World Public Opinion. org

World Public Opinion on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

July 1, 2008

Q31-IP1: In the Israel-Palestinian conflict, do you think [Country] should take Israel's side, take the Palestinians' side, or not take either side?

	Take Israel's side	Take the Palestinians' side	Take neither side	DK/NS
Mexico	3	4	88	5
Peru	4	4	76	17
US	21	3	71	5
France	4	6	79	12
Great Britain	2	8	79	11
Russia	7	7	58	28
Spain [*]	7	12	64	17
Ukraine	4	4	69	23
Azerbaijan	6	19	54	22
Egypt	5	86	9	0
Iran	3	63	18	16
Turkey	4	42	38	17
Nigeria	15	23	55	7
China	2	10	74	14
India	24	23	22	32
Indonesia	7	38	43	12
South Korea	10	5	82	3
Thailand	6	7	64	24
Average	7	20	58	15

^{*} Take neither side combines Spanish answers of "take neither side" plus "take both sides"

Q32-IP2: I would like to know how well you think various parties are doing their part in the effort to resolve the Israel-Palestinian conflict.

Q32a-IP2a: How well do you think Israel is doing its part: very well, somewhat well, not very well, or not well at all?

	Very well	Somewhat well	Very / Somewhat well	Not very well	Not well at all	Not very / Not at all well	DK / NS
Mexico	1	27	28	23	34	57	16
US	4	26	30	41	18	59	11
France	2	16	18	38	26	64	18
Great Britain	4	20	24	37	20	57	20
Russia	4	10	14	24	17	41	46
Ukraine	2	8	10	22	10	32	58
Azerbaijan	11	8	19	28	31	59	23
Egypt	2	11	13	46	42	88	0
Turkey	3	7	10	8	55	63	27
Nigeria	14	24	38	31	19	50	12
China	4	37	41	29	10	39	20
India	11	24	35	16	9	25	40
Indonesia	4	10	14	44	22	66	20
South Korea	8	19	27	52	17	69	3
Thailand	2	13	15	20	13	33	51
Average	5	17	22	31	23	54	24
Palestinian ter.	4	9	13	20	61	81	6
Average w/ Palestinian ter.	5	17	22	30	25	55	23

Q32b-IP2b: What about the Palestinians?

	Very well	Somewhat well	Very / Somewhat well	Not very well	Not well at all	Not very / Not at all well	DK / NS
Mexico	1	23	24	24	37	61	15
US	2	13	15	47	28	75	11
France	1	12	13	44	22	66	21
Great Britain	3	18	21	41	16	57	22
Russia	2	10	12	27	14	41	47
Ukraine	1	6	7	22	12	34	60
Azerbaijan	11	14	25	32	18	50	24
Egypt	12	51	63	32	5	37	0

Turkey	12	19	31	11	31	42	28
Nigeria	15	31	46	28	15	43	12
China India Indonesia South Korea Thailand	3 11 11 3 5	37 23 38 19 12	40 34 49 22 17	32 17 24 58 20	4 9 6 16 13	36 26 30 74 33	24 40 21 4 50
Average	6	22	28	31	16	47	25
Palestinian ter.	40	35	75	10	5	15	10
Average w/Palestinian ter.	8	23	31	29	16	45	24

Q32c-IP2c: What about the US?

	Very well	Somewhat well	Very / Somewhat well	Not very well	Not well at all	Not very / Not at all well	DK / NS
Mexico	3	11	14	14	63	77	9
France Great Britain Russia Ukraine	2 4 3 1	13 18 7 6	15 22 10 7	27 37 20 20	44 22 29 21	71 59 49 41	15 20 41 53
Azerbaijan Egypt Palestinian ter. Turkey	7 3 2 2	12 13 10 6	19 16 12 8	20 43 22 7	38 43 55 57	58 86 77 64	23 0 11 27
Nigeria	23	30	53	21	17	38	10
China India Indonesia South Korea Thailand	2 9 3 5 10	13 24 17 23 17	15 33 20 28 27	43 20 41 40 15	26 14 19 30 11	69 34 60 70 26	16 33 20 3 46
Average	5	15	20	26	33	59	22
US Average w/ US	7 5	37 14	44 19	31 26	15 34	46	10 21

Q32d-IP2d: What about the Arab countries?

