



Perceptions of the European Union in Latin America

Roberto Domínguez

Professor of International Relations at Suffolk University (Boston)

rdominguez[@]suffolk.edu

Abstract

This working paper examines the puzzle of the gaps between the images that the EU projects, voluntarily and involuntarily, and the perceptions of the EU in Latin America. After reviewing some of the debates related to the role of perceptions in public policy and EU Public Diplomacy (EUPD), the paper analyzes some critical developments in global perceptions of the EU based on the study Update of the 2015 Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU Policies Abroad (2021 Update Study), which assessed the attitudes of the EU in 13 countries. The third section examines some studies on the attitudes of the EU in Latin America, including some contributions from Latinobarometer. The fourth section offers comparative cases of EU perception in Brazil, Mexico, and Colombia based on the findings of the 2021 Update Study. The analysis of each country relies on the interpretation of surveys with some references to the press analysis and interview methods provided in the 2021 Update Study. Each case discusses specific trends in the following areas: visibility, primary descriptors, global economics, and international leadership. Also, it identifies some patterns in perceptions of the EU in social development, climate change, research/technology, development assistance, culture, the case of the critical juncture in the survey (pandemic), and the EU as a normative setter. The final section offers some general trends in the perceptions of the EU in Latin America.

Keywords

EU Public Diplomacy, perceptions, public opinion, normative power, global leadership.

Resumen

Este documento de trabajo estudia el rompecabezas de la distancia entre las imágenes que la UE proyecta, de forma voluntaria e involuntaria, y las percepciones de la UE en América Latina. Después de revisar algunos de los debates relacionados con el papel de las percepciones en la política pública y la Diplomacia Pública de la UE, en el artículo se analizan algunos avances importantes en las percepciones de la UE a escala mundial a partir del estudio *Análisis de la percepción de la UE y de las políticas europeas en el extranjero de 2015 (Estudio actualizado de 2021)*, que evaluó las actitudes hacia la UE en 13 países. La tercera sección examina algunos estudios sobre las actitudes hacia la UE en América Latina, incluidas ciertas contribuciones del Latinobarómetro. La cuarta sección recoge casos comparables de percepción de la UE en Brasil, México y Colombia a partir de los resultados del *Estudio actualizado de 2021*. El análisis de cada país se centra en la interpretación de las encuestas, aunque hay ciertas referencias a los métodos del análisis de la prensa y las entrevistas que se utilizaron en el *Estudio actualizado de 2021*. Cada caso aborda las tendencias específicas en los siguientes ámbitos: visibilidad, descriptores principales, economía global y liderazgo internacional. Además, identifica ciertos patrones en las percepciones de la UE en los ámbitos del desarrollo social, el cambio climático, la investigación y la tecnología, la ayuda al desarrollo, la cultura, el caso del momento clave de la encuesta (pandemia) y la UE como referente normativo. La sección final se centra en ciertas tendencias generales en las percepciones de la UE en América Latina.

Palabras clave

Diplomacia Pública de la UE, percepciones, opinión pública, poder normativo, liderazgo mundial.

Roberto Domínguez

Professor of International Relations at Suffolk University in Boston, Massachusetts. He was a Jean Monnet fellow at the European University Institute in Florence. He holds a doctoral degree from the University of Miami. His current research interest is comparative regional security governance, security governance in Latin America, and European Union-Latin American Relations. Some of his recent publications include: “External Powers in Asia”, with Bjørnar Sverdrup-Thygeson (in *EU-Asia Security and Trade*, Palgrave, 2020); “The United States and the European Union”, with Joshua Weissman LaFrance (in *Oxford Encyclopedia of EU Politics*. Oxford University Press, 2020); “Global Governance in the United States” (in *Global Governance from Regional Perspectives: A Critical View*, Oxford University Press, 2017); “Mexico and the EU in the context of Mega-Regional Trade Agreements” (in *The European Union and Latin America trade relations in an unpredictable time*, Manchester University Press, 2022). He is one of the Associated Editors of the *Encyclopedia of European Union Politics* (Oxford University Press, 2021). Professor Dominguez has also contributed as a consultant for projects for the European Parliament, the European Commission, Transparency International, the US Library of Congress, and the US Fulbright Commission.

In an age of immediate communication, images and perceptions play a crucial role in formulating public policies at the local, state, and global levels of political aggregation. The European Union, like most international actors, implements policies based on shared aims among EU member states, institutions, and citizens. Often, the pictures that policies project do not resonate and are interpreted and perceived in a variety of ways by recipient actors. The puzzle of the image-perception gap is essential to this working paper on the perceptions of the EU in Latin America.

This document is divided into four sections to help you develop your analysis. The first section describes the issue that the image-perception gap offers to public diplomacy. In the case of EU Public Diplomacy (EUPD), the challenge is also associated with the complex coordination of actions and messages as a result of the interaction between multiple EU institutions and European Union Member States (EUMS) in crafting EU foreign policy, as well as the diversity of interests of actors involved in the process. The second half of this working paper examines some key developments in global perceptions of the EU. This section takes material from the Update of the 2015 Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU Policies Abroad (2021 Update Study) (PPMI, PD-PCF and The University of Canterbury, 2021g), which assessed the attitudes of the EU in 13 countries at the same time. The third section examines some studies on the attitudes of the EU in Latin America, including some contributions from Latinobarometer. The fourth section offers comparative cases of EU perception in Brazil, Mexico, and Colombia based on the findings of the 2021 Update Study. Each example or subsection will select a few variables from the three scenarios, relying primarily on the survey approach with some references to the press analysis and interview methods. Each subsection discusses specific trends in the following areas: visibility, primary descriptors, global economics, and international leadership. Later, the subsection continues with some patterns in perceptions of the EU in the areas of social development, climate change, research/technology, development assistance, culture, the case of the key juncture in the survey (pandemic), and the EU as a normative setter.

1. Thoughts on the Relevance of the Image-Perceptions Gap and Public Diplomacy

In an age of instant communication, images and perceptions play an essential role in implementing public policies. The substance and factual elements of public policies that produce collective goods are the most effective sources for projecting positive images and, ultimately, creating favorable perceptions. This appears to be unproblematic. However, policymakers face a more difficult challenge: bridging the gap between policies and image projection, on the one hand, and recipient actors' perceptions, on the other. The central puzzle that has paved the way for a growing industry of image consultants, scholars, and communication experts is the image-perception gap.

The study of images and perceptions permeates many aspects of human activity. Understanding perceptions has been critical in shaping various strategies, from marketing and advertising to political campaigns. In a world of instant communications, the first televised US presidential debate in 1960 between Republican Vice President Richard Nixon and Democrat Senator John F. Kennedy opened new avenues for political advisors. A few decades later, Donald Trump's election and presidency represented the triumph of marketing and branding in the context of American political polarization. President Trump's political marketing strategy emphasized emotion, particularly anger, over policy, limiting his ability to represent all Americans or engage in bipartisan congressional negotiations (Cosgrove, 2022).

Dealing with image-perception gaps is more complicated than electoral politics from the standpoint of International Relations. Audiences from various cultures interpreted international actors' policies differently. At the same time, audiences are frequently more concerned with local factors that immediately impact their lives rather than global events. Intentionally or unintentionally, international actors' actions and inactions (states, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations) project images of their beliefs, political culture, and interests. The interpretation of the projected images is more complicated—recipients filter images based on various factors such as historical context, culture, and calculations. Cultural and societal filters may provide a platform for permeating relationship orientations ranging from enmity to amity. Even more challenging is the constant shift in the interests and cultures of the actors projecting images and the recipients interpreting them (Dominguez, 2019).

Countries and international organizations frequently addressed the image-perception gap in foreign policy through initiatives and public diplomacy programs. Public diplomacy (PD) is a growing field in International Relations. The term “PD” was coined in the 1960s in the United States, gaining traction as globalization accelerated and digital media proliferated. The 9/11 attacks were a watershed moment in public diplomacy and soft power (Nye, 2004) studies, as the US realized it needed to focus its public diplomacy strategy on growing anti-American sentiment in the Middle East and beyond (Jun Ayhan, 2018). NPD attempted to shift away from the unidirectional communication practices of old public diplomacy and toward two-way symmetrical communication practices (Melissen, 2005; Snow, 2009). India (Hang Nga and Hong Quang, 2021; Kos-Stanish and Car, 2021), Vietnam (Hang Nga and Hong Quang, 2021), Brazil (Kos-Stanish and Car, 2021; Ribeiro Hoffmann and Sandrin, 2016), and Republic of Korea (Yoon and Chung, 2020) have all been studied in the PD literature.

In terms of the European Union, EU Public Diplomacy (EUPD) has received more scholarly attention. The EU's role as an actor in the global arena makes studying EUPD difficult. The coordination of actions and messages is complex due to the complicated interaction between multiple EU institutions and European Union Member States (EUMS) in crafting EU foreign policy, as well as the diversity of interests of actors involved in the process. Beyond the realms of specialists and policymakers, the EU's global role remains ambiguous, if not unknown, to larger general audiences (Cross and Melissen, 2013). Regardless of the analytical challenge of EU actorness, the EUPD has been the subject of numerous studies, including discussions about the EUPD (Baumler, 2019), the context of strategic partnerships (Ferreira-Pereira and Smith, 2021), and the EU global strategies (Chaban and Holland, 2019). EUPD has also been studied from the standpoint of social media use by the European External Action Service (EEAS), its agencies, and EU Delegations (Yoon and Chung, 2020), post-structural approaches (Sandrin and Ribeiro Hoffmann, 2018) and soft power through education programs (Ferreira-Pereira and Mourato Pinto, 2021). Other studies on public diplomacy have been published about the EU-Africa (Langan, 2021), EU-China (Song and Ai, 2022), and EU-Russia (Nitoiu and Pasatoiu, 2021). The study of perceptions of the EU Latin America has received less attention. Some articles have studied perceptions in the region (Schiavon and Domínguez, 2015; Dominguez, 2011), and other publications have investigated the efficacy of EUPD in Mexico (Dominguez, 2021, 2020) and Brazil (Ferreira-Pereira, 2021; Sandrin and Ribeiro Hoffmann, 2018) or conducted case study comparisons (Dominguez *et al.*, 2022).

2. Overview of Perceptions of the EU around the world

This section examines some general trends related to the perceptions of the EU in the world. From different disciplines, there is an increasing number of publications that provide essential insights and snapshots about how regions and countries perceive the EU. The field of perceptions of the EU around the world has been prolific. Extensive literature has been published applying common analytical

frameworks to numerous case studies (Chaban and Holland, 2019, 2014; Lucarelli and Lorenzo, 2010). Still, more work is needed to improve the understanding of the perceptions about the EU worldwide. As perceptions are greatly based on surveys, one of the main challenges is the systematic gathering of information over time. Within the EU, the Eurobarometer has provided a valuable source of information about the opinion of Europeans in numerous areas of the integration process. From the original goal of “revealing Europeans to themselves”, the Eurobarometer project has conducted surveys regularly since 1974 and provided systematic information to detect solid trends and changes in perceptions over a long period. However, there is no similar tool to study the perceptions of the EU around the world, rather questions about the EU as part of more extensive surveys or studies within specific time frames.

