



## **Flash Eurobarometer 422**

# **CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION IN THE EU**

## **SUMMARY**

Fieldwork: June 2015

Publication: September 2015

This survey has been requested by the European Commission, Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy and co-ordinated by Directorate-General for Communication.

This document does not represent the point of view of the European Commission.  
The interpretations and opinions contained in it are solely those of the authors.

**Flash Eurobarometer 422 - TNS Political & Social**

**Project title** Flash Eurobarometer 422  
"Cross-border cooperation in  
the EU"

**Linguistic Version** EN

**Catalogue Number** KN-04-15-608-EN-N

**ISBN** 978-92-79-50789-2

**DOI** 10.2776/964957

© European Union, 2015

## **Flash Eurobarometer 422**

# **Cross-border cooperation in the EU**

Conducted by TNS Political & Social at the request of the European Commission, Directorate-General Regional and Urban Policy

Survey co-ordinated by the European Commission, Directorate-General for Communication (DG COMM "Strategy, Corporate Communication Actions and Eurobarometer" Unit)

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**INTRODUCTION ..... 2**

**I. Awareness of EU regional policy-funded cross-border cooperation activities 6**

**II. Going abroad to other countries ..... 10**

**III. social trust of the EU population living in border regions covered by the Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes ..... 16**

**IV. Living in a border region: an obstacle or an opportunity?..... 26**

**V. Obstacles to cross-border cooperation between border regions covered by an Interreg cross-border cooperation programme ..... 29**

**ANNEXES**

**Technical specifications**

## INTRODUCTION

For the last 25 years European Territorial Cooperation (ETC), known as Interreg, has promoted the harmonious economic, social and territorial development of the EU as a whole. Starting as a community initiative with 11 participating Member States and a budget of 1.1 billion, it has grown to benefit all 28 Member States, with a budget of 10.1 billion euros. Although initially only covering cross-border cooperation, Interreg has expanded to encompass three strands of cooperation: cross-border (Interreg A), transnational (Interreg B) and interregional (Interreg C). Interreg has become a key instrument in supporting and promoting cross-border cooperation across a range of fields including health, education and transport<sup>1</sup>.

Interreg A (cross-border cooperation) supports cooperation between adjacent NUTS III border regions in at least two different EU Member States or between EU Member States and some countries outside the EU. It aims to develop the untapped growth potential of border areas, as well as enhancing cooperation to support the harmonious development of the Union. The EU includes substantial border regions: 37.5% of the EU population live in the border areas defined by 38 international borders<sup>2</sup>.

Borders often represent barriers to harmonious development, as well as being symbols of a past, less unified Europe. A lack of trust and generally negative attitudes towards the citizens of neighbouring countries also pose a challenge. A lack of trust makes people less willing to cooperate, which leads to lost opportunities to maximise the benefits that could flow from the Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes.

This survey was commissioned to improve understanding of these issues of trust and co-operation, and how they may impact on these programmes. It explores a range of issues, including:

- Awareness of cross-border cooperation programmes running in the respondent's area,
- Travel abroad in general, and to partner countries in particular,
- Reasons for travelling to partner countries,
- General trust in others,
- Attitudes towards citizens of neighbouring countries in specific social categories or situations (work, family, neighbours),
- Whether living in a border region is viewed as an opportunity or an obstacle, and
- Specific obstacles to cross-border cooperation between border regions.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/fr/policy/cooperation/european-territorial/](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/fr/policy/cooperation/european-territorial/)

<sup>2</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/fr/policy/cooperation/european-territorial/cross-border/](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/fr/policy/cooperation/european-territorial/cross-border/)

The survey was conducted among citizens living in the border regions covered by the Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes. In total 54 Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes were considered<sup>3</sup>.

Throughout this summary, programmes are identified by a number, followed by the name of the countries concerned. For example, "CB053 Slovenia-Hungary" represents the Interreg cross-border cooperation programme between Slovenia and Hungary<sup>4</sup>.

This survey was carried out by TNS Political & Social network in the border regions covered by the Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes of the 28 Member States of the European Union, Norway and Switzerland between 10 and 30 June 2015. Some 40 619 respondents from different social and demographic groups were interviewed by telephone (landline and mobile phone) in their mother tongue on behalf of the European Commission, DG Regional and Urban Policy. The methodology used is that of Eurobarometer surveys as carried out by the Directorate-General for Communication ("Strategy, Corporate Communication Actions and Eurobarometer" Unit)<sup>5</sup>. A technical note on the manner in which interviews were conducted by the Institutes within the TNS Political & Social network is appended to this report. Also included are the interview methods and confidence intervals<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> The definition of programmes adopted was that of the 2013 Regulation that entered into force in 2015 and only regions marked with "\*" in the regulation were considered. (Source: [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2014.183.01.0075.01.ENG](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2014.183.01.0075.01.ENG)). For programmes marked by an asterisk and highlighted in the abbreviations table on the following page (only programmes involving Austria or Germany) the sampling frame included all NUTS3 regions associated with the programmes and not only those eligible for the ERDF allocation distribution

<sup>4</sup> In the case of the two cross-border cooperation programmes "CB006 Spain-France-Andorra (POCTEFA)" and "CB024 Germany-Austria-Switzerland-Liechtenstein", the survey was not conducted among respondents in Andorra and Liechtenstein.

