another EU country
  - Socialised with people from other EU countries
  - Press freedom
  - Participation in educational exchanges
  - Non-EFTA neighbours

➤ Engagement
  - Turnout in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

➤ Attitudes
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

➤ Approval
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

➤ Expectations
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country’s economic situation
  - EU’s economic situation
  - Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Structural Cohesion

➤ Resilience

– Premise –
Societies that are prosperous and free of conflicts resulting from inequality are more inclined to cooperate with others.

Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Expectations
Economic Ties
Funding
Policy Integration
Security

Resilience

Factor: Government debt
Definition: General government gross debt to GDP
Unit: Percent
Abbrev.: debttogdp
Source: Eurostat, sdg_17_40

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Structure Cohesion

Resilience

- Premise –
  Societies that are prosperous and free of conflicts resulting from inequality are more inclined to cooperate with others.

Disposable income
Government debt

Factor Poverty
Definition People at risk of poverty or social exclusion
Unit Percent
Abbrev. atrisk
Source Eurostat, t2020_50

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

- Experience
  - Citizens of other EU countries
  - Population living near EU border
  - Visited another EU country
  - Socialised with people from other EU countries
  - Press freedom
  - Participation in educational exchanges
  - Non-EFTA neighbours

- Engagement
  - Turnout in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

- Attitudes
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

- Approval
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

- Expectations
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country's economic situation
  - EU's economic situation
  - Optimism about EU's future

---

EU Cohesion Monitor

- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval
- Expectations

Resilience

Premise:
Societies that are prosperous and free of conflicts resulting from inequality are more inclined to cooperate with others.

Structural Cohesion

- Resilience
  - Disposable income
  - Government debt

Factor: Unemployment

- Definition: Annual average of active population
- Unit: Percent
- Abbrev.: unemployment
- Source: Eurostat, une_rt_a

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
**Individual Cohesion**

**Experience**
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

**Engagement**
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

**Attitudes**
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

**Approval**
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

**Expectations**
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

---

**EU Cohesion Monitor**

---

**Structural Cohesion**

**Resilience**

1. Disposable income
2. Government debt
3. Poverty
4. Unemployment
5. Income Equality

- **Definition**: Gini coefficient of equivalised disposable income
- **Unit**: Scale from 0 to 100 points
- **Abbrev.**: gini
- **Source**: Eurostat, ilc_di12

---

**– Premise –**

Societies that are prosperous and free of conflicts resulting from inequality are more inclined to cooperate with others.
Individual Cohesion  ➔  EU Cohesion Monitor  ➔  Structural Cohesion

### Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

### Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

### Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

### Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

### Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

---

**Premise**
A high level of trade integration with other European economies increases a country’s cohesion within the EU.

---

**Economic Ties**
1. Trade in goods with the EU
2. Trade in services with the EU
3. Trade openness towards the EU

---

**Download Monitor Data (Excel)**
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Experience

Resilience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Economic Ties

Policy Integration

Security

Funding

Strategic Cohesion

Premise
A high level of trade integration with other European economies increases a country’s cohesion within the EU.

Factor
Trade in goods with the EU

Definition
Share of exports and imports to global trade

Unit
Percent

Abbrev.
tradegoods

Source
Eurostat, ext_lt_intratrd

Download Monitor Data (Excel)

Close Economic Ties
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Experience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Resilience

Economic Ties

Policy Integration

Security

Funding

– Premise –
A high level of trade integration with other European economies increases a country's cohesion within the EU.

Structural Cohesion

– Economic Ties –

Factor
Trade in services with the EU

Definition
Share of credit and debit to global trade

Unit
Percent

Abbrev.
tradeservices

Source
Eurostat, bop_its6_tot

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Security

Policy Integration

Funding

– Premise –
A high level of trade integration with other European economies increases a country’s cohesion within the EU.

Structural Cohesion

Economic Ties

1. Trade in goods with the EU
2. Trade in services with the EU
3. Trade openness towards the EU

Factor: Trade openness towards the EU
Definition: Share of trade in goods and services to GDP
Unit: Percent
Abbrev.: tradetogdp
Source: Eurostat, tec00001

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

- Premise –
  Inflow of EU funding increases awareness of membership benefits. Net contributions to the EU budget strengthen ownership of the European project.

Structural Cohesion

Funding
1. EU spending in country
2. Contribution to the EU budget

Close Funding

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

- **Experience**
  - Citizens of other EU countries
  - Population living near EU border
  - Visited another EU country
  - Socialised with people from other EU countries
  - Press freedom
  - Participation in educational exchanges
  - Non-EFTA neighbours

- **Engagement**
  - Turnout in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

- **Attitudes**
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

- **Approval**
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

- **Expectations**
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country’s economic situation
  - EU’s economic situation
  - Optimism about EU’s future

---

**EU Cohesion Monitor**

**Structural Cohesion**

- **Funding**
  - **Factor**: Contribution to the EU budget
  - **Definition**: Balance of payments to the EU budget to GNI
  - **Unit**: Percent
  - **Abbreviation**: balanceofpay
  - **Source**: European Commission

---

**Premise**

Inflow of EU funding increases awareness of membership benefits. Net contributions to the EU budget strengthen ownership of the European project.
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Experience

Resilience

Policy Integration

Structural Cohesion

Participation in EU policies, including the transposition of EU law, strengthens EU cohesion. On the contrary, opt-outs from core areas of cooperation weaken cohesion.

Policy Integration

1. Number of opt-outs
2. Single market transposition deficit
3. Single market infringements

Close Policy Integration

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

Structural Cohesion

Policy Integration
- Factor: Number of opt-outs
- Definition: Policies: Euro, Schengen, CSDP, JHA, Charter of Fundamental Rights, European Public Prosecutor, Article 50 Procedure
- Unit: Number
- Abbrev: optouts
- Source: ECFR research

Premise - Participation in EU policies, including the transposition of EU law, strengthens EU cohesion. On the contrary, opt-outs from core areas of cooperation weaken cohesion.
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Structural Cohesion

Policy Integration

Factor: Single market transposition deficit
Definition: Transposition of EU legislation into national law
Unit: Number
Abbrev.: transposition
Source: European Commission

Experience
- Participation in EU policies, including the transposition of EU law, strengthens EU cohesion. On the contrary, opt-outs from core areas of cooperation weaken cohesion.
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Structural Cohesion

Policy Integration

- Premise – Participation in EU policies, including the transposition of EU law, strengthens EU cohesion. On the contrary, opt-outs from core areas of cooperation weaken cohesion.