A limited number of institutions and think tanks in several countries conduct regular surveys and analyses about perceptions of foreign policy that include questions related to the perceptions of local audiences about Europe or the European Union. The Chicago Council on Global Affairs provides insights and analysis on US foreign policy and America’s global engagement and advances policy solutions on critical global issues. The Chicago Council Survey has been conducted since 1974, providing a trusted and widely cited source of longitudinal data on American public opinion about a broad range of US foreign policy and international issues. The Chicago Council Surveys are highly respected and widely used in policy circles and academic research in the United States and abroad (Smeltz *et al.*, 2022).

The Global Attitudes and Trends Team at the Pew Research Center surveys and produces reports on international public opinion on various subjects, ranging from people’s assessments of their own lives to their attitudes about the current state of the world. The reports explore global public opinion, but the questions about the European Union are limited (Pew Research Center, 2022). In particular, Pew has implemented a few questions related to the EU in the Republic of Korea, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States, Japan, Singapore, Malaysia and Israel (Fagan and Gubbala, 2022).

One of the main challenges in examining the perceptions of the EU in the world is the application of methodologies based on synchronous research and data. In some cases, analyses focus on the review of the traditional press (newspapers), while in others, on surveys. Two projects have been conducted combining different methods and providing a consistent comparison of the perceptions of the EU. The first is the *Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU’s Policies Abroad* (2015) or *2015 Baseline Study*. The European Commission’s Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI) requested the study. It was implemented in January – November 2015 by the three partner organizations: the Public Policy and Management Institute (PPMI) (the lead partner) based in Vilnius, Lithuania; the National Centre for Research on Europe (NCRE), located at the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand; and the NFG Research Group, based at Freie Universität Berlin, Germany (PPMI, NCRE and NFG, 2015). The second was the *Update of the 2015 Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU’s Policies Abroad* or *2021 Update Study*, which was requested by the FPI too. The implementation of the study started on 4 January 2021. The B&S Europe consortium led it, and the assignment was implemented by the team of PPMI (the sub-contractor) in close cooperation with experts from the Public Diplomacy and Political Communication Forum (PD-PCF), University of Canterbury (PPMI, NCRE and NFG, 2021).

The 2015 and 2021 studies contribute to understanding EU perceptions worldwide by applying four simultaneous tools to gather information synchronously in thirteen countries: online surveys (public opinion), media analysis (newspapers), social media analysis and interviews with the local opinion- and decision-makers as well as focus groups with students. The 2021 Update Study is an in-depth, multi-method analysis of the perceptions of the EU and Europe in 13 of the EU’s key partners – 10 Strategic Partner countries that were included in the 2015 Baseline Study: Brazil, Canada, China, India, Japan,

Mexico, Russia, South Africa, Republic of Korea and the US – as well as three additional countries: Colombia, Indonesia, and Nigeria (PPMI, NCRE, and NFG, 2021).

The 2015 and 2021 reports provide an overview of the perceptions of the EU. The database and analysis of the reports are extensive, but some highlights can present contrasting perceptions about the EU (Table 1).

First, positive perceptions of the EU were recorded in the survey in all countries, but there is a significant variation. The first tier of countries reached between 60 and 80% of positive perceptions: Nigeria, Indonesia, Colombia, Mexico, India, Brazil, and South Africa. The second tier, between 40 and 59%: United States, Republic of Korea, and Canada. The third tier is between 20 and 39%: Russia, China and Japan. Supplementing the third tier of countries, negative perceptions (somewhat negative and very negative) were higher in China (18.8%), Russia (17.4%), and the US (15.3%). Also, in comparison to 2015, there has been an increase in positive attitudes (“very positive” and “somewhat positive”) over the last five years in all locations except China, where there has been an increase in negative attitudes and a decrease in positive attitudes (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021f: 12-14). Also, compared to other international organizations, the EU comes either first or second in terms of positive views in all surveyed countries except China, Indonesia, India and Nigeria. The comparison is with UN, Mercosur, World Bank, WTO, USMCA, NATO and ASEAN (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021e: 16)

TABLE 1. Generally speaking, please indicate how positive or negative you feel about each of the following countries and organizations (the EU)?

	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Neither	Somewhat negative	Very negative	Do not know	Base (n)
Brazil	38,2%	38,0%	17,8%	2,7%	1,0%	2,3%	1150
Canada	12,0%	38,5%	32,2%	7,1%	3,9%	6,3%	1018
China	7,6%	20,1%	50,7%	16,0%	2,8%	2,9%	1108
Colombia	41,0%	38,4%	15,6%	2,8%	0,8%	1,4%	1106
Indonesia	37,7%	41,7%	15,8%	3,8%	0,1%	1,0%	1133
India	33,2%	42,0%	18,3%	3,4%	0,3%	2,8%	1145
Japan	8,3%	28,6%	45,0%	7,8%	2,2%	8,0%	1126
Mexico	38,0%	38,8%	18,2%	2,3%	0,7%	2,0%	1227
Nigeria	56,6%	28,9%	12,0%	2,1%	0,4%	0,1%	1012
Republic of Korea	13,7%	34,0%	40,4%	5,5%	3,1%	3,2%	1030
Russia	9,8%	30,0%	41,1%	13,5%	3,9%	1,7%	1114
South Africa	28,6%	36,5%	23,2%	6,0%	3,3%	2,3%	1158
Total	26,2%	34,3%	27,7%	6,4%	2,1%	3,4%	14427

Source: PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021e: 50.

Second, in responding to the question which of the following words, if any, best describes each of the following countries and organizations, the term most often associated with the EU is “modern”. It came first in all but two surveyed countries (Japan and the Republic of Korea). The term “strong” came second or third in eight surveyed countries, and “efficient” came third in six countries. “United” (in Canada, Colombia, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, and the Republic of Korea), “multicultural” (in Canada and the Republic of Korea), and “peaceful” (in Nigeria, South Africa, the Republic of Korea) are the three categories in which the EU tops in more than one country. Association with negative terms such as “aggressive”, “hypocritical” or “arrogant” is low across all countries except Russia, where “hypocritical” is the third term most likely to be associated with the EU, an improvement from 2015 (48% in 2015 compared to 24.5% in 2021). In turn, the deterioration of the perception of the EU in China is visible through the increase of respondents in this country associating the EU with the terms “hypocritical” (from 6.9% in 2015 to 17.2% in 2021) and “arrogant” (from 13.1% to 18.2%) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021e: 19-22).

Third, based on questions about the likelihood and desirability of EU’s leadership, the 2021 report plotted both variables and identified three groups. The first group includes Nigeria, Indonesia, India, South Africa, Colombia, Mexico and Brazil. Their respondents see the EU’s leadership as both highly likely and desirable. In all these countries except India, the likelihood is slightly higher than the desirability. In the second group of countries, respondents come from Canada, the US, and Japan. Participants see the EU’s leadership as moderately likely and desirable. For these countries, the EU leadership is seen as slightly more desirable than likely, indicating a certain level of sympathy from respondents, while they might also consider that the future of their country is less dependent on the actions and decisions made by the EU. Finally, the third group of countries comprises Russia, the Republic of Korea and China. While showing moderate level of likelihood and desirability, respondents there also exhibit a higher level of probability than desirability of the EU’s leadership. Overall, across all 13 countries, the EU is seen as benevolent but less potent than other global actors. In China, Russia and the US, the public sees their respective countries as the most likely and desirable global leaders. This is based on a high opinion of their own countries’ capabilities and a relatively low opinion of the EU as an actor. And for most of the countries in this study, the US is the most likely and most desirable global leader, followed by the EU and Japan (in Canada and Colombia, the EU’s global leadership is seen as the most desirable, but the US still leads in likelihood). An exception is public perceptions in Indonesia, and Japan is seen as the most desirable and most likely global leader (followed by the EU and the US) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021e: 22-27).

Four, the visibility of countries, leaders and institutions in *traditional media* and *social media* analysis across 13 locations follows two trends. The first is the visibility of Germany, France, Italy, and Spain in 2015 and 2021. The second is the visibility of other EU countries linked to specific events. This is the case of The Netherlands in traditional media to Ireland and Hungary on social media in the context of the EU in 2021 (COVID-19 measures, border checks between neighboring Northern Ireland and the UK, or media freedom). Regarding the visibility of EU institutions and leaders, the European Commission and its Presidents (Ursula von der Leyen and Jan Claude Juncker) have received attention in traditional media with more notes in 2015 and 2021. The Commission has been followed by the EU High Representative (HR) Josep Borrell, President of the European Council, Charles Michel, and the President of the European Central Bank, Christine Lagarde, in 2021. This marks a change from the 2015 Baseline Study, in which the most visible leaders were the European Commission, followed by the President of the European Parliament, Donald Tusk, the President of Eurogroup, Jeroen Dijsselbloem, and only after these, the then-HR Frederica Mogherini. Related to contextual challenges, the European Central Bank in 2015 and the European Medical Agency in 2021. In both the EU and Europe datasets, the most visible leaders of the EU Member States are Angela Merkel, Emmanuel Macron and Mario Draghi. Viktor Orbán, Sebastian

Kurz, Pedro Sánchez, Andrej Babiš, Mark Rutte and Mette Frederiksen are mentioned too, but to a much lesser extent (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021g: 11-12).

3. Perceptions of the EU in Latin America

In the context of perceptions of the EU in Latin America, academic studies have discussed the cases in Brazil (Sandrin and Ribeiro Hoffmann, 2019), Venezuela (Fioramonti, 2009) and Mexico (Dominguez, 2019; Chanona, 2010). Others have focused on Latin American perceptions (Schiavon and Domínguez, 2015; Dominguez, 2011). On the other hand, some surveys have provided a solid base for analyzing perceptions in Latin America. While the European Union has been only part of more extensive surveys, some initial views about perceptions in Latin America. Three surveys and reports are essential for the analysis.

The first is Latinobarometer, which has become a reference for understanding public opinion in Latin America. Since 1995, Latinobarometer has produced numerous reports and an annual public opinion survey involving 20,000 interviews in 18 Latin American countries. Based on the database provided by Latinobarometer, one of the survey questions is related to the European Union: What is your opinion of the relationship between your country and the European Union? Very good, good, bad or very bad. Table 2 presents the overview of perceptions.

TABLE 2. Opinion of the relationship between your country and the EU

	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Venezuela
Very Good	6,3%	7,4%	21,5%	21,8%	15,6%	14,0%
Good	67,9%	70,9%	71,3%	61,3%	60,3%	46,8%
Bad	22,2%	18,7%	6,0%	13,1%	17,6%	24,6%
Very Bad	3,6%	3,0%	1,1%	3,8%	6,4%	14,6%

Source: Elaborated based on Latinobarometer Online Analysis. Average responses of the following years: 1997, 2003-2011, 2013, 2015-2018, and 2020 (Latinobarometer, 2022).

The sample of the six Latin American countries presents a decreasing order of the average of positive opinions (merging very good and good) about the relations between the country surveyed and the European Union for the years 1997, 2003-2011, 2013, 2015-2018, and 2020: Chile (93.2%), Colombia (83.1%), Brazil (78.3%), Mexico (75.9%), Argentina (74.2%) and Venezuela (60.8%).

Annex I (at the end of this document) present the yearly breakdown of table 3-1. One of the main findings in Annex I is that the six countries have experienced increasing negative perceptions about the EU in the past decade. In Chile, while the average negative responses was 7.1% (bad and very bad) for the years included in table 3-1, they peaked at 11.7% in 2020 in contrast to 3.4% in 2010. Colombia, where the average negative perception was 16.9%, started registering a higher number of negative perceptions since 2003, reaching more than 20% in three non-consecutive years (21.7% in 2013, 24.9% in 2015 and 27% in 2020).

