

# DATA PROTECTION

Fieldwork: September 2003

Publication: December 2003

This survey was requested by Directorate General Internal Market, Unit E4  
- Media and data protection - and coordinated by Directorate General Press and  
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.

This opinion poll has been carried out at the request of the Directorate-General Internal Market, Unit E4 – Media and data protection, managed and organised by the Directorate-General Press and Communication ('Public Opinion Analysis' Sector).

It was carried out between September 1 and September 30 2003, in all European Union countries, on behalf of the European Opinion Research Group (EORG: a consortium of market research and public opinion agencies, made out of INRA in Belgium – I.C.O. and GfK Ad Hoc Worldwide).

The questionnaire, technical specifications and names of the agencies associated with this research are all shown in appendix.

This report is in no way binding upon the European Commission.

This report was originally written in English.

**Table of contents**

Introduction.....	5
I. PROTECTION OF CITIZENS' PRIVACY .....	7
II. CITIZENS' TRUST IN ORGANISATIONS HOLDING PERSONAL INFORMATION .....	11
II.1. Medical services and doctors.....	11
II.2. Insurance companies.....	13
II.3. Credit card companies .....	15
II.4. Banks and financial institutions .....	17
II.5. Employers.....	19
II.6. The police .....	21
II.7. Social security .....	23
II.8. Tax authorities .....	25
II.9. Local authorities .....	27
II.10. National authorities .....	29
II.11. Credit reference agencies.....	31
II.12. Mail order companies.....	34
II.13. Non-profit organisations.....	36
II.14. Market and opinion research companies .....	38
III. VIEWS ON DATA GATHERING AND PRIVACY OF INFORMATION.....	40
IV. KNOWLEDGE OF LEGISLATION AND DATA PROTECTION PRACTICE .....	48
V. TOOLS FOR THE PROTECTION OF DATA PRIVACY .....	54
VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF DATA PROTECTION TOOLS .....	56
ANNEXES .....	62
ANNEX I: ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE.....	63
ANNEX II: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS .....	73

**Notes for the reader:**

1. The following are the abbreviations for Member States used in the tables in this report:

<b>B</b>	Belgium
<b>DK</b>	Denmark
<b>D West</b>	'Old' Länder/Western Germany
<b>D Total</b>	Germany
<b>D East</b>	'New' Länder/Eastern Germany
<b>GR</b>	Greece
<b>E</b>	Spain
<b>F</b>	France
<b>IRL</b>	Ireland
<b>I</b>	Italy
<b>L</b>	Luxembourg
<b>NL</b>	Netherlands
<b>A</b>	Austria
<b>P</b>	Portugal
<b>FIN</b>	Finland
<b>S</b>	Sweden
<b>UK</b>	United Kingdom

The distinction between the old and new German Länder has been maintained in the Eurobarometer since 1990. This is because marked differences of opinion between these two parts of the country are still evident.

2. The abbreviation used for the whole of the European Union is EU15.
3. It should also be noted that percentages may total more than 100% because of the rounding up of figures or where questions allow for more than one response.
4. The same wide range of socio-demographic data available in 2003 is not available for either the 1991 or 1996 surveys referred to in this report. The abbreviation NA is also used where comparisons cannot be made on a country-by-country basis between the 12 EC Member States of the 1991 survey and the 15 EU Member States in 1996 and 2003.

## **Introduction**

This report looks at EU citizens' views about privacy relating to information held about them by a variety of public and private organisations and related issues.

Views are assessed across the European Union and results are based on both a country-by-country view and a socio-demographic analysis which attempts to highlight both the similarities and differences by such varied factors as age, education, occupation, etc.

The main data making up this report were gathered between 1 and 30 September 2003 and are part of wave 60.0 of the Standard Eurobarometer. Details of the technical specifications of the survey are included in the Annexes to this document.

This survey comprised seven questions and a copy of the questionnaire is also included in the Annexes.

For comparative purposes and to detect trends in European Union citizens' views, reference is also made to the findings of two previous pieces of research.

The more recent of these (Eurobarometer 45.1) was conducted in Spring 1996 and surveyed the same fifteen Member States.

The earlier survey was conducted in Autumn 1991 amongst the twelve countries making up the European Community at that time. Data from this earlier survey can be used to make comparisons on a country-by-country basis, but, as the number of states taking part is different, direct comparisons cannot be made using a 'European' average.

The following report firstly assesses EU citizens' views on the general issue of personal data privacy and examines the level of concern they feel on this subject.

Respondents were then surveyed as to the level of trust they had in the acceptable use of personal data held by organisations such as banks, police, doctors, etc.

Views were then gathered as to attitude towards specific aspects of data collection and data management covering such areas as confidence in the efficacy of the legal framework on data protection, security of information on the Internet, etc.

Individuals' knowledge of legislation, complaints procedures, sanctions on law-breakers and rights to restrict the use of personal information, etc. were then analysed.

There are a number of technologies available which are intended to control and limit the collection and storage of personal data on the Internet. Respondents to the survey were asked whether they were aware of these tools. As a rider to this, further questions were asked to those who, though aware of these tools, had never made use of them.

The clash between the fundamental rights and freedoms of individuals and the necessity for national security was also an issue reviewed in this survey when the question of telephone and Internet monitoring was raised.

Throughout this survey, it will become increasingly apparent that fundamental variations in attitude are usually based upon a country-by-country view rather than on a particular socio-demographic characteristic such as gender, age, education or occupation.

Accordingly, full details of the country-by-country analysis are provided in tabular form with a written commentary on the key elements and trends contained therein.

In most instances, however, the use of tables to display socio-demographic data will be limited to those questions where there is evidence that these data are relevant to a full analysis of the situation.

Where this is not the case, the editor has included comments on those particular areas where a given trend or notable variation emerges.

## I. PROTECTION OF CITIZENS' PRIVACY

Respondents were asked whether they believed that their privacy was being properly protected.

**Q. 30. Different private and public organisations keep personal information about us. It is sometimes said that our privacy must be properly protected? Are you concerned or not that your privacy is being protected?**

### Country analysis

	Very concerned			Fairly concerned			Not very concerned			Not at all concerned			Don't know		
	91	96	03	91	96	03	91	96	03	91	96	03	91	96	03
B	29	23	23	27	35	32	24	30	25	14	11	20	6	2	1
DK	13	13	13	31	33	29	32	32	32	24	22	25	1	0	1
D.W	22	14	18	34	34	38	28	40	32	10	8	10	3	5	3
D.T	23	14	19	38	35	39	27	39	31	9	8	10	3	4	3
D.O	29	14	22	41	38	42	22	35	27	6	10	7	1	2	2
Gr	51	37	58	26	29	26	12	16	9	7	16	6	5	3	2
E	15	12	13	22	34	33	30	28	32	28	22	22	6	4	1
F	54	40	37	21	43	37	9	10	15	4	5	9	5	2	2
Irl	47	28	36	28	37	36	15	24	17	6	8	6	4	3	5
I	47	11	14	30	27	33	10	33	34	10	25	17	3	4	2
L	32	23	27	30	33	34	23	27	20	8	15	16	7	3	2
NL	15	11	15	39	36	33	30	35	35	15	17	18	1	1	1
A	NA	15	19	NA	23	32	NA	40	30	NA	16	14	NA	6	6
P	16	31	13	32	34	37	20	18	27	25	13	20	7	4	3
Fin	NA	6	15	NA	24	34	NA	44	38	NA	24	14	NA	2	0
S	NA	59	54	NA	27	31	NA	10	12	NA	2	3	NA	1	1
UK	44	43	41	32	38	34	15	13	16	8	5	8	2	1	1
EC12	35	NA	NA	31	NA	NA	19	NA	NA	12	NA	NA	4	NA	NA
EU15	NA	24	25	NA	34	35	NA	26	25	NA	13	13	NA	3	2

On average, in 2003, 60% of all EU citizens were concerned to a greater or lesser degree, about the broad issue of the protection of privacy. This figure shows a small increase on the figures recorded in an identical poll seven years previously.

In fact, in the later poll, one in four EU citizens (25%) was **very** concerned about the issue.

As so often happens in surveys of this kind, this average figure hides a wide variation in opinion. Only 13% of Danes, Spanish and Portuguese were **very** concerned about this issue. However, at the other end of the scale, were more than half the Greeks and Swedes who were polled with figures of 58% and 54% respectively.

Interestingly, the slight average increase on figures across the European Union is not seen in the data from these last two mentioned countries. The Greek figure showed a significant increase from 37% to 58% while the Swedish figure showed a decline from 59% to 54%. Amongst nations where there was a notable increase in the number of those who were **very** concerned are East Germany (14% to 22%) and Ireland (28% to 36%).

A noticeable increase in concern was also observed in Finland. In 1996, only 30% of those polled felt some degree of concern over this issue. By 2003, this figure had risen to 49%.

Portugal, on the other hand, moved against the general trend with the percentage of the population being **very** concerned about this issue falling sharply from 31% to 13% in the seven years between these two polls.

At the other end of the spectrum, 13% of EU15 citizens, in both 1996 and 2003, said that they were **not at all** concerned about the protection of their privacy. Least concerned in 2003 were the Danes (25%), the Spanish (22%) and the Portuguese (20%).

Looking back at the data collected in 1991 for the 12 Member States of then European Community (EC), some notable changes over this twelve-year period emerge.

A substantial decrease in the highest degree of concern was noted in France, Ireland and Italy over this period. In France, for example, in 1991, 54% of those polled were **very** concerned about this issue. This figure, by 2003, had fallen to 37%, while those who were **not at all** concerned had increased from 4% to 9% over the same period and those who were **not very** concerned have shown a growth of six percentage points from 9% to 15%.

Over the same period, in France, there was an increase of those who were **fairly** concerned from 21% to 37%.

All these changes reflect a broad drift away from the **very** concerned area towards lesser levels of worry.

Very similar patterns were seen in the Irish and Italian figures where the numbers of those who were **very** concerned fell from 47% to 36% and 47% to 14% respectively.

In Italy, in fact, if we group together those who were **very** concerned and **fairly** concerned and label them as 'concerned' and do the same exercise with those who were **not very** concerned or **not at all** concerned and group them as 'not concerned', the real extent of this shift can be seen.

In this example, the Italian 'concerned' figure drops from 77% to 47%, while the 'not concerned' figure rises from 20% to 51% over the same period.

Although it is not possible to make a valid statistical comparison between the two figures as they are not looking at the same sample, it is interesting to note that, in 1991, 35% of the EC12 were **very** concerned about this issue and, twelve years later, this sentiment was felt by only 25% of those in the EU15 poll.



**Socio-demographic analysis**

	Level of concern									
	Very		Fairly		Not very		Not at all		Don't know	
	1996	2003	1996	2003	1996	2003	1996	2003	1996	2003
<b>Gender</b>										
Male	24	26	35	35	26	25	12	13	2	2
Female	24	25	34	35	26	25	13	13	4	2
<b>Age</b>										
15-24	21	19	34	35	27	28	15	16	3	2
25-39	23	25	38	37	27	27	11	10	2	2
40-54	28	27	33	36	25	25	10	10	2	2
55+	24	27	33	32	25	23	14	15	4	2
<b>Education</b>										
Up to age 15	22	24	32	32	25	26	16	16	4	3
16-19	26	26	36	37	25	26	11	11	2	2
20+	26	30	35	36	27	23	11	11	2	1
<b>Occupation</b>										
Self-employed	23	27	36	37	26	23	14	12	1	2
Managers	27	28	34	40	28	24	9	8	2	1
Other white collar	24	25	35	36	28	28	11	10	2	1
Manual workers	26	24	36	38	25	25	11	12	2	2
House persons	19	25	35	31	27	27	14	14	5	2
Unemployed	30	28	32	33	21	25	14	12	2	3
Retired	24	28	32	31	25	24	15	16	5	2
Students	19	19	33	33	30	30	14	16	4	3
<b>Residence</b>										
Rural/village	N/A	24	N/A	34	N/A	26	N/A	15	N/A	2
Medium town	N/A	23	N/A	36	N/A	27	N/A	13	N/A	2
Large town	N/A	31	N/A	34	N/A	23	N/A	11	N/A	1
<b>Income</b>										
--	N/A	26	N/A	30	N/A	26	N/A	16	N/A	3
-	N/A	24	N/A	36	N/A	26	N/A	12	N/A	2
+	N/A	23	N/A	37	N/A	28	N/A	11	N/A	2
++	N/A	25	N/A	36	N/A	26	N/A	12	N/A	1
EU15	24	25	34	35	26	25	13	13	3	2

As mentioned in the 'Notes for the reader' preceding this report, the reader will notice that fundamental variations in attitude to this broad scene-setting question are generally based upon a country-by-country view rather than on particular socio-demographic characteristics, such as gender, age, education or occupation.

As an indication of this, in this socio-demographic analysis of the situation, the figures above show little variation or trend. For example, it will be noted that those having a particular level of concern show no strong variance by gender and age.

Taking the example of Europeans who were **not very concerned**, it can be seen that the 2003 EU15 average of 25% is exactly the same for men and women while, by age bands, the figures only range between 23% and 28%.

This broad consensus is in sharp contrast to the country-by-country analysis on the same aspect which shows a range from 9% in Greece to 38% in Finland.

In this particular case relating to the level of concern, there is a small indication that the issue is of more relevance to older people and those with a higher level of education.

When looking at adult occupation (i.e. excluding students), no major variations are noted.

As can also be seen from the figures above, there were very few variations by residence or income.

The socio-demographic figures from 1996 also have these same broad characteristics with just minimal differences by age, gender, etc.