<sup>5</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm)

<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that the total of the percentages in the tables of this report may exceed 100% when the respondent could give several answers to the question.

**Note:** In this report, countries are referred to by their official abbreviation. The abbreviations used in this report correspond to:

ABBREVIATIONS			
BE	Belgium	LT	Lithuania
BG	Bulgaria	LU	Luxembourg
CZ	Czech Republic	HU	Hungary
DK	Denmark	MT	Malta
DE	Germany	NL	The Netherlands
EE	Estonia	AT	Austria
IE	Ireland	PL	Poland
EL	Greece	PT	Portugal
ES	Spain	RO	Romania
FR	France	SI	Slovenia
HR	Croatia	SK	Slovakia
IT	Italy	FI	Finland
CY	Republic of Cyprus*	SE	Sweden
LV	Latvia	UK	The United Kingdom
CH	Switzerland	EU28	European Union – 28 Member States
NO	Norway		

\* Cyprus as a whole is one of the 28 European Union Member States. However, the 'acquis communautaire' has been suspended in the part of the country which is not controlled by the government of the Republic of Cyprus. For practical reasons, only the interviews carried out in the part of the country controlled by the government of the Republic of Cyprus are included in the 'CY' category and in the EU28 average.

**Note:** The 54 Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes referred to in this report are listed below:

ABBREVIATIONS	
CB001 Belgium-Germany-Netherlands	CB029 Slovenia-Croatia
CB002 Austria-Czech Republic*	CB030 Slovakia-Czech Republic
CB003 Slovakia-Austria*	CB031 Lithuania-Poland
CB004 Austria-Germany/Bavaria*	CB032 Sweden-Finland-Norway (Nord)
CB005 Spain-Portugal (POCTEP)	CB033 Italy-France (Maritime)
CB006 Spain-France-Andorra (POCTEFA)	CB034 France-Italy (ALCOTRA)
CB008 Hungary-Croatia	CB035 Italy-Switzerland
CB009 Germany/Bavaria-Czech Republic*	CB036 Italy-Slovenia
CB010 Austria-Hungary*	CB037 Italy-Malta
CB011 Germany/Brandenburg-Poland*	CB038 France-Belgium-Netherlands-United Kingdom (Two seas)
CB012 Poland-Slovakia	CB039 France-Germany-Switzerland (Rhin supérieur-Oberrhein)
CB013 Poland-Denmark-Germany-Lithuania-Sweden (South Baltic)*	CB040 France-United Kingdom (Manche - Channel)
CB014 Finland-Estonia-Latvia-Sweden (Central Baltic)	CB041 France-Switzerland
CB015 Slovakia-Hungary	CB042 Italy-Croatia
CB016 Sweden-Norway	CB044 Belgium-France (France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen)
CB017 Germany/Saxony-Czech Republic*	CB045 France-Belgium-Germany-Luxembourg (Grande Région)*
CB018 Poland-Germany/Saxony	CB046 Belgium-The Netherlands (Vlaanderen-Nederland)
CB019 Germany (Mecklenburg-West Pomerania/Brandenburg)-Poland	CB047 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-North Ireland/Scotland)
CB020 Greece-Italy	CB048 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-Wales)
CB021 Romania-Bulgaria	CB049 Hungary-Romania
CB022 Greece-Bulgaria	CB050 Estonia-Latvia
CB023 Germany-The Netherlands*	CB052 Italy-Austria
CB024 Germany-Austria-Switzerland-Liechtenstein*	CB053 Slovenia-Hungary
CB025 Czech Republic-Poland	CB054 Slovenia-Austria*
CB026 Sweden-Denmark-Norway (Öresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak)	CB055 Greece-Cyprus
CB027 Latvia-Lithuania	CB056 Germany-Denmark
CB028 Sweden-Finland-Norway (Botnia-Atlantica)	PC001 Ireland-United Kingdom (PEACE)

\* For programmes marked by an asterisk and highlighted (only programmes involving Austria or Germany) the sampling frame included all NUTS3 regions associated with the programmes and not only those eligible for the ERDF allocation distribution

\* \* \* \* \*

*We wish to thank the people throughout Europe, Switzerland and Norway who have given their time to take part in this survey. Without their active participation, this study would not have been possible.*




## I. AWARENESS OF EU REGIONAL POLICY-FUNDED CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION ACTIVITIES

### - The majority of the people living in EU border regions are not aware of EU-funded cross-border cooperation activities in their region -

Respondents living in the border regions of the Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes<sup>7</sup> were asked whether they were aware of any EU-funded cross-border cooperation activities in their area<sup>8</sup>. Although almost one-third (31%) have heard about these activities - 12% have heard of them and know what they are, and 19% have heard of them, but do not know exactly what they are - most respondents have not heard of these activities in their region (68%).