1. Number of opt-outs
2. Single market transposition deficit

Factor: Single market infringements
Definition: Referred cases to the European Court of Justice
Unit: Number
Abbrev.: ecjreferrals
Source: European Commission

Close Policy Integration

Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Individual Cohesion

- **Experience**
  - Citizens of other EU countries
  - Population living near EU border
  - Visited another EU country
  - Socialised with people from other EU countries
  - Press freedom
  - Participation in educational exchanges
  - Non-EFTA neighbours

- **Engagement**
  - Turnout in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

- **Attitudes**
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

- **Approval**
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

- **Expectations**
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country’s economic situation
  - EU’s economic situation
  - Optimism about EU’s future

---

**EU Cohesion Monitor**

- **Experience**
  - Citizenship of other EU countries
  - Population living near EU border
  - Visited another EU country
  - Socialised with people from other EU countries
  - Press freedom
  - Participation in educational exchanges
  - Non-EFTA neighbours

- **Engagement**
  - Turnout in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

- **Attitudes**
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

- **Approval**
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

- **Expectations**
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country’s economic situation
  - EU’s economic situation
  - Optimism about EU’s future

---

**Structural Cohesion**

- **Security**
  1. Participation in multinational deployments
  2. Multinational commands and forces
  3. Multinational development and procurement

---

**Premise**

Cooperation on multinational defense creates shared responsibility for group security and strengthens cohesion.
Individual Cohesion

- Experience
  - Citizens of other EU countries
  - Population living near EU border
  - Visited another EU country
  - Socialised with people from other EU countries
  - Press freedom
  - Participation in educational exchanges
  - Non-EFTA neighbours

- Engagement
  - Turnout in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

- Attitudes
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

- Approval
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

- Expectations
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country’s economic situation
  - EU’s economic situation
  - Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

- Experience
  - People's experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and well-being.

- Engagement
  - Participation in multinational deployments

- Attitudes
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

- Approval
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

- Expectations
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country’s economic situation
  - EU’s economic situation
  - Optimism about EU’s future

Structural Cohesion

- Security
  - Participation in multinational deployments
  - Deployments: NATO, EU, OSCE
  - Number of deployments
  - Source: International Institute for Strategic Studies

- Premise
  - Cooperation on multinational defense creates shared responsibility for group security and strengthens cohesion.
### EU Cohesion Monitor

#### Individual Cohesion

- **Experience**
  - Citizens of other EU countries
  - Population living near EU border
  - Visited another EU country
  - Socialised with people from other EU countries
  - Press freedom
  - Participation in educational exchanges
  - Non-EFTA neighbours

- **Engagement**
  - Turnout in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
  - Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

- **Attitudes**
  - Trust in the European Union
  - Image of the European Union
  - National interests in the EU
  - Perception of European identity
  - Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
  - Feeling of attachment to the EU

- **Approval**
  - Economic and monetary union
  - Common foreign policy
  - Common defence and security
  - Common migration policy

- **Expectations**
  - Life in general
  - Personal job situation
  - Household financial situation
  - Country’s economic situation
  - EU’s economic situation
  - Optimism about EU’s future

#### Structural Cohesion

- **Security**
  
  - **Factor**: Multinational commands and forces
  
  - **Definition**: Memberships: PESCO, NATO, Multinational Corps Northeast, Framework Nation Concept, Eurocorps, European Gendarmerie Force, Nordic Defence Cooperation, Baltic Defence Cooperation, Benelux Defence Cooperation, European Air Transport Command, Movement Coordination Centre Europe

- **Unit**: Number

- **Abbrev.**: commands

- **Source**: ECFR research

---

**Close Security**
Individual Cohesion

Experience
- Citizens of other EU countries
- Population living near EU border
- Visited another EU country
- Socialised with people from other EU countries
- Press freedom
- Participation in educational exchanges
- Non-EFTA neighbours

Engagement
- Turnout in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections
- Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

Attitudes
- Trust in the European Union
- Image of the European Union
- National interests in the EU
- Perception of European identity
- Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
- Feeling of attachment to the EU

Approval
- Economic and monetary union
- Common foreign policy
- Common defence and security
- Common migration policy

Expectations
- Life in general
- Personal job situation
- Household financial situation
- Country’s economic situation
- EU’s economic situation
- Optimism about EU’s future

EU Cohesion Monitor

Structural Cohesion

Security
1. Participation in multinational deployments
2. Multinational commands and forces
3. Multinational development and procurement

Factor: Multinational development and procurement
Definition: Partners: A400M, A330 MRTT, Eurofighter, ESSOR, MALE PRAS, TIGER, NH90, PAAMS
Unit: Number
Abbrev.: developprocure
Source: ECFR research

Close Security
Download Monitor Data (Excel)
Overall Results

Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual C. dominating</th>
<th>Strong Cohesion²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Cohesion²</th>
<th>Structural C. dominating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Results
- Country Groups
- Eurogroup
- New Hanseatic Group
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Changes

3
Overall Results

Country Groups
- Eurogroup
- New Hanseatic League
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

Individual Cohesion: Strong Cohesion²
- 12
- 3

Weak Cohesion²: Structural Cohesion
- 13

Overall Results
- 2017
- 2007
- Changes

EU
- IE
- MT
- DK
- ES
- SI
- SE
- HR
- FR
- CY
- UK
- IT
- PT
- EL
- BG
- DE
- FI
- NL
- AT
- RO
- BE
- LU
- EE
- LT
- LV
- SK
- PL
- CZ
- HU

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
## Overall Results

### 2017 | 2007 | 07>09>11>13>15>17 | Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Groups</th>
<th>Individual Cohesion</th>
<th>Structural Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eurogroup</td>
<td>Strong C. dominating</td>
<td>Weak Cohesion²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanseatic League</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent Seven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Seven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visegrád Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benelux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual C. dominating</th>
<th>Strong Cohesion²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Results

Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual C. dominating</th>
<th>Strong Cohesion^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Cohesion^2</th>
<th>Structural C. dominating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Results

Country Groups
- Eurogroup
- New Hanseatic League
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Structural Cohesion

Individual Cohesion

Changes
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Overall Results

Country Groups
- Eurogroup
- New Hanseatic League
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Cohesion Quadrants
- Strong Cohesion
- Weak Cohesion
- Individual Cohesion
- Structural Cohesion

Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

Overall Results 2017 | 2007 | 07>09>11>13>15>17 | Changes

Graph showing the positioning of various countries across the four cohesion quadrants, with markers for individual and structural cohesion.
Overall Results