Minor changes over the seven-year period are seen in an increase in the level of concern of managers (fairly concerned 34% to 40%) and those aged 40 to 54 (fairly concerned 33% to 36%).

## II. CITIZENS' TRUST IN ORGANISATIONS HOLDING PERSONAL INFORMATION

The levels of trust that respondents accorded to various institutions and organisations in relation to personal information they held were then assessed.

### II.1. Medical services and doctors

**Q 31.1. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust medical services and doctors to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

#### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	79	89	89	10	8	8	5	3	3
DK	92	86	91	7	11	7	1	3	3
D.W	68	79	80	19	16	14	6	5	6
D.T	71	80	82	18	15	13	5	5	6
D.O	81	86	88	12	10	8	3	4	4
Gr	72	64	73	17	31	24	5	5	3
E	71	84	83	13	12	14	4	5	2
F	79	82	87	15	16	10	3	2	3
Irl	81	87	84	10	7	10	3	6	6
I	59	73	79	32	17	11	5	10	10
L	81	84	85	7	11	7	4	6	4
NL	89	92	92	7	6	12	3	3	2
A	NA	83	82	NA	14	15	NA	4	6
P	80	78	82	10	18	9	3	4	3
Fin	NA	91	89	NA	8	11	NA	2	2
S	NA	80	87	NA	16	10	NA	4	2
UK	91	88	88	7	10	10	2	2	2
EC12	75	NA	NA	16	NA	NA	4	NA	NA
EU15	NA	81	84	NA	14	12	NA	4	4

Medical services and doctors were held in particularly high regard by EU15 citizens on the issue of the correct use of personal information. On average, 84% of EU15 citizens **trusted** the medical profession in this way and, in Denmark and the Netherlands, this was a sentiment held by more than nine out of ten citizens polled.

The country which had the lowest level of **trust** was Greece (73%), although this figure shows a marked increase on the 64% recorded in 1996. Interestingly, the 1991 figure was at a level virtually equal (72%) to that recorded in the 2003 survey.

Overall, the 2003 figures show a small increase from 81% to 84% of those saying they **trust** the medical profession in this regard and this last figure shows a notable increase over the figure for the EC12 in 1991 when this **trust** level reached only 75% of that poll.

Larger than average increases in **trust** in the two most recent polls were noted in Italy (73% to 79%), Sweden (80% to 87%), France (82% to 87%) and Denmark (86% to 91%).

Amongst the '**don't knows**', a relatively high figure of 10% was noted in Italy in both 1996 and 2003.

To look at longer-term trends that affect twelve out of the current fifteen EU membership, reference is made to the data collected in 1991 which show interesting trends over the twelve-year period.

However, trend figures are perhaps more relevant looking at the variations over the past seven years rather than extending the analysis to a period of twelve years, and when phrases such as 'a noticeable increase' or 'a small decrease' are used, these refer to the variations between the 1996 and 2003 information.

Although the 1991 poll covered all EC citizens at the time, making a direct comparison of the average total figures cannot be done as the constituent parts are not consistent. This means that comparisons of a broad nature will only be made between the 1996 and 2003 figures.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

On a socio-demographic basis, the only statistic meriting comment relates to the relatively small 78% of the self-employed who **trusted** doctors and the medical profession.

## II.2. Insurance companies

**Q. 31.2. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust insurance companies to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	36	56	52	48	36	42	11	7	7
DK	61	48	59	32	46	33	6	7	8
D.W	22	31	38	64	58	51	7	12	12
D.T	21	31	39	64	57	50	8	11	11
D.O	20	35	43	65	56	49	10	9	9
Gr	44	30	27	29	60	65	21	10	8
E	39	45	49	37	44	43	13	11	8
F	29	33	41	62	62	52	5	5	7
Irl	43	47	36	42	35	48	9	19	16
I	34	34	35	47	48	49	14	17	17
L	56	58	69	29	32	26	9	10	5
NL	53	58	54	39	35	38	7	7	8
A	NA	49	57	NA	39	34	NA	13	9
P	53	44	49	29	46	43	11	10	8
Fin	NA	61	72	NA	32	22	NA	7	7
S	NA	53	62	NA	36	31	NA	12	7
UK	56	41	39	38	51	50	5	8	11
EC12	36	NA	NA	49	NA	NA	9	NA	NA
EU15	NA	39	42	NA	51	48	NA	10	10

The percentage of EU15 citizens who **do not trust** insurance companies to use their personal information in an acceptable way has decreased from slightly more than half of those polled to somewhat less (51% to 48%). An interesting, but not directly comparable, figure shows that just 49% of EC12 citizens polled in 1991 **did not trust insurance** companies in this way.

In fact, when the 10% of those who did not express an opinion are removed from the equation, 53% of EU citizens in the latest poll actually expressing an opinion **do not trust** this aspect of insurance companies' behaviour.

Using this same 'net' figure, the figures rise to nearly three out of four Greeks (71%) voicing this opinion.

At the other end of the scale, Finland's insurance companies are held in much higher esteem with 77% of those expressing an opinion saying that they **trust** these organisations to use personal information in an acceptable way. This high level of trust was also noted in Luxembourg and Denmark, although the Danish figures in this respect are still percentage points less than they were in 1991.

The Irish experience, however, is against the general flow of an improving opinion and the percentage of those polled **trusting** insurance companies with this information has decreased substantially from 47% to 36% in that country over the past two surveys.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

Women generally have a less jaundiced view about insurance companies with only 44% of their number as opposed to 51% of men holding the negative view.

Increasing age and higher levels of education also tend to increase the likelihood of negative opinions. For example, compared with the EU15 average of 48% for those who said they **did not trust**, this figure falls to 42% amongst 15 to 24 year olds and rises to 52% amongst those who had been educated to age 20 or beyond.

There was also a variation depending on respondents' residence with 44% of those living in rural areas as opposed to 50% of those living in large towns **not trusting** insurance companies concerning this issue.

Looking back at the 1996 socio-demographic figures, the patterns are broadly similar except that a larger proportion of women (48%) and men (54%) **did not trust** this aspect of insurance companies at that time.

### II.3. Credit card companies

**Q. 31.3. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust credit card companies to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

#### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	29	55	49	52	35	42	11	10	10
DK	30	34	48	56	49	36	6	17	16
D.W	12	23	29	72	64	54	7	13	17
D.T	11	25	31	73	61	52	8	14	17
D.O	7	33	41	79	51	42	10	16	17
Gr	37	27	13	27	55	80	30	18	7
E	31	39	44	40	46	48	29	15	8
F	22	34	32	66	57	60	8	9	8
Irl	27	30	25	52	40	53	15	30	22
I	28	37	37	47	37	42	20	27	20
L	50	52	63	30	31	30	11	17	7
NL	26	34	39	49	45	46	23	21	15
A	NA	28	43	NA	55	45	NA	18	12
P	43	46	43	31	37	46	18	17	10
Fin	NA	51	64	NA	34	23	NA	15	13
S	NA	26	45	NA	53	43	NA	21	12
UK	28	27	26	62	60	60	9	13	14
EC12	24	NA	NA	57	NA	NA	13	NA	NA
EU15	NA	32	35	NA	52	52	NA	16	14

Credit card companies are less trusted than insurance companies and 52% of the EU15 poll **did not trust** them in both 1996 and 2003. This can be compared with an average figure of 57% amongst EC12 citizens in 1991.

The only solace that credit card companies can have is that the high level of '**don't knows**' has fallen slightly from 16% to 14% between 1996 and 2003 and there has been a small increase in the level of **trust** across the European Union from 32% to 35%.

Once again, the attitude held on a country-by-country basis is seen to be a much more important factor than socio-demographic characteristics.

Accordingly, making up this 52% EU15 average are figures as diverse as 80% in Greece and 23% in Finland of citizens who **did not trust** credit card companies to use their personal information in an acceptable way. Not only are these figures very different but the shift of opinion in these two EU Member States in regard to this issue has been in totally different directions over the seven-year period.

In 1996, 55% of Greeks **did not trust** credit card companies in this aspect of their business. At the same time, this was an opinion held by 34% of Finns. Seven years later, it can be seen that the Greek figure has increased by twenty-five percentage points to 80% while the Finnish figure has fallen by eleven percentage points to 23%.

Turning back the clock to 1991, the number of Germans who **trusted** credit card companies in this way was only 11%. The last two polls show a substantial increase in this figure first to 25% in 1996 and then to 31% in 2003. Similar increases were seen in Belgium.

Over this longer period, the figures in the UK showed a small but steady decline (28% - 27% - 26%) while, in Greece, there was a substantial decline in this figure between the three polls (37% - 27% - 13%).

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

The extreme variations between countries should be compared with the much smaller differences on the socio-demographic front.

Analysing those EU15 citizens who **do not trust** credit card companies in regard to this issue, shows only small socio-demographic variations. For example, 52% of those educated up to age 15 held this view – exactly the same percentage as those whose education had continued to 20 years or beyond.

Leaving aside students (41%), there was little variation between all occupational classes including, inter alia, such varied groups as managers, manual workers, house persons and the unemployed. The figures for all these groups were contained in a tight band between 51% and 54%.

Similar negligible differences were seen by income level. There was a figure of 53% amongst the lowest income group and 50% of those with the highest income.

Residence also had little bearing on the results with this view being held by 54% of those living in a large town compared with a similar 50% living in a rural area or village.

The 1996 socio-demographic data showed very similar patterns with only small variations by age (47% for the youngest and 50% for the oldest age groups) among those **not trusting**.



## II.4. Banks and financial institutions

**Q. 31.4. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust banks and financial institutions to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	52	65	62	35	27	33	8	8	5
DK	76	69	79	20	27	17	3	4	4
D.W	46	43	54	40	47	36	7	11	10
D.T	49	45	56	38	44	35	7	10	9
D.O	59	56	64	29	35	29	7	9	8
Gr	60	60	36	25	34	59	9	7	6
E	47	46	53	34	44	42	7	9	6
F	39	41	44	54	54	50	3	5	6
Irl	50	50	44	39	34	45	6	16	11
I	41	46	48	45	38	38	9	16	14
L	74	71	71	14	21	25	4	8	5
NL	60	67	68	34	26	27	5	7	5
A	NA	58	67	NA	30	26	NA	12	6
P	66	69	66	22	24	28	5	7	6
Fin	NA	73	86	NA	25	13	NA	2	2
S	NA	60	81	NA	30	15	NA	10	4
UK	58	55	60	37	38	34	5	6	7
EC12	49	NA	NA	39	NA	NA	6	NA	NA
EU15	NA	50	55	NA	40	37	NA	9	8

The EU15 average opinion regarding having **trust** in banks and financial institutions in this domain has improved by ten percent from 50% to 55% between the last two surveys.

Noticeable variations between EU Member States were, again, seen with substantial upward movement in the figures from the Nordic countries. Increases from 60% to 81% were recorded in Sweden, 73% to 86% in Finland and 69% to 79% in Denmark. Other major increases were seen in Germany (45% to 56%).

However, perhaps caused by well-publicised public enquiries involving a number of banks in Ireland and Belgium, the percentages of citizens **trusting** the way these institutions handled client information fell from 50% to 44% and 65% to 62% respectively in these two countries.

However, both these decreases are overshadowed by the massive shift in public opinion in Greece.

In 1996, 60% of Greeks **trusted** this aspect of banks and financial institutions while only 34% did not. Seven years later, the figures were virtually reversed with 59% of those polled **not trusting** and only 36% trusting.

An interesting additional factor is observed in the cases of Ireland and Belgium where, as detailed above, the trust figures moved against the general EU15 picture.

Scandals in both these countries have dislodged a large percentage of the **'don't know'** vote and moved them to the **'do not trust'** camp where the figures were already increased by a migration of those who previously had confidence in this aspect of banks' behaviour.

In Ireland, while the trust figures decreased by six percentage points, the **'do not trust'** factor increased by eleven percentage points with the balance being fuelled by a decrease in the **'don't knows'** from 16% to 11% over the same period.

The Belgian figure shows a similar, albeit scaled-down, pattern.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

Once again, there were relatively small variations in the 2003 socio-demographic data compared with the large swings seen in the country analysis above.

Accordingly, while there was a variation between the level of male and female **trusting** of banks and financial institutions, this was only a two percentage point variation to either side of the average producing figures of 53% for men and 57% for women.

On an age basis, ignoring the 62% figure for those aged 15 to 24, there was only a one percentage point difference between the average of the oldest group surveyed (55+) and those aged 25 or more with figures of either 53% or 54%.

Again, variation by levels of education was minimal with extreme figures of 53% and 55% - a mere two percentage points between the highest and the lowest.

Reviewing the pan-European sample by occupation produced slightly larger variations but still minimal compared with country-by-country variations. Accordingly, the range was limited between 62% for students and 47% for the unemployed. This is to be compared with variations between 86% (Finland) and 36% (Greece) in the country analysis.

The support for the **'trust'** element was 57% in rural areas, 55% in small/medium-sized towns and 52% in large towns.

Looking back to the 1996 figures, the pattern of minimal variation based on socio-demographic factors was also present.

For example, while the EU15 figure was slightly lower at 50%, the male/female spread was still only two percentage points on either side of this number (male: 48%, female: 52%).