Q1. Have you heard about any EU funded cross-border cooperation activities in the region where you live?



- Yes, and you know what they are
- Yes, but you do not know exactly what they are
- No
- Don't know


TOTAL

<sup>7</sup> Also known as Interreg CBC Programmes. These support cooperation between adjacent NUTS III border regions in at least two different EU Member States or between EU Member States and some countries outside the EU. The aim is to tackle common challenges identified jointly in the border regions and to exploit the untapped growth potential in border areas, while enhancing the cooperation process for the purposes of the overall harmonious development of the Union.


<sup>8</sup> Q1 Have you heard about any EU funded cross-border cooperation activities in the region where you live? Yes, and you know what they are; Yes, but you do not know exactly what they are; No; Don't know.

Respondents living in border regions covered by Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes in Eastern European countries and in Ireland are generally more likely to have heard about EU funded cross-border cooperation activities in their region. Awareness is highest in the Czech Republic (50%), Hungary (48%), and Ireland and Bulgaria (both 43%), and lowest in Cyprus (13%) and the UK (14%).

**Q1 Have you heard about any EU funded cross-border cooperation activities in the region where you live?**



Results presented do not represent the overall view of residents in a country, but the average view of respondents in the border regions covered by cross-border cooperation programmes



**Q1: Have you heard about any EU funded cross-border cooperation activities in the region where you live?**

**% yes**


- ≤ 25.0%
- 25.1% - 28.0%
- 28.1% - 34.0%
- > 34.0%

0 500 Km

© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries

An analysis of the highest and lowest levels of awareness at the overall programme level reveals that respondents are the most likely to have heard about cross-border cooperation activities in the regions covered by the following programmes: *PC001 Ireland-United Kingdom (PEACE)*, *(CB053) Slovenia-Hungary*, *CB030 Slovakia-Czech Republic* (all 46%), *CB018 Poland-Germany/Saxony* (45%), *CB052 Italy-Austria* and *CB017 Germany/Saxony-Czech Republic* (both 44%).

In contrast, for the programmes *CB040 France-United Kingdom (Manche - Channel)*, *CB016 Sweden-Norway* and *CB048 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-Wales)* only 13%, 14% and 16% respectively of respondents living in these areas have heard about cross-border cooperation activities funded by the EU.



Highest and lowest results per programme


## II. GOING ABROAD TO OTHER COUNTRIES

This second section considers respondents' propensity to travel abroad in general, and to what extent those who travel abroad are inclined to travel to the country or countries covered by the Interreg cross-border cooperation programme in which their region participates. The reasons for travelling to other countries participating in the same programme are also analysed.

### - Just over three-quarters of respondents living in EU border regions have travelled abroad to another country –

Respondents were asked how often they travel abroad<sup>9</sup>. Just 6% travel abroad several times a month, with a further 4% travelling once a month. Around a quarter (26%) travel abroad several times a year, while 40% do so once a year or less often. Almost a quarter (24%) never travel abroad.

D7. How often do you go abroad to other countries?




<sup>9</sup> D7 How often do you go abroad to other countries? Several times a month; Once a month; Several times a year; Once a year or less often; Never, Don't know.

The following table and map shows that respondents living in border regions covered by Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes in Scandinavian and Central European countries are more likely to travel abroad than those living in the border regions of other EU Member States. Respondents in Norway and Switzerland are the most likely to do so (both 96%), followed by respondents living in Luxembourg (95%) and Austria (91%). In contrast, only 48% of respondents in Greece and 50% in Romania have ever travelled abroad.

#### D7 How often do you go abroad to other countries?

Total 'Goes abroad to other countries' (65% or below)		Total 'Goes abroad to other countries' (between 65.1% and 75%)		Total 'Goes abroad to other countries' (between 75.1% and 85%)		Total 'Goes abroad to other countries' (above 85%)	
ES	62%	CZ	73%	DE	81%	LU	95%
HU	62%	SK	72%	CY	81%	AT	91%
LT	60%	LV	70%	SI	81%	DK	90%
BG	56%	FR	69%	EE	79%	FI	89%
IT	56%	PL	67%	BE	78%	NL	88%
PT	55%	HR	66%	MT	78%	IE	87%
RO	50%			UK	77%	SE	86%
EL	48%						
						NO	96%
						CH	96%

Results presented do not represent the overall view of residents in a country, but the average view of respondents in the border regions covered by cross-border cooperation programmes



D7: How often do you go abroad to other countries?

% goes abroad to other countries

- ≤ 65.0%
- 65.1% - 75.0%
- 75.1% - 85.0%
- > 85.0%

0 500 Km


© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries

**- The majority of the people living in EU border regions have travelled to a neighbouring country covered by an Interreg cross-border cooperation programme in their region for at least one reason–**

Respondents who had travelled abroad were asked if they had travelled, for a range of reasons, to another country or countries covered by a programme running in their region<sup>10</sup>. The summarised results from all of these questions reveal that overall, 53% have travelled to another country covered by the same programme, while 47% have not.