The average of positive responses in Brazil and Mexico is in the range of high 70%. In contrast, in the case of Brazil, while the average negative responses has been 21.7%, they have surpassed 25% since 2015, reaching more than 30% in 2017 and 2020. In Mexico, the average negative perceptions in table 2 is 24%. However, negative responses jumped to 32.3% in 2015 and again to 32.6% in 2020.

Negative perceptions in Argentina and Venezuela show a more consistent negative trend. In Argentina, the average of negative responses is 25.8% and higher numbers were registered in 2008 (28%), 2011 (30%), 2013 (37.8%), 2015 (34.6%), and 2020 (40.7%). Venezuela registered the lowest average of positive responses: 58.6%. In parallel, the average of negative responses was 39.2%. However, there has been an increasing negative trend since 2013: 48% in 2013, 52.9% in 2015, 64.1% in 2016, 54.6% in 2017, 66.8% in 2018 and 72% in 2020.

The second is the public opinion reports published by the Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE). Launched in 2004, the CIDE project studies Mexicans' social attitudes and political culture concerning Foreign Policy and International Relations. Several surveys have been conducted in which the main priorities are the Western Hemisphere (United States, identity, migration, Latin America). Nonetheless, the reports have included some information regarding European-related topics. The report summarizing the findings between 2004 and 2014 indicates that regarding the knowledge of the Mexican population about international issues, in 2014, 52% knew the meaning of the acronym UN, compared to 62% in 2004. Knowledge of the Euro fell from 59% in 2006 to 40% in 2014 (Maldonado *et al.*, 2016). The 2018-19 report also presents some information regarding Europe. When Mexicans evaluated regions, North America was the most valued region, with an average of 63.6 points, followed by Europe, with 60.1 points, and Asia-Pacific, with 58.2 points. Mexicans also recognized the leadership of Pope Francisco, with an average of 59.8 points; Angela Merkel, with 55 points; and Vladimir Putin, with 54.8 points. Regarding countries, Germany and the United Kingdom have also managed to maintain a high valuation, alternating the first and second places in the order of valuation of European countries. From 2012 to 2018, Spain's score has been stable (Maldonado *et al.*, 2020: 49-53).

The 2010-2011 comparative report included Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, and Peru and had a few references to European actors. Regarding the ranking of European countries, Spain was second in Ecuador, third in Mexico, and fourth in Brazil, Peru, and Colombia. Germany was ranked third in Brazil, fifth in Colombia and Mexico, sixth in Peru, and seventh in Ecuador. Another finding is that 27.30 of the respondents in the survey "have not heard, do not know or do not answer" when asked about the EU. The percentage by country presented the following numbers: Colombia 16, Ecuador 26, Mexico 33, and Peru 35 (information not available for Brazil) (González *et al.*, 2011: 42). Another critical finding is regarding the ranking of regions in the surveyed countries. While for the Colombians, Ecuadorians, and Mexicans, the region best valued is North America, Brazilians and Peruvians ranked Asia-Pacific first. This result may be due to the narrowing and strengthening of economic relations of these two nations with Asian countries. Europe was ranked third in Brazil and Peru, and second in Colombia, Ecuador and Mexico (González *et al.*, 2011: 84-85).

The survey "European Union – Latin America: Perspectives, Agendas and Expectations" is the third important source of perceptions about the EU. The study was processed by Latinobarómetro in the second half of 2021 and polled a representative sample from ten Latin American countries: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The survey was overseen by an academic advisory board that examined and analyzed the results. It is part of a long-term research program run by the Dialogo y Paz team at Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung's journal Nueva Sociedad. The survey was conducted between 10 September to 4 October 2021 (Latinobarómetro, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, and Nueva Sociedad, 2021a).

The study mentioned above indicates that almost half of Latin Americans perceive Europe as their preferred region for partnership, and over two-thirds stated that they have a “good” or even “very good” vision of their country’s relationship with the EU. Regarding the partnership between Latin American countries and the EU, as indicated in table 3, positive perceptions are experienced to collaborate with the EU. However, when it comes to hard power issues, Europe is perceived as a comparably weak actor, with only 7% stating that the EU is a world leader in military affairs and 11% saying that the EU is leading in the area of economic power (Noyan and Stuart Leeson, 2022).

TABLE 3. The EU as the best partner in the following areas

	World Peace	Human Rights	Science	Humanitarian Aid	Environmental Protection	Fight Against Terrorism	Technology Development	Fight Against Poverty	Military Power	Economic Power
Argentina	44	50	22	48	52	13	4	40	5	10
Bolivia	61	68	16	57	63	19	5	59	6	13
Brazil	46	48	21	45	47	13	6	47	6	8
Colombia	56	60	22	46	61	16	4	51	7	11
Costa Rica	56	56	18	38	61	16	4	55	8	13
Chile	59	59	29	53	63	18	5	54	8	10
Guatemala	63	60	14	48	57	21	5	55	8	16
Mexico	57	56	18	47	57	20	8	51	8	11
Uruguay	55	58	25	52	62	18	5	50	6	9
Venezuela	64	56	17	44	62	15	4	50	5	8

Source: Based on data from the survey “European Union – Latin America: Perspectives, Agendas and Expectations” (Latinobarómetro, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, and Nueva Sociedad, 2021b).

4. Three Case Studies

The variety of methodologies and studies to understand the perceptions of the EU in Latin America provides snapshots. The previous 2015 and 2021 studies contribute to understanding EU perceptions worldwide by applying four simultaneous tools to gather information synchronously in thirteen countries. In the case of Latin America, Brazil and Mexico were included in the 2015 study, and Colombia was added to the 2021 study.

Table 4 lists the four methods to gather information about the EU in Brazil, Mexico and Colombia. First, the online surveys (public opinion) were coordinated and conducted by PPMI through an online panel provided by Syno International. The data collection took place from 28 April to 16 May 2021. Second, regarding the media analysis (newspapers), the quantitative part of the general trends in a large press media sample was carried out by PPMI. The study monitored six popular daily newspapers in Brazil, Colombia and Mexico from 1 February to 30 April 2021. The Factiva repository aggregated content from licensed and accessible sources, and in-house data processing was applied to produce the results. The

qualitative media content analysis of the news that reported the EU as a significant focus/theme was designed, supervised and coordinated by experts from the Public Diplomacy and Political Communication Forum (PD-PCF), University of Canterbury (UC), New Zealand, and conducted by Country Experts trained by the PD-PCF, UC.

The third is social media analysis. The data collection process was automated using the online social media monitoring tool Mediatoolkit. Social media posts were collected from Twitter, Facebook and Instagram using automated queries. Social media posts collected from 1 February to 30 April 2021. The fourth method was interviews with the local opinion- and decision-makers as well as focus groups with students conducted by the Country Experts, with training support and supervision from PD-PCF, UC, following the approval of the UC Human Ethics Committee. As part of this study, interviews and focus groups aim to provide in-depth explanations about perceptions of Europe and the EU and cross-reference the findings from the public opinion survey and traditional and social media analyses. Semi-structured, anonymous qualitative group interviews under Chatham House Rule were conducted with all EU Delegations across the 13 key partner countries. Interviews lasted between 60 to 90 minutes. The group interview with representatives of the EU Delegation to Brazil was conducted in March 2021 by members of the Core Team (PD-PCF, UC and PPMI) and the Country Experts.

TABLE 4. Methods of the 2021 Update Report

Public Opinion (Survey)	Media (Newspapers)	Social Media	Interviews
Brazil			
Respondent profiles in the Brazil were established based on data from the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) and the survey included a total of 1150 individuals aged between 15 and 64 years old.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -O Globo -Folha de São Paulo -O Estado de São Paulo -Correio Braziliense -Zero Hora -Valor Economico Datasets: EU (821 articles) and Europe (1608 articles). Qualitative media (content analysis): 97 articles.	The resulting sample of Brazilian social media posts collected from 1 February to 30 April 2021 includes 188,205 mentions, of which 41,006 mention the EU (74% in Portuguese) and 147,199 mention Europe (91% in Portuguese).	Focus group: 8 students. Multipliers and influencers: 12. Representatives of the EU Delegation.
Colombia			
The respondent profiles in Colombia were established based on data from the Colombian National Statistics Directorate (DANE) and the survey included a total of 1,106 individuals aged between 15 and 64 years old.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -El Espectador -El Pais -El Tiempo -El Heraldo -El Nuevo Siglo -Portafolio Datasets: EU (584 articles) and Europe (1,162 articles). Qualitative media (content analysis): 33 articles.	The resulting sample of Colombian social media posts collected includes 19,234 mentions, of which 5,904 mention the EU (81% in Spanish) and 13,349 mention Europe (86% in Spanish).	Focus groups: 8 participants. Multipliers and influencers: 12 individual interviews Representatives of the EU Delegation.

Public Opinion (Survey)	Media (Newspapers)	Social Media	Interviews
Mexico			
Respondent profiles in Mexico were established based on data from the Mexican National Institute of Statics and Geography (INEGI). The survey included 1,227 individuals aged between 15 and 64 years old.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -La Jornada -El Universal -Reforma -Milenio -El Financiero -El Economista Datasets: EU (825 articles) and Europe (2,662 articles) Qualitative media (content analysis): 134 articles.	The resulting sample of Mexican includes 93,050 mentions, of which 30,121 reference the EU (88% in Spanish) and 62,929 reference Europe (90% in Spanish).	Focus group ten undergraduate students. Multipliers and influencers: 13 individual interviews . Representatives of the EU Delegation.

Source: Elaborated to summarize the methodology of 2021 Report (PPMI, PD-PCF and University of Canterbury, 2021b).

Based on the 2021 report, the following subsections select a few variables to provide an overview of the perceptions of the EU in Brazil, Colombia and Mexico. The analysis of the three cases will draw mainly on the method of the survey with some references to the method of press analysis and interviews. Each subsection covers some trends in the following areas: visibility, main descriptors, global economy, and international leadership. Later will continue with some trends of the perceptions about the EU in the areas of social development, climate change, research/technology, development assistance, culture, the case of the critical juncture in the survey (pandemic), and the EU as a normative setter.

4.1 Brazil

Following Sandrin and Ribeiro Hoffmann (2022), long and medium-term cultural local filters and immediate events have influenced perceptions of the EU in Brazil. From deep-seated cultural perceptions based on history and the colonial legacy to the foreign policy imprint of governments, perceptions of the EU combine multiple factors. In Santander and Saraiva's view (2016), there is a permanent match and mismatch between the Brazilian and EU vision of one another's role in the world and interests in critical regional and international political issues.

The EU-MERCOSUR agreement carried high expectations for improving Brazilian perceptions of the EU, particularly concerning greater market access to Brazilian goods. Still, these have been undermined by Bolsonaro's government, whose stance on climate change, human rights, and regional integration diverge from those of the EU. Brazilian mixed perceptions of the EU in the issue-area of energy, particularly biofuels, appeared prominently (Sandrin and Ribeiro Hoffmann, 2019). Expectations regarding the conclusion of the EU-MERCOSUR agreement, in 2019, after 20 years of negotiations, were encouraging, casting a positive light on the perceptions of the EU, especially among government officials and businesses. Other problematic trends registered by the relevant studies are a general lack of awareness about the EU in Brazil and an increasing lack of interest among the general public, as indicated by one of the few existing surveys in this period (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021c). Other elements shaping the perceptions of the EU in Brazil are the politicization of regionalism in South America, the EU-Mercosur relationship, the crisis in Venezuela, and the agenda within CELAC and Mercosur (Weiffen and Nolte, 2020). The EU-Brazil Strategic Partnership was established in 2007. It generated many expectations, but despite the fruitful Sectorial Dialogues (Blanco and Luciano, 2018), it has been underperforming since its creation. (Dominguez *et al.*, 2022).