## II.5. Employers

**Q. 31.5. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust employers to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	35	57	59	47	30	29	13	13	12
DK	65	63	72	27	25	16	7	13	12
D.W	42	56	55	36	31	29	14	13	16
D.T	40	55	53	39	32	30	14	14	17
D.O	31	48	44	49	34	37	15	18	19
Gr	31	34	44	50	57	49	13	9	7
E	32	49	46	45	39	42	13	12	12
F	29	44	52	57	46	39	11	10	9
Irl	45	60	61	38	21	24	11	19	15
I	40	43	54	43	34	28	13	23	19
L	50	52	62	29	26	26	12	23	12
NL	51	64	67	35	23	22	12	13	11
A	NA	60	67	NA	22	21	NA	18	12
P	44	52	58	37	37	32	11	11	10
Fin	NA	65	64	NA	27	25	NA	9	11
S	NA	51	64	NA	33	27	NA	16	9
UK	58	63	58	33	26	28	8	11	14
EC12	41	NA	NA	42	NA	NA	12	NA	NA
EU15	NA	52	55	NA	34	32	NA	14	14

The belief that employers could be **trusted** to use personal information in an acceptable way was held by 55% of EU citizens polled – a three percentage point increase on the 52% logged in 1996.

There was a noticeable difference within Germany: in the Western Länder, 55% of those polled **trusted** employers as opposed to only 44% in the Eastern Länder. This latter figure is the same as the lowest country figure in Europe, namely that of Greece which is itself a substantial increase from the 34% recorded in 1996.

Danish employers were the most **trusted** in the EU with a figure of 72% which was a nine percentage point increase on the 63% recorded in 1996.

Once again, substantial variations were seen on a country-by-country basis. In 1996, Denmark, as noted above, and the UK both had 63% of those polled **trusting** employers to use personal information in an acceptable way. Seven years later, the Danish figure had increased by nine percentage points while the UK figure had fallen by five percentage points.

Substantial increases in the '**trust**' factor were noted in Sweden (51% to 64%) and Italy (43% to 54%).

Other noteworthy variations between the two polls were seen in the level of '**don't know**' scores in Luxembourg and Austria. In both cases, the figures fell substantially (Luxembourg 23% to 12%) and Austria (18% to 12%).

Between 1991 and 2003, there was a marked increase in this aspect of **trust** in the citizens of a number of countries. In Belgium, for instance, the figure rises from 35% in 1991 to 59% in 2003.

Similar increases are seen in Greece (31% to 44%), Spain (32% to 46%) and France (29% to 52%).

The UK figure, despite a rise to 63% in the 1996 poll, fell back in the 2003 poll to 58% - the same level as it was in 1991.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

Looking at the 55% of EU citizens who **trusted** employers to use personal information in an acceptable way in the 2003 poll were identical numbers of men and women.

Statistics were also virtually identical on all age groups except the oldest band (55+) where the figure at 51% was below the EU average of 55%.

Education played a minimal part in creating a difference in the statistics and the only noticeable variations by occupation were, perhaps unsurprisingly, the unemployed (43%) and other white-collar workers at 61%.

## II.6. The police

**Q. 31.6. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust the police to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	42	61	64	42	31	30	11	8	6
DK	84	83	85	13	14	11	2	4	4
D.W	50	65	76	33	26	17	9	9	8
D.T	48	64	75	35	27	17	9	9	8
D.O	43	62	72	43	28	19	9	10	9
Gr	47	58	68	39	38	29	8	6	3
E	60	72	77	20	23	19	9	6	4
F	41	51	67	49	44	27	6	5	7
Irl	57	72	68	31	17	24	6	10	8
I	58	64	73	30	22	14	7	15	13
L	58	65	74	26	26	21	8	9	5
NL	68	72	75	22	20	21	8	8	4
A	NA	62	73	NA	29	21	NA	9	7
P	63	64	73	24	32	22	5	5	5
Fin	NA	85	87	NA	11	10	NA	4	3
S	NA	75	81	NA	19	15	NA	6	4
UK	64	70	66	31	24	27	4	6	7
EC12	55	NA	NA	33	NA	NA	7	NA	NA
EU15	NA	65	72	NA	27	21	NA	8	7

In the 2003 survey, police forces across Europe earned the **trust** of nearly three out of four (72%) EU respondents who believed that they would use personal information they held about citizens in an acceptable way.

This figure shows a substantial ten percent increase from the 1996 survey (65%-72%) and, in some cases, the increase is considerably more. For example, trust levels rose from 51% to 67% in France, 62% to 73% in Austria and 64% to 75% in Germany.

In fact, against this background of increased **trust**, the only two exceptions were Ireland and the UK, where the figures fell from being above the EU average to below it.

In the Irish case, in the seven years between the two surveys, there was a migration from the '**don't know**' camp to increase the number of those who **do not trust** the police to use personal information in an acceptable way with figures of 17% in 1996 and 24% in 2003.

The highest level of **trust** on police use of personal information was noted in the Nordic countries where figures of 87% were recorded in Finland, 85% in Denmark and 81% in Sweden.

At the other end of the scale, only 64% of Belgians **trusted** the police to use this personal information in an acceptable way.

**Trust** in this aspect of police work has risen steadily in a number of European countries over the period between the first and latest poll.

Noticeable in these increases are Belgium (42% to 64%), Germany (49% to 75%), France (41% to 67%) and Greece (47% to 68%).

Denmark achieved a figure of 84% in 1991 and this has now risen slightly to 85% - the second highest figure in the EU15.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

Looking at the EU15 average of 72% who **trusted** the police to use personal information in an acceptable way, there were no significant variations by age or education in the 2003 survey.

By occupation, no major differences could be seen except that lower than average figures were noted among the self-employed (67%) and the unemployed (62%).

There was, unusually, a difference between the male and female sample with 75% of women **trusting** the police as opposed to 69% of men.

These broad patterns were virtually identical to those seen in the 1996 survey.

## II.7. Social security

**Q. 31.7. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust the social security to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	53	68	72	31	21	19	11	10	9
DK	72	69	70	22	23	19	5	8	10
D.W	32	64	64	49	25	24	12	11	12
D.T	33	65	64	48	25	24	12	10	12
D.O	38	67	67	43	23	23	12	10	10
Gr	58	53	67	27	41	28	14	6	4
E	61	76	79	22	19	18	9	5	3
F	58	61	74	33	34	22	6	5	5
Irl	53	61	63	33	21	25	9	18	12
I	52	54	68	35	29	17	8	17	15
L	68	79	83	15	13	13	9	8	4
NL	61	63	66	28	23	22	10	14	11
A	NA	69	74	NA	22	20	NA	10	6
P	73	70	79	14	25	17	5	5	5
Fin	NA	82	80	NA	13	16	NA	5	4
S	NA	50	64	NA	33	25	NA	18	11
UK	60	50	60	31	29	27	9	10	13
EC12	52	NA	NA	34	NA	NA	9	NA	NA
EU15	NA	63	69	NA	27	22	NA	10	10

Over the seven-year period between the two surveys, the 'trust' factor in social security bodies rose by 10% across the European Union from 63% to 69%. Only two countries (Finland and Germany) showed minimal reductions in their figures.

Five countries had considerably higher than average increases in this positive growth. These were Sweden (50% to 64%), Greece (53% to 67%), Italy (54% to 68%), the UK (50% to 60%) and France (61% to 74%).

Although the average EU15 figures remained constant amongst the 'don't knows', there was a reduction of one-third or more in the level of Swedish and Irish 'don't knows'.

In the twelve years covered by these three surveys, there has been a noted decrease in the Greek 'don't know' factor from 14% to 4%.

Despite slipping from 65% to 64% between the 1996 and 2003 polls, the German figure is still virtually twice as high as the 33% recorded in 1991.

Similar but less dramatic increases are noted in Belgium (53% to 72%) and Spain 61% to 79%.

The UK figure, on the other hand, stays constant at 60%, although the 2003 figure shows a ten percentage point increase on the relatively low 50% trust factor accorded in 1996.

Denmark is the only country where the trust factor has actually declined over the twelve years in question.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

The 2003 EU15 average of 69% **trusting** the social security to use personal information in an acceptable way was made up of 70% of the female poll and 67% of the male poll. Apart from this statistic and lower-than-average figures of 63% for the self-employed and 64% of the unemployed, there were no other noteworthy variations in the socio-demographic data.

The 1996 figures reflect the minimal variations by socio-demographic factors at the time of that survey.



## II.8. Tax authorities

**Q. 31.8. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust the tax authorities to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	28	45	53	56	42	38	10	13	9
DK	78	72	77	18	23	17	3	5	6
D.W	33	50	55	50	39	34	9	11	11
D.T	32	49	54	50	39	35	10	12	12
D.O	29	47	49	52	38	38	14	15	13
Gr	40	36	58	44	57	38	10	7	4
E	44	58	67	31	34	27	13	8	6
F	35	44	56	55	50	36	6	6	9
Irl	36	45	50	49	34	36	9	21	14
I	27	35	52	54	47	31	13	18	17
L	54	60	66	29	24	26	7	17	9
NL	63	72	74	29	21	21	6	7	5
A	NA	52	61	NA	36	28	NA	13	11
P	50	58	62	33	35	30	9	7	8
Fin	NA	76	80	NA	20	16	NA	4	4
S	NA	67	81	NA	25	14	NA	8	5
UK	62	64	62	32	27	27	5	9	12
EC12	40	NA	NA	44	NA	NA	9	NA	NA
EU15	NA	51	59	NA	38	31	NA	10	10

There was an approximately 15% increase across the European Union amongst those who **trusted** the tax authorities to use personal information in an acceptable manner.

However, in four countries, the figure was considerably greater.

In the vanguard were increases in Sweden (from 67% to 81%), Italy (35% to 52%), France (44% to 56%) and Greece (36% to 58%). This last figure represents an increase of approximately 60% over the seven-year period.

The UK was the only country where the level of **trust** actually declined (64% to 62%) between 1996 and 2003.

The level of '**don't knows**' remained constant over the seven-year period although this figure hides substantial decreases in the 'don't know' factor in Sweden, Ireland and Belgium.

Taking the longer-term view, over the past twelve years, it can be seen that figures in the UK for those who **trusted** the tax authorities have remained constant at 62%, while, in Denmark, a minimal fall is noted, from 78% in 1991 to 77% in the most recent survey.

These flat figures can be compared with the substantial increases noted in Belgium (28% to 53%), Germany (33% to 55%), Spain (44% to 67%), France (35% to 56%) and Italy (27% to 52%).

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

Included in the 2003 EU15 average of 59% of those who respondents who **trusted** the tax authorities on this issue are variations as extreme as 81% and 50% on a country-by-country basis.

However, these substantial variations are, again, not detected in the socio-demographic data. For example, the male and female figures are identical at 59%, while, on an age basis, the variation is negligible ranging between 58% and 60%.

While minimal compared with the huge variations in country-based data, small differences are, however, noted in two aspects. While this positive view is held by 61% of people living in a rural area or small to middle-sized town, it only gained support from 55% of those living in large conurbations.

There is also a small but noticeable difference based on income levels. While this view is held by 56% of those on the lowest income level, the belief finds favour amongst 63% of those at the other end of the income scale.

## II.9. Local authorities

**Q. 31.9. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust the local authorities to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	37	55	59	45	34	33	13	12	8
DK	73	69	76	20	23	16	6	8	9
D.W	38	49	59	44	38	30	11	13	11
D.T	35	47	57	47	39	31	11	13	11
D.O	24	41	49	59	42	39	12	17	12
Gr	51	56	56	33	37	39	10	7	5
E	53	67	70	27	25	25	9	8	6
F	38	46	53	54	47	37	6	8	10
Irl	41	48	48	45	31	35	9	21	17
I	33	40	57	49	35	26	13	25	18
L	55	66	72	27	21	21	9	13	7
NL	60	66	63	30	26	30	8	8	7
A	NA	59	62	NA	29	27	NA	12	10
P	57	62	71	24	31	23	11	7	6
Fin	NA	51	66	NA	32	27	NA	8	7
S	NA	48	59	NA	35	29	NA	18	12
UK	48	49	50	45	38	39	7	13	12
EC12	42	NA	NA	44	NA	NA	9	NA	NA
EU15	NA	51	58	NA	36	31	NA	13	11

European attitudes towards local authorities resemble those held regarding tax authorities. Accordingly, the level of **trust** regarding their use of personal data increased by a similar figure from 51% in 1996 to 58% in 2003.

There are a number of countries where the increase in **trust** level is substantial and the figures for Italy (40% to 57%) and Sweden (48% to 59%) mirror the substantial increases seen in the previous sub-question (tax authorities).

Interestingly, while in the previous question relating to tax authorities, the Greek figure rose substantially (36% to 58%), when the issue relates to local authorities, the level of **trust** among the Greek poll remains constant at 56%. In addition, there is a small but noticeable increase in the percentage of Greeks who **do not trust** their local authorities in the area of data protection.

Other notable increases in the level of trust were observed in Finland (51% to 66%) and Sweden (48% to 59%).

The data from Ireland is atypical in that while the level of '**don't knows**' has decreased at approximately the same rate as the EU15 average, these '**don't knows**' migrated to the '**do not trust**' rather than the '**trust**' camp.

Contributing to the overall decline in the '**don't know**' figure from 13% to 11% across the European Union were substantial movements in Luxembourg (13% to 7%), Belgium (12% to 8%) and Sweden (18% to 12%).

Looking at the long-term trends amongst those countries for which data are available for all three surveys, notable increases in **trust** are seen in Italy where the level rose from 33% in 1991 to 40% in 1996 and then to 57% in 2003.

Similar substantial increases were seen in Belgium (37% - 55% - 59%), France (38% - 46% - 53%) and Spain (53% - 67% - 70%).

In the UK, however, the figures have remained virtually flat over the twelve-year period moving from 48% to 49% and, finally, to 50%.

### Socio-demographic analysis

Once again, in 2003, variations in socio-demographic data pale into insignificance compared with the country-by-country analysis where the range amongst those **trusting** stretches from 48% in Ireland to 76% in Denmark.

