

WORLDPUBLICOPINION.ORG

World Opinion on Addressing Hunger and Poverty

October 15, 2008

Q1. Do you think the developed countries do or do not have a moral responsibility to work to reduce hunger and severe poverty in poor countries?

	Do	Do not	DK / NS
Argentina	85	10	5
Mexico	90	8	1
US	81	17	2
France	79	19	2
Germany	87	12	1
Britain	81	14	5
Italy	89	10	2
Russia	54	29	17
Ukraine	87	6	7
Egypt	71	27	3
Jordan	81	11	8
Palestinian Ter.	50	49	1
Turkey	81	15	4
Kenya	92	8	1
Nigeria	87	12	1
China	83	5	12
India	72	14	13
Indonesia	87	4	8
S Korea	90	10	1
Taiwan	91	5	4
Average	81	14	5

Q2. As you may know, [country] is a member of the OECD, a group that includes most industrialized countries. These countries have agreed to a set of goals, called the Millennium Development Goals. A key goal has been to cut hunger by half throughout the world and reduce severe poverty by the year 2015. If the cost of achieving these goals were shared among these countries, the cost for [citizens] would be [enter country amount - see chart] per person per year. Assuming the people in the other countries were willing to pay their share, would you be willing to pay [enter country amount - see chart*] a year to cut hunger by half and reduce severe poverty?

	Would be willing	Would not be willing	DK / NS
US	75	22	3
France	86	14	1
Germany	76	20	4
Britain	79	15	6
Italy	84	12	4
Russia	54	24	23
Turkey	78	11	10
S Korea	80	18	1
Average	77	17	7

*Per person, per year cost to cut hunger by half and reduce severe poverty in respondent's currency:

	Amount in \$USD	Amount in Respondent's Currency
France	\$45	29 EUROS
Italy	\$39	25 EUROS
Great Britain	\$49	25 POUNDS
South Korea	\$23	24,000 WON
Turkey	\$10	12 LIRAS
US	\$56	\$56
Germany	\$43	27 EUROS
Russia	\$11	257 RUBLES

WORLDPUBLICOPINION.ORG

RESEARCH PARTNERS

Country	Research Center	Contact
Argentina	Graciela Romer y Asociados	Ms. Graciela C. Römer graciela@romer.com.ar (+54-11) 4345-2864/5
China	Fudan Media and Public Opinion Research Center (FMORC), Fudan University	Dr. Baohua Zhou zhoubaohua@yeah.net
Egypt	Attitude Market Research	Mr. Mohamed Al Gendy mgendy@attitude-eg.com +202 22711262
France	Efficiencie 3	Mr. Samuel Lee samuel.1@efficiencie3.com +33 3 26 79 03 59
Germany	Ri*Questa GmbH	Dr. Bernhard Rieder riquesta.rieder@t-online.de +49 (0)7641 934336
Great Britain	Chatham House (Royal Institute of International Affairs) / Facts International	Dr. Robin Niblett rniblett@chathamhouse.org.uk +44 (0)20 7957 5702
India	Centre for Voting Opinion & Trends in Election Research (CVoter)	Mr. Yashwant Deshmukh yashwant@teamcvoter.com 91 120 4247135
Indonesia	Synovate	Ms. Eva Yusuf Eva.Yusuf@synovate.com (+62-21) 2525 608
Italy	Demoskopoea	Ms. Clara Mariotti mariotti@demoskopoea.it +39 06 85.37.52.26
Jordan	Center for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan	Dr. Fares Braizat f.braizat@gmail.com (+962 6) 5300100
Kenya	Research Path Associates Limited	Mr. Stephen Dimolo Ashers steve.ashers@rpa.co.ke +254-20-2734770
Mexico	Reforma	Dr. Alejandro Moreno alejandromoreno@reforma.com +52 56 28 72 35
Nigeria	Market Trends Research International	Mr. Michael Umogun m.umogun@research-intng.com + 234-1 791 79 87