In 2021, the EU's visibility in Brazil was higher than in 2015. In 2021, the general assessment of the EU as a partner to Brazil was positive: 59.2% of survey respondents thought the relationship with the EU was "very good" (22.5%) or "rather good" (36.7%), placing the EU third only to the US (79.8%) and Japan (64.4%). The trend is an improvement from 2015, when 57.5% of respondents said the overall relationship with the EU was "very good" (16.1%) or "rather good" (41.4%). According to the survey, in 2021, 78.2% of Brazilian respondents believed the EU should have stronger political ties with Brazil, up from 68.5% in 2015. Furthermore, in 2021, 62.2% thought the EU was a trustworthy partner (25.7% strongly agree, 36.5% agree, 5.4% disagree, and 1.8% strongly disagree), up from 54.9% in 2015. In contrast, 71.1% of Brazilians agree that the EU is an essential partner in international relations with Brazil, while in 2015, these numbers were slightly higher: 81.1%.

In the eyes of the Brazilian public, the EU's overall visibility has increased compared to the 2015 Study. The share of answers to the option "Do not know/ cannot answer" in the question about how positive or negative they feel about the EU moved from 6% in 2015 to 2.3% in 2021. The frequency of hearing or reading about the EU (on TV, radio, internet, newspapers, or simply by word of mouth), according to the survey, is slightly higher than in 2015, which might help explain the EU's increased visibility in 2021: 33.3% of survey participants hear or read about the EU "more or less every day" (compared to 28.6% in 2015), 35% "about once a week" (in 2015 – 35.6%), and 12.8% "about once a month" (in 2015 – 11.9%) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021a).

The European Commission was mentioned in the qualitative media analysis concerning several events: democratic backsliding in Poland and Hungary (freedom of the press); the mistreatment of Commission President Ursula von der Leyen during an official visit to Turkey; EU sanctions against China for HR violations in Xinjiang; Iran's refusal to accept an EU invitation to participate in informal talks on the country's nuclear program; EU support for Ukraine in the context of Russian military deployment to the country's border; and COVID-related news, including vaccine procurement. Hence, the most visible EU officials are Ursula von der Leyen, Mario Draghi and Charles Michel. In 2015, the European Central Bank was the most cited EU institution, followed by the European Commission – both appearing in the context of the Greek debt crisis. The most visible EU Member States in the qualitative media analysis are France and Germany (in the context of COVID-related news), Italy (Mario Draghi becoming Prime Minister of the country), and Hungary (for curtailing press freedom and administering the non-EMA approved Sputnik vaccine). In 2015, due to the Greek debt crisis, the most mentioned member state was Greece, followed by Germany (usually mentioned in the context of negotiations with Greece). The UK ranked third, reflecting the British General Election. In the public opinion survey, more than half of the respondents consider Portugal (71.2%), Italy (68.5%), France (67.6%), Spain (62.1%), and Germany (55.9%) the most attractive European countries. As for the terms associated with the EU, survey respondents reacted positively.

The Brazilian general public observed the EU as more modern, efficient, peaceful, united and stronger in 2021 than it did in 2015, as well as less arrogant, aggressive and hypocritical. They see the EU as modern (47.8%), strong (45.3%), efficient (42%), peaceful (31.8%) and united (31.4%) – a significant improvement from 2015, when 25% of Brazil respondents perceived the EU as modern, 33.8% as strong, 25.9% as efficient, 12% as peaceful and 19.3% as united. However, Japan, the US and China are considered more modern than the EU. The US, Russia and Japan are considered stronger. Japan and China have a better record for efficiency (57.8% and 42.1). As for the negative terms, 5.4% of survey respondents find the EU arrogant, 4.7% aggressive and 3.1% hypocritical. These figures are lower than in 2015, when 13.7% of respondents considered the EU arrogant, 7.8% aggressive and 9.2% hypocritical. The interviews reveal another finding. While a few youth and experts in 2015 expressed perceptions of the EU as an arrogant actor, establishing a vertical, top-down, one-way relationship with Brazil, in 2021, both interviewees

reveal a desire for more EU pressure on the Brazilian government – particularly regarding deforestation and climate, as well as undemocratic practices and human rights violations (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021a).

In the areas of the economy and trade, the EU is perceived as very influential in global economic affairs by 55.5% of the survey respondents, behind the US (86.1%), China (69.6%), and the IMF (56%). In 2015, 49.5% of survey respondents perceived the EU as very influential and ranked it third. Now, China has surpassed the EU. Regarding the economic relations with the EU, 82.1% of the respondents agreed that the EU should have more robust economic ties with Brazil, an increase from 2015 (68.2%). In 2021, 75.5% of respondents perceived the EU as an essential trade partner (39.8% strongly agree, and 35.5% agree) and 66.4% as an important foreign investor (29% strongly agree and 37.4% agree). In 2015, numbers were lower, at 58% and 55%, respectively.

Under the thematic frame of politics, Brazilian survey respondents see the US as the most likely leader in international affairs (68.2%), followed by China (44.9%) and the EU (38%). In terms of desirability, the EU comes in third as well (36.4%), after the US (46.7%) and Japan (42.3%). China ranks poorly (21.4%). In 2015, the EU's global likelihood (31.5%) and desirability were lower (23.2%). The Brazilian public sees the US as the most critical actor in keeping worldwide peace and stability (75.7% of respondents), followed by the UN (72.5%) and then the EU (65.5%). In 2015, the EU was seen as very important by 40.8%, surpassed by the UN. Now the EU has been surpassed by the US. As for the perception of the EU's role in political affairs, in 2021, the EU is seen as performing “very good” in the fight against terrorism and radicalization (40.7%) and “fairly good” in the support for regional and international cooperation (44.5%), foreign policy (43.4%), justice and the rule of law (37.4%) and media freedom (37.7%) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and University of Canterbury, 2021b).

The surveyed Brazilian public assesses the EU's performance in social development as mostly high; in fact, higher than in 2015. The total share of “very high” and “fairly good” evaluations is over 60% in 2021 in the following areas: level of education (88.5%), overall quality of life in the EU (86.6%), creating employment opportunities (82%), social justice and solidarity (75.4%), climate change and activism (74.2%), gender equality (72%), eradication of poverty (67.9%), reducing income inequality (66.6%), protection of minorities (62.3%). In 2015, the total share of “very high” and “fairly good” evaluations were: level of education (76.6%), overall quality of life (76%), creating employment opportunities (59.6%), social justice and solidarity (65.7%), climate change and activism (73%), gender equality (64.9%), eradication of poverty (59.8%), reducing income inequality (58.4%), protection of minorities (51.7%).

Brazilian respondents evaluate the EU's role in fighting climate change and protecting the environment as “very positive” and “somewhat positive” (50.9% and 33.1%, respectively), placing the EU as the second most positively evaluated international actor in his issue area, behind the UN (57.6% and 28.5%). Traditional media (press) in the observed period rarely have news about the EU acting as an actor in the energy field. Energy is also ranked surprisingly low in the perceptions of experts and youth regarding the relevance of this topic for EU-Brazil relations.

Three policy areas received little attention in the press, but surveys can shed some light. First, while the general public perceives the EU positively in the areas of Research, Science, and Technology (RST), the EU is seen as trailing the US (82.6%), Japan (79.7%), and China (74.9%) as “very important” in advancing innovation and technological progress in the world, with 64.9%. In 2015, only 43.6% of people thought the EU was significant. The second focus is on development and assistance. When compared to other major countries/institutions providing aid to developing countries, the EU ranks third (68.6% of survey respondents), trailing the US (73.9%) and the UN (72.5%). In 2015, only 36%

thought the EU was very important in this area. Third, according to the public opinion survey, 89.6% of Brazilian respondents find EU culture and lifestyle “very attractive” or “somewhat attractive”, making the EU the most appealing international actor in the eyes of the Brazilian public (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021a).

The critical juncture in 2015 was the migration crisis and, in 2021, the pandemic. Public opinion denotes primarily positive views of the EU in the issue area of health: 82.3% of Brazilian report they have “very good” or “fairly good” perceptions of the EU in this issue area, which contrasts media and interview findings. For example, in traditional media (press), health is the second most visible theme after the economy. In the press, several articles presented the EU as a relatively ineffective actor in dealing with the pandemic in the following areas: vaccine procurement (disputes with the UK and AstraZeneca (AZ) for delays in vaccine supplies); EMA approval of Johnson & Johnson, AZ and Janssen vaccines, exclusion of Sputnik from the EU’s vaccination strategy; slow vaccine rollout; restrictions on the use of AZ by EU MSs; EU export controls of vaccines manufactured in the bloc to third countries; and discussions on a “Digital Green Pass” (travel pass after vaccinations) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021a).

In terms of normative setter, public opinion in Brazil recognizes the EU’s performance in the promotion and defense of human rights worldwide, ranking it third after the US and the UN. However, the EU was ranked second in 2015 - now surpassed by the US. Perceptions of the EU as hypocritical or lecturing other countries on issues have also persisted, particularly among young people in the interviews (PPMI, PD-PCF, and University of Canterbury, 2021a).

4.2. Mexico

Perceptions of the EU in Mexico have been dominated by the interpretations of the events occurring in the EU, the evolution of global agreements, and the role of the EU in the diversification of Mexican foreign policy. According to the 2015 survey report (PPMI, NCRE, and NFG, 2015), the general perception of the EU in Mexico has been positive in that it often is associated with an alternative model to the dominant role of the United States. In particular, there is a broad positive perception of the EU normative actorness related to democracy, human rights, and environmental protection (PPMI, NCRE, and NFG, 2015). However, some left-leaning political sectors of the population emphasize the colonial shadow of the past and the role of Spain and Europe as colonizers (PPMI, NCRE, and NFG, 2015: 173). Other studies highlight that some perceptions are reactions to short- and medium-term events that project weaknesses or challenges in the EU, such as Brexit, difficulty accommodating immigrants, political extremism, erosion of democracy, and economic crises (Dominguez, 2020). Based on activities reported on its website (Delegation of the European Union to Mexico, 2021), the EU Delegation is actively implementing activities to produce enduring networks with local actors. One of the significant bilateral policy achievements was the conclusion of the modernization of the Global Agreement, which provides a conducive and attractive platform for PD. To develop more awareness about the opportunities of the agreement, since 2018, roadshows have provided opportunities to meet with mayors, local leaders, and business communities more widely across the country. On the other hand, PD actions have started a dialogue with the most relevant think tanks in fora that include European and Mexican experts. The dialogue fields include organized crime, international relations, and global cooperation, which has successfully extended the EU’s reach in specialized influential groups (EU-MEXICO Think Tank Dialogue Initiative since 2019).