Country Groups
- Eurogroup
- New Hanseatic League
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Structural Cohesion

Individual Cohesion

EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

- Individual C. dominating
- Strong Cohesion
- Weak Cohesion
- Structural C. dominating

Overall Results 2017 | 2007 | 07 > 09 > 11 > 13 > 15 > 17 | Changes
Overall Results

Country Groups 2017 | 2007 | Routes

Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual C. dominating</th>
<th>Strong Cohesion²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Cohesion²</th>
<th>Structural C. dominating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Results
Country Groups
- Eurogroup
- New Hanseatic League
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

EU

New Hanse

Southeast Four

Southern Seven

Big Six

Visegrád Four

Benelux
Overall Results

Country Groups

- Eurogroup
- New Hanseatic Group
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Nordics
- Baltics
- Benelux

Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Cohesion</th>
<th>Individual Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural C. dominating

Weak Cohesion

Overall Results

Country Groups
Overall Results Countries & Groups
crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual C.</th>
<th>Strong Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Cohesion</td>
<td>Structural C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Results Country Groups
- Eurogroup
  - New Hanseatic Group
  - Affluent Seven
  - Southern Seven
  - Big Six
  - Founding Six
  - Southeast Four
  - Visegrád Four
  - Baltics
  - Benelux
  - Nordics

Eurogroup 2017 | 2007 | Routes

Details Results Profile

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

Overall Results
Country Groups
Eurogroup
New Hanseatic Group
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

Eurogroup 2017 | 2007 | Routes

Detailed Results
Profile
Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual C. dominating</th>
<th>Strong Cohesion²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Cohesion²</th>
<th>Structural C. dominating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Results
Country Groups

Eurogroup
New Hanseatic Group
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

Detailed Results
Profile
New Hanseatic League 2017 | 2007 | Countries

Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual C. dominating</th>
<th>Strong Cohesion²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Cohesion²</th>
<th>Structural C. dominating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Results
Country Groups
Eurogroup
New Hanseatic League
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics
New Hanseatic League 2017 | 2007 | Countries

Denmark
Estonia
Finland
Ireland
Latvia
Lithuania
Netherlands
Sweden

Overall Results
Country Groups
Eurogroup
New Hanseatic League
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

Individual Cohesion
Structural Cohesion
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Overall Results
Country Groups
Eurogroup
New Hanseatic League
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

Detailed Results

Denmark
Estonia
Finland
Ireland
Latvia
Lithuania
Netherlands
Sweden
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Estonia
New Hanseatic League 2017 | 2007 | Countries
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- Sweden

Overall Results
Country Groups
Eurogroup
New Hanseatic League
Affluent Seven
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Big Six
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Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics
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Denmark
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Ireland
Latvia
Lithuania
Netherlands
Sweden
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New Hanseatic League 2017 | 2007 | Countries

Overall Results
Country Groups
Eurogroup
New Hanseatic League
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

Sweden

Detailed Results

Denmark
Estonia
Finland
Ireland
Latvia
Lithuania
Netherlands

Sweden
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Overall Results Countries

Country Groups
- Eurogroup
- New Hanseatic League

Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual C.</th>
<th>Strong Cohesion²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Cohesion²</td>
<td>Structural C. dominating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Results Profile

Overall Results
Country Groups
Eurogroup
New Hanseatic League

Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics
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Crosshairs at EU28 2017 mean - defining four cohesion quadrants

Individual C. Strong Cohesion
Strong Cohesion
Weak Cohesion
Weak Cohesion

Overall Results
Country Groups
Eurogroup
New Hanseatic League
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Visegrád Four
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Nordics
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Affluent Seven 2017 | 2007 | Countries

Austria
Belgium
Denmark
Finland
Luxembourg
Netherlands
Sweden
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Baltics
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### Affluent Seven 2017 | 2007 | Countries

Austria
Belgium
**Denmark**
Finland
Luxembourg
Netherlands
Sweden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Results</th>
<th>Country Groups</th>
<th>Eurogroup</th>
<th>New Hanseatic League</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affluent Seven**

Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

---

### Detailed Results

- Austria
- Belgium
- Denmark
- Finland
- Luxembourg
- Netherlands
- Sweden

### Overall Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affluent Seven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Seven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding Six</td>
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Security

Top Group
1. Luxembourg 8.3
2. Ireland 7.6
3. Malta 7.5
4. Belgium 7.2
5. Lithuania 7.1
6. Estonia 6.8
7. Spain 6.8

Upper Middle Group
8. Netherlands 6.7
9. Portugal 6.6
10. Germany 6.5
11. Slovenia 6.4
12. Cyprus 6.3
13. Romania 6.3
14. Finland 6.2
15. Latvia 6.2

Lower Middle Group
16. Croatia 5.9
17. Bulgaria 5.8
18. Slovakia 5.8
19. Sweden 5.8
20. Austria 5.7
21. France 5.7
22. Denmark 5.5
23. Italy 5.1
24. Poland 4.9
25. Greece 4.5
26. Czech Rep. 4.3
27. Hungary 4.3
28. UK 4.3

EU 2017 Median

Quartiles define groups - EU 2017 Median
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**11-year trend**

Luxembourg 7.5
Belgium 7.3
Slovenia 7.0
Spain 7.0
Estonia 6.9
Ireland 6.7
Lithuania 6.7
Germany 6.6
Netherlands 6.6
Cyprus 6.5
Greece 6.5
Malta 6.4
Slovakia 6.4
France 6.3
Romania 6.3

Quartiles define groups - EU 2017 Median
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Cyprus 6.5
Greece 6.5
Malta 6.4
Slovakia 6.4
France 6.3
Romania 6.3

- Top Group
- Upper Middle Group
- Lower Middle Group
- Bottom Group

Croatia 6.1
Hungary 6.1
Denmark 6.0
Italy 6.0
Poland 5.9
Austria 5.7
Finland 5.7
Latvia 5.5
Portugal 5.5
Bulgaria 5.4
Sweden 5.4
Czech Rep. 4.8
UK 4.6

11-year trend 2007 09 11 13 15 17
Overall Results Countries & Groups ecf.eu/eucohesionmonitor
Individual Cohesion

2017 2007 11-year trend

Gains +1.1
10 +0.9 +0.8 +0.7 +0.5 +0.4 +0.3 +0.2 +0.1 0.0
Losses -0.1
16 -0.2 -0.3 -0.5 -0.6 -0.9 -1.0 -1.8 -2.0