There were no significant variations by gender, age, education, place of residence or income level.

	Trust		Do not trust		Don't know	
	1996	2003	1996	2003	1996	2003
<b>Occupation</b>						
Self-employed	48	54	40	35	12	11
Managers	51	56	37	33	12	11
Other white collar	53	60	35	31	12	9
Manual	50	58	40	32	10	10
House persons	54	60	32	30	15	10
Unemployed	42	51	41	39	16	11
Retired	53	59	34	29	14	12
Students	51	60	32	26	15	13
EU15	51	58	36	31	13	11

As an example, using data from both the 1996 and 2003 surveys relating to occupation, it can be seen how tightly grouped these figures are.

The only 'occupation' which is slightly out of line is unemployment.

## II.10. National authorities

**Q. 31.10. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust the national authorities to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust		Do not trust		Don't know	
	1996	2003	1996	2003	1996	2003
B	49	57	37	32	13	10
DK	70	76	22	15	8	9
D.W	49	56	37	26	14	18
D.T	48	55	37	27	15	18
D.O	42	48	38	33	19	19
Gr	47	53	46	40	7	7
E	66	69	26	26	9	6
F	44	54	47	33	10	13
Irl	52	46	25	35	23	18
I	34	51	36	25	30	24
L	63	67	18	25	19	8
NL	66	60	23	32	12	8
A	54	59	30	27	16	14
P	65	71	26	23	10	6
Fin	66	71	26	22	8	7
S	56	71	29	19	15	10
UK	44	42	39	39	16	20
EU15	48	55	36	30	15	15

Over the 1996-2003 period, there was a notable increase in European Union citizens' **trust** in their national authorities to treat their personal information in an acceptable way. No figures are available for 1991 because this question was not included in the survey at that point.

This is clearly indicated by the percentage points gap between those who **trust** and those who **do not trust** over this period. In 1996, this was twelve percentage points (48% - 36%) while seven years later, in 2003, the difference had more than doubled to twenty five percentage points (55% - 30%).

Over the same period, the level of '**don't knows**' remained constant at 15%.

Major increases in those who **trusted** their national authorities in this regard were noted over this period in Italy (34% to 51%), Sweden (56% to 71%) and France (44% to 54%).

There were only two countries where the level of trust actually decreased over these seven years. In the UK, the level of **trust** dropped two percentage points from 44% to 42%. The level of '**don't knows**' increased from 16% to 20%, while 39% of the poll did not trust national authorities in either 1996 or 2003.

The Irish situation contrasts with that of the UK in that the percentages of people **trusting** and those who did not express an opinion fell by six and five percentage points respectively. Both these groups migrated to the **do not trust** camp which, in the 2003 figures, makes up 35% of the Irish poll.

The Italian '**don't know**' factor, although down by one-fifth from its 1996 level of 30% was, at 24%, substantially larger than the EU15 average of 15%.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

Once again, the 2003 country-by-country data show considerable differences with figures as disparate as 42% in the UK and 76% in Denmark contributing to the EU15 average of 55% who **trusted** national authorities' usage of personal data.

There are no substantial variations in the data relating to gender, age, education or place of residence in either the 1996 or 2003 surveys.

By occupation, however, there was a notable difference between the 61% figure amongst students compared with 49% amongst the unemployed making up the 2003 55% average. This gap was mirrored in the 1996 survey when 51% of students and 41% of the unemployed contributed to the 48% average at that time.

As income levels rose, so did the level of **trust** in the way in which national authorities would use personal information. Accordingly, in the 2003 survey, 54% of those on the lowest income level gave their trust compared with 59% of those at the top of the income ladder.

## II.11. Credit reference agencies

**Q. 31.11. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust credit reference agencies, that is organisations which keep records of people's loans, to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	29	37	36	51	42	49	14	21	15
DK	40	35	41	51	50	42	7	15	17
D.W	16	25	34	70	62	50	7	14	17
D.T	15	26	36	69	59	47	18	15	17
D.O	18	31	45	65	48	40	12	20	16
Gr	38	32	27	36	51	62	20	17	11
E	33	36	36	38	46	50	17	19	15
F	26	27	29	62	61	61	8	12	11
Irl	29	27	23	54	48	58	12	25	19
I	21	21	25	52	48	52	20	31	23
L	34	35	34	43	37	47	14	29	19
NL	36	42	37	51	40	49	12	19	14
A	NA	24	31	NA	58	55	NA	19	14
P	43	40	40	30	45	45	19	16	15
Fin	NA	45	54	NA	40	30	NA	15	16
S	NA	38	46	NA	39	41	NA	23	13
UK	22	16	21	70	69	62	8	15	18
EC12	25	NA	NA	58	NA	NA	12	NA	NA
EU15	NA	27	31	NA	55	53	NA	18	16

On average across the European Union, 53% of those polled **did not trust** credit reference agencies to use personal information in an acceptable way. This figure is a two percentage point improvement on 1996 but still accounts for more than half of EU citizens polled.

In 2003, the **least trusting** nations were Greece and the UK (62%), closely followed by France (61%). At the other end of the spectrum was Finland, where only 30% of those polled held this negative opinion.

In fact, Finland was the only country in the 2003 survey where more than half of those polled (54%) actually **trusted** credit reference agencies regarding data privacy issues.

When looking at major changes over the past seven years, two countries are noticeable by the worsening of their attitude towards credit reference agencies. Against the general trend, the **'do not trust'** factor increased by ten percentage points in Ireland (48% to 58%) and in Luxembourg (37% to 47%).

On the other hand, following the general EU15 trend in the decreasing of the **'do not trust'** factor are Germany, where the figure falls steeply from 59% to 47% and Finland where the decrease is from 40% to 30%.

The Swedish figures are interesting in that there was a substantial decrease in the **'don't know'** factor on this issue with a fall from 23% in 1996 to 13% in 2003.

Against the general EU15 trend, the '**do not trust**' figure increases, albeit slightly, from 39% to 41% but the principal destination of this previously '**don't know**' contingent is to boost the trust quotient from 38% to 46%.

There were also substantial reductions in the '**don't know**' quotients in Italy and Luxembourg.

Looking at the longer term patterns from 1991 to 2003, a steady but substantial increase was noted in the German **trust** factor which, starting from a low base of 15% in 1991, matched the EU15 average in 1996 and, by 2003, was noticeably ahead of this EU15 average.

Moving in the opposite direction is opinion in Greece. In this country, there was a noticeable decrease in the 'don't know' level from 20% in 1991 to 17% in 1996 and just 11% in 2003.

At the same time, the Greek **do not trust** factor has increased steadily since 1991 from 36% to the 2003 figure of 62%.

### Socio-demographic analysis

	<b>Trust</b>	<b>Do not trust</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	30	56	14
Female	32	50	18
<b>Age</b>			
15-24	35	48	17
25-39	34	53	13
40-54	30	56	14
55+	27	52	20
<b>Education</b>			
Up to age 15	29	52	20
16-19	31	54	15
20+	31	57	12
<b>Occupation</b>			
Self-employed	28	59	13
Managers	30	59	11
Other white collar	30	56	14
Manual	35	53	12
House persons	32	49	19
Unemployed	29	54	17
Retired	26	52	21
Students	37	44	18
<b>Residence</b>			
Rural/village	33	51	16
Medium town	30	53	17
Large town	30	56	15
<b>Income</b>			
--	31	51	19
-	33	53	14
+	33	55	12
++	33	55	12
EU15	31	53	16



Although the socio-demographic data are relatively consistent, when looking at the group who **trust** credit reference agencies' use of personal data, some noteworthy variations occur in the larger group (i.e. the 53% of those who, in 2003, **did not trust** the way these agencies used personal information).

There was a difference between the male and female statistics with 50% of women **not trusting** this aspect of credit reference agencies compared with 56% of men.

There were also notable differences also based upon age. Although no clear trend emerges, the figures vary between 48% of those aged 15 to 24 and 56% of those aged 40 to 54.

Again, there are variations based upon educational level with 57% of those who had continued their education to 20 years or beyond **not trusting** credit reference agencies as opposed to only 52% of those whose education had ended aged 15 or below.

Once more, there were no clear differences in terms of place of residence and income level.

## II.12. Mail order companies

**Q. 31.12. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust mail order companies to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	14	19	25	70	67	66	11	14	10
DK	15	13	17	80	78	71	5	10	12
D.W	15	19	20	69	69	66	9	11	14
D.T	14	19	22	71	70	65	9	11	13
D.O	10	16	29	78	73	60	8	10	11
Gr	32	31	27	33	54	65	27	16	8
E	19	18	22	55	70	71	14	12	7
F	9	17	18	83	79	75	4	5	7
Irl	17	19	18	63	55	63	14	26	18
I	13	13	16	68	69	71	15	18	14
L	23	23	28	59	66	63	9	11	9
NL	13	17	23	78	72	67	7	10	10
A	NA	23	25	NA	64	63	NA	12	12
P	28	20	23	52	71	67	12	9	10
Fin	NA	21	29	NA	70	61	NA	10	10
S	NA	22	23	NA	61	63	NA	17	14
UK	17	16	22	76	73	64	7	10	14
EC12	15	NA	NA	70	NA	NA	10	NA	NA
EU15	NA	17	21	NA	71	68	NA	12	11

Although their image has improved slightly over the past seven years, mail order companies' use of personal information is still **not trusted** by two-thirds (68%) of EU15 citizens and this figure rises to 75% in France.

The above-mentioned improvement in attitude is, however, not seen in two countries. In Greece, the confidence level has deteriorated with 65% of those polled in 2003 being in the '**not trusting**' camp as opposed to just 54% in the 1996 survey. In the case of Ireland, not only has there been a substantial reduction in the '**don't know**' quota (26% to 18%) over this seven-year period but the '**do not trust**' factor has increased from 55% to 63%.

In the UK, while the number of those **not trusting** has fallen sharply from 73% in 1996 to 64% in 2003, it would appear that these people have migrated relatively equally both to the **trust** and '**don't know**' camps.

Taking the longer-term view back to 1991, it can be seen that the Greek level of **distrust** has risen substantially from a base of 33% in 1991 through 54% in 1996 to the 65% seen in the 2003 survey.

While the Irish level of **distrust** was at 63% in 1991, it fell to 55% in 1996 and then returned to its 1991 in the most recent survey.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

There are no major variations in this part of the 2003 survey based upon gender, age or place of residence.

Those who were educated longest were more inclined **not to trust** (74%) than those who had left school aged 15 or less (64%).

People at the higher end of the income scale tended to have less confidence in this aspect of mail order companies' behaviour.

## II.13. Non-profit organisations

**Q. 31.13. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust non-profit organisations to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust			Do not trust			Don't know		
	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003	1991	1996	2003
B	26	33	36	52	42	45	17	25	19
DK	34	37	36	54	50	42	11	14	22
D.W	31	30	42	50	51	38	11	19	20
D.T	28	29	42	52	52	38	12	19	20
D.O	16	25	40	61	54	40	17	20	20
Gr	41	39	31	29	41	57	24	20	12
E	42	45	40	28	36	48	18	19	13
F	28	37	41	54	53	45	14	11	14
Irl	37	33	34	41	34	41	16	33	25
I	39	35	45	37	37	33	16	28	22
L	37	37	46	37	39	43	17	24	11
NL	47	50	43	38	34	43	14	17	14
A	NA	36	41	NA	43	45	NA	21	15
P	49	50	54	28	38	33	16	12	13
Fin	NA	37	41	NA	48	43	NA	15	16
S	NA	34	36	NA	46	48	NA	21	16
UK	39	34	35	45	45	40	15	21	25
EC12	35	NA	NA	44	NA	NA	15	NA	NA
EU15	NA	36	41	NA	45	41	NA	19	18

Although their credibility in this respect has improved over the past seven years, opinion across the European Union is equally divided as to whether non-profit organizations use personal information in an acceptable way.

While the **trust** factor is accepted by 41% of EU citizens, this conceals figures as low as 31% in Greece and as high as 54% in Portugal. The Greek figure has fallen sharply from 39% in 1996, while Germany has seen a substantial increase in the trust quotient from 29% to 42%.

There are high '**don't know**' figures in the UK and Ireland where a quarter of those polled did not express an opinion. While the Irish figure in this regard has shown a sharp fall from the 33% recorded in 1996, the British figure moves against the EU15 trend by showing an increase from 21% to 25%.

A substantial decrease in the Luxembourg '**don't know**' factor (24% to 11%) is reflected in a four percentage point increase in the do not trust figure (39% to 43%) and an even larger nine percentage point increase in the **trust** quotient from 37% to 46%.

Going back to the 1991 survey, the Portuguese already had the highest **trust** factor in the EC at 49%. As is seen above, this figure has grown steadily since then.

This can be compared with the Greek experience where, in 1991, 41% of those polled tended to **trust** non-profit organisations' use of personal data. This support level has decreased ever since.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

While there were no exceptional variations or trends to report by gender, place of residence, income, age or education, 48% of managers as opposed to the 41% EU15 average **did not trust** non profit organizations' usage of personal information.

