

Embargoed Until 15:01 GMT Tuesday, June 24 2008

WORLDPUBLICOPINION.ORG

World Public Opinion on Torture

June, 24 2008

Q30-T1: Most countries have agreed to rules that prohibit torturing prisoners. Which position is closer to yours?

	Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives	Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture	DK / NS
Mexico	24	73	3
US	44	53	3
France	16	82	2
Great Britain	16	82	3
Poland	27	62	11
Russia	36	49	15
Spain	11	82	7
Ukraine	26	59	15
Azerbaijan	33	54	12
Egypt	46	54	0
Iran	35	43	22
Palestinian ter.	28	66	6
Turkey	51	36	13
Nigeria	54	41	5
China	28	66	6
India	59	28	13
Indonesia	34	61	5
S Korea	51	48	1
Thailand	44	36	19
Average	35	57	9

Embargoed Until 15:01 GMT Tuesday, June 24 2008

[Ask only those who answer “Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives” in Q30-T1]

Q30a-T1a: What about cases that have nothing to do with terrorism? Do you think that there should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases or that in general governments should be allowed to use torture to try to get information?

	Clear rules should be maintained (Q30)	Should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases - Depends - DK	Governments should be allowed to use torture	DK/NS on Q30
Mexico	73	17	7	3
US	53	31	13	3
France	82	12	4	2
Great Britain	82	11	4	3
Poland	62	20	7	11
Russia	49	29	7	15
Spain	82	6	6	7
Ukraine	59	18	8	15
Azerbaijan	54	26	8	12
Egypt	54	40	6	0
Iran	43	28	8	22
Palestinian ter.	66	23	5	6
Turkey	36	34	18	13
Nigeria	41	39	15	5
China	66	10	18	6
India	28	47	12	13
Indonesia	61	29	6	5
S Korea	48	38	13	1
Thailand	36	34	10	19
Average	57	26	9	8

WORLDPUBLICOPINION.ORG

RESEARCH PARTNERS

Country	Research Center	Contact
Azerbaijan	International Center for Social Research	Dr. Tair Faradov tfaradov@yahoo.com (+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	Efficienc3	Ms. Laetitia Larreguy laetitia.l@efficienc3.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	Reforma	Dr. Alejandro Moreno alejandro.moreno@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
Poland	CBOS	Dr. Michal Wenzel m.wenzel@cbos.pl (+0-22) 693 47 25 / 693 46 93

Embargoed Until 15:01 GMT Tuesday, June 24 2008

Russia	Levada Center	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 jnoya@rielcano.org + 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
Poland	870	3.4	Nov 29 – Dec 4, 2007	Face-to-face	National
Russia	1600	3.5	Jan 18-22, 2008	Face-to-Face	National ⁸
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 ⁹
Turkey	719	3.7	Jan 12-24, 2008	Face-to-face	National
Ukraine	2046	3.1	Feb 8-18, 2008	Face-to-face	National ¹⁰

Embargoed Until 15:01 GMT Tuesday, June 24 2008

United States	1309	3.3	Jan 18-27, 2008	Internet	National ¹¹
---------------	------	-----	-----------------	----------	------------------------

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 represent 75 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 Russia, all items were half sampled; each item was answered by 800 respondents.

⁹ In Thailand, the survey was conducted in 10 provinces of the country including Bangkok, Samutprakarn, Chantaburi, Ratchaburi, Chiang Mai, Kampanget, Kornkean, Sakonnakorn, Chumporn, and Songkla.

¹⁰ In the Ukraine, all items were half-sampled; each item was answered by at least 1,020 respondents.

¹¹ 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.