Overall, the EU in Mexico is seen as an actor of medium significance – mainly due to the perceived importance of the US. The visibility of the EU has slightly increased since 2015. The general evaluation of Mexico’s relationship with the EU is ranked as “very good” and “rather good”, yet second to the

relationships with the US, China, Japan, and Russia. When asked about opinions on the EU on selected issues, the Mexican public “strongly agree” and “agree” that Mexico should have stronger ties with the EU with 77.3%, which is a decrease from 2015 (82.5% in 2015). They also find the EU to be a significant with 77.1% (72.2% in 2015) and trustworthy with 75% (69.3% in 2015) partner. The survey also shows a share of respondents who “neither agree nor disagree” with the importance of the EU as a trustworthy was 18.8% (21.9% in 2015) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021d).

The visibility of the EU has slightly increased in Mexico since 2015. Although the online survey indicates that the Mexican public is slightly less indifferent towards the US, UN, China, and Brazil than the EU, it also shows that only 1.9% of respondents in Mexico do not know or cannot indicate how positive or negative they feel about the EU (a proxy indicator of awareness). Moreover, in 2015 the survey ranked Russia and Japan higher than the EU, and 4% of survey respondents could not indicate how they felt about the EU. In 2021, four international actors were seen as playing a significant role in Mexico: the US, which is perceived as a highly influential actor in Mexico historically, was also recurrently mentioned in focus groups and interviews; the UN, which is referenced as part of the priorities of Mexican foreign policy; China, seen as increasingly present in the Mexican economy; and Brazil, regarded as a competitor of Mexico as it is the largest economy in South America (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021d).

Due to the pandemic, Mexican social media registered the European Commission as the most frequently mentioned EU institution (1,702 times), followed by the European Parliament (1,515) and the EMA (1,411). In traditional media, in addition to the high visibility of the EMA, articles also covered the European Commission in the context of the EU’s handling of the COVID-19 pandemic and the news about the EU-Mexico Agreement; the European Parliament features in views on tensions with Russia, and several articles refer to the EU Delegation to Mexico explaining the rationale behind the EU’s restrictions for vaccines exports. Among EU officials, Josep Borrell is mentioned in different aspects of EU-Russian relations and the reactions to the EU’s policy on the exports of vaccines. Articles focusing on various aspects of EU actions in the pandemic also reference Ursula von der Leyen. Given the Greek crisis and the Iran Deal, the 2015 Study found that the European Commission and the European Central Bank were the most mentioned EU institutions. Jean Claude Juncker and Federica Mogherini were the most frequently mentioned EU officials.

When compared to the findings of the 2015 Study, associations with the EU remain similar. In the 2015 report, the EU was primarily described as multicultural and modern; and least often described as hypocritical, aggressive, or arrogant. In 2021, a large share of respondents considered the EU modern (52.8%), strong (44.3%), efficient (43.5%), united (38.2%) and multicultural (27.2%). Japan is the only country referenced more frequently than the EU in terms of being modern (75.6%), strong (53.8%), efficient (57%), and united (42.5%). The US is seen as stronger (49.9%), more modern (63.2%) and multicultural (29.3%), and China as stronger (46.9%), more modern (62.7%), and more efficient (47.8%). Only 5.2% of respondents associate the EU with negative descriptors of “hypocritical”, 4.7% “arrogant”, and 4.1% “aggressive” (in contrast to 7.3%, 14% and 8.4% respectively, in 2015). Moreover, the US and Russia are more frequently referenced with negative descriptors than the EU: “aggressive” (26.8% and 25.6%, respectively); “arrogant” (24.5% and 12.6%); and “hypocritical” (13.1% and 5.4%).

When the EU is compared to other countries and organizations in global economic affairs, public opinion ranks the EU (47.4%) sixth after the US (74.6%), China (71.9%), IMF (57.1%), Japan (50.3%) and WTO (49.2%) in terms of its global economic importance. Compared to 2015, the EU was ranked fifth, ahead of Japan. When the public is asked about the EU’s economic role in Mexico, the perception of the EU as a critical economic player is mainly positive. Under the categories of “strongly agree” and “agree”, 84.5%

of the participants in the survey mention that the EU should have stronger ties with Mexico; 76.5% view the EU as an essential trade partner for Mexico. Quite significant is that 70.1% of people agree with the perception of the EU as a critical investor in Mexico. On the negative side, 18.3% of respondents “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with the statement that the EU is an essential source of agricultural and food products for Mexico. In comparison, 62.3% of survey participants agree with the statement, “The European Union is protecting its market at the expense of others”. The 2015 report did not provide a comparative question. Still, a close response indicated that the Mexican public “strongly agree” and “agree” around 70% regarding the importance of the EU as a trade partner (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021d).

In political terms, Mexican survey respondents see the US, China, and Russia as more likely to take a strong leadership role in world affairs five years from now: approximately 80% of responses in the categories “very likely” or “somewhat likely” in contrast to around 70% for the EU and Japan. Interestingly, the Mexican public sees the EU’s leadership as very desirable (68.8%), ceding only slightly to Japan (70.6%) and closely followed by the US (65.5%), China (61.4%) and Russia (61.4%). In 2015, the EU led the responses regarding the desirability of its leadership, followed closely by Japan. Regarding the likelihood of strong leadership, more than 80% of responses chose the US, while around 70% indicated the EU, closely followed by Japan and China. Survey respondents also rank the UN (68.8%) as the key “very important” actor in maintaining global peace and stability, followed by the US (57%), China (56.4%), Russia (55%) and the EU (52.2%). The fifth place of the EU is consistent with news reports indicating the limited leverage that the EU has over Russia or China. One of the interviewees notes that while “the EU is leading in development, in which it is quite active in the international arena”, it is “less cohesive in other areas. The more an issue has to do with national sovereignty, the higher the tension with the EU and the harder it is to reach a consensus for collective action. This is the case of migration, borders, and the nuclear weapons” (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021d).

The performance of the EU is evaluated as “very good” in five areas: combating climate change and protection of the environment with 39.3% (26.4% in 2015), media freedom with 35% (29.5% in 2015), fight against terrorism and radicalization with 30.9% (25.1% in 2015), and peacekeeping with 30.2% (25.1% in 2015). Public opinion in Mexico ranks the performance of the EU as slightly worse in dealing with refugees and displaced people (8.8% of “fairly bad” or “very bad” evaluations), supporting developing countries (6.3%). One student in the focus group finds that the dramatic images of the 2015 migration crisis have negatively affected the image of the EU. Two interviewed experts also indicate that the EU’s economic assistance allocated to Mexico has decreased after Mexico was classified as a middle-income country. The Mexican public rank the UN (90.7%) as the actor that plays a “very important” or “somewhat important” role in combatting global climate change and protecting the environment, followed by the EU (89.2%), the US (85.4%) and China (84.1%) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021d).

The Mexican public ranks the EU (56.5%) fourth after China (77.2%), Japan (73%) and the US (70%) on its importance to advance to innovation and technological progress internationally. In 2015, Mexican respondents saw the EU lagging behind Japan, the US and China in the field of innovation and technologies. Regarding development and assistance, the Mexican public also references the US (50.5%) as a “very important actor” in providing support to developing countries to eradicate poverty – slightly higher than the EU (49.6%). In 2015, in terms of support for developing countries, respondents considered the EU as a critical actor, more important than the US and others, meaning that the EU has decreased its actorness in this theme since. In the area of culture, 90.5% of respondents find the EU “very attractive” or “somewhat attractive”, second after Japan (92.7%), which is similar to the 2015 Study findings. On the public perception of the EU in various fields of culture and sports, the main areas that

rank high are monuments and museums (53.9%), history (52.5%), arts (51.4%), modern architecture and design (50%), and lifestyle (47.8%) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021d).

In the traditional media analysis, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the six newspapers in Mexico publish the most significant number of articles on health-related issues. In the 2015 Study, health was not a separate thematic frame. EU policies that address COVID and vaccine exports to Mexico dominate the debate in the sample. The EMA is the most visible EU institution. In the public opinion survey, perceptions of the EU's Global Health activities are seen relatively positive ("very good" - 43.5%, and "fairly good" - 36.2%). In comparison, 15% of respondents do not provide either a good or bad evaluation. The focus group participants rank health as the fourth most crucial theme in EU policies in Mexico. One of the interviewees says: "After several adjustments and disagreements, both parties were able to cooperate in the provision of vaccinations" (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021d).

The findings of this report and the 2015 study are similar concerning positive perceptions of the EU as a normative actor and negative perceptions that derive from the EU's internal crises. The normative influence of the EU is perceived positively, but internal EU crises have evoked negative images in Mexico. The 2015 Baseline Study found that Mexico perceived the EU as a normative actor. In 2021, the Mexican public assigned the EU a prominent role in promoting human rights worldwide. The EU (85.2%) is second only to the UN (89.9%) and is slightly ahead of Japan (84.4%) and the US (79.3%). The Mexican public also considers the EU and Mexico to be like-minded in terms of norms, such as democracy with 78% (65.9% in 2015) and gender equality with 80.4% (70.6% in 2015). More than half of survey respondents in Mexico "strongly agree" or "agree" with the statement that Mexico and the EU share the same democratic principles, with 51.6% (44.8% in 2015). However, the share of those who "disagree" or "strongly disagree" with this statement is also high at 13.7% (20.5% in 2015). The Mexican public finds five values in their views that are "definitely similar" or "less similar" with the respective views of the EU: liberty with 86.9% (73.1% in 2015), respect for human dignity (84% and 70.2% in 2015), respect for human rights with 82.9% (71.8% in 2015), solidarity with 82.9% (72.9% in 2015), and non-discrimination with 76.9% (67.8% in 2015). Survey respondents also see some values as "not very similar" and "not at all similar": justice with 22.2% (28.1% in 2015), non-discrimination with 20.5% (26.5% in 2015), and equality with 19.4% (23.6% in 2015). Some interviewees believe that political polarization in Mexico and the relative erosion of democracy have created a gap between Mexico and the EU in their views of democratic principles. Here, the EU is seen as an example to follow. More than two-thirds (76.5%) of people surveyed believe that the EU is an excellent example for Mexico in promoting gender equality. This trend in public opinion is reflected among focus group participants and several interviewees who recognize the EU through the Spotlight Initiative in Mexico (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021d).

4.3. Colombia

Quiroga (2022) points out that perceptions of the EU in Colombia have recently been linked to the EU's role as a trade partner and supporter of Colombia's peace and post-conflict process. First, Colombia's relationship with the EU was primarily, but not exclusively, channeled through the Andean Community (CAN). Internal CAN disagreements slowed the regional integration process in the 2000s, resulting in the interregional EU-CAN dialogue losing relevance. The Colombian liberal economic approach and goal of encouraging investment resulted in the negotiation and ratification of the 2013 Trade Agreement between the EU, on the one hand, and Colombia and Peru, on the other. Second, the Colombian peace process has been essential to the EU-Colombian relationship. Throughout the 1990s, the EU supported a variety of projects, including the Peace Laboratories, which were agricultural projects that aimed to promote local economic development in areas plagued by poverty, illicit crops, and violence. In 2016,

the Colombian government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) signed the Peace Agreement after more than fifty years of conflict. The EU supported the negotiations, and the EU appointed Eamon Gilmore as Special Envoy for Peace Talks and established the EU Trust Fund For Peace in 2015 (Fondo Europeo para la Paz en Colombia, 2021).