The following table and map demonstrate that respondents in Luxemburg (82%), Ireland (78%), and the Netherlands (74%) are the most likely to have travelled to a neighbouring country for at least one reason. Respondents in Switzerland living in the border regions covered by the Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes are also amongst the respondents who are most likely to travel to a neighbouring country (79%). At the other end of the scale only 22% in Greece and 31% in Lithuania have done so.


**Q2T3 Going abroad to neighbouring countries**



Results presented do not represent the overall view of residents in a country, but the average view of respondents in the border regions covered by cross-border cooperation programmes

<sup>10</sup> Q2. How often do you go to [COUNTRY FROM PROGRAMME] for each of the following reasons? To visit family; To visit friends; To use public services (for example health or education services); To shop for goods or services (for example buying clothes or to visit a hairdresser); For work or business purposes; For leisure activities including tourist visits.





**Q2T3: Has travelled to a neighbouring country for at least one reason**

**% of all respondents**


- ≤ 39.0%
- 39.1% - 50.0%
- 50.1% - 61.0%
- > 61.0%

0 500 Km

© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries

**- Respondents living in border regions are most likely to travel to a partner country covered by an Interreg cross-border cooperation programme for leisure activities -**

An analysis of the reasons why respondents go abroad to a partner country shows that respondents in border regions are most likely to travel to neighbouring countries for leisure activities including tourist visits (44%), while 26% have travelled to shop for goods or services. Just under one in five (17%) have travelled to a partner country to visit friends, while around one in ten to visit family or for work or business purposes (both 11%). Respondents were least likely to have travelled to a partner country to use public services (7%).




### III. SOCIAL TRUST OF THE EU POPULATION LIVING IN BORDER REGIONS COVERED BY THE INTERREG CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION PROGRAMMES

This third section explores social trust, first addressing the general level of trust in other people, and secondly the feelings of trust respondents would have towards people from programme partner countries if they were their managers, co-workers, neighbours or family members.

#### - More than six out of ten agree that generally, most people can be trusted -

Respondents were asked if in general they thought most people could be trusted<sup>11</sup>. Overall 61% agree, with 16% strongly agreeing and 45% somewhat agreeing. Just over a quarter somewhat disagree (26%), while 12% strongly disagree.

Q4. Generally speaking, would you agree or disagree that most people can be trusted?




- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

TOTAL

<sup>11</sup> Q4 Generally speaking, would you agree or disagree that most people can be trusted? Strongly agree; Somewhat agree; Somewhat disagree; Strongly disagree; Don't know.

There is a wide variation in agreement across the programmes. In 42 programmes at least half agree to some degree that most people can be trusted. Respondents living in regions covered by *CB026 Sweden-Denmark-Norway (Öresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak)* (88%), *CB016 Sweden-Norway* (87%), *CB032 Sweden-Finland-Norway (Nord)* and *CB028 Sweden-Finland-Norway (Botnia-Atlantica)* (both 85%) are the most likely to agree.

At the other end of the scale those living in the border regions covered by *CB015 Slovakia-Hungary* (39%), *CB022 Greece-Bulgaria* (40%) and *CB030 Slovakia-Czech Republic* (41%) are the least likely to agree that most people can be trusted.




Highest and lowest results per programme

**- A large majority would feel comfortable with having a citizen of a partner country as a manager, work colleague, neighbour or family member –**

Respondents were also asked how comfortable or uncomfortable they would be about having a citizen of a partner (neighbouring) country as a manager, work colleague, neighbour or family member<sup>12</sup>. The summarised results of all of these questions show that more than eight out of ten respondents say they would feel comfortable about having a citizen of a partner country in any of these social categories (82%), while a small proportion (15%) say they would feel uncomfortable with at least one of the categories. Almost one in ten (9%) say they would feel uncomfortable with only one social category, while 7% would feel uncomfortable with two or more.

**Q3T1. Mutual social trust among people living in border regions**




TOTAL


<sup>12</sup> Q3 Would you personally feel comfortable or uncomfortable about having a citizen from [COUNTRY FROM PROGRAMME] as your ...? Manager; Work colleague; Neighbour; Family member.

The following tables and maps clearly illustrate that respondents in northern and western areas are the most likely to feel comfortable with having a citizen of a partner country as a manager, work colleague, neighbour or family member, followed by those in central areas. More than nine out of ten respondents in Finland, Sweden and Norway (all 93%) would feel comfortable with having a citizen of a partner country in any of the social categories, as would 92% of those in Ireland. This compares with 57% in Bulgaria, 65% in the Czech Republic and 66% in Poland, highlighting that at least half of all respondents in each country would feel comfortable with all these social categories.