## II.14. Market and opinion research companies

**Q. 31.14. The following organisations may keep personal information about us. Do you trust market and opinion research companies to use this information in a way you think acceptable?**

### Country analysis

	Trust		Do not trust		Don't know	
	1996	2003	1996	2003	1996	2003
B	48	44	25	40	25	16
DK	66	56	20	27	13	17
D.W	40	41	30	28	30	31
D.T	41	43	29	27	29	30
D.O	48	51	25	24	27	25
Gr	47	42	37	47	16	10
E	45	37	36	46	19	17
F	46	41	41	44	13	16
Irl	48	34	24	44	28	22
I	54	50	21	27	26	23
L	56	57	22	32	22	11
NL	63	47	23	40	15	13
A	49	44	24	37	27	19
P	54	50	27	27	18	23
Fin	48	42	38	40	14	18
S	49	46	27	35	24	18
UK	46	40	37	36	17	24
EU15	47	43	31	35	21	22

Market and opinion research companies were **trusted** with personal data by 43% of EU15 citizens polled in 2003 – a four percentage point decrease on comparable figures from 1996. This type of organisation was not covered by the 1991 survey.

The highest level of **trust** was observed in Denmark at 56% although this figure is itself substantially lower than the 66% recorded in 1996.

At the other end of the scale, only 34% of the Irish poll **trusted** these organizations with personal data and this figure also shows a fall of fourteen percentage points over the seven-year period.

The overall '**don't know**' factor has also increased - albeit slightly - from 21% to 22%. Prominent amongst these 'don't know' figures are 31% of Germans.

While on average across the European Union, the percentage of those people **not trusting** the usage of personal information by market and opinion research companies increased by approximately 10% (31% to 35%), much greater increases were recorded in Ireland (24% to 44%), the Netherlands (23% to 40%) and Belgium (25% to 40%).

All in all, it is difficult to identify any clear pattern emerging on a country-by-country basis in this situation.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

While, on average, 35% of EU15 citizens **did not trust** the way that market and opinion research companies would use their personal information, this was a view more strongly held by managers (44%) and people on the highest income levels (40%).

No other noteworthy variations were observed in the 2003 figures.

The 1996 data also contained relatively flat figures with no noteworthy socio-demographic variations except that men (34%) were **less likely to trust** these organisations than women (29%) in a 31% EU average scenario.

### III. VIEWS ON DATA GATHERING AND PRIVACY OF INFORMATION

**Q. 32.1. Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree that you should be informed why organisations are gathering your personal data and if they are sharing it with other organisations?**

#### Country analysis

	<b>Tend to agree</b>	<b>Tend to disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	88	8	4
DK	92	4	4
D.W	90	5	5
D.T	90	6	5
D.O	89	7	4
Gr	92	2	6
E	88	5	7
F	93	4	3
Irl	96	1	3
I	90	7	3
L	83	14	3
NL	91	6	3
A	82	11	7
P	91	3	6
Fin	88	10	2
S	96	2	2
UK	94	4	2
EU15	91	5	4

Nine out of ten EU citizens **tended to agree** that they should be informed why organizations are gathering their personal data and whether these are being shared with other organizations.

In Ireland, this sentiment had the approval of 96% of those polled and, apart from Austria (82%) and Luxembourg (83%), no other EU Member State returned a figure of less than 88%.

#### Socio-demographic analysis

On a socio-demographic basis, there were no worthwhile variations detected by gender, occupation, place of residence or age.

Some minor variations were noted.

87% of those who had been educated to age 15 or less **tended to agree** compared to 93% of those educated until 20 years or more.

A similar small variation was seen by income level where 87% of those at the lowest level **tended to agree** compared with 94% of the highest earners.



**Q. 32.2. Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree that the level of personal data protection provided by the law in (OUR COUNTRY) is high?**

**Country analysis**

	<b>Tend to agree</b>	<b>Tend to disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	49	28	23
DK	62	19	19
D.W	57	24	19
D.T	55	27	18
D.O	48	37	15
Gr	33	46	22
E	33	33	34
F	45	29	26
Irl	40	26	34
I	42	37	21
L	54	23	23
NL	55	30	16
A	54	28	18
P	31	32	37
Fin	76	16	8
S	64	22	14
UK	41	35	24
EU15	46	31	23

The EU15 average of 46% tending to agree with this proposition hides a wide spread of opinion, once again.

For example, 76% of Finns **tend to agree** that their country has a high level of personal data protection and only 8% had no opinion on the matter. In Portugal, on the other hand, only 31% of those polled **tended to agree** with this proposition and more than one-third (37%) of those in the Portuguese poll did not express an opinion.

Making up the 46% EU15 average of those **tending to agree** are three countries (Finland, Sweden and Denmark) where the figures exceed 60% and three countries (Greece, Spain and Portugal) where the maximum figure is 33%.

The above cases tend to show a potential north-south divide on this matter. Taking the same three countries in the example above and looking at their reactions to the '**don't know**' question, we find that the northern group (Finland, Sweden and Denmark) have an average 'don't know' figure of 14% while the southern group (Greece, Spain and Portugal) have an average 'don't know' figure of 31%.

Other data from individual countries which are noteworthy are the 34% '**don't know**' figures in Ireland and Spain and the very high (46%) proportion of Greeks who **tended to disagree** with the proposition.

## Socio-demographic analysis

Once again, compared with the extreme variations in opinion in the country-by-country analysis, the pan-EU variations on this issue by socio-demographic factors are relatively low.

Accordingly, while there is a variation, for example, on a male/female basis amongst those **tending to agree**, the divergence is quite small. On average, 46% of all EU citizens tend to agree with this motion and, while there is a difference between female opinion (45%) and male opinion (48%), these are minor differences compared with those observed between countries.

A similar situation arises when the age of the respondents is considered. Again, compared with an EU15 average of 46%, there are divergences between the youngest segment (48%) and the oldest (44%). But, again, these variations are relatively insignificant.

As might be expected education had a marked effect on the '**don't know**' responses in several parts of this survey. In this particular question, only 17% of those who had been educated to age 20 or beyond did not hold an opinion compared with an EU15 average of 23% and a figure of 30% amongst those who had left school at age 15 or younger.

Place of residence was relatively unimportant in determining a response to this question.

While income had little effect on those **tending to agree** with this motion, 34% of those on the highest level of income tended to disagree compared with 27% of those on the lowest level. As might be expected, there was a strong correlation between salary level and the '**don't know**' segment. While 17% of those at the top end of the income scale could neither agree nor disagree with the statement, this figure rises to 27% amongst those on the lowest income level.

**Q. 32.3. Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree that people's awareness about personal data protection in (OUR COUNTRY) is low.**

**Country analysis**

	<b>Tend to agree</b>	<b>Tend to disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	68	17	15
DK	65	19	16
D.W	60	21	19
D.T	60	22	19
D.O	59	23	18
Gr	75	11	14
E	61	13	26
F	83	8	9
Irl	71	9	20
I	77	14	10
L	80	13	8
NL	71	19	10
A	57	27	16
P	80	8	12
Fin	64	27	10
S	66	22	12
UK	72	14	14
EU15	70	15	15

On average, more than two-thirds of EU citizens (70%) **tended to agree** that awareness of personal data protection in their home country was low. As has been seen on numerous occasions in other parts of the country analysis in this report, this average figure conceals a wide spread of opinion ranging from 57% in Austria to 83% in France.

The same spread of opinion is also seen in the constituent figures making up the EU15 average of 15% of those who **tended to disagree** with the statement. Amongst these figures are figures of 9% or less from Ireland, France and Portugal and figures of 27% in Austria and Finland.

A similar range is seen in those respondents who answered '**don't know**' and here results vary from 8% in Luxembourg to 26% in Spain.

**Socio-demographic analysis**

On the other hand, no significant variations or trends were again seen in the socio-demographic data relating to gender, age or place of residence.

Small variations are, however, noted once again in areas relating to education, occupation and income which are frequently inter-connected and which often appear as the only noteworthy variables in the socio-demographic analysis.

Accordingly, while the EU15 average of those **tending to agree** was 70%, figures of 75% are recorded for those who studied to age 20 or more and managers, and a figure of 74% for those in the highest income band.

At the other end of the scale, figures of 66% are noted for those who left school at age 15 or below, 71% for manual workers and 68% for those on the lowest income scale.

**Q. 32.4. Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree that you are worried about leaving personal information on the Internet such as name, address, date of birth or gender?**

**Country analysis**

	<b>Tend to agree</b>	<b>Tend to disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	58	29	13
DK	63	29	8
D.W	59	20	21
D.T	59	20	21
D.O	57	21	21
Gr	74	7	19
E	64	15	21
F	64	25	11
Irl	73	13	14
I	63	21	17
L	61	28	10
NL	72	18	10
A	59	26	15
P	43	33	24
Fin	68	20	13
S	76	19	5
UK	73	16	12
EU15	64	20	16

Virtually two-thirds (64%) of EU15 citizens polled **tended to agree** that they were worried about leaving personal information on the Internet.

There was, however, no discernible pattern (e.g. north/south divide, level of Internet connectivity) between the five countries (Sweden, Greece, Ireland, the UK and the Netherlands) where this figure reached 72% or more.

At the other end of the scale, low concern was expressed in Portugal where only 43% of those polled **tended to agree** with this statement.

Amongst the '**don't knows**' which averaged 16% across the European Union were a wide range of figures from 24% in Portugal to 5% in Sweden.

**Socio-demographic analysis**

While both men and women matched the EU15 average at 64% and there was no discernible pattern based upon age, education appeared to be a major factor in determining responses to this question. Accordingly, while amongst those who had been educated up to age 15 or below, 55% **tended to agree** with this statement, more than a quarter (26%) voiced no opinion.

At the other end of the educational scale, 72% of those who had been educated to age 20 or beyond **tended to agree** with the statement and only 9% **did not give an answer**.

Similar wide variations were seen when analyzing the results by occupation. While 75% of managers **tended to agree** and only 6% **did not know**, these figures were 52% and 28% respectively for the retired.

On an income basis, a similar pattern is repeated with 56% of those on the lowest income level **tending to agree** and 22% **not knowing** compared with figures of 70% and 10% respectively for those at the top of the income scale.

**Q. 32.5. Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree that (NATIONALITY) legislation can cope with the growing number of people leaving personal information on the Internet?**

**Country analysis**

	<b>Tend to agree</b>	<b>Tend to disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	26	40	35
DK	28	43	29
D.W	24	43	33
D.T	24	43	33
D.O	25	42	34
Gr	26	34	40
E	30	23	48
F	26	47	27
Irl	30	29	40
I	25	41	34
L	31	39	30
NL	45	30	25
A	42	32	26
P	24	27	50
Fin	36	45	19
S	13	61	26
UK	20	48	32
EU15	26	41	34

On average, across the European Union, one-third of those polled (34%) **did not know** whether their national legislation could cope with the issue of personal information on the Internet. This figure reached 50% in Portugal and 48% in Spain compared with 19% in Finland and 25% in the Netherlands.

Overall, the largest grouping across the EU were the 41% who **tended to disagree** with this proposition but, again, this average figure hides variations as extreme as 61% in Sweden and 23% in Spain.

**Socio-demographic analysis**

There were no major trends or variations by gender, age or place of residence in relation to this sub-question.

However, education produced noticeable variations amongst those who **tended to disagree** with the issue or who had no answer. Accordingly, 32% of those with the lowest level of education **tended to disagree** with the issue and 44% **did not know**. These figures are in sharp contrast with those who had received education until age 20 or beyond. In this group were found 50% of those **tending to disagree** and only 25% who **did not know**.

Occupation also appeared to be a major factor in these responses. Amongst managers, 51% of those polled **tended to disagree** with this proposition and 24% **did not know**. These figures stand out against the retired amongst whom 32% **tended to disagree** and a substantial 46% **did not know**.

A similar pattern is seen based upon income level where 35% of those on the lowest level **tended to disagree** compared with 49% of those with the highest income. The pattern repeats itself when the '**don't knows**' are reviewed; these make up 39% of those on the lowest income and only 26% of those at the other end of the income scale.

**Q. 32.6. Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree that (NATIONALITY) organisations that keep personal information should not be allowed to transfer these without your consent to similar organisations in a country which is not a member of the European Union?**

### Country analysis

	<b>Tend to agree</b>	<b>Tend to disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	83	8	9
DK	82	9	9
D.W	83	6	11
D.T	83	6	10
D.O	85	6	9
Gr	80	6	14
E	73	7	20
F	87	6	8
Irl	82	6	13
I	82	8	10
L	87	8	5
NL	88	6	6
A	78	12	10
P	72	9	19
Fin	90	7	3
S	86	9	5
UK	81	8	11
EU15	82	7	11

Making up the 82% EU15 average who **tended to agree** with this statement were 90% of Finns but only 73% of the Spanish and 72% of the Portuguese respectively. In addition, these last two countries had very high levels of **'don't knows'** with 20% being recorded in Spain and 19% in Portugal compared with an EU15 average of 11%.

### Socio-demographic analysis

There were no discernible patterns or variations based upon gender, age or place of residence, but, again, there were differences related to education/ occupation/ income.

Accordingly, compared with an EU15 average of 82% of people **tending to agree** with this proposition, those who had left school at age 15 or before and those who were on lowest income band recorded figures of 77% and 78% respectively. These can be compared with the figures for those whose education continued to age 20 or beyond and those in the highest income band where figures of 87% were recorded in both cases.

The **'don't know'** factor was again affected by education. Compared with an EU15 average of 11%, the **'don't know'** factor for those who had left school aged 15 or less was 17% compared with only 6% amongst those educated to age 20 or beyond. Similar figures were seen in this 'don't know' category when income levels were reviewed. The 'don't know' percentage for those on the lowest level was 15% compared with only 5% for those at the higher end of the income scale.