According to the results of the 2021 public opinion poll, after the United States, Colombia regards the EU as the second most crucial partner (40.3% of respondents “strongly agree” or “agree” with this statement), 43.5% agree that “the EU is a trustworthy partner” and 44.5% believe “the EU should have stronger political ties” with Colombia. Regarding the frequency of reading/hearing news about the EU, 35.5% of Colombians hear/read about the EU “more or less every day” and 39.9% “about once a week”. In 2021, the most visible EU actors mentioned in the Colombian press are the European Commission, European Parliament, the EMA (due to the pandemic), and the European Central Bank. In traditional media, only a few articles mention EU officials. In the context of EU political statements, the most visible is President of the European Commission Ursula von der Leyen and High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Josep Borrell. Patricia Lombart, Head of the EU Delegation to Colombia, is visible in bilateral relations. Pedro Sanchez is the most frequently mentioned EU Member State Head on social media, which is unsurprising given Colombia’s close relationship with Spain. Colombians believe that Spain (78.6%), Italy (77.0%), France (75.6%), and Germany (68.5%) are the most appealing European countries (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021b).

Colombians most frequently associate the EU with descriptors like modern (56.4%), efficient (45.7%), strong (43.4%), united (39.5%), and multicultural (35.0%). In comparison, the public assigns the descriptor modern to Japan (74.0%), the United States (66.9%), and China (59.9%) more prominently than the EU. Japan (58.7%) and China (50.3%) receive more responses describing them as efficient. Russia (62.1%), Japan (54.0%), and the United States (52.5%) are represented as more potent than the EU. In comparison to the other actors, the EU has the lowest percentage of negative terms such as aggressive (5.8%), arrogant (4.1%), and hypocritical (3.1%). In contrast, Russia is the most aggressive (40.3%), arrogant (20.1%), and hypocritical (12.2%) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021b).

The review of the different areas of the perceptions of the EU in the international agenda indicates the following. More than half of survey participants consider the EU to be a “very influential” actor in the global economy (53.0%). Still, participants consider the US (82.2%), China (73.4%), and the International Monetary Fund IMF (61.4%) to be more influential. The EU is regarded as more significant than Japan (50.9%), the World Trade Organization (50.8%), Russia (43.5%), Brazil (13.3%), South Africa (11.6%), and India (10.3%). Less than 7% find the EU “not very influential or not influential at all”.

Under the thematic frame of politics, 74.80% of Colombians believe that the EU should take a more decisive leadership role in world affairs than the US (71.90%), Japan (65.90%), China (55%), or Russia (50%). However, the US (88.3%) is thought to be more likely to take on this role than the EU (76.70%); China (83.70%) and Russia (76.90%) are also considered more likely than the EU. The surveyed public also believes that the EU plays a “very important” role (59.5%) in maintaining global peace and stability, second only to the United States (65.9%) and the United Nations (65.8%) and followed by other international actors such as NATO (54.8%), China (53.7%), and Russia (53.1%).

In areas of social development, there is a positive trend in the perceptions of Colombian public opinion about EU actions in education (50.7%—in “very good”), overall quality of life (44.5%), creating employment opportunities (36.6%), gender equality (30.9%), social justice and solidarity (30.7%), and climate change activism (30.7%). The EU also rated “fairly good” in terms of minority protection (35.6%), poverty

eradication (34.0%), integrating migrants and refugees (35.3%), and income inequality (33.1%). On the other hand, regarding combating climate change and protecting the environment, the EU (64.0%) was ranked third “very important” global actor after the United States (66.1%) and the United Nations (64.1%).

The 2021 survey also presents information in three areas that the traditional press barely covers. In RTS, 56.1% of survey respondents believe the EU is “very important” in advancing global innovation and technological progress. However, more respondents consider China (80.3%), the United States (77.1%), and Japan (73.3%) to be “very important”. In terms of development and assistance, the EU was rated as a “very important” actor in assisting developing countries to eradicate poverty and build peace (53.3% of respondents), nearly matching the US (55.7%) and the UN (55.8%). Regarding the areas of culture, respondents see the EU as the most attractive location in terms of culture and lifestyle: 67.4% find the EU’s culture and lifestyle “very appealing”, followed by Japan (59.8%) and the United States (55.2%). In terms of monuments and museums (55.5%), history (52.8%), modern architecture and design (51.5%), arts (48.4%), sports (46.4%), music (45.1%), lifestyle (44.1%), multiculturalism (42.7%), luxury goods and clothes (41.9%), theater and cinema (41.7%), and food and cuisine (39.5%), survey respondents have a “very positive” perception of the EU (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021b).

At the time of the implementation of the survey, Colombian news and surveys were primarily focus on the COVID-19 Pandemic. The EMA’s approval of vaccines, the EU’s vaccination campaign, the study of the adverse effects of AstraZeneca vaccines, the EU’s ban on vaccine exports, and the Digital Green Pass/COVID Vaccine Passport were all highlighted and criticized in the traditional press. However, most survey participants rate the EU’s performance in global health and medical research as “very good” (40.4% and 41.8%, respectively) (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021).

Finally, regarding the role of the EU as a norm setter, Colombians acknowledge a convergence of values and norms between the EU, as 34.6% of survey respondents strongly agree and 38.1% agree with the statement “The EU is a good example for Colombia in promoting equality between women and men”. The public opinion poll also assesses the perception of individual values’ similarity to EU values. Colombians describe their values for liberty (45.6%), respect for human dignity (43.7%), respect for human rights (42.2%), pluralism (41.8%), solidarity (39.7%), equality (38.9%), the rule of law (38.7%), tolerance (38.6%), justice (38.4%), non-discrimination (37.5%), democracy (37.4%), equality between men and women (37.1%), and minority rights (35.7%) as “definitely similar” or “more or less similar” (PPMI, PD-PCF, and University of Canterbury, 2021). Colombians consider the UN (62.7%) to be “very important” in promoting and defending human rights around the world, followed by the EU (58.4%), the US (54.1%), Russia (41.7%), Japan (40.6%), and China (39.5%). These findings are consistent with the EU’s perceived role in preserving global peace and stability (59.5% rate it as “very important”).

5. Final Considerations

Overall trends in global perceptions of the EU suggest a link between positive and negative perceptions and four independent variables: a) global context, b) alignment of shared values, c) bilateral institutional development (for example, agreements and strategic partnerships) and interdependence, and d) local political culture. From this vantage point, explaining positive EU perceptions in Chile or negative perceptions in China appears straightforward. However, studying global perceptions of the EU is more difficult due to nuances in perceptions where one variable dominates more than others in a given historical context. Domestic polarization, for example, has influenced increasing negative or skepticism of the EU in recent years in the United States and Chile. More systematic research should be added to the growing body of publications that already provide valuable insights and snapshots of how regions

and countries perceive the EU. Because perceptions are heavily based on surveys, developing a systematic collection of information over time, similar to Eurobarometer, is one of the most difficult challenges.

According to the 2021 survey, perceptions of the EU (question “how you feel about the EU”) and the relationship between the EU and the three countries (question “how you evaluate the EU”) are positive overall. The average positive feelings about the EU in the three countries were 77.47% (the highest was Colombia), and the relationship evaluation was 56.4% (Brazil, the highest). Two other trends are worth noting. For both questions, the average number of respondents who chose “neither positive nor negative” is high: 17.2% for feelings about the EU and 32.37% for relationship evaluation. Mexico had the highest number in both questions. Also, the number of negative responses is low (see Tables Annex II-1 and II-2).

While all three countries are optimistic about the EU’s desirability and likelihood in world affairs, Colombia received the most positive responses, followed by Brazil and Mexico (see Tables Annex II-3 and II-4). When asked about the EU’s influence or importance in various policy areas, the survey found that Colombia had the highest positive responses about the EU in global economic affairs, fighting climate change and protecting the environment, and promoting and defending human rights. Brazilian respondents were the most optimistic about peace, security, and poverty eradication. While the perceptions of the EU Mexico received fewer positive responses in the areas above, the overall trend in the three countries is positive. The differences between the three countries are only a few % age points (see Table Annex II-5).

In the survey’s descriptors, people in the three countries associated the EU with the term “Modern” as the first option. The second was “Strong” in Brazil and Mexico (third in Colombia), and the third in both countries was “Efficient” (second in Colombia). “United” was ranked fourth in Colombia and Mexico (fifth in Brazil), and “Peaceful” was ranked fifth (fourth in Brazil). “Arrogant” was 5.4% and 4.2% in Brazil and Colombia, respectively, and “Hypocritical” was 5.1% in Mexico (see Table Annex II-7).

The policy recommendations in the 2021 Update Report combine new ideas with existing initiatives that are internally and externally regarded as best practices (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021g: 87-110). According to this working paper, many of the activities suggested by the 2021 Update Report are already being carried out by EU Delegations, raising the question of what else needs to be done to bridge the gap between the images projected by the EU and the perceptions of audiences worldwide. While no single/best/one-size-fits-all approach applies to all countries, the EU can strengthen and develop long-term strategy-oriented recommendations and short-term practice-oriented public diplomacy actions. The most challenging task is constantly reviewing and upgrading the EU’s strategic narrative, based on tangible policies projected and implemented in key partners. “Regularly fine-tune the narrative’s projection by incorporating external reception at the systemic (how the world is organized), identity (norms and values), and issue-specific (informed by concrete policies) levels” (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021f: 19)

The EU’s multiple voices but single messages in partner countries necessitate strategy coordination between EU Delegations and Embassies of EU Member States. Their collaborative efforts will help to maximize communication outreach; complement each other’s public diplomacy expertise/action; and assist smaller states that may need more diplomatic representation in a key partner country or need more resources for larger-scale public diplomacy actions on the ground. On the other hand, climate diplomacy, RST, and culture are all areas where the EU is perceived positively. Reinforcing and expanding the EU climate and cultural diplomacy across key partner countries will benefit the EU’s image. Building institutional and governance structures that mainstream climate change into more considerable organizational public diplomacy thinking is critical in terms of practice-oriented steps. Support capacity-building and funding activities in climate, RST, and culture.

Finally, in the field of digital diplomacy, as the COVID-19 pandemic has caused significant changes in public diplomacy, some long-term recommendations include capitalizing on the positive perception of the “resilient” and timely counterbalancing the emerging negative perceptions of the EU. Continue to use digital tools to reach out to audiences beyond the existing “bubbles” of those who are friendly with, interested in, and informed about the EU and engage in dialogue with diverse audiences. The 2021 Update Report recommends developing common strategic communication/public diplomacy toolkits and best practices for in-person, hybrid, and modes of learning lessons, embodying digital diplomacy and including digital diplomacy tools and trainings.

Annex 1. What is your opinion about the relationship between your country and the EU?