2007 2017
Malta 6.4 7.5
Portugal 5.5 6.6
Ireland 6.7 7.6
Luxembourg 7.5 8.3
Latvia 5.5 6.2
Finland 5.7 6.2
Bulgaria 5.4 5.8
Lithuania 6.7 7.1
Sweden 5.4 5.8
Netherlands 6.6 6.7
Austria 5.7 5.7
Romania 6.3 6.3

Individual Cohesion
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Expectations

Structural Cohesion
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Policy Integration
Security
Experience 11-year trend

Individual Cohesion
Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval
- Expectations

Structural Cohesion
Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Policy Integration
- Security

Press freedom
Participation in educational exchanges
Non-EFTA neighbours

Citizens of other EU countries
Population living near EU border
Visited another EU country
Socialised with people from other EU countries

Gains +2.5 +1.6 +1.5 +1.3 +1.2 +1.0 +0.9 +0.8

Losses -0.3

2007 2017
07 07
08 08
09 09
10 10
11 11
12 12
13 13
14 14
15 15
16 16
17 17

Overall Results Countries & Groups ecfr.eu
Engagement 11-year trend

**F1** Turnout in EP elections

**F2** Votes for anti-EU parties in EP elections

**F3** Votes for anti-EU parties in national elections

---

**Individual Cohesion**
- Experience

**Engagement**
- Attitudes
- Approval
- Expectations

**Structural Cohesion**
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Policy Integration
- Security

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gains</th>
<th>Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Overall Results Countries & Groups**
- ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

---

**RETTHINK: EUROPE**
- About
- Composition
- Overall Results
- Rankings
- Countries & Groups
Attitudes 11-year trend

Individual Cohesion
- Experience
- Engagement

Attitudes
- Approval
- Expectations

Structural Cohesion
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Policy Integration
- Security

F1 Trust in the European Union
F2 Image of the European Union
F3 National interests in the EU
F4 Perception of European identity
F5 Satisfaction with democracy in the EU
F6 Feeling of attachment to the EU

Gains
- Finland: +2.4
- UK: +1.8
- Lithuania: +1.7
- Luxembourg: +1.5
- Latvia: +1.2
- Bulgaria: +1.0
- Sweden: +0.9
- Germany: +0.7
- Portugal: +0.6
- Croatia: +0.5
- Malta: +0.2
- Netherlands: 0.0
- Hungary: -0.1

Losses
- Estonia: -2.3
- Slovakia: -2.3
- Poland: -2.0
- Italy: -1.3
- Belgium: -1.0
- France: -1.0
- Czech Rep.: -1.0
- Spain: -0.7
- Cyprus: -0.7
- Slovenia: -0.7
- Greece: -0.5

Countries & Groups ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
Approval 11-year trend

F1 Economic and monetary union
F2 Common foreign policy
F3 Common defence and security
F4 Common migration policy

Individual Cohesion
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Expectations

Structural Cohesion
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Policy Integration
Security

Gains
+1.5
+1.2
+0.6
+0.5
+0.4
+0.2
+0.1

Losses
-0.3
-0.4
-0.5
-0.6
-0.7
-0.8
-0.9
-1.0
-1.3
-1.4
-1.5
-1.6
-1.9
-2.4
-3.3
-3.6

Spain 6.3 7.8
Lithuania 5.6 6.8
Malta 5.1 5.7
Portugal 4.4 4.9
Luxembourg 6.9 7.3
Ireland 5.7 5.9
Germany 7.6 7.7
Bulgaria 4.9 5.0

Latvia 5.4 5.4
Netherlands 7.0 7.0
Sweden 3.6 3.6

UK 2.6 2.3
Romania 5.6 5.2
Croatia 5.7 5.2
Estonia 6.0 5.5
Italy 5.3 4.7
Cyprus 7.0 6.3
Austria 5.1 4.3
Finland 5.0 4.2
France 6.4 5.4
Slovenia 7.7 6.4
Belgium 7.7 6.3
Greece 7.3 5.8
Slovakia 7.3 5.7
Denmark 5.1 3.2
Poland 6.4 4.0
Hungary 6.9 3.6
Czech Rep. 6.3 2.7

Overall Results
Countries & Groups
ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
Expectations

11-year trend

Individual Cohesion
- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval

Structural Cohesion
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Policy Integration
- Security

F1  Life in general
F2  Personal job situation
F3  Household financial situation
F4  Country’s economic situation
F5  EU’s economic situation
F6  Optimism about EU’s future

Gains
- Portugal: +3.0
- Ireland: +2.5
- Finland: +1.7
- Malta: +1.4
- Luxembourg: +1.2
- Cyprus: +1.0
- Hungary: +0.7
- Netherlands: +0.5
- Italy: +0.2
- Slovenia: +0.1

Losses
- Belgium: -0.2
- Croatia: -0.4
- Bulgaria: -0.5
- Denmark: -0.7
- Latvia: -0.8
- Slovakia: -1.1
- Czech Rep.: -1.2
- Germany: -1.2
- Poland: -1.1
- Sweden: -2.2
- Romania: -4.8
- Estonia: -2.2
- Spain: -2.2
- Lithuania: -4.8
- Greece: -2.2

2007 2017

Overall Results
Countries & Groups
Structural Cohesion

Individual Cohesion
- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval
- Expectations

Structural Cohesion
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Policy Integration
- Security

Overall Results
Countries & Groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resilience
11-year trend

Individual Cohesion
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Expectations

Structural Cohesion
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Policy Integration
Security

Gains
Poland 4.1 5.5
Malta 5.8 6.9
Germany 6.1 7.1
Romania 3.8 4.7
Czech Rep. 5.8 6.5
Slovakia 5.1 5.8
Estonia 5.3 5.8
Hungary 4.6 5.0
Bulgaria 3.7 4.1
Belgium 5.8 6.1
Denmark 6.6 6.8
Latvia 4.6 4.7
Finland 6.4 6.5
Lithuania 5.0 5.1
Sweden 6.7 6.8

Losses
Austria 6.7 6.7
Portugal 4.7 4.7

Poland
Malta
Germany
Romania
Czech Rep.
Slovakia
Estonia
Hungary
Bulgaria
Belgium
Denmark
Latvia
Finland
Lithuania
Sweden
Austria
Portugal

Gains
-1.4
-1.1
-1.0
-0.9
-0.7
+0.5
+0.4
+0.3
+0.2
+0.1
0.0

Losses
-0.1
-0.2
-0.3
-0.5
-0.6
-1.1
-1.3
0.0
**Economic Ties**  
11-year trend

F1  Trade in goods with the EU
F2  Trade in services with the EU
F3  Trade openness towards the EU