**Q. 32.7. Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree that most non European Union countries do not have data protection laws that are as effective as the laws in place in the European Union?**

**Country analysis**

	<b>Tend to agree</b>	<b>Tend to disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	43	15	42
DK	53	8	40
D.W	51	7	41
D.T	49	8	43
D.O	42	10	48
Gr	51	9	40
E	37	8	56
F	50	11	39
Irl	45	5	50
I	41	13	47
L	59	12	29
NL	57	8	35
A	57	12	31
P	40	13	47
Fin	77	7	16
S	55	10	35
UK	40	10	50
EU15	46	10	44

When asked whether they felt that other countries' data protection laws are as effective as those in the EU, one of the more significant aspects of the responses to this question is the high level of **'don't knows'** recorded which average out at 44% across the EU.

This **'don't know'** factor reaches half those polled in Ireland and the UK and as much as 56% of the Spanish sample.

Amongst those **tending to agree** were a very high percentage of Finns (77%) and 55% or more of Swedes, Austrians, Luxembourgers and Dutch.

At the other end of this scale were countries such as Spain (37%) and Portugal and the UK (40%).

**Socio-demographic analysis**

There were few major variations or trends discernible by gender, age or place of residence.

Education, however, once again played a noticeable part in these results with 49% of those who had left school aged 15 or younger being in the 'don't know' camp compared with only 39% of those whose education had continued to age 20 or beyond.

While 42% of those who had left school at age 15 or younger and 45% of those on the lowest income scale tended to agree with the proposition, these figures increase to 51% of those educated to age 20 or above and 53% of those on the highest income level.

#### IV. KNOWLEDGE OF LEGISLATION AND DATA PROTECTION PRACTICE

**Q. 33 a.1. Before today, had you heard or not about independent authorities monitoring the application of data protection laws, hearing complaints from individuals and imposing sanctions on law breakers?**

##### Country analysis

	Heard	Not heard	Don't know
B	19	78	4
DK	26	71	3
D.W	25	68	8
D.T	23	70	7
D.O	17	77	6
Gr	25	71	4
E	19	76	6
F	29	67	5
Irl	24	72	5
I	34	60	6
L	23	72	5
NL	41	52	6
A	28	64	8
P	20	78	2
Fin	22	75	3
S	33	64	3
UK	25	71	4
EU15	27	68	6

The level of knowledge about the existence of these independent authorities was low across the European Union and two-thirds (68%) of EU citizens were **not aware** of their existence.

There was no clear pattern on a basis such as a north/south divide or Internet connectivity that grouped the three countries (the Netherlands, Italy and Sweden) with the highest level of awareness of these bodies involving more than a third of those polled in each country.

##### Socio-demographic analysis

Again, there were no major trends or variations discernible in the data relating to gender and age.

Education was, once again, a determining factor and, compared with an EU15 average of 27% who had **heard** of these bodies, high figures (39%) were noted for those educated to age 20 or beyond and relatively low figures (18%) for those who had left school aged 15 or younger.

Unsurprisingly, managers scored highly in this sub-question recording a figure of 42% compared with 20% of house persons and 21% of the retired.

A similar spread was noted based upon income with figures of 35% for the best paid and 22% for those at the other end of the income scale.

Compared with the EU15 average of 27% who had heard of these bodies, the figures were 30% for the residents of large towns and 23% for those living in rural areas or villages.



**Q. 33 a.2. Before today, had you heard or not about laws granting individuals access to personal data held by others and the right to correct or remove data which are inaccurate or have been obtained unlawfully?**

**Country analysis**

	<b>Heard</b>	<b>Not heard</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	24	71	5
DK	23	73	4
D.W	23	64	14
D.T	21	66	13
D.O	16	75	10
Gr	13	82	5
E	24	70	6
F	38	57	5
Irl	25	70	5
I	53	42	5
L	27	68	6
NL	38	53	9
A	26	67	7
P	19	78	3
Fin	28	67	5
S	26	68	7
UK	33	63	4
EU15	32	61	7

On average, 32% of EU15 citizens had heard of these laws, although this figure included numbers as disparate as 13% in Greece and 53% in Italy.

Considering the precise phrasing of the question, there were surprisingly high levels of **'don't knows'** in Germany.

There was also a notable difference between all the figures for East and West Germany.

**Socio-demographic analysis**

35% of men had heard of these laws as opposed to only 29% of women but there were no noticeable trends by age or place of residence.

Education, however, once more had a major effect on these results with 46% of those who had studied to age 20 or more giving this a positive reply as opposed to only half that number (23%) among those who had left school aged 15 or younger.

Again, a similar pattern emerges for managers where 49% of those polled had heard of these laws compared with only 29% of manual workers.

Income levels also played a significant part in the socio-demographic analysis in that 43% of those at the highest level were aware of the legislation compared with only 27% in the lowest income bracket.

**Q 33 b. Have you ever exercised this right****Country analysis**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	10	89	1
DK	12	87	1
D.W	5	92	3
D.T	6	92	3
D.O	8	92	0
Gr	4	96	1
E	4	93	3
F	8	86	6
Irl	6	85	10
I	8	91	1
L	17	63	21
NL	7	92	1
A	6	92	2
P	3	94	3
Fin	9	87	4
S	12	83	5
UK	8	84	9
EU15	7	89	4

The 32% of the total poll who had **heard** of this right were then asked whether they had ever exercised it.

Only a very small percentage had done so and the average figure across the EU15 was only 7% of this sample.

No discernible pattern can be seen in these data.

**Socio-demographic analysis**

No variations or trends emerge from this small data sample.

**Q. 33 a.3. Before today, had you heard or not that those collecting personal information are obliged to provide individuals with certain information such as their identity and the purpose of the data collection?**

### Country analysis

	<b>Heard</b>	<b>Not heard</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	26	66	8
DK	34	60	6
D.W	46	46	8
D.T	45	48	8
D.O	38	54	7
Gr	30	66	5
E	28	62	10
F	34	58	9
Irl	39	53	8
I	63	29	9
L	23	68	9
NL	50	45	5
A	24	67	9
P	23	74	3
Fin	45	51	4
S	60	31	9
UK	45	46	10
EU15	42	50	8

Amongst the 42% of EU15 citizens who were **aware** that this information should be given there were wide variations on a country-by-country basis.

In Italy and Sweden, the figures were 60% or above while in Austria, Portugal and Luxembourg, the figures did not exceed 24%.

### Socio-demographic analysis

There was a noticeable variation by gender in that only 39% of females had **heard** of this obligation compared with 46% of men.

There were no major variations or trends by age of respondent or place of residence.

However, education, once more, emerges as a major influence in this area. While only 33% of those educated to age 15 or less had **heard** about this subject, the figure rises to 55% amongst those whose education had been to age 20 or beyond.

58% of managers had also **heard** of this as opposed to only 35% of house persons and the unemployed.

And, yet again, those on the highest income levels appeared to be far better informed in that 54% of them were aware of this obligation as opposed to only 34% of those in the lowest income bracket.

**Q. 33 a.4. Before today, had you heard or not about the right to object to the use of personal information for the purpose of direct marketing (opt-out)?**

**Country analysis**

	<b>Heard</b>	<b>Not heard</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	38	56	6
DK	38	56	6
D.W	47	43	10
D.T	46	44	10
D.O	41	51	8
Gr	33	63	5
E	31	59	10
F	57	38	6
Irl	40	52	8
I	57	31	11
L	32	60	8
NL	60	34	6
A	43	49	9
P	33	64	3
Fin	73	25	2
S	61	29	10
UK	51	41	8
EU15	49	43	8

Virtually half (49%) of EU15 citizens polled had **heard** about the right to opt-out.

However, as in many previous instances in this report, there is a wide variation in the figures on a country-by-country basis. While this knowledge was claimed by 73% of the Finnish poll and 61% in Sweden, the figure was only 31% in Spain, 32% in Luxembourg and 33% in Portugal and Greece.

**Socio-demographic analysis**

The 49% average across the European Union was made up of 46% of the females polled and 52% of the male sample.

There were no major trends or variations discernible by age.

However, major variations again occur when looking at education and occupation.

Only 36% of those who had left school at age 15 had **heard** of this opt-out clause as opposed to 64% of those who had studied to age 20 or beyond.

68% of managers were also aware of this right as opposed to only 46% of manual workers, 42% of the retired and 39% of house persons.

People living in cities (52%) were more likely to have **heard** of this right than those living in rural areas or villages where the information had reached only 45% of that group.

Once again, income levels had an effect on this knowledge level in that the opt-out facility was known about by 60% of those on the highest income and only 42% of those at the other end of the income scale.

**Q. 33 a.5. Before today, had you heard or not about the need to have your agreement to use your personal information and your right to oppose some uses?**

**Country analysis**

	<b>Heard</b>	<b>Not heard</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
B	37	57	6
DK	44	50	6
D.W	52	38	10
D.T	51	40	10
D.O	47	45	8
Gr	35	60	5
E	34	57	9
F	47	44	9
Irl	36	54	10
I	71	21	8
L	32	60	8
NL	58	35	7
A	45	45	10
P	29	67	4
Fin	67	29	4
S	52	36	12
UK	45	44	10
EU15	49	42	9

On average, across the European Union, 49% of citizens had **heard** of the need to provide agreement for someone to use their personal information and their right to oppose some uses compared with the 42% who had **not heard** of this.

However, these broad averages, once again, hide major differences between countries.

Accordingly, while 67% of Finns had **heard** of this legislation and 29% had **not heard**, the figures are reversed in Portugal where those who had not heard of the right made up 67% of the poll and only 29% had heard of it.

**Socio-demographic analysis**

Focusing on the 49% who had **heard** of the necessity to have this agreement were 46% of women and 53% of men.

No clear pattern emerged based on age but there was again a substantial variation relating to educational level. This measure was known to 65% of those educated to age 20 or beyond but to only 38% of those who had left school aged 15 or younger.

Nearly two-thirds of managers (66%) were **aware** of the need to obtain agreement as opposed to just 40% of house persons and 42% of the retired.

The fact was also more common knowledge in large towns (52%) than in rural areas (45%).

Higher levels of income also generated a higher level of awareness of this issue. 60% of those on the top income band knew of this obligation whereas the figure was only 42% amongst those on the lowest income scale.

## V. TOOLS FOR THE PROTECTION OF DATA PRIVACY

**Q. 34. A lot of personal data are collected when people are on the Internet. Have you heard of tools or technologies limiting the collection of such data? And, if so, have you ever used these tools or technologies?**

### Country analysis

	No, I have not heard about them	Yes, I have heard about them, but I have never used them	Yes, I have heard about them and I have already used them	Don't know
B	77	15	5	4
DK	68	18	13	2
D.W	69	17	9	5
D.T	71	16	8	4
D.O	77	14	6	3
Gr	81	10	3	7
E	76	16	3	5
F	73	20	4	4
Irl	75	17	3	5
I	74	18	4	4
L	65	24	8	3
NL	59	26	12	3
A	63	23	5	9
P	81	16	2	2
Fin	72	17	8	3
S	58	24	14	4
UK	74	17	6	3
EU15	72	18	6	4

72% of EU citizens had **never heard** of these tools or technologies but, yet again, this average figure hides substantial variations by country. In Greece, the figure rises to 81% while in more computer-literate Sweden the figure is only 58%.

In all these cases, however, the figures for those who have **heard** of the tools but have **never used** them should perhaps be aggregated with those who **have not only heard of these tools but already use them** to give a fuller picture. Accordingly, in Sweden, this total 'knowing' and 'using' figure is 38%, while, in Greece, it is only 13%.

Focusing on this small group of people who have **heard of and used these tools** shows that three countries are relatively well advanced in this area. Against the EU15 average of 6%, figures of at least twice this magnitude are seen in Sweden (14%), Denmark (13%) and the Netherlands (12%).

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

Looking initially at those people who have **heard of and used these tools and technologies**, it is seen to be a predominantly male domain, with 8% of men and 4% of women making up the 6% average figure.

Younger people (aged 15 to 39) are four times as likely **to make use of these tools or technologies** than people aged 55 or more with figures of 8% and 2% respectively.

Education, as might be expected, also plays a significant part in this usage pattern with only 2% of those who left school aged 15 or less using these tools compared with 11% of those who studied until age 20 or beyond.

Again, unsurprisingly, 13% of managers as opposed to 3% of house persons, 4% of manual workers and just 2% of the retired have adopted this technology.

People on higher incomes and living in large towns are also much more likely to make **use of these technologies or tools**.

## VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF DATA PROTECTION TOOLS

### Q. 35. Why have you never used these tools or technologies?

#### Country analysis

	Don't know how to install them on my computer	I would not know how to use them	I am not convinced that they work	I am not really concerned about my privacy when I go on the Internet	They are too expensive	Other	DK
B	23	24	21	21	2	13	6
DK	29	25	13	27	6	15	4
D.W	24	34	18	30	5	13	5
D.T	23	34	19	28	6	14	5
D.O	20	32	24	19	13	16	4
Gr	9	35	19	17	4	21	5
E	18	34	17	17	3	13	10
F	18	19	20	19	7	18	13
Irl	22	16	21	13	5	16	15
I	18	34	16	18	5	14	7
L	27	23	24	14	6	14	7
NL	33	31	21	23	6	15	4
A	24	19	12	21	8	23	8
P	10	29	14	19	6	14	11
Fin	19	23	21	31	5	16	8
S	25	27	19	20	6	18	6
UK	21	33	16	14	7	16	8
EU15	21	30	18	20	6	16	8

The 18% of the total poll who had heard about these tools but had never used them were then asked why.

The first two most cited reasons were based upon concerns over technology.

The prime reason cited by 30% of this group was that they **would not know how to use them**. This was the situation affecting 35% of Greeks and 34% of Germans, Spaniards and Italians in contrast to only 16% of the Irish.

A second technological reason concerned the **inability to install them on a computer** and was quoted by 21% of the poll. This was the most common reason claimed by 33% of Dutch people as opposed to only 9% of Greeks.