	Total	1997	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2018	2020
Total (6 countries)																	
Very Good	14,6%	18,4%	11,5%	14,6%	17,2%	14,0%	15,8%	12,9%	14,6%	15,9%	16,1%	12,6%	13,5%	13,7%	16,1%	13,7%	12,4%
Good	63,1%	64,1%	66,0%	63,0%	68,1%	70,0%	66,4%	65,6%	67,2%	67,3%	63,9%	60,5%	57,6%	58,6%	58,5%	57,4%	51,6%
Bad	16,9%	14,9%	17,8%	15,6%	11,7%	13,1%	14,4%	17,4%	14,5%	13,3%	16,2%	21,0%	20,7%	19,3%	18,3%	19,8%	24,3%
Very Bad	5,5%	2,5%	4,8%	6,8%	3,0%	2,8%	3,5%	4,1%	3,7%	3,5%	3,9%	5,9%	8,1%	8,4%	7,0%	9,1%	11,6%
Argentina																	
Very Good	6,3%	9,9%	3,9%	6,6%	10,9%	6,6%	5,4%	3,2%	4,3%	6,1%	1,7%	2,7%	6,8%	5,2%	11,2%	10,1%	7,4%
Good	67,9%	71,8%	71,3%	65,9%	70,1%	75,7%	71,0%	68,7%	72,2%	75,3%	68,2%	59,5%	58,7%	73,1%	66,3%	61,5%	51,9%
Bad	22,2%	16,8%	21,2%	22,8%	15,1%	15,6%	18,9%	24,1%	21,8%	17,7%	27,8%	33,4%	30,1%	18,9%	17,1%	21,6%	34,4%
Very Bad	3,6%	1,5%	3,6%	4,7%	3,9%	2,1%	4,6%	4,0%	1,7%	0,9%	2,3%	4,4%	4,5%	2,9%	5,4%	6,8%	6,3%
Brazil																	
Very Good	7,4%	3,9%	9,5%	8,5%	10,7%	9,2%	12,8%	2,7%	7,3%	11,0%	6,3%	9,9%	2,1%	5,7%	4,2%	5,9%	6,0%
Good	70,9%	74,2%	70,0%	72,7%	70,0%	70,4%	68,2%	72,5%	77,3%	73,8%	75,6%	74,8%	72,7%	66,6%	65,1%	68,5%	62,4%
Bad	18,7%	18,3%	16,7%	13,6%	15,1%	18,0%	16,6%	22,5%	14,1%	12,8%	16,3%	13,6%	22,7%	24,2%	27,2%	22,4%	26,6%
Very Bad	3,0%	3,6%	3,8%	5,2%	4,3%	2,4%	2,3%	2,3%	1,2%	2,4%	1,8%	1,7%	2,5%	3,5%	3,5%	3,1%	5,1%
Chile																	
Very Good	21,5%	22,7%	13,2%	19,6%	22,8%	18,6%	19,7%	19,6%	23,5%	24,3%	29,7%	26,4%	26,6%	20,7%	19,6%	17,0%	20,5%
Good	71,3%	65,3%	79,3%	74,7%	74,6%	76,4%	72,1%	73,3%	72,6%	72,2%	63,7%	64,3%	67,3%	73,2%	70,9%	71,5%	68,7%
Bad	6,0%	11,6%	6,8%	4,2%	2,3%	4,7%	7,7%	6,6%	3,6%	2,8%	6,5%	6,1%	4,8%	5,3%	7,6%	8,8%	7,8%
Very Bad	1,1%	0,4%	0,7%	1,5%	0,2%	0,4%	0,5%	0,5%	0,3%	0,6%	0,1%	3,2%	1,3%	0,7%	1,9%	2,6%	2,9%
Colombia																	
Very Good	21,8%	23,0%	12,0%	20,5%	21,8%	20,7%	21,5%	23,9%	27,4%	26,3%	24,7%	18,7%	18,3%	19,4%	23,2%	22,2%	22,6%
Good	61,3%	70,1%	72,7%	55,0%	64,0%	61,4%	62,2%	61,7%	58,0%	62,7%	65,1%	59,6%	56,9%	61,2%	61,9%	61,0%	50,3%
Bad	13,1%	6,5%	13,4%	17,5%	11,8%	14,2%	13,8%	12,3%	11,5%	9,7%	8,0%	18,1%	17,3%	15,2%	11,4%	11,6%	17,4%
Very Bad	3,8%	0,5%	1,9%	7,1%	2,4%	3,7%	2,5%	2,0%	3,1%	1,4%	2,3%	3,6%	7,6%	4,2%	3,6%	5,2%	9,6%

	Total	1997	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2018	2020
Mexico																	
Very Good	15,6%	19,5%	14,3%	14,3%	10,7%	10,6%	15,3%	15,5%	13,3%	13,8%	19,7%	11,8%	14,1%	21,4%	25,5%	20,7%	10,4%
Good	60,3%	48,8%	60,2%	61,9%	72,2%	71,2%	66,2%	59,6%	63,7%	63,8%	60,9%	60,4%	53,6%	50,2%	55,1%	57,0%	57,0%
Bad	17,6%	24,5%	20,6%	17,4%	15,1%	13,6%	12,9%	19,3%	16,9%	16,1%	13,4%	23,2%	22,7%	17,4%	12,9%	15,0%	21,3%
Very Bad	6,4%	7,1%	4,9%	6,4%	2,0%	4,6%	5,6%	5,5%	6,2%	6,3%	5,9%	4,7%	9,6%	11,0%	6,5%	7,3%	11,3%
Venezuela																	
Very Good	14,0%	28,4%	14,5%	17,6%	26,2%	17,0%	19,1%	12,1%	12,5%	12,0%	13,9%	7,0%	9,6%	8,6%	10,3%	8,1%	7,0%
Good	46,8%	58,5%	45,2%	46,3%	56,6%	65,5%	58,7%	57,8%	57,7%	55,4%	49,8%	44,2%	37,6%	27,3%	35,2%	25,2%	21,1%
Bad	24,6%	11,0%	27,5%	19,4%	11,7%	13,5%	16,6%	20,2%	20,0%	22,5%	25,4%	31,2%	29,8%	36,0%	34,4%	38,2%	39,3%
Very Bad	14,6%	2,1%	12,8%	16,7%	5,6%	4,0%	5,6%	9,9%	9,7%	10,1%	10,9%	17,6%	23,1%	28,1%	20,2%	28,6%	32,7%

Source: Elaborated based on Latinobarometer Data (Latinobarometer, 2022)

Annex II. Frequency Tables elaborated based on Tables of the Survey (PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury, 2021e: 50-218)

Table Annex II-1						
Q1. How positive or negative you feel about the EU						
	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Neither positive nor negative	Somewhat negative	Very negative	Do not know/ Cannot answer
Brazil	38,2%	38,0%	17,8%	2,7%	1,0%	2,3%
Colombia	41,0%	38,4%	15,6%	2,8%	0,8%	1,4%
Mexico	38,0%	38,8%	18,2%	2,3%	0,7%	2,0%

Table Annex II-2						
Q3. Which of the following words best describes your country's overall relationship with the EU?						
	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Neither positive nor negative	Somewhat negative	Very negative	Do not know/ Cannot answer
Brazil	22,5%	36,6%	24,9%	8,6%	3,5%	3,9%
Colombia	22,9%	35,4%	32,5%	4,6%	0,9%	3,7%
Mexico	19,3%	32,7%	39,7%	4,6%	0,5%	3,1%

Table Annex II-3						
Q4. How desirable or undesirable is it that the EU takes a strong leadership role in world affairs?						
	Highly desirable	Somewhat undesirable	Neither desirable nor undesirable	Somewhat undesirable	Highly undesirable	Do not know/ Cannot answer
Brazil	36,4%	31,3%	17,2%	7,3%	4,9%	2,9%
Colombia	37,0%	37,8%	17,8%	3,9%	2,2%	1,4%
Mexico	34,5%	34,3%	23,1%	4,9%	2,4%	0,8%

Table Annex II-4

Q5. How likely or unlikely is it that the EU will take a strong leadership role in world affairs five years from now?						
	Very likely	Rather likely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Rather unlikely	Very unlikely	Do not know/ Cannot answer
Brazil	38,0%	33,9%	17,3%	5,8%	2,9%	2,1%
Colombia	38,0%	38,8%	14,9%	5,7%	1,8%	0,8%
Mexico	36,7%	38,5%	16,5%	5,8%	1,3%	1,2%

Table Annex II-5

How influential/important, if at all, in (area) is the EU?					
Q6. Global Economic Affairs					
	Very influential	Somewhat	Not very influential	Not at all influential	Do not know/
Brazil	55,5%	31,6%	8,1%	2,0%	2,8%
Colombia	53,0%	36,4%	7,8%	1,7%	1,1%
Mexico	47,4%	37,8%	11,7%	1,1%	1,9%
Q7. Peace and stability					
Brazil	65,5%	24,7%	6,4%	1,8%	1,6%
Colombia	59,5%	30,0%	7,3%	2,3%	0,9%
Mexico	52,2%	36,1%	8,6%	1,5%	1,7%
Q8. Fighting global climate change and protecting the environment					
Brazil	67,6%	22,9%	5,4%	2,5%	1,7%
Colombia	64,0%	27,7%	5,9%	1,4%	1,0%
Mexico	60,2%	29,0%	7,8%	1,6%	1,3%
Q10. Erradication of poverty and building a fairer and more stable world					
Brazil	68,5%	21,8%	5,2%	2,1%	2,3%
Colombia	53,3%	31,7%	9,9%	3,4%	1,7%
Mexico	49,6%	34,9%	10,4%	2,6%	2,5%
Q11. Promoting and defending human rights worldwide to protect human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity					
Brazil	71,0%	19,6%	4,8%	2,3%	2,3%
Colombia	58,4%	32,2%	5,9%	2,4%	1,1%
Mexico	52,0%	33,2%	9,3%	2,9%	2,7%
Q12. Advancing innovation and technological progress in the world					
Brazil	64,9%	25,7%	5,7%	1,5%	2,2%
Colombia	56,0%	32,2%	9,2%	1,0%	1,5%
Mexico	56,5%	32,7%	7,2%	1,3%	2,4%
Q13. Attractive in terms of their culture and lifestyle					
Brazil	59,4%	30,2%	5,6%	2,5%	2,2%
Colombia	67,5%	25,4%	5,2%	1,1%	0,9%
Mexico	62,1%	28,4%	6,1%	1,5%	1,9%

Table Annex II-6

EU's Performance						
	Very good	Fairly good	Neither good nor bad	Fairly bad	Very bad	Do not know/ cannot answer
Q14_2. Global trade						
Brazil	57,8%	29,8%	6,2%	2,4%	0,8%	3,0%
Colombia	48,2%	36,9%	11,4%	1,4%	0,5%	1,6%
Mexico	48,7%	36,8%	10,8%	2,1%	0,3%	1,2%
Q14_4. Agriculture						
Brazil	37,3%	35,2%	17,4%	4,4%	1,4%	4,4%
Colombia	30,7%	33,1%	26,6%	4,4%	0,8%	4,4%
Mexico	30,0%	35,2%	27,7%	4,1%	0,4%	2,6%
Q14_11. Global Health						
Brazil	51,5%	30,8%	10,9%	3,0%	1,4%	2,4%
Colombia	40,4%	36,3%	16,2%	3,5%	0,7%	2,8%
Mexico	43,5%	36,2%	15,0%	3,1%	0,5%	1,7%

Table Annex II-7

Q17_2. The EU is a trustworthy partner to your country in international relations						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know/ cannot answer
Brazil	25,7%	36,5%	26,7%	5,4%	1,8%	3,8%
Colombia	26,9%	43,5%	20,9%	3,4%	1,4%	3,9%
Mexico	28,6%	46,4%	18,8%	3,3%	0,2%	2,6%

Table Annex II-8

Q2. Which of the following words best describes the EU? Select as many words as apply to it										
	Modern	Peaceful	Efficient	Strong	United	Trustworthy	Multicultural	Hypocritical	Arrogant	None of these
Brazil	47,8%	31,8%	42,0%	45,3%	31,4%	24,2%	4,7%	3,0%	5,4%	3,6%
Colombia	56,4%	32,5%	45,8%	43,3%	39,5%	27,8%	5,8%	3,1%	4,2%	1,9%
Mexico	52,8%	31,2%	43,4%	44,3%	38,2%	24,2%	4,2%	5,1%	4,7%	2,2%