**Q3T1 Would you personally feel comfortable or uncomfortable about having a citizen from a neighbouring country as your neighbour/ work colleague/ family member/ manager?**



Results presented do not represent the overall view of residents in a country, but the average view of respondents in the border regions covered by cross-border cooperation programmes



**Q3T1: Would you personally feel comfortable or uncomfortable about having a citizen from a neighbouring country as your neighbour / work colleague / family member / manager?**

**% feels comfortable**

- <= 77.0%
- 77.1% - 84.0%
- 84.1% - 88.0%
- > 88.0%




© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries

**- At least eight out of ten respondents would feel comfortable with a citizen of a partner country either as neighbour, work colleague, family member or manager –**

Turning to the level of comfort towards having a citizen of a partner country as a manager, work colleague, neighbour or family member, the chart below shows that at least eight out of ten respondents would feel comfortable with a citizen of a partner country in each of these categories. There is little difference between the degree of comfort that would be felt when having a citizen of a partner country as a neighbour (90%), work colleague (88%) or a family member (86%). Respondents would be slightly less likely to be comfortable with having a citizen of a partner country as a manager (80%).

Q3. Would you personally feel comfortable or uncomfortable about having a citizen from [COUNTRY FROM PROGRAMME] as your ... ?




As mentioned above, nine out of ten respondents (90%) overall, say they would feel comfortable having a citizen from a partner country **as a neighbour**. More than three-quarters of respondents in each programme say this.

Almost all respondents in *PC001 Ireland-United Kingdom (PEACE)*, *CB032 Sweden-Finland-Norway (Nord)*, *CB026 Sweden-Denmark-Norway (Öresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak)* and *CB016 Sweden-Norway* (all 98%) would feel comfortable with a citizen of a partner country as a neighbour.

This compares with 77% of those in *CB009 Germany/Bavaria-Czech Republic*.




Q3.3. Would you personally feel comfortable or uncomfortable about having a citizen from [COUNTRY FROM PROGRAMME] as your ...?  
Neighbour



Highest and lowest results per programme

The scatterplot below illustrates that there is a moderate positive correlation between respondents who agree that in general people can be trusted, and those who would be comfortable having a neighbour from a partner country.


In general the higher the proportion of respondents in a region who agree that people can be trusted, the higher the proportion who would be comfortable with a neighbour from a partner country.



Overall, 88% of respondents say they would feel comfortable having a citizen from a partner country **as a work colleague**. At least three-quarters of respondents in each programme say this.


Respondents in *CB026 Sweden-Denmark-Norway (Öresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak)* (97%), *PC001 Ireland-United Kingdom (PEACE)*, *CB048 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-Wales)*, *CB032 Sweden-Finland-Norway (Nord)*, and *CB016 Sweden-Norway* (all 96%) are the most likely to agree.

At the other end of the scale just 75% in *CB018 Poland-Germany/Saxony* do so.




Highest and lowest results per programme

As in the case of neighbours, there is a moderate positive correlation between respondents who agree that in general people can be trusted, and those who would be comfortable having a work colleague from a partner country. In general the higher the proportion of respondents in a region who agree that people can be trusted, the higher the proportion who would be comfortable with a colleague from a partner country.




Overall, almost nine out of ten respondents (86%) say they would feel comfortable having a citizen from a partner country **as a family member**. At least six out of ten respondents in each programme say they would feel comfortable.

Almost all respondents in *CB026 Sweden-Denmark-Norway (Öresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak)*, *CB016 Sweden-Norway* (both 97%), *PC001 Ireland-United Kingdom (PEACE)* and *CB044 Belgium-France (France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen)* (both 96%) would feel comfortable with a citizen of a partner country as a family member. At the other end of the scale 62% of those in *CB022 Greece-Bulgaria* and 72% in *CB021 Romania-Bulgaria* say the same.



Highest and lowest results per programme


The positive correlation between respondents who agree that in general people can be trusted and those who would be comfortable having a family member from a partner country, while still moderate, is weaker than for any of the other social categories asked about.



Overall 80% of respondents say they would feel comfortable with a citizen from a partner country **as a manager**. A majority of respondents agree within each programme.


Respondents in 57 IE/UK (PEACE), CB047 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-North Ireland/Scotland) (both 94%), CB032 Sweden-Finland-Norway (Nord), CB026 Sweden-Denmark-Norway (Öresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak) and CB016 Sweden-Norway (all 93%) are the most likely to agree.

At the other end of the scale 54% of respondents in CB022 Greece-Bulgaria, and 61% in CB011 Germany/Brandenburg-Poland and CB017 Germany/Saxony-Czech Republic (Saxony) also agree.



Highest and lowest results per programme

The scatterplot below illustrates a moderate positive correlation between respondents who agree that in general people can be trusted, and those who would be comfortable having a manager from a partner country. This is the strongest correlation of any of the categories.




#### IV. LIVING IN A BORDER REGION: AN OBSTACLE OR AN OPPORTUNITY?

##### - Respondents are more likely to think living in a border region is an opportunity than an obstacle -

Respondents were asked whether they thought living near the border with a partner country represented more of an obstacle, more of an opportunity, or had no impact<sup>13</sup>. The majority (55%) say it has no impact, while 37% consider it more of an opportunity, and just 4% say it is more of an obstacle.

Q5. Would you say that living near the border with [COUNTRY FROM PROGRAMME] represents ...