**Lack of concern about basic privacy issues** was cited by 20% of the EU15 sample and was most important in Finland (31%). This factor was of least importance in Ireland (13%).

Lack of conviction that this **type of software would actually work** was the most cited reason by Luxembourgers (24%) compared with only 12% of Austrians.

**Cost** was not a major deterring factor and was only cited by 6% of those polled. In East Germany, however, this was a reason given by 13% of those polled.



When taking the most often cited reason for not using in a particular country, i.e. Belgium: 24% of the poll would not know how to use them; Denmark: 29% don't know how to install them, etc., an interesting overall pattern emerges.

Eight of the fifteen EU countries have as their prime reason the fact that they **would not know how to use them**, five would **not know how to install them on their computer**, one was convinced that they would not work and one is unconcerned about privacy when they go on the Internet.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

Based on the fact that thirteen of the EU15 Member States cite as their reasons for never having used these tools or technologies the fact that they would not know how to use them (8 countries) or they would not know how to install them on their computer (5 countries), the socio-demographic analysis is focused on these two segments.

Looking first at the data for those who gave the reason for the non-usage of these tools as being that they **would not know how to use them** were 36% of women and 25% of men out of a sample average of 30%.

Age was of little relevance apart from those aged 55 or more where the figure rises to 36%.

Education, on the other hand, plays an important part with 38% of those who left school aged 15 or less citing this as a reason for non-usage compared with only 26% of those educated until age 20 or beyond.

While 37% of the unemployed cited this as a reason, this falls to only 23% of managers.

No variation or major trends are observed by either income or place of residence.

The second most important reason cited by an average of 21% of this sample was that they **would not know how to install them on their computer**.

Once again, women (24%) were more concerned about this issue than men (18%) but no clear data emerged from data relating to age or educational level.

Interestingly, 26% of managers cited this as the reason that they had never used these tools compared with only 14% of the unemployed and 17% of other white-collar workers!

No significant data or trends emerged in respect to income level or place of residence.

## VII. THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM AND THE MONITORING OF COMMUNICATIONS

**Q. 36 a. In light of the fight against international terrorism, do you think that people should agree to have their telephone calls monitored?**

### Country analysis

	No, the right of individuals must always be respected	Yes, if the monitoring only affects those suspected of terrorist activities	Yes, but only if monitoring takes place under supervision of a (NATIONALITY) judge	Yes, everyone should	Yes, other	DK
B	26	44	14	9	0	7
DK	39	35	22	3	0	1
D.W	28	36	21	6	0	9
D.T	30	36	19	6	0	9
D.O	38	36	11	5	0	10
Gr	48	34	10	3	0	6
E	38	34	18	2	0	9
F	28	43	13	12	1	4
Irl	45	28	9	4	1	12
I	34	45	9	9	1	2
L	29	40	14	13	1	4
NL	34	38	16	10	0	3
A	48	32	12	5	1	3
P	30	41	10	11	1	7
Fin	26	58	10	3	0	3
S	25	53	14	5	0	2
UK	37	42	8	6	1	6
EU15	33	40	14	7	0	6

40% of the EU15 sample believed that the **monitoring of telephone calls should be allowed for those suspected of terrorist activities**. Within this figure, a strong line was taken by Finland (58%) and this view was also held by 53% of Swedes.

The second most popularly held view (33% of the poll) took the view that telephone calls should not be monitored as the **rights of individuals must always be respected**. Keen to defend the citizen's right were 48% of Greeks and Austrians and 45% of the Irish.

These two views cover 73% of the EU15 sample.

A third option where the monitoring would take place **under the supervision of a national judge** received strong support in Denmark (22%) and was an option favoured by 14% of the total EU15 poll.

While only 7% of those surveyed felt **that everybody's phone should be able to be monitored**, this was a view that received relatively strong support in Luxembourg (13%) and France (12%).

Amongst the **'don't knows'**, a figure of 12% - twice the EU15 average - was observed in Ireland.

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

No significant variances with averages were noted in the largest group where 40% of those polled wished monitoring only to take effect on those **suspected of terrorist activities**.

Among the EU15 average of 33% who were against monitoring on the grounds that the **rights of individuals must always be respected** were 38% of 15-24 year olds compared with only 29% of 55 year olds.

36% of those who had been educated to age 20 or beyond held this belief compared with 30% who had finished schooling at age 15 or less.

While 18% of managers felt that **monitoring should take place under the supervision of a judge**, this view was subscribed to by only 10% of the unemployed.

**Q.36 b. In the light of the fight against international terrorism, do you think that people should agree to have their Internet use monitored?**

**Country analysis**

	No, the right of individuals must always be respected	Yes, if the monitoring only affects those suspected of terrorist activities	Yes, but only if monitoring takes place under supervision of a (NATIONALITY) judge	Yes, everyone should	Yes, other	DK
B	20	43	15	11	1	11
DK	30	37	24	4	0	5
D.W	22	36	20	8	0	14
D.T	23	36	18	8	1	15
D.O	29	36	12	6	0	16
Gr	41	29	11	3	0	16
E	33	35	15	3	1	15
F	19	45	15	15	2	6
Irl	31	30	10	7	1	20
I	20	44	13	15	0	7
L	25	38	14	16	0	7
NL	28	40	17	10	0	3
A	40	29	15	6	1	9
P	22	34	8	14	1	22
Fin	23	55	10	4	0	8
S	22	51	14	8	0	5
UK	25	43	11	10	1	10
EU15	25	40	14	10	1	11

In a technological extension to the telephone monitoring question, the issue of monitoring Internet use was reviewed.

Overall, the main response from 40% of those polled was that **monitoring should only take place on those suspected of terrorist activities**. This figure is identical to that in the previous question on telephone monitoring. High figures were noted in Finland (55%) and Sweden (51%).

However, there was less support for the **rights of the individual** when related to the Internet than the telephone and, accordingly, only 25% of the EU15 considered this to be the stance that should be taken. This view, however, generated particularly strong support in Greece (41%) and Austria (40%).

**Monitoring under the supervision of a judge** was a solution favoured by 24% of Danes and 18% of Germans compared with an EU15 average of 14%.

There was a small but noticeable difference in the support for the principle that **everybody should be able to be monitored** on the Internet compared with the replies to the question relating to the telephone with figures of 10% (Internet) and 7% (telephone).

Compared with the question relating to telephone call monitoring, there was a substantial increase in the **'don't know'** factor which averaged 11% across the European Union. Particularly high figures in this area were noted in Portugal (22%) and Ireland (20%).

### **Socio-demographic analysis**

28% of 15 - 24 year olds felt that Internet monitoring should not be allowed as the fundamental **rights and freedoms of individuals must always be respected**. However, this view was held by only 20% of those aged 55 or more.

Respondents with higher levels of education also affirmed this belief with 30% of those educated to age 20 or more voicing this opinion compared with only 20% of those who had left school aged 15 or less.

31% of students also held this view as opposed to only 20% of the retired.

Relatively high levels of 'don't knows' were observed amongst older people with a figure of 17% recorded by those over 55 compared with 6% for those aged 15 to 24.

## **ANNEXES**

**ANNEX I: ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE**

Q.1. What is your nationality? Please tell me the country(ies) that applies(y).  
(MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE)

Belgium	1,	→ Q.2
Denmark	2,	
Germany	3,	
Greece	4,	
Spain	5,	
France	6,	
Ireland	7,	
Italy	8,	
Luxembourg	9,	
Netherlands	10,	
Portugal	11,	
United Kingdom (Great Britain, Northern Ireland)	12,	
Austria	13,	
Sweden	14,	
Finland	15,	
Other countries	16,	→ Close interview
DK	17,	

EB59.2 - Q.1. - TREND

**Now, let's talk about the protection of your personal data.**

Q.30. Different private and public organisations keep personal information about us. It is sometimes said that our privacy must be properly protected. Are you concerned or not that your privacy is being protected? Are you...(READ OUT)

- Very concerned ..... 1
- Fairly concerned ..... 2
- Not very concerned ..... 3
- Not at all concerned ..... 4
- DK ..... 5

EB45.1 - Q.47. - TREND



Q.31. I am going to read you a list of (NATIONALITY) organisations that may keep personal information about us. For each of them, please tell me whether you trust them or not to use this information in a way you think acceptable?

	READ OUT	TRUST	DO NOT TRUST	DK
1	Medical services and doctors	1	2	3
2	Insurance companies	1	2	3
3	Credit card companies	1	2	3
4	Banks and financial institutions	1	2	3
5	Employers	1	2	3
6	Police	1	2	3
7	Social Security	1	2	3
8	Tax authorities	1	2	3
9	Local authorities	1	2	3
10	National authorities	1	2	3
11	Credit reference agencies, that is organisations which keep records of people's loans	1	2	3
12	Mail order companies	1	2	3
13	Non-profit organisations	1	2	3
14	Market-and opinion research companies	1	2	3
15	I don't trust any of these organisations (SPONTANEOUS)		2	

EB45.1 - Q.48. - TREND

Q.32. For each of the following statements, please tell me if you tend to agree or tend to disagree?  
(SHOW CARD)

	READ OUT	TEND TO AGREE	TEND TO DISAGREE	DK
1	You should be informed why organisations are gathering your personal data and if they are sharing it with other organisations	1	2	3
2	The level of personal data protection provided by the law in (OUR COUNTRY) is high	1	2	3
3	People's awareness about personal data protection in (OUR COUNTRY) is low	1	2	3
4	You are worried about leaving personal information on the Internet such as name, address, date of birth, gender	1	2	3
5	(NATIONALITY) legislation can cope with the growing number of people leaving personal information on the Internet	1	2	3
6	The (NATIONALITY) organisations that keep personal information should not be allowed to transfer these without your consent to similar organisations in a country which is not a member of the European Union	1	2	3
7	Most non European Union countries do not have data protection laws that are as effective as the laws in place in the European Union	1	2	3

EB60.0 - NEW

Q.33. a) Before today, had you heard or not about...? (SHOW CARD)

b) IF "YES", CODE 1 FOR ITEM 2 IN Q.33.a.

Have you ever exercised this right?

	READ OUT	Q.33.a.			Q.33.b.		
		HEARD	NOT HEARD	DK	YES	NO	DK
1	Independent authorities monitoring the application of data protection laws, hearing complaints from individuals and imposing sanctions on law breakers	1	2	3			
2	Laws granting individuals access to personal data held by others and the right to correct or remove data which is inaccurate or has been obtained unlawfully	1	2	3			
Q.33.b.	(INT.: IF "HEARD", CODE 1 IN ITEM 2) Have you ever exercised this right?				1	2	3
3	<b>ASK ALL</b> Those collecting personal information are obliged to provide individuals with certain information such as their identity and the purpose of the data collection	1	2	3			
4	Right to object to the use of personal information for the purpose of direct marketing (opt-out)	1	2	3			
5	The need to have your agreement to use your personal information and your right to oppose some uses	1	2	3			

EB60.0 - NEW

Q.34. A lot of personal data are collected when people are on the Internet. Have you ever heard of tools or technologies limiting the collection of such data? (INT.: FOR EXAMPLE: COOKIE FILTERS) (IF YES) And have you ever used these tools or technologies or not?

- No, I have not heard about them..... 1
- Yes, I have heard about them, but I have never used them..... 2
- Yes, I have heard about them and I have already used them ..... 3
- DK..... 4

EB60.0 - NEW

**IF " HEARD ABOUT THEM BUT NEVER USED THEM", CODE 2 IN Q.34., OTHERS GO TO Q.36.**

Q.35. Why have you never used these tools or technologies?  
(SHOW CARD - READ OUT - MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE)

- I would not know how to install them on my computer ..... 1,
- I would not know how to use them ..... 2,
- I am not convinced that they work..... 3,
- I am not really concerned about my privacy when I go on the Internet ..... 4,
- They are too expensive..... 5,
- Other (SPONTANEOUS) ..... 6,
- DK..... 7,

EB60.0 - NEW

**ASK ALL**

Q.36. In light of the fight against international terrorism, do you think that people should agree to...

- a) have their telephone calls monitored? (SHOW CARD - READ OUT - ONE ANSWER ONLY)
- b) have their Internet use monitored? (SHOW SAME CARD - READ OUT - ONE ANSWER ONLY)

	READ OUT	<u>Q.36.a.</u>	<u>Q.36.b.</u>
		TELEPHONE CALLS	INTERNET USE
1	No, the fundamental rights and freedoms of individuals must always be respected	1	1
2	Yes, if the monitoring only affects those suspected of terrorist activities	2	2
3	Yes, but only if monitoring takes place under the supervision of a (NATIONALITY) judge	3	3
4	Yes, everyone should	4	4
5	Yes, other (SPONTANEOUS)	5	5
6	DK	6	6

EB60.0 - NEW

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

D.1. In political matters people talk of "the left" and "the right".  
How would you place your views on this scale? (SHOW CARD)  
(INT.: DO NOT PROMPT - IF CONTACT HESITATES, TRY AGAIN)

LEFT					RIGHT				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Refusal..... 11  
DK..... 12

EB59.2 - D.1. - DEMO TREND

**NO QUESTIONS D.2. TO D.6.**

D.7. Could you give me the letter which corresponds best to your own current situation?  
(SHOW CARD - READ OUT - ONE ANSWER ONLY)

Married..... 1  
Remarried ..... 2  
Unmarried, currently living with partner..... 3  
Unmarried, having never lived with a partner..... 4  
Unmarried, having previously lived with a partner, but now on my own..... 5  
Divorced..... 6  
Separated ..... 7  
Widowed ..... 8  
Other (SPONTANEOUS)..... 9  
Refusal (SPONTANEOUS)..... 10

EB59.2 - D.7. - DEMO TREND

D.8. How old were you when you stopped full-time education? (INT.:IF "STILL STUDYING", CODE '00')

--	--

EB59.2 - D.8. - DEMO TREND

**NO QUESTION D.9.**

D.10. Gender.