**Individual Cohesion**
- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval
- Expectations

**Structural Cohesion**
- Resilience

**Economic Ties**
- Funding
- Policy Integration
- Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gains: +2.0, +0.8, +0.7, +0.5, +0.4, +0.3, +0.2, +0.1, 0.0, -0.1
Losses: -0.2, -0.3, -0.5, -0.8, -1.1

**Overall Results Countries & Groups**
ecfr.eu/eucohensionmonitor

**RETHINK: EUROPE**
About  Composition  Overall Results  Rankings  Countries & Groups
Funding 11-year trend

F1 EU spending in country
F2 Contribution to the EU budget

Individual Cohesion
Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Expectations

Structural Cohesion
Resilience
Economic Ties

Funding
Policy Integration
Security

2007 2017
Gains +4.5 +3.6 +2.8 +2.6 +2.1 +1.9 +1.0 +0.6
12

Losses -0.1 -0.2 -0.5 -0.7
10

Bulgaria 2.9 7.4
Romania 2.2 5.8
Hungary 3.7 6.5
Czech Rep. 2.5 5.1
Slovakia 3.2 5.3
Croatia 1.2 3.1
Poland 3.6 4.6
Estonia 4.0 4.6
Latvia 4.5 5.1
Luxembourg 7.9 8.4
Slovenia 2.6 3.1
Belgium 4.3 4.4

Austria 2.9 2.9
France 3.0 3.0
Greece 5.1 5.1
Italy 3.0 3.0
Lithuania 5.4 5.4
UK 2.6 2.6

Sweden 2.8 2.7
Denmark 3.0 2.9
Finland 3.1 3.0
Germany 2.9 2.7
Netherlands 2.8 2.6
Cyprus 2.6 2.4
Spain 2.8 2.3
Ireland 2.9 2.2
Malta 4.1 3.4
Portugal 4.0 3.3

EU spending in country
Contribution to the EU budget

Overall Results Countries & Groups ecf.eu.eucohesionmonitor
Security 11-year trend

Individual Cohesion
- Experience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval
- Expectations

Structural Cohesion
- Resilience
- Economic Ties
- Funding
- Policy Integration

Security

Participation in multinational deployments
- F1

Multinational commands and forces
- F2

Multinational development and procurement
- F3

Overall Results Countries & Groups ecfr.eu/ecohesionmonitor

Sweden 1.6 4.1
Poland 2.1 4.5
Germany 5.0 7.0
Spain 4.7 6.6
UK 4.1 5.9
Finland 2.1 3.9
Croatia 1.1 2.7
Romania 2.0 3.6
Czech Rep. 1.7 3.3
France 4.6 6.0
Netherlands 3.8 5.2
Bulgaria 1.7 3.1
Italy 5.4 6.7
Austria 1.9 3.0
Hungary 2.0 3.1
Luxembourg 3.4 4.4
Greece 1.7 2.7
Belgium 3.8 4.8
Lithuania 2.1 3.1
Slovakia 2.0 3.0
Estonia 2.4 3.3
Denmark 2.4 3.1
Portugal 2.4 3.1
Latvia 2.4 3.0
Slovenia 2.1 2.7
Cyprus 1.0 1.3
Ireland 2.3 2.3
Malta 1.0 1.0
Using quartile calculation, the graph shows the different data distributions for all indicators on the scale from 1 to 10.

EU28 2017 vs. EU28 2007

**Data Distribution**

- **Experience**
  - EU28: 3.9 | 5.8 | 8.9

- **Resilience**
  - EU28: 3.4 | 5.7 | 7.8

- **Engagement**
  - EU28: 2.2 | 7.5 | 10.0

- **Attitudes**
  - EU28: 2.6 | 6.1 | 8.8

- **Approval**
  - EU28: 2.3 | 5.4 | 7.8

- **Expectations**
  - EU28: 2.4 | 6.1 | 8.7

- **Security**
  - EU28: 1.0 | 3.3 | 7.0

- **Economic Ties**
  - EU28: 2.8 | 5.9 | 8.5

- **Funding**
  - EU28: 2.2 | 3.3 | 8.4

- **Policy Integration**
  - EU28: 1.5 | 6.6 | 7.0

- **Resilience**
  - EU28: 1.0 | 3.3 | 7.0

**Countries & Groups**

- 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

**EU28**

- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

**Quartiles**

- Maximum
- Q75
- Q50/Median
- Q25
- Minimum

- A quarter of the countries is in the top range
- Half of the countries are in the middle range
- A quarter of the countries is in the bottom range
EU28 2017 vs. Eurogroup 2017

Overall Results
- Individual Cohesion
- Structural Cohesion

Attitudes
- Experience
- Resilience
- Engagement
- Economic Ties
- Policy Integration
- Approval
- Expectations
- Security
- Funding

EU28
- 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

Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

EU28 2017 vs. EU28 2007:
- 5.1
- 5.1
- 6.1
- 4.8

EU28 2017 vs. Eurogroup 2017:
- +0.4 in relation to EU28
- +0.1 in relation to EU28

* Overall Results
* Profile
**EU28 2017 vs. Affluent Seven 2017**

- 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

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

**Overall Results**
- Individual Cohesion
- Structural Cohesion

**Profile**
- Experience
- Resilience
- Engagement
- Attitudes
- Approval
- Security
- Economic Ties
- Policy Integration
- Funding

**Comparisons**
- EU28 2017 vs. EU28 2007
- Affluent Seven 2017

**Values**
- +0.4 in relation to EU28
- +0.3 in relation to EU28
EU28 2017 vs. Southern Seven 2017

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

EU28
- 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

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven

Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Experience

Resilience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Overall Results

Profile

0.0 in relation to EU28

-0.4 in relation to EU28

* Overall Results
* Profile
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EU28 2017 vs. Big Six 2017

Overall Results

- Attitudes
  - EU28 2017 vs. Big Six 2017
    - Differences in relation to EU28: -0.5
    - Differences in relation to Big Six: -0.1

- Engagement
  - Experience
  - Resilience

- Security
  - Economic Ties
  - Policy Integration

Countries & Groups

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

* Italy
* Latvia
* Lithuania
* Luxembourg
* Malta
* Netherlands

EU28
Eurogroup
New Hanse
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven

Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

* Poland
* Portugal
* Romania
* Slovakia
* Slovenia

* Spain
* Sweden
* UK
Overall Results

Profile

EU28 2017 vs. Visegrád Four 2017

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

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

EU28
Eurogroup
New Hanse
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Resilience