- More of an obstacle
- More of an opportunity
- It has no impact
- Don't know

TOTAL

<sup>13</sup> Q5 Would you say that living near the border with [COUNTRY FROM PROGRAMME] represents: More of an obstacle; More of an opportunity; It has no impact; Don't Know.

The majority of respondents living in regions covered by programmes *CB056 Germany-Denmark*, *CB037 Italy-Malta* (both 52%), and *CB010 Austria-Hungary* and *CB005 Spain-Portugal (POCTEP)* (both 51%) say that living near the border of the partner country is more of an opportunity. In contrast 18% of respondents living in the regions covered by *CB031 Lithuania-Poland* and *CB055 Greece-Cyprus* say the same.

It is worth noting that no more than one in ten respondents in every programme consider living near the border an obstacle.




#### Highest and lowest results per programme

The table below provides a more detailed analysis at the programme level, presenting the results for each region covered by a cross-border cooperation programme. It highlights the most notable differences between the regions of the partner countries covered by the same programme in terms of perceiving the border as an opportunity. The biggest difference (52 percentage points) was observed between respondents living in border regions covered by the programme *CB010 Austria-Hungary*, where Hungarian are more likely to perceive living near the border as an opportunity than respondents in Austria.

Q5. Would you say that living near the border with [COUNTRY FROM PROGRAMME] represents ...  
Answer: More of an opportunity

	Binary	Values	Difference
CB010 Austria-Hungary	HU:AT	77% vs. 25%	52
CB054 Slovenia-Austria	SI:AT	67% vs. 23%	44
CB038 France-Belgium-Netherlands-United Kingdom (Two seas)	FR:BE	58% vs. 18%	40
CB003 Slovakia-Austria	SK:AT	62% vs. 24%	38
CB045 France-Belgium-Germany-Luxembourg (Grande Région)	FR:LU	67% vs. 32%	35
CB017 Germany/Saxony-Czech Republic	CZ:DE	52% vs. 17%	35
CB047 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-North Ireland/Scotland)	IE:UK	56% vs. 22%	34
CB009 Germany/Bavaria-Czech Republic	CZ:DE	56% vs. 22%	34
CB024 Germany-Austria-Switzerland-Liechtenstein	AT:CH	54% vs. 21%	33
CB018 Poland-Germany/Saxony	PL:DE	49% vs. 17%	32

The map presents the results for respondents living in each region covered by the Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes considered.



**Q5: Living near the border represents...**

- more of an opportunity
  - it has no impact
  - more of an obstacle
  - don't know / no answer
- 
- surveyed programme areas

0 500 Km

© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries


## V. OBSTACLES TO CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION BETWEEN BORDER REGIONS COVERED BY AN INTERREG CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION PROGRAMME

Respondents were asked the extent to which they considered a range of factors to be problems affecting cooperation between their country and partner countries<sup>14</sup>. These issues include legal or administrative differences, accessibility, language differences, social and economic differences and cultural differences.

### - Respondents are most likely to say language differences are a problem for cooperation between their country and a partner country –

Respondents are most likely to say that language differences are a problem for cooperation between their country and a partner country (57%). This is the only issue identified as a problem by at least half. More than four out of ten consider socio-economic differences (46%) or legal or administrative differences as problems (45%), while at least three out of ten say cultural differences (32%) or accessibility (30%) are problems.

Q6. Thinking about the cooperation between [OUR COUNTRY] and [COUNTRY FROM PROGRAMME], to what extent are any of the following a problem ... ?




<sup>14</sup> Q6 Thinking about the cooperation between [OUR COUNTRY] and [COUNTRY FROM PROGRAMME], to what extent are any of the following a problem ...? Legal or administrative differences; Accessibility (for example geographical barriers or transport infrastructure); Language differences; Social and economic differences; Cultural differences.



As mentioned above, of all the potential issues listed, respondents are most likely to say that **language differences** are a problem for cross-border cooperation (57%).

Respondents in programmes involving Germany and Poland, and Germany and the Czech Republic are most likely to say language difficulties are a problem: *CB019 Germany (Mecklenburg-West Pomerania/Brandenburg) - Poland* (85%), *CB018 Poland -Germany/Saxony*, (84%) *CB011 Germany/Brandenburg-Poland* (82%), *CB009 Germany/Bavaria-Czech Republic* (79%) and *CB017 Germany/Saxony-Czech Republic (Saxony)* (78%). In addition, 78% of respondents in programme *CB002. Austria-Czech Republic* say this is a problem.


At the other end of the scale there are only five programmes where fewer than one in five say language difficulties are a problem: *PC001 Ireland-United Kingdom (PEACE)* (14%), *CB048 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-Wales)* (16%), *CB047 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-North Ireland/Scotland)* (17%), *CB030 Slovakia-Czech Republic* (18%) and *CB004 Austria-Germany/Bavaria* (19%).



Highest and lowest results per programme

Overall almost half (46%) say that **social and economic differences** are a problem for cross-border cooperation; at least a quarter of respondents in each programme say that these differences are a problem.