Palestinian Territories	Palestinian Center for Public Opinion	Dr. Nabil Kukali kukali@p-ol.com (+972-2) 2774846
Russia	Levada Center	Ms. Ludmila Khakhulina lkahul@levada.ru (+7 095) 229-55-44
South Korea	East Asia Institute	Dr. Han Wool Jeong hwjeong@eai.or.kr +82 02-2277-1683
Taiwan	TVBS	Mr. Wang Yeh-Ding ydwang@tvbs.com.tw +886-2-23568961
Turkey	ARI Foundation / Infakto Research Workshop	Mr. Yurter Ozcan Yurter@arifoundation.org +1 (804) 868 0123 Dr. Emre Erdogan emre.erdogan@infakto.com.tr +90 212 231 07 08
Ukraine	Kiev International Institute of Sociology	Dr. Vladimir Illich Paniotto paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua (+38) 044 537-3376 / (+38) 044 501-7403
United States	Program on International Policy Attitudes / Knowledge Networks	Dr. Stephen Weber sweber@pipa.org +1-202-232-7500 Dr. Michael Dennis mdennis@knowledgenetworks.com +1-650-289-2160

METHODOLOGY

Country	Sample Size (unweighted)	MoE (%)	Field dates	Survey methodology	Type of sample
Argentina	679	3.8	August 20-29, 2008	Face-to-face	Urban ¹
China	1011	3.2	Jul 26 – Aug 2, 2008	Telephone	National ²
Egypt	600	4.0	Jul 21 – Aug 1, 2008	Face-to-face	Urban ³
France	600	4.1	August 5 - 12, 2008	Telephone	National
Germany	1008	3.1	Jul 15 – Aug 12, 2008	Telephone	National
Great Britain	803	3.5	Jul 31 – Aug 8, 2008	Telephone	National
India	1118	3.0	Aug 30 – Sep 2, 2008	Face-to-face	National ⁴
Indonesia	716	3.7	Jul 26 – Aug 18, 2008	Face-to-face	National ⁵
Italy	600	4.1	July 16-30 and Sep 4-10, 2008	Telephone	National
Jordan	583	4.1	August 12-15, 2008	Face-to-face	National
Kenya	1000	3.2	July 17-30, 2008	Face-to-face	National
Mexico	850	3.4	August 9-10, 2008	Telephone	National ⁶
Nigeria	1000	3.2	August 9-18, 2008	Face-to-face	National ⁷
Palestinian territories	638	4.0	August 1-7, 2008	Face-to-face	National ⁸
Russia	800	3.5	Aug 15-20, 2008	Face-to-Face	National
South Korea	600	4.1	August 28-29, 2008	Telephone	National
Taiwan	823	4.1	August 22-31, 2008	Telephone	National
Turkey	1023	3.1	Jul 28 – Aug 18, 2008	Face-to-face	National

Ukraine	1043	3.1	Aug 30 – Sep 9, 2008	Face-to-face	National
United States	875	3.4	August 9-20, 2008	Internet	National ⁹

¹ In Argentina, the survey was executed in the urban areas of Capital Federal and Gran Buenos Aires, representing 35 percent of Argentina’s population.

² In China, the survey was a probability sample of urban and rural households with land-line telephones in the provinces of Anhui, Hebei, Heilongjiang, Hubei, Jiangsu, Shanxi, Shanghai, Sichuan, and Yunnan—representing approximately 60 percent of the mainland Chinese population. The sample was 40 percent rural, 60 percent urban (rural households make up approximately 55 percent of the population).

³ In Egypt, the survey was executed in the urban areas of Cairo, Alexandria, Giza, and Subra. These four urbanized areas represent 75 percent of Egypt’s urban population, which is 42 percent of the national population.

⁴ In India, a face-to-face survey was conducted in urban and rural areas in 14 of the largest Indian states; these states comprise 77 percent of India’s population. The sample is 60 percent urban, India’s population is approximately 30 percent urban.

⁵ In Indonesia, a national probability sample was conducted in both urban and rural areas and covering approximately 87 percent of Indonesia’s population.

⁶ In Mexico, a random telephone sample of adults who had landline telephones was conducted in all 31 states and the Federal District. Telephone penetration in Mexico is 55 percent.

⁷ In Nigeria, the sample was developed by selecting six states, one per geographic region, based upon their size and representativeness. Within each state, sampling points were selected by means of a multi-stage random sample which disproportionately sampled urban areas. The final sample is 75 percent urban; Nigeria is approximately 50 percent urban.

⁸ In the Palestinian territories, a face-to-face national probability survey was conducted among the population of the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip.

⁹ In the United States, the poll was an online survey drawn from a nationally representative sample of the Knowledge Networks online panel. This panel is probabilistically-based, selected from the population of US telephone households and subsequently provided with an Internet connection if needed. Items in the US survey were split sampled so that each item was answered by at least 870 respondents.