Economic Ties

Engagement

Approval

Expectations

- 1.3 in relation to EU28
+ 0.5 in relation to EU28
Austria 2017 vs. Austria 2007

EU28 2017

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Experience

+ 1.5*

Resilience

0.0

Economic Ties

0.1

Funding

0.0

Policy Integration

0.2

Attitudes

0.2

Approval

0.8

Expectations

0.1

Security

1.1

Overall Results

Countries & Groups

eucohesionmonitor

RETHINK: EUROPE

About Composition Overall Results Rankings

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
Overall Results

Countries & Groups
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ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Security
Policy Integration
Funding
Resilience
Economic Ties

Austria 2017 vs. Austria 2007
EU28 2017

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Cyprus
Croatia
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltic
- Benelux
- Nordics

Individual Cohesion
Structural Cohesion

Austria 2017 vs. Austria 2007
EU28 2017

-0.4
+0.1

6.2
6.1
5.7
5.2
5.1
4.6

in relation to EU28

RETHINK: EUROPE

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
Belgium 2017 vs. Belgium 2007

**Individual Cohesion**
- Belgium 2017: 7.2
- Belgium 2007: 5.9
- EU28 2017: 5.9

**Structural Cohesion**
- Belgium 2017: 7.2
- Belgium 2007: 5.9
- EU28 2017: 5.9

**Experience**
- EU28: +1.0

**Resilience**
- EU28: +0.3

**Engagement**
- EU28: +1.2

**Attitudes**
- EU28: +1.0

**Approval**
- EU28: +1.4

**Expectations**
- EU28: +0.2

**Security**
- EU28: +1.0

**Economic Ties**
- EU28: +0.1

**Policy Integration**
- EU28: +0.0

**Funding**
- EU28: +0.1

**Top 5 gain**
- Italy
- Maltese
- Malta
- Germany
- Slovakia

**Bottom 5 loss**
- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Denmark
Bulgaria 2017 vs. Bulgaria 2007 EU28 2017

Overall Results

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

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

EU28  Eurogroup  New Hanse  Affluent Seven  Southern Seven  Big Six  Founding Six

Southeast Four  Visegrád Four  Baltics  Benelux  Nordics

Experience 23.
Resilience 27.
Engagement 12.
Attitudes 14.
Approval 18.
Expectations 22.
Security 15.

Funding 2.
Policy Integration 22.
Economic Ties 17.
Overall Results

Countries & Groups

About
Composition
Overall Results
Rankings
Countries & Groups

Experience: +0.8
Resilience: +0.4
Economic Ties: +0.2
Funding: +4.5
Policy Integration: +0.1
Security: +1.4
Expectations: +0.5
Approval: +0.1
Engagement: +1.1
Attitudes: 1.0

Bulgaria 2017 vs. Bulgaria 2007

EU28 2017
Bulgaria 2017 vs. Bulgaria 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

Experience
Resilience
Economic Ties
Policy Integration
Security
Funding

Attitudes
Approval
Expectations

Individual Cohesion
Structural Cohesion

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Cyprus
Croatia
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28
Eurogroup
New Hanse
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrad Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

-0.3 in relation to EU28
-0.1 in relation to EU28
Croatia 2017 vs. Croatia 2007 EU28 2017

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

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

EU28
Eurogroup
New Hanse
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Expectations

Approval

Attitudes

Engagement

Approval

Expectations

Attitudes

Engagement

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Overall Results

Countries & Groups

Overall Results
Croatia 2017 vs. Croatia 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Approval

Expectations

Security

Attitudes

- 0.2 in relation to EU28

- 1.0 in relation to EU28

EU28

Eurogroup

New Hanse

Affluent Seven

Southern Seven

Big Six

Founding Six

Southeast Four

Visegrad Four

Benelux

Nordics

Austria

Belgium

Bulgaria

Croatia

Cyprus

Czech Rep.

Denmark

Estonia

Finland

France

Germany

Greece

Hungary

Ireland

Italy

Latvia

Luxembourg

Malta

Netherlands

Poland

Portugal

Romania

Slovakia

Slovenia

Spain

Sweden

UK

Croatia 2017 vs. Croatia 2007

EU28 2017

- 0.2 in relation to EU28

- 1.0 in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28
Overall Results

Countries & Groups

eurohesionmonitor

Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Expectations
Security
Policy Integration
Funding
Economic Ties
Resilience

Cyprus 2017 vs. Cyprus 2007 EU28 2017

Individual Cohesion
Structural Cohesion

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Cyprus 2017 vs. Cyprus 2007 EU28 2017

6.3
3.7

EU28

Rank in EU28

Overall Results

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor
Overall Results

Countries & Groups

Experience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Resilience

Security

Policy Integration

Funding

Economic Ties

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Bulgaria</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Czech Rep.</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Estonia</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>EU28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Results

- Experience: 2.
- Engagement: 10.
- Attitudes: 16.
- Approval: 13.
- Expectations: 7.
- Policy Integration: 1.
- Funding: 10.

Comparative Performance:

- Estonia 2017 vs. Estonia 2007
- EU28 2017

Rankings:

- Individual Cohesion
- Structural Cohesion

Note: Specific performance metrics and rankings are not detailed in the image.
Overall Results

Countries & Groups

- Estonia 2017 vs. Estonia 2007
- EU28 2017

- Individual Cohesion
- Structural Cohesion

- Experience: +1.6 since 2007
- Resilience: +0.5 since 2007
- Engagement: 0.0
- Economic Ties: +0.1
- Attitudes: 0.1
- Funding: +0.6
- Approval: 0.5
- Policy Integration: +2.0
- Expectations: 1.2
- Security: 0.9

Top 5 gain
Bottom 5 loss

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28
* Eurogroup
* New Hanse
* Affluent Seven
* Southern Seven
* Big Six
* Founding Six
* Southeast Four
* Visegrád Four
* Baltics
* Benelux
* Nordics
* Top 5 gain
* Bottom 5 loss

Estonia 2017 vs. Estonia 2007 EU28 2017

RETHINK: EUROPE
Finland 2017 vs. Finland 2007

**Overall Results**
- Experience: +0.9 since 2007
- Resilience: +0.1 since 2007
- Engagement: +1.6
- Attitudes: +2.4*
- Approval: -0.8
- Expectations: +1.7*
- Security: +1.8*
- Economic Ties: +0.3
- Funding: +0.1