	Very well	Somewhat well	Very / Somewhat well	Not very well	Not well at all	Not very / Not at all well	DK / NS
Mexico	2	26	28	18	37	55	17
US	1	11	12	47	31	78	11
France	1	9	10	37	32	69	21
Great Britain	3	20	23	37	14	51	26
Russia	2	10	12	22	15	37	51
Ukraine	1	5	6	17	11	28	66
Azerbaijan	6	13	19	27	22	49	32
Palestinian ter.	4	29	33	34	23	57	10
Turkey	2	10	12	9	49	58	30
Nigeria	19	26	45	25	18	43	13
China	3	37	40	25	5	30	31
India	16	18	34	18	13	31	35
Indonesia	13	37	50	22	4	26	24
South Korea	2	17	19	59	17	76	5
Thailand	4	10	14	19	13	32	54
Average	5	18	23	28	20	48	28
Egypt	9	62	71	19	10	29	
Average w/Egypt	5	19	24	28	21	49	27

Q32e-IP2e: What about the European Union?

	Very well	Somewhat well	Very / Somewhat well	Not very well	Not well at all	Not very / Not at all well	DK / NS
France	2	31	33	32	16	48	19
Great Britain	6	25	31	33	12	45	25

Q32f-IP2f: What about [country]?

	Very well	Somewhat well	Very / Somewhat well	Not very well	Not well at all	Not very / Not at all well	DK / NS
Great Britain	7	26	33	35	12	47	19
Russia	10	26	36	10	7	17	47

Q33-IP3: Here are some things that the UN Security Council could offer to do if Israel and the Palestinians were to come to a peace agreement. Please say whether you favor or oppose the UN Security Council saying that it would be willing to:

Q33a-IP3a: Send a peacekeeping force to enforce the peace agreement

	Favor	Oppose	DK/NS
Mexico	82	15	3
US	61	31	8
France	74	21	5
Great Britain	67	21	13
Russia	47	25	29
Spain	60	23	17
Ukraine	35	32	33
Azerbaijan	74	14	12
Egypt	64	36	0
Palestinian ter.	63	35	3
Turkey	65	16	19
Nigeria	89	9	2
China	81	11	8
India	50	18	32
Indonesia	88	4	9
South Korea	83	16	1
Thailand	50	9	41
Average	67	20	14

Q33b-IP3b: Make a commitment to protect Israel if it is attacked by its Arab neighbors

	Favor	Oppose	DK/NS
Mexico	57	35	8
US	53	37	10
France	65	25	11
Great Britain	51	30	19
Russia	28	36	37
Ukraine	15	39	46
Azerbaijan	57	21	22
Egypt	16	84	0
Palestinian ter.	12	85	4
Turkey	43	31	25
Nigeria	61	32	6
China	80	11	8
India	34	34	32

Indonesia	48	34	19
South Korea	65	31	4
Thailand	31	16	53
Average	45	36	19

Q33c-IP3c: Make a commitment to protect Arab countries if they are attacked by Israel

	Favor	Oppose	DK/NS
Mexico	66	26	8
US	38	50	12
France	61	25	14
Great Britain	54	29	18
Russia	27	34	39
Ukraine	15	38	47
Azerbaijan	63	15	22
Egypt	82	18	
Palestinian ter.	75	20	5
Turkey	50	24	26
Nigeria	67	27	7
China	84	9	7
India	28	19	53
Indonesia	71	11	19
South Korea	63	30	6
Thailand	32	14	54
Average	55	24	21