Male ..... 1  
Female..... 2

EB59.2 - D.10. - DEMO TREND

D.11. How old are you?

--	--

EB59.2 - D.11. - DEMO TREND

**NO QUESTION D.12. TO D.14.**

D.15. a) What is your current occupation?

**IF NOT DOING ANY PAID WORK CURRENTLY, CODES 1 TO 4 IN D.15.a.**

b) Did you do any paid work in the past? What was your last occupation?

	<b>D.15.a.</b> CURRENT OCCUPATION	<b>D.15.b.</b> LAST OCCUPATION
<b>NON-ACTIVE</b>		
Responsible for ordinary shopping and looking after the home, or without any current occupation, not working	1	
Student	2	
Unemployed or temporarily not working	3	
Retired or unable to work through illness	4	
<b>SELF EMPLOYED</b>		
Farmer	5	1
Fisherman	6	2
Professional (lawyer, medical practitioner, accountant, architect, etc.)	7	3
Owner of a shop, craftsmen, other self-employed person	8	4
Business proprietors, owner (full or partner) of a company	9	5
<b>EMPLOYED</b>		
Employed professional (employed doctor, lawyer, accountant, architect)	10	6
General management, director or top management (managing directors, director general, other director)	11	7
Middle management, other management (department head, junior manager, teacher, technician)	12	8
Employed position, working mainly at a desk	13	9
Employed position, not at a desk but travelling (salesmen, driver, etc.)	14	10
Employed position, not at a desk, but in a service job (hospital, restaurant, police, fireman, etc.)	15	11
Supervisor	16	12
Skilled manual worker	17	13
Other (unskilled) manual worker, servant	18	14
NEVER DID ANY PAID WORK		15

EB59.2 - D.15. - DEMO TREND

**NO QUESTIONS D.16. TO D18.**

D.19. Are you in your household, the person who contributes most to the household income?  
(READ OUT)

- Yes..... 1
- No ..... 2
- Both equally ..... 3
- DK..... 4

EB59.2 - D.19. - DEMO TREND

**NO QUESTION D.20.****IF "NO", CODE 2 IN D.19.**

D.21. a) What is the current occupation of the person who contributes most to the household income?

**IF "NOT DOING ANY PAID WORK CURRENTLY", CODE 1 TO 4 IN D.21.a.**

b) Did he/she do any paid work in the past? What was his/her last occupation?

	<b>D.21.a.</b> CURRENT OCCUPATION	<b>D.21.b.</b> LAST OCCUPATION
NON-ACTIVE	1	
Responsible for ordinary shopping and looking after the home, or without any current occupation, not working		
Student		2
Unemployed or temporarily not working		3
Retired or unable to work through illness		4
SELF EMPLOYED	5	1
Farmer		
Fisherman		6
Professional (lawyer, medical practitioner, accountant, architect, etc.)		7
Owner of a shop, craftsmen, other self-employed person		8
Business proprietors, owner (full or partner) of a company		9
EMPLOYED	10	6
Employed professional (employed doctor, lawyer, accountant, architect)		
General management, director or top management (managing directors, director general, other director)		11
Middle management, other management (department head, junior manager, teacher, technician)		12
Employed position, working mainly at a desk		13
Employed position, not at a desk but travelling (salesmen, driver, etc.)		14
Employed position, not at a desk, but in a service job (hospital, restaurant, police, fireman, etc.)		15
Supervisor		16
Skilled manual worker		17
Other (unskilled) manual worker, servant	18	
NEVER DID ANY PAID WORK		15

EB59.2 - D.21. a. &amp; b. - DEMO TREND

**NO QUESTIONS D.22. TO D.24.**

D.25. Would you say you live in a...? (READ OUT)

rural area or village .....	1
small or middle sized town .....	2
large town .....	3
DK.....	4

EB59.2 - D.25. - DEMO TREND

**NO QUESTIONS D.26. TO D.28.**

D.29. We also need some information about the income of this household to be able to analyse the survey results for different types of households. Here is a list of income groups. (SHOW CARD)  
Please count the total wages and salaries PER MONTH of all members of this household; all pensions and social insurance benefits; child allowances and any other income like rents, etc...Of course, your answer as all other replies in this interview will be treated confidentially and referring back to you or your household will be impossible. Please give me the letter of the income group your household falls into BEFORE tax and other deductions.

B.....	1
T.....	2
P.....	3
F.....	4
E.....	5
H.....	6
L.....	7
N.....	8
R.....	9
M.....	10
S.....	11
K.....	12
Refusal.....	13
DK.....	14

EB59.2 - D.29. - DEMO TREND



## ANNEX II: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS STANDARD EUROBAROMETER 60.0

Between 1<sup>st</sup> September 2003 and 30<sup>th</sup> September 2003, the European Opinion Research Group, a consortium of Market and Public Opinion Research agencies, made out of INRA in Belgium – I.C.O. and GfK Worldwide, carried out wave 60.0 of the standard Eurobarometer, on request of the EUROPEAN COMMISSION, Directorate-General Press and Communication, Opinion Polls.

The Standard EUROBAROMETER 60.0 covers the population of the respective nationalities of the European Union Member States, aged 15 years and over, resident in each of the Member States. The basic sample design applied in all Member States is a multi-stage, random (probability) one. In each EU country, a number of sampling points was drawn with probability proportional to population size (for a total coverage of the country) and to population density.

For doing so, the points were drawn systematically from each of the "administrative regional units", after stratification by individual unit and type of area. They thus represent the whole territory of the Member States according to the EUROSTAT NUTS 2 (or equivalent) and according to the distribution of the resident population of the respective EU-nationalities in terms of metropolitan, urban and rural areas. In each of the selected sampling points, a starting address was drawn, at random. Further addresses were selected as every N<sup>th</sup> address by standard random route procedures, from the initial address. In each household, the respondent was drawn, at random. All interviews were face-to-face in people's home and in the appropriate national language.

<u>COUNTRIES</u>	<u>INSTITUTES</u>	<u>N° INTERVIEWS</u>	<u>FIELDWORK DATES</u>	<u>POPULATION 15+ (x 000)</u>
Belgium	INRA BELGIUM	1030	1/10 – 30/10	8,458
Denmark	GfK DENMARK	1000	1/10 – 30/10	4,355
Germany (East)	INRA DEUTSCHLAND	1014	1/10 – 19/10	13,164
Germany (West)	INRA DEUTSCHLAND	1043	2/10 – 19/10	56,319
Greece	MARKET ANALYSIS	1000	6/10 – 30/10	8,899
Spain	INRA ESPAÑA	1000	8/10 – 29/10	34,239
France	CSA-TMO	1051	1/10 – 22/10	47,936
Ireland	LANSDOWNE Market Research	1001	1/10 – 28/10	3,004
Italy	INRA Demoskopea	1000	2/10 – 28/10	49,531
Luxembourg	ILRes	606	1/10 – 30/10	357
The Netherlands	INTOMART	1023	1/10 – 30/10	13,010
Austria	SPECTRA	1031	2/10 – 28/10	6,770
Portugal	METRIS	1000	4/10 – 25/10	8,620
Finland	MDC MARKETING RESEARCH	1011	1/10 – 30/10	4,245
Sweden	GfK SVERIGE	1000	1/10 – 30/10	7,252
Great Britain	MARTIN HAMBLIN LTD	1004	1/10 – 30/10	46,370
Northern Ireland	ULSTER MARKETING SURVEYS	310	2/10 – 24/10	1,314
	TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS	16124		

For each country a comparison between the sample and the universe was carried out. The Universe description was derived from Eurostat population data or from national statistics. For all EU member-countries a national weighting procedure, using marginal and intercellular weighting, was carried out based on this Universe description. As such in all countries, minimum gender, age, region NUTS 2 were introduced in the iteration procedure. For international weighting (i.e. EU averages), INRA (EUROPE) applies the official population figures as provided by EUROSTAT or national statistic offices. The total population figures for input in this post-weighting procedure are listed above.

The results of the Eurobarometer studies are reported in the form of tables, datafiles and analyses. Per question a table of results is given with the full question text in English, French and German. The results are expressed as a percentage of the total. The results of the Eurobarometer surveys are analysed and made available through the Directorate-General Press and Communication, Opinion Polls of the European Commission, rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 Brussels. The results are published on the Internet server of the European Commission: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/public\\_opinion/](http://europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/). All Eurobarometer datafiles are stored at the Zentral Archiv (Universität Köln, Bachemer Strasse, 40, D-50869 Köln-Lindenthal), available through the CESSDA Database <http://www.nsd.uib.no/cessda/europe.html>. They are at the disposal of all institutes members of the European Consortium for Political Research (Essex), of the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (Michigan) and of all those interested in social science research.

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. With samples of about 1,000 interviews, the real percentages vary within the following confidence limits:

Observed percentages	10% or 90%	20% or 80%	30% or 70%	40% or 60%	50%
Confidence limits	± 1.9%	± 2.5%	± 2.7%	± 3.0%	± 3.1%

**STANDARD EUROBAROMETER 60.0  
CO-OPERATING AGENCIES AND RESEARCH EXECUTIVES**

**The European Opinion Research Group EEIG  
Christine Kotarakos  
111, rue Colonel Bourg – B-1140 Brussels  
Tel : +32 2 724 89 15 – Fax : +32 2 724 89 12  
e-mail: christine.kotarakos@eorg.be**

**INRA in BELGIUM SA/NV  
159-165, avenue de la Couronne – B-1050 Brussels  
Tel : +32 2 642 47 11 – Fax : +32 2 648 34 08**

BELGIQUE	INRA BELGIUM 159, avenue de la Couronne B-1050 BRUXELLES	Mr. Jean-Michel Lebrun Jean-Michel.Lebrun@inra.com	tel. fax	++/32 2 642 47 11 ++/32 2 648 34 08
DANMARK	GfK DANMARK Sylows Allé, 1 DK-2000 FREDERIKSBERG	Mr. Finn Villemoes Finn.Villemoes@gfk.dk	tel. fax	++/45 38 32 20 00 ++/45 38 32 20 01
DEUTSCHLAND	INRA DEUTSCHLAND Papenkamp, 2-6 D-23879 MÖLLN	Mr Christian HOLST christian.holst@inra.de	tel. fax	++/49 4542 801 0 ++/49 4542 801 201
ELLAS	Market Analysis 190 Hymettus Street GR-11635 ATHENA	Mr. Spyros Camileris markanalysis@ marketanalysis.gr	tel. fax.	++/30 1 75 64 688 ++/30/1/70 19 355
ESPAÑA	INRA ESPAÑA Avda de Burgos Nº 12, 8ª planta 28036 Madrid SPAIN	Ms Victoria MIQUEL victoria.miquel@ consulting.ecoipsos.es	tel. fax	++/34 91 7672199 ++/34 91 3834254
FRANCE	CSA-TMO 30, rue Saint Augustin F-75002 PARIS	Mr. Bruno JEANBART bruno.jeanbart@csa-tmo.fr	tel. fax	++/33 1 44 94 59 10 ++/33 1 44 94 40 01
IRELAND	LANSDOWNE Market Research 49, St. Stephen's Green IRL-DUBLIN 2	Mr Roger JUPP roger@Lmr.ie	tel. fax	++/353 1 661 34 83 ++/353 1 661 34 79
ITALIA	INRA Demoskopea Via Salaria, 290 I-00199 ROMA	Mrs Maria-Adelaide SANTILLI Santilli@demoskopea.it	tel. fax	++/39 06 85 37 521 ++/39 06 85 35 01 75
LUXEMBOURG	ILReS 46, rue du Cimetière L-1338 LUXEMBOURG	Mr Charles MARGUE charles.margue@ilres.com	tel. fax	++/352 49 92 91 ++/352 49 92 95 555
NEDERLAND	Intomart Noordse Bosje 13-15 NL - 1201 DA HILVERSUM	Mr. Dré Koks Dre.Koks@intomart.nl	tel. fax	++/31/35/625 84 11 ++/31/35/625 84 33
AUSTRIA	SPECTRA Brucknerstrasse, 3-5/4 A-4020 LINZ	Ms Jitka NEUMANN neji@spectra.at	tel. fax	++/43/732/6901 ++/43/732/6901-4
PORTUGAL	MetrisGfK Rua Marquês da Fronteira, 8 – 1º Andar 1070 - 296 LISBOA	Ms Mafalda BRASIL mafaldabrasil@metris.gfk.pt	tel. fax	++/351 210 000 200 ++/351 210 000 290
FINLAND	MDC MARKETING RESEARCH Ltd Itätuulenkuja 10 A FIN-02100 ESPOO	Mr. Mika Kiiski Mika.Kiiski@tns-gallup.fi	tel. fax	++/358 9 613 500 ++/358 9 613 50 423
SWEDEN	GfK SVERIGE S:t Lars väg 46 S-221 00 LUND	Mr Rikard EKDAHL rikard.ekdahl@gfksverige.se	tel. fax	++/46 46 18 16 00 ++/46 46 18 16 11
GREAT BRITAIN	MARTIN HAMBLIN LTD Mulberry House, Smith Square 36 UK-London Swip 3HL	Mr. Ross Williams ross.williams@ martinhamblin.co.uk	tel. fax	++/44 207 222 81 81 ++/44 207 396 90 46