**Individual Cohesion**
- 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

**Structural Cohesion**
- EU28
  - Eurogroup
  - New Hanse
  - Affluent Seven
  - Southern Seven
  - Big Six
  - Founding Six
  - Southeast Four
  - Visegrád Four
  - Baltics
  - Benelux
  - Nordics

**EU28 2017**
- Finland 2017 vs. Finland 2007
- EU28 2017

**Top 5 gain**
- *Top 5 gain*
- *Bottom 5 loss*
France 2017 vs. France 2007 EU28 2017

Overall Results

Experience

Resilience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Security

Funding

Policy Integration

Economic Ties

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Bulgaria</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Czech Rep.</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Estonia</th>
<th>Finland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

France 2017 vs. France 2007 EU28 2017

Overall Results in relation to EU28

- 0.4
+ 0.2

Experience

Resilience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Security

Funding

Policy Integration

Economic Ties
Germany 2017 vs. Germany 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

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

EU28

- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Experience

Resilience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

+ 0.4 in relation to EU28

+ 0.5 in relation to EU28

Germany 2017 vs. Germany 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

Overall Results

About  Composition  Overall Results  Rankings  Countries & Groups
Hungary 2017 vs. Hungary 2007 EU28 2017

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

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  EU28  Eurogroup  New Hanse  Affluent Seven  Southern Seven  Big Six  Founding Six  Southeast Four  Visegrád Four  Baltics  Benelux  Nordics

Experience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

Resilience

Economic Ties

Approval

Expectations

Security

Resilience

Economic Ties

Policy Integration

Funding

Experience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Security

Resilience

Economic Ties

Policy Integration

Funding

Overall Results

Countries & Groups
Ireland 2017 vs. Ireland 2007 EU28 2017

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Austria    Belgium    Croatia    Cyprus    Czech Rep.    Denmark    Estonia    Finland    France    Germany    Greece    Hungary    Ireland

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrad Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

EU28 rank in EU28

Overall Results

Experience

Resilience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Security

Economic Ties

Policy Integration

Funding

26. rank in EU28

9. rank in EU28

8. rank in EU28

6. rank in EU28

5. rank in EU28

4. rank in EU28

28. rank in EU28

25. rank in EU28

22. rank in EU28
Ireland 2017 vs. Ireland 2007 EU28 2017

Overall Results

Experience (+0.8)
Resilience (-0.6)
Economic Ties (-1.1)
Funding (+0.7)
Policy Integration (+0.5)
Security (-0.0)

Engagement (-0.5)
Attitudes (+1.0)
Approval (+0.2)
Expectations (+2.5*)

Individual Cohesion
Structural Cohesion

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Cyprus
Croatia
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Top 5 gain
Bottom 5 loss

Ireland 2017 vs. Ireland 2007 EU28 2017

RETHINK: EUROPE
Italy 2017 vs. Italy 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

Countries & Groups

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Policy Integration

Funding

Security

Approval

Expectations

Attitudes

Engagement

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
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

EU28

• Eurogroup
• New Hanse
• Affluent Seven
• Southern Seven
• Big Six
• Founding Six
• Southeast Four
• Visegrad Four
• Baltics
• Benelux
• Nordics

1. Policy Integration
2. Security
10. Expectations
20. Approval
23. rank in EU28
24. rank in EU28
26. Economic Ties
20. Engagement
21. rank in EU28
5.1

Overall Results
Italy 2017 vs. Italy 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

Countries & Groups

Experience
Resilience
Economic Ties
Funding
Policy Integration
Security

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28

* Eurogroup
* New Hanse
* Affluent Seven
* Southern Seven
* Big Six
* Founding Six
* Southeast Four
* Visegrád Four
* Baltics
* Benelux
* Nordics

Attitudes

Funding

-1.0

0.0

in relation to EU28

in relation to EU28

Italy 2017 vs. Italy 2007

EU28 2017

Italy

2007 09 11 13 15 17

Structural Cohesion

Individual Cohesion

2007 09 11 13 15 17
### Latvia 2017 vs. Latvia 2007 EU28 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Individual Cohesion</th>
<th>Structural Cohesion</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>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</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>Poland</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>Slovenia</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU28</th>
<th>Individual Cohesion</th>
<th>Structural Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eurogroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent Seven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Seven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visegrad Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benelux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in EU28</th>
<th>Latvia 2007</th>
<th>Latvia 2017</th>
<th>EU28 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Luxembourg 2017 vs. Luxembourg 2007 EU28 2017

Overall Results Countries & Groups

Experience 1.  
Resilience 1.  
Economic Ties 2.  
Funding 1.  
Policy Integration 1.  
Expectations 10.  
Approval 3.  
Attitudes 1.  
Engagement 1.  
Structural Cohesion 1.  
Individual Cohesion 1.  

Austria  
Belgium  
Bulgaria  
Cyprus  
Croatia  
Czech Rep.  
Denmark  
Estonia  
Finland  
France  
Germany  
Greece  
Hungary  
Ireland  
Italy  
Latvia  
Lithuania  
Malta  
Netherlands  
Poland  
Portugal  
Romania  
Slovakia  
Slovenia  
Spain  
Sweden  
UK  
EU28  
- Eurogroup  
- New Hanse  
- Affluent Seven  
- Southern Seven  
- Big Six  
- Founding Six  
- Southeast Four  
- Visegrád Four  
- Baltics  
- Benelux  
- Nordics  

Luxembourg 2017   vs.   Luxembourg 2007    EU28 2017

8.3  
7.1  
1.

Overall Results
Malta 2017 vs. Malta 2007

Overall Results

Experience +2.5*
Resilience +1.1*
Engagement 0.0
Economic Ties +2.0*
Funding -0.7
Policy Integration +1.5*
Approval +0.6*
Security 0.0
Expectations +1.4*

Individual Cohesion
Structural Cohesion

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Cyprus
Croatia
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

* Top 5 gain
Bottom 5 loss

Malta
Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg

Malta 2017 vs. Malta 2007 EU28 2017

Overall Results

Top 5 gain
Bottom 5 loss

+ 1.1 since 2007
+ 0.8 since 2007
+ 0.6
+ 0.6
+ 0.7
+ 0.8
+ 1.1
+ 1.4
+ 1.5
+ 2.0
+ 2.5
+ 4.1
+ 4.9
+ 5.6
+ 7.5
Malta 2017 vs. Malta 2007

