

WORLDPUBLICOPINION.ORG

World Public Opinion on Racial and Ethnic Equality

March 20, 2008

Q1: How important is it for people of different races and ethnicities to be treated equally?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol)	DK / NS
Mexico	94	5	1	0	0	0
USA	79	17	2	1	0	0
France	69	25	2	2	1	1
Great Britain	87	10	1	0	0	1
Russia	37	46	10	3	1	3
Ukraine	50	37	8	2	1	3
Azerbaijan	68	21	8	2	1	1
Egypt	71	26	3	0	0	0
Iran	62	20	2	1	0	14
Palestinian ter.	70	23	5	2	0	1
Turkey	73	15	5	3	2	2
Nigeria	71	25	3	1	1	0
China	90	8	1	0	0	1
India	44	15	5	5	30	2
Indonesia	75	14	5	1	2	3
S Korea	71	23	5	1	0	0
Average	69	21	4	2	2	2

Embargoed until 21:00 GMT 20 March 2008

Q2: Thinking about the course of your lifetime, would you say, compared to the past, people of different races and ethnicities are now treated much more equally, a little more equally, a little less equally, much less equally, or that there has been no real change?

	Much more equally	A little more equally	A little less equally	Much less equally	No real change	Minorities are treated better than the majority (vol.)	DK / NS
Mexico	11	55	10	2	19	0	1
US	42	40	6	2	10	0	0
France	12	50	10	6	20	0	2
Great Britain	39	40	5	2	12	0	2
Russia	12	25	12	8	25	4	15
Ukraine	10	26	6	5	38	1	12
Azerbaijan	20	19	12	7	31	4	6
Egypt	17	47	24	11	0	0	0
Iran	32	44	5	2	5	0	12
Palestinian ter.	7	20	36	18	12	4	3
Turkey	16	38	13	7	9	2	13
Nigeria	11	32	28	17	10	2	0
China	34	44	13	2	4	1	4
India	27	27	9	10	9	5	15
Indonesia	31	51	8	2	4	1	4
S Korea	4	67	6	2	20	0	0
Average	20	39	13	6	14	2	6

Embargoed until 21:00 GMT 20 March 2008

Q3: Do you think the government should make an effort to prevent discrimination based on a person's race or ethnicity, or do you think the government should not be involved in this kind of thing?

	Should make an effort	Should not be involved	Government does too much (vol.)	DK / NS
Mexico	94	5	1	1
USA	83	17	0	0
France	85	12	1	3
Great Britain	85	13	0	2
Russia	71	11	4	14
Ukraine	71	16	3	10
Azerbaijan	70	11	12	7
Egypt	73	27	1	0
Iran	76	10	0	14
Palestinian ter.	64	15	17	4
Turkey	79	8	4	9
Nigeria	90	8	2	0
China	90	8	0	2
India	46	17	6	31
Indonesia	88	8	2	2
S Korea	96	4	0	0
Average	79	12	3	6

[Ask if “Should make an effort” or DK/NS in Q3]

Q3a: Do you think the government is doing enough in this regard or do you think it should do more?

	Doing enough	Should do more	Government is doing too much (vol.) (Q3+Q3a)	Should not be involved (Q3)	DK / NS
Mexico	7	86	1	5	1
US	38	45	0	17	0
France	18	68	1	12	1
Great Britain	31	54		13	3
Russia	24	35	4	11	25
Ukraine	19	46	3	16	16
Azerbaijan	34	33	16	11	6
Egypt	36	37	1	27	0
Iran*	40	31	1	10	19
Palestinian ter.	13	50	19	15	4
Turkey	25	52	5	8	10
Nigeria	9	79	3	8	1
China	20	70	0	8	2
India	24	28	21	17	10
Indonesia	17	66	2	8	7
S Korea	5	91	0	4	0
Average	22	54	5	12	7

* In Iran, respondents that answered “Don't know/Not sure” on Q3 were not asked Q3a.

Embargoed until 21:00 GMT 20 March 2008

Q4: Do you think that employers should or should not be allowed to refuse to hire a qualified person because of the person's race or ethnicity?

	Should	Should not	DK / NS
Mexico	24	72	3
US	13	86	1
France	6	94	1
Great Britain	16	83	1
Russia	18	72	10
Ukraine	15	77	9
Azerbaijan	8	82	10
Egypt	25	75	0
Iran	12	72	16
Palestinian ter.	23	74	3
Turkey	18	72	10
Nigeria	34	64	1
China	10	88	3
India	30	43	27
Indonesia	13	84	3
S Korea	41	58	1
Average	19	75	6

Embargoed until 21:00 GMT 20 March 2008

[Ask if “Should not” or DK/NS in Q4]

Q4a: Do you think the government has the responsibility to try to prevent employers from refusing to hire someone because of a person’s race or ethnicity or do you think the government should not be involved in this kind of thing?

	Has responsibility	Should not be involved	Should be allowed not to hire (Q4)	DK / NS
Mexico	64	9	24	2
USA	69	17	13	1
France	69	23	6	3
Great Britain	69	13	16	2
Russia	58	13	18	11
Ukraine	65	10	15	10
Azerbaijan	72	9	8	10
Egypt	56	19	25	0
Iran*	61	5	12	22
Palestinian ter.*	53	19	23	4
Turkey	23	43	18	16
Nigeria	56	8	34	1
China	77	11	10	3
India	27	20	30	24
Indonesia	80	3	13	4
S Korea	53	6	41	0
Average	60	14	19	7

* In Iran and the Palestinian territories, respondents that answered “Don't know/Not sure” on Q4 were not asked Q4a.

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. Rosemary Hollis RHollis@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
Russia	Levada Center	Ms. Ludmila Khakhulina lkhahul@levada.ru (+7 095) 229-55-44

Embargoed until 21:00 GMT 20 March 2008

South Korea	East Asia Institute	Dr. Han Wool Jeong hwjeong@eai.or.kr +82 02-2277-1683
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
Russia	1600	3.5	Jan 18-22, 2008	Face-to-Face	National ⁸
South Korea	600	4.1	Feb 11-12, 2008	Telephone	National
Turkey	719	3.7	Jan 12-24, 2008	Face-to-face	National
Ukraine	2046	3.1	Feb 8-18, 2008	Face-to-face	National ⁹
United States	1309	3.3	Jan 18-27, 2008	Internet	National ¹⁰

- 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% of Egypt's urban population, which is 42% 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% urban, India's population is approximately 30% urban.
- ⁴ In Indonesia, a national probability sample was conducted in both urban and rural areas and covering approximately 87% 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%.
- 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% urban; Nigeria is approximately 50% 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 the Ukraine, all items were half-sampled; each item was answered by at least 1,020 respondents.
- ¹⁰ 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.