References

- BAUMLER, B. (2019): *EU Public Diplomacy: Adapting to an Ever-Changing World*, Los Angeles, University of Southern California.
- BLANCO, L. F. and LUCIANO, B. T. (2018) “Understanding EU’s strategic partnerships in Latin America: a comparative assessment of EU-Brazil and EU-Mexico relations”, *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 26 (4), pages 459-472.
- CHABAN, N. and HOLLAND, M. (2014): “The Evolution of EU Perceptions: from single studies to systematic research”, in CHABAN, N. and HOLLAND, M. (eds.): *Communicating Europe in the Times of Crisis: External Perceptions of the European Union*, New York, Palgrave-McMillan, pages 1-23.
- CHABAN, N. and HOLLAND, M. (eds.) (2019): *Shaping the EU Global Strategy. Partners and Perceptions*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- CHANONA, A. (2010): “So Far, So Close? Mexico’s Views of the EU”, in S. LUCARELLI and F. LORENZO (eds.): *External Perceptions of the European Union as a Global Actor*, New York, Palgrave, pages 120-134.
- COSGROVE, K. (2022): *Donald Trump and the Branding of the American Presidency: The President of Segments*, Switzerland, Palgrave Pivot.
- CROSS, M. and MELISSEN, J. (2013): *European public diplomacy: soft power at work*, New York, Palgrave MacMillan.
- DELEGATION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION TO MEXICO (2021): “Press”. Available at: https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/mexico_en. Accessed 3 August 2021.
- DOMINGUEZ, R. (2011): “The Perceptions of the EU in Latin America”. The Third International Conference “Europe From the Outside In”. The Kolleg-Forschergruppe “Transformative Power of Europe”, Berlin, December 15-17.
- (2019): “Strategic Partner and Model of Governance: EU Perceptions of Mexico”, in CHABAN, N. and HOLLAND, M. (eds.) (2019): *Shaping the EU Global Strategy Partners and Perceptions*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, pages 147-164
- (2020): “Perceptions of the EU/Brexit in Mexico: Offsetting Negative Impacts”, in N. CHABAN, A. NIEMANN and J. SPEYER (eds.): *Changing Perceptions of the EU at Times of Brexit. Global Perspectives*, London, Routledge, pages 132-146.
- (2021): “The EU and Mexico: The Strategic Partnership in the Context of the Global Agreement”, in L. C. FERREIRA-PEREIRA and M. SMITH (eds.): *The European Union’s Strategic Partnerships. Global Diplomacy in a Contested World*, Switzerland, Palgrave MacMillan, pages 269-289
- DOMINGUEZ, R., RIBEIRO HOFFMANN, A., SANDRIN, P. and QUIROGA, A. (2022): “Journal of Contemporary European Studies”, *EUPD performance in Latin America: Assessing the cases of Brazil, Mexico and Colombia*. Doi: 10.1080/14782804.2022.2094901.
- FAGAN, M. and GUBBALA, S. (2022): “Positive views of European Union reach new highs in many countries”, Pew Research Center, Available at: <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2022/10/13/positive-views-of-european-union-reach-new-highs-in-many-countries/>. Accessed 1 December.
- FERREIRA-PEREIRA, L. C. (2021): “European Union-Brazil Relations: A Strategic Partnership in Suspended Animation”, in L. C. FERREIRA-PEREIRA and M. SMITH (eds.): *The European Union’s Strategic Partnerships. Global Diplomacy in a Contested World*, Switzerland, Palgrave MacMillan, pages 151-176
- FERREIRA-PEREIRA, L. C., and SMITH, M. (2021): *The European Union’s Strategic Partnerships. Global Diplomacy in a Contested World*, Switzerland, Palgrave MacMillan.
- FERREIRA-PEREIRA, L. and MOURATO PINTO, J. (2021): “Soft Power in the European Union’s Strategic Partnership Diplomacy: The Erasmus Plus Programme”, in L. C. FERREIRA-PEREIRA and M. SMITH (eds.): *The European Union’s Strategic Partnerships. Global Diplomacy in a Contested World*, Switzerland, Palgrave, pages 69-94.
- FIORAMONTI, L. (2009): “Is the European Union a ‘better option’? Public opinion and elites’ discourse in Venezuela”, in L. FIORAMONTI and S. LUCARELLI (eds.): *The EU Viewed by the Others: Drawing Some Conclusions*, Firenze, Research Project 5.2.1. GARNET - Jointly Executed Research Project 5.2.1.

- FONDO EUROPEO PARA LA PAZ EN COLOMBIA (2021): “About The European Trust Fund for Colombia”. Available at: <https://www.fondoeuropeoparalapaz.eu/en/about-eutf/>. Accessed August 2.
- GONZÁLEZ, G., SCHIAVON, J. A., CROW, D. and MALDONADO, G. (2011): *Las Américas y el Mundo 2010-2011. Opinión pública y política exterior en Brasil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico y Peru*, Mexico City, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas.
- HANG N., THI, L. and HONG QUANG, T. (2021): “Public Diplomacy in Strengthening India: Vietnam Relations”, *India Quarterly* 77 (2), pages 209-303.
- KADIR, J. A. (2018): “Editorial: Special Issue on Soft Power and Public Diplomacy in East Asia”, *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia* 17 (1), pages 1-4.
- KOS-STANISH, L. and CAR, V. (2021): “The Use of Soft Power in Digital Public Diplomacy: The Cases of Brazil and India in the EU”, *Croatian Political Science Review* 58 (2), pages 113-140.
- LANGAN, M. (2021): “An Unhealthy Relationship? The European Union’s Health Interventions and Public Diplomacy in Africa in the context of the COVID-19 Pandemic”, *Workshop Public Diplomacy* Online (May 21).
- LATINOBAROMETER (2022): “Online Analysis”. Latinobarometer. Available at: <https://www.latinobarometro.org/latOnline.jsp>. Accessed December 20.
- (2021a): “What are Latin America’s perceptions on the European Union?”. Available at: <https://data.nuso.org/en/about-the-survey>. Accessed 1 December.
- (2021b): “Data. Best partner in the following areas”. Available at: <https://data.nuso.org/en/best-partner-in-the-following-areas/>. Accessed 1 December.
- LUCARELLI, S., and FIORAMONTI, L. (2010): *External Perceptions of the European Union as a Global Actor*, New York, Palgrave.
- MALDONADO, G., GONZÁLEZ, G., SCHIAVON, J.A., MÉNDEZ GUTIÉRREZ, G.A., and RAMÍREZ OLGUÍN, C. (2020): *México, las Américas y el Mundo 2018-2019. Reporte de la encuesta de opinión pública y política exterior durante el 2018 y 2019*, Mexico City, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas and Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung.
- MALDONADO, G., MORALES CASTILLO, R., GONZÁLEZ, G., CROW, D., and SCHIAVON, J. A. (2016): *Mexico, the Americas, and the World 2004-14, Ten Years of Public Opinion and Foreign Policy*, Mexico City, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas.
- MELISSEN, J. (2005): “The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice”, in J. MELISSEN: *The new public diplomacy: Soft power in international relations*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, pages 3-27.
- NITOIU, C. and PASATOIU, F. (2021): “Public diplomacy and the persistence of the conflict and cooperation dichotomy in EU-Russia relations”, *Workshop on Public Diplomacy* Online (May 21).
- NOYAN, O., and STUART LEESON, S. (2022): “EU has huge potential for closer partnership with Latin America, study says”, *EurActiv-Event Report* (Jun-Aug).
- NYE, J. S. (2004): *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York, Public Affairs.
- PEW RESEARCH CENTER (2022): “Global Attitudes and Trends Team”. Available at: <https://www.pewresearch.org/about/research-teams/global-attitudes-and-trends-team/>. Accessed December 22, 2022
- PPMI, NCRE, and NFG (2015): “Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU’s Policies Abroad”, December 7.
- (2021): “Update of the 2015 Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU’s Policies Abroad”, November 15.
- PPMI, PD-PCF, and The University of Canterbury (2021a): “Brazil”, in PPMI, PD-PCF and University of Canterbury (eds.): *Update of the 2015 Perceptions Study: Final Report. Volume II*, pages 11-32.
- (2021b): “Colombia”, in in PPMI, PD-PCF and University of Canterbury (eds.): *Update of the 2015 Perceptions Study: Final Report. Volume II*, pages 81-108.
- (2021c): “Country Summaries”, in PPMI, PD-PCF and University of Canterbury (eds.): *Update of the 2015 Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU’s Policies Abroad. Executive summary and volume I*, pages 71-111.
- (2021d): “Mexico”, in PPMI, PD-PCF and University of Canterbury (eds.): *Update of the 2015 Perceptions Study: Final Report. Volume II*, pages 178-198.

- (2021e): *Update of the 2015 Analysis of the Perception Study. Annex II: Comparative Public Opinion Survey Report*.
 - (2021f): *Update of the 2015 Perception Study. Executive summary*, Funded by the European Union.
 - (2021g): *Update of the 2015 Perception Study. Final Report. Volume I*: Funded by the European Union.
- RIBEIRO HOFFMANN, A. and SANDRIN, P. (2016): “The EU seen from Brazil: Images and Perceptions”, ECPR, Prague.
- SANDRIN, P. and RIBEIRO HOFFMANN, A. (2018): “Silences and Hierarchies in European Union Public Diplomacy”, *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 61 (1), pages 1-18.
- (2019): “The EU seen from Brazil: Images and Perceptions”, in CHABAN, N. and HOLLAND, M. (eds.): *Shaping the EU Global Strategy: Partners and Perceptions*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, pages 27-54
- SCHIAVON, J. A., and DOMÍNGUEZ, D. (2015): “Latin American Perceptions of Europe and the European Union”, *Stosunki Międzynarodowe-International Relations* 51 (1), pages 127-140.
- SMELTZ, D., DAALDER, I., FRIEDHOFF, K., KAFURA, C. and SULLIVAN, E. (2022): *Pivot to Europe: US Public Opinion in a Time of War*, Chicago, Chicago Council on Global Affairs.
- SNOW, N. (2009). “Rethinking Public Diplomacy”, in N. SNOW and N. J. CULL (eds.): *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, New York, Routledge, pages 3-11.
- SONG, W. and AI, W. (2022): “Role conflict, its compromise, and the European Union’s public diplomacy in China”, *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*. *Manuscript in this volume*.
- WEIFFEN, B., and NOLTE, D. (2020): *Regionalism Under Stress. Europe and Latin America in Comparative Perspective*, Abingdon on Thames, Routledge.
- YOON, S.-W. and CHUNG, S.-W. (2020). “The EU’s Public Diplomacy in Asia and the World through Social Media: Sentiment and Semantic Network Analyses of Official Facebook Pages of European External Action Service and EU Delegation to the Republic of Korea”, *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia* 19 (2), pages 234-263.



Fundación Carolina, January 2023

Fundación Carolina
Plaza del Marqués de Salamanca nº 8
4ª planta, 28006 Madrid - España
www.fundacioncarolina.es
[@Red_Carolina](https://twitter.com/Red_Carolina)

ISSN-e: 1885-9119

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33960/issn-e.1885-9119.DT76en>

How to cite:

Domínguez, R. (2023): "Perceptions of the European Union in Latin America",
Documentos de trabajo nº 76en (2ª época), Madrid, Fundación Carolina.

The views and opinions expressed in this text are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect
the official policy or position of Fundación Carolina.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