Overall Results

In relation to EU28

Experience

Resilience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

EU28 2017

+ 1.4

in relation to EU28

- 0.2

in relation to EU28

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

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

EU28
• Eurogroup
• New Hanse
• Affluent Seven
• Southern Seven
• Big Six
• Founding Six
• Southeast Four
• Visegrád Four
• Baltics
• Benelux
• Nordics

Malta 2017 vs. Malta 2007

EU28 2017
Netherlands 2017 vs. Netherlands 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Experience

Resilience

Engagement

Economic Ties

Attitudes

Funding

Approval

Policy Integration

Expectations

Security

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28

- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Netherlands

Comparisons:

Individual Cohesion

- 2007 vs. 2017

Structural Cohesion

- 2007 vs. 2017

Comparison to EU28:

- 2007 vs. 2017

Overall Results:

- Experience
  - +0.6 in relation to EU28
- Resilience
  - +0.3 in relation to EU28
**Overall Results**

**Countries & Groups**

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

**Experience**

**Resilience**

**Engagement**

**Attitudes**

**Approval**

**Expectations**

**Security**

**Economic Ties**

**Funding**

**Policy Integration**

**Funding**

Poland 2017 vs. Poland 2007 EU28 2017

### Individual Cohesion

- 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
- EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

### Structural Cohesion

- 10
- 8
- 6
- 4
- 2
- 10
- 8
- 6
- 4
- 2
- 10
- 8
- 6
- 4
- 2
Overall Results
Countries & Groups
ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Experience
Engagement
Attitudes
Approval
Expectations
Security
Policy Integration
Funding
Economic Ties
Resilience

Portugal 2017 vs. Portugal 2007 EU28 2017

Individual Cohesion
Structural Cohesion

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Cyprus
Croatia
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Benelux
- Baltics
- Nordics

Portugal

2007 09 11 13 15 17
2007 09 11 13 15 17

6.6
4.8

**Overall Results**
Portugal 2017 vs. Portugal 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results
- Individual Cohesion
  - 2007 09 11 13 15 17
  - 5.5 6.6 4.7 4.8

- Structural Cohesion
  - 2007 09 11 13 15 17

EU28
- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrad Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Top 5 gain
- Experience +1.2
- Engagement +0.3
- Attitudes +0.9
- Approval +0.5 *
- Expectations +3.0 *
- Security +0.7

Bottom 5 loss
- Resilience -0.0
- Funding -0.7 *
- Economic Ties +0.2
- Policy Integration +0.6

* Top 5 gain
  / Bottom 5 loss

Since 2007

Portugal 2017 vs. Portugal 2007 EU28 2017

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

About Composition Overall Results Rankings Countries & Groups ecf.eu/eucohesionmonitor
Romania 2017 vs. Romania 2007 EU28 2017

Overall Results

Countries & Groups

Experience 27.
Resilience 22.
Economic Ties 10.
Funding 4.
Policy Integration 22.
Security 12.
Approval 16.
Expectations 3.
Attitudes 10.
Engagement 8.

Individual Cohesion
2007 09 11 13 15 17

Structural Cohesion
10 10 88 66 44 22

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28
Eurogroup
New Hanse
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

Romania

EU28 rank in
27.
8.
10.
16.
3.
22.
10.
4.
22.
12.

Romania 2017

EU28 2017

6.3
5.1
Spain 2017 vs. Spain 2007 EU28 2017

Overall Results

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Austria Belgium Bulgaria Croatia Cyprus Czech Rep. Denmark Estonia Finland France Germany Greece Hungary Ireland

EU28

- Eurogroup
- New Hanse
- Affluent Seven
- Southern Seven
- Big Six
- Founding Six
- Southeast Four
- Visegrád Four
- Baltics
- Benelux
- Nordics

Spain

Italy Latvia Lithuania Luxembourg Malta Netherlands Poland Portugal Romania Slovakia Slovenia Sweden UK

EU28 rank in

Overall Results

Experience 15.
Resilience 25.
Economic Ties 20.
Funding 27.
Policy Integration 15.
Security 3.
Expectations 13.
Approval 1.
Engagement 6.
Attitudes 18.

Spain 2017

Spain 2007

EU28 2017

6.8

4.9

15.

6.

18.

25.

20.

13.

1.

6.

19.

27.

15.

3.

19.

6.

19.

6.

11.

13.

15.

17.

2007 09 11 13 15 17

2007 09 11 13 15 17
Sweden 2017 vs. Sweden 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

Countries & Groups

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Funding

Policy Integration

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Security

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Cyprus
Croatia
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland

EU28
Eurogroup
New Hanse
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrád Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics

Top 5 gain
Bottom 5 loss

Sweden

Top 5 gain
Bottom 5 loss

EU28 2017 vs. Sweden 2007

Sweden 2017 vs. Sweden 2007

EU28 2017
Sweden 2017 vs. Sweden 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

In relation to EU28

- 0.3

- 0.3

in relation to EU28

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Policy Integration

Funding

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Security

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Austria    Belgium    Bulgaria    Croatia    Cyprus    Czech Rep.    Denmark    Estonia    Finland    France    Germany    Greece    Hungary    Ireland

EU28    Eurogroup
• New Hanse
• Affluent Seven
• Southern Seven
• Big Six
• Founding Six
• Southeast Four
• Visegrad Four

Benelux
• Nordics

Sweden

Sweden 2017 vs. Sweden 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

In relation to EU28

- 0.3

- 0.3

in relation to EU28

Experience

Resilience

Economic Ties

Policy Integration

Funding

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Security

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

Austria    Belgium    Bulgaria    Croatia    Cyprus    Czech Rep.    Denmark    Estonia    Finland    France    Germany    Greece    Hungary    Ireland

EU28    Eurogroup
• New Hanse
• Affluent Seven
• Southern Seven
• Big Six
• Founding Six
• Southeast Four
• Visegrad Four

Benelux
• Nordics

Sweden
UK 2017 vs. UK 2007

EU28 2017

Overall Results

Individual Cohesion

Structural Cohesion

UK 2017 vs. UK 2007

EU28 2017

Experience

Resilience

Engagement

Attitudes

Approval

Expectations

Funding

Policy Integration

Security

- 1.8 in relation to EU28

- 1.4 in relation to EU28

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
EU28
Eurogroup
New Hanse
Affluent Seven
Southern Seven
Big Six
Founding Six
Southeast Four
Visegrad Four
Baltics
Benelux
Nordics
EU28

Overall Results

in relation to EU28

6.2
6.1
4.3
5.1
3.7
4.6
4.3
3.7
6.2
6.1
4.6
5.1
3.7
4.3