Respondents in areas covered by programmes *CB010 Austria-Hungary* and *CB002 Austria-Czech Republic* are the most likely to say this (both 68%), followed by those in *CB003 Slovakia-Austria* (67%). At the other end of the scale 25% of those in *CB028 Sweden-Finland-Norway (Botnia-Atlantica)* and 29% in *CB023 Germany-The Netherlands* and *CB026 Sweden-Denmark-Norway (Öresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak)* also say social and economic differences are a problem.




Highest and lowest results per programme

Overall 45% of respondents say that **legal or administrative differences** are a problem for cross-border cooperation, and at least a quarter of respondents in each programme region say the same.

Respondents are most likely to agree that this is a problem in *CB035 Italy-Switzerland* (63%), *CB040 France-United Kingdom (Manche - Channel)* (61%) and least likely to do so in *CB028 Sweden-Finland-Norway (Botnia-Atlantica)* (26%), *CB016 Sweden-Norway* and *CB026 Sweden-Denmark-Norway (Öresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak)* (both 27%).

At least half of the respondents in *CB048 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-Wales)* (58%) and *CB047 United Kingdom-Ireland (Ireland-North Ireland/Scotland)* (52%), as well as 47% in *PC001 Ireland-United Kingdom (PEACE)* say that legal or administrative differences are not a problem at all.




Highest and lowest results per programme

Overall 32% of respondents say **cultural differences** are a problem for cross-border cooperation. Across all programmes, between 18% and 50% say this is a problem.

Respondents living in the areas covered by *CB018 Poland-Germany/Saxony* are the most likely to say cultural differences are a problem for cross-border cooperation (50%), followed by those in *CB011 Germany/Brandenburg-Poland* (46%).


At the other end of the scale 18% of those in *CB008 Hungary-Croatia*, *CB016 Sweden-Norway*, and *CB021 Romania-Bulgaria* and 19% in *CB004 Austria-Germany/Bavaria* say this is a problem.



Highest and lowest results per programme

Finally, **accessibility (geographical barriers or transport infrastructure)** is least likely to be mentioned as a problem for cross-border cooperation with a partner country (30%), although across regions the proportions range from 49% to 15%.

Respondents in the regions covered by *CB035 Italy-Switzerland* are the most likely to say accessibility is a problem (49%), followed by those in *CB020 Greece-Italy* (48%). In contrast 15% of those in *CB008 Hungary-Croatia* and *CB050 Estonia-Latvia*, and 16% of those in *CB023 Germany-The Netherlands* say this is a problem.



Highest and lowest results per programme

## **ANNEXES**

## **FLASH EUROBAROMETER 422**

### **"Cross-border cooperation in the EU"**

### **TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS**

Between the 10<sup>th</sup> and the 30<sup>th</sup> of June 2015, TNS Political & Social, a consortium created between TNS political & social, TNS UK and TNS opinion, carried out the survey FLASH EUROBAROMETER 422 about "Cross-border cooperation in the EU".

This survey has been requested by the EUROPEAN COMMISSION, Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy. It is a general public survey co-ordinated by the Directorate-General for Communication (DG COMM "Strategy, Corporate Communication Actions and Eurobarometer" Unit). The FLASH EUROBAROMETER 422 covers the population living in the border regions covered by the Interreg cross-border cooperation programmes of the 28 Member States of the European Union, Norway and Switzerland and aged 15 years and over. The survey covers the national population of citizens as well as the population of citizens of all the European Union Member States that are residents in these countries and have a sufficient command of the national languages to answer the questionnaire. All interviews were carried using the TNS e-Call center (our centralized CATI system). In every country respondents were called both on fixed lines and mobile phones. The basic sample design applied in all states is multi-stage random (probability). In each household, the respondent was drawn at random following the "last birthday rule".

TNS has developed its own RDD sample generation capabilities based on using contact telephone numbers from responders to random probability or random location face to face surveys, such as Eurobarometer, as seed numbers. The approach works because the seed number identifies a working block of telephone numbers and reduces the volume of numbers generated that will be ineffective. The seed numbers are stratified by NUTS2 region and urbanisation to approximate a geographically representative sample. From each seed number the required sample of numbers are generated by randomly replacing the last two digits. The sample is then screened against business databases in order to exclude as many of these numbers as possible before going into field. This approach is consistent across all countries.

For each region covered by the Intereg program a comparison between the sample and the universe was carried out. The universe description was derived from Eurostat population. For all regions surveyed, a weighting procedure, using marginal and intercellular weighting, was carried out based on this Universe description. In all regions, gender, age and working status were introduced in the iteration procedure. The total population figures for input in this post-weighting procedure are listed on the next page. Readers are reminded that survey results are estimations, the accuracy of which, everything being equal, rests upon the sample size and upon the observed percentage. Depending on sample sizes the real percentages vary within the following confidence limits:

Statistical Margins due to the sampling process (at the 95% level of confidence)											
<i>various sample sizes are in rows</i>						<i>various observed results are in columns</i>					
	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	
	95%	90%	85%	80%	75%	70%	65%	60%	55%	50%	
N=50	6,0	8,3	9,9	11,1	12,0	12,7	13,2	13,6	13,8	13,9	N=50
N=500	1,9	2,6	3,1	3,5	3,8	4,0	4,2	4,3	4,4	4,4	N=500
N=1000	1,4	1,9	2,2	2,5	2,7	2,8	3,0	3,0	3,1	3,1	N=1000
N=1500	1,1	1,5	1,8	2,0	2,2	2,3	2,4	2,5	2,5	2,5	N=1500
N=2000	1,0	1,3	1,6	1,8	1,9	2,0	2,1	2,1	2,2	2,2	N=2000
N=3000	0,8	1,1	1,3	1,4	1,5	1,6	1,7	1,8	1,8	1,8	N=3000
N=4000	0,7	0,9	1,1	1,2	1,3	1,4	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,5	N=4000
N=5000	0,6	0,8	1,0	1,1	1,2	1,3	1,3	1,4	1,4	1,4	N=5000
N=6000	0,6	0,8	0,9	1,0	1,1	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,3	1,3	N=6000
N=7000	0,5	0,7	0,8	0,9	1,0	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,2	1,2	N=7000
N=7500	0,5	0,7	0,8	0,9	1,0	1,0	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	N=7500
N=8000	0,5	0,7	0,8	0,9	0,9	1,0	1,0	1,1	1,1	1,1	N=8000
N=9000	0,5	0,6	0,7	0,8	0,9	0,9	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	N=9000
N=10000	0,4	0,6	0,7	0,8	0,8	0,9	0,9	1,0	1,0	1,0	N=10000
N=11000	0,4	0,6	0,7	0,7	0,8	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	N=11000
N=12000	0,4	0,5	0,6	0,7	0,8	0,8	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	N=12000
N=13000	0,4	0,5	0,6	0,7	0,7	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9	0,9	N=13000
N=14000	0,4	0,5	0,6	0,7	0,7	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,8	N=14000
N=15000	0,3	0,5	0,6	0,6	0,7	0,7	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,8	N=15000
	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	
	95%	90%	85%	80%	75%	70%	65%	60%	55%	50%	



ABBR.	COUNTRIES	INSTITUTES	N° INTERVIEWS	FIELDWORK DATES		POPULATION 15+
BE	Belgium	TNS Dimarso	1.809	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	8.939.546
BG	Bulgaria	TNS BBSS	602	10/06/2015	25/06/2015	6.537.510
CZ	Czech Rep.	TNS Aisa s.r.o	1.506	10/06/2015	29/06/2015	9.012.443
DK	Denmark	TNS Gallup A/S	1.111	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	4.561.264
DE	Germany	TNS Infratest	4.410	10/06/2015	27/06/2015	64.336.389
EE	Estonia	TNS Emor	700	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	945.733
IE	Ireland	IMS Millward Brown	903	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	3.522.000
EL	Greece	TNS ICAP	900	10/06/2015	29/06/2015	8.693.566
ES	Spain	TNS Demoscopia S.A	601	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	39.127.930
FR	France	TNS Sofres	3.025	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	47.756.439
HR	Croatia	HENDAL	902	10/06/2015	27/06/2015	3.749.400
IT	Italy	TNS ITALIA	2.412	10/06/2015	29/06/2015	51.862.391
CY	Rep. of Cyprus	CYMAR	302	10/06/2015	12/06/2015	660.400
LV	Latvia	TNS Latvia	1.000	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	1.447.866
LT	Lithuania	TNS LT	1.010	10/06/2015	29/06/2015	2.829.740
LU	Luxembourg	TNS Dimarso	400	10/06/2015	19/06/2015	434.878
HU	Hungary	TNS Hoffmann Kft	1.512	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	8.320.614
MT	Malta	MISCO International Ltd	301	10/06/2015	18/06/2015	335.476
NL	Netherlands	TNS NIPO	1.406	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	13.371.980
AT	Austria	TNS Austria	2.216	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	7.009.827
PL	Poland	TNS OBOP	2.215	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	32.413.735
PT	Portugal	TNS EUROTESTE	300	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	8.080.915
RO	Romania	TNS CSOP	609	10/06/2015	22/06/2015	18.246.731
SI	Slovenia	RM PLUS	1.204	10/06/2015	18/06/2015	1.759.701
SK	Slovakia	TNS AISA Slovakia	1.210	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	4.549.956
FI	Finland	TNS Gallup Oy	1.204	10/06/2015	27/06/2015	4.440.004
SE	Sweden	TNS SIFO	2.314	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	7.791.240
UK	United Kingdom	TNS UK	1.622	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	51.848.010
<b>TOTAL EU28</b>			<b>37.706</b>	<b>10/06/2015</b>	<b>30/06/2015</b>	<b>412.585.684</b>
NO	Norway	TNS Gallup AS	1.507	10/06/2015	29/06/2015	3.866.395
CH	Switzerland	DemoSCOPE	1.406	10/06/2015	30/06/2015	7.012.685
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>40.619</b>	<b>10/06/2015</b>	<b>30/06/2015</b>	<b>423.464.764</b>