RESEARCH PARTNERS

Country	Research Center Contact			
Azerbaijan	International Center for Social Research	Dr. Tair Faradov <u>tfaradov@yahoo.com</u> (+99 412) 492 27 34/672 22 49		
China	WorldPublicOpinion.org	Dr. Stephen Weber sweber@pipa.org +1 202 232 7500		
Egypt	Attitude Market Research	Mr. Mohamed Al Gendy mgendy@attitude-eg.com +202 22711262		
France	Efficience 3	Ms. Laetitia Larreguy laetitia.l@efficience3.com +33 3 26 79 75 82		
Great Britain	Chatham House (Royal Institute of International Affairs) / GlobeScan	Dr. Robin Niblett rniblett@chathamhouse.org.uk +44 (0)20 7314 3667 Mr. Lloyd Hetherington lloyd.hetherington@globescan.com +1 416 962 0707		
India	Team CVoter	Mr. Yashwant Deshmukh yashwant@teamcvoter.com 91 120 4247135		
Indonesia	Synovate	Ms. Eva Yusuf Eva.Yusuf@synovate.com (+62-21) 2525 608		
Iran	WorldPublicOpinion.org	Dr. Stephen Weber sweber@pipa.org +1 202 232 7500		
Mexico	<u>Reforma</u>	Dr. Alejandro Moreno <u>alejandro.moreno@reforma.com</u> +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		
Peru	Grupo de Opinión Publica, Universidad de Lima	Dr. Luis Benavente lbenaven@correo.ulima.edu.pe (+511) 437-6767		
Russia	<u>Levada Center</u>	Ms. Ludmila Khakhulina lkhahul@levada.ru (+7 095) 229-55-44		

South Korea	East Asia Institute	Dr. Han Wool Jeong hwjeong@eai.or.kr +82 02-2277-1683		
Spain	Elcano Royal Institute	Mr. Javier Noya <u>jnoya@rielcano.org</u> + 34 91 781 6770		
Thailand	ABAC Poll Research Center, Assumption University	Dr. Noppadon Kannika noppadonknn@au.edu +66-2-719-1550		
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
Azerbaijan	602	4.1	Jan 13 – Feb 5, 2008	Face-to-face	National
China	1000	3.2	Jan 10-25, 2008	Telephone	Urban ¹
Egypt	600	4.1	Jan 17-27, 2008	Face-to-face	Urban ²
France	600	4.1	Feb 5-11, 2008	Telephone	National
Great Britain	800	3.5	Jan 29 – Feb 19, 2008	Telephone	National
India	1023	3.2	February 25-29, 2008	Face-to-face	National ³
Indonesia	811	3.5	Jan 19-29, 2008	Face-to-face	National ⁴
Iran	710	3.8	Jan 13 – Feb 9, 2008	Face-to-face	National
Mexico	850	3.4	Jan 25-27, 2008	Telephone	National ⁵
Nigeria	1000	3.2	February 7-18, 2008	Face-to-face	National ⁶
Palestinian territories	626	4.0	February 10-23, 2008	Face-to-face	National ⁷
Peru	597	4.1	March 15-16, 2008	Face-to-face	Urban ⁸
Russia	1600	3.5	Jan 18-22, 2008	Face-to-Face	National ⁹
South Korea	600	4.1	Feb 11-12, 2008	Telephone	National
Spain	600	4.1	Mar 26 – Apr 9, 2008	Telephone	National
Thailand	2699	1.9	Apr 21 – May 6, 2008	Face-to-face	National ¹⁰
Turkey	719	3.7	Jan 12-24, 2008	Face-to-face	National
Ukraine	2046	3.1	Feb 8-18, 2008	Face-to-face	National ¹¹
United States	1309	3.3	Jan 18-27, 2008	Internet	National ¹²

¹ In China, the survey was a national probability sample of urban telephone households across China. A stratified PPS sample design was developed to sample 20 cities; urban households represent approximately 45 percent of the Chinese population.

² In Egypt, the survey was executed in the urban areas of Cairo, Alexandria, Giza, and Subra. These four urbanized areas represent75 percent of Egypt's urban population, which is 42 percent of the national population.

³ 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.

⁴ In Indonesia, a national probability sample was conducted in both urban and rural areas and covering approximately 87 percent of Indonesia's population.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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.

⁸ In Peru, the survey was executed in the metropolitan areas of Lima and Callao, representing 31 percent of the population.

⁹ In Russia, all items were half sampled; each item was answered by 800 respondents.

¹⁰ In Thailand, the survey was conducted in 10 provinces of the country including Bangkok, Samutprakarn, Chantaburi, Ratchaburi, Chiang Mai, Kampangpet, Kornkean, Sakonnakorn, Chumporn, and Songkla.

¹¹ In the Ukraine, all items were half-sampled; each item was answered by at least 1,020 respondents.

¹² 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 940 respondents.